

A Biblical Review of Critical (Race) Theory

Michael D. Finney

May 11, 2021

Updated March 4, 2022

Contents

Introduction	1
CT is a Worldview (WV)	3
Definition of a WV	3
Proponents Call CT a WV	5
Questions Asked by a WV	7
CT History	8
CT Contrasted with the Bible: WV Questions	9
Knowledge	9
God.....	12
Humanity.....	16
Morality.....	19
CT is a Social Justice WV	21
Social Justice Issues	21
Abortion Rights.....	21
Homosexual Rights.....	23
Transgender Rights	24
Social Justice Equity	25
Social Justice Issues from a Christian Perspective	28
Social (Justice) Gospel.....	29
SJ is Anti-Biblical Justice	30
Conclusion	30
Bibliography	32

Introduction

Özlem Sensoy and Robin DiAngelo wrote one of my daughter’s college textbooks, called *Is Everyone Really Equal?*¹ It was an advanced English Honors Course called “Harry Potter and Social Justice.” You may not have heard of Sensoy, but DiAngelo is a popular speaker known for her book, *White Fragility*.² Sensoy and DiAngelo believe that everyone has a “worldview” and that “Everything we do in the world (our actions) is guided by a worldview (our theory).”³ The theory or worldview that Sensoy and DiAngelo endorse is called Critical Theory or Critical Race Theory (CT or CRT).⁴

The most basic understanding of this theory is that it divides everyone up into “identity groups” based on whether or not they are the “oppressor” or “oppressed.”⁵ For example, in a textbook called, *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*, heterosexism is identified as one of many “forms of oppression” because it normalizes male-female sexual relationships at the expense of homosexual relationships.⁶ Consequently, the biblical position that heterosexual behavior is normal and “natural” while homosexual behavior is “that which is against nature” is inherently oppressive (Rom 1:26).⁷ In fact, Queer Theory (QT), a cousin of CT, teaches that the belief in any established norm is oppressive. Consequently, Christians who believe that a moral

¹ Özlem, Sensoy and Robin DiAngelo, *Is Everyone Really Equal?: An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2017), cover.

² Robin J. DiAngelo, *White Fragility: Why It’s so Hard to Talk to White People about Racism* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2018), cover.

³ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, xxvi, 28.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁵ Helen Pluckrose and James Lindsay, *Cynical Theories: How Activist Scholarship Made Everything about Race, Gender, and Identity-and Why This Harms Everybody* (Durham, NC: Pitchstone Publishing, 2020), 277.

⁶ Maurianne Adams and Lee Anne Bell, *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge), 57.

⁷ *Ibid.*

lawgiver determines universal, unchanging moral norms are members of an oppressive hegemony.

Furthermore, you are oppressive because of *who* you are, not *what* you do. For example, suppose you are a white, male, heterosexual, Christian. In that case, you have no “lived experiences” as a “subordinated identity,” and you experience unfair privilege because of your position in these oppressive groups.⁸ Consequently, you are guilty of racism, misogyny, homophobia, and religious intolerance by birth. It is the new “original sin.”⁹

Although CT has flown under most Christians' radar, it has been growing by leaps and bounds among progressives for some time. It is now evident in public education at all levels, government agencies including the military, social media, big tech, and the news media. It has also entered the church.¹⁰ Many professing believers and church leaders have accepted CT; therefore, Christian apologists need to develop a biblical response to this antibiblical worldview (1 Cor 10:4; Eph 6:12; 1 Pet 3:15; Jude 1:3).

However, some within the church claim that CT is not a worldview; it is just a tool to view racism.¹¹ They also argue that those of us who reject CT and CRT (Critical Race Theory, a cousin of CT) do so because we are “too fragile” to discuss race (*White Fragility*).¹² However,

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Jim Goad, *Whiteness: The Original Sin* (Stone Mountain, GA: Obnoxious Books, 2018), 1.

¹⁰ Kate Shellnutt, “Southern Baptists Keep Quarreling Over Critical Race Theory,” *Christianity Today*, December 3, 2020, assessed January 21, 2021, <https://www.christianitytoday.com/news/2020/december/southern-baptist-critical-race-theory-debate-crt-seminary-s.html>.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, “Foreword,” paragraph 4.

they really mean that oppressors should be quiet and listen to the oppressed because they have more knowledge and “competence to speak.”¹³

Consequently, whites, males, heterosexuals, and Christians should follow the lead of non-whites, non-males, non-heterosexuals, and non-Christians and learn from their “lived experiences.”¹⁴ This CT worldview is based on “power and oppression;” it comes straight out of liberation, “feminist, womanist, and queer theologies,” and it is bringing a “postmodern critical lens to Christianity.”¹⁵ What have we learned from them? “God has taken sides,” and He is the greatest oppressor of all.¹⁶

CT is not just hostile to Western Civilization; it is hostile to the Bible and the God of the Bible. CT is a tool, but it is a tool for viewing the world. Consequently, it is a worldview, and it is antithetical to a Biblical Worldview.

CT is a Worldview (WV)

Definition of a WV

The word, worldview “comes from the German word *Weltanschauung*,” and it literally means “to look at the world.”¹⁷ All of us have certain beliefs concerning the world we live in;

¹³ Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 2017), 11.

¹⁴ Adams and Bell, *Teaching for Diversity*, 57.

¹⁵ Buetta Warkentin and Alexander Sawatsky. "Points of Discourse: Reconciling Christianity and Social Work through Critical Theory, " *Social Work and Christianity* 45, no. 2 (Summer, 2018), 62.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ David Scott, “A Church Without a View: Jonathan Edwards and Our Current Lifeview Discipleship Crisis,” *Christian Apologetics Journal* 7, no. 2 (2008): 27–28.

“everyone has a worldview.”¹⁸ Our worldview is based on how we answer questions about “the most fundamental issues we as human beings need to consider.”¹⁹ For example:

- Is there a God?
- Why are we here?
- How do we know anything?
- What is morally or ethically wrong?

On the other hand, our worldview is *not only* based on *how* we answer these questions; it is also a *tool* we use to answer additional questions. As we accumulate knowledge and experience, we begin to form our worldview; then, as we develop our worldview, we begin to use this new framework or map for answering other questions about the world. In other words, “our worldview presuppositions” are used to determine how “we interpret data that we encounter” throughout life.²⁰ That means using the *wrong worldview* to interpret data can lead to even more *wrong conclusions* about the world.

On the other hand, we all have a way of looking at data and using it to confirm our view of the world.²¹ For example, I am a Christian with a biblical worldview, and I became convinced that the Bible was God’s word some time ago. Furthermore, it is unreasonable to believe that everything came from nothing (the Big Bang). Creation itself was, by definition, a supernatural event, so I know that we live in a supernatural world.

Consequently, I have no problem believing in the supernatural resurrection of Jesus based on historical evidence if that is where the evidence leads. On the other hand, those who reject all

¹⁸ Tawa J. Anderson, W. Michael Clark, and David K. Naugle, *An Introduction to Christian Worldview: Pursuing God’s Perspective in a Pluralistic World* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic: An Imprint of InterVarsity Press, 2017), 69.

¹⁹ James W. Sire, *The Universe next Door: A Basic Worldview Catalogue* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009), 12.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 35-37.

²¹ Anderson, et al., *An Introduction*, 31.

supernatural experiences will usually not even consider whether or not Jesus rose from the grave regardless of the evidence because of a worldview bias. For example, Renowned agnostic and Religious Studies professor at UNC, Bart Ehrman, admits that he refuses to “consider the possibility of a miracle” or supernatural event in *any* “historical investigation.”²² Despite his argument that this is not due to an atheistic “antisupernatural (*sic*) bias,” that is precisely what it is.²³ Still, we should all be aware that we have a certain amount of bias built into our worldview, and we should be upfront about it when discussing worldviews with others.

