RACISM, LIBERATION THEOLOGY
and LIBERAL ELITISM

by Dr. D. W. Ekstrand

INTRODUCTION

This particular study was inspired by a close black friend of mine who was a part of my ministry with college students here in Arizona in the early 80s; I will refrain from using her name, out of respect for her and those who know her. She was a beautiful young lady with a very sharp mind and great people skills. She was raised in a military family that was in active service when she was a part of my ministry. After graduating from Arizona State University, she told me she was moving to Washington, DC, to experience what it really means to live in a “black community;” up until then she had never lived in a predominantly black one. That was understandable to me, so I bid her good bye and wished her God’s best. This young graduate was one classy woman. With that in mind, this study addresses those issues that she recently brought to my attention. Due to the fact that much of what I have written in this study could be interpreted wrongly if taken out of context, I am requesting that “you state the context” should you desire to “quote” any of my comments. It is a sad commentary on this day in which we live, that people like to “twist” what others have said, in order to support the presumed integrity of their own thinking.

Since many of you who are reading this study may not be “Christians,” let me preface my remarks by saying this — in all likelihood your understanding of what it means to be a Christian is inaccurate; being a Christian is not simply about believing a bunch of forensic truths that you religiously embrace... it’s about experiencing a divine work of God in your life. Naturally that is not an easy construct of thought for a non-Christian to understand; to compare it to a physical reality, it would be like understanding what it is like to be in “weightless space,” when in fact you have never been there. A person becomes a true born-again Christian when he humbles himself before God and admits his sinful condition (i.e., his self-orientation in life) — at that point, God opens his heart to understand and believe the truth and then make him a new creation;” that’s what it means to be “born again” (cf. John 3:3) — this is not the work of man, but the work of God. It is God who gives man a “deep abiding conviction of the truth” (cf. Heb 11:1); so it’s not like you have to convince yourself as to what is true and what is not true; truth is not attained by the wisdom of men — salvation is the work of God in the heart and mind of the believer. Whereas all believers were previously spiritually dead in their sins, God made them spiritually alive in Christ (cf. Eph 1:13; 2:1-5; Col 1:3-6; Jam 1:21; Acts 16:14; Rom 4:3; 2 Cor 5:17); again, this is not simply a forensic truth, it is a dynamic reality (one of which the non-believing world knows nothing — to many in the unbelieving world this is “a foolish concept;” 1 Cor 2:14). The reality is this: Jesus Christ went to the cross and died for our sins that He might “reconcile us” to Himself and make us righteous creatures in His eyes (cf. John 3:16; Rom 4:3-8; 6:23; Col 1:13); prior to salvation we were “alienated” from God because of our sinfulness (cf. Rom 5:10; Eph 2:3; Col 1:20-22). The work of Christ is made efficacious in our lives when we place our faith (our trust) in Him; i.e., we concur with the truth (cf. Rom 5:1; 8:1; Eph 2:8-9). If you are “not a believer,” I thought it would be helpful to at least give
definition to this truth, because the ramifications of it are far-reaching in this study, due in part to erroneous comments that some in the unbelieving world have attributed to Christianity; the reality is this: if someone isn’t truly a believer, they will be inclined to wrongly judge many tenets of the Christian faith. So let me be clear. Christianity is not simply about believing a bunch of forensic truths that one adopts as his religious doctrine; therefore don't make it out to be that, because that is a serious error in judgment. In short, salvation is a work of God in the life of a person who has humbled himself before Him, and placed his trust in Him (read Micah 6:8; Ps 40:4; Prov 3:5; Jam 1:21). The question to each of you who are reading this study is this: “Do you believe the truth?” The apostle Paul expressed his concern to those who were wondering if indeed what he was teaching them was of God; thus he exhorted them to “examine themselves as to whether or not they were in the faith” (cf. 2 Cor 13:5). When believers humbly reflect upon God's Word, the Holy Spirit gives them a deep abiding conviction as to its truthfulness (cf. Acts 17:11; Heb 11:1). So, the assurance of salvation is produced in our hearts first and foremost through the Word of God by God's Spirit, and later on through our love for holiness, hatred of sin, love of the brethren, practical righteousness, and separation from the world.

The good news of salvation through Jesus Christ is not a doctrine for one particular race, it is a doctrine for the entire human family. Essentially, the biblical concept of “salvation” refers to “deliverance from the bondage of sin and death and eternal judgment,” i.e., those poignant realities that ultimately govern man’s existence (cf. Gal 1:4; 3:13; Rom 8:2). Ultimately, man's sinful condition resulted in rebelliousness (cf. Matt 21:28-29), lawlessness (cf. Matt 7:23; 13:41; 24:12), and sickness of soul, defiling him from within (cf. Mark 2:17; Mt 12:35; 15:19-20; 23:25); thus leaving him indebted to God (cf. Mt 6:12; 18:23-27; Col 2:13-14). God therefore called all men to repentance (cf. Mk 1:15; Lk 5:32; 13:3; 15:10); i.e., to a change of outlook and lifestyle that enthrones God rather than oneself (cf. Mt 9:9; 16:24; Jn 8:11). This incredible salvation was made possible because of God's transcendent love for sinful man — He sent His Son (Jesus Christ) to this world to redeem man through the cross (cf. Rom 6:23) — the cross is the supreme demonstration of the love God has for sinful man (cf. Jn 3:16; 15:16). It was the cross whereby God provided salvation for man; thus it was an act of God with eternal and cosmic significance. So Christ crucified is the summary of the Christian message (cf. 1 Cor 2:2); in Him we are justified (i.e., made righteous) before God (Rom 3:26), and forgiven of all our sins (cf. 1 Cor 15:3). If the cross is not central to our lives, then we are “enemies of the cross of Christ” (cf. Phil 3:18); to be an enemy of the cross is to reject its need and purposes; self-righteousness, self-indulgence, self-gratification, and self-glorification all make one an enemy of the cross. So either we make Christ and His will our life, or we remain self-centered and make ourselves the foundation of our life (cf. Mt 16:24-25; Gal 2:20; Phil 1:21; Col 3:4).

The principle problem with the human family is that it is “fallen” by nature; i.e., the core of its being is “diabolical” … “self-centered” … and ruled by Satan and the forces of darkness; thus the human family is not a righteous family, “instead it is an unrighteous one.” Those are difficult constructs for human beings to accept, because they think they possess some inherent goodness; but Scripture emphatically declares “that is not the case” (read Lk 18:19; Jn 8:43-44; Rom 3:10-18; Col 1:13; 1 Jn 3:8) — mankind dwells in darkness; as such “he hates the light & hates God” (cf. Jn 3:19-21; Rom 1:30); so it should not be surprising that “he hates God's people” (cf. Lk 21:17; Jn 15:18; 17:14). Hence, there are two kinds of people in the world: those who are of God and those who are of Satan (the children of Satan comprise about 85% of the human family – Mt 7:13-14). If you fail to reflect upon the various references listed, you may question the veracity of that
truth; conversely, if you are an unrepentant person (i.e., one who has not turned from his self-centered orientation), you will argue against this truth and refuse to accept it. The “greatest commandment” God has given to fallen man is that “he love God and love his fellow man” (cf. Mt 22:36-40). Likewise, Jesus commanded His followers to “love each other” (cf. Jn 13:34-35; 1 Jn 4:7-8); the reality is, either you are a person of love or you are a person of hate. According to Scripture, to argue against that truth is foolishness. By the way, it is only possible to “love” if the Holy Spirit has been poured out in your heart (cf. Rom 5:5), and the Holy Spirit is only given to those who humble themselves before God and place their trust in Him (cf. Jn 14:17; Rom 8:9; 1 Cor 6:19; Gal 4:6; Jam 1:21; 1 Jn 4:13; Jn 3:16; 1 Jn 1:9). This didactic lies at the foundation of the Christian life, and is foundational to understanding much of what is written in this study… so you may need to refer to it over and over again. You will constantly be confronted with the word “diabolical” — should you find that troubling, refer back again to this paragraph.

If we were to define our universe, we would have to start by saying that it is a “moral universe” — Scripture tells us that our Creator is a “HOLY GOD;” that is the “most emphatic” statement in the entire Bible (cf. Is 6:3; Rev 4:8); there is no darkness in Him whatsoever (1 Jn 1:5). The fact that God is “holy” means He is “absolutely pure and sacred;” He is so holy and pure that “no man can look upon Him and live” (cf. Ex 33:20). Just as God is holy, so He has made us “His holy children” — God said to Moses and His people, “You are a holy people to the Lord your God; the Lord your God has chosen you to be a people for His own possession” (cf. Deut 7:6; Jer 2:3). The word “holy” in Greek (hagios) is also translated “saint,” as God’s children we are saints; i.e., we have been “set apart unto the Lord” (cf. Rom 1:7; 8:27; 1 Cor 1:2; Eph 1:15). Peter said to the believing world: “Be holy in all your behavior; for it is written, ‘You shall be holy, for I am holy’” (cf. 1 Pet 1:15-16; Lev 11:44; 19:2). God has called us with “a holy calling” (cf. Eph 1:4; 2 Tim 1:9); thus as believers we are to “come apart from the world” (cf. 2 Cor 6:17), and live to the praise of God’s glory (cf. 1 Cor 10:31; Gal 3:17). If we make little of God’s holiness, we will make little of our sinfulness and make little of the cross. Paul tells us that “God dwells in unapproachable light” (cf. 1 Tim 6:16); thus He is referred to as “light” (1 Jn 1:5); “Jesus is the light that came into the world to enlighten dark sinful man as to what is true” (Jn 1:4-9; 8:12), “but the vast majority of men reject the light because they prefer the dark” (Jn 1:11; 3:19) — i.e., they choose the dark because that defines the core of their being. By definition, light refers to that which is of God, and dark refers to that which is of Satan. When one reflects upon “pure moral truth” he will see himself as being sinful and in need of God’s mercy. Due to the fact the vast majority of men reject this truth, “they hate the light because it condemns them” (Jn 3:20); thus they proudly and stubbornly refuse to acknowledge their fallen nature and their sinful condition. The difference between the “believer” and the “unbeliever,” lies in the different attitudes they take toward the “light;” the unbeliever rejects the light (i.e., what Jesus taught) “because he loves the darkness in his soul;” it is not offensive to him therefore he refuses to die to his unrighteous sinful self (he just doesn’t see himself as unrighteous). On the other hand, thebeliever humbly and willingly comes to the light that he might experience God’s mercy and forgiveness — he is interested in the truth, and dealing with things as they really are; as such, he hates his sin and loves righteousness (cf. Jn 1:8-10; 2:9-10; 3:7-10). By definition light reveals things for what they really are (cf. Jn 3:20; Eph 5:13) — Jesus exposed the evil nature of man, by condemning his thinking, his lifestyle, and his religion (read John 1:4-5; 3:20; 8:12; 12:46; Prov 16:25).
The reality is, man is not free to do as he pleases in life (cf. Gen 2:15-17; Deut 28:1f; 28:15f; Jer 26:13; Acts 5:29; Rom 2:8); as such, he will be held accountable for everything he does in life (cf. Mt 12:36-37; Rev 20:11-12). Denying that reality isn't going to change it one iota — fallen man doesn't set the standard and determine reality; that is God's divine prerogative alone. The problem with the Pharisees back during the time of Christ was that they insisted on seeing themselves as being good and righteous, but Christ clearly revealed to them that they were not good and righteous (cf. Lk 18:19), that they were actually evil and unrighteous (cf. Mt 23:1-39); that their religiosity was repugnant and unacceptable to God — obviously that was highly upsetting to them and really made them angry, to the point that they crucified Christ! (cf. Lk 23:21). Remember, Christ was condemning the teachings of Judaism as it was being practiced; they had made it legalism and ritual. Isn't it amazing how truth can be such an abhorrent reality to fallen man? (cf. Jn 3:20). The reality is this: the wisdom of men is earthly, natural, demonic, selfish and ego-centric… whereas the wisdom of God is pure, peaceable, gentle, reasonable, merciful and kind (cf. Jam 3:15-17) — anything that is diabolical in its orientation is completely contrary to that which is of divine orientation; thus the wisdom of men and the wisdom of God are antithetical to each other (polar opposites; cf. Is 55:8-9; Prov 16:25). With the foregoing in mind, the question that begs an answer is this: How can one possibly be that wrong when he judges himself? When we are “proud” we are blind to the truth of who we really are — “we have closed our eyes” (cf. Mt 14:15; Rom 3:10-12; 3:23; 6:23)… it is only when we “humble” ourselves before God that He reveals truth to our hearts (cf. Jam 4:6; 1 Pet 5:5). The other question that begs asking is this: How can any of us claim to be good people when we are not? One shouldn't need to be convinced of his sinfulness after having lived in his skin for a number of years; that would be akin to the paraplegic denying his condition after having lived with it for fifty years; it is sheer folly (cf. Rom 1:22). The reality is, man is an extremely obstinate creature; we are all despicable sinners (cf. Lk 18:19; Rom 1:21-22; Eph 4:17-19); I'm no different that you are, and you're no different than I am; we're all made of the same stuff, so take off that proud garment you're wearing and throw it in the trash! The ultimate truth of this whole didactic is this: If you cannot identify with what I have just written, your eternal destiny will not be with God — this was Christ's message to the human family (cf. Jn 3:16; Rom 6:23; Mt 25:31-46). The main things the “unbelieving world” values are these — the perverse thinking of this world, the desires of the flesh, the pride of life, immorality, sensuality, impurity, one's passions, strife, hate, disputes, anger, enmities, dissensions, profanity, envy, drunkenness, carousing, jealousy, brashness, etc. (cf. Gal 5:19-21; 1 Jn 3:16). Conversely, the things the humble “believing world” values are these: being a people who love and care for others, being a people of kindness and goodness, being a people who are peaceful and gentle, a people who denounce and repent of their sinful thoughts & actions, a people who strive to control their fallen nature, a people who love Christ and His church, a people who submit to the lordship of Christ, a people who appear as lights in this world, and are a people of faith (cf. Gal 5:22-23; Eph 5:8; Phil 2:15; 1 Jn 3:7-10; 4:7-8). I guess the question is this: “In what direction does your heart lean?” This isn't an easy life to which we've been called for three reasons: the ugly diabolical world in which we live… Satan and the forces of darkness… and our own sinful flesh. The apostle John wrote these words to the Church, “Do not love the world, nor the things in the world; i.e., the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes and the boastful pride of life; because the world is passing away and all its lusts… only those who do the will of God will abide forever” (cf. 1 Jn 2:15-17). I understand the foregoing may be very disconcerting to you, so let me encourage you to give careful consideration to what I have written, because this is “God's message” to humanity. Beloved, this could be the last time God presents His case to you… please don't treat it lightly.
Another principle I would like to address up front is this—commensurate with knowledge, understanding, truth and reality is “logic” [true unabated logic]; without which one cannot truly understand any particular construct of thought; to understand anything one must see the logic of it. Carefully reflect upon that truism. The chief problem all of us have when wrestling with any construct of thought, is the “innate bias” that governs so much of our thinking— the idea of bias implies a natural bent or inclination of temperament; thus it is that constitution upon which many of our thoughts rest. Naturally, our thinking is the product of everything we have experienced in life—we have all processed an incredible amount of data since we were born, and over time we have wrestled with the integrity of much of that data…but not always doing so rightly; sometimes we have wrongly concluded certain aspects of that information. Since the culture of influence under which we were raised is so significant to the development of who we have become, it is important that we reflect upon the dynamics of other cultures in order that we might see the integrity of much of our thinking; in particular, the integrity of those constructs of thought that “conflict” with the thoughts that other people have. Sadly, most people fail in this regard—they just continue to build upon that foundation of thought that has occupied their thinking all along; hence their innate bias often dictates reality in their minds. The truth is, most people have a very difficult time questioning the foundation of their thinking when they are confronted with contrary thoughts (though we all question our thoughts to some degree). Obviously that didactic applies to both Christians & non-Christians alike…when we are conflicted in our thinking, we owe it to ourselves to take the time to give careful consideration to our thinking; numerous times we are exhorted in Scripture to reflect upon that which controls the discourse in our minds (cf. Ps 1:2; 25:4-5; 94:11; 119:9-16; Prv 23:7, 12; Is 55:8-9; 65:2; Mt 15:19; 22:42; Lk 9:47; Acts 17:11; Rom 12:3; 1 Cor 3:18-19; 10:12; 13:11; 14:20; Gal 6:3; Jas 1:26). That is one of the reasons I like philosophical thought, because philosophy by definition is “a logical explanation of reality;” the most respected philosophers down through the centuries have embraced a level of logic that stresses the importance of truth and integrity of thought; it doesn’t try to “trick” you into embracing some ideological ideal that isn’t grounded in unadulterated truth—“truth” is always foundational to purity of thought. So the ultimate question we must ask ourselves is this: “Are we really interested in knowing the truth or do we simply want to satisfy ourselves with information that supports our innate bias?”

The chief antagonist in this study is an extreme liberal elite named John Pavlovitz— it was his reckless words that prompted me to address many of the issues that I present in this study; for those of you who are unaware of the themes to which he speaks, I have placed “his article” at the end of this study as an addendum — it might be best if you read his thoughts before reading this study; it will give “context” to what I have written. In his article he attacks the Christian community with such hatred it is almost impossible to fathom…thus his statements about the Christian faith are nothing but venomous diabolical constructs of thought. It is a very sad commentary, because many people in our world believe the garbage that he is selling in the marketplace. Sometimes you have to fight fire with fire—hence my incendiary response. Because Pavlovitz interjects “politics” into the conversation, he leaves me no choice but to address the political world (which I abhor). The reality is, I find politics disgusting… I have tried to steer clear of it now for a number of years, but every now and then it finds a way of getting into my wheelhouse…this time it was by the provocative diabolical thinking of a man named John Pavlovitz; when you read what I have written, you will no doubt sense the disdain that I have
for these subjects. Obviously, anytime one is forced to argue against an ideologue that he has little respect for and strongly disagrees with, it is not a pleasant, enjoyable experience; you’re fortunate, all you have to do is read this stuff; I had to write it! I wish the political world wasn’t such an aggravation to me, but it is (cf. 2 Cor 12:8). As much as I enjoy wrestling with the teachings of Scripture (theological truth)… I abhor wrestling with fallen human thought (especially the thoughts of someone who has no understanding of the diabolical nature of his position). It became quite obvious to me that this was simply a task that God had assigned to me, so I will try my best to answer the various issues that are on the table. Being as I have had to wrestle with these issues fulltime now for almost three months (writing requires extensive editing), I’m now looking forward to bringing this study to a close (I penned those words on my last edit).

**Keeping the foregoing in mind, the “premiere issue” in this study** is a matter of “believing what is true, not what you want to be true” — there is a world of difference between those two didactics. I have already underscored some “spiritual dynamics” that Scripture emphatically states; thus I would encourage you to “humble yourself” at this point and ask God for the grace to “know the truth” (only God can open one’s mind to the truth; that is why the Holy Spirit is called “the Spirit of truth” — cf. Jn 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; Acts 16:13; 1 Cor 12:34; 1 Th 1:5; Jam 1:21). Every human being should want to believe the truth and not believe a lie; why would anyone want to believe something that is not true? Sadly the majority of people simply believe what they really want to believe.” The reality is, if you’re not ready to defer to “divine truth” (i.e., you’re convinced that what you believe is in fact true), *God will not respond to your prayers*; thus there really isn’t any point in praying if that indeed is the case — in other words, “divine truth” *is not up for mere consideration*; that if you like some particular didactic you will embrace it, but if you don’t like it you won’t embrace it; *God doesn’t operate that way.* I find it strange that one would even pray to God when in fact he is not willing to defer to Him — such is akin to making God into a little genie who simply “gives you want you want;” that concept of God is nowhere to be found in Scripture. Again, let me encourage you to carefully reflect upon the various references I have listed above… if you sense you are “kind of open to the truth,” ask God to give you a heart to know Him and to know the truth; salvation is totally the work of God in the human heart (cf. Act 16:14; Titus 3:5). Anyone can entertain spiritual truths without desiring to truly know them, but such “dynamic realities” will not be an inspiration to their soul if they do not possess humility of heart — God only dispenses grace to those who are humble (cf. Jam 1:21; 4:6); without *divine enlightenment,* one will only understand things on a human level (cf. 1 Cor 2:14); by the way, this isn’t some strange theological teaching; this is the revelation of God to man — *there is only one truth, and man doesn’t determine what is true; he simply accepts it or rejects it.* The reality is, one must come to the end of himself and express his *desire to know the truth no matter what it might cost him.* That is precisely how I came to faith in Christ. For those of you who want to know what the Christian faith is all about, let me encourage you to read a study I did titled, “The Dynamics of Genuine Faith” — it’s on my website: [www.thetransformedsoul.com](http://www.thetransformedsoul.com) — you can access a “printable pdf version” by clicking on the “icon” in the upper right hand corner of it.

**Dear friend,** not sure exactly where to begin this discourse or exactly what issues I should even address, because a number of them are quite provocative. Obviously I don’t want to offend you or upset you (not at all) but neither do I want to be glib or simply tell you what you want to hear, or hold back from addressing the issues that are on the table before us. My thinking is this: if you were bold enough to state the issues, I should be bold enough to address them. The email
that you sent to me, and the corresponding article that you forwarded with that email, was not only fomenting and full of incendiary remarks that caught me a little off guard, but actually a little eye-opening. In his article John Pavlovitz expresses a great deal of anger toward the “white Christian world” for voting for Donald Trump as President. Though it is not uncommon for many people in our world to express their disdain for those they don’t agree with politically, Pavlovitz takes things to an altogether different level — his expressed anger toward the white Christian world not only reflects a level of extreme arrogance, but is very lacking in integrity. Naturally I’m going to have to deal with him on that level. His comments are so inflammatory that one wonders if this is truly a reflection of the anger and demonic thinking that now characterizes so much of our political world — God forbid that it is — but it seems to be at some level. Thus, I felt the need to take the time and properly respond to it… as mentioned earlier, I don't normally like dealing with these kinds of issues because in most cases they are just a matter of people expressing their political bias, but Pavlovitz's remarks take things to a far deeper level; that will make a whole lot more sense to you once you have read this study. In the following pages, you will be reading some material that is both disconcerting & disturbing; in spite of that fact, let me just encourage you to try and keep an open mind when reflecting upon the various constructs of thought. Due to the nature of this study, some of what is written is a matter of opinion that I try to logically substantiate theoretically & philosophically. If nothing else, this study should help you rethink your construct of faith and what you believe about God and our world, and in so doing help you solidify your thinking on some very poignant issues.

With that in mind, let me begin by first saying this: my wife and I attend Scottsdale Bible Church here in Scottsdale — though it consists of several ethnicities, the majority of them are white. In addition to attending Scottsdale Bible, however, I teach a group of seniors every week in a bilingual church here in Scottsdale — New Life Community Church — the senior pastor is young man of Mexican descent (Luis Medrano); he preaches in Spanish the first service, and in English the second service. For years I have always had a heart for the Mexican community… back in my college ministry days at Grace Community Church Tempe, we did several projects in a number of Mexican communities here in Arizona as well as ministering in several Native American communities — some of you may have been a part of those ministries. When teaching “World Religions” & “Christian Studies” in a number of local colleges here in the Phoenix area over the past 15 years, I always took the time to commend my Mexican students for “bringing strong family values to our country;” due to the fact I feel very strongly about those values, I would spend a good bit of time expanding on the significance of them, and encourage them to aggressively pass them on to the rest of us living here in the US. Because “our culture” is in desperate need of moral reform, I felt that was a good platform on which to address that issue. Keep in mind, our American culture is the premiere culture of the western world (i.e., it is that culture that is being widely promulgated all around the world)… regrettably, it has a way of destroying family values, thus I would tell my Mexican students that our culture would probably (and sadly) win the day in their homes as well; that their families in all likelihood would probably end up succumbing to our western values not too many years hence. Remember, these were courses on religious studies, and “morality” is a foundational element of religious doctrine. The truth is, our diabolical western values have already made significant inroads into the vast majority of countries all over the world (thanks to the perverted thinking and values of Hollywood and liberal America). Obviously I feel very strongly about the direction America has gone both
morally and spiritually in recent years. It's amazing how rapidly the forces of darkness have grabbed control of so many institutions in our country (cf. Eph 6:12; Col 1:13).

**Beloved, your comments to me raised some compelling issues** in my mind regarding both the political world and the spiritual world. I shared a construct of thought with you in my email that I believe is foundational to those “human values” by which people live. Let me reiterate it: “There is enough information out there in the world to satisfy one's ignorance on any subject.”

The issue is this: if one ascribes to a certain body of knowledge and firmly believes it, it is very unlikely he will ever reject that body of knowledge. Sadly, many people embrace their innate bias and start building upon its foundation with “truth claims” that support that bias; obviously after a given period of time, that individual will accumulate a “significant amount of data” that coincides with his thinking; hence, he becomes an ardent believer or follower of it (Rom 1:18-32).

Remember, the Zebra doesn’t change his stripes – the older one becomes, the more wedded he becomes to those didactics that govern his life. This principle reminds me of the old maxim, “garbage in, garbage out;” should we eat nothing but junk in our lives, regardless of how good it may taste, it will ultimately have a negative affect upon us physically; conversely, should we entertain our minds with a bunch of trash (falsehood), no matter how wonderful those thoughts may appear to be to us, they will ultimately destroy us psychologically & spiritually.

Scripture addresses this subject over and over again. I mentioned in my email to you that the Greek language (the language in which the New Testament was originally written) has qualities to it that no other language in the world has; thus it is said to be “the most exacting language ever devised” — by the way, GOD is its author… He is the author of all languages (cf. Genesis 11:6-9).

Furthermore, New Testament Greek is a language that can say things in an unequivocal manner and with great emphasis (i.e., emphatic emphasis). The Greek verb has a number of “moods” to it — one of which is “The Indicative Mood” — this mood states things as “facts” (not opinions), and when stated emphatically, it is basically stating things this way: “Don’t argue with what is written; it is the absolute truth of God.” Frequently the Lord Jesus prefaced His teachings by saying, “Truly, Truly, I say to you” (cf. Jn 1:51; 3:3; 3:5; 3:11; 5:19; 5:24; 5:25; 6:26; etc.). Essentially He was “emphatically” declaring an “unequivocal truth.” Keeping that in mind, the message is this: it is these truths that must be the foundation of one’s thinking and faith: even though we might wrestle with them at some level (which is simply what it means to be human), we must forego our innate tendency to reject them. How do we do that? As mentioned earlier, we are to “humbly approach God” in our admittedly sinful state, and ask Him to make His Word alive in our heart and lead us into truth” — it is the Holy Spirit who “opens our hearts to believe truth;” it is not a function of human reason; though man reads and reflects upon what is written, God is the one who convicts the heart and gives him understanding (cf. Jn 14:16-17, 26; 16:13; Acts 16:14; Rom 10:17; Jam 1:21); truth can only be revealed to the human heart by the Holy Spirit — that’s why He is called the Spirit of truth. As you no doubt have noticed, I frequently list some biblical references throughout this study; they are placed there to expand upon and give emphasis to what is written — remember, when you read those passages, you’re reading GOD’s WORD, not my word. Reflect upon that statement.

**Some of the inherent issues in your email are quite volatile,** and made me question whether or not I even wanted to respond to them… especially in this polarizing culture. Due to the fact so many people here in America have such “strong opinions” on these subjects (on both sides of the aisle), sometimes it just seems best to “let sleeping dogs lie;” by the way, that was the
position the majority of white Americans took when the likes of Jesse Jackson started lambasting everyone (I address that more later). Seriously, how does one respond to someone who is screaming, ranting, raving and going off the deep end? What “possible good” can come from trying to dialogue with someone who is belligerently convinced that anyone who opposes his thinking is a racist and an idiot; quieting such a person is not possible, let alone trying to have honest discourse with him. Remember, “angry people don’t listen;” they are so consumed with how they feel they can’t hear what you are saying. When one lets his emotions run the gamut in his thinking, he ultimately relegates himself to a world of unreality. Generally, the intelligent thing to do is to simply “walk away” from such a person, because trying to get them to see the error of their way is simply fatuously blowing in the wind. The likes of Jesse Jackson reminds me of something the great statesman and orator Daniel Webster said: “It is one thing to get a new idea into someone’s mind, it’s quite another to get an old idea out of someone’s mind” — once a person has strongly wedded himself to some construct of thought (whatever it may be), it is highly unlikely that person will ever change his mind and adopt a view that is antithetical to his innate bias. The truth is, our world is so replete with juvenile thinking, it does not even care that its position lacks integrity… it simply believes what it wants to believe. That’s just another characteristic of what it means to be a fallen human being; we are very stubborn stupid creatures to say the least — most people aren’t interested in “truth,” they are only interested in affirming their innate bias. Remember, “there is enough information out there in the world to satisfy one’s ignorance on any subject” — let’s take a moment and apply that didactic: there’s enough information out there in the world to hate any political group (be they Democrats or Republicans)… to hate any religious group (be they Christians or Muslims or Hindus)… to hate any racial group (be they Whites, Blacks, Asians)… and anything else in this world. Again, reflect upon the ramifications of that statement.

**Hate is not only a poignant issue in our world… it is a very significant one in Scripture.**

Both the Old Testament Hebrew word for hate (sane) and the New Testament Greek word for hate (miseo) have as their basic meaning “strong opposition to love;” thus antithetical to hating is loving. Throughout Scripture the unrighteous are said to love evil & hate God; conversely, the righteous are said to love God and hate evil (cf. Ps 97:10; Prv 8:13; Amos 5:15; Rom 1:28-21; 12:9). Christ often reminded His disciples of the “hatred” which would come upon the people of God, that if the world hated Him it would also hate them (cf. Jn 15:18-23; 17:14). Remember, the world hated Jesus so much it crucified Him, in spite of the fact that He had done nothing wrong (cf. Jn 19:4, 6) — have you ever pondered the ultimate reason for their actions? Scripture states unequivocally that “men love darkness rather than light” (Jn 3:19-21) — when the light exposes the diabolical nature of our humanness, essentially we will be pushed in one of two directions — either we will humbly accept that truth, or we will proudly reject it; and God only extends His grace to those who are humble (cf. Jam 4:6; 1 Pet 5:5). Obviously there are contentious dynamics at work in the interior of every believer, and both of them are striving to pull us in their direction (Gal 5:17). The apostle Paul tells us that hating the things of God is not only a work of the evil one (Satan), but is also a work of the flesh (cf. Gal 5:20). Note the words of David, Asaph, and Solomon —

- Those who hate the Lord pretend obedience to Him (cf. Ps 81:15)
- Those who hate the righteous will be condemned (cf. Ps 34:21)
- The fear of the Lord is to hate evil (cf. Prv 8:13)
Sadly, once people align themselves with a certain body of knowledge, they will continue to build on that construct of thought until it almost becomes impossible to turn from (Rom 1:18-32). It should be noted, as human beings we're not only “thinking” creatures, we're also “emotional” creatures, and it is here where the human family has such a difficult time with reality. If the foregoing is somewhat troubling to you, I understand that; I'm as human as you are; this isn't kindergarten material. Obviously, “it is not my desire to make you or anyone else angry,” it is simply a perspective that the minds of men need to consider if they really want to reconcile the different constructs of thought by which people live their lives. It wasn't that long ago that leftist ideologists simply bought into the argument that “religion” was simply the product of human thought, that the only reason it exists in our world is that missionaries have sold it in the marketplace — in other words, the only reason it exists is that people were “taught” it by other people; that was simply a biased reactionary response that had no foundation in reality whatsoever — none. Ultimately, it was grounded in diabolical hatred of religious thought. Incredibly as it may seem, the world of science (supreme reality in the minds of the unbelieving leftist world) has since proven that that indeed is not the case, that religion is not the product of human thought. Anthropologists have discovered that religion is an integral part of the entire human family. The renowned German anthropologist Wilhelm Schmidt and others have done studies on nearly every culture and people group in the world (including those in Africa, Asia, America, Europe & Australia; as well as African tribal groups, Filipino Pygmies, Australian Aborigines, and tribal groups here in America), and discovered that all of the 5,000 people groups in the world believe in a Creator God; thus claiming that religion is inherent to the human family, that religion has nothing to do with the outside world passing on its thinking to the primitive world; that it is not the result of some outside influence or missionary endeavor; that it is an integral part of the human soul. The reality is, leftist ideologues simply let “their hatred” dictate reality in their minds — truth is not the bottom line to them; they simply love darkness, and any didactical argument (regardless of its integrity) is fine with them, as long as it takes “God” off of the table. The bottom line is, are you interested in believing what is “true,” or are you simply willing to satisfy yourself with believing biased fallen human thought?

Contrary to what you might be inclined to believe, iconoclastic liberalism is not the political answer to the human family in our world… liberal elitism arrogantly portrays itself as the only body of knowledge on the political stage in our country that possesses integrity (the issue should actually be pretty clear: self-acclimation and reality are vastly different animals; claiming something to be true does not make that didactic true — any logician knows that). For one to claim that his thinking is the only body of knowledge that is deserving of approval and acceptance by the populace is “absolute nonsense” — it is one thing to declare what you believe, it is quite another to claim absolute soundness of thought (veracity). Making an absolute didactical statement without diligently considering the sum total of all knowledge on a subject is downright “foolishness;” therefore to make one’s own biased thinking the only authoritative didactic by which the human family should live borders on “stupidity.” Another sober thought to consider is this: according to Scripture, believers are not to align themselves with the bureaucrats, technocrats, ethnologists, behaviorists, and those who politically demean other human beings; instead they are to align themselves with Christ and make divine truth (not diabolical human thinking) the foundation of their thought-lives and the governor of their actions. It is here, however, where the liberal elites in our country go bonkers, because they think Christians are throwing away their brains and discarding common sense for ethereal constructs of thought that are without foundation.
Yet they never stop to logically think about “the presupposition that governs their thinking” — that only human thinking possesses integrity and is worthy of our trust. Now that might be well and good if we all agreed with each other as to what is true, but we don’t! And God isn’t going to let the human family ever be in full agreement (cf. Gen 11:5-8; Ex 4:11); why would He? He will continue to convolute human thinking until He is ready to close the book on mankind. Now you can argue all day to the contrary, but that isn’t going to change it one iota. So “whose thinking” are you going to embrace? And what criteria are you going to use to vindicate that line of thinking? Beloved, if that defines you, you are going down “a dead-end street.” Though there may be a degree of logic to your thinking, you cannot demonstrate that it possesses the slightest degree of credibility or integrity; it is nothing but circular reasoning that is grounded in fallen human thought (cf. Rom 1:25, 28-31). Should you claim there is no Transcendent Reality (God) in the universe, then you have pretty much relegated yourself to living by your own fallen human thinking… but what evidence are you embracing that suggests that there is no God? A funny little comic book or the remedial thoughts of men? The truth is: “all extant evidence points to the fact that there is a Transcendent Reality in the universe” — Albert Einstein stated it this way: “The scientist is possessed by the sense of universal causation… His religious feeling takes the form of a rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection.” Since you would simply be building your premise on remedial human thought, you would then have to “ignore all the evidence.” Thus fallen human thinking not only denies the logic of divine wisdom without the slightest degree of credence, but the integrity of it as well. Essentially, the foundation of the temporal thoughts of men is a proud heart; i.e., a heart that refuses to acknowledge that “it is not the end all in life,” and that “it does not possess absolute autonomy.” The various didactics that are presented throughout this study, give greater definition to the foregoing. Let me make one more comment before moving on: little does the liberal elite know that he is arrogantly and stubbornly abandoning true wisdom for falsehood (cf. Prov 12:15; 14:12; 16:25; Rom 3:10-18).

I find it strange that the liberal elite pretend to be a people of “high moral character;” i.e., they want the world to think that “they are a people of virtue… who have strong family values, and have great children who are decent & law-abiding.” Ultimately, why is that the case? According to Scripture, all human beings know that “moral character is the supreme value of the human family;” that moral character is not only an important virtue for man, but is an extremely important virtue. With that in mind, I find it ironic that leftist ideologues fail to do what’s right when they know what’s right — down deep they know what’s right, as all men do, so they put on a cloak of righteousness in our world, yet they don't fess up to it with their jargon; they lack the integrity to make those values an integral part of their political ideology. I find that very strange. On the one hand they want the world to believe that they are a highly virtuous people, yet on the other hand they don't have the integrity to speak up and give voice to it. If what they truly want others to believe about them (that they are persons of high moral character) is not really the deep conviction of their heart, why do they insist that the world see them as those who possess it? Why are they not being true to their convictions? Why is that? Why the pretense? Why do they want the world to think they are truly a virtuous people when virtuousness isn't really foundational to who they really are? If they don't really care, then why do they go to all the trouble to wear a cloak of righteousness in public? Since they obviously want the world to see them as morally righteous, why are they so reluctant to
embrace those expressed virtues (expressed by their pretense) with their public discourse? You need to answer that question. The reality is, they are not a people of virtue… thus they are a fraud. I’m very much aware “that statement” may be troubling to you, so let me give “context” to this issue. The reason man feels an absolute need to possess moral character is this: God has instilled eternity and His moral law in the mind & heart of every human being (cf. Rom 2:14-16; Ecc 1:11, 14; 3:11, 14; 12:13-14), so man doesn’t have the freedom in his soul to simply live contrary to God’s moral law… no man is free from the weight of that conviction; even criminals behave in a relatively good manner most of the time (the emphasis on “relatively good,” because no man is “truly good;” cf. Lk 18:19). The reality is, God is going to hold all men accountable for violating His moral law; obviously without an internal awareness of right and wrong, God wouldn’t hold him accountable for it (cf. Rom 1:18-32; 3:19; 14:10-12; Mt 12:36; “16:27; Rev 20:12). So moral character is a foundational element of the entire human family. Every religion is based upon this fact; that’s why all religions have the same moral constructs — contrary to what some diabolical fools would have you believe, they are not the innovations of man. What is perplexing is this: “Why does the political left actually condemn’ mixing virtue with their political ideology?” Even more perplexing is why leftist ideologues berate those who are advocates of moral character; yet they still act in such a way so as to convince the electorate that they are a people of moral character. Here’s a real quagmire of thought to consider: why do many leftists put on a cloak of righteousness in public (i.e., pretend to be a people of moral character), yet promote ungodly, unrighteous behavior? (i.e., things like homosexuality, co-habitation, and various forms of immorality — porn & nakedness on television and in Hollywood; cf. Eph 4:17-19; 5:3-4; Col 3:5-8). Remember, God is the one who declares what is right and what is wrong, not man; so don’t try to foolishly change the rules and attempt to extract from God something that is “His prerogative alone.” To apply the foregoing truism and muddy the water even further, leftists frequently declare that they are not gay, but that they don’t have any problem with someone who is gay, to the point that they come down hard on those who are anti-gay; yet, ironically “they make it very clear that they themselves are not gay” — why is it so important for them to “stress that they are not gay”? If being gay isn’t a big deal to them, why do they insist that others see them as not being gay? Now there’s a conundrum for you — you want the public to know you live one way, but you are outspokenly supportive of those who live contrary to the way you live.” The question is, why don’t they publicly endorse their lifestyle of pretense that they are so insistent that the world see them as possessing? Do you really think leftist thinking possesses integrity?