Recognizing our biases does not mean we should use *opposing* worldviews to make sense of the world. However, some professing Christians insist that competing *frameworks* can be used as “*analytical tools*” for learning things about our world; they are mistaken (*emphasis added*).²⁴ Our worldview or tool is like a pair of glasses or lenses that shade our view of the world a certain way.²⁵ If our worldview glasses are incorrect, we have a poor view; if the framework is flawed, the whole structure might come crumbling down, and if the map is wrong, then we are headed in the wrong direction (1 Cor 13:12; Luke 6:49; Matt 15:14). Consequently, using a *correct* worldview (glasses, map, or framework) is critical to a *correct* view of the world we live in (Heb 13:4).

Proponents Call CT a WV

Özlem Sensoy and Robin DiAngelo, authors of the college textbook on Social Justice and CT mentioned above, also use *glasses*, *maps*, and *frameworks* to illustrate how they believe

²² Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (and Why We Don't Know About Them)* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009), 172.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Shellnutt, “Southern Baptists,” *Christianity Today*, paragraph 5.

²⁵ Anderson, et al., *An Introduction*, 8.

worldviews function. They teach that a “useful metaphor” for how we “make sense of the world is to think of our culture as a pair of *glasses* that we wear at all times” (*emphasis added*).²⁶ These glasses operate like “cultural *maps* we follow to navigate and make sense of our lives and new things we encounter” (*emphasis added*).²⁷ In fact, they refer to CT as the basis for their “critical social justice *framework*” (*emphasis added*).²⁸ Finally, they also teach that: “Everything we do in the world (our actions) is guided by a worldview (our theory)” (parentheticals are theirs).²⁹ Likewise, a member of the CT family, Critical Race Theory (CRT), is called by its proponents “a theoretical *framework*” (*emphasis added*).³⁰ In other words, multiple academic sources advocating CT refer to it as “a *worldview* dedicated to examining issues of race, racism, and systems of power” (*emphasis added*).³¹ Systems of power and oppression are essential concepts of all variations of CT. All critical theorists (CT, CRT, QT, SJT, etc.) answer the most critical worldview questions the same way. Consequently, since CT provides a framework for answering most of life’s fundamental questions, and since its proponents call it a worldview, it is a worldview.

Furthermore, it views a Christian worldview, sometimes referred to as “Christian hegemony,” as a systematically oppressive worldview.³² Therefore, “social justice educators” seek to challenge a biblical worldview by making it a “more inclusive world view.”³³ They

²⁶ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 43.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 28.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 46.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.

³⁰ Ruben J. Garcia, "Critical Race Theory and Proposition 187: The Racial Politics of Immigration Law" *Scholarly Works*, Paper 662 (1995): 120.

³¹ Jessica T. DeCuir-Gunby, “Using Critical Race Mixed Methodology to Explore the Experiences of African Americans in Education,” *Educational Psychologist* 55, no. 4 (2020), 244, 246.

³² Adams and Bell, *Teaching for Diversity*, 255.

³³ *Ibid.*, 32.

believe that all “religions are ‘alive’ and that they grow and change.”³⁴ Consequently, CT is a social justice worldview that seeks to define and *alter, not simply aid*, a biblical worldview.

Questions Asked by a WV

Some crucial questions separating worldviews have to do with how they approach the nature of God, humanity, knowledge, and morality.³⁵ For example, suppose you believe that there is no God, that human life results from an accidental chemical evolutionary process, that knowledge is obtained by reason using empirical research, and that morality is subjective. In that case, you probably have a naturalistic atheistic worldview. On the other hand, if you believe in a personal trinitarian God who created a good universe; man brought sin into the world; knowledge is obtained by studying God’s natural revelation (His creation) and His revealed Word (the Bible), and morality is objective and based on God’s character, then you probably have a biblical or Christian worldview.

Other worldviews include Deism, Islamic Theism, Pantheism, Nihilism, Existentialism, and Postmodernism (this is not meant to be an exhaustive list). There are also variations within each worldview. For example, there are dispensationalists and covenant theologians with differing eschatological views about the last days, but both have a biblical worldview. Likewise, some naturalists believe in the eternity of matter, and some believe that matter and the universe had a beginning. There are also variations among the Postmodern worldviews. One such variation is Critical Theory.³⁶

³⁴ Ibid., 290.

³⁵ James P. Eckman, *The Truth about Worldviews: A Biblical Understanding of Worldview Alternatives* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004), 13.

³⁶ Jeff Myers and David A. Noebel, *Understanding the Times: A Survey of Competing Worldviews* (Colorado Springs, CO: David C Cook, 2015), chapter 15, section 5, “Postmodernism.”

CT History

CT, as a term, “was first coined in 1937.”³⁷ CT was used as “a code word” for “Marxism,” a “social theory rooted in Hegelian-Marxist” theories.³⁸ Marx believed that the proletariat class (the workers) was oppressed by the bourgeois (the capitalist middle class). He prophesied that conditions would become so bad for the workers that they would eventually rebel against their capitalist oppressors.³⁹ However, there never was an economic revolution; instead, capitalism resulted in an increased middle class and an improved quality of life for the working class.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, CT is sometimes called “Cultural Marxism” because it “takes the Marxist ideas of oppressed and oppressor classes and applies them to other identity categories, such as race, gender, and sexuality.”⁴¹

In other words, Marxist intellectuals were waiting for capitalism to fail but what they saw was “that capitalism was developing in a direction opposite the way that Marxism said it should develop.”⁴² Furthermore, Marxist intellectuals realized that proletariats would never advance the cause without a push.⁴³ Therefore, they recognized the “need for a modification of classical Marxist theory.”⁴⁴ First, they “realized that only a major cultural revolution *led by intellectuals*”

³⁷ Douglas Kellner, "Critical Theory and the Crisis of Social Theory," *Sociological Perspectives* 33, no. 1 (1990): 20.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Paul Johnson, *Intellectuals* (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1988), 63-64.

⁴⁰ Gregory Clark, *A Farewell to Alms, A Brief Economic History of the World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2007), 260-272.

⁴¹ Pluckrose and Lindsay, *Cynical Theories*, 277.

⁴² Stephen R.C. Hicks, *Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault* (Milwaukee, WI: Scholarly Publishing, 2004), 136.

⁴³ Ibid., 140-141.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 140.

could bring about the desired changes (*emphasis added*).⁴⁵ This new cultural emphasis is another reason CT is sometimes referred to as *Cultural Marxism*.⁴⁶

Marxist intellectuals also began to rethink their “epistemology.” In the “1920s and 1930s, there had been some early suggestions that Marxism was too rationalist, too logical, and deterministic.”⁴⁷ Some believed that finishing off capitalism would require an “initiative” that was “neither rational nor inexorable but rather subjective and unpredictable.”⁴⁸ As a result, Cultural Marxism rejected the parts of Marxism that they saw as “too wedded to reason.”⁴⁹ Consequently, Cultural Marxists changed their epistemology, their views on the nature of knowledge, to a subjective relativism and became part of the postmodern worldview family.

CT Contrasted with the Bible: WV Questions

Knowledge

This epistemological shift answers one of our worldview questions; how does CT view knowledge? Cultural Marxism, or CT, rejects rational, empirical knowledge in favor of lived experiences. Sensoy and DiAngelo argue “that knowledge is socially constructed.”⁵⁰ They go so

⁴⁵ Walter L. Adamson, *Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980), 92.

⁴⁶ Pluckrose and Lindsay point out that early postmodernism rejected Marxism. Postmodernism was a rejection of science, and Marx claimed that his theory was based on social science (it was not; see Paul Johnson's book, *Intellectuals*), so early postmodernism did reject Marxism. However, postmodernism supposedly rejects all metanarratives (i.e., truth claims or worldviews) which would not only result in the rejection of Marxism and Christianity, but also the rejection of postmodernism (the rejection of all truth claims is a truth claim). Nevertheless, a postmodern rejection of Marxism is not the same as a rejection of *Cultural Marxism*, nor does it prove that Cultural Marxism rejected postmodernism. CT was developed by Marxists and began with most of the same Marxist philosophies which it expanded. It is like Marxism on steroids.