To continue this line of reasoning… The left can’t just claim that “no one has a right to pass on their lifestyle values to others” — then why do they insist that the world adopt their values? It should be noted, we are not passing along “our values” to others… we are upholding those universal values that are of God; “thus you cannot say that being anti-gay is grounded in corrupt human thought.” Furthermore, why does the left “morally” support the gay life-style? — simple logic says, “you can’t deny someone else the right to express their morality, while at the same time claim that your morality is the right morality” — by whose authority do you make such a claim? You may have to carefully reflect upon that construct of thought; keep morality at the center of your thinking. The logic the left uses to support its position is actually quite interesting; it claims that it is “immoral” not to support gay-rights; but the rationale it uses is simply the product of human thought; they have no authority that they can appeal to outside the innate bias of human thinking (a man-made court; which is exactly the way the Pharisees operated). By the way, I find it interesting that the left “quotes the court” when it agrees with its decisions, but it
ignores it when it doesn’t agree with it; another inconsistency of the liberal left. The problem with the left is that it simply responds in a “reactionary manner” when confronting those on the right who condemn homosexuality; in so doing they ascribe to what they believe is “a higher moral”—they launch themselves into the moral stratosphere with “post-modern thought;” i.e., “what is right for you may not be right for me!” It is with just such mindless argumentation that they joyfully turn the world of morality upside down; to make this whole issue even more mind-boggling, they then continue to insist that the world see them as a people of virtue. I’m not sure you can accept everything I have just stated, because it is a strong indictment against leftist ideological thinking; you may need to read it again to get clarity on it. In a crass manner, one could word the problem this way to someone on the left: “If you are really a slut, why do you insist on acting as if you are not a slut?” Why does the liberal left make its ideological constructs the only moral tenets mankind should embrace; yet they completely abandon the divine moral absolutes God has clearly stated in His Word and has written on their hearts — essentially, they displace true morality with political morality, and they defend their deductions with “reactionary logic” (i.e., with logic that simply satisfies their initial reaction, in spite of the fact that their construct of thought has not been carefully thought through). In other words, they are simply looking for an “excuse” to satisfy their dark thinking… they are not interested in “truth;” post-modernism has taken truth off the table; yet if there is no truth, then why do they insist that they are right? The problem with leftist ideological thinking is that it fails to see “the contradictory nature of its logic of argumentation.” In large part, this was the way the Pharisees argued; they only saw things from the vantage point of fallen human thinking; all they did was look at issues from a human perspective (i.e., a humanistic interpretation of Scripture); thus they always looked for ways of “justifying” what they had come to believe. Again, this is simply a matter of “circular reasoning” — you begin with a construct of thought that you feel good about (i.e., you presuppose that something is true — yet you cannot demonstrate that your presupposition is true), and then you seek to justify that thought with all of the information that you can gather; thus vindicating your position.

The reality is this: if you take “GOD” off of the table, the best you can do is employ circular reasoning — why’s that? because you have taken TRUTH off of the table! Scripture clearly tells us, “God gives people over to a depraved mind when they reject Him as their Creator” (cf. Rom 1:25, 28). Now whether you believe that or not is irrelevant; that is the reality; remember, GOD is the one who determines reality; if you exchange the truth of God for a lie, your thinking will be nothing but depraved human thought… if you think your kind of reasoning is glorious, then go ahead and keep thinking that way; but it is nothing but junk; at best, all we as human beings can do is employ circular reasoning when we arrogantly remove God from the discourse. As stated earlier, “there is enough information out there in the world to satisfy your ignorance on any subject.” The problem with leftist ideological thinking is that it is completely grounded in just such forms of thought — though it may appear to be brilliant on the one hand, it is insanely idiotic on the other hand. By the way, many on the right are just as guilty of moronic thinking as those on the left; this isn’t just a political problem, this is a human problem; all human beings are guilty of reactionary justification: when you are simply preoccupied with one side of an issue, you are relegating yourself to a very low level of argumentation; that’s why studying Scripture is no walk in the park—it forces you to look at both the human side of an issue and the divine side of an issue… it exposes us for who we really are, and for who God really is. Beloved, God has called the wisdom of men “FOOLISHNESS” — now either that is true or it is not true; so either
you are going to believe God or you are going to believe man. Sadly, at this juncture it appears as though you have chosen to believe man (political man no less). Remember, all man does is look for some construct of reasoning that satisfies his dark soul, in spite of the fact that there is no foundation to his thinking. How’s that for an oxymoron? Remember, all human beings can do is begin with a presupposition and commence arguing from there, without the slightest degree of proof that their presupposition is true — the anal evolutionist begins with the presupposition that there is no God (again, without the slightest degree of evidence). Is it no wonder God calls the thinking of men foolish? With that in mind, let me appeal to you that you at least study the great philosophers of history (and the great theologians of history) that you might appreciate the significance and need of true unabated logic when wrestling with such profound issues.

Let’s return to the subject at hand... Why do leftist ideologues hypocritically insist that the world not see them as morally deficient creatures? Furthermore, why do they show disdain for those who are advocates of moral virtue? Sooner or later you are going to have to answer this question. Why do these leftist insist that the public believe “they are actually moral church-going people of all things,” yet strongly criticize the religious moral element in our culture? In short, why do they do one thing and say another? (i.e., why are they playing-acting — “being hypocritical”). By comparison, it would be like coming down hard on criminals, when they in fact are criminals; the reality is this: the pretense with which they live life is without integrity. In order to shed more light on this issue, let’s look at what Scripture has to say about it: “Don’t claim to be what you’re not; you claim to be righteous, but you live as one who is unrighteous.”

If you are not grounded in Scripture, the essence of “being righteous and being unrighteous” might be a little puzzling to you – those who are “righteous” have a heart for God and His will; those who are “unrighteous” are simply governed by their own fallen human thinking (Scripture also calls such people “wicked & evil;” it is not referring to someone that human beings would judge as being a “bad person”). Keeping that in mind, Jesus called the Pharisees “hypocrites,” i.e., ones who are play-acting: ones who simply live a life of pretense. Several times in Matthew’s gospel Jesus exposes the Pharisees (that group of individuals that the entire Jewish community thought was the most righteous group of people in the world; cf. Mt 5:20; 19:25) for who they truly were: “You portray yourself as being one thing, yet you condemn others for being no different than you are” (cf. Mt 23:13, 14, 15, 16, 23, 25, 27, 29). They didn’t practice what they preached; their walk was one thing, but their talk was another; they lacked integrity. Obviously this principle needs careful reflection. Jesus said, “The hypocrite wants to be seen as truly good, when in fact he is not truly good” (cf. Mt 6:2, 5); in other words, he is deceiving people by living a life of deception. Jesus put it this way: “You honor Me with your lips, but your heart is far from Me” (Mt 15:8); “You are not true to who you say you are. You hypocrite, first take the log out of your eye, before you try and take the speck out of your brother’s eye” (cf. Mt 7:5); the essence of His message was this: “You have a deplorable problem; before you scold others who have a far less serious problem, resolve your own problem” (cf. Mt 7:1-3). Jesus was coming down hard on their arrogance!” You might remember, these hypocrites were so exasperated with the things Jesus taught, they killed him! True outspoken followers of Christ should probably not expect anything different from the diabolical left (it is very obvious, they are not a humble people of moral virtue); as Jesus said, “If they persecuted Me, they will also persecute you” (cf. Jn 15:20). Keep in mind, “a hypocrite is someone who pretends to be what he is not” (he’s play-acting) — hypocrites arrogantly don’t see the folly of their way. Why is that? because this issue ultimately requires that one humbly look at the very core of his being, which isn’t an easy task, because the hearts
of men are “proud” — they actually think they possess more virtue than other people. The vast majority of the Pharisees in the ancient world could not identify with the significance of this truth; they simply weren’t a “humble” people (thus, they lacked understanding — it is God who gives man understanding). Basically, there are three things that characterize those who truly believe in Christ: what they are, what they believe, and what they do. Beloved, it all starts with “humility” (i.e., “lowliness of mind,” which is the opposite of arrogance; cf. Ps 25:9; Is 66:2; Rom 12:3, 16; Jam 4:6; 1 Pet 5:5-6; Mt 11:29). Don’t play games with what God teaches and satisfy yourself with human thought. The foregoing is an indictment against the godless left — writes King Solomon: “The perverse in heart are an abomination to the Lord… but the blameless in their walk are His delight” (cf. Prv 11:20; Mt 17:17; Phil 2:15). If you are not into “true unabated logic,” the foregoing was probably a frustrating read for you — pure logic lies at the root of divine truth (cf. Jam 3:17).

CHRISTIANITY AND RACISM

What is particularly disturbing to me is your accusation that white Christians are racists; in so doing you are differentiating between the various segments of the Christian world, as if there are actually numerous kinds of Christians. The foundation of that thought is where we should probably begin. Though one-third of the world identifies itself as being a part of the Christian community, those who are truly “born again” are probably only about 13-15% of our world; simply going to church and calling oneself a Christian doesn't make one a Christian (i.e., a follower of Christ). What makes a person a true born-again Christian is this: he humbles himself before God, he acknowledges his sinfulness, he trusts in the redemptive work of Christ on cross for salvation, and he obeys the commands of God (cf. Jn 14:15; Rom 3:23; Gal 2:20; Eph 2:8-9; Heb 11:6; Jam 4:6; 1 Pet 1:2). According to Scripture, “there is only one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God” (cf. Eph 4:4-6)… in addition to that, there is no racial divide or distinction between the various people groups of those who are truly born-again (cf. Col 3:11; Rom 10:12) — thus we are “ONE” — to distance oneself from others in the body of Christ is to acknowledge that one is truly not born-again. The “oneness” that exists in the Christian world is not just a forensic truth; it is a dynamic reality; we are truly “ONE.” We cannot change the vernacular or redefine Christianity to suit our ideals; the reality is this: “only God’s ideals make a difference;” we cannot effectuate a change in our soul by subscribing to any other ideal. For you to somehow claim that “white Christians are racists” because they voted for Trump and not Hillary, is to distance oneself from the Christian community. Due to the fact that you are differentiating between “white & black Christians” is troubling in that you are identifying with an aphorism that is foreign to Scripture… hence it is not of God. By embracing such a didactic, you are redefining Christianity on your own terms, and making it what you want it to be… as Christians we are not free to dictate reality — that is God’s prerogative, not man’s. It is also interesting to note that you are subscribing to a very narrow definition of “racism,” and basing it on one’s political bias — in short, you are calling white Christians “racists” because they voted for Trump and not Hillary. Again, that is very troubling. Due to the fact that we as Christians are truly “one body,” we cannot divide the body of Christ into several entities; i.e., white Christians; black Christians; etc. Thus I must insist that we not segment the Christian community; regardless of color or ethnic origin, all believers in Christ are “CHRISTIANS” (i.e., followers of Christ — not some racial, political divide); in short, Christ is our identity.
In your email to me you mentioned that white Christians by their vote “demonstrated an inability to acknowledge the pain that others were experiencing” (presumably the black population). Apparently the rationale is this: if white Christians knew how much pain blacks were experiencing, they would not have voted for Trump. That statement is replete with problems… I don't want to just ignore it, so I'll address it in more detail later on. Though I don't want to be insensitive to what you and the majority of blacks are experiencing, neither do I want you to be insensitive to what the Christian world is experiencing — above everything, as Christians we are fighting against the demonic forces of darkness on every level, and an integral part of that fight is that of defending our religious freedoms. That construct of thought doesn't seem to be that significant to you; instead it seems to be an issue of secondary importance in your mind, if it is truly important to you at all. Though pain is a significant reality in our world on all kinds of levels, it is also relative (some forms of pain are far more significant than others, and demand urgent attention). As important as it is to minister to those individuals who are experiencing pain, it is even more important to minister to the “spiritual needs” of those individuals. I’m not being crass here; I'm trying to shed light on the most important issue in the human family — the spiritual needs of individuals is actually far more important than the physical and emotional needs of individuals (as pronounced as they may be)… physical death is a big thing, but spiritual death is monumental — physical death is temporal, but spiritual death is eternal. In your email you said the Christian community was “making peace with oppression” in order that they might experience “the hope of personal peace and affluence;” that's a pretty provocative statement — it raises a number of thoughts in my mind: “the oppression” of which you refer can be quite varied and can occur on numerous levels; exactly what it is you are referring to I'm not sure… and exactly what constitutes deliverance I'm not sure. The reality is, some forms of oppression will never get resolved in this life; it’s also important to remember that Christians are experiencing extremely significant oppression all over the world, including here in America; but that doesn't seem to be a primary concern to you — 100,000 Christians will be martyred for their faith this year; can you actually say that “the oppression blacks are experiencing in America” is greater than that? (I deal more with this subject later). Though there may be problems in the black community, you can’t make having a “black orientation” the supreme didactic that needs to rule in the minds of everyone in our country. You have to keep in mind, we don't live in a perfect little world; there are injustices being done everywhere in our world; contrary to what you may think, “I have been unjustly dealt with several times in my life” — thanks to leftist ideologues, my wife and I lost everything we owned eight years ago (about $250,000). This world isn’t nearly as “one-sided” as you're making it out to be… blacks aren’t the only people in our country who are experiencing some negatives. One of the problem is, when blacks get poor service at Denny’s, they claim “racism;” when whites get poor service, they blame it on “lousy service” — they can't play “the race card.”

Regrettably, blacks frequently claim that they are “victims;” perhaps they are at times, but when you always have “an excuse” for everything in life, you are really damaging your chances of making much of your life; your mental perspective is hurting you; essentially, you're buying into the thinking that the entire world and life is against you, and that you can't win; the reality is, you're destroying your life with a mindset that Scripture speaks out against (cf. Phil 4:8; Prv 23:7). The reality is, none of us have been given a “gold spoon” in life in an absolute sense… we all have “rough roads” to travel… though it may not appear that way to some people's thinking, that is the reality — remember, life consists of far more than the color of one's skin; there are
a host of physical issues, emotional issues, mental issues, relational issues, and spiritual issues. Why is it that many of the “super rich” in our world have committed suicide? Many studies have shown that “poorer people” are often a far happier people than “wealthier people” — it’s when we learn to accept our lot in life, and stop grumbling about everything we don’t have, that life becomes a more enjoyable experience. I’m not making light of problems in the black community, but making more of them then they genuinely deserve can be very troubling as well — look at it this way, if we were to grade the problems that various groups of people have experienced down through the ages on a scale of “1–100” (one hundred being the most severe)… exactly where would African Americans grade out? Obviously “their grade” would be relative to what others have experienced; it would be nowhere near “one hundred” (that grade would be reserved for the Jewish community in Hitler’s Germany and the Christian community in Stalin’s Russia; over 20,000,000 were slaughtered in those two countries during the second World War); personally, I don’t think the black world in America is anywhere near “fifty” — maybe it’s “ten.”

With that number in mind, you **may actually feel a little anger toward me,** because you think African Americans deserve a grade of at least “thirty.” Let me share two popular truisms with you at this point: “You can’t judge another until you have walked in his shoes” (which is true)… and “You can’t see the forest for the trees;” *i.e.,* when you’re obsessed with a few particular trees (issues) in front of you, you will more than likely not see things rightly; your perspective will be distorted. Like anything in life, when we go down a tough road, we might think it’s the toughest road in the world; the truth is, it’s only when we compare it to what others might be going through that we are able to properly weigh things. Think about my life for a moment — you have no idea what God has subjected me to in life (by the way, it hasn’t been a pleasant little journey like you may be inclined to think; just because I’m an ardent believer in Christ doesn’t mean my life has been a wonderful little joy ride; if anything, the opposite is true *(read* Job 1:8, 12 & 2 Cor 11:23-28)*; if you choose not to read those passages, what I just mentioned probably won’t make much sense). The reality is, you might think “your problems” (or those of the black community) are far more significant than mine, when in fact your problems could be far less significant. Due to the fact there are so many “upsetting issues” that we all go through in life, it is nearly impossible to “compare our problems.” There’s an old proverbial saying that my wife and I have on a plaque over our washer/dryer that goes like this: “*If all of our troubles were hung on a line, you’d take yours and I’d take mine.***” Obviously, over time we all learn to live with the troubles that have been placed on our plate — it might be helpful to keep in mind that the various problems we go through in life can vary significantly; some of us experience physical ailments, others mental depression, others emotional issues, societal and cultural issues, financial issues, relational and spiritual issues. With that in mind, let me encourage you to read a study I did on “*My Journey of Faith.***” in it I expand upon a number of things that I have experienced in life that you might find helpful to reflect upon… you can find it on my website — [www.thetransformedsoul.com](http://www.thetransformedsoul.com)

Beloved, there is only “one book” that defines reality, and that is God’s Word; either you let it guide you into truth, or you will satisfy yourself with believing that which is not true; all fallen human thinking distorts reality; only God gives definition to divine truth. The psalmist David said, “*God is a God of truth… He desires truth in the innermost being***” *(cf. Ps 31:5; 51:8)*… his son, Solomon, said to his sons, “*Do not let kindness and truth leave you… know the certainty of truth***” *(cf. Pr 3:3; 22:21)*. Jesus said, “*Those who worship God must worship Him in spirit and truth***” *(cf. Jn 4:24)*. Incidentally, the Holy Spirit is “*the Spirit of truth***” *(cf. Jn 14:17)*. Scripture tells us that “*those who reject the truth of God have exchanged truth for a lie***” *(cf. Rom 1:25)*. Beloved,
in this life you are either going to embrace the truth, or you are going to embrace untruth; there is no other alternative.

You also assumed that Christians who voted for Trump, were only concerned about “their own personal wants” rather than the needs of others. Let me address that by saying this: the primacy of our vote is not simply to be about us and our own affluence (i.e., wealth), but about God and His will for our country. The long and short of it is this, most Christians undoubtedly believed that voting for Trump was wiser than voting for Hillary, because they thought the ramifications of Hillary being President was more detrimental to both the physical & spiritual well-being of our country. Your insistence that the Christian community should have made the concerns of the black community first & foremost in their thinking is a little problematic, because that means we would have had to ignore the greater economic and spiritual good of our country. Though the economic condition of any country is vital for creating jobs and helping meet the needs of its citizens, the spiritual issues are even more important. According to Scripture, our desires in life, first and foremost, are to be subordinate to the will of God (cf. Mt 26:39; also Mt 6:10), not the will of man (i.e., our own agenda). The Christian community wasn’t “sacrificing others for the sake of doctrine,” as you so stated… as if doctrinal truth is simply forensic truth (i.e., ideas) that should only be embraced if the conditions merit it. That was not the case at all; it was simply a matter of deferring to the lordship of Christ and His will for our world and our lives. It is a little disconcerting to keep restating this value, because it appears that is not a value you treasure; that there are other “worldly values” that are more important to you. By the way, I address this matter in far more detail later on in this study. As Christians, we take very serious “those spiritual realities” with which we as believers continually have to confront. Paul said, “to live is Christ” (cf. Phil 1:21; Gal 2:20). We have not been placed on this planet to simply make life a pleasant, joyful, happy experience; we’ve been placed here to walk in the light and to live to the praise of God’s glory and do His bidding in the world (cf. Eph 5:8; Phil 1:29; 2:13; 1 Jn 1:7). Quite frankly, it is not possible to satisfy the demands of the liberal elite and live to the glory of God, because many of the values of the liberal elite establishment are not “pro-God;” rather they are “anti-God” (cf. Mt 12:30; Prov 16:25).

REMARKS BY JOHN PAVLOVITZ

The article by “John Pavlovitz” that you sent to me was so lacking in integrity, that it’s almost not worth commenting on; but being as E. J. Montini, a leftist ideologue who is always writing some commentary in the Arizona Republic, made a similar statement in his column, I felt that since this line of thinking appears to have gone viral, I should probably address it. The reality is this: Pavlovitz’s argument is like “blaming God” for all of the decadent behavior in our world… or blaming doctors for all of the diseases in our world… or blaming language for the conveyance of some untruth that someone wrote about. Think about the nonsensical logic of those three didactics. It is mind-boggling to think that people with half a wit would make such juvenile deductions. The reality is, “Pavlovitz has no understanding whatsoever of what true Christianity really teaches,” so for him to spout off as he does is simply absolute foolishness (cf. Rom 1:28; 1 Cor 1:18, 23), but that is precisely what he does. Thus I feel justified in attacking him hard, because such demonic thinking is not deserving of a gentle response. For him to somehow imply that the perverse behaviors of some godless freaks (remember there
are godless freaks on both the right & the left) can be attributed to true born-again Christians is so incredulously insane (spiritually speaking); it’s hard to believe that someone who seemingly professes some Christian knowledge (but obviously only a debased human understanding of it) would embrace that line of thinking. Perhaps it is best at this point to interject God’s perspective on it—for someone to recklessly & arrogantly declare something to be true that is not true (in particular, vilifying & denigrating God’s people) is to subject oneself to “divine judgment” if there is one thing that God hates it is arrogant pride (cf. Jam 4:6; 1 Pet 5:5; Prv 6:16; 8:13; 16:18; Ps 31:23; 34:21; 81:15; Is 13:11). For the sake of those of you who are a little bewildered by this conversation, here’s the problem: the liberal elite (i.e., the highest echelon of the Democratic Party) are now having a field day demeaning Republicans and White Christians because some pro-Trump supporters have resorted to “being ugly and cruel” to some pro-Obama and leftist ideologues… in so doing, they are blaming everyone who voted for Trump. Apparently the didactical reasoning the liberal elites are using to justify their disdain and disgust for those who voted for Trump is this—if Trump wouldn’t have won the election, these perverse behaviors would not have occurred; therefore everyone who voted for Trump must share in the guilt of these ugly behaviors. Carefully reflect upon that construct of thought. Essentially it implies that all people are either beautiful wonderful leftists or ugly putrid right-wingers; thus implying that there is no middle ground. If that indeed is true, that means every issue in the liberal elite’s book is a “one-hundred to zero issue” (i.e., an open-shut case); so either you are a wonderful person or a deplorable person, and they are the ones who define who you are. That is the nonsensical equation that leftist ideologues are now employing when judging those on the right side of the aisle. By the way, should Pavlovitz’s logic be legitimate, one must then apply that same logic to those on the left—thus if a Democrat rapes someone, that means all Democrats are rapists… or if a Democrat lies (as Hillary did), that means all Democrats are liars… or if a Democrat commits a crime, that makes all Democrats criminals. Beloved, is this the kind of nonsense you really believe? I can’t believe I’m talking to a reasonably intelligent person; that’s how mind-boggling this is to me.

It is really hard to believe that there are people out there in the world this crazy—is this really true? For those of you who embrace the thinking of men like Pavlovitz, remember the door swings both ways—if you are going to apply such logic to people on the right, you must also apply it to people on the left. So don’t use this kind of idiocratic logic when describing people politically or spiritually; it is not only wrong & inappropriate; it is extremely damaging to the relational capacities of the human family all over the world. Sadly, some people will buy into the stupidity of this logic & embrace it as their own—“Why not? That’s what our leaders believe!” Due to the slanderous accusations made by leftist ideologues toward the Christian world, I have felt the need to “attack them” with the same degree of contempt and disrespect that they have shown to those who don’t agree with their diabolical thinking… so some of my responses are going to be just as derisive and cynical as theirs are. Though that doesn’t make for a pleasant little conversation, that’s the juvenile climate that has been established by those on the left. Beloved, to be intolerant of anyone who doesn’t embrace your political position is actually quite disconcerting, because it aligns you with a people who hate God and His people. It is disturbing to think that our “so-called civilized world” is this demented & juvenile—how dumb can we as human beings really be? I read a lot of Scripture and it tells me that people can really be dumb—but this dumb? that’s hard to believe. The problem most human beings have is that “they oftentimes open their mouth before thinking.” Regrettably, our political
pundits seem to be the masters of doing so; they seem to lack the ability to think through both sides of an issue; it’s as if every issue is “an open-shut case.” Sadly, they’re more interested in “stirring the pot” than bringing people together or resolving issues, or doing what is best for the country. Remember, when you’re “wedded” to a particular didactic or construct of thought, it takes a lot discipline to weigh things properly (i.e., look at things from both sides), and if there is one thing our culture is not, it is this: it is not a disciplined culture; as such, we often seem to act like a bunch of emotional children. By the way, it is here that Scripture plays such an important roll; it tells us to humbly sit in God’s presence and let Him instruct our hearts. The problem with the unbelieving world is that it thinks “fallen human reasoning” is not only virtuous, but that it is the answer to man’s problems; you would think after 6,000 years (that’s how long the civilized world has been in existence) of human beings trying to get their act together, that people would learn that “human beings are a failure, that they simply don’t have what it takes to do so.” If you think humanity has made some wonderful advancements, do your homework… you’ll discover how wicked man still is after 6,000 years. Far more people have been slaughtered in the last 100 years than at any time in human history. The reality is, man is an “ugly creature;” that’s why Christ went to the cross. Again, if you’re convinced that man is a good guy, you are delusional (cf. Lk 18:19); sadly, you are going to take those thoughts with you all the way to the grave… and then on that “great wake-up day” you are going to have to tell God why you believed that nonsense and misled your fellow man and stubbornly rejected His word. As human beings we all stand in awe of “the atomic bomb,” because it is an incredible physical reality that simply blows our minds; the energy that is made manifest simply by splitting a single atom is mind-boggling. Think of it, God made this little, tiny, invisible atom… and the power it contains could blow the city of Washington, DC off the map; by the way, God is omnipotent! He’s no weak paralyzed puppet, or a dinky little atom bomb! And you are worshipping at the altar of fallen man? (stupid moronic man?). Beloved, you are far too smart to be living by the dictates of fallen human logic. Incidentally, shortly after creation another bomb blew up… it’s magnitude makes the atomic bomb look like a little candle on a birthday cake — it’s referred to as “the Adam Bomb;” this bomb was so powerful it impacted the entire created order (cf. Rom 8:20-22); so great was the effect of Adam’s sin that the entire created realm is going to one day be entirely destroyed & remade, and sin will forever be removed from God’s universe (cf. Rev 21:1). Perhaps the words of Job expresses your heart’s desire — “Lord, I have declared things I did not understand, things too wonderful for me, which I did not know… therefore I retract, and I repent in dust and ashes” (Job 42:3, 6). Beloved, once again, consider the incredible “power” that exists in a small invisible nuclei of a uranium atom… now imagine having a “coffee cup” full of such atoms — that would be “countless billions of atoms” — can you even fathom the unbelievable power in that little cup of atoms? Remember, God’s omnipotence (i.e., His unlimited power) lies at its foundation. Here you are worshipping a bunch of “stupid arrogant men” who don’t have a “pea” full of power to do anything! Maybe you should read what Einstein had to say again… he put things in their proper light.

Regarding the “ugly behavior” of those described by John Pavlovitz, ultimately the reality is this — “Hollywood,” the so-called friend & kissing cousin of the left, is the guilty partner in the crimes that he mentioned. Hollywood has helped set the stage for the expression of ugliness and hatred in our world — How so? Because it hates godly virtue (cf. Jn 3:19-21) — it doesn’t just dislike it, it hates it; the last thing Hollywood does is promote godly virtue, so how in the world could one expect Hollywood (the standard bearer of our corrupt society) to encourage virtuous
living in our world? Remember, it is the “leftist ideologues” who abolished the virtuous teachings of Scripture from our schools... it is this sector that promulgates the idea that there is no such thing as “absolute truth” (make sure you also apply these didactics to your thinking); that what is true for you may not be true for me (that's the essence of postmodernism in present-day America); it is “the left” that attacks the virtues of Christianity, saying that “Christians hate those who do not comply with their teachings” (carefully think about that; though it is true that Christians hate “the sin,” they don't hate “the sinner”). Pavlovitz and his liberal friends obviously don't have the ability to differentiate between those two didactics. So to somehow blame the Christian world for “the stupidity of the ‘unrighteous’ is beyond reason and incredulous.” That would be like blaming the mailman for the contents of some piece of mail that was delivered to your house... or blaming the inventor of the game of baseball for an injury incurred by a broken bat at some ballgame. In the same manner, Pavlovitz equates the “ugly behavior” of some in our world with white Christians who voted for Donald Trump — according to his logic, there are only two kinds of people — bad people & good people — all those who voted for Trump are bad people, and all those who voted for Hillary are good people... and Pavlovitz makes that deduction based upon the disgusting behavior of some people who were rejoicing over Trump's election. Again, that would be like blaming the sun for not shining on a cloudy day... or blaming your car for running out of gas. These kinds of deductions have no place in an uncivilized world, let alone a civilized world; they are sheer madness... all such nonsense does is agitate and provoke more idiotic behavior. One can easily deduce that it was the expressed anger of “the liberal left” that helped spawn the hatred of some dumb kids. Every time things don't go the way “the left” wants them to go, they voice their extreme anger by rioting and the like (sadly, that's not an unacceptable behavior for those on the left — why is that?), and make accusations that not only distort the truth but cause people on the other side of the aisle to also become angry. We also have to remember, people are easily swayed even by nonsense when their leaders act like fools (cf. Jim Jones' cult of some 30 years ago). We don't seem to possess the maturity or the integrity that is needed in this country to even carry on “honest dialogue,” whether or not it is on the left or the right; instead we have to denigrate the opposition and throw it under the bus, and lie about it and hope that people will believe our lies, and then we expect our children to behave right? the truth is, our adult world is “a lousy role model!” Look at the behavior patterns of many young blacks — sadly, they didn't have “fathers” in their homes to discipline them and instill “respect” in them. God designed the human family this way: Mothers bring gentleness, compassion, patience and a softer hand to the table... whereas Fathers provide for the physical needs of their families and bring protection, discipline, and a stronger hand to the table — the reality is, men & women bring different qualities to the table (contrary to what the feminists want you to believe); perhaps one could metaphorically describe them with “paint brushes” — whereas women would be a finer more delicate brush, men are a bigger and broader brush; we are not the same... women aren't men and men aren't women; that's the way God made us... just as men and women possess different physical qualities, so they possess different inner qualities; though we may differ in a number of ways and each play a different role in the family, neither one of us is superior or inferior to the other. You'll notice, when children are hurting, they run into their mother's arms, not their father's. Contrary to what liberal elites want to believe, both are necessary. Sadly, more than three-quarters of blacks in America have only been raised by their mothers; you can thank the “diabolical left” for promulgating those sleazy values; just think about it, if we had not outlawed “God's moral teachings” in our schools, our society would probably be a far more loving, caring and respectful one. What is disturbingly disappointing is that they won't
admit this until they stand at Hell's door. That's how intense Satan's grasp is on the soul of the left. Beloved, this isn't just some human religious thought... this is divine reality.

**OUR POLITICAL WORLD**

One of the reasons I dislike our “political system” so much, is that is seems to be governed by hate, lies and deception. Regarding our “two party” system of government – in order to help quell political lying and political hatred (at least a little), I think we need to develop a political system where we can establish a “coalitional government,” so that the radicals cannot gain access to the throne. Regarding all of the various issues that are laid out before the electorate, there needs to be a way whereby “the radical elements” (both left and right) are not able to control the decision or the discourse. By the way, I would define radicals as comprising about 10-12 percent of the populace on each end of the spectrum; thus that would leave the middle seventy-five percent making the decisions (because it seems to be here where sanity rules); with that in mind, I believe in consensus, not dissension. Obviously, I'm not a fan of the radical left or the radical right, because they don't seem to have any respect for those whose position differs from theirs. When radicals push their way into the throne room, ultimately it only ends up increasing the divide and hatred among the masses. Regarding the selection of candidates for each party (probably a minimum of four parties would be best), the old system we used to use years ago in this country was far more likely to choose worthy and qualified candidates, rather than simply having public popularity contests, where deception can easily rule the day. Our system of choosing presidential candidates seems to be as juvenile as there is in the entire free world (though a few others apparently are copying us); yet even with that in mind I can still hear many people respond: “Oh, but it's an open and honest system!” (but that statement doesn't vindicate the system). Regarding “the debates” that are central to our elections, surely we can bring a far higher level of respect, dignity and common sense to them. It doesn’t appear to be that difficult; identify two or three major topics that are to be discussed in each debate, and give each candidate a list of the ten questions that will be asked of them (a week prior); we shouldn't be into “playing games & surprising people with tricky questions that serve no constructive purpose;” we shouldn't be trying to compete with “reality television.” Most Americans are sick of the way in which we conduct our debates... we've turned them into “little side shows,” where the people cheer on their candidate. Following each debate, all news sources need to “clearly state the case” for each candidate on each position, and give the “pros & cons” as outlined by the various party's involved (where each party is limited to 100-150 word responses; or something to that effect)... newspaper commentators must keep from “stating their opinions” until the end of the report — their biased thinking doesn't need to be on the front page or stated up-front. The issue before the public needs to be one of “civility,” not “complicity.”

I was surprised that you actually called Trump a “racist;” apparently you made that deduction because of his position on “fixing the border & taking a stronger stance on immigration”? By the way, Obama was very strong on that issue prior to his “first election;” apparently he simply took that position to garner more votes from mid-America (another bit of “trickery” emanating from one of our political entities). To call these immigration issues “racist” is not only a little far-fetched, but prejudicial (a preconceived judgment), and renders a very remedial definition of what it means to truly be “racist.” Obviously, Trump's personality isn't what one would
call normal, but that doesn’t make him a bad person — in that regard, Trump is a different kind of guy that some may not be able to relate to; though he may differ from the norm, that doesn’t make him any less human or less qualified than you or me. Furthermore, though Trump seems a little impulsive at times, that just seems to be a common trait by the vast majority of those in the political arena; it is just what the electorate wants to hear — it majors on babble. To be fair to Trump, one needs to judge him by his resume (he seems to have a pretty good one) and how he dealt with things in the business world… it’s here where he appears to have done fairly well; we can only hope it transmits over into the political realm (at this point there doesn’t seem to be any reason for doubting that it won’; he seems to be pretty transparent, much to the chagrin of the establishment on both the left and the right). Though Trump has never served in political office (which in my book is more a positive than a negative), that doesn’t mean he won’t be an effective servant for us; in actuality, it will probably make him a better servant of the people; at least he doesn’t “owe” all of his political supporters a staff position or some financial perk. Additionally, he seems to have a lot more smarts than the typical politician in Washington. I like the fact that he’s not your typical “yes” man. Now, if Trump stumbles and is not effective, then he will only end up serving one term… and if he is effective, then you and some of your friends on the left might actually applaud him. It is also difficult for democrats to claim that “he’s unqualified,” since Obama essentially had no qualification whatsoever; he was simply a community organizer; which is almost embarrassing; think about it, the entire world watched the US (far and away the most powerful and influential country in the world) elect someone without the slightest bit of experience; and then watched him embarrass himself and America by going on the world stage in Europe and giving a speech that everyone chuckled at; causing people to question — “Who do you think you are instructing us?” Though America needed a black president to help mend the fences (that were being exasperated by the left), I wish we would have chosen someone else like Colin Powell, who formerly served as Secretary of State; he had a number of wonderful qualities and wasn’t into some form of leftist ideology. In the final analysis, Obama had a pretty good personality, but that's about as far as it went — he had no ability at all to effectuate economic growth and economic recovery; thus he just seemed to leave it alone and hope everything would settle down and turn around all by itself… he had a great opportunity to “bring people together and mend the fences,” but he couldn’t even do that; the truth is, he actually exacerbated the problem, and increased the divide among the masses (it’s almost like that was his intent). It’s no wonder Hillary lost — Obama blamed it all up and Hillary blamed Obama for getting them into such a mess). The reality was, they were both to blame; neither of them possessed the kind of quality that a country of our stature requires (how people like that get into the throne room is beyond me). By the way, just as we needed a black president (it would have been great to have had an exceptional one who would have encouraged the entire world), so we also need a woman president, but we don’t just need “any woman” to be our president (especially one of questionable character & lacking in integrity); we need an exceptional one with great leadership skills. In case you may have forgotten, three of the top ten leaders in our world in the 20th century were women — Margaret Thatcher, Indira Gandhi & Golda Meir… these three women were brilliant, effective, common sense, exceptional leaders.
OUR MENTALLY DEFICIENT WORLD

I made a statement to you in my email that “the unbelieving world” can’t get its mind around (i.e., John Pavlovitz and his friends); they simply have no understanding whatsoever of a very significant didactic that is taught in Scripture — “Let every person be in subjection (that’s emphatically stated) to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God. Therefore he who resists authority actually opposes the ordinance of God” (that’s emphatic! — cf. Rom 13:1-2ff). The reality is, just because one can read English, doesn’t mean he is capable of understanding what God teaches in His Word; that is a foundational teaching of Scripture. The apostle Paul clearly expands upon this truth in his first letter to the Corinthians — he states, “A natural man (i.e., a man who doesn’t truly know Christ) does not accept the things of the Spirit of God (divine truth); it is actually foolishness to him; the reality is, he cannot understand the things of God, because the things of God are spiritually appraised” (cf. 1 Cor 2:14); without the indwelling presence of God’s Spirit, one cannot discern truth (cf. Jn 14:17, 26; 16:13). The problem with man is, he thinks he can discern the integrity of Scripture with human reasoning; the reality is, that is not possible. With that in mind, notice the words of Paul that have been emboldened in the Romans 13 passage above: those words are highly emphatic in Greek grammar. So whether it be Obama or Trump, both are God’s divine appointments for this particular hour — the question naturally arises as to “why” these two men were chosen? The reality is, everything in this world serves God’s higher purposes: including all of those things we don’t understand with our tiny little human minds (cf. Dan 4:28-37). My thinking is this, “God is trying to awaken His people to acts of kindness, and get them to be the church in the world, and not simply play church” (i.e., simply attend church). It’s important to note, the word “church” literally means “called out ones;” as such, “the church are those God has called out in this world to be His people, and as His people, we have a responsibility to serve and love others” (cf. Matt 22:36-40; John 13:34-35; 15:8; 1 Cor 4:1-2; 12:4-7; Gal 6:9; Eph 2:10; 4:11-12; Titus 2:14; 3:1, 8, 14; 1 Jn 3:18). Remember, “this is God’s world, not man’s;” the reality is, God is doing a work in it that transcends human understanding (cf. Is 46:9-11; 55:8-11, 59:1-2, 64:8; 66:2; Prv 1:7). Man’s part in this world is to be loving, kind, patient, tender-hearted, and forgiving of one another; not hurting or hating one another (cf. Eph 4:31-32; Rom 14:1-23; Jn 15:12; Col 3:12-15; 1 Jn 1:7-9). It is the world that hates us as followers of Christ, not fellow believers (John 15:18-19). Be us “black or white,” every believer has this obligation; none of us have been given a special dispensation to opt out of our responsibility. “We are one body who have been called to diligently preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” (cf. Eph 4:3); “there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free man, black nor white, male nor female; we are all one (emphatic!) in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). Only the proud (i.e., those who do not believe) reject that biblical didactic; if the Holy Spirit resides in a person, God will instruct him that he might believe the truth. Those who are not humble before God, never come to know the truth; their proud hearts simply distances them from the Lord… thus disqualifying them from knowing and understanding the truth; the sad reality is, your proud friend John Pavlovitz has no understanding at all of divine truth (as such, he has made some very insidious remarks).

Contrary to what “the left” is inclined to believe, iconoclastic liberalism is not the answer to this corrupt world in which we find ourselves; sadly, liberal elitism arrogantly portrays itself as the only body of knowledge in American politics that possesses integrity; as such it is the only construct of thought that is deserving of approval and acceptance by the vast populace… thus
Your friend Pavlovitz needs to button it, because he's acting like a child, to the detriment of many — people actually read that kind of stuff and buy into it, just like you did; think about that. Just because things don't go the way “we want them to go,” doesn't mean we turn into monsters and hate-mongers. It's like being a little child who doesn't get what he wants (an ice cream cone), so he screams & rants & raves. At some point our stupid political world needs to institute some changes or we are going to turn this country of ours into a cesspool of diabolical trash. Here's a question for you: “What if you never get your way in this political world in which we live?”