⁴⁷ Hicks, *Explaining Postmodernism*, 156.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 1, 15, 228.

far as to deny that “ $2+2=4$.”⁵¹ Now, to be specific, CT proponents do not deny that two plus two might *sometimes* equal four; it is just that it might *not* always equal four. This relativity sounds like it comes straight out of George Orwell’s dystopian future in his book called *1984*.

Orwell fictionalized the view that truth or “reality is simply a social construct” and took it to its nightmarish conclusion.⁵² Winston, the main character, was tortured until he realized that two plus two could sometimes be “five.”⁵³ Likewise, “the conceptual operating system underlying” CT is that any approach that accepts the view that two plus two equal four “as an objective statement of basic arithmetic contributes to a system of oppression.”⁵⁴ When atheist and mathematician James Lindsay tweeted “ $2+2=4$,” Hannah-Jones, the author of the debunked “1619 Project,”⁵⁵ retweeted, “Using Arabic numerals to try to make a point about white, Western superiority is just so damn classic.”⁵⁶

In other words, CT rejects logic and reason, including simple arithmetic, because they are oppressive tools used to keep the dominant group in control.⁵⁷ Instead, CT favors the “lived experiences and perspectives that marginalized groups bring to bear on an issue due to their

⁵¹ James Lindsay, “ $2+2$ Never Equals 5,” *New Discourses*, August 3, 2020, paragraph 5, accessed April 20, 2021, <https://newdiscourses.com/2020/08/2-plus-2-never-equals-5/>.

⁵² Timothy Sandefur, “Reviews: *Cynical Theories: How Activist Scholarship Made Everything about Race, Gender, and Identity—and Why This Harms Everybody* by Helen Pluckrose and James Lindsay.” *The Objective Standard*, November 25, 2020, accessed April 20, 2021. <https://theobjectivestandard.com/2020/10/cynical-theories-how-activist-scholarship-made-everything-about-race-gender-and-identity-and-why-this-harms-everybody-by-helen-pluckrose-and-james-lindsay/>.

⁵³ George Orwell, *1984* (New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin, 1949), 197, Kindle.

⁵⁴ Lindsay, “ $2+2$ Never Equals 5,” paragraph 11.

⁵⁵ The Heritage Foundation, “New York Times Quietly Edits ‘1619 Project’ After Conservative Pushback,” *The Heritage Foundation*, September 26, 2020, paragraph 12, accessed April 20, 2021, <https://www.heritage.org/american-founders/impact/new-york-times-quietly-edits-1619-project-after-conservative-pushback>).

⁵⁶ Lindsay, “ $2+2$ Never Equals 5,” paragraph 7.

⁵⁷ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 18.

insider standing.”⁵⁸ Notice that they are not referring to all lived experiences. The lived experience of oppressed groups is superior to the *objective knowledge* and *lived experiences* of the privileged. In other words, marginalized peoples “have special knowledge based solely on their ethnicity.”⁵⁹ Or, as the professed antiracist T. J. Yosso writes, “CRT recognizes that the *experiential knowledge of People of Color* is legitimate, appropriate, and critical to understanding, analyzing and teaching about racial subordination” (*emphasis added*).⁶⁰ Anyone who disagrees is guilty of disagreeing with SJ “scholars;” consequently, they should be “shut down” and silenced.⁶¹ After all, these *are* self-professing SJ *experts!* They have mastered SJ issues and have a “more complex *understanding* of social phenomena,” and everyone else should bow to their expertise (*emphasis added*).⁶²

Voddie Baucham rightly labels this as “Ethic Gnosticism” from the Greek word *gnosis* for knowledge.⁶³ Gnosticism is considered by many to have been the “most serious threat to early Christian faith.”⁶⁴ One of its “central doctrines was the belief that those who embraced the movement possessed a special knowledge which led to salvation.”⁶⁵ Consequently, if oppressive groups want *to know when* they are being oppressive, they need to ask oppressed peoples because only they have this special knowledge.⁶⁶ As DiAngelo writes, “all perspectives are *not*

⁵⁸ Ibid., 26.

⁵⁹ Voddie T. Baucham, *Fault Lines: The Social Justice Movement and Evangelicalisms Looming Catastrophe* (Washington, D.C.: Salem Books, 2021), 91.

⁶⁰ Tara J. Yosso, “Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth,” *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8, no. 1 (2006): 74.

⁶¹ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 9-10.

⁶² Ibid., 10.

⁶³ Baucham, *Fault Lines*, 91.

⁶⁴ Norman L. Geisler and Ralph E. MacKenzie, *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1995), 82.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, 138.

equally valid.”⁶⁷ Therefore, “oppressed groups can claim *automatically*,” based on their group identity, to have “an *epistemological*, scientific, and political advantage” (*emphasis added*).⁶⁸ In other words, because of their *lived experiences*, women have more *knowledge* than men; people of color have more knowledge than whites; homosexuals have more knowledge than heterosexuals; transgender people have more knowledge than cisgender people *and non-Christians have more knowledge than Christians*. No wonder some professing Christians claim that believers need help from *marginalized peoples* to bring “new ways of understanding” to the Bible.⁶⁹

God

Additionally, Sensoy and DiAngelo argue that *knowledge* is based on the hierarchal *power* of the dominant group.⁷⁰ However, one of the stated goals of CT activists includes “reversing” the “traditional hierarchy” (Isa 14:12-14).⁷¹ The dominant religion is Christianity, which they also view as a “hegemonic system,” a system with a hierarchy, and at the top sits God (Ps 47:9).⁷² Ultimately, that places “God himself – a male God who only spoke to men and whom only men could speak for” as the greatest oppressor of them all.⁷³ One way CT seeks to

⁶⁷ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 127.

⁶⁸ Sandra Harding, *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (New York, New York: Routledge, 2004), 8.

⁶⁹ E. Randolph Richards and Brandon J. O’Brien, *Misreading Scripture with Western Eyes: Removing Cultural Blinders to Better Understand the Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 110.

⁷⁰ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 92.

⁷¹ Chris Beasley, *Gender and Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers* (London: Sage, 2005), 21.

⁷² Paul Kivel, *Living in the Shadow of the Cross: Understanding and Resisting the Power and Privilege of Christian Hegemony* (Gabriola Island, British Columbia: New Society Publishers, 2013), chapter 2, paragraph 1.

⁷³ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 68.

strip God of His power is to control the language. After all, truth is subjective, and it is determined by the one in power.⁷⁴

Therefore, one of CT's goals is to control the language through "political correctness."⁷⁵ Furthermore, they try to control the *dialogue* by labeling anything that *they* deem offensive or insulting as hate speech.⁷⁶ However, only the oppressive group, the dominant majority, can be guilty of using hate speech because it is an oppressive tool; hence, it can only be used to keep the oppressors in power.⁷⁷

For example, at Yale University in 2015, an associate master of Silliman College criticized new rules that restricted freedom of expression in Halloween costumes for being comparable to limiting *free speech*. This intellectual challenge led to calls for the resignation of the professor and spouse (another professor). The reason for permanently silencing the Silliman professors was that they had used "freedom of speech" as a *tool* to dismiss the voices of "oppressed and marginalized" peoples.⁷⁸ Consequently, the professors were literally accused of committing "violence" against the students.⁷⁹ In case this is not sinking in, let me clarify. Professors complained about a new rule that limited free speech; therefore, they were guilty of trying to limit the speech of marginalized people who wanted to limit free speech. Thus, they had

⁷⁴ Ibid., 192.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 149.

⁷⁶ Sünje Paasch-Colberg, Christian Strippel, Joachim Trebbe, and Martin Emmer, "From Insult to Hate Speech: Mapping Offensive Language in German User Comments on Immigration," *Media and Communication* 9 no. 1 (3 February 2021), 171.

⁷⁷ Note: majority does not always mean majority, for example women have minority status even though they outnumber men.

⁷⁸ Kate Manne and Jason Stanley, "When Free Speech Becomes a Political Weapon," *The Chronicle Review*, November 13, 2015, paragraph 2, accessed April 20, 2021, https://www.chronicle.com/article/when-free-speech-becomes-a-political-weapon/?bc_nonce=aejoqsw02hgu9n6quvhlfr&cid=reg_wall_signup).