The truth is, this world is NEVER going to go the way we want it to; it is always going to be encumbered with problems. Jesus said, “In this world you will have tribulations” (Jn 16:33) — this world was NEVER meant to be a little utopia; that possibility ended in the Garden of Eden...we

making it the only authority of truth to which the human family should submit. This arrogant, condescending philosophy of thought believes that the stupid hicks (white Christians) in our country don't know what's good for them...that any body of knowledge that is outside of the liberal consensus is idiotic. What an absolutely numb-headed claim: “If you don't agree with us and what we think, you're a moron.” This “culture of contempt” borders on lunacy, hatred, and a level of mindlessness that borders on insanity; it's not that far removed from the ancient arrogant Babylonians of a bygone era, or the extreme socialistic thinking of Adolf Hitler that resulted from severe economic depression. The reality is this: when anger rises to the throne in man's soul, he turns into a beast and it matters not what action he takes, “because to him the end justifies the means.” Sadly, the educated savvy of the left finds great “pleasure” in ridiculing the so-called stupid thinking of the right. Being as the arrogant elites are not capable of satisfactorily addressing the issues at hand, they resort to slander and mockery to bring people into their camp; all liberal elitism seems to do is spawn hate for those who disagree with them. That is precisely the road down which your friend John Pavlovitz has traveled...he sees actions in our world that “he hates” (and rightfully so); but he mindlessly associates them Christianity. Just because the vast majority of Christians reject many of the ideological thoughts of the left (and rightfully so) doesn't mean they are the advocates and proponents of demonic behavior. Similarly, just because some idiots embrace Donald Trump (obviously there are idiots on both sides of the aisle), does not mean that he is the one who is responsible for their juvenile behavior. When you recklessly insist on making direct correlations between various actions and ideological ideas, regardless of the integrity of those correlations, and then you try to sell them in the marketplace as absolute facts, sadly, you are naturally going to sway some people to your way of thinking, and cause others to reject your way of thinking...ultimately, reckless correlations are going to “bear the fruit of hatred, rebellion and division” (because we reap what we sow). I'm still not sure you understand the argument, so let me expand upon it this way: though true born-again Christians may disagree with some construct of thought that is propounded by the left, that doesn't mean anyone who disagrees with the left is a born-again Christian — there could be a host of other reasons why people disagree with leftist ideology. One can no more paint the “opposition” with one brush, than one can say that all Blacks are of this stripe, or that all Whites are of that stripe, or that all Orientals are of another stripe — obviously there is significant diversity of thought among all of these racial groups. To scream and rant and rave at everyone because they don’t buy into your constructs of thought is extremely juvenile, and isn’t going to convince the world that you are right. The “hateful rhetoric” that is espoused by the left is only going to produce “hate” by some people who disagree with them — how can anyone deduce anything else? To somehow think that “your hatred” is virtuous and justifiable is pure diabolic madness.
now live in a fallen cursed world (of which the left knows nothing), that God is going to one day destroy... until that day, He asks us as His children to “walk in the light” (cf. Eph 5:8-9; 1 Jn 1:7; 2:9-10; 2 Cor 6:14), but all the left does is “walk in the dark.” If we insist that our peace and joy (even as believers) be grounded in a “positive world,” we will NEVER experience peace and joy, because God is not going to let our world gleefully skip along... so to focus all of our energies on making it utopia (an impossibility), rather than being the hands and feet and voice of Jesus in this world, will ultimately only leave one disappointed, discouraged, depressed and angry — living by such a didactic is akin to a crippled paraplegic living with a “false hope” that his painful world is going to be turned right-side up in just a few short months. If our happiness is dependent upon “getting our way in life,” it is going to become a very vexing issue for us. As the old song goes, “This world is not our home, we’re just a passing through; our treasures are laid up somewhere beyond the blue.” Should we insist on “making this temporal world a wonderful little paradise,” it is ultimately going to bring significant disconcerction to our soul; life isn’t about making planet earth a glorious little utopia that we want it to be — living by such a construct will only lead to frustration and discouragement. Why? because God is not going to let that happen; that is not the reason we live on this planet. GOD is the reason (cf. Rom 11:36; Col 3:4). Now, if that construct of thought is unacceptable to you, then you will continue to travel down a “dead end street” — incidentally, that is GOD’s summation, not mine (cf. Mt 7:13-14). Though we all struggle with accepting God’s will for our lives (life can be very challenging at times), that is the life to which God has called us (cf. Mt 6:10; 26:39).

The reality is, the vast majority of all the people on planet earth refuse to be governed by “divine truth” in this life; instead they embrace “the lies of man and the Evil one.” Contrary to what any one might think, those are the only two options — The Lord told the prophet Isaiah to cry out to His people and tell them how transitory they are, and how permanent His Word is: “All human flesh is like grass... it withers when I breathe upon it... but My Word stands forever” (cf. Is 40:6-8). Conversely, Jesus expressed it this way: “He who is not with Me is against Me” (cf. Mt 12:30). If the foundation of our thoughts are not grounded in the truths of Scripture, we are walking in darkness (cf. Jn 3:19-21; 8:12; 12:46; Eph 6:12; Col 1:13; 1 Jn 1:6; 2:11). Regarding the dark thinking of the liberal elite, I’m reminded of the division that took place in Canada back in the 1990s when I was serving up in Vancouver, British Columbia — there was a strong element in French-speaking Canada (the eastern province of Quebec) that was trying to “separate” from the rest of the country (the English-speaking sector), but when the aboriginals up in northern Quebec got involved in the debate, the French-leaders responded to them with these words — “We’ll take care of you and make sure you’re provided for;” to which the aboriginals replied, “Who do you think you are telling us what you are going to do; you don’t rule us; take a hike; we make our own decisions.” Here was another case in point where the liberal elites of Canada thought “they knew best!” — the aboriginals rightly told them to “stick it where the sun doesn’t shine.” The resultant effect was, Quebec remained a Canadian province. Elitist thinking has no place in our world; nothing could be worse in the world than to be governed by the proud arrogance of the self-acclaimed elite (need I remind you, that was Adolf Hitler’s claim). Because I sense you are arguing about the issue of “intelligence,” let me share some information on that subject. Years ago there were studies done on the brains of the entire human family... it had been thought by evolutionists that the brains of the aboriginals and the primitive world were smaller, and more animalistic — they were proven “completely wrong!” Much to their dismay, they discovered that the average vocabulary of these so-called “animal people” was
three or four times greater than the average person here in America (the land of the brilliant). Ultimately, they were astonished to discover that the average American has a vocabulary of about 10,000 words, whereas the vocabulary of many tribal people in our world often exceeds more than 30,000 words; incidentally, they also discovered that the “rational capacities” (i.e., rational deductions) of all human beings essentially are “equal” — the reality is, God did not make one people group intellectually inferior to another; so to somehow claim a higher level of intelligence is stupid (don’t go down that road). You are aware, are you not, about how God feels about “proud minds”? He despises them and calls them “fools” of the highest order; He calls the arrogant wisdom of this world “absolute foolishness” (i.e., profound stupidity). He says where there is no humility of thought, there is nothing but foolishness, and that He will one day expose that diabolical nonsense for what it is and judge it accordingly (sadly, that word “judge” is a joke to the elite minds of our world; but one day it is going to become a very sober reality for them, when they stand before our Creator — though they may laugh today, they will cry tomorrow). The difference between a humble child of God and an arrogant child of Satan, is that truly born-again believers understand their deficient nature and corrupt minds — your friend John Pavlovitz knows nothing of his innate deficiency. With all of that in mind, either we work together in this political malaise in which we live, and we stop denigrating each other with foolish prodigious claims, or we will destroy our society; being as we’re so air-headed, that is probably what is going to occur. Just to let you know, I address the essence of “racism” in depth later on, and try to give contextual understanding to its poignance, which it obviously possesses. Remember, Scripture tells us that as believers we are not to align ourselves with the behaviorists, and those who politically demean other human beings; do you not claim that white Christians demean blacks? and that the liberal elite demean white Christians? Thus Scripture tells us that we are to align ourselves with Christ and make divine truth (not diabolical human thinking) the foundation of our thought-lives and the governor of our actions. Tolerance is one thing, advocacy is another; those two didactics are two different animals altogether. Though there are diabolical behaviors that I must tolerate as a Christian (much like the early Christians did), I cannot be “an advocate” of those behaviors… instead, I must speak out against them, yet do so with the understanding that those who live by these standards “walk in darkness” — their “fallen nature” dictates their behavior. No believer can stand before our world and advocate ungodly, corrupt behavior.

THE ETERNALITY OF GOD

Ultimately, if the “Infinite Eternal God” is not preeminent in your thinking (i.e., if He is not that “Reality” in your mind that transcends all things), then you will ultimately only embrace those constructs of thought that are nothing but the product of fallen human thinking; it is divine wisdom that is to govern our lives — we are to have the mind of Christ; that is what “faith” is all about. Yet the vast majority of people in the western world “worship at the altar of human thought; believing that it is the supreme wisdom of the universe;” which is about as nonsensical a deduction as one can make. Think about it, you bring together a group of people “of like mind,” and then you collectively deduce that “you are right and everyone else is wrong!” and then you proclaim to the world that “those who don’t agree with you are stupid!” That is precisely what the liberal elites have done in Washington, DC — here’s a group of people “of like mind” (97% of the populace in DC are ardent liberals), who love their little diabolical enclave, and believe that
“they are the answer” to the problems of our world. Let me compare this setting to a “little dog” who lives on a tiny piece of property in a quiet little rural town — he love everything about that piece of property; it is “home” to him; it is that family and comfortable plot of land that “defines life for him;” that is his life experience. Little does he know that the “big world” beyond his home is a very different world, not at all like the one in which he lives. As fate would have it, the day came when his family took him away on a long trip, and his world was completely turned upside down… and he longed to go back home where he came from; he was not at all comfortable in that new environment. The message is this: when that community in which you live gives definition to “the bigger world,” you will grossly misjudge that world and the people who inhabit it. Beloved, when you insist that “your small political world define life and the bigger world beyond your world,” you are embracing dark thoughts — “since when is your little groupie the standard bearer for other people? when in fact it has little or no understanding of what other people value and why they believe what they believe?” The truth is, if you were to travel around this world for a few short years (without all of your cohorts at your side — in other words, you need to get away and do some serious thinking on your own), there is no doubt in my mind that you would return to your home with a completely different understanding of those constructs of thought that a few years earlier defined you; because this world is not at all what you have made it out to be. You can ask anyone who is widely traveled if this indeed is not the case… being exposed to the bigger world is a very sobering experience. When all you do is let that little world before your eyes dictate reality to you, you are making some very brash deductions (essentially you are making the world compatible to your thinking). Little do the liberal elites know that “belligerence and darkness” rules in their soul; as such, they have no respect whatsoever for those who are not in agreement with them; incidentally, that is the American black world as well. Remember, if we don’t “respect others,” we’re the most diabolical of all people; though we may not understand their thinking, we must respect them as persons. Since other people’s thinking is grounded in life-experiences with which we are not familiar (thus admittedly making it difficult to fully appreciate and respect their thinking), we have no right to judge them harshly for embracing the constructs of thought that they do — are you listening to what I am saying? Since you have no idea what the culture of other people is like, how can you condemn them? To make this more personal, you have “no idea” what my upbringing was like, and you know almost nothing of the culture in which I was raised; yet, here you are telling me that “you know what’s best for me and my world!” It’s like giving medical advice to someone when you are not a physician. Re-read the aboriginals response to the leaders of French-speaking Quebec (just a couple of pages earlier). It is precisely here where the diabolical left fails so terribly; they simply don’t have the capacity to differentiate between what someone believes and the person himself — if they hate the ideal, they hate the person; this is a very childish response… thus they often attack the “messenger” when they are unable to argue succinctly and expose the seeming lack of integrity of their opponents “message” — that is simply the modus operand of the liberal elite. I’m not just espousing tricky little constructs of thought that are forcing you into a corner without the possibility of your escaping… I’m sharing divine truth with you in hope that you will see the error of your way. I don’t for one moment pretend to think that “the unbelieving left” would buy into the arguments that I present in this study; they are simply too arrogant and too narrow-minded to do so (again, study the issue of “arrogance”).

Scripture clearly teaches that without humility one will never come to the truth; without humility one will never come to the truth; in spite of the lack of integrity with which they think,
nothing in all the world will cause them to turn from such thinking. The truth is — “only God dictates reality” and sets the standard by which we’re to live. So is it any wonder that God calls man’s thinking “absolute foolishness” when it is antithetical to His? (cf. 1 Cor 1:19-20, 27-29; 3:19; Ps 94:11; Ecc 1:17). Beloved, does it not bother you that your thinking is deemed foolishness by God? In the next four paragraphs I interject a few ancillary thoughts at this point to give context to some of the aforementioned… if some of this material is somewhat troubling to you, let me encourage you to read some of the works of the great philosophers and theologians down through the centuries, because they are ardent believers in “the integrity of true unabated logic;” thus they are thought of as “logicians.” The reality is, true unabated logic must have an eternal aspect to it (that is, something that transcends that which is temporal), if it is to logically understand that which is temporal, and not simply be satisfied with extremely limited temporal thinking. I find it interesting that the brother of Jesus, James, called God’s wisdom “reasonable” (cf. Jam 3:17)… remember, it is God who has given us “minds” with which to think and process divine truth; but when we approach things with an arrogant heart, our minds cease to function as God so designed. Remember without the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, divine wisdom cannot be understood by the human mind (cf. 1 Cor 2:14). Nevertheless, the human mind when it is humble, open and honest can still reflect upon things at a provocative level. Let me share some of Albert Einstein’s most prodigious thoughts (at least from my perspective); because of his respect for truth (the reality of what is) and the integrity with which he approached ultimate reality, I’ve always enjoyed reflecting upon these words — “The scientist is possessed by the sense of universal causation… His religious feeling takes the form of a rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection.” Though Einstein wasn’t a believer in the strict sense of the word, his humility of thought was commendable.

To take the foregoing arguments a step further, and somehow conclude that all things are simply the result of “random chance” is also illogical, because it defies the very laws by which science operates. Science has demonstrated by the scientific method that random chance never results in order, design or function; thus establishing what is referred to as “the second law of thermodynamics” (the law of entropy). Hence, by definition, where there is order, design or function there is a cause (i.e., a creator), and that is what science is about — essentially “it is about discovering why things are what they are, and why things work the way they do.” If you struggle with constructs of logic, let me encourage you to study the subject in detail, and not just settle for remedial answers pro-offered by some liberal elite who refuses to accept even the possibility that there is a “God” — it should be remembered, all evidence points in the direction of a Creator; no evidence points in the opposite direction; i.e., in the direction of evolution. Logic tells us that “when one excludes the possibility that reality may include a Supreme Being,” one doesn’t end up with one! Wow, isn’t that an amazing deduction! And then the liberal elite has the audacity to claim that one doesn’t exist! It’s called “circular reasoning” — if one starts with the presumption that there is no God (i.e., one presupposes that no God exists); guess what? one ends up proving there is no God! It is such a juvenile way of determining ultimate reality, that most scientists around the world of any repute are now embarrassed by the narrow-mindedness of those in the scientific community (particularly here in America) who insist on approaching the subject with preconceived bias. The reality is, the bias with which they conducted their search, ultimately determined the answer that they arrived at. By the way, this is primarily the result of “leftist ideology” in higher-education here in America — I think it’s important for you
to know, there are very few other countries in the world that embrace such a narrow-minded approach to this issue; this is simply the consequence of the liberal elite in America “demanding a separation between church and state;” thus GOD is no longer an acceptable reality in the public arena in our country (including our schools)—that’s why it is no longer found in the textbooks that are used in our public schools (it is forbidden); that’s how much “hatred” there is in the liberal element that essentially now controls the public arena here in America. Now perhaps you will understand why there is such hatred for “stupid white Christians” by the liberal elite in our country. Let me repeat myself—such biased thinking is not prevalent in the scientific communities of Europe and the majority of other countries; it’s only prevalent here in “the land of the free!”—how’s that for an oxymoron?

You would think the logic of “the second law of thermodynamics” and that of the great philosophers of history would move the scientific world in America in another direction, but many of them refuse to acknowledge that such a Transcendent Reality might exist. History reminds me of the words of the world’s self-acclaimed “cosmological genius,” Carl Sagan; a distinguished professor of evolution at Cornell University (one of the bastions of the liberal elite)... he mocked and berated the thought that there was even the possibility that there was a God, and the leftist ideologues cheered him on; if you mentioned the word “devil or satan,” he would simply laugh at you and respond, “How could you, an educated man, be so stupid as to think that there is actually a devil?” Before his death Carl Sagan said to the world that “evolution is a proven fact!” The evolutionists and liberal elites in America roared their approval exclaiming, “Case closed! God doesn’t exist!” as if Carl Sagan was the final word on “cosmology” (space and mass). By the way, it’s almost impossible to “prove a negative;” thus for Sagan to declare that “God doesn’t exist,” is about as anal a concept as has ever been voiced by a member of the human family. In case the foregoing argument is a little puzzling to you, reflect upon this question: “How do you know that God doesn’t exist?” i.e., “How do you know what you cannot know?” You would have to know “all things” to know that there is no God; if indeed there is none. So to make a brash statement like that without the slightest bit of evidence essentially is beyond stupid; to think that some reasonably respected thinker would ever make such a claim is “befuddling”—how in the world did modern man ever reach this level of madness? Such didactics makes one question whether or not modern man is the least intelligent creature who has ever occupied this planet—remember, we all begin life with a completely “empty head” (no knowledge); we end up becoming the totality of what we learn to accept as true; in that sense, we’re no different than primitive man; just because we’re born in the 20th century doesn’t mean we’re smarter than those who went before us (that’s a favorite little didactic of evolutionary thinking). Today, this sorrowful, arrogant bumbling fool (Carl Sagan) is in Hades awaiting his final judgment (cf. Ps 14:1; Lk 16:19-31; 2 Tim 4:1-5; 1 Pet 4:5; Rev 20:12-15). The picture really isn’t that difficult a one to draw: arrogant fools love being the objects of worship & the kings of wisdom in our world; obviously, for such a person to admit anything to the contrary (i.e., that God might exist), he would have to “humble himself” before the entire world and all of his colleagues; think about it, that can be a very self-denigrating experience—you’ve written textbooks and lectured all over America, and have adamantly, emphatically & arrogantly declared to the populace that “evolution” is a proven fact! And now you have to eat crow and stand up before the world and admit that you may have been wrong? Proud men don’t do that. I wouldn’t have come down this hard on him if he had simply given his opinion (as many others have), because that indeed is all it was; instead, he violated one of the premiere
tenets of science (making a declaration without having evidence to support that claim), and then he proceeded to violently attack those who disagreed with him, as if “his loud screaming voice” actually gave him credibility and established him as the ultimate determinant of cosmological truth—it would be like claiming that it is impossible for a human being to live beyond the age of 150 years; if you have no evidence to support such a claim, you cannot make that claim. Such diabolical human thinking always causes me to reflect upon the eternal future of such individuals “when they will have to stand before God and give an account of their mindless words” (Mt 12:36-37). To believe anything to the contrary is just more diabolical nonsense (i.e., absolute foolishness; that’s why God describes it, and if anyone has the authority to make such a statement, God does). The questions that beg asking are these: “Why is there such an animus against religion here in America?” Scriptural says that “men love darkness rather than light;” since America seems to be the epi-center of Christendom in our world, it is here where Satan is doing his most profound work, and this he does through the unbelieving world. A second question that needs asking is this: “Why do so many American scientists argue so vehemently in defense of evolution?” The answer to that question is the same as the preceding: because America is the center of evolutionary thought in our world. Incidentally, about thirty years ago (1981) the British Museum of Natural History in London opened a new exhibit on “evolution” to mark its one hundredth anniversary. One of the world leading scientific journals, “Nature” (a popular American publication) ran a critical editorial in response to the museum’s suggestion that “evolution by natural selection was only one of a number of possible explanations.” Some of you may not appreciate the significance of that critical editorial—remember, many in the scientific world here in America think they are the premiere scientists in the world; the reality is, that is not at all the case; that is simply the extreme arrogance of many people here in America (for those of you who have been indoctrinated into believing such nonsense, that may be a very difficult construct for you to believe). Regarding the critical editorial by the journal “Nature,” two weeks after the article was published, 22 members of the museum’s distinguished staff of biologists wrote the following letter to the editor of Nature—

Sir, as working biologists at the British Museum of Natural History we were astonished to read your editorial. . . . How is it that a journal such as yours that is devoted to science and its practice can advocate that theory be presented as fact? This is the stuff of prejudice, not science, and as scientists our basic concern is to keep an open mind on the unknowable. . . . Are we to take it that evolution is a fact, proven to the limits of scientific rigor? If that is the inference then we must disagree most strongly. . . . we have no absolute proof of the theory of evolution.

Numerous non-Christian scientists (I express it that way to alleviate any suspicion one might have regarding the various scientists I quote) from around the world have stated unequivocally that “there is no hard evolutionary evidence,” contrary to what many of America’s liberal elite have claimed. I quote a number of these scientists in a study I did titled, “Ultimate Reality”—you can find it on my website should you desire to read it. It is also important to mention here that the more advances science makes in the world, the more credibility “creationism” gets, and the less credibility “evolutionary theory” gets. Here’s the logic: if something is indeed true, the evidence cannot reveal it to be untrue—that is one of the sacred beauties of truth…thus one should never fear the facts, because they can only substantiate that which is true.” The only so-called facts one should fear, are those that are arrived at with dishonest intrigue;” it is these
purported facts that distort reality; this has happened several times down through the ages, to the embarrassment of those who propounded them; among them was the insistence of many that the earth was flat and not round… sadly, even the Pope jumped in and sided with “the flat earth” group. The good news is, every year in America more and more scientists are coming out of the closet and abandoning evolutionary thinking (because the evidence continues to embarrass its adherents) and move scientists in the direction of “creationism.” If evolution were indeed true, it would be extremely easy to prove, because all the evidence would logically point in that direction; but since it is not true, it cannot be proved (it is not possible to prove an untruth as being true); furthermore, the more evidence the scientific community continues to discover, the worse evolutionary thinking appears; so it is not a matter of our fearing that we will one day wake up and discover we were wrong, and that we were the stupid people! Truth can never be disproved; it can only be vindicated. Just a few years ago I was invited to present a “creationist view” to a college science class that included a few visiting college professors (including a couple from Arizona State); the teacher was an ardent evolutionist; he not only denounced much of what I had said to the class, but proclaimed to have “proof” that evolution was the process whereby we all came into existence. Obviously, he must have felt ashamedly diminished and humbled in the presence of his students because of what he believed and taught, so he stood up and tried to embarrass me by making some “brash statements;” so rather than entertaining the thoughts that I had shared with his class, he attacked them without the slightest degree of any evidence (he just claimed to have evidence)… again, that seems to be the way in which the man-centered liberal establishment responds when it is backed into a corner. I find it interesting that the common message that is being promulgated in the scientific world today in America is this: “Whether or not there is a GOD is a religious issue, not a scientific one, and we don’t involve ourselves with religion.” I find that statement interesting as well, because they (i.e., Carl Sagan and his cohorts) use to “appeal to scientific evidence” as proof that the God of the Bible does not exist. The underlying animus that still characterizes the spirit of many in the American scientific community, is that “there is still a disparagingly, fervent heat boiling in many scientists souls, because religion is absolutely repugnant to them” — they not only hate the fact that parents teach their children that God exists, but they refuse to let our schools teach their kids that He might exist. One can’t help but wonder how they are going to respond when they stand before God’s eternal judgment and are “forced to give an account for the nonsense they espoused.” You can hear God saying, “I understand that you told the world that I didn’t exist… I’ve got three questions for you:

1. Why did you make such a foolish claim?
2. Why did you believe such a foolish claim?
3. Why did you denigrate those who believed in Me?

“As such, you are now going to suffer the eternal consequences of your arrogance” (cf. Mt 12:36; 16:27; Jn 3:19; Rom 2:5-9; 1 Pet 4:5; 2 Pet 2:4-6). At this point in time in the created realm, judgment appears to be a big joke to many people (in particular to the liberal elites), but a day is coming when our Creator is going to look them in the eye, and there will be no place to run or hide… contrary to what some think, the price they are going to pay for their arrogant proclamations is eternal damnation; I’m well aware that that is a difficult construct for temporal human minds, but that’s what Scripture teaches. Remember, God only communicates truth to the humble; as the prophet Micah stated: “What does the Lord require of you? that you do justice, love kindness, and walk humbly with your God” (cf. Mic 6:8; Deut 10:12; Jam 4:6). The principle problem of
leftist ideologues is that they view humility as stupidity; thus when they look at Christians they see a “stupid people”… a people who haven’t enough sense to think; a people who have thrown their brains away; a people who simply follow some stupid religious thinking. Obviously, the liberal elite hates humility; he sees it as weakness, feebleness and incompetence… little does the liberal elite know “that therein is the beginning of wisdom” (cf. Ps 25:9; Prov 1:7; 11:2; 15:33; Is 66:2; Dan 4:37; Zeph 2:3; Jam 1:21; 1 Pet 5:5). So when you look at Christians, don’t look at them as being “the morons of the world;” look at them as having the integrity and the honesty to admit their deficient nature, and their desire to be the people God would have them be. The question is this: What are you stupid morons (i.e., you liberal elites) going to say when God undresses you on the last day and discloses your perverted thinking? Beloved, we don’t determine the economy of God, so don’t foolishly use fallen human logic to argue to the contrary. It is actually very interesting to think that a human being can argue convincingly to his soul with untruth, and then ardently believe that his thoughts are absolute truth. I almost wonder if that even possible; i.e., do they really believe what they say they believe? or deep down do they question what they profess to believe? Scripture seems to suggest that the unbelieving world is really “sold out” to what it professes to believe; that they are “truly convinced” of the integrity of their diabolical thinking (cf. Rom 1:25, 28, 32; Is 44:20; Jer 13:25). Remember, there will come a day “when every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (cf. Phil 2:10-11)... there is no escape route; this is the reality.

An extremely important reality is this: “when one dismisses that which is Eternal from his thinking, as if it is not that significant, he completely distorts reality.” It is the “small temporal minds of men” that mess everything up — their minds are not only small, they are fallen and perverse, and actually see themselves as the center of the universe, which is about as illogical a didactic as one could possibly arrive at; yet human beings actually defend that didactic — no wonder God calls the thinking of men “foolish” (cf. 1 Cor 1:20)... in actuality, it is beyond foolish; it is arrogant and downright stupid. To make oneself “the god of one’s little world” is undeniably the most irrational thing one could possibly do. However, the reality is, it is just such thinking that often controls the discourse that takes place in our minds... like everyone else, I constantly find myself interpreting reality from my vantage point; in spite of the fact that my temporal mind is capable of is distorting reality. Beloved, when trying to see things from an eternal perspective, it is essential that one see “The Eternal Prime Mover” as all that exists outside of creation (i.e, the temporal realm); only then can one think & argue sensibly. Though that didactic is a difficult one for any of us to fully wrap our minds around, it will make considerably more sense to you after you read the following paragraphs. To somehow conclude that the God of creation removed His hand from the created order (which in itself is beyond reason; remember, He is all that existed), and let things happen as they may (whatever that may mean), without in any way effectuating the result, simply defies logic. Let us attempt to define the essence of that which is eternal — if you were the Eternal Creator, by definition you would transcend everything else that exists, because everything else would have come into existence through you; therefore should you decide to create something, its essence would naturally be temporal, rather than eternal, because only you as “Creator” possess eternity — again, by definition only that which has existed from all eternity possesses eternal essence, and the only thing that has always existed is GOD. As the only Eternal Reality, God naturally exists outside of the created order (space, mass & time); i.e., He transcends the created order — keeping that in mind, I frequently refer to Him as “The Transcendent One or Transcendent Reality.” Now,
due to the fact He transcends all things, *He naturally sees the End from the Beginning* — though that may be a difficult construct for you at this point, it will become far clearer shortly when I graphically depict it. By the way, the foregoing is precisely the way the Bible defines the God of creation (cf. Is 46:10; 14:24; 25:1; Ecc 3:11; Rom 11:33-36).

Now, *to somehow suggest that the Eternal Transcendent One is simply a “deistic god”* (i.e., one who simply created everything and saw no need for further involvement — thus he simply wound up the clock and left everything alone); is another construct that defies logic and reason. Many people in our world actually see God in that light, and believe that things just happen as they may — because they don’t see God as one who is *eternal*, they simply see Him as one who is *temporal* and completely unaware of the future; yet such thinking is not only illogical, it is antithetical to what Scripture teaches — it does not at all define the God of the Bible (the God of creation). Furthermore, it denies the essence of what it means to truly be Eternal. Essentially the problem is this: man exists in the *Temporal Realm* (the created order), and his understanding of God is that He also exists in this realm, so everything he thinks about God is vastly less than He really is. Obviously it is extremely difficult for man to appreciate anything in the *Eternal Realm*, because his temporal mind does not have the capacity to see the fullness of something that is eternal (i.e., infinite) in nature. For instance, should you try to come up with “*the largest number in the universe*,” you could not do so because numbers just continue on ad infinitum (they never end). It is at this point where the temporal human mind just “shuts the door” on the subject, and stops thinking about it, because his mind has reached a barrier it cannot go beyond. The same logic can be applied to “space” — there is no end to it… it just keeps going and going and going; now should one actually come to the end of it, you now have another issue to deal with: What’s on the other side of that “end”? More space, so you must simply “shut the door” on that subject as well. Most of us are no doubt aware of the fact that there is “*no end*” to space; it just keeps going and going, etc. Obviously the created order in some way reflects the *glory* of its Creator (i.e., the eternality of God), and it is just such dynamics that transcend human thought. For some reason, even some believers have a difficult time seeing God as “*relevant*” to all that is going on in our world, as if He’s a non-player… they relegate Him to mere deistic status who simply exists in the heavenlies, thus minimizing His involvement in the created order… but that does not at all correspond with what Scripture teaches; God not only transcends the created order, He is actively orchestrating all things after the council of His will (cf. Eph 1:11) — though man plans his way, it is God who directs it; to think anything to the contrary is sheer arrogance… man isn’t the one who ultimately determines what goes on in this world; he doesn’t have the capacity to instill his will in this world; remember, *this is God’s world, not man’s* (cf. Prv 16:1, 9; Is 45:5-7; 46:9-11; 55:8-11); thus man’s focus is to be on *God* and what He is doing in this world, not on *man* and what he is doing (i.e., we are to focus on God’s will, not man’s will — cf. Mt 6:10). Ultimately, God has given us an “*eternal hope,*” not a “*temporal hope*” (cf. Rom 8:18-25; 12:12; 15:4; 1 Cor 13:13; Col 1:5, 27; 1 Tim 4:10; Titus 1:2; 2:13; 3:7; Heb 3:6; 6:18-19; 10:23; 1 Pet 1:3, 13; 1 Jn 3:3); so try though as we may (and we all do) to make our world a little utopia, that is not going to happen. *Life is not about us and what we want… it’s about God and what He wants* (cf. Mt 6:10; 16:24; 26:39). Are you going to *defer to Him and His will,* or insist on *doing your own thing?* Beloved, reflect upon the words of the psalmist David, “*The Lord will accomplish what concerns me*” (cf. Ps 138:8) — “*faithful is He who called you: He will bring it to pass*” (cf. 1 Th 5:24). Remember, we live in a fallen world; as such “*we are to fix our hope on the living God*” (cf. 1 Tim 4:10).
Perhaps the best way to understand the significance of that which is Eternal is to graphically compare it with that which is Temporal. To do so, take a piece of paper and draw a small circle on it, and place the words “space, mass & time” inside that circle (by the way, these qualities define the created order)… and then place the word “GOD” outside the circle — such a graphic depiction helps a person differentiate between that which is eternal and that which is temporal. Since it is important to see GOD as transcending the created order, carefully look at the graphic depiction you have just drawn. You’ll notice GOD exists outside of the created order in the “eternal realm;” i.e., that realm that is “infinite in scope” (there are no limits to it) — by the way, the eternal realm doesn’t just stop at the end of the paper upon which you drew everything… it continues on ad infinitum; it never stops. So you might also write “temporal realm” inside the circle, and “eternal realm” outside the circle. Now when you take a look at what you have drawn, the magnitude of that which is Eternal should start to overwhelm your thinking, because it is infinitely greater than that which is Temporal: there is no comparison between the two. As your drawing attests, “Time” is a part of God’s creation (it did not exist in eternity past); hence “time” in all its fullness is visible to God — He sees both the beginning and the end; that’s why Scripture alludes to the fact that “God planned the beginning from the end” (cf. Is 46:10; Jn 1:1-2; 6:64; 8:44; Heb 1:10; 1 Jn 3:8; Rev 21:6; 22:13). Since some people struggle with the idea of God seeing that which is still yet future (at least in the temporal realm); that is understandable as long as you keep God in the temporal realm, but God exists in the eternal realm; so seeing something that is still yet future, is not a problem when looked at from an eternal perspective. Remember, God is omniscient — there is nothing He does not know (past, present or future). It is only when human beings force God into the temporal realm that God loses His incredible majesty. Remember, God transcends space, mass and time. The prophet Isaiah over and over again focused on the eternity of God and the temporality of man. At one point he wrote, “All the nations of the world are as nothing before God; they are regarded by Him as less than nothing and meaningless…. it is God who reduces rulers to nothing” (read Is 40:17, 23; also Is 40:18, 25, 28; 42:8; 43:10-13; 44:6-8; 45:5-7, 22-23; 46:9-11; 55:8-11; 64:8; 66:1-2) — the point being, that which is eternal is “infinitely greater” than that which is temporal; the two cannot even be compared (again, the biggest number you can come up with is totally insignificant when compared with infinity; there is simply no way to compare that which is infinite with that which is finite — since that which is infinite is endless, by definition that which is finite almost doesn’t even exist; for instance compare the number two to the number five that has one billion zeros after it; as stated above, it is not even possible to compare the two). Again, the human mind simply “shuts the door on the subject” because it has ventured into an area that is infinitely beyond his ability to think; in short, it transcends human thought. Ultimately the point is this — without an appreciation of the “Eternality of God,” one seriously minimizes Him and comes up with illogical explanations when attempting to define reality and the cosmos (as Carl Sagan did) — what else could one come up with? he has taken the eternal answer off the table! Hence, his answer is simply the product of exceedingly limited human thinking, which God has described as “foolishness” — the reality is, fallen man simply operates in the “small circle” that you drew on the paper; yet he somehow concludes that “therein” is the answer to everything that exists… in so doing he passes judgment on things that require an understanding of that which is “outside of that circle” (i.e., that which is eternal). I mention the foregoing to simply help you see God as the GOD who really is — He’s no little earthly puppet. ☺
GOD IS SOVEREIGNLY RULING

An incredible reality of which the world knows “nothing,” is that God is actually working out “HIS PLAN” for your life (cf. Ps 139:13-16; Ps 23; Ps 56:8; Prov 16:9; 19:21; Ecc 11:5; Is 25:1; Jer 29:11). Many believers struggle with the idea that the life to which they have been called is actually “God’s plan” — contrary to popular opinion, that is the reality; arguing to the contrary doesn’t change that fact. God is not just sitting on the sideline watching man run around and do as he pleases. We don’t live in an accidental, happenstance world that is the product of our own doing (that is simply the thinking of fallen man and our modern world – cf. Ps 14:1; 53:1). It is here where your friend John Pavlovitz is completely in the dark… whereas he thinks this is “man’s world,” this is “God’s world.” God is not only the author of all that exists, He is the author of life and all it contains — clearly that is a difficult construct for human beings to understand; and without a “humble heart” one will never come to accept it — remember, “God doesn’t cast His pearls before swine (i.e., the arrogant)” (cf. Mt 7:6; 10:14). The human response to such a didactic (that God is orchestrating His purposes in this world) is to often conclude that we as human beings must then be robots; but that is not the implication of that truth, nor does it correspond with divine revelation. Being as this particular construct is a pretty significant one in and of itself, some people need to study what Scripture has to say regarding the sovereignty of God and ultimate reality — I have written several studies on this issue myself (you can find them on my website: www.thetransformedsoul.com). With that in mind, let me briefly expand on this subject to at least give “context” to it; hopefully I can shed a little light on it. Let me begin by saying: Ultimately we need to see things from an eternal perspective (i.e., from God's perspective; as previously stated, God is the initiator of all that exists; everything begins and ends with GOD; to take Him off the table is to take the answer to everything off the table). The reality is this, when trying to see things from an eternal perspective… one will ultimately & logically come to the conclusion that the Eternal Prime Mover (GOD) is in absolute control of all things… and that nothing in the universe happens outside of His superintendence. Incidentally, there are numerous passages throughout Scripture that attest to that fact (read Isaiah chapters 43 to 55). The logic is actually pretty simple: if you were GOD and nothing else existed, and you were to create something, would it not be in total subjection to you and your will? Obviously, it would be; how could it not be? As the only Eternal Reality, Scripture states that “God does all things after the counsel of His will” (cf. Eph 1:11) — of course He does; what other logical conclusion could one possibly arrive at? Anything else would be completely nonsensical and illogical. It is only the Temporal minds of men that argue to the contrary, because they see the created order as “THE BIG REALITY;” when in fact (compared to God) it is NOTHING! Less than nothing! (cf. Is 40:17-18, 22-26). The reality is this: either we let God be GOD, or we reject Him and invent our own god. That is precisely what your friend John Pavlovitz has done; to respond as brashly as he did clearly reveals the temporal bias with which he thinks, as well as his deficiency in understanding the essence of who God is; though his intentions may be good, they are completely grounded in falsehood; which means they are valueless.

Now, should people insist that they are the author of much that takes place in their lives, what criteria do they use to make such a deduction? Their own efforts and accomplishments? What conclusion would they draw if their successes, wealth and health were instantly removed from their lives? Read what Job had to say on this subject (cf. Job 1:21). The uninformed and the temporal minds of men would probably conclude that “they just experienced some bad luck in
life.” If that’s the case, however, that would make “happenstance,” rather than they themselves, the ultimate answer to everything. With that in mind, the only alternative left on the table for them would be that of satisfying themselves with gambling at the “Crap Table” in Vegas, and hope that the dice simply bounces in their direction. But what if it doesn’t? All they can do is basically conclude, “that’s just the way the mop flops or that’s the way the cookie crumbles!” Now if everything happened to go according to “their plan,” they could make the claim that “they are the chief cause of everything in their life!” But (that’s an important but) God in His wisdom tells us that, He won’t permit us to successfully run the show in our lives. Perhaps He might for a short period of time, so that He can knock it all off the table in one big fell swoop, “to teach us that we aren’t the big cheese in life… we aren’t the difference maker… we aren’t the big petunia that we want to think we are.” By the way, there is no reason for a believer to ever have to go down that road; only the most stubborn of us insist on doing so (cf. Ps 32:8; 37:23; Prov 16:9). Just because God has established laws that work in the operation of the universe, does not mean “our actions” are the ultimate cause of everything in our lives (read Prov 16:1, 9; 19:21; 20:24; Ps 37:23; Jer 10:23; Ecc 1:14-15; 2:17; 3:14; 7:13-14; 12:13-14). Though one can attempt to logically exclude God as the supreme postulate in life, and may satisfy himself for a season, there will come a day when his little world will be tipped upside down. Ultimately God will have the last word in our lives, and in the end will shine His light on everything, and reveal it all for what it is (cf. 1 Cor 4:5; Dan 4:30-37); thus for a person to stubbornly refuse to consider the presence of the Transcendent One in all of life is pure folly. To stubbornly insist on rationalizing everything from a human perspective, and disregard the teaching of Scripture, is to build one’s life on falsehood and dwell in darkness. God’s Word tells us that we are to interpret everything in the light of Scripture, because it gives “context” to everything: that is, it helps us understand the divine reason for everything. Beloved, use your stubbornness (if that indeed is what it is) to pursue divine truth and not the thinking of men; everything must be confirmed with the teaching of God’s Word (that’s why He gave it to us). . . . to disregard it and live to the contrary is to “walk in darkness” (cf. Mt 24:35; Is 46:8-13; 55:11).