⁷⁹ Ibid., paragraph 31-32.

to be silenced because they were *not* entitled to the same free speech as the oppressed. CT proponents literally argue that “there is *no equality in freedom* of speech.”⁸⁰

Free speech and rational arguments are part of the “master’s tools;” they are used by the dominant group “to prevent the master’s house from being dismantled.”⁸¹ However, it is essential to remember that CT breaks up society into different intersectional identities. In other words, dominant groups (i.e., white, male, heterosexual, cis-gendered, and “Christian”) use these tools for the “oppression” of non-white, female, homosexual, transgender, and non-Christian peoples.⁸²

God says, “Come now, and let us reason together” (Isa 1:18). However, CT rejects both free speech and reason; they also consider both to be oppressive tools of Christianity. After all, God, the God of the Bible, the Christian God, is the white man’s God. Furthermore, the Trinity is presented as “a *white*-bearded elder, a younger blue-eyed *blondish* Jesus, and a *white* dove” (*emphasis added*).⁸³ Consequently, using logic and reason in open dialogue to talk about the White God is taboo.

Jesus said, “Go ye into all world, and preach the gospel to every creature;” Paul “reasoned” and “persuaded” Jews and Gentiles of the truth of the gospel; Peter said for every believer “to be ready always” to defend their faith, and Jude challenged Christians to “contend for the faith” (Mark 16:15; 2 Cor 10:5; 1 Pet 3:15; Jude 1:3). CT says that when Christians use free speech for witnessing, and when apologists use logical arguments for defending Christianity,

⁸⁰ Chris Demaske, “Critical Race Theory,” Middle Tennessee State University, *The First Amendment Encyclopedia*. 2009, paragraph 7, accessed April 19, 2021 at <https://www.mtsu.edu/first-amendment/article/1254/critical-race-theory>.

⁸¹ Manne and Stanley, “When Free Speech,” paragraph 32.

⁸² Adams and Bell, *Teaching for Diversity*, 261.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 273.

they oppress the marginalized. They call it “Christian hegemony,” and they claim it results in oppression of other religions, including “agnostics” and “atheists.”⁸⁴ In fact, witnessing is a form of “bullying and harassment.”⁸⁵

On the other hand, if an atheist accuses a Christian of being part of an oppressor group and the believer either defends herself or ignores the claim (anything but confesses her guilt),⁸⁶ then that believer is using Christian fragility “as a form of bullying.”⁸⁷ In other words, Christians cannot use free speech to proclaim Christ, or they are bullies. Nor can they defend themselves and their faith, or they are bullies. Nor can they be neutral and silent, or they are bullies.

In 1941 C.S. Lewis predicted this irrational approach when he described the rejection of *reasonable dialogue* as a demonic strategy to keep “people from the Church.”⁸⁸ Furthermore, this stand against open *dialogue* and *reason* is a stand against *logic* itself; *logic* is the root of both words, and it is a word used by John to refer to Christ, the Logos (John 1:1). The rejection of truth is a rejection of the written Word of God (John 17:17). It is also a rejection of Jesus Himself, who is truth incarnate; He is “the way, the *truth*, and the life” (*emphasis added*, John 14:6). Consequently, this is not just a postmodern worldview; it is an anti-biblical worldview, an anti-God worldview, and an anti-Christ worldview.⁸⁹

⁸⁴ Ibid., 283.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 274, 283.

⁸⁶ Using masculine pronouns is a form of male hegemony, but it is okay to use female pronouns because they are the marginalized group. This is another example of free speech for me but not for thee.

⁸⁷ DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, 112.

⁸⁸ C.S. Lewis, *The Screwtape Letters: Letters from a Senior to a Junior Devil* (Canada: Samizdat eBook), 1.

⁸⁹ A bird’s eye view of CRT’s rejection of logic, objective truth, cause and effect relationships, and Christianity’s hegemony could be seen (before it was taken down) in the anti-racist chart posted in 2020 by the National Museum for African American History and Culture at the Smithsonian institution. See Jonathan Butcher and Mike Gonzalez, “Critical Race Theory, the New Intolerance, and Its Grip on America,” The Heritage Foundation, December 7, 2020, “The Work Place CRT Trainings,” paragraph 1, accessed April 22, 2021, <https://www.heritage.org/civil-rights/report/critical-race-theory-the-new-intolerance-and-its-grip-america>).

Humanity

The third and perhaps most crucial worldview question that CT answers has to do with its view of humanity.⁹⁰ All proponents of CT believe that *humanity* can be divided into two classes: the dominant oppressive group and the minoritized oppressed group (Gal 3:28).⁹¹ “In *any* relationship between groups,” one group is the “dominant group,” and the other group is the oppressed “minoritized group” (*emphasis added*).⁹²

For example, in Israel, the Jews would have been the dominant group during the time of Jesus, and gentiles would have been the oppressed group. Consequently, Brandon Robertson, a self-professed progressive Christian reverend, teaches that Jesus had to repent of his racism and bias against the Syrophoenician woman of Mark chapter seven.⁹³ Robertson argues that Jesus used a racial slur when he called this gentile woman a “dog.”⁹⁴ Some Christian apologists have addressed this, and they have shown that Robertson took the relevant verse out of “context.”⁹⁵

The apologists are correct, but that is not the real issue. According to CT, no *proof* is needed to convict someone of racism; they simply “start from that premise.”⁹⁶ In other words, the woman’s *lived experience* is what counts. She experienced racism; therefore, this is *an example of the inherent racism* of Jesus as a Jew. Consequently, according to Robertson, the woman “spoke truth to power” and “Jesus repented” of his sin.⁹⁷ Any reasonable explanation of why

⁹⁰ Eckman, *The Truth*, 13.

⁹¹ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, xxii, 47.

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ Ken Ham, "Was Jesus a Racist? Homosexual "Pastor" Says So," *Answers in Genesis*, March 18, 2021, paragraphs 1-11, accessed May 05, 2021, <https://answersingenesis.org/culture/was-jesus-racist-homosexual-pastor-says-so/>).

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, 17.

⁹⁷ Ham, "Was Jesus," paragraphs 1-11.

Jesus used the expression is a denial of the inherent racism in the system itself. The Christian worldview that Jesus came to offer Himself as a sinless sacrifice must be modified to fit a CT framework of oppression.

CT teaches that oppression exists throughout multiple diverse identities, and remember, one group is always oppressive and dominant.⁹⁸ In Western Civilization, whites oppress people of color; men oppress women; heterosexuals oppress non-heterosexuals, and Christians oppress other religions and atheists and on and on (including oppressed left-handed people).⁹⁹ Not only does CT place everyone in these identity groups, but it bases specific cultural characteristics of individuals *not based on their actions* but on their position within these two-sided groups. For example, DiAngelo argues that “only whites can be racist,” and even when white people morally object to racism, this merely “increases their resistance to acknowledging their complicity with it.”¹⁰⁰ She adds that “White identity is inherently racist.”¹⁰¹ In other words, whiteness is her original sin;¹⁰² but she strives to be “less white” because “to be less white is to be less racially oppressive.”¹⁰³

CRT divides all humanity even further; you are either racist or antiracist (there is no neutral ground).¹⁰⁴ On the other hand, Christianity teaches that everyone, regardless of ethnicity, is created in the image of God (Gen 1:26-27). However, when Adam sinned, “he plunged the whole *race* into a helplessly fallen state of bondage to evil;” this is the biblical doctrine of

⁹⁸ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 47.

⁹⁹ Robin DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, xvi.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 22, 108.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 149.

¹⁰² Jim Goad, *Whiteness: The Original*, chapter 1, paragraph 1.

¹⁰³ DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, 150.

¹⁰⁴ Ibram X. Kendi, *How to be an Antiracist* (New York, NY: Random House, 2019), “My Racist Introduction,” paragraph 35, Kindle.

“*original sin*” (*emphasis added*, Ps 51:5; Rom 5:12).¹⁰⁵ Notice that biblically there is only one *race*, the human *race*, and everyone is born a sinner (Rom 3:23; Acts 17:26). In other words, “original sin is imputed to *all* of mankind,” not just whites (*emphasis added*, Ps 51:5; Rom 5:12).¹⁰⁶

Consequently, the reason for evils like racism and slavery is that we are all born sinners. That is why slavery and racism preceded the birth of America by millenniums. That is why every ethnicity has been guilty of both sins. Perversely, CRT views “whiteness” as the original sin, which is “imputed in the form of white complicity.”¹⁰⁷ Consequently, CRT teaches that “people who call themselves white Christians will never be free” unless they confess “the sin of white racism, white supremacy, [and] white privilege.”¹⁰⁸

Whiteness is *not* the original sin. Everyone is a child of Adam and born a sinner regardless of melanin count (Gen 3:20; Ps 51:5; Isa 64:6; Acts 17:26; Rom 3:23). Furthermore, this type of division is not biblical, and it will only cause more division—meanwhile, the solution to both division and sin is Christ who “hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us*” (Eph 2:14). The Bible teaches that “[t]here is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28).

Consequently, there is a growing desire for unity *and* diversity within local churches *at any cost*. After all, Jesus prayed to His Father that “those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are” (John 17:11). Therefore, some claim that the presence of *black* churches

¹⁰⁵ John MacArthur, *The Battle for the Beginning: The Bible on Creation and the Fall of Adam* (Nashville, TN: W Pub. Group, 2001), 196.

¹⁰⁶ Baucham, *Fault Lines*, 77.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ Jim Wallis, “On the 50th Anniversary of Dr. King’s Assassination, Confessing the Church’s Complicity in Racial Division,” *Sojourners*, (April 4, 2018), paragraph 2, accessed April 22, 2021 at <https://sojo.net/articles/50th-anniversary-dr-kings-assassination-confessing-churchs-complicity-racial-division>

and *white* churches, like the “existence of Christian denominations,” is “shameful and sinful.”¹⁰⁹ However, our disagreements about worship styles, cultural preferences, and minor doctrinal differences do not prove disunity (Rom 14:1). On the contrary, the fact that we can and do enjoy Christian fellowship with one another “without compromising the fundamentals of the faith” proves that there is unity *and* diversity (Rom 12:4-5; 1 Cor 12:12, 27).¹¹⁰ On the other hand, forcing brothers and sisters who have different worship styles to come together every Sunday will not bring more unity. Furthermore, telling them that they *are* divided by skin color, that those with lighter skin are inherently racist, and those with darker skin are inherently more knowledgeable will only bring real division.

Consequently, we cannot allow CT to invade our churches and teach that *whiteness* is the original sin. Humanity is not divided between the racists and antiracists; however, it is divided into two groups; as J. Vernon McGee used to say, there are the “saints and the ain’ts.”¹¹¹ The solution to racism is not antiracism; it is Christ. Revelation describes “a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues” (Rev 7:9). What unites all these diverse groups? It is not antiracism; it is the Lamb of God that took away their sins (Rev 7:9-17).

Morality

Christians are not saved because they stop sinning, but because they trust the One who never sinned (Rom 5:21). Christians are not *sinless*; only Christ is sinless; however, we strive to *sin less*, not be *less white*. In other words, Christians do not use grace as an excuse to sin (Rom

¹⁰⁹ Paul Copan, *When God Goes to Starbucks: A Guide to Everyday Apologetics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008), 192–193.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 194.

¹¹¹ J. Vernon McGee, *Thru the Bible Commentary*, vol. 4 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997), 649.

6:1). On the contrary, we try to live moral lifestyles in obedience to and out of love for God (Acts 5:29; 1 Peter 1:16; 1 John 5:3).

Proponents of CT also care about morality. They call it Social Justice (SJ). Furthermore, SJ is not just about theoretical justice. SJ is about *actively* taking stands against immoral acts of oppression and injustice. SJ activism is so important that it is being implemented into the Social Studies curriculum of elementary school children as early as kindergarten.¹¹² On April 19th of this year (2021), the “U.S. Department of Education announced that officials are preparing to use taxpayer money for K-12 schools to advocate the idea that America is systemically racist.”¹¹³ *Educating for Social Justice in Early Childhood*, edited by Kessler and Swadener, tells educators how to implement an “early childhood curriculum – including classroom practices” to engage “young children” in “social justice issues.”¹¹⁴

SJ advocates and educators argue that we cannot be neutral; if we “decide not to take on this commitment,” then we “actively support and reproduce the inequitable status quo” of social injustice.¹¹⁵ Therefore, CT or “Critical social justice recognizes inequality as deeply embedded in the fabric of society (i.e., as structural), and *actively* seeks to change this” (*emphasis added*).¹¹⁶ Although justice is also a biblical issue, it is not the same as SJ (Ps 82:3).

¹¹² Currently, in NC where I live, the social studies curriculum from kindergarten up teaches students to “look for ways that they can be civic-minded and make changes happen within their own classroom, school, *and community*” (*emphasis added*; the word community is added to the activism of 1st graders on up). As will be shown in the next section, these social justice changes that children are encouraged to work towards will be defined by liberal SJ frameworks. See <https://sites.google.com/dpi.nc.gov/social-studies/standards/public-draft-reviews?>

¹¹³ Jonathan Butcher, “Biden Administration Wants Schools to Teach Prejudice. Here’s What Parents Should Know,” *The Daily Signal* (April 19, 2021), assessed April 22, 2021 at https://www.dailysignal.com//print?post_id=770635.

¹¹⁴ Shirley A. Kessler and Beth Blue Swadener, *Educating for Social Justice in Early Childhood*. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2020), i.

¹¹⁵ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone*, 196.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, xx.

CT is a Social Justice WV

Social Justice Issues

Social Justice issues are so crucial to CT that the theory is sometimes called “*critical social justice*” instead of critical theory.¹¹⁷ CT is even defined as the ability to “think critically about *social justice*” (*emphasis added*).¹¹⁸ It is, as already mentioned, a *worldview* with a “critical social justice *framework*” that uses “a critical social justice *lens*” to view the world (*emphasis added*).¹¹⁹ Consequently, CT is sometimes referred to as “Social Justice Theory.”¹²⁰

I will use capital SJ to refer to the specific social justice issues that proponents of CT are actively addressing. In other words, there may be other social justice issues that are important but are not addressed by SJ warriors. Remember, according to CT, whoever controls the language has the power. Therefore, we must understand what *they* mean by SJ.

For example, if I said that I was pro-choice, how would most people understand that? Would they think that I was for school *choice*? Would they believe that I believed Americans should be able to *choose* their own insurance and doctors? Would they assume that I thought that we should be able to *choose* whether or not to wear a mask during Covid19? No, they would think that I supported the right of a pregnant mom to *choose* to abort her baby. Likewise, when SJ warriors ask if you stand up for SJ issues, they have specific issues in mind.

Abortion Rights

¹¹⁷ Özlem Sensoy and Robin DiAngelo, *Is Everyone Really Equal?: An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2017), xx.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, xxii.

¹¹⁹¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 11, 13, 26, 46, 198, 211.

¹²⁰ Pluckrose and Lindsay, *Cynical Theories*, 19.

One of those SJ issues is abortion. SJ “celebrates abortion as an expression of female liberation from patriarchal oppression.”¹²¹ In other words, they believe that women are still oppressed by white Christian men who want to discriminate against females by prohibiting their reproductive rights and telling women what they can and cannot do with their bodies. Consequently, Planned Parenthood is *not* considered *immoral* for “bargaining” chopped up “baby parts.”¹²² On the other hand, my not wanting to support “organizations that provide abortions” *is* considered *immoral*.¹²³ Is this what Isaiah had in mind when he wrote, “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil” (Isa 5:20)?