As the John the Baptist declared in his last testimony, “A man can receive nothing (that word is emphatic in Greek, so keep that in mind) unless it has been given him from heaven” (Jn 3:27). Before continuing on, humbly reflect upon that construct and apply it to everything you possess in life (not only the physical things you have in life, but your giftedness as well — it is in meditating for hours on such thoughts, whereby one’s theology becomes far more “God-centered” rather than “Man-centered.”” your theology will only become a dynamic reality in your life when you humbly sit and Jesus’ feet and reflect upon significant truths). The apostle Paul said, “What do you have that you did not receive? And if you received it, why do you boast as if you did not receive it?” (cf. 1 Cor 4:7; Deut 8:18; Rom 12:3, 6; 1 Pet 4:10). Beloved, you need to take a few minutes and reflect upon that construct of thought — it is by meditation on divine realities that they become real to us and impact our lives. Though such constructs are troubling to those who insist that they are the product of own efforts and genius, after years of living through all of the ups and downs of life, and studying God’s Word, one cannot ultimately arrive at such a shallow conclusion . . . if you are truly a believer, the Holy Spirit will instruct your heart on this matter; the issue is simply too significant for God to let a believer live his entire life somehow thinking that “he is his own man.” Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon during the Babylonian captivity of the Jewish people some six-hundred years before Christ, “foolishly believed he had accomplished everything by the might of his power” (Dan 4:30); as such, God lowered the boom
on him and made him live like a beast in the field and made him eat grass for seven years, “until he recognized that the Most High is the ruler over the realm of mankind and bestows it upon whoever He wishes” (cf. Dan 4:32). Following his restoration Nebuchadnezzar “raised his eyes toward heaven, and ‘reason’ returned to him, and he blessed the Most High and praised and honored Him saying: ‘His dominion is an everlasting dominion (I find it interesting that he interjected “eternity” into the equation — obviously he was no dummy), and His kingdom endures from generation to generation’ (Dan 4:34). The truth is, God is the omnipotent, eternal Sovereign of the universe; none of us are the product of our own doing or making. Writes the apostle Paul, “The wisdom of men is absolutely foolish to God” — you are a man, are you not? (cf. 1 Cor 3:18-19; 1 Cor 1:20-21). Take a moment and read what happened to King Herod Agrippa I (read Acts 12:21-23). With all of the foregoing in mind, “humility” should characterize our hearts… and where there is humility God extends “grace” (cf. Jam 4:6; 1 Pet 5:5). The foregoing reminds me of the troubled thinking of the psalmist Asaph — when he saw his wicked oppressors prosper, he ultimately began to question the ways of God and said…

“Surely in vain I have kept my heart pure, and washed my hands in innocence; for I have been stricken all day long, and chastened every morning — when I pondered to understand this, it was troublesome in my sight; it wasn’t until I came into the sanctuary of God that I perceived their eternal destiny; that they shall be destroyed in a moment, and swept away by a wave of sudden terrors that are too horrible to contemplate. Ultimately I concluded that it was stupid of me to become bitter and agitated over the seeming prosperity of the ungodly. Lord, in questioning your justice I was acting more like a beast then a man… forgive me… yet in spite of my ignorant behavior, You have not forsaken me; I am continually with You, and You hold on to me like a father holds his child by the hand. Throughout my entire life, You guide me with Your counsel, and then at last You will receive me into glory. Thou art the strength of my life” (Psalm 73; cf. 1 Pet 5:10).

**The reality is, we don’t live in a “world of equality,” we live in a “world of inequality,”** and that is a very troubling construct for many people. Should God have assigned the task of creation to you or me, it’s highly unlikely that we would have created it the way God did, or let it ultimately become the world that it is today. The reality is, “as human beings we are each totally unique,” and we each have our own strengths & weaknesses (issues & problems). Just as some of us suffer from significant physical infirmities, others of us suffer from significant mental conditions; yet none of us are remotely close to possessing physical or mental perfection. We are all fallen creatures and our differences as human beings are extremely wide-ranging; we are not of the same race, we don’t look the same, we don’t have the same personalities, our skill-sets are different, we each suffer from a myriad of internal conditions due to the fall; contrary to how wonderful we may appear to other people. The truth is, there is no such thing as human perfection or a generic human being; that’s right, we’re all atypical. Furthermore, *God created each one of us in the womb* with vastly different qualities and predispositions (cf. Ps 119:73: 139:13-14; Is 44:24); none of us are an accident; incidentally, that is why abortion is wrong! We are not simply the product of sexual intercourse, we are the product of GOD! Any other thinking is diabolical! This isn’t some brainless human deduction, this is a DIVINE REALITY! To continue with what we were previously discussing… we were all raised in different families and experienced vastly different upbringings; we were not all raised in the same culture or taught the same philosophies
of life and values... some of us were unfairly mistreated and abused in life and have experienced significant psychological damage; as a result we have a very difficult time understanding ourselves and reconciling everything that happened to us. I find it interesting that many people judge others as if we are all essentially the same — we are not. Our differences can actually be immense... yet we are often led to believe that our commonality overrides all of our differences... that there is a "generic concept" that adequately defines us all. That can be a very troubling deduction for many people, because it ignores many of the painful deficiencies that define them. The reality is, "some people have a far more difficult road to travel in life than others;" we are not all the same; "there is no generic understanding of the human family." we are all incredibly unique individuals who have been placed in this world to accomplish God's higher purposes. Though we are all sinful human beings, exactly what that looks like in each of us is "radically different." All of us have certain psychological and emotional issues, and as painful and frustrating as they may be, we may never get to that point where we are able to overcome them in life... some people are victims of extreme mental anguish... others are mentally retarded... and still others are so psychotic and schizophrenic that you wonder what planet they were born on. Whatever our physical or mental conditions may be, God asks us to live with everything He has placed on our plate and "trust Him come what may." Remember, we are all fallen creatures who live in a seriously fallen world, yet God somehow is glorifying Himself in and through it all; that is simply the wonder and greatness of our God (read Is 45:5-7; 46:9-11; 55:8-11; 64:8; Jer 32:17, 27; Rom 11:33-36; Col 1:16). One particular verse stands out in my mind: "I am the LORD, the God of all flesh; is anything too difficult for Me?" (cf. Jer 32:27) — let that verse settle deep in your heart.

**Regarding the fact "we are created beings."** God says, "Shall the thing that is molded say to the molder, 'Why did you make me like this?'" (Rom 9:20). "Does not the potter have a right over the clay?" (Rom 9:21). "Shall the potter be considered as equal with the clay? Shall the clay say to the potter, 'What are you doing?'" (cf. Is 29:16; 45:9; Jer 18:1ff). The reality is, we are each the product of God's hands; though we may struggle with accepting that fact, that does not invalidate it; insisting that it not be so does not make it irrelevant. The truth is — "God formed our inward parts, and made us who we are in our mother's womb" (Ps 139:13); "as such, we are fearfully and wonderfully made" (cf. Ps 139:14). In addition to all of the positive characteristics we possess, we all have a number of negative characteristics (idiosyncrasies) as well; which is simply the result of living in a fallen universe (God didn't make us perfect in our mother's womb). With that said, God would have each of us live with all of the different characteristics that are a part of who we are, to the praise of His glory (Jn 9:1-3). The reality is, "God asks each of us to live with a number of negative challenges in life," though some of us have exceedingly more than others, God has willed that we possess the ones that we have (Jn 21:21-22)... God never intended this life to be a pleasant little utopia (that is simply not the way He designed the economy under which we live; His eternal purposes are beyond the thinking of men — cf. Is 55:8-9); if your goal in life is to make it a fabulous little utopia, He is going to rain on your little parade and disillusion you. So when we try to make this life "a wonderful little paradise," which is what most people try to do, God is not going to let that happen, because that is not the reason we live on this planet (cf. Mt 6:25-34; Lk 12:15-34; 1 Pet 1:6-7; 4:1, 12; 5:10). There is no such thing as "heaven on earth." Regarding the "reason" for man existence, let me encourage you to read a study I did on it titled, "Sin and Man's Eternal Purpose;" you can find it on my website: www.thetransformedsoul.com — I can't suggest that study too strongly; it is an incredibly eye-opening study that completely changed much of my thinking. Always keep in mind, "God's thoughts are not our thoughts, neither are
**His ways our ways... as high as the heavens are above the earth, so are His ways higher than our ways** (cf. Is 55:8-9). To argue to the contrary not only makes God less than He really is (the only sovereign in all the universe), but leads one into a foolish, mindless state of existence that refuses to accept reality. In actuality, everything we possess (be it physical, mental or spiritual) was given to us by God... it is only our insistence on “personal autonomy” that makes us rebel so strongly against “the law of submission;” and it is only our fallen human nature that insists on thinking and acting in contrary fashion. Though that is a very humbling truth, it is one that actually takes away the anxiety in one’s soul and brings a genuine, grateful perspective to one’s life (because truth truly sets a person free to be the person God wants him to be)... so don’t make our political world your life; make God your life (cf. Jn 8:31-32; Phil 1:21; Col 3:4).

**Liberation Theology**

**Remember, truth is the reality of “what is,” and only divine truth is “liberating”** (John 8:31-32); due to the fact we inhabit “sinful flesh” (i.e., fallen human thinking) there are times when even the believing community finds it difficult to accept divine truth (because of the presence of indwelling sin; i.e., our sin nature). One of the significant problems in the “black community” is that some have attempted to supplant “Christian theology” by embracing the “Liberation Theology” that is so prevalent in Latin America. Basically, liberation theology is a movement that seeks to “unite theology and socio-political concerns” — ultimately, it has its roots in the philosophical origins of knowledge, and the social perspectives of three prominent 18th & 19th century German philosophers: Immanuel Kant, George Hegel and Karl Marx. As you might recall, Immanuel Kant argued for the autonomy of human reason; with that in mind, liberation theology is not worked out in response to “God's self-disclosure to the human family through the Scriptures” (i.e., the Bible); instead it is replaced by discovering God through human interaction with history. With that in mind, Karl Marx argued that human wholeness can only be realized through overcoming the alienating political and economic structures of society, “so liberation theology involves engaging oneself in the struggle to bring about society's transformation” (that's its ultimate goal). Because Marxism and liberation theology condemn religion for supporting the status quo and legitimizing the power of the oppressor (which it probably did in some segments of our world — but that doesn't justify throwing out the baby with the bathwater); what's important here is that one not accuse “genuine born-again believers” of doing that; remember the vast majority of those who “profess to be Christians” are not true genuine believers; the majority of those in question here were actually Roman Catholics and Russian Orthodox. Thus because Marxism and liberation theology condemn religion for supporting the status quo and legitimizing the power of the oppressor, it turns the Christian faith into a means for bringing about the “liberation of the oppressed” — therefore claiming that the struggle is with “man's inhumanity to man, and not with “unbelief” — in that sense it puts the cart before the horse... rather than focusing on God (the solution to all of our deficiencies), it focuses on man's liberation. (the problem with which he is preoccupied); hence thus liberation theology gives preeminence to man's suffering and despair, and his being delivered from it, rather than upon the transcendent majesty and holiness of the God of creation and His redemptive love for man through the cross. With that in mind, the essence of “evangelism” in liberation theology is that of “announcing God's participation in the human struggle for justice.” The importance of Jesus for liberation theology lies in His exemplary struggle for the poor and the oppressed — so
Jesus is not GOD in an eternal, transcendent, ontological or metaphysical sense; instead liberation theology simply focuses on Jesus’ relational significance through others (it essentially is preoccupied with man's deliverance from oppression).

The strength of liberation theology is in its compassion for the poor and its conviction that Christians should not remain passive and indifferent to their plight; inhumanity between people is sin and deserves the judgment of God and Christian resistance. Though liberation theology rightly condemns using God for one's own ends and purposes, it wrongly denies God's definitive self-disclosure in biblical revelation — thus it makes it difficult to distinguish between theology and ideology. Though liberation theology is right in exposing both the oppressor and the fact of oppression in society, Scripture understands sin and alienation from God as a dilemma that not only confronts the oppressor but also the oppressed. Though biblical theology does teach that God has a heart for the poor, it does not teach that the poor are actually the embodiment of God. The problem with liberation theology is that it politicizes the gospel to the point that the poor are offered a solution that could be provided with or without Christ. It is important that one rightly understand the significance of the cross, and that he not make it a vicarious identification of God with human suffering. The Bible emphatically declares it is the substitutionary death of God's Son offered on behalf of sinful man, that he might triumph over sin, death, and the devil. When we make “political liberation” the ultimate goal (i.e., the lack of oppression), and not “spiritual identification with Christ,” we have made that which is of secondary importance the main thing. As believers in Christ, we have been “spiritually set free from the law of sin and death” (i.e., sin and the penalty of sin no longer has autonomy over us; cf. Rom 8:2) — the ramifications of that when properly understood has a transformational effect upon a believer’s life. In short, “the spiritual liberation we experience has nothing to do with physically experiencing some kind of liberation in this world;” the reality is, physical liberation may not occur; we live in the confines of a diabolical world, and it is this world that we need to evangelize with the good news of a loving, forgiving God, and in obedience to Him strongly influence the world in a godly direction. Beloved, if you're embracing a form of “liberation theology,” you are embracing an important ideal rather than the Gospel of Jesus Christ: just because you are attaching “His name” to your theology, doesn't make Him a part of it. Here's the point: if your little world should not get better, but actually get worse (and it might), how is that going to affect your faith? The God of our faith must be significantly bigger than any negative or adverse condition (suffering and the like). Beloved, spiritual truth needs to be the foundation of your faith; not some political reality.

Though “professing Christians” down through the centuries have not always behaved in ways that reflect Christ, one cannot deduce that the Christian faith is the problem; that would be like rejecting and condemning the office of President because of the poor behavior of some President (the problem lies with the individual himself not the office he holds). In like manner, just because someone may have had an ancestor who was a horse thief doesn't mean he should abandon his family. Christianity is not false because one of its members commits some serious sin or transgression, any more than the science of mathematics is false because some math teacher miscalculates a problem; neither of these disciplines are to be condemned because one of its adherents does something wrong. The truth of the matter is, there are bad mathematicians, bad accountants, bad doctors, bad teachers, bad ballplayers, bad electricians, bad senators, bad everything (including bad Democrats ☹ and people who claim to be Christians). The Christian
faith calls its adherents to “turn the other cheek” and “love one another” — just because an individual may live under the guise of Christianity & disobey these injunctions, doesn’t mean one can equate their wrongdoing with the Christian faith itself. The truth of the matter is, our behaviors may be completely contrary to the teachings of Christ — keep in mind two points here: not all people who profess to be Christians are Christians, and all people inhabit sinful flesh — believers & unbelievers alike. Though there may be some “bad apples” in the Christian world (most of which are not true genuine believers), one must keep in mind that Christianity has an incredible record of “doing good” in our world; a better record than any other people group by far… so to demean the Christian faith because of few rotten apples is to really exercise a poor level of judgment. If anyone wishes to condemn Christianity because of the failures of some of its adherents, to be consistent, they must also applaud Christianity for its successes. Therefore, one should not believe or disbelieve in Christianity because of the actions or behaviors of some of its proposed adherents; instead they should believe in Christianity because of “who Jesus is and what He did.” Let’s take a moment and look a little deeper at this matter called “liberation theology” —

Simply stated, “liberation theology” is a movement that attempts to interpret Scripture through the plight of the poor; it believes true followers of Jesus must bring about social and political change, and align themselves with the working class… and that all church doctrine should grow out of the perspective of the poor. Thus liberation theology gives primary focus to liberating people from all forms of social injustice in the here and now, rather than in the life hereafter — in other words, its focus is on experiencing a little heavenly utopia in this life; not the life to come. Jesus taught the exact opposite: “My kingdom is not of this world” (cf. Jn 18:36). Though Christians should be concerned for the plight of the poor and disadvantaged, social injustice is not a core principle of the gospel. The message of the gospel is that we are all (rich and poor alike) infected with sin (Rom 3:23), and all merit eternal separation from God (Rom 6:23). Jesus died on the cross, taking the punishment that we deserve (cf. 2 Cor 5:21; 1 Jn 2:2), providing for our salvation. If we place our trust in Jesus as our Savior, all of our sins are forgiven, and we will be granted entrance into heaven after death (John 3:16). In short, that is the gospel. When a person receives Jesus as his Savior, he becomes a “new creation” (2 Cor 5:17), and the indwelling Holy Spirit begins the process of conforming him to the image of Christ (Rom 12:1-2); only through “this spiritual transformation” can racism & injustice be conquered. Liberation theology fails because it attacks the symptoms without truly addressing the disease; sin and our fallenness is the disease, whereas hatred, racism and social injustice are the symptoms. Though the Bible teaches the followers of Christ to care for the poor (cf. Gal 2:10; Jam 2:15-16; 1 Jn 3:17), and speak out against injustice, it does not place social action on an equal footing with the gospel message. As important as feeding the hungry is, it cannot take the place of the gospel of Christ (Acts 3:6); to do so drastically minimizes the significance of the gospel. Man’s primary need is spiritual, not social or physical. Furthermore, the gospel is for all people, not only the poor, but for the rich as well (cf. Lk 2:10); to assign special status to any group as being preferred by God is to discriminate, something God does not do (cf. Acts 10:34-35). Christ brings unity to His church (i.e., to that community of believers who have placed their trust in Him), not division along socio-economic, racial or gender lines (cf. Eph 4:15). By the way, there is far more wealth in the unbelieving world here in the United States than in the believing world — in spite of that fact, the believing community dominates charitable giving & charitable service; though true believers only constitute about 13% of the American population, they overwhelmingly
dominate caring for & providing for the needy (studies have shown that their giving & serving accounts for about 80% of all giving and charitable service in our country… in spite of the fact that the liberal element is vastly more wealthy than the Christian element). I find it interesting that the liberal northeastern sector of our country is not only far and away “the most wealthy,” it is far and away “the least generous,” and that the poorest sector of our country is the south, and it is far and away “the most generous” — why is that? because the northeastern sector has the lowest number of true born-again believers per capita. Regarding the number of people in our country who attend a protestant church on any given Sunday, statisticians tell us that number is about 56,000,000 — that means just over 17% of our population attends a protestant church on Sunday; since many of the more liberal protestant churches don’t even believe in the integrity of Scripture or the divinity of Christ, probably about 15,000,000 of those who attend church on any given Sunday are not truly born-again believers; thus we can probably conclude that about 13-15% of our population are genuine believers (obviously, they don’t all attend church every week; so maybe there are about 50,000,000 true born-again believers in our country — perhaps there are an additional 10,000,000 true born-again Catholics; thus about one-sixth of our entire population are probably believers, and of that number maybe a fourth or a fifth are teenagers and children). Remember the words of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount — “Broad is the way that leads to destruction, and narrow is the way that leads to life, and few there be that find it… so beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep’s clothing; inwardly they are ravenous wolves” (cf. Mt 7:13-15).

Christian Theology

As mentioned above, believers are in “the process” of being transformed into the image of Christ: they all inhabit “sinful flesh” just like you — no human being is virtuous; “there is none good but God” (cf. Lk 18:19)… no matter what side of the fence we are on politically or socially, “we are all fallen creatures;” don’t make yourself out to be something you are not — you and I and the entire world are no different in that regard. The incredible reality for “the believer” is this: “God is at work in him transforming him into the image of Christ;” it’s a life-long process that doesn’t end until he gets to heaven (cf. Rom 8:28-31ff; 2 Cor 3:18; Gal 4:19; 1 Pet 2:2); so to some-how expect that true born-again Christians should be “perfect” is foolish; that just shows a very poor understanding of what Scripture really teaches. Again, “we are all fallen creatures.” The difference between someone who is a true believer and one who is not a true believer is this — “the believer is a forgiven fallen creature who has been made spiritually alive in Christ” (cf. Col 2:13; Eph 2:1-10; Rom 6:11; 1 Pet 3:18); whereas the unbeliever is an unforgiven fallen creature who is spiritually dead (cf. Eph 2:1-5; Col 2:13). That is the GOSPEL: don’t turn it into something that it is not. Sadly, liberation theology focuses on an ancillary thought rather than the premier thought — subsidiary thoughts (as good and wonderful as they may be) are NOT to supplant the supreme thought… secondary matters are to take a backseat to that which is preeminent (Jesus Christ; cf. Col 1:18). GOD is to have preeminence over our families, our race, our social standing, our health, our wealth, our desires, and everything else in life (cf. Mt 10:37-39; 19:29; Lk 14:26; 16:13; Jn 12:25). Just because some particular socio-political issue moves our spirit and inspires us to give great value to it, does not mean we are to make that our religion rather than GOD. The problem with fallen man is that his wants oftentimes rule in his soul, and he makes them a part of the divine aspect of his faith: we can’t add GOD to our little paradigm of thought (as righteous
as that particular thought may be) and somehow think that is what it means to believe in God… in that sense GOD then becomes subordinate to that issue that occupies first place in our life… we have supplanted GOD with an IDEAL. Our sin condition is vastly more important than any injustice we may be experiencing. The question is, “Does your construct of faith have room for trials and problems?” If our theology of GOD has no room for injustice, inequity, suffering, ill-treatment, persecution, poverty, pain, abuse, malfeasance, sickness, rejection, etc., our god is “what we want,” not the GOD of creation & salvation. Let me remind you of what the Lord Jesus said to His disciples the night before He went to the cross, “In the world you have tribulation, but take courage; I have overcome the world” (cf. Jn 16:33); essentially Jesus was saying this, “in spite of the fact that you will encounter significant tribulations in this life, you can rest assured that you on the winning side;” incidentally, all twelve disciples were “martyred for their faith” (with the exception of the apostle John)… they didn't get an easy road to glory. Why should you or I? Does your theology of faith have a level of character to it that permits you to live with the difficulties and injustices of life? or is it simply the product of humanistic thought? Consider this, some 70,000,000 Christians have been martyred for their faith since the first century; presently 100,000 are being killed every year in the world because of their faith in Christ (and about 90% of them are being slain and raped by Muslims). Let me encourage you to check out the following website; there are a number of “sobering pictures” on it that you need to look at; it might cause you to re-think your position — https://ww.gatestoneinstitute.org/6661/obama-christian-martyrdom

When one considers the atrocities that many believers are experiencing in this world, it's not at all uncommon for some of them to ask, “Where is God? Why did He not intervene & deliver us? Why do Christians have to suffer such indignation? Shall we just respond with “fallen human thinking,” and get angry & deny God because things don't go the way we want them to go? In truth, the problems of injustice that the black community is experiencing here in America (as wrong as they may be), are far less significant than the reprobate behavior of the unbelieving world toward the Christian community; are you now one with the unbelieving world? When we only focus on “our concerns,” we generally misinterpret the bigger picture. Beloved, how many blacks do you think were murdered by true God-fearing white Christians in the last five years? If there were ten, I would be shocked. Though many in the black community have suffered abuse in some way, it is also true that numbers of true born-again [white] Christians have suffered as well; one cannot ignore one at the expense of the other. Christians are getting ridiculed and berated every day by godless liberals and godless news commentators (and those are your friends?). I seldom if ever hear blacks being ridiculed and berated by our news commentators; apparently, that’s against the law… but that's not the case with followers of Christ.

Regarding the “Christian community” in our world: aside from being the founders of our country and the freedoms we enjoy, and those who constructed the constitution and wrote the bill of rights (it is amazing how the sleazy left has tried to eliminate the significance of Christianity from our nation's history, as if it the spiritual constructs of thought that governed the thinking of our forefathers had absolutely nothing to do with the foundations upon which our nation was built; you would have to study America's history to understand the significance of what I have just stated — volumes could be written on that subject (the liberal elites hate being confronted with such facts, because they can't understand how “truly great men” could have been that committed to the teachings of Scripture; it might be good for you to study the Christian faith that influenced our nation's forefathers). By the way, it was the Christian community that delivered blacks from slavery… that liberated women from oppression… that fought for
**Again,** I want to give in secret. 

That established thousands of orphanages… that built hundreds of thousands of schools… that educated people… invented the world of science (much to the chagrin of the liberal establishment)... that put the majority of the world's languages into written form… originated colleges and universities and erected thousands of them; nearly all of the Ivy League schools were of Christian origin (they were established by Christian churches; yet today these same diabolical institutions have an "intense hatred" for Christianity, as if Christians are nothing but stupid barbarians (sadly, that seems to be an important construct for you as well — the "ideal" that has fostered your faith has produced "hatred" in your soul; let me encourage you to re-think your beliefs and your theology; it is grounded in darkness, not light — you can thank liberal America for its diabolical impact upon your life). In addition to the aforementioned it was the Christian community that established **homeless shelters** for the poor, **food banks** for the poor, **thrift stores** for the poor (Grace Community Church runs the largest one here in the east valley; it's called "Gracies Thrift Store"), **assisted living centers** for the sick & elderly, and **retirement centers** for the elderly. It was the Christian community that built thousands of **medical centers and hospitals and care centers** all over the world, **modern medicine** has its origin in the Christian community, **crisis pregnancy centers**, thousands of **Christian Schools & Day Care Centers**, **hundreds of Adoption Agencies**, **Suicide Prevention Centers**, **Legal Aid Services**, **Christian Radio & Television Stations**, **Worldwide Mission Organizations**, **YMCA's & YWCA's**, **Salvation Army;** the list goes on and on. The rest of the world has hardly done **anything** when compared to the work done by the Christian community. What have "**leftist ideologues**" done other than killing 58,000,000 babies since Roe vs. Wade? In the past couple of weeks we've seen two very large gatherings of people in Washington, DC — the first was a "**Women's Rights March,**" and the second was a "**March for Life**" — the character of the first group was loud, profane & ugly... the second group was kind, polite & nice (can't imagine why there was such a difference; obviously I'm being facetious 😊). Why are Christians so prone to serve and give? "Because the love of God has been poured out in their hearts through the Holy Spirit" (cf. Rom 5:5); it is the indwelling presence of God's Spirit in the souls of men that "moves them" to be the hands and feet and voice of Jesus in this world; **genuine love is not a human trait** (the left has proved that). Believers are "**naturally**" more inclined to serve & give to others, not because of their own inherent goodness (Lk 18:19), but because of the presence of the Holy Spirit in their lives. All of the incredible work that's been done in our world by the Christian community, is a work **GOD HIMSELF has done through His people.** By comparison, those without God's presence in their lives, are far less loving and caring — the reality is, the rest of the world has hardly done anything (all it does is "tax people," so as to provide them with welfare and food stamps, and pay for their abortions. Do you not find it ironic that the unbelieving world is very selfish with its own money? that its record of **personal giving** is much lower than that of the believing world? Though there are a number of wealthy unbelievers who give large endowments to various organizations, **most of them give "to be seen by others" or "to get their name put in lights" or "have a building or project named after them"** (cf. Mt 6:1-4) — that's very popular in Hollywood; you can hear their heart saying, "**I don't want to give in secret!**" Of course not, they want the whole world to see how wonderful they are! I find it interesting that very little giving in the Christian world is done with such motives (again, read Mt 6:1-4).
GOVERNMENTAL INTEGRITY

A number of years ago there were several studies done on “the effectiveness of our tax dollars in helping meet the needs of the needy;” ultimately they discovered that it took about nine dollars to get “one dollar” into the hands of a truly needy person; in other words, bureaucracies are not nearly as wonderful as many have made them out to be; it’s as if bureaucrats always finds a way of getting the bucks into their own pockets. Think about it, it takes about $1,000 to get $100 into the hands of someone who really needs help… now for some reason, that doesn’t seem to bother politicians… many of them actually seem to be more interested in increasing the size of the bureaucracies that exist in our country;” furthermore, the leaders who head up these bureaucracies simply try to build them and make them larger; after all, the bigger they are the more important they are and the more esteem they get… and the more tax money the government allocates to them. Bureaucracies are a favorite institution of the left; the more the merrier! You’ll notice there’s very little charitable giving & serving & hands on compassion work being done by the liberal left… instead their aim is to simply make government bigger and bigger. I’m curious as to how you would judge the “effectiveness” of a bureaucracy? what criteria you would use to make that judgment? what would the “bottom line” be to you for making it an acceptable government agency? In other words, if spending $10 to get $1 into the hands of someone in need is not acceptable to you… what would be acceptable to you? Spending $3? $5? Does this information bother you? or do you just write it off saying “That’s just the way things go” & “We tried, and that’s all that really matters.” By the way, far more is being accomplished by “charitable non-prophet organizations” in our country to help meet the needs of the poor than by sleazy government bureaucracies (remember, all government does is basically hire people and give them the vast majority of the funds to make the bureaucracy work! Not so with non-prophets; they don’t use the majority of their funds to pay wages with tax-payers money; they invest their private donations into meeting needs of people with volunteers who really “care” for those whom they are serving). Do you not find it a little odd that “the costs” of running our bureaucracies are not being “discussed” in public by those who have been elected to serve us? Or am I being too harsh on these political morons? In case you’re wondering, prior to the establishment of Obama Care, the poor were not without medical service; the needs of the poor were being met in numerous emergency medical centers all across the country; so it was not as if the poor were being denied medical service (as some politicians tried to communicate). Just to shed a little light on “one issue here in Arizona” — our state government paid for about 250,000 births a year by illegal immigrants (the Mexican world has known for years that the US will pay for the birth of their child if “delivery” were to happen on US soil; thus many pregnant mothers would come to the United States a month before giving birth so as to have their medical services paid for; another “perk” they got was that their child automatically was given “US citizenship” — anyone born on US soil automatically gets citizenship rights. With all of the foregoing in mind, Obama Care has resulted in eliminating many medical services for senior citizens (of which I’m one) that used to be covered by Medicaid and related insurance premiums (I don’t have a lot of money like you do, so that has been a problem for me); obviously some serious adjustments need to be made to the overall structure of our nation’s healthcare system; I found it little odd that the compassionate left threw seniors under the bus. It should also be noted that the cost of Obama Care is already four times higher than it was projected it to be just a few years ago; and it continues to go up at an incredible rate. Can we actually assume that congress was that dumb? No, they knew full well that the cost of the
program was going to sky-rocket; it doesn't take genius to figure that stuff out. Then again, because my undergraduate degree was in “Finance,” I'm probably more sensitive to this stuff. Furthermore, I place a very strong emphasis on “Integrity” — a governmental oxymoron. By the way, of all of the issues I least enjoy discussing are those that are politically oriented; because I find the political world absolutely disgusting (due to its serious lack of integrity). You probably don't mind wrestling with political garbage because you are more into the “ideas” rather than the “fruition” of those ideas (i.e., “reality”); fruition cannot be secondary to ideas in my book.

Do you like the way our political world “justifies” its actions? The strategy in passing our National Health Care was, “Just keep quiet and get it passed; we'll worry about the cost later.” As you no doubt are aware, the liberal Democrat, Bill Clinton, commented that “Obama Care has been a disaster; it never should have been passed in the first place.” By the way, just because it was instituted by Obama is not what makes it good or bad (besides, he didn't do any work on it personally; that work was done by the party leaders); what makes it good or bad is the integrity and structure of the system itself — how effective it is, and how much bang we get for our buck? That's the measuring stick in any economy. Though Obama's intentions were good, that doesn't make the product good. Furthermore, just because Obama is black doesn't make the product good or bad; yet the black community has been led to believe that those who opposed Obama's actions are “racists” (good old Jesse Jackson logic: “keep the divide going!”) that's simply the way the majority of blacks & the political left think and how they want others to think; anyone who opposes them is deemed a racist and an idiot… they are so much into creating volatility and division that “hate” just keeps sky-rocketing in our world — that's who they are, a people of hate… either you support what they believe or you're deemed a racist. Remember, angry people don't listen, so it's hardly even worth putting this information on the table. Hopefully both sides of the political spectrum can come together and make some modifications to our healthcare system, and keep it from being such a divisive issue — by the way, there isn't a truly good one anywhere in the world (did you know that?). Canada's is about as good as there is, and it is replete with problems… it's great for people suffering from minor issues (flu and colds, etc.), but it's a mess when it comes to significant surgeries and life-issues; if you need an MRI for some problem, they basically tell you that they won't be able to get one done for you for about five or six months (because that's how long the “waiting lists” are); so they encourage people to go down to the states and get one done (remember, the vast majority of people in Canada live just a few miles north of the American border). As you might recall, no loud voices came out screaming to embrace Canada's healthcare system — because it is a remedial system at best. It's only those of you who think that “government” is the answer to all our problems, that are truly delusional — government is not only “not the answer” to our problems, it is a significant contributor to our problems. One would have to study the “effects” of government to appreciate that didactic… if one isn't into investigating its integrity, one will simply believe what he wants to believe. By the way, if this stuff was really simple, our world would be on “cloud nine” — the reality is, our world is in the mud! If you keep fooling yourself, when you are 95 years old, you may start to question why you had believed all of the nonsense that you believed (you won't be the first one to arrive at that position) — most people simply refuse to learn from history.

Obviously, we don't live in a kind, sweet little world where everyone gets along; we live in a disgustingly political world that will say and do anything to defeat the opposition and be the
ruling power. It is pretty hard to think that an educated person would actually believe in the integrity of our political system: after all, many of our politicians walk away from it with a lot of bucks in their pockets; how so? they sell their souls to the highest bidders. How do you think the Clintons and the Obamas and others have accrued so much wealth? I would much rather elect someone who isn’t starving for bucks, because they would be far more inclined to simply “do what needs to be done,” to elect a person who can strongly be influenced by big bucks presents its own problems (cf. 1 Tim 6:9-10); look at all of the countries that poured money into the Clintons coffers in the last few years — what do you think it was, just a birthday present? Incidentally, those countries were disappointed when Hillary lost, because they weren’t going to get any return on their buck! So here we had two people elected as president (both Clinton and Obama) who were raised in relatively poor conditions, now walking around the world relatively wealthy… I can almost hear the left saying, “Well, they deserve to be wealthy!” Obviously, there is no point in arguing the case. Regardless of one’s political orientation, that is somewhat troubling to me, but that’s just the way human beings are (money strongly influences them; cf. 1 Tim 6:10). Again, financial issues have just always been a part of my DNA.

*Though our political world tries to “meet the needs of the needy,”* it frequently goes astray in doing so… instead of meeting the expressed needs, it creates even greater need. I remember when the scientific world declared that *margarine* was far more healthy for us than *butter,* that resulted in large numbers of people switching over to margarine, only to learn years later that butter was actually healthier for us than margarine. Though the world of science didn’t intentionally mislead people, that’s precisely what it ended up doing. The message is this — we can’t simply build our world on good intentions, our goals must also possess integrity. For years there were large numbers of people in the world exclaiming the virtue of “socialism,” over the apparent decadent nature of “capitalism” — it wasn’t until “the fruit” of each system was carefully considered and measured, that capitalism was easily declared the winner. You would think that this issue was finally put to rest, but that is not the case… there are still thousands of people insisting on “giving it another try!” In other words, they refuse to learn from the past; it’s called stupidity, but that’s our world. The principle problem inherent in Marxist thinking and socialism is that “they radically reduced incentive” — it was found that where the incentive to work was minimized, so also went the economy. Ultimately it was determined that *people need to work hard, be responsible & be held accountable* for economies to be effective and fruitful. Interestingly enough, all three of these values are strongly taught in Scripture. It should also be noted that the wealthiest economies in the world (much to the chagrin of the diehard socialists, who insist that there must be another way to achieve their goals) are grounded in “capitalistic structures,” not socialist ones — this has been evidenced all over the world, including the former communist countries of Russia and China (both of those countries now have significant capitalistic enterprises; so, capitalism did not end up being the “big evil” that many people on the left tried to make it out to be. All capitalism needs are a few controls that help keep it functioning with integrity — a very few controls — and keep government out of trying to micro-manage it). In spite of that fact, there are still a number of leftist ideologues in this country that continue to “denounce capitalism,” and attack it as if its the world’s number one cancer — sadly, ideology rather than reality governs their thinking. The reality is this — if someone doesn’t understand the essence of economics, they should not be included in the debate — if someone lacks foundational economic smarts, they need to get out of the room; be it someone on the left or someone on the right… it’s like discussing blood pressure with-
out understanding its significance (that's foolish) — wasting one’s time discussing it is even stupid; we don't need leaders who need to be in the classroom, we need leaders who have graduated from the classroom… political office can't be a “training station,” it needs to be a “work station” (if you haven't learned yet, you have no business being in office). To the satisfaction of some of those on the left, let’s say capitalism is a cancer (obviously nothing is perfect), but if that is the case, then it is a more tolerable cancer than any other economic structure that has ever existed; because no other economic structure is nearly as effective as capitalism. The only place in the world where “communal living” has worked is in Israel (and only on a very isolated basis where it is actually dependent upon the mother country's economy); several years ago Israel's government established various “ethnic communes” to make it possible for Jewish immigrants from other countries to live in Israel… each of these communes consisted of people from the same countries of origin (Russia was a common one) who spoke the same language, and only involved about 200-300 people each… the reality is, they are not economic structures, but small farming communities where people live together on just a few acres of land — these people work the land, build their own living structures, educate their children, and provide their own necessary amenities. The reason these communes work is that they are all of the same mind and the same faith, have the same work ethic and respect and value each other; it should be noted, these aren't wealthy communes. When my wife and I traveled to Israel a number of years ago, we visited a commune — the people who lived there were dedicated, hard-working, responsible people, who had all come out of very difficult living conditions in their home country (many of them gave up everything they owned in order to leave their country of origin). Though it might be possible to make a case for communal living on an extremely limited basis, one cannot apply such structures to that of a country that needs to tax its people and provide the necessary resources to keep it economically vibrant & growing. One can't just create some “little utopia” in his mind, and somehow conclude “that’s the answer!” Though that might be a pleasant little thought, reality is far more sobering than that — wishful thinking isn’t nearly as glorious and efficacious as our little “dreaming minds” insist that it be.

Here’s a construct that everyone needs to keep in mind: “Reality is what it is” — wanting it to be something that it is not is one thing… insisting that it be something that it is not is quite another. By the way, I'm not so naive so as to think that the foregoing thoughts are going to convince the ignorant of their way, and cause them to abandon their ideological bias — if there is anything that history tells us it’s this: “people don't learn from history;” they are simply too stubborn. Regardless of the issues that we have to deal with in life, it is important that “we deal with the reality of what is,” and not try to make it what it is not — though that is not necessarily easy, that must be “the goal” of one's life. Let me illustrate it this way: “in the winter, lakes generally freeze over in colder climates, and ice soon dominates the surface.” As a child I had never been on a lake covered with ice; thus when some people told me to “go for a walk on the lake,” I naturally questioned the integrity of that; I was reluctant to step out onto it for fear that it would cave in. It wasn't long, however, until I saw a truck “driving across the lake!” Obviously that convinced me that the “ice” was more than adequate to hold my little body. So here's the “the reality;” contrary to what I may have believed early on, “the reality was what it was”; and my lack of knowledge didn't change that reality… what is true is true, whether we believe it or not; and what is false is false, whether we believe it or not... we don't determine what is true — reality is what it is. The most important thing in life is that of “aligning our lives with the reality of what is, and not trying to make it what it is not.” With that didactic in mind, “it is important
to know that it is God Himself who defines reality,” and He has communicated it to us in His Word — now, the important thing when studying His Word is to “let it say what it says, and not try to read into it something that it does not say;” simply respect the function of language — to properly interpret what Scripture says, we must interpret its words historically, grammatically, and literally… it is not allegorical fiction that simply has some ethereal meaning… it is God’s expression of what is — and that, my friend, is reality.

Regarding the issue of “wealth” in America… contrary to what some may believe, there is more wealth in the liberal world than there is in the conservative world: yet the liberal world has long been saying that “the wealthy rich” (i.e., the Republicans) are the problem; that was a very clever message they used to get the poor and union employees to vote for them. The reality is, “wealth” is not a political issue (there is more wealth on the left than on the right). Regarding the economic structure of our country, the capitalists are the ones who employ the vast majority of our people; though capitalists generally make significantly more money then those who work for them (monetary incentive is what makes capitalism so effective; where there is no incentive, people neither invest nor do they work), those people who are employed by the capitalists are rewarded for their work — they are not only given a job, they are given a wage. It should be noted, when this world no longer has any “rich capitalists” (I'm not nearly as rich as you are, so I have no ulterior motive in making that statement), this world will die of starvation — when there is no wealth, there is no health… when there are no big bucks in the world, there are no jobs in the world. Who is going to hire you? a government that has no money? (remember, governments only get money by taxing people, and when there is no money being created in the marketplace, the government doesn't get any money — this is real basic stuff). Furthermore, it has been proven over & over again, that government does not have the capacity to be “a good economical employer” — why? because all incentive is removed from the table; that's why bureaucracies are such a mess (they produce very little bang for our bucks — very little!). Over & over again governments all around the globe have proven to be “so inefficient at running any kind of business,” that the majority of them have “opted out” of trying to do so. It is one thing to gamble with the government's money (it doesn't cost you a thing; it is quite another matter to gamble with your own money (it can cost you everything!). Recently, the government of Japan wisely sold out on trying to “run their mail system” — it is now being run by private industry, and is far more efficient and cost-effective than it was before. The United States ought to do the same thing, because all we’re getting from this governmental bureaucratic mess is poorer and more costly service. A few years ago I complained to the Post Office that delivered our mail in Tempe, that we never knew “when” our mail would be delivered (it's not fun to go to your mailbox two or three times a day, and discover that the mail has still not yet been delivered)... they responded to me saying, “Mail carriers can deliver the mail anytime they want throughout the day... even evening if they so choose; that they are not held to any particular time table.” You might want to chuckle at that for a few minutes before reading on; that's our government for us. Surely you are not justifying that nonsense, are you? One of the primary responsibilities of government is that “stimulating the economy” so that it will continue to “create jobs;” the problem is, the vast majority of those in congress (and even our president) have no idea “how” to do that. I teach a course on “Leadership in Business & Leadership in Ministry” at Grand Canyon University; with that in mind, after having observed some incredibly great leaders over the years, I have come up with the an axiom that describes three qualities that any effective leader must possess, regardless of what it is they are leading —
1. They must know *WHAT* to do
2. They must know *HOW* to do it
3. They must have the *ABILITY* to do it; *i.e.*, have the wherewithal to do it

Obviously each of these three qualities requires a lot of reflection... since that is not the purpose of this study, I won't expand upon them. However, all three of these qualities apply to *every form of leadership* (be it parental, vocational, or political)... the problem is, we elect people who simply want to "be" governor or "be" president (in spite of the fact that they may be ill-prepared or unqualified; it's simply an *egocentric must* for them, regardless of whether or not they have the necessary skills to provide great leadership). By the way, the majority of those who hold "*elected offices*" in our country are not qualified (both sides of the aisle).

**Welfare in America**

*Let me cover one more issue that is of tremendous importance — it is called “welfare.”*

Essentially welfare is the government's attempt to meet the needs of the needy... none of us would be so cold so as to argue against that — where there is genuine need, government needs to step in and meet those needs. Period. However, we cannot create a "*culture of dependency,*" whereby an individual is able to "*take advantage of the generosity of the state.*" *Bill Clinton* himself held this position when he was president. The problem with our government is that it [admittedly] doesn't know "*how*" to stop dependency... thus it just continues to ignore the problem of having created a culture of dependency. It seems to argue that being too strict would hurt some deserving people... so the argument seems to be, "*let's just keep throwing money down the drain, and hope that people will one day get off their duff and find a job.*"

Now that is what you call "*brilliant government.*" By the way, is that your position? Be very clear with your answer — do you just subscribe to whatever position your political god-fathers subscribe to? or do you have your own contrary conviction? Do you *excuse* those who hold a position that lacks accountability? What would you propose as an alternative? Obviously I'm trying to drag you off the dime (if that indeed is where you are) and stop acquiescing and deferring to dishonest leftist ideologues. The *integrity* of everything we do as a nation should be first and foremost in our thinking. By the way, those who *propose* certain governmental programs, need to own up to *their responsibility* in making sure that their proposal is one that possesses integrity, and not just pass that piece of legislation simply because they believe the *virtue of their intent is sufficient;* and thus make it the responsibility of the opposition to give integrity to the program (such a deduction is completely lacking in integrity). It is precisely here where the political thinking behind ObamaCare completely fell apart. I'm very curious as to how you argue this; do you buy into the sleazy argument, "*Oh, we'll find a way to pay for it later?*" If our system of government was at least designed in such a way where "*integrity*" ruled, that would be an incredible improvement, but our government is replete with dishonesty, deception and lies. I'd love to hear your thinking on this particular issue. I always push the envelope on the issue of integrity, because I believe we need to have integrity in every sphere of society; be it in the home, in marriage, in our schools, in the workplace, in our culture, in our government, in our churches, in our theology, and in every other sphere of society — the word "*integrity*" implies soundness, completeness, honesty & incorruptibility; it's foundation is "*truthfulness;*" how could one not be an advocate of integrity? I’ll tell you how, if one is convinced that the only way to accomplish his desires is to lie and cheat, he will ultimately
opt out of being a man of integrity — to him the end justifies the means. That is simply what it means to be a fallen, diabolical human being. Deep down, does that characterize you? It is only the dishonest and truly ignorant in our country that ultimately conclude that “all is well.” The reality is, all is not well.

Let me share a true story with you — years ago we used to get a number of people knocking on the door of our church who were “needy;” they needed food for their family, money for gas, money to pay their rent, or money to pay their electric or utility bill. Being as churches have been a “sacred cow” for the hurting & the needy in our country for years, “thousands of people were dishonestly taking advantage of the generosity of Christian churches;” i.e., they would “lie” about some problem they said they had, and we would give them money to help meet the need they said they had. Obviously, we had to come up with a plan to identify those individuals who were “dishonestly using the system to their advantage.” In conjunction with several other churches & Christian organizations, we developed a system whereby we processed information on those individuals who were expressing a need to us, and established an agency through which the “truly needy” in our community could receive help. Though it took a little time to process the information they would give to us, it proved to be a highly effective system; ultimately we discovered that between 80-85 percent of all the people who were asking for funds were dishonest and lying to us. Something else we did was offer those in need an opportunity to “do a little work on our campus for funds we would give them;” we found the illegitimate ones didn’t want to do the work (which was not at all surprising; they would actually get mad at you for being so mean and uncaring). Within a couple of years we were told by governmental officials that “we would be liable for any injury people may incur while working on our campus;” once again our wonderful government found a way to upset the apple cart. For years I advocated that people on welfare “should be assigned to a work force in the city to help pay for their welfare;” my thinking was, that would keep them responsible & working, and not just let them sit around and collect benefits from taxpayers. This program was turned down for two reasons — the “public unions” that were working in our city opposed it… and those on “the left side of the aisle” said, “making people work for their benefits was not only unkind but inhuman;” I never did understand why making someone “work” was deemed inhuman… the majority of us work all the time; if a person is not incapacitated in some way, why not let him work? Scripture takes a completely different view than the leftist ideologues — it says, “If a man is not willing to work, neither let him eat” (2Th 3:10). So where does that leave us? What is the alternative? Just keep pouring money down the drain and hope that they will one day get off their duff and find a job? To give a little context to the foregoing, remember it was Bill Clinton who spoke out against creating a “culture of dependency;” was he being mean & inhuman? No, not at all; he was employing common sense and being responsible. By the way, I'm not a Republican in the strict sense of the word, as some of you may have assumed... I'm my own brand of conservatism; not one deemed an ultra conservative, but one who is a common sense, compassionate conservative. In case you're interested to know, “I never listen to the news commentators on television.” They simply don't have the capacity to focus on the integrity of a particular issue any more than our politicians do; rather than presenting both the pros & cons of an issue, they seem to be more interested in denigrating those they disagree with. So I never watch it... it's like listening to some one-sided biased politician. One can't help but wonder why news commentators and politicians have such a difficult time “honestly debating the integrity an issue.
and looking at it from both sides.” It's like all issues are a “one-hundred to zero vote” in their minds; thus all politicians do is attack and berate the opposition.

**Regarding the allocation of funds to the needy… where exactly do we stop?** Obviously it is not possible to meet everybody's “wish list,” so what needs do we meet and what needs do we not meet? Let's say you argue for spending $30 billion on helping meet people's needs, whereas others maintain that number should be $25 billion — are we to say that you are more righteous and more virtuous than the other person? That's leftist ideological thinking by the way. What if I should step in at the last minute and argue for spending $35 billion — am I now the most righteous one? Why? Why not? Are there other issues that one should first consider before making that judgment? Is the biggest spender the most righteous and the most virtuous, regardless of the ramifications of such spending upon the country as a whole? What if your proposal reduces military spending and the overall safety of our country? How do you know whether it does or doesn't? Incidentally, should the future demonstrate that a reduction in military spending is what caused us to suffer a significant terrorist attack, how would you respond? Would it make any difference how you respond? After all, the damage has already been done. By the way, is there a “ceiling” on the total amount that government should tax people? All notable economists believe it is essential that countries place a ceiling on taxation & spending if they want to have a vibrant economy, yet not too long ago our congress made a number of rash decisions that ultimately resulted in the collapse of our nation's economy. I found it interesting that those most responsible didn't have he integrity to own up to their poor judgment (which isn't surprising — in truth, it would have been shocking if they had owned up to it). Remember, many of us paid a very steep price for their actions… instead, the guilty parties involved simply focused on the virtuosity with which they made those decisions. Though kind intent isn't a non-issue, it's important that people understand the integrity of their decisions… we can't just make decisions in life based on our emotions, we must also consider the wisdom of our decisions. Again, my wife and I basically lost everything we owned, thanks to some extremely poor judgment by those elected to serve our nation's best interests. The reality was, their reactionary spending and over-taxing ultimately had a negative impact upon a nation's economy. A significant part of the problem is this: we politicize everything… we denigrate those who disagree with us… we want the world to think the opposition is ugly, mean & stupid; i.e., we do anything we can to make ourselves look “good” in the eyes of the electorate. That is simply what it means to live in a “fallen world;” there is very little integrity in it — by the way, integrity is a divine value. Regarding the issue of “spending” — it should be obvious, the more one spends today, the less one has at his disposal tomorrow (that is just common sense). The question is this: “To what degree are we willing to mortgage our future for the sake of some expressed-need today?” If we just keep raising the debt ceiling, we are going to negatively impact the future of our kids, and “make them pay” for our impulsiveness and lack of discipline. This is the road our nation has traveled down now for a number of years… it has resulted in the deterioration of our nation's infrastructure (our roads, bridges & other foundational structures; many of which are rapidly approaching their final days)… so how do we go about fixing these things? Only fix those that are the most significant, and let the others self-destruct? Or do we continue to mortgage our future? The logic is pretty simple: if we can't live on what we earn, how can we expect our children to live on “less then they will earn”? By the way, 36% of our nation's gross domestic product (GDP) is being spent by all three levels of government — the Feds spend 19%; the State 10%; and the Local 7% — due to the fact our taxes don't provide all
of the necessary funding, our nation just continues to borrow against the future; so our national dept just continues to climb. With that in mind, is it any wonder why private industry is vastly more efficient and productive than government? (remember, if industry is unproductive, it has to close its doors — it doesn't have the governmental advantage of mortgaging its future)... surely, you're not worshipping at the altar of “government”?

The political entities like to “babble” and try and get people to think that “their policies” are the liberating answer to all the problems in our world — the reality is, NO ONE has all of the answers to our problems... why would GOD let human beings establish a little utopia on earth and live happily ever after when it violates His will? Again, if you have a “human god,” it's understandable that one would take that position, but our God is not a temporal human... He is the eternal Transcendent One. The truth is the self-centeredness of the individual (i.e., his fallen, sinful humanness) is the problem. No human being would ever turn to GOD if his self-centered life was a happy, joyful experience — why would he? Conversely, why would God BLESS those whose religion is focused on MAN and his world, rather than GOD and the eternal order, when in fact it is contrary to what Scripture teaches? As men, can we just make up our own religion and tie God to it in some way, and then think that we are pleasing God and doing right? Scripture is very clear — we don't determine reality, God does... we don't create the rules, God does... we aren't the end-all, God is (cf. Rom 11:36). Over and over again in the Old Testament, God's people Israel “mixed their ideals with God's,” and somehow expected Him to honor their efforts; their syncretism repeatedly resulted in harsh judgments by God (Deut 28:1-14 and 28:15-38ff). God declared to His people, “Woe to the rebellious children, who execute a plan, but not Mine, and make an alliance, but not of My Spirit” (cf. Is 30:1). God calls those “wicked” who do not subscribe to His Lordship/His ways (cf. Ps 1:1-6; 32:10; Prv 13:5; 17:15; Is 55:8). With that in mind, “Why would GOD permit your world to go in the direction that you want it to go, if it indeed is of your own making?” The question arises, what if life doesn't go the way you want it to go? What would then happen to your faith? Beloved, we can't hook GOD to our political wagon (as grand as we may think our wagon is) and somehow believe that “that theological construct” is of divine origin, and one that finds acceptance with God. Just because we may like one of Christ's teachings (caring for the poor), doesn't mean that particular construct is to become the chief cornerstone of our faith — either GOD has preeminence in our thinking and in our theology, or He has no place at all: GOD doesn't take a backseat to any value we may have. When we make “good ideals” our religion (i.e., that which we value above everything else), contrary to human thought, GOD is not on the throne of our lives — diabolical SELF is on the throne, regardless of how wonderful one may think his “little ideals” are. Remember, Satan is an “angel of light” — he uses that which is good to fight against what is best (God's will). I'm not denigrating a particular people (i.e., blacks); I'm denigrating the foundation of a belief system that has attempted to integrate GOD into its theological system of thought. The foundation of one's religion must be GOD HIMSELF for it to reflect reality... keep in mind, reality is “what is,” not what one may “want it to be;” any other reality is simply a matter of exchanging ultimately reality for temporal gratification. Are you truly interested in the truth, or “just what you want it be”? The reality is, people of every stripe (black & white) are suffering all over the world every day in numerous ways... now as painful as such suffering may be, “we're not to make deliverance from that suffering the number one goal of our life.” Let me be clear, I am not minimizing black suffering in our culture, however genuine their suffering may be... but the truth is there are groups of people in our world who are undergoing far more
painful suffering than the black populace in America… these people are being brutally raped, tortured and beheaded, and experiencing levels of cruelty that people in the west cannot even imagine. As significant as “social injustice” may be, you can't make it the ultimate concern of your life… just as your oppressors (if that indeed is what you call them) are sinful, so also are you the oppressed. The reality is, we are all sinners; thus we must all see the cross of Christ as that which must have preeminence in our lives. The reality is, God really loves us and He has a divine purpose for our lives that includes a glorious eternal destiny in heaven; and an integral part of His plan for us, is that of helping us navigate through this wicked diabolical world. What are you doing to help meet the needs of other people? How truly generous are you with your time and resources? What are you doing to encourage your brothers & sisters in Christ in their ministry of service? (Eph 4:11-16; Titus 3:8; Heb 10:24-25; 13:1-3; I Jn 3:17-18; 4:7-11).

BLACK LIBERATION THEOLOGY

As you are no doubt aware, “James H. Cone” is the chief architect of “Black Liberation Theology;” he has written several books on the subject. He states, “Black Liberation Theology refuses to accept a God who is not identified totally with the goals of the Black community. If God is not for us and against White people, then He is a murderer and we had better kill Him (God). Black theology will accept only the love of God which participates in the destruction of the White enemy. What we need is the Divine love expressed in Black power. Which is the power of Black people to destroy their oppressors here and now by any means at their disposal. Unless God is participating in this holy activity we must reject his love.” Beloved, it is almost impossible for me to think that you have actually abandoned the Christian faith and have now embraced the thinking of a man like James Cone; such a man is referred to as “anti-Christ” in Scripture. Obviously, I pray you haven't gone down that road; but if you have, you need to know you are traversing a very dangerous path — one that will have horrific eternal ramifications. Cone's thinking actually parallels that of the Muslim world (that's probably where much of his thinking came from) — any action is okay that brings about the advance of Islam. The foundation laid by Cone is that Black theology embrace Marxism and a distorted self-image of the perpetual victim; this victim identity invites a distorted view of reality, fosters nihilism, and divides rather than unites. Jeremiah Wright, the African American pastor of Trinity Church in Chicago, was Barak Obama's spiritual mentor for twenty years; it was at Trinity Church where he found religion, where he was married, and where his daughters were baptized. Jeremiah Wright latched onto Cone's race-based theology and mixed it with Christianity; his statements are the heart of this theology — “Jesus was a poor black man” because he lived in oppression at the hands of “rich white people.” Black theology has held that having black conceptions of God and images of Christ is crucial for empowerment; thus it politicizes Christianity and emphasizes racial autonomy.

In his famous speech on race relations – “A More Perfect Union” – Obama referred to the supremacist black nationalist belief that “Blacks are the real Jews; God’s Chosen People.” In his book “Dreams From My Father,” he said: “I imagined the stories of ordinary black people merging with the stories of David and Goliath, Moses and Pharaoh, the Christians in the lion's den, Ezekiel's field of dry bones. Those stories — of survival and freedom and hope — became our story, my story; the blood that had been spilled was our blood, the tears our tears.” Obviously,
**God’s revelation** (Scripture) is not the foundation of Black Liberation Theology; rather, hatred for white injustice and oppression is its foundation. The most disconcerting thing about Obama’s declaration is its influence on the black community — how many African Americans are opting out of their biblical faith and embracing the thinking and theology of Obama and James Cone? It is understandable that the vast majority of blacks voted for Obama (93%) because he is black, but how much his thinking has impacted Black constructs of faith is altogether another issue. Again, I don’t know what those numbers are; I can only hope that they are small, but I fear that they are larger than most people think. Beloved, my prayer is that you have not abandoned your faith in lieu of a political orientation in life. Though “racism” continues to exist in our world at some level, and cannot be approved or supported (anything that is wrong is to be rejected), neither can the fight against racism and injustice be the foundation of our theology — to do so is to *make a significant issue the premiere issue*. As I sit here today and reflect upon our recent past and the election of Barrack Obama, I’m now far more troubled than I was eight years ago. I remember all of the rhetoric that was going around out there in our political world concerning his close association with Jeremiah Wright, and how Obama attempted to “distance himself from Wright and what he taught” (rather than owning up to his true convictions, he disavowed being who he really was; the “end” justified the means in his mind — that same tenet is used in Islam); but now, years later some very sobering truths have surfaced in my mind. I wish I would have been more attentive in examining the essence of Black Theology and what Wright was teaching; for some reason I was not — I had already found politics to be nothing but a twisted, dishonest discussion of reality. Apparently I just hoped that Obama was simply “an attendee” of a prominent black church in Chicago; that he really wasn’t into all of the diabolical theology that was being propounded in that church (as he had intimated). Now years later as I reflect upon Barrack and Michelle Obama’s comments, it has become very evident that “they are not only ardent followers of Black Theology, but they have a diabolical love for the Islamic world, and a diabolical hatred for Israel and Christianity” — if you have ever studied the Bible you know “that’s a No-No;” the Jews and Christians are God’s chosen people whether you like it or not (cf. Gen 12:1-3; Num 24:9; Deut 7:6; 14:2; Ps 33:12; Is 45:4-7; Eph 1:4; 2:10; 2 Th 2:13; Mt 25:34); somewhere along the line, you’re going to have to learn to “let God be GOD.” You can’t displace Him with human diabolical thinking — numerous nations and people have struck out at God’s people since He chose Abraham and his descendents to be His servants in this world; i.e., those who serve His purposes. Though none of us fully understand exactly what God is doing in our world at any given moment in time, He has clearly told us to “trust Him and His plan for His people.”

**Due to Obama’s influence on America’s civil and foreign policy,** as a nation we now find our self on the precipice of falling prey to diabolical principles in pretty much every sector of society, where God is neither acknowledged or followed — political ideology seems to have displaced divine truth; that is, the thinking of men has displaced God’s thinking. Remember, our country was founded by men and women who not only believed in religious freedom, but believed in those divine principles that God has outlined in His Word (read the constitution); as such, we experienced God’s favor in this world — just as Israel did when it embraced God in its history. But now with ever-increasing defiance and rejection of God’s divine precepts, it appears as if we will now reap what we have sown; since we have now sown diabolical ideals, we will reap accordingly — it should be obvious, America has been on a downward plight now for a good while. To deny the superintendence of God in this world is the foundation of diabolical thought. No doubt you have noticed how often I have used the word “diabolical” in this study — the
reason I have used it so often is that it clearly defines any behavior that is not God honoring… *if something is not of God, it is diabolical*; ultimately, those are the only two moral constraints under which men operate in this world — either we live with a *diabolical orientation*, or we live with a *divine orientation* (i.e., either we defer to the devil, or we defer to God); those are the only two options that God has given to this fallen world (to opt out of one is to embrace the other). Taking God off the stage is the most foolish action one can make (cf. Ps 14:1; Rom 1:21-25); as important as the “sun” is to life on this planet… so is “God” to the spiritual well-being of all His creatures. Obviously God has not left man with the responsibility of figuring everything out on his own (man doesn’t have the ability to do that)… rather He has asked man to “simply humble himself before Him,” (i.e., acknowledge his infirmities, deficiencies & inadequacies) and in so doing “He will open his heart to believe and extend grace to him” (cf. Acts 16:14; 1 Cor 12:3; 1 Th 1:5; Jam 1:21; 4:6; 1 Pet 5:5) — *it is the proud person that God rejects* (i.e., those who think they are wise wonderful creatures). The reality is, we are all a bunch of decrepit sinful people (i.e., a person with a “self orientation”); but the vast majority of human beings are simply too proud to fess up to that truth. Now if we as human beings were basically all that really existed, then we would each have the option of using our own skill-set to determine our own destiny, and those who got in our way we would either extricate from our lives or we would relocate to another area. Obviously, all of us as human beings don’t think the same, and don’t have the same values, so more than likely we would continually be at war with each other (which is a pretty good picture of our present world). I remember the words of that young black guy who was arrested in Los Angeles some 30-40 years ago — “*Can’t we all just get along*?” Do you really need me to answer that? No we can’t all just get along… because we are all stubborn sinful creatures; though that answer may not sit well with you, that is the reality; only the diabolical element in our world insists that it has the answer to the fallen nature of man — again, nothing could be more foolish. By the way, Scripture tells us that “God is restraining sin’s expression in our world,” so that it doesn’t completely dominate all that goes on this world… so don’t fool yourself into thinking that *man is basically good*; that there are just a few rotten apples in the world — the whole human family is rotten to the core (cf. Lk 18:19; Rom 3:10-19). The sobering news is, God is going to one day remove His hand from it (to a degree) and let sin pretty much have “full expression”… and then the end shall come, and God will judge the world accordingly. Always keep “the big picture” in mind when looking at reality — *God is on the thrown* (cf. Is 55:6-11; 66:1-2); never lose sight of that fact.

**Michelle Obama’s recent comment that “all hope is now lost”** (due to Trump being elected President), makes sense if you are really a believer in Black Theology; but little does she know, she has been deceived (cf. Gen 3:13; 2 Cor 11:3; Col 2:8; Rev 12:9), and is embracing a system of thought that is simply a “dead end street” (it may sound good and appeal to her innate bias, but ultimately it is going nowhere, because it is not of God) — I feel sorry for both Michelle & Barrack because they have believed diabolical lies (such thinking is not of divine origin). In addition to the Obamas, I feel sorry for those blacks who have embraced this false hope and have made Black Theology their construct of faith… all in the hope that they will ascend to the throne and dictate what goes on in their little world. Beloved, my prayer is that you have not gone down that road. It is no wonder that Michelle expressed “hatred” for our country years ago, because both her and her husband were ardent believers in Black Theology (i.e., that Black Theology is the answer to the black world). Beloved, I’m not “the end all” on this issue or a man of impeccable virtue (none of us are), I am a follower of Christ who simply knows virtue when I see it (because
God has clearly defined it in His Word). The reality is, either we believe what God says, or we believe what man says (those are the only two options). The most troubling aspect of Black Theology is its “hated for Christians.” Any diabolical didactic like that is a “work of Satan;” thus, Black Theology is diabolical in its orientation. Satan was not only the cause of the fall of the human race (cf. Gen 3), he’s the one who tempts every human being… he’s the one who leads them astray… he’s the one who rules over the unbelieving world (cf. Is 14:12-17; 2 Cor 4:3-4; Eph 2:2; Col 1:13), and he is in continual conflict with those who have placed their faith in Christ (cf. Eph 6: 11-18; 1 Cor 5:5; 1 Jn 5:16). Should those of you who fail to be ever mindful that Satan is constantly working in our world, you are deluding yourself (cf. 1 Pet 5:8). Scripture clearly teaches us about “what is going to happen at the end of the age” — Satan is going to rule (God is going to let him to do so for a season to accomplish His own eternal purposes), and in so doing Satan will be in opposition against God and His people, as he has been since the very beginning. He is going to manifest himself in the future as “the abomination of desolation” in the temple (cf. Dan 11:31; Mt 24:15; Mark 13:14; Rev 13:14-15); and “exalt himself to the position of deity” (Dan 11:36-39; 2 Th 2:3-4). Paul defines Christ’s archenemies as “the lawless one” & “the man of lawlessness” (cf. 2 Th 2:3, 8-9).

It is important to always remember that Satan disguises himself as “an angel of light” (2 Cor 11:14); therefore he is “very deceitful” (Gen 3:13). He plays on our wishes and our wants, so we can’t just believe what we want to believe; we must examine the Scriptures to see if what we are thinking and being taught is indeed “true” (cf. Acts 17:11; 2 Tim 2:15). Jesus told His disciples that “false Christs and false prophets will arise so as to mislead — if possible even the elect” (cf. Mt 24:24); thus God’s children must not let themselves be “swayed by false doctrine” (cf. Eph 4:14; 6:11; 1 Cor 14:20; Gal 3:1). Whether or not you like someone’s political rhetoric or not, you must examine the foundation of what they’re saying, and ask yourself if it “aligns with what God’s Word teaches;” remember, “the righteous live by faith” (that is, by believing what God says; cf. Rom 1:17). As Christians we are to confide in other believers so that we may not stray from the truth (cf. Acts 17:11; Eph 4:11-16).

**What we appear to be seeing in Black Theology is the beginning of a “hateful divide”** that Satan is going to use to persecute God’s people here in America. Quite frankly, I never thought I would see that day when the persecution of Christians began to take centerstage in our nation; it seemed so foreign to everything I had experienced in years past… but now there are five significant sectors in our society that are joining hands in lambasting the Christian community — the diabolical left, the majority of our news commentators, the liberal elites, the entertainment industry, and the ultra-liberal black community — all five of these entities seem to be coming together to establish a federation of hate — remember the words of Jesus: “men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil” (i.e., their deeds are self-oriented rather than God-oriented – cf. Jn 3:19); Jesus goes on to say that “everyone who does evil hates the light” (Jn 3:20). The reality is, the diabolical left hates Christianity (both its doctrine & its followers). For those of you who think this is a little far-fetched, you haven’t been paying attention to the demonic ugliness that has been sweeping through our country in recent years. Beloved, though there may be a number of ugly issues in our world that many of us may hate and disagree with, they cannot be “first and foremost” in our thinking; they must be subordinate to God and dealt with in a way that honors Him and His Word. The Lord Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, “You’ve heard it said, ‘You shall love your neighbor, and hate your enemy;’ but I say to you ‘love your enemy’ and pray for those who persecute you in order that you may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: He causes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on
the righteous and the unrighteous. For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? If you greet your brothers only, what do you do more than others? Do not even the Gentiles do the same?” (cf. Mt 5:43-47). The fact that love is commanded shows that it is a matter of our will, not our emotions: nowhere in Scripture are we ever commanded to “feel” anything, because our feelings cannot be controlled in an absolute sense. Though our feelings can be intense at times, we are not to let them rule in our lives (by the way, my feelings sometimes get very intense, just like yours do); the dynamic of the flesh is feelings, whereas the dynamic of the Spirit is faith (obedience to God’s Word). The ultimate question we must each ask ourselves is this — “Am I going to let my feelings rule in my soul, or am I going to let God’s Word rule in my soul?”

Clearly James E. Cone operates on “feelings” — he hates anything he doesn’t agree with, and has made “hate” a primary construct of his faith. No matter how justified one may feel he is in “hating someone,” hate is antithetical to the teaching of Scripture — though we are to hate what is evil, we are not to hate people. “We are not to repay evil for evil, but do what is right” (cf. Rom 12:17). “We are not to be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good” (cf. Rom 12:21). Remember, Jesus Himself told us “We are to love our enemies and do good to them” (Mt 5:44), in so doing “we will heap burning coals on their head” (i.e., cause an acute sense of shame in their heart — Rom 12:20). Down through the ages God repeatedly reminded His people to never take revenge saying, “Vengeance is Mine, I will repay” (cf. Prv 20:22; 24:29; Deut 32:35; Ps 94:1; Rom 12:19); it is God’s prerogative to punish wrong-doing, not man’s; incidentally, the “I will repay” is stated emphatically in Greek — God doesn’t want believers to think for one moment that our enemies are going to get away with evil. The apostle Paul writes, “Do not be deceived, God is not mocked; for whatever a man sows, this he will also reap. For the one who sows to his own flesh shall reap corruption, but the one who sows to the Spirit shall reap eternal life” (Gal 6:7-8). The message is very clear, “we cannot live according to the dictates of our flesh” (i.e., our fallen sinful nature). Martin Luther King, Jr. said, the tragedy of repaying evil for evil is that we add evil to evil — he called it “the chain reaction of evil,” as hate multiplies hate and violence multiplies violence in “a descending spiral of destruction” (Strength to Love, Hodder & Stoughton, 1964, p. 51). The question is, are you going to heed his words, or the words of those diabolical leaders who have replaced him as “head of the Black world” in our country? Martin Luther King, though a man of foibles like all of us, was a man after God’s own heart; he walked in the light because he had trusted Christ as his Savior. When the Holy Spirit indwells us, He moves our hearts & lives in a godly direction. Obviously, no matter how virtuous any of us may think we are, none of us “like” everything or every person; but that is not the point Jesus is making. Instead Jesus is saying, “In spite of the fact that you don’t like your enemy, you are to show love to him” (not hate); i.e., you’re to respond with “love” even toward those you may not necessarily like, and in so doing let God minister His grace to their heart. You’ll notice, God Himself deals graciously with both the just and the unjust, both the good and the bad. Jesus closes this little discourse by exhorting us to imitate God by dispensing blessing to everyone without partiality (Matt 5:43-48). Obviously, one cannot love unless the love of God has been poured out in his heart by the Holy Spirit (cf. Rom 5:5; 1 Jn 3:10-18; 4:7-13; 4:19-21); hence, the spiteful leaders of Black Theology are “not loving people;” why? because the Holy Spirit has not taken up residence in their soul; therefore hate rules in their soul; they are simply defunct human beings like all other unbelievers. The Lord Jesus told His disciples the night before He went to the cross, “[keep this in mind], apart from Me you can do nothing, so you need to abide in My love” (i.e., be ever conscious of my love for you; Jn 15:5, 9-10); unbelievers do not love and do not abide in God’s love, because God’s Spirit does
not dwell in them (Rom 8:9); instead they simply live by the dictates of their flesh and what seems right to them (i.e., to their fallen human minds — cf. Prov 16:25); that’s the reason why “hate” rules in their soul. Do I ever have feelings of hate? Of course I do; all of us do… so you’re not alone on that issue; but we’re not to let hate rule over us. By the way…

If you think that “hate” is the end-all for “the left” (i.e., that hate is the “answer” to achieving your goals), you better wake up, because “those on the right” have just as much capacity to “hate” as those on the left; just because the right is not as vocal as the left, you provoke it enough with your rhetoric and you’re going to see it manifest itself in this world in equally ugly ways… “the right” is not some weak little wimp that some of you on the left foolishly think it is — if you are that naive, study the last thousand years of world history… the right can be as ugly as the left, probably even more so if it so chooses; once you have taken some unfair hits, you get far more fuel in your tank than the opposition, so don’t go down that road. The left seems to have a difficult time with “majority rule,” because it oftentimes does not agree with them; so when the pendulum swings against them they actually become somewhat anarchistic (another juvenile behavior); thus here’s a group of people who will pretty much do anything to get their way. Due to the fact the Christian world largely rejects the “moral values” of the left, the left will launch every attack possible on them, including calling them “bigots & racists” (in hopes of getting more people into their camp). The truth is, ardent leftist ideologues embrace every diabolical value in the western world, and will do whatever it needs to do to make those values foundational to our culture; even if it means “war.” Whatever our immediate future holds (it could be war), the reality is, God is ruling and will one day bring down the hatchet on those who have arrogantly sided with the evil one and hated His people. If history tells us anything, “it tells us that those who ‘hate’ will not listen to those who do not align themselves with their way of thinking”… so those of us on the right should not be surprised; it appears we are just going to have to wait until the hatchet drops.

If there is anything certain in this world, it’s this: “God will have the last word.” Only time will prove that to the diabolical people of our world: “when you hate the light and love darkness you will never listen”… and only “by being humble before God” will one’s eyes be opened to the truth (because God is the dispenser of truth). Now should the left attack the right, the left might be surprised at the result, because the right seems to be a lot more disciplined than the left (they’re not merely as prone to screaming their heads off). Just because the left’s soul burns with intense hatred, doesn’t mean their hatred is greater than anyone else’s… furthermore, the emotion of hatred ultimately becomes an impediment rather than an advantage; a hindrance rather than a help — because it blinds one’s vision, and causes him to think irrationally (stupid). Consider “Adolf Hitler.” Remember, God is the one who ultimately controls the outcome (cf. Prov 16:1, 9). Just because significant emotional fire (rage) burns in one’s soul, has nothing to do with who wins the battle; more often than not those who are angry & undisciplined lose in a very painful way. Ultimately, it is usually arrogant thinking that causes people to go to WAR! It’s happened hundreds of times in our world. As the old song expressed it, “When will we ever learn?” In many respects “hate” is just plain “stupid” — it’s a reactionary emotion that controls the discourse in people’s mind, and generally destroys them. Incidentally, a significant corollary of hate is “anger” — though there is an upside to proper anger (cf. Eph 4:26), there is a very destructive downside to it when it is not grounded in biblical truth (cf. Jam 1:20; Prv 15:1; 19:11; 29:8; 30:33). As King Solomon said, “Anger resides in the bosom of fools” (cf. Ecc 7:9). Essentially, anger is
damaging when it is ventilated or when it is internalized; i.e., when people blow up or when they clam up. God has written a lot on this subject in His Word, if you want to study the issue. I find it interesting that even the wise sages of history were able to discern the folly of hatred — Confucius (about 525 BC) said: “It’s easy to hate, and it’s difficult to love; this is how the whole scheme of things works. All good things are difficult to achieve.” Likewise, Buddha (he lived during the same time period as Confucius) said, “Never in the world does hatred cease by hatred; hatred ceases by love.” Then there was the renowned scientist George Sarton who said, “The most malicious kind of hatred is that which is built upon a theological foundation” — sadly, hatred is the essence of Black Theology. If you don’t like what God has to say, at least listen to some of the great sages of history. The long and short of it is, the foundation of “hate” is man’s diabolical flesh — when you let hate rule in your soul, you will pay a steep price. Is “truth” foundational to your thinking, or are “other values” more important to you?

As believers, “we are to do good to all people, especially to those who are of the household of faith” (cf. Gal 6:10; Mt 5:16; 7:17f; 12:35; Lk 6:27; Eph 2:10). Did you notice that word “especially”? Showing love to God’s people is a “must” — the Bible clearly teaches that “hating God’s people” is a sign that one is not truly of the household of faith, and is an indicator that one is not truly born again (1 Jn 3:10-18; 4:7-8, 20). Though all of us as believers stumble in life, and possibly even for a period of time, all true born-again believers ultimately persevere to the end because of the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit who continually moves us in a godly direction (cf. Rev 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21; Rom 8:25; 15:5; Phil 1:6; 1 Tim 6:11; 2 Tim 3:10; Titus 2:2). According to the apostle John, however, there were some who had left the early first century church, and he responded this way: “They went out from us, but they were not really of us: for if they had been of us, they would have remained with us; ultimately they went out from us in order that it might be shown that they were not truly of us” (1 Jn 2:19). Conversely, Jesus said, “Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Lord, Lord’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father... many will say to Me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, we prophesied in Your name; we cast out demons in Your name; we did this and that in Your name.’ Behold, I will declare to them, ‘I never knew you (i.e., “I never had relationship with you”): depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness” (lawless individuals do not humbly acknowledge their sinfulness or hunger after the truth and embrace the lordship of Christ; they are not subordinate to Christ and His will for their lives). The reality is, one can come close to knowing some spiritual truths and not truly be born-again; thus without humility of heart and hungering after the truth, one will rebel against God and His people. Remember, evil oftentimes masks itself with pre tense — it is talk without truth... action without holiness... profession without divine substance. Satan disguises himself as an “angel of light” (cf. 2 Cor 11:14); the reality is, those who are evil “hate the light” (cf. Jn 3:20), because the one and only true GOD is not their god (cf. Is 45:5-7).

**STRONG BLACK PASTORS**

There are numerous “black pastors” in our world today and down through the years who are worthy of following, beginning with Martin Luther King, Jr. In addition to King there are men like Charles Adams, James Perkins, E. K. Bailey, A. Louis Patterson, E. V. Hill, and C. L. Franklin. Early on in my ministry I had the privilege of attending a “National Congress on the Bible” in San Diego — one of the keynote speakers was E. V. Hill from Los Angeles;
what an incredible communicator and expositor of the Word (buy anything he published and read it). Another great black preacher in the US today is Dr. Crawford Loritts; he’s the Senior Pastor of “Fellowship Bible Church” in Roswell Georgia; he’s a brilliant Christian Scholar and Professor who I’ve had the privilege of sitting under several times (contact him about what you are going through, and have him direct you to a vibrant believing community where you live). One of the most dynamic young black pastors in our country today is Charlie Dates; he’s the Senior Pastor of Progressive Baptist Church in Chicago (a powerful inner-city church); Dates is only about forty years old, but he is already an incredible role model for black Christians and black pastors. He’s a graduate of the University of Illinois & Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Chicago; he’s an adjunct professor at Moody Bible Institute, and is on the Community Advisory Board for the Chicago Fire Department. Charlie Dates states, “The witness of M. K. curry, Jr., Frederick Douglass, Mary McLeod Bethune, Martin Luther King, and countless others is that they edified the church through the exposition of biblical propositions & taught America to live according to our professed Christian ideals.” He is quick to point out that “the black church did not historically engaged in social justice in lieu of the gospel; rather it did so because of the gospel.” He goes on to say that “we should hear more about the ministries of young, faithful black pastors like Romell Williams, Carlos Kelley, Adron Robinson, Terry Brown, George Parks, Jr., George Hurtt, Phillip Pointer, Sr., Blake Wilson, Watson Jones III, Shaun Marshall, Bryan Carter, Walter Carter & Kelon Duke. These are men who preach the Bible responsibly, who handle Christian theology appropriately, and who lead growing black churches.” To give context to who Charlie Dates is, read the following seven major beliefs of his church —

1. God: We believe in one God, Creator of all things, holy, infinitely perfect, and eternally existing in a loving unity of three equally divine Persons: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Having limitless knowledge and sovereign power, God has graciously purposed from eternity to redeem a people for Himself and to make all things new for His own glory.

2. The Bible: We believe that God has spoken in the Scriptures, both Old and New Testaments, through the words of human authors. As the verbally inspired Word of God, the Bible is without error in the original writings, the complete revelation of His will for salvation and the ultimate authority by which every realm of human knowledge and endeavor should be judged. Therefore, it is to be believed in all that it teaches, obeyed in all that it requires, and trusted in all that it promises.

3. The Human Condition: We believe that God created Adam and Eve in His image, but they sinned when they were tempted by Satan. In union with Adam, human beings are sinners by nature and by choice, alienated from God, and under His wrath. Only through God's saving work in Jesus Christ can we be rescued, reconciled and renewed.

4. Jesus Christ: We believe that Jesus Christ is God incarnate, fully God and fully man, one Person in two natures. Jesus – Israel’s promised Messiah – was conceived through the Holy Spirit and born of the Virgin Mary. He lived a sinless life, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, arose bodily from the dead, ascended into heaven, and now sits at the right hand of God the Father as our High Priest and Advocate.
5. The Work of Christ: We believe that Jesus Christ, as our representative and substitute, shed His blood on the cross as the perfect, all-sufficient sacrifice for our sins. His atoning death and victorious resurrection constitute the only ground for salvation.

6. The Holy Spirit: We believe that the Holy Spirit, in all that He does, glorifies the Lord Jesus Christ. He convicts the world of its guilt. He regenerates sinners and in Him they are baptized into union with Christ and adopted as heirs in the family of God. He also indwells, illuminates, guides, equips, and empowers believers for Christ-like living and service.

7. The Church: We believe that the true church comprises all who have been justified (i.e., made righteous) by God's grace through faith alone in Christ alone. They are united by the Holy Spirit in the body of Christ, of which He is the Head. The true church is manifest in local churches, whose membership should be composed only of believers. The Lord Jesus mandated two ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper, which visibly & tangibly express the gospel. Though they are not the means of salvation, when celebrated by the church in genuine faith, these ordinances confirm and nourish the believer.