Nonetheless, abortion arguments are no longer the same as they were back in the days of Roe versus Wade. Back then, abortion advocates claimed that the fetus was not a baby girl or boy but a bunch of cells; the baby was just tissue, and besides, they only wanted abortion to be “safe, legal, and rare.”¹²⁴ Today, they seldom make any of those arguments. They rarely argue that the fetus is just a bunch of cells. Even when they do, they know that the baby has her own DNA and blood type and is in every scientific way a living person; they also know that the first baby pictures that most people save in their scrapbooks are the ultrasound photos.¹²⁵ The argument is not about whether or not a baby is a person: the debate is only about the right to

¹²¹ Thaddeus J. Williams, *Confronting Injustice without Compromising Truth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic, 2020), 264.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 131.

¹²³ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone Really*, 179.

¹²⁴ Janet Morana, *Recall Abortion: Ending the Abortion Industrys Exploitation of Women* (Charlotte, NC: Saint Benedict Press, 2013), chapter 3, paragraph 1.

¹²⁵ Randy Alcorn, *Why Pro-Life* (Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers, 2004), 42.

choose to end that life. Consequently, they want to be able to *choose* to end the life of an unborn child all the way through birth and sometimes even after the baby is born.¹²⁶

Of all the social justice issues, like hunger, homelessness, and human trafficking, this is the only *legal* one. In other words, this is a *systemic* issue because it *legalizes* sacrificing babies (Exo 20:13; Lev 18:21). It is not *lawful* to “starve people, force them to live on the streets, or traffic them for money.”¹²⁷ All of those are problems that should concern Christians, but they are not legal. However, it is legal to kill unborn babies in every state, and Christians are forced to pay for the murder of these innocent children through tax dollars that support Planned Parenthood. Abortion is not justice; it is injustice, and it is systemic.

Homosexual Rights

SJ warriors also fight for gay and lesbian rights (LGBTQ: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Rights). “The same-sex marriage debate [is not] about cakes;” nonetheless, it seeks to legally force Christian bakers to use their talents to design a *specific* cake specially created for the gay or lesbian couple.¹²⁸ They believe gay couples should be allowed to drive by three bakeries on their way to a Christian baker to force that Christian baker to bake a cake for them. However, the real goal is to force Christians to recognize homosexuality as a legitimate lifestyle, equal to heterosexuality, and not a sin (Lev 18:22; Mark 1:6-9; Rom 1:26-28; 1 Cor 7:2; 1 Tim 1:10; Jude 1:7). If the baker does not comply and “fails to acknowledge and

¹²⁶ Nat Hentoff, "U.S. Senate Again Fails to Pass Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act," CATO Institute, November 12, 2014, paragraph 8, accessed March 30, 2021, <https://catholicreview.org/u-s-senate-again-fails-to-pass-born-alive-abortion-survivors-protection-act>.

¹²⁷ Alan Shlemon, "Social Justice Begins at Conception," Stand to Reason: Clear-Thinking Christianity," January 1, 2016, paragraph 4, accessed March 29, 2021, <https://www.str.org/w/social-justice-begins-at-conception>.

¹²⁸ Williams, *Confronting Injustice*, 6.

celebrate” their gayness, then he must be put out of business.¹²⁹ Again, this is not justice, this is injustice, but it is what is meant by SJ.

Transgender Rights

The most current SJ issue concerns trans rights. SJ warriors want to allow trans women (biological men) to use the bathroom, locker room, and shower room of their choice. Even though biological males have male genitals and XY chromosomes, while biological females have female genitals and two X chromosomes (no Y chromosome) they argue that gender is not determined by biological science but is a “social construct.”¹³⁰ Therefore, they want biological males, with male genitals and XY chromosomes, to be allowed to go into the bathrooms and showers of biological girls. Furthermore, they want to force girls to compete against biological males in all sporting events even though males are naturally physically stronger (1 Pet 3:7). As a result, biological girls are “being left off the podium at track meets as trans athletes take state championships.”¹³¹ Athletes *born male* are transforming high school girls' field hockey and soccer teams.¹³² Professional biological *male* “trans MMA” fighters have been allowed to fight against women, which can and has resulted in a “*female* opponent’s” skull being broken (*emphasis added*).¹³³ Once again, SJ is not just; it is unjust.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 33.

¹³⁰ DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, 80.

¹³¹ Voddie T. Baucham, *Fault Lines*, 197.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

Social Justice Equity

Nonetheless, SJ warriors continue to argue that they are fighting against injustices and discrimination. However, they not only fight for unjust issues and call it justice, but they also fight for inequality and call it equity. SJ does not favor *equality* of opportunities for *individuals*; they favor instead *equity* of outcome for social *groups*.

Sensoy and DiAngelo define racism as an “*unequal distribution* of privileges, resources, and power between White people and peoples of color” (*emphasis added*).¹³⁴ Kessler and Swadener, in *Educating for Social Justice in Early Childhood*, refer to this type of SJ as “[r]edistributive justice.”¹³⁵ Redistribution of resources is not based on individual merit or hard work but on membership in an identity group.

Consequently, this so-called justice is a redistribution system from one group to other specific social groups. In other words, they are not concerned with individual poverty but with group poverty. Therefore, they favor taking from all whites in the form of taxes and sales, including poor whites, to redistribute wealth to blacks and other minorities. For example, in 2021, the city of Oakland, California, is “creating a universal basic income program,” however, it is not universal because it “will only give money to ‘black, indigenous, and other people of color.’”¹³⁶ Furthermore, by *not* helping poor white individuals, the city can “create more equity” among the social groups.¹³⁷ In other words, it is not only good to help specific ethnic groups, but it is also morally good to keep some white people poor. This is *not* justice.

¹³⁴ Sensoy and DiAngelo, *Is Everyone Really*, 228.

¹³⁵ Kessler and Swadener, *Educating for Social Justice*, xxv.

¹³⁶ Jarrett Stepman, "The Resegregation of America," *The Daily Signal*, April 01, 2021, paragraph 27, accessed April 01, 2021, at <https://www.dailysignal.com/2021/03/31/resegregation-of-america/>).

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, paragraph 34.

Nonetheless, Ibram Kendi and others use racial disparities as proof of racism and the need for SJ.¹³⁸ That is because it is assumed that disparities “*must* be the result of racial discrimination” (*emphasis added*).¹³⁹ However, if disparities prove that the system is set up to favor whites and oppress minorities, why did whites “rank sixteenth” among ethnicities in the 2018 “Median Household Income by Selected Ancestry Groups” census?¹⁴⁰ As Williams asks:

“How can we reconcile the Social Justice B narrative that America remains systemically white supremacist to its core when Indians, Taiwanese, Lebanese, Turkish, Chinese, Iranian, Japanese, Pakistani, Filipino, Indonesian, Syrian, Korean, Ghanaian, Nigerian, and Guyanese earn more income on average than whites in the United States?”¹⁴¹

There are other reasons for the disparities; however, these explanations are entirely ignored because they do not support the SJ narrative. For example, “a black child today is 2.5 times more likely than a white child to be born out of wedlock.”¹⁴² That is, at least, one reason for income disparity, but it can also explain prison disparities.¹⁴³ Thomas Sowell cites prison studies that show most inmates were *not* raised by both parents.¹⁴⁴ Add to that the fact that many prisoners had parents who had been imprisoned, and the results multiply.¹⁴⁵ Consequently, it is circular logic to define racism as disparities and then use disparities to prove racism.

¹³⁸ 5. Ibram X. Kendi, *Stamped from the Beginning: The Definitive History of Racist Ideas in America* (New York: NY: Nation Books, 2016), 11.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Williams, *Confronting Injustice*, 97.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Thomas Sowell, *Discrimination and Disparities* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2018), chapter 5, “Solutions,” paragraph 3.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

Nonetheless, SJ warriors *often* use circular logic to prove racism. Robin DiAngelo quotes Ibram Kendi to argue that disparity is proof of “systemic racism.”¹⁴⁶ However, this is after she admitted that she would not “attempt to *prove* that racism exists;” instead, she would “*start from that premise*” (*emphasis added*).¹⁴⁷ When someone starts with the premise that racism exists and then looks for it everywhere, they see it everywhere. Consequently, both Kendi and DiAngelo keep on claiming that Michael Brown's death proves that the justice system is systemically racist and that police (white and black) are inherently racist against black men.¹⁴⁸ This narrative continues even though a black DOJ, under a black president, using black and bi-racial witnesses, found no evidence of any wrongdoing by the police officer.¹⁴⁹

Empirical evidence, however, is not necessary. As already pointed out, experience trumps objective proof. Michael Brown was killed by a white police officer; therefore, he experienced racism. Evidence to the contrary be damned. Likewise, disparities prove racism. Consequently, SJ seeks to erase these disparities by redistributing wealth from white families to black families and other minorities based solely on ethnicity. “The great equalizers must step in yet again, make more laws, redistribute more wealth, enforce more ‘social justice’ until the quest for ‘equality’ turns us into Communist Russia, North Korea, or Venezuela 2.0.”¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ DiAngelo, *White Fragility*, 17.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 96.