LIBERAL ELITISM

Your apparent allegiance to “liberal elitism” is a little disconcerting, because it is that element that seems to be destroying our country. The political left has taken the Bible out of our schools, and is doing everything it can to remove it from the public arena; it has removed prayer from our schools… it has made the Sabbath (Sunday in the Christian community) the same as Saturday (a day with no sacred value whatsoever)... it has instituted abortion, and has defined it as good and proper (58,000,000 babies have been murdered in their mother's womb in the past fifty years, much to the joy of the liberal elites; sadly, blacks comprise an inordinate number of those horrible deaths)... in addition, liberal elites endorse homosexuality and the gay lifestyle (Hollywood promotes it to the hilt)... they are the chief advocates of evolutionary teaching in our schools, and the chief critics of creationism (not even permitting it to be mentioned as a possibility; read today's textbooks)... it has rejected the thinking and teaching that moral values are absolute, “that what is true for you is not necessarily true for me” (that's the essence of liberal postmodern thinking; it is doing everything it can to “muddy” the waters morally and drive people away from any kind of absolute thinking)... it is an ardent supporter of profanity, perverse lifestyles & pornography (which in itself is destroying our country)... it encourages co-habitation rather than marriage (the black community now essentially lives by that standard; nearly 75% of all black children are born out of wedlock — is it any wonder that young blacks don't “respect others”)? According to the world of psychology, respect is a quality that fathers (the standard bearers in our homes) impart to their children; when you have no father in the home, you significantly increase the possibility that that child won't be very respectful of others... furthermore, the liberal elites are doing everything they can to remove “Christmas” from the national stage — rather than wishing people “Merry Christmas,” it wants people to wish others “Happy Holidays” (I'm curious, is that your mantra also? Obama tried to instill this cultural value in our country — his hatred for orthodox Christianity was very troubling)... additionally, the foremost comrade of the liberal elites in America is Hollywood and the entertainment industry (the center of perversion and diabolical values in the entire civilized world);
all Hollywood keeps trying to do is push the moral compass further & further into the devil’s cesspool (nearly every movie is grounded in some diabolical plot; be it sex, immorality, intrigue, hate, crime and the like). In spite of the fact that America was founded by “Christians,” and its constitution is grounded on the ideals presented in Scripture, the liberal elite is doing everything it can to erase it from our textbooks, as if such religious thought was not only insignificant, but that it was actually historically irrelevant. With the foregoing in mind, is it any wonder why Christians steer clear of the diabolical left? Why in the world would we want to embrace the enemy of God (Satan) and his values?

**Quite frankly, it is mind-boggling to consider how “far” we have fallen as a society,** and how corrupt we have become. The black populace was far kinder and more pleasant and more respectful back in the 1950s when I was growing up — they were a kind, peaceful people; not at all like many are today. Yet even today I still find “the older black generation” far more friendly, courteous & congenial than “the younger generation;” characteristics every human being should exhibit. One can’t be expressly ugly & defiant and expect others to treat them nicely; that’s simply not going to happen; *respect is earned;* we reap what we sow; as Martin Luther King said, ugliness only begets ugliness; it results in people distancing themselves from each other, and disrespecting each other. Keep in mind, “the door swings both ways” — the responsibility for societal solidarity is not just a white man's problem or just a black man’s problem; it is the problem of everyone in society… foremost it rests with the “leaders” of our country; yet some of these leaders actually aggravate people & exacerbate the problem, rather than being strong genuine voices who bring solidarity & unity. Numerous times over the last eight years there were crimes committed by young blacks, and police officers appeared to respond harshly with them (be it justifiable or unjustifiable); regrettably, President Obama only seemed to focus on the harsh treatment and ignore the crime that precipitated that treatment (remember, he publicly voiced his anger before a court convicted them of using inappropriate force). It’s my thinking that Obama should have down “hard” on both the one committing the crime and its responders, while at the same time leaving the door open a bit regarding the perceived guilt of the responders (numerous people reported seeing things in different ways; some were simply lying about what they saw — and they weren't held accountable for it; why would you hold them accountable? that would only make blacks angrier). Whether or not Obama should have made it a national issue or not (if it was a white on white situation, or a black on black situation, nothing would have come of it; but because it was a white on black situation, the President had to step in? That seemed a little much)... it was Obama's responsibility to quiet the people; if he said anything at all, he should have told the world that “crime is both inexcusable and wrong and is deserving of punishment;” while at the same time saying that law enforcement officers need to “exercise as much restraint as possible” when arresting someone who is believed to have committed a crime. Sadly, Obama's words only served to “heighten anger” in the black community; and rightfully so; how could one expect them to respond any different when their president was also voicing anger? The reality was, he didn't need to go down that track. He made it sound like blacks are the only ones being dealt with wrongly by police officers (I have even been unduly dealt with by a police officer, but I didn't have the option of accusing him of racism; so it's not just blacks who occasionally suffer mistreatment by them).
The truth of the matter is, blacks not only commit far more crimes than whites do (proportionately speaking), they also commit far more crimes against whites than whites do against blacks — for instance, blacks rape far more whites than whites rape blacks (imagine how the black world would respond if the opposite were the case — why should whites tolerate such injustices?); yet our news commentators never mention statistics that put blacks in a bad light. Yet if our news commentators were transparent on these issues, many in the black world would go absolutely crazy. The reality is, news commentators simply don’t want to stir the pot; after all, what good would it do? It would simply cause more problems. Any statistics that put blacks in a bad light are almost always ignored both by our politicians and ours news commentators; obviously they don’t want to exacerbate a problem or increase societal anger. When Bill Cosby addressed the character & corrupt behaviors of some in the black community a number of years ago, the black populace essentially told him to “shut up!” It was a little surprising that no black leaders came to his defense. Why was that? Obviously, there’s enough turmoil and volatility in the black world without adding more fuel to the fire… furthermore, people are also inclined to reject what they don’t want to hear, or excuse it in some way, and embrace what they do want to hear, regardless of the integrity of an issue. I’m not throwing blacks under the bus; I am simply trying to try to draw attention to some of the “inequities” that exist in our political world. Many of our leaders tend to operate by the old maxim, “the end justifies the means” — if it’s best to be quiet, be quiet; if it’s best to speak up, speak up; “the reality is, it doesn’t matter how we get there, the important thing is simply getting there and getting what we want.” Lying and cheating are simply a part of the game. The lying that goes on in the political world is so profound, it is difficult to fathom (especially to those of us who were raised in a far more genteel and respectful world). Yet the populace today, by and large, doesn’t really seem to give a rip; you can here them saying, “Hey, everybody lies; what’s the big deal?” The reality is, our society isn’t offended by lying — “it’s the norm” — we’re simply reaping what we have sown. I would like to hear your thinking on these issues, and how you justify them. Do you really believe “the end justifies the means”? If so, how do you reconcile that didactic with divine law? Is man responsible to obey God’s law? Is it incumbent upon the leadership of our country to publicly support and embrace “those moral didactics” that are common to every religion in the world? (except one), or do we travel the road of Islam and say “the end justifies the means”? Are your practical belief structures more in line with Islam than with Christianity?

THE CONTEXT FROM WHICH I SPEAK

Since “context” is critical to understanding some of the issues that be front us, I thought it might be helpful to share the context in which I was raised. I grew up in southern California (Pasadena)… the blacks lived on the west side of town, and we lived on the east side of town. Incidentally, the baseball hall of famer Jackie Robinson grew up in Pasadena; we both played sports at Pasadena City College (though he preceded me by a generation). All I knew growing up was that “blacks and whites differed in some ways” — though several of my Junior High and High School friends were black, I don’t ever remember discussing the black/white issue or insinuating that one of us was better than the other; we just got along with each other… my teen schools years were 1956-1961. It was apparent that “the racial divide” that existed in the south did not exist where I lived in California. Martin Luther King, Jr. still had not yet come on the national stage; when he did in the mid-60s, we then became aware of the various “segregation
issues that were taking place in the south: sitting in the back of the bus, and not using the same restrooms, etc.” these behaviors were foreign to anything I or my friends had experienced — it simply didn't exist where we grew up. When Martin Luther King got everyone's attention as to all that was going on in the south, we watched the news and tried to make sense of it all. In spite of all that was going on back in the 60s, both blacks and whites had “strong family values” and divorce was basically taboo to both groups, and our social behaviors were very similar (people were kind and polite and respectful to each other). When one looks at our world today, it is difficult to understand how decadent our society has become, and how quickly it was driven into “an immoral abyss” (one that the majority now actually endorses). To return to the topic at hand, when Martin Luther King died, a co-hort of his named Jesse Jackson became the self-acclaimed pope of the black world here in America;” sadly, he didn't continue to expound and preach the things that King taught; instead he brought a different fervor to the table; rather than embrace the teachings of Scripture (love & forgiveness & reconciliation & compassion & community), he became the chief architect of “hate” in the political world, and did nothing but exacerbate the racial divide and alienate large numbers of people; remember, up until this point the black and white communities where I grew up were kind and respectful; essentially, we all shared the same values. It was at this point that Jesse Jackson announced to the world that if you don't vote for certain individuals or certain pieces of legislation, “you were a racist;” thus implying that no other alternative or rationale was acceptable. The Democratic Party in those days wasn't nearly as much into “leftist ideology” as it is today; that's simply how much it has evolved — you are probably not aware of that, because that was not the case when you were growing up.

One of the problems that surfaced when Martin Luther King died, was deciding on just how to deal with Jesse Jackson, because he was not the co-equivalent of King; so the leaders of the Democratic Party were faced with an awkward situation — should they speak up or keep quiet? Though they didn't necessarily agree with him and some of the things he was saying, they chose to not address the issue on the national stage for obvious reasons… so rather than challenge his thinking before the world, they simply hoped that some of his rhetoric would just die down... but that's not what happened; instead it took on a life all of its own; sadly many in the black world bought into it, hook, line and sinker (and understandably so). Now, just who was this young buck anyway? Though he associated with King in some way, King himself often questioned his integrity and didn't really trust him… his crudeness and dishonesty and reactionary personality were troubling to him; that he was often vulgar and arrogant was also disconcerting. You must keep in mind the Democratic Party in those days wasn't at all like the one before us today… so what were their leaders to do? Obviously they chose to keep things under lock and key, and simply hoped that things would move forward in a positive direction. My thinking is, the majority of blacks back then must have assumed that everything Jackson was saying, was essentially what Martin Luther King had said; but that was not at all the case. Without fully understanding the evolution of all that has transpired in our political world the last fifty years, one will see King & Jackson in the same light and believe they were of the same stripe; but that is to paint King with a much uglier brush. When the mass populace back then considered what Jesse Jackson was saying, they didn't buy into his nonsensical reasoning, because it was exacerbating the divide. Again, it was the black community that he hurt, because they in large part bought into his incendiary remarks, in spite of the fact that his rhetoric didn't come close to reflecting Martin Luther King's message… nevertheless the black community
Because of the significant differences between Martin Luther King and Jesse Jackson, I really believe if you are truly a fan of Jesse today, you would not have not been a fan of King; they simply didn't preach the same message. Martin Luther King was a peaceful man of God, whereas Jesse Jackson's persona was and is that of a defiant, angry man; which sadly defines much of the black world today; that can be directly attributed to Jesse and his political cohorts. Though that is very evident in the outside world, it may not be evident to those in the inside world who harbor so much hatred. If you're an angry person, you're a follower of Jesse Jackson; if you're a peaceful person, you're a follower of Martin Luther King, and in all likelihood a follower of Jesus Christ. One should also remember, Martin Luther King's ministry was about “civil rights, social change, kindness and understanding” (and his ministry was principally in the south where blacks faced several inequalities); on the other hand, Jackson sought prominence on the big stage (he wanted the entire world's attention) and “demanded a level of retribution and preferential treatment for blacks” — his defiant attitude actually resulted in some blacks claiming “black supremacy.” So whereas King's humility affected our world in a positive dynamic way, Jackson's arrogance was met with negativity and resistance; regrettably, Jackson's ugly message became the premiere construct of large numbers of people in the black community; blacks who disagreed with his rhetoric were labeled “Oreos” (black on the outside, white on the inside; is it any doubt that “hatred” exploded in the black community under Jesse's watch?). What a wonderful way to win people over to your way of thinking (sounds like John Pavlovitz); as such, many in the black community fed on that sleazy didactic and “hatred” soon began to dominate the thinking of many in the black world. That in a nutshell defines the ministry of Jackson; it was arrogant, demanding and divisive; humility was no where to be seen. When an “arrogant heart” defines who you really are, you will never win people over who are outside your camp. Just when the world was becoming sensitive to some of the societal issues with which blacks had to deal, and were trying to do their part in healing the divide, along comes Jesse Jackson, and rather than helping tear down the fences, he erects the fences! If there has been an idiot in the black world it has been Jackson. This principle will make far more sense to you once you have read the entirety of this study. At this point I can understand if you are rebelling against what I have just written… so read on.

Obviously Jesse Jackson was and is “a man of hate;” it boils in his soul. The last thing he was and is, is a man of peace, healing and reconciliation. The Reverend (there's an oxymoron for you) Jesse Jackson made everything “political,” and “inter-racial problems” started surfacing everywhere in our country… sadly, blacks started exhibiting a “far more crude behavior;” they became “far more vocal and angry,” and were “far more in your face and intolerant” of anyone who didn't agree with them and embrace them… “riots” started taking place… black
families started falling apart at an unbelievable rate. Jesse Jackson was not at all like Martin Luther King: he was often angry, arrogant & indignant in his speech; frequently people would hear him cursing in the background… the last thing “the Reverend Jesse Jackson” was, was “reverent;” he spawned hatred, and the behavior patterns of the black world became far more negative, problematic, demanding & profane. His arrogant, angry rhetoric started “alienating and separating people” rather than bringing them together. How could he have been a man after God's own heart and rejected the teaching of the Word: “A kind word turns away wrath, but a harsh word stirs up anger” (cf. Prv 15:1), and “A hot-tempered man stirs up strife, but the slow to anger pacifies contention” (cf. Prv 15:18; also Prv 12:23; 13:16; 15:28). Beloved, these aren’t just little forensic truths, they are dynamic truths that God effectuates! Jackson had no more religious fiber in his soul than the devil does. We don’t have the option of running the show in this world — that is God's prerogative, not man's. Either we comply with His word, or we pay the price! What began 50 years ago under the leadership of Martin Luther King, took a nosedive under the leadership of Jackson to the point where it has taken our world down-hill both relationally and morally… and the liberal left has now accentuated the problem to the degree that the entire political world in our country is governed by hate (hate on both the right and the left) — it is not a matter of racial hate… it is a matter of political hate. It’s hard to know what kind of an effect Jesse Jackson would have had upon our world if he was a man of God who had walked down the same path that Martin Luther King did, but the darkness in his soul rendered him unfit for such service; one can only imagine what God is going to say to him on the Last Day: “Yes, you lived in a troubled world, but rather than seeking My wisdom, you tried to resolve things with anger, demonic strategies and ungodly behavior — I gave you an incredible responsibility, but you completely blew it; remember, to whom much is given, much is required” (cf. Lk 12:48). Jesse Jackson could have done so much good in our world, yet only brought hate and division. I find his egocentricity absolutely disgusting. God has charged His church (i.e. His people) with the duty of loving others and proclaiming deliverance from sin through the cross of Christ… conversely, He has given the state the duty of ensuring political order — though He has given the church and state different responsibilities, they are not to be governed by different ethics — there is only one morality… remember, “the government is a minister (servant) of God to do us good, and a minister of God to bring wrath upon those who practice evil” (cf. Rom 13:4); only that which is good is to be rewarded, and only that which is evil is to be punished. If the state, however, commands what God forbids or forbids what God commands, believers must disobey the state in order to obey God; as the apostles said to the Jewish high-court (the Sanhedrin), “We must obey God rather than men” (cf. Acts 5:29; 4:19). Beloved, the Christian world isn’t going to bow to the diabolical thinking of the left.

THE ISSUE OF RACISM

Regarding the issue of “racism,” there were a number of things that were a little troubling to me back in my younger years. As I reflect on that world… though I knew there were differences between blacks and whites, there were various issues that I was not aware of back then. Since I wasn't raised in a black world, racism wasn’t a big issue in my life. All I knew was there were a few blacks in my life that I got along with… I had never abused a black, swore at a black, demeaned a black, screamed at a black, or hurt a black. And here comes a man named Jesse Jackson, “accusing me of being a racist for not agreeing with everything he was saying” — at
first that was a little confusing to me, because I wasn't this little hate monger that he was implying… try though as I may to process everything he was saying, here was a guy I had a difficult time identifying with… a guy who was denigrating me, my family, and my friends. My thinking is, the majority of white America was also struggling with his brash comments. He actually seemed to be “intruding into my life in an ugly kind of way;” after all, what had I ever done to deserve his slanderous remarks? With that in mind, the black world needs to be aware of the fact that the vast majority of us didn’t live in a predominantly black world… rather, we (i.e., whites, Asians, etc.), were simply raised in quiet, peaceful little communities where this “race stuff” wasn’t a issue; and now it was all being shoved in our face; somehow we were all being dragged into the issue. Though it may be hard for you as a black person to understand, the issue of “blackdome” was not a prominent one in our world, but Jesse Jackson was now making it one. Obviously there was a degree of disconcertion regarding this issue that not only frustrated us, but even made us angry; no one likes being judged unfairly. My thinking was more along this line: if there are issues in the south that need to be addressed, then go ahead and address them, but why are you bringing the entire world on to your stage? (remember, the United States only comprises 5% of the world’s population; and the black population in America, only one-half of one percent of the world’s population). Furthermore, why was Jackson insisting that all of us are guilty as well? It’s one thing to make everyone aware of a problem, it is quite another to indict everyone who does not embrace your thinking.

**Looking back on the world in which I grew up**, it's hard to recall everything that we experienced back then, just as it is hard to process the integrity of the issue of racism outside of the south. When you are inclined to make everything a “black and white issue” (not racially speaking), you are giving very narrow definitions to the issues involved, and discrediting and disrespecting any variance of thought; in other words, you are saying there is no justification whatsoever for not fully embracing everything you are saying. Even though there may be a degree of truth to what you are saying, you can't say your construct of thought is “absolute truth;” to make such a claim, means you fully understand all sides of an issue (when in fact you don't). Though *from your context* you may feel justified in making that judgment, you don't fully understand the context of those who differ with you. This will make far more sense to you a little later on in this study. As I continue to reflect back upon that world in which I grew up, one prominent issue comes to mind — though there may have been “a separation of sorts” between various people groups in our culture, it didn't seem like these separations were highly antagonistic or ugly; i.e., we weren't experiencing “significant racial tension” in our communities. We all essentially just kept to ourselves, respected our differences, did our own thing, and weren't ugly to each other; we didn't intrude into each other's lives… there was simply a level of respect that existed in our communities. As we look at our world today, there are a number of vastly different cultures that exist in it… it is not a matter of demeaning and denigrating all of those cultures that aren't the same as ours; it is simply a matter of respecting those that exist and not simply try to justify our disdain for those cultures that aren't to our liking — how do you think these cultures feel about our culture? Do they not have the right to judge us harshly as well? Since when are we “the standard bearer”? The reality is, this world in which we live isn't as simple as some people try to make it out to be. Thus, when dealing with this matter of racism as you see it, be careful that you don't take it out of *context*; i.e., that you not impose *your context* on everyone else, because in so doing, you are guilty of the very thing you are accusing other people of doing — being prejudicial; you are “prejudging” others who don't see the world as
you see it; the reality is, we each look at the world through different lenses (i.e., through different cultural perspectives, cultural values, and cultural experiences).

I find it a little strange that I’m being called “a racist” since I actually have black friends; only diabolical leftist thinking can make such a deduction. The reality is, the liberal black community “despises” blacks who associate or identify with the white community (i.e., the white Christian community); they actually accuse such blacks as “kissing the white man’s butt” (i.e., deferring to white people in order to be at peace with them)... I’m not sure where “the logic of that madness” comes from, but its root is certainly not of divine origin (it is completely of satanic origin); thus causing incessant hatred among blacks and whites. As mentioned earlier, the lack of integrity among black liberal leadership (Jesse Jackson and the like) is a light year removed from that which Martin Luther King brought to the table. In a sense it is puzzling to see why the liberal elites honor Martin Luther King at all, because what he taught is antithetical to what they teach — why do they honor him? what are they doing, changing him into a person he was not, to their own satisfaction? thus in reality accusing him of not really playing with a “full deck” because of his excusable ignorance? Obviously, you aren’t being true to who Martin Luther King was… or was he simply “the first step” in getting the political ball rolling? Do I even have to give you an answer to a question you are unable to rationalize? For those of us who insist on “integrity of thought,” this is a very troubling issue. Present day black liberal leadership seems to only grab onto a few of the issues that King espoused, and discard those issues with which they do not agree; by the way, that pretty much reflects the position of Black Liberation Theology; pick and choose what you like about Jesus & discard what you don’t like. With all of its extreme hatred, liberal blacks cannot claim a level of virtue that exceeds that of their fellow man — where’s the virtue? Since the beginning of time “hatred” has characterized the human family in every corner of the world; it began with the first human family when Cain killed his brother Abel (cf. Gen 4:1-8), and it has resulted in countless wars and murders ever since. God clearly defined that which is to be “hated,” and that which is to be “loved,” the stern prophet of righteousness, Amos, said, “Seek good & not evil, that you may live... hate evil & love good, that the Lord might be gracious to you” (cf. Amos 5:14-15). The wisest man who has ever lived, Solomon (cf. 1 Kg 3:12), said to his sons, “The fear of the Lord is to hate evil and hate falsehood” (cf. Prv 8:13; 13:5). Conversely, the prophet Micah said, “Listen to me, you who hate good and love evil — when you cry out to the Lord, He will not answer you; rather He will hide His face from you” (cf. Mic 3:1-4). In the second rendering of the Law, Moses said, “Know that the Lord your God, He is GOD, and is faithful to those who love and obey Him; but He will destroy those who hate Him” (Deut 7:9-10). Those who are evil in this world “hate the light;” remember, GOD is light (cf. Jn 3:20; 8:12; 1 Jn 1:5); don’t try to make Him into something He is not.

Regarding the matter of “racism,” it is important that one first define what it really is. According to Webster’s Dictionary, “racism is the belief that racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race.” If that is the term that we are going to use, then we need to stick with that definition, rather than garner up one of our own and recklessly apply it to those who don’t fit our paradigm of thought. If the sole determination of another person’s value is “the color of their skin,” then we can assume that they are a “racist.” But the reality is, there is another vibrant issue that plays a more significant role in racial compatibility, and that is the issue of “cultural bias;” it is my opinion that cultural bias is more often the issue than “racial bias.” I can almost here your goony friend, John Pavlovitz, saying, “See, he’s try-
ing to justify his racism”] Tell him to button his lips and try thinking a little bit before talking. The reality is, “when we differ from other people culturally,” we frequently don’t share a lot of “commonality,” and it is just that that keeps us from developing strong relationships with them; things that they value are significantly different from things we value. By way of application, I share very little common ground with the majority of people in the entertainment industry (Hollywood); their arrogance and perverse behaviors are actually disgusting to me; I have no desire whatsoever to share space with them; I’m not interested in immersing my flesh in their sleazy values — it’s hard enough to live with my flesh, let alone feed it with their corrupt trash. The reality is: we know what the majority of the people of Hollywood are; like the prostitute, it’s only a matter of determining their price. The fact is, I don’t share their rotten values; “thus our cultural differences are unbridgeable;” they hate mine and I hate theirs. Am I “culturally biased”? Absolutely; all of us are. Can I say that my “cultural preferences” are wrong and sinful? No, not at all. The truth is, I try to be mindful of sinful, prejudicial thoughts whenever they come into my mind, and deal with them accordingly (cf. 1 Cor 10:5). My wife and I were privileged to live in Vancouver, Canada, for several years, and one of the qualities of life we particularly enjoyed up there was the “cosmopolitan nature” of that city; there were people of every stripe from every sector of the world living there… we loved walking around the city and enjoying all of the “different cultures” that were a part of the Vancouver landscape. Nearly all of the people were pretty respectful and considerate of each other… though some of them may have had their issues, none of them seemed to denigrate others or be discourteous or “stick their noses up at others;” therefore I often got involved in conversations with people of a different stripe (in particular those who were humble and kind and of a pleasant disposition)… I’m pretty open that way… I’ve always enjoyed chatting with people who are of a different origin than me; differences have always intrigued me for some reason. One of my younger brothers is married to a woman from Argentina; I’m always chatting with her about the various aspects of life in her home country… I find those things fascinating. Hence, I’m an ardent student of “biblical culture” as well, because it helps give “context” to so much of what was going on in Israel’s history and in the Roman world.

One of the men I had a strong connection with in our church in Vancouver was from India; his name was Raj Mathur; he was about sixty years old back then… frequently he would chat with me about various issues and ask me to pray for him, because the things he was struggling with in life were disconcerting to him. Raj was raised a “Hindu,” and really struggled with amalgamating much of his Hindu thinking with what Jesus taught… he would listen intently to my sermons, and study what the Scriptures had to say, yet his Hindu thinking frequently posed a problem to him… his faith demanded a physiological evidence of God’s presence in his world, but that is not a didactic of the Christian faith (much to the chagrin of even many in the believing community); essentially many Christians insist that their faith have a visible physiological presence to it, but Scripture does not teach that: “We don’t walk by sight; we walk by faith” (2 Cor 5:7); i.e., simply believing what God has to say (cf. Hb 11:1, 6). Apparently that is a very difficult construct for Hindus. Though Raj and I were raised in very different worlds, we still shared a few common cultural values, so we got along well; he even appreciated some of my humor. 😃 Being as Vancouver was about 30% Asian back in the early 1990s when Barb and I were there (it’s 40% today), it was that particular sector with which we most often dialogued; sometimes Barb and I would go shopping in the Asian sector, and 95+% of all the people around us would be black-haired Asians; it felt very similar to what I had experienced in the orient.
Let me add a little side note at this point: When I counsel young couples who are planning on getting married, I like them to reflect upon “those things they have in common,” because I believe the more things people have in common, the greater the chances are that they will end up having a successful marriage. I think people need to have a minimum of 80% in common if they are going to successfully navigate through life together; couples who don't share much in common are far more likely to see the dissolution of their marriage. When we look back in history, it becomes pretty clear that the vast majority of people married someone from the same small community in which they were raised (the reality was, over ninety percent of the world's population lived in small rural communities; not large cities like we do today)... thus they had a very similar identity and held the same values... since the vast majority of us today are raised in big cities, that is very rare; hence marriage isn't a very strong institution in our culture... and now you have the left coming alongside everyone and ridiculing marriage: another sleazy value of leftist ideologues. Regarding the importance of “commonality,” if you think about it, that’s why “on-line dating services” (E-Harmony & others) attempt to connect people together who have a lot of things in common... for me, I believe couples need to be in agreement on three things: they need to agree Religiously, Philosophically & Politically: i.e., people need to pretty much value the same things in life. That should be a pretty logical construct; when people value the same things and have similar beliefs, it not only makes it easier for them to communicate with each other, but reduces the chances of their being at odds with each other. Similarly, we all hold a number of things in common with our closest friends — to get along famously with someone, we can't be at odds with them on the most fundamental issues of life; if we don't see eye-to-eye on the biggest issues, we aren't going to be the closest of friends. In like manner, just like thugs get along with thugs, and goons with goons, and morons with morons, so also decent people get along with decent people; again, this isn't rocket-science — this is just common sense.

The church in which we ministered in Vancouver was about one-third Asian, and it was with this racial group that our ministry was the most effective and fruitful (for several reasons). The Caucasian community in Vancouver is not only anti-God... it is actually outspoken in its hatred for religion: that was actually quite surprising to us; it wasn't something we anticipated at all. By the way, only 1½% of the people in Vancouver are “churched” (that includes both believing and non-believing faiths); so the vast majority of churches have less than 50 people attending their services (we had 50 people; the average is probably about 30 people). I could share a number of stories about the indigenous white Canadians and their abhorrence for Christianity, but that's not the purpose of this study — if you're aware of the history of Christian radio in Canada, you’ll remember it was outlawed by the liberal elites in Canada about 60 years ago (that's what happened when they grabbed the throne); since they thought the Christian message was divisive (which it is in a sense) and not inclusive, they decided to outlaw it (perhaps that strikes a chord in your heart; I'm sure it does in John Pavlovitz's heart). If you think about it, that is actually quite similar to the radical left in our country; apparently it's okay to offend the stupid Christian world, but it's not okay to offend the brilliant leftist ungodly world. By the way, the “left” has tried for years to shut down Christian radio and television — it's probably only a matter of time until they succeed in doing so... though that may sound good to you and the liberal elites, keep in mind, GOD is going to have the last word; ultimately the left is going to lose. Though the unreligious white Canadian in British Columbia finds Christianity repulsive, the Asian community was very “open” to us and listened to what we had to say — they were not nearly as narrow-minded and obstinate as the leftist ideologues. Thus we experienced far more
fruitfulness in our ministry with those who were Asian than the white indigenous Canadian. Incidentally, it should be noted, every province in Canada is far more open to the gospel than those living in Vancouver: the truth is, Vancouver is probably the demonic capital of Canada, and is probably more “anti-religious” than any city in the US (with the possible exception of Washington, DC 😊). Vancouver seems to have a very belligerent attitude toward religious thinking. With that in mind, I was quite surprised to learn later on in our ministry in Vancouver of the “cultural differences” that existed in the Asian community — I had wrongly assumed that they were all basically the same… for some reason I thought their cultures essentially were quite similar, and that they had a mutual admiration society, but that was not at all the case. We had Asians in our church from China, Japan, Taiwan & Hong Kong (because of Canada's immigration policy, they were all relatively wealthy; I believe if you have a half-a-million dollars in cash, you can enter into Canada, but only with the understanding that you had to leave your hall-a-million dollars in Canada should you decide to leave; in other words, they don’t want those who decide to leave Canada to adversely effect its economy — how’s that for an immigration policy?). What was surprising to me was the fact that “these Asian groups didn't famously get along with each other… their cultural differences seemed to set them apart; some of them felt their culture was of a “higher status” than other Asian cultures; some felt their cultural values were simply too different; others believed their education or their position in life was more significant — with these differences in mind, some in the Asian community were reluctant to associate with other Asians… even though they were tolerant with each other as Christians, they didn't necessarily form close friendships with those who differed significantly from them.

When I was in India, I discovered that the Hindu people were divided into a very complex “caste system,” that was actually crucial to their religion. It is a system that has nothing to do with the color of one's skin, but that ranks people in groups based on heredity within their rigid system of social stratification. The “caste” to which a person belongs is a closed group whose members are severely restricted in their choice of occupation and degree of social participation. Marriage outside of one's cast is prohibited. Furthermore, one's social status is determined by the caste of one's birth. In general, the caste system functions to maintain the status quo in its society. Each of the various castes have their own distinctive rules, customs and modes of government. The five most common castes in India are the Brahmins (the priestly and learned class)… the Kshatriyas (the warriors and rulers)… the Vaisyas (the farmers and merchants)… the Sudras (the peasants and laborers)… and the Panchamas (those who perform menial tasks). Though the occupational barriers have slowly been breaking down since the 19th century, the social distinctions have been more persistent. Incidentally, there are over one billion people living in India. I mention the foregoing not to justify hate, but to inform you of the significant differences that exist among people groups in our world — the reality is, we are not all of one stripe. There's a wise old Indian proverb that goes like this: “Don't judge another person until you have walked in his shoes;” it's pretty hard to disagree with that; the reality is, neither of us have walked in the other person's shoes. If I were to “give preference to one particular value that is common to the human family,” it would be the issue of “character.” I have found that people by-in-large are measured by their “character;” people of relatively high character often disassociate and disapprove of people of low character, and vice-versa: people of low character disassociate themselves from people of higher character. That reality is common to the human family: nearly all human beings tend to distance themselves from people of lower or very dissimilar character… I'm sure you don't even hang around black people of low character, just as
I don't hang around white people of low character. That's not wrong behavior. The psalmist said, “How blessed is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked, nor stand in the path of sinner, nor sit in the seat of scoffers” (Ps 1:1). The truly blessed person is the one who steers clear of the lifestyle of the ungodly… though he can be a real friend to the ungodly, he does not partner with him (cf. 1 Cor 5:9; 6:15-16; 2 Cor 6:14; Eph 5:7). Though believers are not to isolate themselves from the unbelieving world, neither are they to compromise their behavior by entering into the world's lifestyle. Would you encourage your children to hang around suspect characters? No, you wouldn't. My dad said to me many times growing up, “Show me your friends and I'll tell you who you are” — that's a pretty poignant axiom.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CULTURE

Back around 1900, my father and his family migrated to North America from Sweden… as did some fifty-million other people from Europe — the mass exodus from Europe took place over a period of about 50 years (1865-1915), and was the result of widespread disease and poor economic conditions. When my father's family arrived here in America, they homesteaded a piece of property just north of the US border in Canada… being as they were Swedish, they naturally settled in a farming community with a number of other Swedes; just to the north of their Swedish community was a German community. Thus all over America immigrants settled in communities where their fellow-countrymen settled… the populations of these settlements were so distinct that they even published newspapers in their respective European languages; incidentally, my father didn't learn to speak English until he was in his teens, yet he didn't have a problem making life work in that part of the country (that is simply what it meant to live in North America in the horse-and-buggy days). Essentially, my father had less than one year of formal education (just like his dad before him); nevertheless, he taught himself to read and write three languages; so public education isn't all it's cracked up to be (did you catch that? we don't need scholarly teachers, beautiful facilities, a playground, books and a desk we can call our own to grow in our smarts; apparently those things aren't as significant as “the liberal elites” have led us to believe). My father grew up working the fields with his family from childhood, not sitting around watching television and playing cops & robbers all day long; it wasn't a crime in those days to have your children work — it produced a lot of fiber and character in them (something many in the black world know very little about; they should have listened to their grandparents, rather than writing them off as being dumb and stupid). Living in a community with people of like stripe was pretty much common sense when my father grew up; why would someone settle in an area that was culturally foreign to them, where the people spoke a different language and had different values? If you are familiar with the various groupings of people here in the US today, you no doubt have seen various ethnic groups living in various sectors of our cities and country — be they Italian, German, Dutch, Polish, Greek, Danish, French, Scandinavian, etc. In the past 50 years we have seen a significant number of Asians immigrate to America… in like manner, they have settled in small Chinese, Vietnamese, Japanese, and Korean communities all over the country; and understandably so. Conversely, we have seen a large number of Mexicans migrate to the United States; they also have naturally settled in communities with large Mexican populations. The foregoing is just common sense; all people are naturally biased culturally; that's their orientation in life; that's simply what it means to be a unique human being; we are not all alike. What makes America different from European countries, is that our white population is
an amalgamation of all European groups; these Americans of European decent now shares a lot in common and associates with each other (most of them now only speak English), in spite of the fact that they are not of the same European family, but it took years to break down some of those barriers because they continued to live in separate sectors in our country. Our culture today has pretty much assimilated the White populace into a single group (though some more than others — interestingly enough, there are still a number of towns in the United States that have a strong ethnic identity; be it German, French, Italian, Dutch, Scandinavian) — for instance, there is still a significant French-speaking sector in Louisiana (as there is in Canada). Obviously, where significant differences still exist, there has not been an amalgamation of those people — so what? They have the freedom to live as they choose. In Europe they still live in communities where they speak the same language and have their own unique identity and culture. Again, so what?

**As you are no doubt aware, many countries in Europe are having a very difficult time**

“assimilating large numbers of Muslims into their countries” because these Muslims insist on isolating themselves and keeping to themselves (understandably), and holding on to their own ethnic identities and culture; as such, they are living in isolated sectors throughout Europe for the most part, and are insisting on having their own autonomy, and not assimilate into the European culture of origin where they live; in that sense, *they have alienated themselves from the people of origin* — they don’t want anything to do with them, in spite of the fact that these European people graciously extended a hand to them and let them come into their countries (it should also be noted, these countries are even “providing these Muslims with free food and healthcare”). These European countries are beginning to question their generosity, and are now asking themselves what they should do. One could rightly deduce that these Muslim immigrants have a right to “maintain their unique identity and be who they are” and insist on maintaining their independence (most people understand that), but so also do the people of origin have a right to “maintain the status quo in their country.” Incidentally, just because one embraces a particular position, doesn’t mean the opposite position is completely lacking in merit. This little world in which you and I live isn’t that simple. There’s an old maxim that goes like this: “*In Rome, do as the Romans do*” — that’s the maxim I was raised on; but that’s not the maxim that governs the thinking of many present-day Muslims; instead, they stubbornly refuse to follow the rule of the people of origin. My personal opinion is that of deferring to the people of origin, and their right to govern as they see fit — you may not be in that camp; we’re not all of the same stripe. The “anger and discontent” that now exists in Europe, will probably boil over at some point, and in so doing, hurt a lot of people and leave a lot of “scars.” None of us like being pushed into a little quagmire of cultural bias with which we’re not comfortable.

**Keeping all of the foregoing in mind, there are also some significant differences** between many blacks and many whites here in America… many blacks have opted to embrace a culture that many whites do not embrace… in like manner, many whites have embraced a culture that many blacks do not embrace. To accuse one of being “racist” is not the issue nor the answer; to think that is to insist on a definition of racism that is very remedial. The reality is, the differences that exist in our communities are largely “cultural,” not “racial;” though a particular race may have some unique cultural values that are not embraced by another race, does not mean those who hold those values are “racists,” any more than the one who does not agree with those values are “racists.” None of us should be so arrogant as to dictate to another group what their cultural values should be. That line of reasoning is *not acceptable* to the vast majority of people in our
world…one cannot \textit{denigrate} another group and then by self-acclamation declare that they are \textit{virtuous}. Such thinking is the epitome of arrogance — where \textit{humility} is lacking, there is arrogance & stupidity (Rom 1:22). According to Webster’s dictionary, \textit{racism is based upon the belief that someone is inferior to you simply because of the color of their skin}. If blacks and whites can congregate together & enjoy each others friendship as many Christians do in their churches, then how can one label them as being “\textit{racists}”? Obviously, something more significant than the color of one's skin is also playing in the mix, and that is “\textit{our cultural differences}.” Again, it's “\textit{our cultural differences}” that people on both sides of the aisle need to respect & accept — though we may not \textit{embrace} the cultural values of others, we must \textit{respect} their cultural values (not necessarily \textit{like} their cultural values). One might stop and consider the “\textit{Gypsy culture}” — for generations people would look at that culture and wonder why it was so strange, because it was so radically different from the norm in our civilized world. Essentially, they were a group of nomadic people who clung tenaciously to their customs and peculiar folkways; they kept to themselves and traveled in small caravans in many regions of our world… some the countries they traveled in (Russia and Europe) would insist that they settle in a particular region of their country and not just wander around every sector of their country and disrupt those who were of a different culture; obviously their strange lifestyle wasn't commonly embraced by others; hardly anyone identified with it, yet that was their prerogative — they were embracing some values that were important to them, and they didn't shove them down everybody else’s throat; they were simply living their strange lifestyle as they felt led to live it. Why is that so wrong? Who are you to condemn it? I'm not saying that you must \textit{respect} someone who hates you or condemns you: I'm saying that you must \textit{respect} those who differ from you — surely you can see the difference in those two constructs. Obviously, there are some “\textit{strange cultures}” in our world that most of us would have a very difficult time identifying with, but that doesn't make those cultures idiotic, stupid or moronic. Frequently my wife and I watch a TV show called “\textit{Bazaar Foods with Andrew Zimmern}” — Andrew travels all over the world to experience the various foods that people eat in different cultures… occasionally, it's difficult to even imagine eating some of that stuff (bugs and the like); yet to the people of those cultures, it's the norm. When one of our friends from Viet Nam invited us to their daughter's wedding, we were given some “\textit{baby birds to eat}” (they had been deep fried, feathers & all); it was a “\textit{gourmet delicacy}” to them… but not to us. ☺ It simply wasn't in our wheelhouse… liking or disliking that food didn't make us right or wrong (what measuring stick would one use to make such a claim? and by whose authority would you make it?)… it simply demonstrated the cultural differences that exist between us. To \textit{denigrate} a group of people because their cultural values are different than ours is \textit{unacceptable} — we are not the \textit{end all} in life. The reality is, if we don't like a particular culture, we should simply move on and find a culture where we can live, and count ourselves blessed to find one… we don't have a right to go to war over it.

\textbf{To apply this didactic to those Muslims in Germany who insist on wearing a “Burka” (i.e., a garment that completely covers their bodies and faces)} — you have two schools of thought: you can pass a law that \textit{forbids} one to wear it in public, or you can \textit{permit} people to wear it in public. Are you going to have unanimity on this? No, not at all. Does that make some people wonderful and other people stupid? No, as human beings we don't all have the same values. To \textit{denigrate} a group because it doesn't embrace your values is anal (especially if that value is a \textit{religious moral value}). Obviously there are \textit{numerous amoral values} in this world that I'm not favorably disposed to (be it lifestyle, behavior patterns, music, etc.); that doesn't make me
good or bad; the same goes for you. If the principle issue involved happens to be a religious conviction that someone holds, obviously we are dealing with something we have no right to condemn (provided that religious construct is not grounded in Satanic thought & hate; because that violates God's moral law). Arrogance is never the answer. Now, should we permit people to wear a Burka, we're probably going to upset a lot of people and stir the pot in our society; and understandably so — to judge those harshly who are intolerant of it, isn't the answer; conversely, to judge those harshly who believe it should be permitted, isn't the answer either. Obviously, I'm not a “pro-Burka” person; I wouldn't want to live in a community where people were constantly wearing a disguise. I'm not comfortable with that — does that make me an immoral person or a racist? No, why does it? Denigrating me because your values differ from mine doesn't make you virtuous — who appointed you “the standard bearer”? One cannot logically justify such thinking. Now, what if those who are “super intolerant” are willing to go to war over this issue? Are we to conclude that those who win the war are wonderful & right… and those who lose the war are stupid & wrong? Hopefully you don't embrace such nonsensical thinking… obviously, that argument doesn't hold water. By the way, someone's going to “lose” on this issue; that's just the way things go at times… sometimes you win, sometimes you lose… sometimes we just have to tolerate what we don't like or don't agree with. Now making oneself “the end all who dictates what is morally right and morally wrong” is not man's prerogative… that is God's prerogative — we must leave that to Him. With all of the foregoing in mind, it should be pretty clear, we don't live in a simple one-dimensional world where everybody's likes and dislikes are the same… we live in a multi-dimensional world that is actually serving God's higher purposes; though none of us fully understand exactly what it is God is doing (remember, our intelligent quotient is only a 150 max: when compared with God's infinite intelligence, our brains are “zero!” so come down off your high-horse). The reality is, God is actively superintending all that is going on in our world to the praise of His glory (cf. Is 55:8-11; 43:13; 46:9-11; Rom 11:36; Eph 5:11; Col 1:16); that is one of the great theological issues that God's people need to meditate upon; it helps one wrestle with the eternality of things,” and not just satisfy oneself with “the temporal nature of things.” If you arrogantly insist on being the end all (i.e., the final word), your foolishness will one day be held against you; you and your liberal cohorts don't determine reality (again, read Daniel chapter 4).

Could it be that God has placed you in “an uncomfortable situation in life” for a higher purpose? He made you a black woman to live in a country in the 21st century that is predominantly white, and that is one of the most advanced countries in world history… He could have made you a woman of another color, and placed you in another country in another age, but He didn't do that. Obviously, He didn't place you in a country that satisfies all of your wants (i.e., utopia). The reality is, you didn't have a choice in that matter; that was God's prerogative. Now, either you can rant & rave & have a fit over it, and align yourself with every diabolical idiot in the world, or you can accept God's will for your life? Beloved, you could've been a Jew living in World War II Germany… but that wasn't the world God willed for you to live in; this one is. The question is, “How are you going to live in the world in which God placed you?” The Lord Jesus said, “In as much as is possible, be at peace with all men” (Rom 12:18); “and do not judge lest you be judged; for in the way you judge, you will be judged; why do you look at the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eye” (cf. Mt 7:1-3). My opinion is this — it is highly unlikely that a significant group of people (be they black, white or whatever) living in a society with a number of freedoms, would have values that are that disgusting and abhorrent to the rest of the human family in this educated, civilized world (in spite
of the fact that Hitler & Stalin lived in the 20th century… with that in mind, I believe it is a lack of understanding and appreciation of the integrity of another group’s values that is the primary problem; obviously, this applies to people on both sides of the political aisle. Ignorance is no virtue; we all suffer from it in some measure. Likewise, Arrogance is no virtue; to claim what one does not know is actually foolishness — by the way, only God’s Word is truly virtuous. So where do we go from here? It should be pretty clear, making all people of one mind, and bringing everyone into the same family on this planet is not going to happen in this life — read what Scripture has to say; that can only happen in Christ (cf. Rom 12:16; 15:5; Phil 2:2). The reality is, we all have our own unique differences and cultural biases — to add some fuel to the fire by calling other people “racists” because they don’t embrace our values is not the answer. For argument sake, let’s say I am physically ugly — if you call me “ugly” to my face, do actually think you are going to win me over to your side? No, not at all. What you will end up doing is increasing the divide between the two of us; that’s why God calls us to “love others,” even those who hate us! Just to add even more fuel to the fire, remember “beauty is in the eyes of the beholder” — you are the one who chooses to see someone as being ugly. I’m not excusing racist behavior or skirting the issue… I’m trying to address the issue and look at it in greater depth (because that’s what it deserves), and not simply put some common, numb-headed, reactionary, prejudicial opinion on the table. To help bring a little “understanding and context” to this issue, let me share my own innate bias with you — when I am around Native Americans & Mexicans, I never feel uneasy around them; I usually feel I am with a group of people who are humble, warm, kind, respectful, and of a fairly sweet disposition; seldom do I feel ill-at-ease around them… sadly, I can’t say that about many in the black world. I actually see southern blacks as having a more genteel spirit than northern blacks; they seem to be more respectful than northern blacks; hence a people with more dignity. I also think that many blacks often “feel a little ill-at-ease around some whites” — after all, the leadership of the black world has made some serious accusations against many in the white world… in so doing they have pretty much closed the door on being able to comfortably and spontaneously dialogue with that group of people… the fault lies with those people who exacerbated the problem several years ago (Jesse Jackson and the like), and with those who continue to “bang away at this issue with their sleazy, condemning rhetoric” — all they are doing is making everyone uncomfortable on both sides of the aisle. There is not a black person in America who hasn't been taught that “most whites are racists;” and there isn't a white person in America who hasn't been taught that “blacks think whites are racists;” now there's a real healthy didactic for you… yet I can hear you saying, “Well, it is true!” You may justify it with all kinds of logic, but you will have to ignore a lot of logic that runs contrary to that position; remember, there is enough information out there in the world to satisfy your ignorance on any subject. Simply subscribing to that body of knowledge that satisfies your innate bias, isn't the answer to life’s problems. There is a lot more involved on this issue than the likes of John Pavlovitz and the narrow-minded left have tried to make it out to be. Beloved, throwing fuel on the fire is not the answer.

Keeping all of the foregoing in mind, when whites & blacks bump into each other out there in the world, what do you think is going through their minds? “He hates me! or He thinks I hate him!” By the way, you are not going to change the discourse on this issue just by having a little gathering where everyone “sings Kumbayah and puts down their hatchet.” No, not at all. The likes of Jesse Jackson and his cohorts have “simply put too much poison in the well,” and sadly it is going to take years to fix; you don't fix cancer with a band aid. Though Jesse may have had
good intentions, he embarked on an issue that required far more knowledge than he had. The reality is this: “the suspicion that whites hate blacks has been deeply ingrained into the minds of both whites and blacks — and has actually caused many people to consider why they may be justified in hating the other race.” Let me emphasize it again: We didn’t need to go down that road; it was just impulsive nonsense. Even more sadly is the fact that blacks really think most white people think blacks are inferior to them — not different; inferior! There is a monumental difference between those two concepts. Beloved, you now seem to be one of those blacks who now believes that… I hurt for you on that score, if that indeed is the case. Perhaps a number of years ago, some people felt “some races” were actually inferior (especially those living in the “jungle”), but I don’t believe that has been the case in the civilized world, where all people are now free. Though there may be a few numb-heads who are racists, I don’t think there are many of them; too many people have demonstrated “smarts” on both sides of the aisle — none of us are superior or inferior to the other (don’t change the definition of racism to satisfy your bias on this issue). The reality is, people are simply different (people are not all the same — I have attested to that numerous times in the foregoing material. So, pray tell, how in the world are we going to get this “racism stuff” out of people’s minds? Obviously, if large segments of our population actually feel they are hated, or that the world thinks they are the haters, you’ve got a lot of “fence mending” to do, and it isn’t going to happen singing “Kumbayah” around a camp fire. Furthermore, one group can’t insist that the other group is responsible to make everything right! By having guys like John Pavlovitz blow their minds on the national stage (because of some very remedial thinking), is only going to pro-long the process. Due to the fact society has been inundated with this junk, everyone now is “walking on egg shells” in the presence of those who differ from them racially (in particular, blacks), and are far more mindful of everything they say and do in the presence of a black person, for fear that it might be offensive or wrong (I actually sense that on both sides of the aisle… where blacks also feel awkward and uncomfortable — the only ones who don’t are the arrogant, in-your-face, loud-mouthed idiots). So the residual effect of calling the majority of the white world “racists” has served no good purpose whatsoever — in no way was it a positive; it was only an ugly negative, that actually served to make “black behavior” worse, and understandably so, because it is rooted in hate. By the way, respecting other people and treating them kindly will get you a lot further in this world than denigrating people and being ugly to the. Again, there is enough information out there in the world to satisfy your ignorance on any subject… it is incumbent upon you to change the discourse in your mind, and intentionally start looking at the other side of the issue — we’re not the ugly demons you are making us out to be.

If people were to vote on “the nicest most virtuous group of people / culture in America,” there is no way in the world the black populace would be at the top of that list; though years ago they might have gotten a number of votes, that is no longer the case — and this is all due to the ugly demeaning rhetoric of black leadership (Jesse Jackson and his cohorts). So an inordinate number of blacks today are rebellious and angry and defiant… many of them are profane and love to just show their muscles and tattoos and have sex with anything that walks… and many black women are following their lead, and acting like cheap sleazy chicks (all one has to do is look at television). Obviously, many blacks don’t embrace this trash, but sadly, an inordinate number do embrace it — and no influential person in the black community is calling them out on it; not even your beloved president. It’s okay in the black world to get some chick pregnant and abandon her and her child… sex is probably the premiere dynamics in much of the black
world; comparatively speaking, crime is a distant second… and decency and dignity are almost off the chart. Now let's say you had a beautiful little daughter, and one of these clowns had eyes for her, what would you do? There's no doubt in my mind what I would do… I wouldn't tolerate him for a minute — case closed — I wouldn't give him a first chance, let alone a second chance. I would simply take whatever steps were necessary to protect my daughter. The long and short of it is this — if I was a super influential black man who had some fiber in his soul and some virtue, I would put together “a group of black men and women” who would grab hold of the throne of the black world and change the discourse that takes place in it, and reverse the direction in which my people are going. My motto would be, “Enough is Enough! Game Over!” Our primary objective would be that of building character in the black world and get everyone working… and no longer permitting sleazy character, juvenile behavior, irresponsibility, excuse making, having a victim mentality, and blaming everyone else for our problems. Our emphasis would not be upon changing whites, instead it would be upon making changes in the black community, and it would be done with a large neighborhood coalition who were committed to the welfare of the community, and who would superintend over the needs of the community and provide direction its residents. Within a few short years every black person would have a job who was able to sit up and take nourishment; no longer would being a parasite be an acceptable option (the opposite of being a parasite is being productive & making a positive contribution to one's world). The reality is, all people (regardless of color) respond to strong leadership. All great movements start with leadership! The vast majority of people must be led! The important thing is having a good effective leader! Read the Bible, it’s very clear — people don’t lead themselves! they need to be led! Blacks had a great leader in Martin Luther King, Jr. and a dismal one in Jesse Jackson.

Blacks need another great leader like King… not an excuse-maker like Obama; we don’t get anywhere in life making excuses… at best, all that produces is a pity party; any leader worth their weight in salt knows that! Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936), the Nobel Prize Winner in Literature from Bombay, India, put it this way: “We have forty million reasons for failure, but not a single excuse.” If all we focus on in this life is “excuses,” we will never amount to a hill of beans, because all excuse-making does is justify our losing. Benjamin Franklin stated it thus: “He that is good for making excuses is seldom good for anything else;” though we can all come up with excuses, they have no upside. What possible good can come from “having an excuse”? Instead of being an effective motivator, they are a horrible deterrent! Let's say your excuse possesses some degree of logic to it, what possible good can come from embracing that logic? Say a white man hates you, what good is it for you to dwell on that emotional negative? It will only produce anger in your soul; furthermore, you really don't know why that person may hate you; you have simply gone off the deep end and let someone else destroy your peace and your life. Can you not let go of some perceived injustice and press on with your life, or are you going to stew over that trash and end up being a bitter person? Let me give a little context to this matter of “hate” — not long ago President Obama “justified the anger” that existed in the black community when some white individual mistreated a black man… so how did the black world respond? They became more angry (understandably so), in spite of the fact that some of the information he bought into wasn't really accurate. Whatever the truth may have been regarding that situation, the reality is, this particular incident happened to be a double-edged sword — there are actually far more crimes committed by blacks against whites, then by whites against blacks. With that in mind, how should white people respond if a black man injures a white man or rapes
a white woman? Shall we now have a white President justify the anger of the white community? Can you even imagine how blacks and leftist ideologues would respond to that? Why is ugly behavior tolerated by one group, yet forbidden by another? Being as there are “five times more whites in our country than there are blacks,” the white populace would have to commit a very large number of crimes just to “balance the books” — i.e., whites would have to commit “five crimes” for every “one crime” that blacks commit; if that were the case, then our crime rates would be equal; but that does not at all define our populace… blacks commit far more crimes against whites, in spite of the fact that whites outnumber them five to one. Beloved, I recognize that is a very poignant issue, yet it is one that you must carefully reflect upon. Are whites never justified in being angry with blacks? or must whites excuse blacks for their behavior because they are victims? As mentioned numerous times throughout this study, “the door swings both ways;” you can’t have your cake and eat it too. My intent here has been to focus on the problem of “making excuses;” in other words, “can blacks say they have a right to be angry?” Sure they can, but so can whites. I fully understand why Obama responded as he did; he was raised in the black world (to a degree), and feasted on all of the ugly rhetoric that has existed in that world for years. Obviously when “hate” dominates a lot of the discourse that goes on in one’s culture, in all likelihood it is going to make inroads into your mind as well. The problem with most people in our world is that they only see “one side” of an issue; they fail to see the integrity of the other side — sadly, the ongoing rhetoric in the black community only focuses on one side… which is pretty understandable, being as their leaders and political representatives only focus on one side of the problem; you would have to be of very strong mind and character to reject the thinking of the masses. I’m not saying that whites are a wonderful, virtuous people, but neither are blacks; the reality is, there is a lot more ugliness in the black world than there is in the white world, and all you seem to do is keep justifying it. Sadly, much of the ugliness in the black community can be attributed to the likes of Jesse Jackson and his cohorts — their rhetoric has contributed significantly to “the racial divide” in our country. Again, we can dialogue on this issue until the moon stops shining, and in so doing discover a number of reasons why things may be as they are; “but we can’t make our focus in life one of excusing ourselves for hating those on the other side of the aisle;” that is a dead end street! In spite of what President Obama may have felt in his soul (because of his upbringing), he never should have said what he said… he needed to have the smarts to “button it” and not go down that road.

Ultimately, people on both sides of the aisle need to focus on “putting forth an effort”… rather than “making excuses;” we don’t have the right to feed our anger with diabolical lies; all excuse making does is “justify a person’s losing!” It will never make a person a winner! “The reason many in the black world are losing is that they won’t get off their duff!” As someone put it, “If something is really important to you, you will find a way… if it is not, you’ll find an excuse.” There is an old American proverb that goes like this: “Excuses are merely nails used to build a house of failure.” My message to the black world in a nutshell is this — There is no reason for you to fail! This world is not anti-black! You are not destined to fail! You have as much ability as anyone else! God did not make blacks an inferior race! You must jettison the “excuse polemic” from your mind! It was the renowned black chemist George Washington Carver (1864-1943) who said, “Ninety-nine percent of failures come from the people who have the habit of making excuses.” In short, when we make an excuse, we are simply justifying our action or our response — for example, when something or someone makes us angry, we justify our anger in some way (i.e., we excuse it)… when we commit a sin, we tend to justify/excuse it.
in some way... when people cheat on their taxes, they justify/excuse it in some way; i.e., they hold court in their mind and defend their response; invariably people identify some justification for responding as they did. In actuality, all excuse making does is “give people an escape route” for not owning up to their obligation or responsibility to do what's right; incidentally, the words “right” and “just” are the same word in Greek (cf. Jn 5:30; Phil 4:8); likewise, being justified means to be made righteous (cf. Rom 4:2-5). Consider Obama’s actions for a moment — rather than “ignite the black world by justifying its anger,” he should have helped change the attitude that exists in so much of the black world. He could have said something like this —

“Obviously, I don’t want to stand here before you and condone anything that is wrong, but neither do I want to give the black world an excuse for responding with ugly behavior. The black world no more has a right to respond with hate and anger than the white world does when blacks commit crimes against them (of which there are many). We can't let someone's ugly behaviors destroy the peace we are fighting so hard to achieve, and let juvenile responses increase the divide. There is no room for hate and anger and ugly reactionary responses. None! We must come together and not separate from each other. Surely the actions of two people can't destroy our unity. If the young man who was arrested is found guilty in a court of law, he needs to suffer the punishment; and if the responder is found guilty for acting too harshly, he needs suffer the consequences as well; these are matters for the court, not a reactionary public.”

Sadly, this has been a very common response by Obama... he never seems to respond with a level of understanding that “mends the fences;” instead he always chooses to somehow justify a negative response by his people. He never comes down hard on the black world for acting irresponsibly and ugly — he still has that “victim mentality” that “excuses wrong behavior.” Even now, with Trump in office, and large protests of various sorts... when the protests get out of hand and become somewhat violent, he never denounces such actions. Why is that? Because he strongly empathizes with them... he has the same degree of “hate” in his heart as they do. Once again, here’s a man who could have done so much good in our world (like King), but instead chose to respond like Jackson — he just kept “stirring the pot!” God’s Word is very clear: “to whom much is given (responsibility), much is required... to whom much has been entrusted, much shall be asked” (cf. Lk 12:48); that is a very sobering thought that all of us need to carefully consider... God doesn't buy into our sleazy excuses. If we can’t respond any better than some emotional, reactionary kid, then we have no business elevating our self to a position of authority in this world. Beloved, “God is not mocked, we are going to reap what we have sown” (cf. Gal 6:7)... so stop responding with mere “humanistic thinking.”

**Listen carefully, when you excuse anger you are condoning it! you cannot excuse hate! you cannot condone hate! Leadership is about taking responsibility, not about making excuses!**

Again, think for a moment: In every situation of life we can take the low road and “excuse our actions” (i.e., our hate, our anger), or we can take the high road and “not excuse such actions.” Are you going to teach your children to “get angry when things don’t go the way they want them to go?” Though we may all get angry at times, that is not the way we are to respond! Getting angry is not the mature, ethical way to respond! Remember, all excuse making does is condone and justify one’s anger! Someone once stated it this way — “Shed the excuses and face reality:
excuses are the losers way out — excuses are vitamins for haters, but poison for the successful.” Successful people hate excuses, because they know there’s not an ounce of good in them. None! From my perspective, the black world needs someone who is willing to tell Hollywood and the sleazy left to “stick it where the sun doesn’t shine!” because all they are doing is dragging the black world into the abyss! Do you honestly think Martin Luther King would be “proud” of the road his people have traveled since he passed away? The “character” of the black world today is vastly inferior to the one in which King lived. Beloved, if you actually think King would be “proud” of the changes made in the black world, you don't even know the man. Though there have been changes made “regarding the rights the black world enjoys,” the “character” the black world possesses has gone down hill significantly. Satan took over when Martin Luther King died… Jesse Jackson’s rhetoric not only affected whites, it affected blacks as well — sadly it drastically affected both groups unfairly: the black community has had to live with all of the residual effects of Jesse Jackson’s lambasting everyone who did not agree with him — the vast majority of the black world seems to have bought into that trash. Though I can't necessarily blame the black world for going down the road they went down, but I can blame their leaders. Jesse Jackson took a problem (no question, there was a problem), and let “his anger” run the discourse in his mind and in his heart… but he had no understanding as to how to “resolve the problem of the black world” — as such he forfeited the opportunity to make great gains! Understandably the political left jumped on his bandwagon — how could they not? How could they belittle him for what he was saying? He was “the black king-pin!” But you’ll notice, they didn't jump on his bandwagon with a whole lot of fervor… the issue was simply too volatile to challenge what he was saying; once again, there's our wonderful little political world doing its thing — “we must maintain harmony in the camp, regardless of whether or not it possesses integrity.”

Return with me to what I was experiencing in southern California back in 60s where I grew up — as blacks and whites, we all knew we had our differences, but we didn't accentuate those differences and become ugly about them or put each other down or strongly voice our opinions of anger… we weren’t an angry people. Though some of you blacks may not believe this, we genuinely accepted each other and got along well together; we went to school together, we played ball together, we laughed together, and we joked together… I served in the Army with a number of blacks (we served together and slept in the same barracks)… I played football with a number of blacks; we NEVER got in each other’s face and went off the deep end… the reality was, we really respected each other. Thanks to Jesse Jackson and his angry antics, that all changed; now maybe he let what he saw in south somewhere control his thinking, but that kind of ugly behavior didn't dominate the landscape where I grew up. Rather than discussing what he was thinking with older blacks who had brains in their heads, he simply spoke to a bunch of bumbling idiots of like stripe who knew nothing of human cultural values and the fallen human condition. For those of you who are genuinely interested in knowing something about humanity, ask the older generation: they are far wiser than the younger generation; some things take a lifetime to learn; learn to trust in the wisdom of the mature; they are far wiser than you think. If you insist on letting “juvenile thinking” rule the day, there will come a time when you will regret your actions. Scripture tells us that “Wisdom is with the aged: with long life is understanding” (cf. Job 12:12; 32:7; 1 Pet 5:5; Prv 1:7; 2:2; 5:1; 18:15; 23:9; 29:8-9; 29:11); sadly and foolishly, Jackson abandoned the wisdom of Martin Luther King, and let his angry heart rule the day… how could one possibly speak with an angry heart, and hope to get a sweet response?
All Jackson did was increase the tension and exacerbate the divide; in so doing, he attacked everyone who disagreed with him; it was actually interesting to watch fellow-democrats keep quiet; most of them were probably hoping that his rhetoric would somehow fall off the stage… but it didn't. And then he actually tried to run for President; it wasn't until then, however, that the Democratic Party said “No” to him. By the way, my father was a union man and a democrat back in the 1950s, so there was a lot of “democrat talk” that went on in our home; he voted for Adlai Stephensen when he ran against Dwight Eisenhower. Sadly those same values no longer control the discourse in the Democratic Party. As stated, the residual effects of Jackson's lambasting were very destructive and divisive; not at all helpful. He should have confided with his black elders, but he was too arrogant and stubborn to do that; whereas young people are more combative and belligerent, older people are far wiser and more peaceable. To this day the older black community still has “dignity & class,” because many of them are a people after God's own heart. To those of you who are reading this, you would do well to listen to your elders… being contentious is seldom the answer to our problems. When you use “reprobate means” (i.e., hate speech and similar behavior) to accomplish your goals, you will almost always “fail” to accomplish those goals — arrogant actions are always costly… if you follow God's rule of life you won't suffer those costs (cf.6al 6:7). To take God off the table on this issue, is simply nonsense — that is precisely the reason the problem is what it is!

So you do the math; we're not all of the same stripe culturally in this world: we have our differences. We don't eat the same foods; we don't like the same music; we don't do the same things or hang out with the same people; we don't have the same values or even wear the same clothes; we don't have the same personalities or speak the same languages; we don't look the same or act the same; we don't have the same set of beliefs or the same religious beliefs; even though we may be of the same race, there can be significant differences between us. With that in mind, what are we to say to that? Force everyone into our way of thinking? and make them adopt our values? and tell everyone that they are stupid and racists? Any reckless, degrading judgment like that will “only increase the divide,” because it is a judgment that is completely lacking in integrity; you call me stupid and then expect me to respect you? Most of us refuse to play games and acquiesce to such juvenile thinking; we are not going to cave-in to that sort of rhetoric; that is simply not how the vast majority of people in this world operate, and rightfully so… the majority of us have been taught to own up to our actions (they are choices that we made), and recognize that all are actions have consequences; thus we must stop blaming everyone else for our problems. I'm willing to help anyone with a genuine problem, but I'm not willing to help someone who won't get off his duff. The Lord Himself said, “if a person is not willing to work, neither let him eat” — none of us owe the cheater, the thief, the parasite, or the slothful, lazy sluggard anything (cf. Prv 6:9-11; 13:4; 20:4; 26:16) — there's an old saying that goes like this: “You made your bed, now sleep in it.” Why should one group not have to pony up and do its part in this world? Why should one group receive preferential treatment? There are too many people with “genuine needs” in this world… to turn our attention to someone who is “grossly undeserving” is wrong. The principle problem for many in the black community in our country today is that they have been told they are victims, that whites are evil, and that blacks are entitled to free money, free food, and free housing and free everything else — now there's a utopian concept upon which to build one's life (obviously I'm being facetious when I say that); we all need a strong constitution to guide us in life, not a victim mentality — there are no free rides in life for the human family. There are numerous respectable blacks in our world that
strongly reject many of the inane didactics of the liberal left; you would do well to listen to them. The African American, Rev. Jesse Lee Peterson (founder of the Brotherhood Organization of a New Destiny), has been telling the black world for years to stop giving into blame and excuse making; what possible good can come from continual excuse making? Jesse Lee said, “Only a hard look in the mirror will bring back sanity to the black community” — I would add leadership to that statement. If one is truly retarded and disabled, that is a totally different issue; but that is not at all what we are discussing here.

Why is it that “poor bush people” from all around the world can come to America and make life work? Thousands came to the US in the 70s from southeast Asia; we helped about 200 of them at Grace Community then… they were not only uneducated, they couldn't speak English, and didn't even understand how our toilets and light-switches worked in our homes! I had the privilege of working with some of them. In spite of their deficiencies they buckled down the hatches and made life work! and didn't demand “a handout!” Now if bush people could make life work in a completely foreign land, why can't blacks? (especially with all the perks and preferential treatment they get). Why do blacks require special treatment? Again, lousy leadership! Are blacks actually inferior to the rest of us? It seems like that is what you are saying — the rest of us are declaring that all people are equal, and that no group deserves preferential treatment; though some people may “need a little help for a short period of time,” no one should just continually need it; why would they? Every human being needs to be held responsible for his or her actions — that is simply the way the human family was designed to function. Since President Lyndon B. Johnson's “War on Poverty” some fifty years ago, we have seen a massive transfer of wealth to black Americans in the form of welfare and other handouts. Institutional racism against blacks was outlawed in the United States back then; in spite of the fact that institutional racism against Whites & Asians has been completely ignored. Blacks receive a disproportionate share of government handouts and government subsistence; apparently inequities are not a problem to the liberal world when it involves blacks — why is that? Obviously, I'm asking a lot of “why” questions… you must answer them, because I need to know the integrity of your thinking. In addition to the monetary handouts, Affirmative Action has granted special consideration to minorities and women in employment and education, and has given blacks unprecedented advantages; yet crime and immorality has exploded since then in the black world; the illegitimacy rate is now three times higher today than it was 50 years ago. Why did the black culture fall into the immoral abyss? Racism was far more significant years ago in America than it is today; why the demise in black culture? The fact are these: whites are not what is killing and holding blacks back today, blacks are killing each other and whites due to the rage & anger that exists as a result of the meltdown on the black family. The 2013 FBI Uniform Crime Report, shows that black offenders killed 90% of black victims… that 14% of white victims were killed by black offenders… yet only 7.6% of black victims were killed by white offenders. Blacks also made up 42% of all cop killers. Those numbers are even worse today, and we've had a black president! It seems like it is okay for blacks to kill whites in our country, but it is not okay for whites to kill blacks — how do you justify that? Now if these numbers were the opposite, that whites were the killers in our country, then I could empathize with your thinking; but that is not the reality. Sadly, black racism hides behind alleged victimhood; no matter what the issue is, many blacks claim to be victims and constantly play the race card; in spite of the fact that government gives them “every advantage.” Beloved, keep in mind, all human beings have enough smarts to think through these issues; the liberal elites don't have a
monopoly on thinking with integrity (yet you seem to think they do). I find it odd that liberals always tend to defend their position by using “one situation” to defend their argument, and then draw their conclusion from that single incident (because it suits their didactic)—when one black is mistreated in some way, then they jump on the bandwagon to make their point; but such kinds of juvenile argumentations are worthless. Put the big numbers on the table so that we can honestly address these issues.

The reality is, we live in an extremely diverse world, and much of it (in particular the Muslim world) is grounded in “hate;” a level of intense hatred you would probably find difficult to even imagine… yet the arrogant stupid liberal elite of our country actually like Muslims more than Christians. I don’t see how a “professing Christian” (you’ll notice I didn’t say a true born-again Christian, I said a professing Christian — because a true believer would NEVER say that) could ever make such a deduction; in my mind it is outside the realm of possibility. Again, with all of the foregoing in mind, consider the “cultural differences” that exist in our country between many blacks and many whites — 73% of blacks are born out of wedlock, and more than 80% of black children are being raised without a father in the home (apparently they have been abandoned by their father); it doesn’t take a community to raise a child, it takes a family — the family is foundational to the economy that God established and purposed for us as human beings to live in (that is divine wisdom); to reject His design is not only folly in principle, but oftentimes reveals itself in a decadent lifestyle. Sadly, many blacks (not all) are loud and boisterous… braggadocios and arrogant… angry and in your face… people who constantly use profanity… people who commit an inordinate number of crimes (our prisons are dominated by blacks)… people who pound their chests and are defiant; people who have little or no respect for law… people who hate policemen (blacks make up some 45% of all cop killers — and you expect police officers to be calm and at peace when around blacks? I wouldn’t be a police officer in a black community); you can hear the heart of a young black guy saying, “No body is going to tell me what to do.” The last thing many blacks are is kind and decent and respectful and pleasant and friendly and caring. Now, exactly what percentage of the black community is like that? That's hard to tell; perhaps it's as low as 10-15%, or as high as 20-25% (again, those are guesstimates, but if it is close to one-fifth of the black world in our country, that is a very significant number). Though I've never lived in a black community, yet some of what I have observed in the world and on television makes me think 15-20% might be pretty accurate; especially after looking at the “black world” in Chicago. As most Americans are aware, the crime rate in Chicago is substantially higher than in any other major city in America; it is responsible for nearly half of the increase in homicides in the US last year (2016); there are more homicides and shooting victims in Chicago than New York City and Los Angeles combined (yet both of those cities have far larger population than Chicago) — last year alone, murder was up 72%, and shootings were up 88% in Chicago (keep in mind, this is a democratic stronghold and is the home of our sitting President, Barack Obama, not some mean, terrible right-winded fascist). It should also be noted that 75% of the crimes in Chicago are committed by Blacks (yet they represent a much smaller percentage of the total population)… 20% are by Latinos (three-fourths of which are illegal immigrants), and only 5% by Whites. So here is Chicago (politically, one of the sleaziest cities in America; that’s been its reputation for years) and once a very desirable city in which to live (perhaps it still is on the north & west sides of town); my wife was raised just west of Chicago), “now the self-acclaimed Black kingdom of America;” one of the ugliest cities in the civilized world — the black community in Chicago is as diabolical as nearly any community in the entire world (remember, the word “diabolical” implies
something of satanic orientation; clearly it is not of divine orientation), and is the home of many of our country's renowned black leaders: Jesse Jackson, Jeremiah Wright, Barack Obama, Rahm Emanuel and numerous other liberal elites; nevertheless, nothing the liberal left has done has been able to “quiet that city” (so don't go blaming it on whites) — all they do is exacerbate the problem with “more hate language,” and now you are telling us that “that's the answer”? The left has spent untold billions of dollars to solve its problems, but nothing has changed the climate and character of that city. Is it not wise perhaps to think that “hatred, money and government are not the end-alls that solve all of our problems”? By the way, I can't imagine the “left” humbly standing on the world stage and admitting that they had taken America down the wrong road; they are very much like the “evolutionists” in that regard; they won't admit they were wrong until God confronts them on the last day; where there is arrogance, there is foolishness (how can one be so numb-headed so as to continue taking the same action over and over again, and expect a different result? Einstein called such anal thinking, “absolute stupidity”); only the arrogant deny that reality.

Statistically speaking, Blacks comprise 13% of the US population (i.e., about 40,000,000 people — incidentally, that means African Americans comprise “one-half of one percent” of all people in the world).… Latinos comprise 17% of our population (about 55,000,000 people)… Asians make up about 6% of our population (about 18,000,000 people)… and Whites make up about 63% of our population (about 205,000,000 people). With that in mind, Blacks make up about one-eighth of our population, and Latinos one-sixth of our population. The total number of people incarcerated in our country is 2,300,000 — and Blacks account for 43% of them; an inordinate number (1,000,000 of them); conversely, the number of illegal Latino immigrants in our country is about 3.7% of the population (roughly 12,000,000 people); yet they account for 13.6% of all crime victims who are serving time in a prison (that equates to about 350,000 people); thus Blacks and Latinos comprise 58% of all those incarcerated in our country. The White population that is serving time represents about 40% of those incarcerated (900,000 people)... in spite of the fact that there are five times more whites than blacks in our country, there are 100,000 more blacks incarcerated than whites. If an equal percentage of the white population was incarcerated, there would be 5,000,000 white people in prison. Incidentally, the legal Latino population accounts for only 3.5% of those in prison (or about 80,000); so it's not those of legal Latino origin who are committing so many crimes — it is the illegal Latino immigrants who are committing the crimes (they commit four times more crimes than those of legal Latino origin). If you did a little homework on those numbers, you would discover that the legal Latino population actually has a slightly lower percentage of people incarcerated than those of the white community (percentage wise, they are very close). I mention these statistics simply to give a little perspective on the composition of our population. One of the issues the liberal left needs to address is “why they are so tolerant of the criminal element among illegal immigrants in our country,” and stop ignoring the issue; it is not a matter of exacerbating the problem, it is simply a matter of having an honest, open dialogue regarding the problem so that we can fix it. People of character & integrity deal with issues, they don't pretend they don't exist. The truth is, we will never come up with answers that solve the problems of our country without addressing all of the issues; sweeping problems under the rug is no more the answer to solving marital problems & raising our children rightly, than it is to effectively governing our country. It should be pretty clear, the political entities in our country aren't interested in “dealing with the truth;” instead, they are simply interested in “running the show & staying in power;” and that's
Incidentally, slaves rate noted, 12,500,000 Africans. Perhaps one of the most surprising things propounded by the “Liberal Elite” is that the most diabolical element in the US claims to be the most virtuous element! Now there’s an oxymoron for you. Obviously Satan has deceived them (cf. Rom 3:13; Gal 6:3; Col 2:8; 1 Th 2:3; 2 Th 2:10; 1 Tim 4:1; 2 Tim 3:13; Rev 12:9). Since all of us are “fallen creatures,” we must all carefully examine things from a biblical perspective; that is, a divine perspective… we can’t just believe the things we want to believe, because more often than not our wants are of “fleshy origin.”

THE ISSUE OF SLAVERY IN AMERICA

Perhaps one of the most surprising things propounded by the “Liberal Elite,” is the fact that they actually like Muslims more than Christians. I think this needs to be expanded upon: here are numerous people in the black community siding with Muslims rather than Christians, in spite of the fact that it was the “Christian world” that brought blacks out of slavery, and the “Arab or Muslim slave trade” that dwarfed the transatlantic slave trade (with which most people are familiar). Muslim slave trade lasted for well over 1200 years (650 AD to 1900 AD), which is four times longer than the transatlantic slave trade. It’s estimated that a minimum of 18,000,000 Africans were enslaved by Arab slave traders, and that over 1,000,000 Europeans were enslaved by the Muslim world during the same period. So Muslim slave trade not only focused on blacks but also on whites, and though it lasted far longer than the transatlantic slave trade, it seems a little odd that there are no cries of “Arab guilt” coming from the black community, or demands for reparations against Muslim nations. Is that not a little puzzling to you? Due to the fact that “slavery” was such a significant issue in the black history of America, it might be wise to examine it in a little detail. To give context to the history of slave trade in the New World, 12,500,000 Africans were shipped to the Americas, but only 10,700,000 survived the journey… and of that number well over ninety percent of them were imported into South America and the Caribbean — only about six percent were sent directly to North America. The total number of Africans shipped directly to North America was 388,000; however most scholars believe another 60,000 to 70,000 Africans ended up here after first landing in the Caribbean, thus bringing the total number of Africans who ultimately arrived on our soil to about 450,000. It should also be noted, Brazil alone received 4,860,000 Africans (more than ten times the number that landed in North America); so North America wasn’t the chief destination of African slaves as some of us were led to believe. Furthermore, black slaves in North America received much better treatment than the majority of slaves in the rest of our transatlantic world; as such the slave death rate was much higher in the Caribbean, Dutch Guiana & Brazil… the birth rate was so low there that they could not sustain their population without importations from Africa; conversely black slaves in North America had a far higher fertility rate, and their families were kept together. Incidentally, slave trade in North America began around 1525 and ended in 1866. It is also interesting to note, according to federal census reports, there were nearly 4,500,000 blacks and 27,000,000 whites in the United States in 1860 (during the time of the Civil War), and that many “free African Americans” also owned slaves. In addition to that, a large number of black slave owners defended their right to own slaves, and actually offered their services to the Confederacy in the South during the Civil War (some believe they may have done that for fear of their own possible enslavement; whether or not that was simply a matter of politicizing the issue is not
known). Whatever the case may have been, the free colored population in Louisiana had no sympathy for abolitionism, and no love for the North; they were willing to fight for Louisiana, just as they had fought to defend New Orleans from the British in 1814-1815 (45 years earlier). I also find it interesting that “a few free blacks owned the services of white indentured servants in the state of Virginia for a period of time,” though that was probably not common, that is still a part of the bigger picture regarding our nation's history. In spite of the fact that this picture is not as indicting as some news commentators and politicians have tried to make it, this is the reality.

The renowned African-American professor of history, John Hope Franklin, at Black Duke University, stated that “over 3,000 free Africans in New Orleans actually owned slaves;” thus the ownership of slaves was not just a white issue here in America, even though considerably more whites owned slaves than free Africans did; history tell us that the number of pre-Civil War American families who actually had slaves was less than five percent. It should also be noted that African blacks sold each other as slaves, and that the first official slave owner in colonial America was a “black man,” not a white man — therefore the accusation that whites started slavery in America is not true (that contradicts what most of us were taught); my aim is not to paint whites with a prettier brush, but to simply put things in their proper perspective and interpret reality as accurately as I can. What is bothering to me is the fact that a number of leftist ideologues insist on ignoring some of our history (in particular, anything that has to do with Christianity or some of these slavery issues; why they refuse to acknowledge that it was the Christian community that was responsible for liberating blacks from slavery is beyond me; why do they insist on withholding that kind of information?). Though the truth can sometimes be “painful,” it still needs to be presented — as is the case in any respectable courtroom, every piece of information needs to be placed on the table, and let things fall where they may. The only reason I felt it might be wise to include this information, is because of the denigrating behavior of leftist ideologues toward the Christian community. Obviously I don't really know what black children are taught by their parents or their school teachers, but I'm suspicious that the entire issue is not accurately being presented to them, because that seems to be the way in which the left operates. If there are omissions, why is that? You can hear them answering, “Well, it really isn't that significant a truth” — that is a typical answer by a leftist ideologue; yet if you study many of these issues in depth, you discover that it was our forefathers theology (i.e., what Scripture has to say about God & our world) that moved them to respond as they did. During the early years of our nation's history our forefathers spent thousands of hours [while congress was in session] praying about particular issues and studying what Scripture had to say about them. Why is that issue not included in our textbooks? and why does the left feel it necessary to withhold it from our children? Obviously, that is a very disturbing thought for leftist ideologues; as such, they refuse to give any emphasis to the significance or relevance of the religious thinking of our forefathers. That's why you will not find this kind of information in our textbooks; in spite of the fact that it was Scriptural truth that ultimately gave definition to their thinking (it was the foundation upon which our constitution was built). Though I don't know exactly what is being taught in our public schools (that was never a subject that I felt the need to study in depth), nevertheless I have heard several scholars argue that the textbooks used in our schools often give an inaccurate portrayal of some parts of our nation's history; thus, I'm highly suspicious that only certain aspects of our history are being taught, and that the influence of Christianity has been omitted. I find it strange that we can't even be honest about our nation's
history. Back to the subject at hand — though many blacks may have “suffered abuse” as slaves, historians tell us that that was the rare exception and not the norm here in America. No doubt in any society there will be some people who are ugly & abusive; but to be fare to the majority, we can’t let the behaviors of a few be that which define us; yet that is precisely what you and John Pavlovitz have done — that kind of juvenile thinking has no place in our world…how can you insist that it does? Why are you being so “hateful”? As I see it, leftist ideologues are simply committed to “distorting reality” for the sake of accomplishing their goals (whatever those goals may be — one of which is the eradication of Christianity in America); “thus the end justifies the means in their book.” Whatever action it takes, they are committed to doing it — just like Black Theology. Keep in mind, God will have the last word — you can play games now, but you are going to pay later (cf. Gal 6:7-8)... again, God is not just a little insignificant religious ideal.