¹⁴⁹ U.S. Department of Justice. “Department of Justice Report Regarding the Criminal Investigation into the Shooting Death of Michael Brown by Ferguson, Missouri Police Officer Darren Wilson,” Washington, DC: Department of Justice, accessed on March 14, 2021, at https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/pressreleases/attachments/2015/03/04/doj_report_on_shooting_of_michael_brown_1.pdf.

¹⁵⁰ Williams, *Confronting Injustice*, 87.

Social Justice Issues from a Christian Perspective

Nonetheless, the redistribution of wealth as a form of social justice is not new to Christianity. It dates back to 1931 when Pope Pius XI used the “term *social justice*” as many as “eight times in his 1931 encyclical.”¹⁵¹ Like modern SJ advocates, Pope Pius XI talked about redistribution. He advocated taking “property and wealth” and distributing it “among persons and classes.”¹⁵²

On the other hand, some Christians argue that “[t]he aim of social justice is to achieve and to maintain *impartiality*, not material equality of *individuals* or uniformity of outcomes” (*emphasis added*).¹⁵³ If Christians want to fight for impartiality and equal opportunities for every individual regardless of group identity, they should probably drop the word *social* from the phrase *social justice*.

Repeatedly, it is argued that social justice is a biblical issue.¹⁵⁴ However, as pointed out, the way SJ is used and defined is not synonymous with, but antithetical to, biblical justice. Christians should favor individual justice for all without bias or prejudice, not group justice that treads on individual rights. Putting the word *social* in front of justice, more often than not, leads to injustice rather than justice.

¹⁵¹ Gloria Zúñiga, *Doing Justice to Justice: Competing Frameworks of Interpretation in Christian Social Ethics*, vol. 4, *Christian Social Thought Series* (Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute, 2002), 15–16.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*

¹⁵³ David W. Jones, *Every Good Thing: An Introduction to the Material World and the Common Good for Christians* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press; Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016), 91.

¹⁵⁴ Efreem Smith, *The Post-Black and Post-White Church: Becoming the Beloved Community in a Multi-Ethnic World* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2012), 54.

Social (Justice) Gospel

Likewise, putting the word *social* in front of the gospel perverts the gospel into “another gospel” (2 Cor 11:4; Gal 1:6-7). Some preachers go so far as to preach “that to exclude social liberation and justice as part of the gospel is to deny the gospel.”¹⁵⁵ Nonetheless, from Peter’s sermon in Acts 2 to Paul’s sermon in Acts 28, the gospel was preached repeatedly without mentioning social justice as necessary for salvation. Actively seeking justice, biblical justice or social justice, is *a work*, and as such, it is not part of the gospel (Rom 9:32; Gal 2:16). Furthermore, when Paul boiled down the gospel to the essentials (“the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ”), it did not include social justice (1 Cor 15:1-11).¹⁵⁶

Nonetheless, Christ did not command the disciples *just* to preach the gospel message of salvation, but to teach believers to “observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded you” (*emphasis added*, Matt 28:19-20). Justice is one of those things that Jesus taught; as a matter of fact, He criticized the Pharisees for neglecting *justice* (Matt 23:23). Some Christians want to bury their head in the sand and ignore justice, politics, apologetics, polemics, and everything but love and grace. However, the Bible addresses all those issues, and they cannot be ignored. Paul said, “I have not shunned to declare unto you *all the counsel of God*” (*emphasis added*; Acts 20:27).

That means that Paul taught on justice.¹⁵⁷ And what did he teach about justice? The apostle taught that justice was *not* based on social standing or ethnicity but that “there was no respect of persons with God” (Rom 2:11). Paul taught that justice was based on individual

¹⁵⁵ Tony Evans, *Oneness Embraced: Reconciliation, the Kingdom, and How We are Stronger Together* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2011), chapter 14, “Justice and the Gospel,” paragraph 1.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, chapter 14, “The Scope of the Gospel,” paragraph 2.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, chapter 14, “The Scope of the Gospel,” paragraph 3.

responsibility; “*he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done*” (*emphasis added*, Col 3:25). Again, God does not judge people for their ancestors' sins or others within their ethnicity. “The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him” (Eze 18:20).

SJ is not biblical justice. Punishing unborn babies for the sins of their parents is unjust. Punishing bakers for their Christian beliefs is unjust. Punishing girls by making them share their showers with biological males and forcing them to compete athletically against men who have gender dysphoria is unjust. Punishing individuals for the sins of others within their ethnicity or ancestry is not justice; it is injustice.

SJ is Anti-Biblical Justice

Consequently, CT turns justice upside down. To combat what it calls systemic oppression that is biased in favor of white heterosexual Christian men, it argues for a biased system in favor of non-white, non-heterosexual, non-Christian, non-cisgender males. The Bible often condemns injustice that favors the more affluent because that is the way that unjust scales usually lean (James 2:3). Nonetheless, Leviticus makes it clear that there should be “no unrighteousness in judgment” and that we should “*not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty*” (*emphasis added*, Lev 19:15). Moses also preached that “Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall *hear the small as well as the great*” (*emphasis added*, Deut 1:17). Consequently, the SJ of CT is an anti-biblical view of justice.

Conclusion

In conclusion, CT gets a few things right. *Race* is a social construct, and Christians should care about *injustices*. However, even a broken clock is right twice a day, but that does not

make it a good tool for telling time. Likewise, CT is a faulty worldview, and it misdiagnoses humanity's problem. It also has a defective view of epistemology, God, and morality.

Consequently, using CT as a guide to aid in our journey through life would truly be a case of the blind leading the non-blind, and it would result in both falling "into the ditch" (Matt 15:14).

Bibliography

- Adams, Maurianne and Lee Anne Bell, *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Adamson, Walter L. *Hegemony and Revolution: A Study of Antonio Gramsci's Political and Cultural Theory*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980.
- Alcorn, Randy. *Why Pro-Life*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers, 2004.
- Anderson, Tawa J., W. Michael Clark, and David K. Naugle. *An Introduction to Christian Worldview: Pursuing God's Perspective in a Pluralistic World*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, an Imprint of InterVarsity Press, 2017.
- Baucham, Voddie T., *Fault Lines: The Social Justice Movement and Evangelicalisms Looming Catastrophe*. Washington, D.C.: Salem Books, 2021.
- Beasley, Chris. *Gender and Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers*. London: Sage, 2005.
- Butcher, Jonathan, and Mike Gonzalez. "Critical Race Theory, the New Intolerance, and Its Grip on America." The Heritage Foundation. December 7, 2020. Accessed April 22, 2021. <https://www.heritage.org/civil-rights/report/critical-race-theory-the-new-intolerance-and-its-grip-america>.
- Butcher, Jonathan. "Biden Administration Wants Schools to Teach Prejudice. Here's What Parents Should Know." *The Daily Signal* (April 19, 2021). Accessed April 22, 2021. https://www.dailysignal.com//print?post_id=770635.
- Clark, Gregory. *A Farewell to Alms, A Brief Economic History of the World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Copan, Paul. *When God Goes to Starbucks: A Guide to Everyday Apologetics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2008.
- DeCuir-Gunby, Jessica T. "Using Critical Race Mixed Methodology to Explore the Experiences of African Americans in Education." *Educational Psychologist* 55, no. 4 (2020): 244-255.
- Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 2017.
- Demaske, Chris. "Critical Race Theory." Middle Tennessee State University. *The First Amendment Encyclopedia*. 2009. Accessed April 19, 2021. <https://www.mtsu.edu/first-amendment/article/1254/critical-race-theory>.
- DiAngelo, Robin J. *White Fragility: Why It's So Hard to Talk to White People About Racism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2018.

- Eckman, James P. *The Truth about Worldviews: A Biblical Understanding of Worldview Alternatives*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2004.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (and Why We Don't Know About Them)*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2009.
- Evans, Tony. *Oneness Embraced: Reconciliation, the Kingdom, and How We are Stronger Together*. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2011.
- Garcia, Ruben J. "Critical Race Theory and Proposition 187: The Racial Politics of Immigration Law." *Scholarly Works*, Paper 662 (1995): 118-154.
- Geisler, Norman L., and Ralph E. MacKenzie, *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1995.
- Goad, Jim. *Whiteness: The Original Sin*. Stone Mountain, GA: Obnoxious Books, 2018.
- Ham, Ken. "Was Jesus a Racist? Homosexual 'Pastor' Says So." *Answers in Genesis*. March 18, 2021. Accessed May 05, 2021. <https://answersingenesis.org/culture/was-jesus-racist-homosexual-pastor-says-so/>.
- Harding, Sandra. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*. New York, New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Hentoff, Nat. "U.S. Senate Again Fails to Pass Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act." *CATO Institute*. November 12, 2014. Accessed March 30, 2021. <https://catholicreview.org/u-s-senate-again-fails-to-pass-born-alive-abortion-survivors-protection-act/>.
- Hicks, Stephen R.C. *Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault*. Milwaukee, WI: Scholarly Publishing, 2004.
- Johnson, Paul. *Intellectuals*. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Jones, David W. *Every Good Thing: An Introduction to the Material World and the Common Good for Christians*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press; Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2016.
- Kellner, Douglas. "Critical Theory and the Crisis of Social Theory." *Sociological Perspectives* 33, no. 1 (1990): 11-33.
- Kendi, Ibram X. *How to be an Antiracist*. New York, NY: Random House, 2019, Kindle.
- Kendi, Ibram X. *Stamped from the Beginning: The Definitive History of Racist Ideas in America*. New York, NY: Nation Books, 2016.
- Kessler, Shirley A., and Beth Blue Swadener, eds. *Educating for Social Justice in Early Childhood*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2020.

- Kivel, Paul. *Living in the Shadow of the Cross: Understanding and Resisting the Power and Privilege of Christian Hegemony*. Gabriola Island, British Columbia: New Society Publishers, 2013.
- Lewis, C.S. *The Screwtape Letters: Letters from a Senior to a Junior Devil*. Canada: Samizdat eBook, 2016. Originally published in 1941.
- Lindsay, James. "2+2 Never Equals 5." *New Discourses*. August 3, 2020. Accessed April 20, 2021. <https://newdiscourses.com/2020/08/2-plus-2-never-equals-5/>.
- MacArthur, John. *The Battle for the Beginning: The Bible on Creation and the Fall of Adam*. Nashville, TN: W Pub. Group, 2001.
- Manne, Kate, and Jason Stanley. "When Free Speech Becomes a Political Weapon." *The Chronicle Review*. November 13, 2015. Accessed April 20, 2021. https://www.chronicle.com/article/when-free-speech-becomes-a-political-weapon/?bc_nonce=aejoqswo2hgu9n6quvhlfr&cid=reg_wall_signup.
- McGee, J. Vernon. *Thru the Bible Commentary*. Vol. 4. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997.
- Morana, Janet. *Recall Abortion: Ending the Abortion Industrys Exploitation of Women*. Charlotte, NC: Saint Benedict Press, 2013.
- Myers, Jeff, and David A. Noebel. *Understanding the Times: A Survey of Competing Worldviews*. Colorado Springs, CO: David C Cook, 2015.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin, 1949, Kindle.
- Paasch-Colberg, Sünje, Christian Strippel, Joachim Trebbe, and Martin Emmer. "From Insult to Hate Speech: Mapping Offensive Language in German User Comments on Immigration." *Media and Communication* 9 no. 1 (3 February 2021): 171-180.
- Pluckrose, Helen, and James Lindsay. *Cynical Theories: How Activist Scholarship Made Everything about Race, Gender, and Identity-and Why This Harms Everybody*. Durham, NC: Pitchstone Publishing, 2020.
- Richards, E. Randolph, and Brandon J. O'Brien. *Misreading Scripture with Western Eyes: Removing Cultural Blinders to Better Understand the Bible*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012.
- Sandefur, Timothy. "Reviews: *Cynical Theories: How Activist Scholarship Made Everything about Race, Gender, and Identity-and Why This Harms Everybody* by Helen Pluckrose and James Lindsay." *The Objective Standard*. November 25, 2020. Accessed April 20, 2021. <https://theobjectivestandard.com/2020/10/cynical-theories-how-activist-scholarship-made-everything-about-race-gender-and-identity-and-why-this-harms-everybody-by-helen-pluckrose-and-james-lindsay/>.

- Scott, David. "A Church Without a View: Jonathan Edwards and Our Current Lifeview Discipleship Crisis." *Christian Apologetics Journal* 7, no. 2 (2008): 21-36.
- Sensoy, Özlem, and Robin DiAngelo. *Is Everyone Really Equal?: An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2017.
- Shellnutt, Kate. "Southern Baptists Keep Quarreling Over Critical Race Theory." *Christianity Today*, December 3, 2020, assessed January 21, 2021. <https://www.christianitytoday.com/news/2020/december/southern-baptist-critical-race-theory-debate-crt-seminary-s.html>.
- Shlemon, Alan. "Social Justice Begins at Conception." Stand to Reason: Clear-Thinking Christianity." January 1, 2016. Accessed March 29, 2021. <https://www.str.org/w/social-justice-begins-at-conception>.
- Sire, James W. *The Universe Next Door: A Basic Worldview Catalogue*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.
- Smith, Efreem. *The Post-Black and Post-White Church: Becoming the Beloved Community in a Multi-Ethnic World*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2012.
- Sowell, Thomas. *Discrimination and Disparities*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2018.
- Stepman, Jarrett. "The Resegregation of America." The Daily Signal. April 01, 2021. Accessed April 01, 2021, at <https://www.dailysignal.com/2021/03/31/resegregation-of-america/>.
- The Heritage Foundation. "New York Times Quietly Edits "1619 Project" After Conservative Pushback." The Heritage Foundation. September 26, 2020. Accessed April 20, 2021. <https://www.heritage.org/american-founders/impact/new-york-times-quietly-edits-1619-project-after-conservative-pushback>.
- U.S. Department of Justice. "Department of Justice Report Regarding the Criminal Investigation into the Shooting Death of Michael Brown by Ferguson, Missouri Police Officer Darren Wilson." Washington, DC: Department of Justice. Accessed on March 14, 2021, at https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/pressreleases/attachments/2015/03/04/doj_report_on_shooting_of_michael_brown_1.pdf.
- Wallis, Jim. "On the 50th Anniversary of Dr. King's Assassination, Confessing the Church's Complicity in Racial Division." *Sojourners*, April 4, 2018. Accessed April 22, 2021. <https://sojo.net/articles/50th-anniversary-dr-kings-assassination-confessing-churchs-complicity-racial-division>.
- Warkentin, Buetta and Alexander Sawatsky. "Points of Discourse: Reconciling Christianity and Social Work through Critical Theory." *Social Work and Christianity* 45, no. 2 (Summer, 2018): 57-67.
- Williams, Thaddeus J. *Confronting Injustice without Compromising Truth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic, 2020.

Yosso, Tara J. "Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8, no. 1 (2006): 69-91.

Zúñiga, Gloria. *Doing Justice to Justice: Competing Frameworks of Interpretation in Christian Social Ethics*. Vol. 4 in *Christian Social Thought Series*. Grand Rapids, MI: Acton Institute, 2002.