Regarding the neighborhoods in which African Americans live — 39% live in the suburbs; 36% live in cities; 15% live in small metropolitan areas; and 10% live in rural communities. There was a time when African Americans moved north for job opportunities, but now the vast majority of them live in the southeastern sector of our country (where jobs are more plentiful). The reason why more Blacks now live in the suburbs is that housing is cheaper, schools are better, and the environment is more attractive; the same reasons why Whites live in the suburbs. In the last fifteen years the density of the black population in Chicago, Detroit and Philadelphia, has gone down significantly… in addition to that, there has been a moderate reduction in New York, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Boston, San Francisco, Seattle, St. Louis, and Washington, DC. Again, African Americans have essentially been migrating to the southeastern sector — to the states of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Arkansas, Texas and Florida. The typical neighborhoods in which Whites, Blacks and Latinos live here in America are as follows:

- **Black Neighborhoods are** — 51% Black, 33% White, 11% Hispanic, 3% Asian
- **White Neighborhoods are** — 80% White, 8% Hispanic, 7% Black, 4% Asian
- **Hispanic Neighborhoods are** — 45% Hispanic, 36% White, 11% Black, 6% Asian

Statisticians report that three-fourths of African Americans are not living in poverty, but that one-fourth are living in poverty — the question is this: “What does it mean to live in poverty here in America?” That definition changes every 10-15 years in our country (depending upon the overall standard of living) and strongly differs from that of many other countries. Those living in poverty in our country generally receive government aid, and possess many of the amenities that most people years ago did not associate with poverty; i.e., they have a place to live... a phone and a television... adequate food and clothing... and oftentimes an automobile; thus in that sense, poverty is not just reserved for those who are starving and homeless as some might think. A recent study reported that 46,000,000 Americans go to bed hungry every night in our country — the study didn’t identify what “going to bed hungry” really meant. Due to the fact that so much of this data is “politically bent,” it is difficult to know the degree of integrity these findings possess; again, that’s a pretty sad commentary on our political world. Think about it, you are a politically appointed to head up some governmental bureaucracy and do a study on some issue related to that bureaucracy, and then report what the “government” discovered; remember, because you are heading up a government agency, you can now report what the “government” has discovered; thus misleading the electorate with your political bias; remember, the man or woman in charge is of a particular political stripe, and they can basically
make a study say whatever they want it to say — though many in our country may buy into their line of thinking, many of us do not. It would be nice if we could insure neutrality of sorts, but that's not possible when one considers the fallen condition of man. I find it interesting that the study regarding “those going to bed hungry,” was released to the public just a couple of weeks prior to the election. You do the math. My thinking is this: though some people undoubtedly go to bed hungry at night, that number is nowhere near 46,000,000 people… but that’s just the way our political government seems to operate. There’s an old saying that goes like this: “you can make statistics say anything you want them to say.” Thus our politicians constantly use “any statistical data” out there in the world to make their point and support their argument; as such, many of the statistics they use are almost meaningless. A fairly popular statistic that is commonly used is this: eight percent of African Americans live in an area of concentrated poverty located in a big city — I actually thought that number would have been slightly higher than that. Incidentally, the overall poverty rate for all people in the United States has recently been stated to be fifteen percent… again, what is the definition of poverty they are using, and how politically-based is that statistic? And is there consensus on that number? If the subject of “poverty” is being discussed, it accurately needs to be portrayed in the discussion, so that there is clarity of understanding and unanimity of thought.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

With all of the foregoing in mind, where do we go from here? What do we do to get along? How do we resolve our differences? How do we create a culture of understanding? How do we eliminate the problems that seemingly divide us? How do we bring about a culture of change? It should be pretty clear, this isn’t a 90/10 issue like John Pavlovitz has tried to make it… it is a 50/50 issue, and as long as one group insists that the other group acquiesce and do all the work, significant change is not possible. Remember, “it is never one’s fault that two tangle.” The responsibility doesn’t lie with one group of people… it lies with all groups of people… and all groups of people “respecting” all groups of people. Furthermore, one cannot claim to have identified the root of the problem without considering all of the evidence; that is basically how our court system operates: you can’t just listen to the twisted testimony of one person and make your judgment (cf. 1 Tim 5:19; Deut 19:15; 2 Cor 13:1); the reason I refer to it as a twisted testimony, is because the testimony of just one perspective is worthless; anyone can paint a pretty convincing picture when all one does is present one side of the argument. As I reflect upon this issue of “racism” that seems so poignant in our society, one of the questions that comes to mind is this: “What more does the black population want in addition to what it has already received?” You can’t just babble on this issue and be hostile with your response like Jesse Jackson; you have to be very clear, precise, calm and forthright. We can’t just share our feelings… we have to go far deeper than that, and respect those we’re talking to. In answer to my question, “What more does the black community want?” Consider some of those significant things the black community has already received: it’s been given its constitutional rights… it’s been given the right to vote… it’s been given access to health care like all people… it’s been given access to education and higher educational scholarships (interestingly enough, it has frequently received preferential treatment in that regard)… it’s been given an inordinate amount of government aid (not that it is undeserving, but it has been given a disproportionate share of welfare, food stamps, etc.)… it’s been given a disproportionate number of government jobs (statisticians tell us that the blacks hold about 18%
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of all government jobs, yet they only comprise 13% of the population; that means about 21% of all blacks work directly for the government. Those are just a few of the issues that come to mind. With the foregoing in mind, “Can you identify any issue that blacks are denied, that non-blacks receive? If there are, you need to expand upon them. I’m not aware of any. Furthermore, when one looks at television, it is very obvious that blacks are given an “inordinate representation,” though they only comprise one-eighth of our population, they receive far greater exposure than that on television? If the Latino segment of our society is significantly larger than the Black segment, why does it receive significantly less exposure than blacks? Conversely, if the Asian segment is half as large as the Black segment, why is it almost non-existent on television? Why is that? Where is the “equality” in all of this? Then there’s the issue of all the “interracial couples” on television — why is it that about 85% of all interracial couples are that of a black man and a white woman? Why the “inequality?” Obviously that’s not an easy question, but you need to address it. Why are “white women” being used to placate the black world if that indeed is the case? Why are “white women” being sacrificed for sake of blacks? Can one genuinely word it that way? Surely, you are not saying it is just happenstance. For the sake of argument, why not have 85% of all the interracial couples be a white man and a black woman? It would be interesting to see how black men would respond if that were the case? Would they respond negatively? Don’t just ignore or pass over these questions; answer them. Again, “Why the inequality?” Are you saying that “whites deserve a taste of their own medicine?” What did I (or people like me) ever do to deserve retribution?

This isn’t easy stuff, is it? Don’t just accuse me of being a racist because I’m addressing some very poignant issues — the door always swings both ways on these issues. By the way, how do you think the Asian or Latino communities would respond if all interracial couples consisted of black men and Asian or Latino females? What’s your thinking on that? Incidentally, I also find it interesting that “black couples” on television are almost always a black man teamed up with a black woman of “either the same or lighter skin color than his;” it’s extremely rare to see a black man teamed up with a woman of “darker color” — this is not a black on white issue, this is a black on black issue. Furthermore, the skin coloration is almost always this way in our society: black men (far more often than not) are paired with a black woman whose skin is of lighter color than his; so there is clearly a “bias” in the black world regarding the color of one’s skin — black men prefer women of either the same color or women of a lighter color. As such, are we to call black men “racists”? Or are we now showing a little “tolerance for preference”? Incidentally, that’s the way “black men” describe it — “they prefer to be hooked up with a woman of lighter color;” they call such a woman “a trophy woman” (surely, this isn’t new to you). Not long ago I watched a television program titled “Light Girls” — it aired on Oprah’s TV station, OWN. The idea of “light girls” referred to “lighter skinned black girls,” in contrast to darker skinned black girls. This particular documentary was conducted by blacks (there must have been at least one-hundred blacks on the program… the lighter skinned black girls essentially said that “they were often abused when they were younger by darker black girls” (sometimes darker blacks would tear their clothes off of them and would beat them up). They also discussed the fact that many dark skinned black girls use some kind of “skin bleaching cosmetic” to make their skin lighter; apparently these products are also widely used in South America, India, and other countries. I get it — do you? By the way, some people go to “tanning salons,” others sit outside in the sun to get a “tan;” yet many in Japan use in umbrella in the sun to keep from getting a tan — they actually use some kind of “white cosmetic” to make their skin extremely white. It appears like
we all have different standards; are we going to throw these people under the bus also? I'm not equally attracted to every person on the planet (for whatever reason); and neither are you. The little “attraction neuron in my head” (or whatever it is called) doesn't render all people “equally beautiful or attractive to me;” though that part of my brain may have developed its definition of beauty over the years, it's not something any of us can stop and change; everyone in the world is not equally attractive to me or anyone else, and none of us can control out innate orientation by subjecting it to some political argument that denigrates our inner core (neither can you); I can't say a person is physically beautiful if the beauty calculator in my head doesn't agree with that, and neither can you — some people I'm attracted to, some people I'm not; it is just a part of the very fabric of my being. But that doesn't mean I hate those that I am not necessarily attracted to, or that I cannot show love to those people who may not be attractive to me.

**One of the amazing dynamics of Scripture is this:** nowhere in Scripture are we commanded to “feel something or like something,” because we cannot control our feelings in an absolute sense; they simply are what they are. I can't make myself like “beets and liver”— I simply don't like it, and I'm not into justifying why that is the case… and I'm not into judging you harshly because you like it. Now back to the topic at hand — the “preferences” by which we all live life is not without its problems; some people are simply deemed unattractive by the populace, which no doubt can be very difficult. Imagine being so ugly people turn away from you; that's a painful thought (in particular for a woman)... how can one not hurt for such a person? In like manner, how does a dark black woman feel in our culture, when it clearly prefers women who are “lighter skinned”? You are fortunate in that regard, because you are “an attractive lighter skinned black woman;” both white & black males are attracted to you; but that's not the case for many women of color. Where does all of this take us? I'm not really sure; all I know is that we all have “some preferences in life that seem to control much of what goes on in our lives,” and it's those preferences that often give direction to our lives... the reality is, the entire world doesn't fit into our little preferential wheelhouse; though half of it might, half it doesn't. Some people I am more comfortable around; some people I am less comfortable around (that is pretty much a standard for all people groups throughout the world); that doesn't mean we are all racists or bigots or empty-headed idiots. I don't believe that kind of jargon has any place in the civilized world... it is way too ugly and too divisive. I don't have a right to denigrate you and your preferences... neither do you have a right denigrate me and my preferences. The reality is, all human beings need to be “sensitive” to the likes and dislikes of others, and treat each other with “dignity and respect” (something seriously lacking in the black world), and not try and shove them into their wheelhouse and their way of thinking. Your insisting that the world see everything as you see it is making yourself the standard bearer... you don't determine reality... obviously, we live in a very convoluted world that is full of division; at best, all we can do is encourage one another to “respect and accept others” as they are — voicing “hatred” for others is not the answer… remember, the door swings both ways... you better learn to “love” your fellow man.

**According to Scripture, we are not to let our emotions and our feelings “dictate reality” in our lives,** because they can easily lead us astray... just because you feel anger toward those who don't have an affinity for what you have an affinity for, doesn't mean you have the right to treat them ugly and berate them — “we are not all the same.” Scripture tells us that we are to “take every thought captive to the obedience of Christ” (cf. 2 Cor 10:5); so if you feel anger in your soul toward someone who doesn't have the same predisposition that you do… you need to listen to
what God's Word has to say about that kind of response, and respond accordingly, and not just
denigrate those who don't agree with your thinking; because you're making a judgment against
someone who simply has a different affinity than you do. This has nothing to do with being a
“racist” (i.e., where someone thinks another person is “inferior to him”); that is not at all what
this is about. Obviously, wrestling with your own innate anger is not an easy task, because it
requires a great deal of discipline; but that is what God calls us to do; we are not to just let our
minds wander through this corrupt world and dwell on those things that find a home in our flesh
(cf. Gal 5:17)… “we are to be transformed by the renewing of our mind” (cf. Rom 12:2); which is in-
deed the mother of all battles. With that in mind, we must determine whether or not those con-
structs of thought that govern our thinking have credence and possess integrity (i.e., wholeness and soundness); if our thoughts do not align with what Scripture teaches, they will be lacking in
both credence & integrity. The problem with the unbelieving world is that the Holy Spirit does
not dwell in them and move their thinking in a godly direction; as such, they simply follow the
dictates of their own fleshly (human) thinking. If people refuse to believe in God, that's their
prerogative; I can share my heart with them and pray for them, but I don't have a right to berate
them and impose my will upon them. Though I can criticize their thinking and those constructs
that rule in their hearts, they still have the right to believe the most inane concepts of the human
family. That doesn't mean I'm free to mistreat them, or act in an unloving way toward them…
though God has not commanded us to “like” people, He has commanded us to “love” people
(cf. Mt 22:36-40). In Scripture, love is an action verb, not a feeling noun; thus, we can even show
love to those we don't necessarily like (cf. Mt 5:43-47).

Exactly why these disparities exist, is probably up for debate... but I would think it has
something to do with “the societal preferences” that are pretty much sold in the marketplace.
Let me illustrate that: two or three hundred years ago, the “in thing” for women was to be fat
and chubby; the “in thing” today is for women to be thin and skinny — my how times change!
That just happened to be the emphasis in the cultures of the western world. I believe there are
some black people groups on the continent of Africa today where “being big and fat” is beau-
tiful, and being skinny is not; so our societal differences are not all the same. If it is consoling
to you, man is not the end-all on the issue of “beauty” — God is! What we believe is beautiful
(according to our innate bias), may in fact not be the case at all. Many people in this world do
not feel as though they are “attractive,” and for some of them that is a very troubling thought —
imagine being so culturally unattractive that you refuse to go out in public, because you can’t
bear the pain of people staring at you and turning away from you; wow, that's hard to imagine,
but some people really do live in that kind of world. Ultimately, the reality is this: when we get
to heaven we are going to see each other as being extremely attractive creatures” (in spite of
the fact that some fear they won't be); no one will be deemed ugly or mediocre with regard to
their looks; we will all be seen as incredibly beautiful creatures. I just threw that in to “stir the
pot.” Are there “inequities” in this world? Of course there are, and there are some extremely
painful ones; we live in a “fallen world” that is being governed by fallen human beings of every
stripe; to somehow think that we can resolve all of these inequities, is to conclude that we can
somehow displace our fallen tendencies with absolute virtue. That not only can't happen; that
won't happen. Though we can make a few minor modifications to our world, that's about it.
Satan isn't sleeping in this world in which we live; the world forces of darkness and spiritual
forces of wickedness are running rampant everywhere in our world (Eph 6:12). Hitler's Germany
killed some 6,000,000 Jews & Stalin's Russia some 15,000,000 Christians in the 20th century!
(not ancient history). Quite frankly, I find it interesting to sit back and watch “the diabolical left” run the show in our culture, and then think of the supposed value they want others to believe they place on the issue of equality. Its arrogance is completely delusional — to them equality is being in agreement with them (they actually have no respect for anyone who disagrees with them, and those they disagree with they hate). The question that begs asking is this: Why the inequality? To think that Hollywood and the leftist ideologues are oblivious to the inequalities they have constructed is beyond nonsense; they know full well what they are doing — the end always justifies the means in their book. At this particular point in our culture, if some issue is supra-agitating to those on the left, they seem to think they are justified in taking any action possible to stem the tide, quiet the storm and resolve the issue. In actuality, what they fail to do is consider the entirety of those issues that are troubling to them — in particular, those views that are contrary to their thinking — they simply let their angry, negative emotions control the discourse in their minds. Countless respectable voices of integrity down through the ages have pounded on this drum: Don’t let anger rule the day in your soul, because that is a sure way of making a mess of things! Simeon B. Lakish stated it this way in The Talmud, “Anger deprives a sage of his wisdom.” Conversely, King Solomon said, “He who is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he who rules his spirit, than he who captures a city” (Prv 16:32). In your arrogance, you feel “your anger is justified,” whereas no one else’s is; therefore you will remain angry. Beloved, there is no end to this kind of madness. Obviously, the ugly behavior of the left is very disconcerting — here is a group of people who are outspokenly tolerant of nearly all perverse behaviors, and extremely intolerant of anyone who disagrees with them; in particular those on the right who are strong advocates of godly behaviors.

Obviously, we do not all share the same values in this world (what is virtuous to one group may be completely repugnant to another group — the people of ancient Rome used to love to watch people being brutally murdered in the arena; they actually “cheered it on!” The disdain that some on the left have in our culture for those on the right is actually quite similar to what existed in ancient Rome; their hatred for those on the right is that intense — by the way, you should keep in mind, “all fallen human beings inhabit sinful flesh,” so those on the right can be just as ugly and mean as those on the left… should those on the left take it upon themselves to arrogantly dictate to the world how it must operate, they are only going to incite similar action by those on the right — for those on the left to somehow think that those on the right are just a bunch of weak little wimps… wow! you are really delusional. Thinking that something is the case, as opposed to what really is the case, are two different realities altogether. The truly wise person respects the opposition, whereas the truly foolish person only respects his own thinking. The fool arrogantly pushes his viewpoint, thus igniting the opposition and resulting in “war.” One more word on this issue: Screaming at the opposition simply demonstrates how foolish and immature that person really is (he’s a child)… the degree of emotion by which one holds on to his convictions is not the end-all that demonstrates the integrity of those convictions. For those on the left who think they shall reign supreme in our world, let me share this with you — you are not the author of life, God is… this is not your world, this is God’s world… you do not determine ultimate reality, God does. Reflect upon those didactics, and come down off your high-horse; they will enlighten your thinking. Those who arrogantly defer to their own wisdom will one day stand before the God of creation and be eternally condemned; to simply refuse to see the folly of your way is never justifiable (Rom 2:1). To let diabolical anger rule in your soul is not the answer to life. Ultimately, the question we must all ask is this: What do we value in
"life?" and from whence do we get our values? Are they of "divine origin" or "human origin"? Are they rooted in fallen human thinking, or rooted in God's Word? Since we're fallen, sinful creatures, it behooves us to defer to the God of heaven, and align our thinking with His thinking. Is that easy? No, it is not — it means dying to oneself and one's own will (cf. Mt 16:24-27; Gal 2:20; Jam 1:21). Will you persist in running your life, or will you defer your Creator?

Some of the questions that really need to be asked are these: “Could not our leaders have addressed all of these issues with a lot more integrity then they did?” (from my vantage point it would not have been that difficult — it simply would have meant being far more transparent and honest; by the way, why do people find it so difficult to be “transparent”? Because their proud heart insists that they live a life of “pretense” — pretending to be what they are not — that is the problem of the entire human family; they simply cannot disclose who they really are — sinful creatures; remember the majority of human beings refuse to acknowledge their fallenness and their sinfulness — as such, they don't experience God's grace in their lives — cf. 1 John 1:5-10). A second question that begs asking is this: “Why did our leaders choose to go down the road that they did?” (an open honest answer could have gone a long way toward bringing a measure of healing to our world; instead they just arrogantly threw some people under the bus to satisfy their own innate political bias). With those questions in mind, let's return to the question we asked up front, “What more does the black population want in addition to what it has already received?” I think I know the answer to that question; do you? Before you continue reading, take a moment, close your eyes, and think through your answer. My thinking is this: blacks simply want to rule themselves (as if that is the answer to life) they want to be the ruling party of the society in which they live they want to tell other people what to do, and not be in submission to anyone who is not black they want to dictate to others, and not be dictated to (and certainly not by those who are white). Do I see the integrity of those conclusions? Absolutely, but they're not reasonable. If you want to be "King Kong" in that part of the world in which you live, then you will need to find a little plot of ground somewhere on this planet and form your own country, and establish your own government, and write your own constitution… because you only comprise 13% of the populace in the United States. To me that's a pretty logical deduction, though it may not be to you. My experience in life is this — I have only lived in a country where the white race has been in the majority… other than what I have read and learned in foreign countries, I have no idea what it would be like be raised and live in a country where I was truly a minority. The reality is, every country I have visited has its own “groupings,” and numerous “sub-cultures” — that just seems to be the way cultures work; yet the culture of the majority in each country is the culture that stands supreme and establishes the guidelines under which all of the sub-cultures co-exist. Furthermore, since every group seems to have its own sub-culture of sorts… there seems to be some level of separation between the various groups. Now, if you want to get along peacefully with the lead culture in your country, and not be at war with them, you need to learn to behave in a non-offensive way around them, and respect them for who they are, and actually defer to them from time to time (if they indeed are the premiere culture). If you find you're not able to do that, then you need to think about moving to an area that is more compatible and acceptable to you.

The reality is, none of us can fully identify with people who are of a different ethnicity or cultural background; it would be very arrogant to insist that one can. Just as men cannot fully understand what it means to be a woman (nor a woman, a man), so also none of us can fully
understand people of a different race & culture. We are simply all different, so for the political world to try and shove us all into “one box” is not the answer; by the way, what box would you shove them into? What if it wasn’t the box you wanted? Why should you get preferential treatment, and someone else not get it? Obviously, there are cultures in this world that are more acceptable to us… should we find ourselves in one that is simply too irritating to us, we should probably seek out another culture that is more in agreement with our thinking. To politically lambaste those who don't agree with our thinking is not the answer (how can one with half a wit possibly think that “expressing hate for someone” is the answer?). Ultimately the question is this: Can our political world actually transition into a world of realistic thinking (i.e., a little utopia), without imposing a level of bias on everyone? No, it can't, because Satan is too active in the minds and hearts of the masses; he is the author of hate & lies (untruth). Though there are some things we can do in our world in a very limited way… we do not have the capacity to “transform this world into some glorious community;” incidentally, that's the message “anti-Christ” will proclaim to the world near the end of time. Jesus told His disciples that “the arch opponent of God” (i.e., anti-Christ) will manifest himself on the world stage at the end of the age, and convince everyone that “peace” shall finally now rule on the earth — he will deceive the entire world into thinking that he is the answer to the world’s problems! He will even declare himself to be “God!” Naturally foolish man (the liberal elites and the like) will rejoice and believe in him… and then God will destroy him before the entire created order. Beloved, “Do not love the world, nor the things that are in the world… this world is passing away, and all of its desires” (cf. 1 Jn 2:15-18; Rev 21:1-8). Make Christ your life, not this world.

**Now, if I did not believe in the God of the Bible.** I would probably do as the families of the sons of Noah did…*their human reasoning led them to build their own little utopia in a distant land, that they might live happily ever after* (cf. Gen 10:32-11:6). By the way, you’ll notice *God didn’t let them do that!* (cf. Gen 11:7-9); men can be pretty clever, but since they are not the ones who define reality or dictate reality, *they can’t do as they please in this world;* this is not man's world, it is God's world (cf. Rom 11:36; Col 1:6)—if you insist on thinking to the contrary, you are only going to end up on your backside, because you do not determine reality. On this issue it appears that you are going to have a very difficult time “deferring to the Lord,” because you are wedded to some very difficult constructs of thought. With the foregoing in mind, if one should stubbornly insist on living life according to his own dictates, then he should do as the sons of Noah did: He should find him a plot of land somewhere on this planet and build his own little utopia, and if he is black, he should make it a little Black Utopia, where only blacks are permitted, and all those who qualify to live in that setting would have to “comply with the laws that he would institute to run that community;” those not in agreement with those laws, or those who have demonstrated lawful in the past, would not be permitted to live in this little utopia (because chaos would not be acceptable). From my vantage point, “the foundational values” by which the community would function would be “being morally upright, decent, respectful, responsible and orderly;” those would be the ruling values we would be employ in the governing of that society. Now should you really think that, *that is the solution to your dilemma,* you need to know that you are aligning yourself with the godless thinking of Noah’s sons, and contrary to what you insist on doing (even though your goal appears to be righteous and good in your eyes), God is not going to let you accomplish your dream land (if that were possible. I would have accomplished it a long time ago 😂). Now should you insist on doing so, you need to know that you are futilely throwing your life away; i.e., you are completely wasting
your life. With all of the foregoing in mind, the important thing in life is that of “aligning our will with God’s will,” and not substitute God’s thinking with our fallen thinking (cf. Mt 6:10; 6:33; 26:39). So rather than living by the dictates of our fallenness (i.e., our flesh), we need to heed the advice of the apostle Paul — “If possible, so far as it depends on you, be at peace with all men” (cf. Rom 12:18). Christians are not to be needlessly provocative or contentious; instead they are to love peace, tirelessly work for a peaceful resolution, and be at peace; but since we live in a world that “hates,” that is not always going to be possible.

Regarding my own interracial relations with those others, I generally try to take the initiative to say hello… be kind… be friendly… and lend a helping hand when the need arises; though my initiatives are seldom rejected, there are times when they are. Since so many people struggle with hatred, or dislike others, or have other issues, our efforts are not always met with a kind, conciliatory response; sometimes people simply don’t want to interact; thus we simply have to accept that and move on. Because you are black, you may be inclined to interpret any negative behavior by those who are white as being “racist” in origin; that, however, is neither being fair to that individual nor is it being fair to you… but that is the residual effects of the loud radical racial discourse that has gone on in our country. Thus we sometimes have to “walk on eggs” around people who aren’t the same as us: why is that? because we never know if we are saying something offensive, or if we are misinterpreting something they might be saying. I know this is true, because it happened to me when I used the word “boy” around a black guy, and I wasn’t even talking directly to him; the long and short of it was, the guy went absolutely bazzerk… I learned that day that the word “boy” was used of “slaves” in the distant past — but I had never heard that before. Case in point, I had used a term completely innocent of what it derogatorily meant in his mind; it was only after he calmed down that I asked him what I had said that made him so angry, and then he explained to me what the word “boy” meant. The same logic can be applied to the terms blacks prefer to be identified with: do they prefer being called blacks, negroes, people of color, darkies or African Americans? Years ago that was “an unknown,” many older blacks preferred “negroes,” but those who were younger did not — that term actually made them angry. When I grew up my father referred to blacks as “darkies” (apparently that was the term they used up in Canada). The issue of “offending someone” because of a word that you might use made for a very uncomfortable situation, where you had to be very careful about what you might say. Since that problem still exists in our world today, one still has to “walk on eggs a little around blacks;” that just goes with the territory. Though at times that is how I feel, that is not always the case — at times I “feel comfortable” around blacks, yet at other times I do not feel comfortable around them. It has been my experience that blacks often do not “feel comfortable” around whites; as stated earlier, that is simply the residual effect of Jesse Jackson’s ugly discourse in our world. Unless that sleazy stuff stops (blacks can’t continue to pass this junk on to their kids; all you are doing is hurting them!), this world is going to remain very uncomfortable for “black & white” encounters. By the way, this is not the case with other ethnic groups (except for some Muslims).

As I bring this study to a close, I’m reminded of the “suffering” that believers go through in life. As the renowned British preacher John R. W. Stott stated in his book on the cross of Christ, “suffering constitutes the single greatest challenge to the Christian faith” (The Cross of Christ; InterVarsity Press, 2006, p. 303). As Scripture itself attests, sometimes suffering appears to be completely unfair; thus causing us as believers to question God like Job did, “Why? Why me?” Suffering is not an uncommon experience for believers. Though some suffering is due to sin,
some suffering is not; the reality is, God often reveals His glory in and through suffering (cf. 1 Pet 2:18-23; also Heb 12:1-3). In addition to that, it is actually by suffering that God grows our faith and develops a steadfast quality to it (cf. Jam 1:2-4; and Rom 5:3-5); so suffering is actually “a means of grace” (cf. Ps 119:57; Phil 1:29). As the apostle Peter writes, “Do not be surprised when you suffer in this life; the reason we as believers suffer is that is the process by which God removes the impurities from our faith” (cf. 1 Pet 4:12); so suffering grows our character and helps remove the dross from our faith—in like manner the impurities in metal are removed by intense fire. Thus suffering and persecution are not to be viewed as strange and abnormal. Peter then concluded his letter with these words: “After you have suffered for a little while, God Himself will perfect, confirm, strengthen and establish you” (1 Pet 5:10); so suffering is not only God’s appointed path to Christ-like maturity in this life, but is the path to our glorification in the life hereafter. Paul writes to his young friend in ministry, Timothy: “All who desire to live godly in Christ Jesus will be persecuted” (cf. 2 Tim 3:12); so the ugliness that is being thrown at the Christian world by the diabolical left is not surprising; in actuality, it should be expected. Those living in the dark will always have an aversion to those living in the light, because those living in the dark “hate the light” (cf. Jn 3:19-21).

Hence, those who take a stand for Christ will experience “persecution;” i.e., the attacks of Satan and this dark world in which we live (cf. Jn 15:20; Acts 14:22; Mt 5:10); Satan doesn’t waste his ammunition on nominal Christians; he turns his big guns on those who storm the gates of Hades; that should be a pretty logical deduction to those of you who are truly sold out to Christ (Gal 5:11). The message of the cross is offensive to fallen man, because it denounces “all human effort” (cf. Rom 9:33; 1 Cor 1:23; Gal 5:11; 1 Pet 2:8) — human beings either rebel against God, or they see no need for the cross and emphasize human potential and human ability… all the cross does in the minds of many liberal Christians is simply exhibit God’s love and inspire them to greater endeavor; which at best is liberation theology. According to Scripture, the quintessential nature of man is this: “He is not righteous (cf. Rom 3:10)… he is not good (cf. Rom 3:12; Lk 18:19)… there is no virtue in him whatsoever; hence, he is in need of God’s forgiveness, God’s mercy, and God’s grace. Without the cross of Christ man is condemned to eternal damnation; it is only because of the cross that man is able to experience eternal life through Jesus Christ. It is important to know that God doesn’t grade on a curve, so it’s not a matter of our comparing ourselves to others, and then thinking that “we are actually pretty good;” God’s standard is absolute perfection, and none of us come anywhere close to being perfect. If you humbly agree with the foregoing, and place your faith in Christ, God makes you His child (cf. Jn 3:16; Rom 3:23; 6:23; Jam 1:21); there’s no room for any level of pride in the Christian life. The cross of Christ is the good news (i.e., gospel) of deliverance and salvation that God accomplished through His Son… there is salvation in no other name (cf. Acts 4:12; 16:31; Rom 10:13; Eph 2:8-9; Titus 3:5). So whether we are black or white, we must all come to the cross to be saved. The message of the cross is that God loved us so much He sent His Son to die for our sins, that He might reconcile us to Himself (cf. Rom 5:8-10; 2 Cor 5:17-21; Col 1:19-23). Those who believe in God submit to Him (cf. Mt 16:24; Lk 14:27; Jam 4:7); those who do not submit to Him do not believe in Him. Believing in God is not just a forensic truth (even the devil believes in God in that sense – Jam 2:19), it is a dynamic reality that completely transforms the life of one who places his trust in Him (cf. 2 Cor 3:18; 5:17; Col 1:13-14); henceforth, “Christ is his life” (cf. Gal 2:20; Phil 1:21; Col 3:4). Paul writes these words to the believers at Corinth, “Test yourselves to see if you are in the faith; examine yourselves” (cf. 2 Cor 13:5). And then to those of Hebrew origin he wrote, “Hold fast the confession of our hope… consider how to stimulate
one another to love and good deeds… and don’t forsake the assembling of yourselves together with other believers” (cf. Heb 10:23-25). These are the didactics that identify the faithful in Christ. Beloved, I listed numerous biblical references throughout this study; let me encourage you to carefully reflect upon each of them.

When God’s unconditional love for us is our “primary focus” in life, all of the difficulties we go through in life will not only become more manageable (i.e., they will cease being so intolerable), but will actually help produce a more steadfast quality to our faith. Thus when we are being challenged on the road of life, we need to respond to others with the love that God has poured out in hearts by the Holy Spirit (cf. Rom 5:5). Though our efforts of kindness are not going to radically change our diabolical world, Lord willing, they will positively impact those individuals whom the Lord places in our path. As God’s children, we are simply called to be the hands and feet and voice of Jesus in this world, and let Him minister in and through us. Beloved, let me encourage you to prayerfully reflect upon the following truths of the Christian faith and apply them to your life — “God is causing everything you are going through in life to work together for your good” (cf. Rom 8:28)… that includes the good, the bad, and the ugly. “God fully understands your frame and is mindful that you are but dust” (cf. Ps 103:14); as such “He empathizes with your weakness and your condition” (Heb 4:15); none of us are anywhere near perfect; not even close, so don’t beat yourself up because of your fallleness (Christ paid the penalty for every one of your sins); just turn again from your fallleness, and get back up in the saddle. We have all stumbled in dramatic fashion (Jam 3:2), yet God never gives up on us… “His lovingkindness is everlasting; it never ceases” (cf. Ps 100:5; 103:17; all of Ps 136:1-26),… “God completes the work He began in us” (cf. Phil 1:6; Rom 8:29-30), “and accomplishes what concerns us” (cf. Ps 138:8); “Faithful is He who calls us; He will bring it to pass” (cf. 1 Th 5:24). Though it may sound strange to you, sometimes God permits us to wander away from Him, that we might see ourselves for who really are, and learn the reality of His love for us in a far deeper way, and in so doing become far more effective servants for Him — read the parable of the prodigal son (cf. Luke 15:11-24). Beloved, “Don’t let the world squeeze you into its mold; be transformed by the renewing of your mind… don’t think more highly of yourself that you ought, but think so as to have sound judgment, as God has allotted to you a measure of faith” (Rom 12:1-3). As His child, God is exhorting you to “repent (i.e., change your mind) about your diminished love for Him, and do the deeds you did at first” (cf. Rev 2:5).

Beloved, “You ought to be a teacher by now, yet you have need again for someone to teach you the elementary principles of the oracles of God” (cf. Heb 5:12). God blessed you with a wonderful mind, but you have failed to use it in teaching others… you have embraced the thinking of men, and have abandoned the thinking of God. My prayer is that you will do an about face (repent), and let God use your life to minister truth to others. In this study I mentioned a number of highly respected black pastors in our world — let me encourage you to connect with one of them regarding a church in your community wherein you can grow and serve and teach; it is by teaching God’s Word that we really grow. Whether you teach two people, ten people, or fifty people, start teaching, and let God do His work in and through you. Remember, to whom much is given, much is required — you still have a number of years ahead of you with which to serve. Let God use your rebellious past (He is fully mindful of it) to minister His grace to others… He uses everything we have been through in life to accomplish His purposes (Rom 8:28). If you will humble yourself before Him, your life will take off like a rocket! Read the two studies I have
included with this one — “The Dynamics of Genuine Faith” & “My Journey of Faith” — both studies will help give context to what I have written in this study. For those of you who just finished reading this study, let me encourage you to go on my website and access these two studies; you’ll find them under the “Additional Studies Link” — www.thetransformedsoul.com
Simply click on the “icon” in the upper right hand corner of each study to access a “printable pdf version” of it.

“May the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope by the power of the Holy Spirit”

(Romans 15:13)
ADDENDUM

White Christians Who Voted for Donald Trump: Fix This. Now.
NOVEMBER 10, 2016 / JOHN PAVLOVITZ

We Christians like to talk about Hell a lot, so let’s talk about Hell a little. Yesterday, in the very first few daylight hours after Donald Trump’s election victory it began — near San Francisco, a home in Noe Valley flew a Nazi flag where kids walk by to get to school. A white middle school student brought a Trump sign to school and told a black classmate it was time for him to get “back in place.” A gay New York City man getting on a bus was told that he should “enjoy the concentration camps, faggot!”

The NYU Muslim Students Association found the word “Trump!” scrawled on the door of their prayer room. A female seminary student was stopped at a coffee shop with the words, “Smile sweetheart, we beat the cunt.” Parents of children of color spent the day picking up their children early from elementary, middle, and high schools across the country because they were inundated with slurs and harassment and unable to study. A group of Hispanic kids in Raleigh were taunted by white children, telling them they were “going back to Mexico.”

This is the personal Hell we’ve unleashed upon our people this week. And if you’re a white Christian and you voted for Donald Trump: You need to fix this. Now. You comprise the lion’s share of Trump’s elevation to the highest office of our country. You knew exactly who this man was while you held your noses and covered your eyes and endorsed him anyway. You are fully responsible for the flood of personal sewage now engulfing children and adults of color, those in the LGBTQ community, those in the Muslim community. And you, white Christian, better get your spiritual shit together and figure out how you’re going make this right.

Let’s be clear about something, brethren: This is not the time to appeal to minorities and marginalized communities to “come together in unity” with white people right now. That was Hillary Clinton’s message, and even though she had the track record and the experience and the wherewithal to make it happen — you passed on it. Instead you chose the guy who’s entire resume is about supremacy and privilege, whose entire campaign was about the fear of the other (the other in this case, being anyone not white, straight, and Christian). You chose the guy endorsed by the KKK. You did.

You need to understand this. Oppressed people aren’t obliged to make nice with their oppressors. The bullied don’t owe anything to the bullies. Victims don’t have to make their assailants feel better. Young children of color aren’t responsible to educate racist children — or their parents.

In the 25th chapter of Matthew’s Gospel, Jesus tells his listeners, that those who followed after him, those who would bear his name are to love the least; not those who are less-than, but those who are treated as less-than. He then paints the picture of the eternal suffering Christians are always so willing to condemn others to, and he says that it will be their lack of love and compassion and mercy for these most vulnerable, most hurting people — that will condemn them.
White Christians and the white Church, especially if you voted for Donald Trump: this is all on you. Your pastors need to speak clearly and explicitly into this, now. Your church websites and social media pages need to address this harassment and bullying and terrorizing, now. You need to talk to your white children and teach them how not to be horrible to other kids, and how to stand up to those who are being horrible, now. You need to talk to your kid’s coaches and to your midweek Bible Study and to your co-workers and your church staff and your gun club — and you need to call this poison out.

White churches, this Sunday, your only sermon should be the one that reminds your white members what the parable of the Good Samaritan was compelling followers of Jesus to be: radically merciful when everyone else looked the other way. You need to reach out to your neighbors and coworkers and classmates and social media friends who are part of marginalized communities and reassure them, listen to them, care for them, be Jesus to them. If not, no matter how you rationalize it or try to squeeze your way out of it, the personal Hell so many people are living in and will continue to live in over the next four years, will be one of your design.

It will be your shared sin. The blood will be on your hands. This is your place and time in history to show people what Jesus is supposed to look like. This is your urgent moment to make a testimony that is Christ-like or to willingly and openly deny Christ. This is your crucial opportunity to be the peacemakers, white Christians; not by compelling the marginalized to be more understanding or to ask them to come to the table with those who are injuring them — but by speaking directly into the face of those inflicting the injury and demanding their repentance. Now you can dismiss these stories or diminish their collateral damage or accuse the victims of exaggeration. You can claim that things will die down once these people “get this out of their systems.” You can turn away and logout and retreat into the cloistered security of your white Christian bubble of privilege. Or, you can step out into the school hallways and bus stops and coffee shops and Twitter feeds and bring the bold, loving, redemptive presence of Jesus you’re always claiming you want to be in the world. You can actually step into Hell and bring the freakin’ love of God.

At times like these, Christians like to smile sweetly and say, “God is in control.” No. God is not in control. God didn’t vote for Donald Trump, you did. Stop passing the buck to God. God isn’t defacing prayer rooms. God isn’t taunting gay teenagers. God is not bullying kids on buses. God isn’t threatening Muslim families. White Christians are. You are in control of this. You have pulpits and pews and a voice and influence and social media, so get to work.

You need to do some knee to the dirt exploratory surgery with your Maker and figure out how you’re going to respond to this — and then respond. For the love of God and for the love of the people you claim that God so loves — fix this. Now.