

PETER ROBINSON: "Why don't the American people see through [elitist nonsense]? Isn't that the fundamental bet that the Founders made, that voters...ultimately would see through nonsense?"

THOMAS SOWELL: "Yes, but that was before nonsense became a large part of the curriculum of our educational institutions." [1]

I hardly ever buy the newspaper. Partly because the \$1 expenditure yields a greater return on investment elsewhere (such as if I had dropped it into the sewer), and partly because taking in the daily statist propaganda via intellectual placebo is inconsistent with Romans 12:2 ("And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind").

Yet, I couldn't resist picking up a copy of the *New York Post* with the cover story: "'Blessed' Bill: My education critics are like Jesus' doubters." [2]

Promoting his plan to "scrap the admissions test for the city's top high schools", Mayor Bill de Blasio made references to Scripture in proselytizing his plan for "more diversity" among NYC's top high schools.

"'Blessed are those who act justly,' he said, likening critics to the apostle who questioned the resurrection of Jesus: 'Scripture...tells us about the naysayers and the doubting Thomases.'"

Apparently, those who raise legitimate criticisms of de Blasio's plan to eliminate entrance qualifications based on academic ability are likened to those who doubt the resurrection of Jesus. ("Hold the logic please, an appeal to the emotions will suffice, thanks.")

"The mayor repeatedly referenced the Bible in a visit to a predominantly black church in East Harlem [3] where he preached that his proposal would increase racial and ethnic diversity at the eight selective schools.

'Blessed are those who act justly,' he told worshippers at the Bethel Gospel Assembly, referring to his plan.

In addition to quoting Psalm 106:3, the mayor even likened his opponents to the apostle who questioned the resurrection of Jesus.

'I think Scripture also tells us about the naysayers and the doubting Thomases,' said de Blasio, who has described himself as 'spiritual' while discussing his own beliefs."

Can we just take a moment to point out the absurdity of de Blasio's appeal to Christ's resurrection and "Doubting Thomas" in rebuking critics of his education plan when we have no reason to think that de Blasio himself believes in the resurrection account of Jesus?

"The congregation drowned out the mayor with applause and a shaking tambourine when he said he would immediately boost the number of spots set aside for poor students who narrowly miss the test cutoff—even though 45 percent at the elite eight currently qualify for free lunches.

*'I've got a new mandate from the voters. I have a new chancellor who is focused on **social justice**,' he said, referring to recently installed Schools Chancellor Richard Carranza.*

The article is rounded out with the emotional collectivist sentiment and anti-individualism of Assemblyman Charles Barron:

*"...It's about all of us rising—so **when an individual makes it, you have not made it until all of us have made it.**"*

All of this nonsense is nothing new for the social progressives who will stop at nothing to impose their perverted view of justice upon those of us who will be forced to fund just such destructive endeavors. In fact, this is how a 1938 National Education Association publication titled *The Purpose of Education in American Democracy* put it:

"...Education has, on the whole, been altogether too much concerned with facts, and too little concerned with values.... There should be a much greater concern with the

development of attitudes, interests, ideals and habits.... Our schools should give prizes not to the one who wins more credit for himself, but to the one who cooperates most effectively with others.... The educated citizen is a cooperating member of the world community.”[4]

It does not seem to occur to de Blasio (or it is simply inconvenient to admit it) that “injustice” and “discrimination” may have nothing at all to do with why the number of Asian students far outweighs the number of blacks, Hispanics and whites enrolled at these schools (according to a table provided in the *Post* article). Economist Thomas Sowell cautions that “Discrimination as an explanation of economic and social disparities may have [an]...emotional appeal for many”, but

“Neither in nature nor among human beings are either equal or randomly distributed outcomes automatic. On the contrary, grossly unequal distributions of outcomes are common, both in nature and among people, in circumstances where neither genes nor discrimination are involved.

What seems a more tenable conclusion is that, as economic historian David S. Landes put it, ‘The world has never been a level playing field.’ The idea that it would be a level playing field, if it were not for either genes or discrimination, is a preconception in defiance of both logic and facts. Nothing is easier to find than sins among human beings, but to automatically make those sins the sole, or even primary, cause of different outcomes among different peoples is to ignore many other reasons for those disparities.”[5]

At the heart of many discussions of disparities among individuals, groups and nations is the seemingly invincible fallacy that outcomes in human endeavors would be equal, or at least comparable or random, if there were no biased interventions, on the one hand, nor genetic deficiencies, on the other. This preconception, which spans the ideological spectrum, is in utter defiance of both logic and empirical evidence from around the world, and over millennia of recorded history.[6]

De Blasio quotes Psalm 106:3. The verse says, “Blessed are those who keep justice, and he who does righteousness at all times!”

So according to NYC's socialist mayor, to "keep justice" means to steal money from private citizens in order to fund an endless array of illegal, unbiblical and unconstitutional government programs, and, in this particular case, to raise "the total proportion of black and Hispanic students from 9 percent to 45 percent" so as to offset the apparently "unjust" Asian dominance among enrollees in the city's top schools. Somehow it is "just" to steal from those who rightfully earn something, be it academic achievement or private wealth, and give it to those who are "underrepresented" (just as long as you do it in the name of "diversity", of course). Sowell again:

"Even aside from any questions about differences in capabilities or potentialities, there are inescapable differences in what people want to do. Does anyone seriously believe that Asian American youngsters have as much interest in playing basketball as black youngsters have? Or does anyone doubt that the Asian youngsters' lesser interest in basketball may have something to do with the dearth of Asian Americans among professional basketball players?"

Differences in what individuals and groups want to do, and are prepared to prioritize, are too often ignored in many well-intentioned policies. The 'no child left behind' educational policies, for example, introduced during the administration of President George W. Bush, ignored the painful possibility that there was no such universal desire for education as implicitly assumed, and that some uninterested children's behavior prevented other children from learning."[7]

De Blasio's ridiculous "education plan" should, of course, surprise no one, since "social justice" is the name of the game and the NYC mayor is simply doing what progressivists have been doing for almost a century. It is more of the same coming from self-anointed government spokesmen devoted to promoting an inverted view of "justice". De Blasio strategically invokes the name of Jesus and various Scripture references to give the impression that his plan is based on a higher moral calling, a vision of the anointed, as it were. Murray Rothbard, himself no friend of Christianity, recounted how such tactics were used in the past to garner support for the progressive agenda:

"Many observers, indeed, reported in wonder at the strongly religious tone of the Progressive Party convention. Theodore Roosevelt's acceptance address was significantly entitled, 'A Confession of Faith,' and his words were punctuated by 'amens' and by a continual singing of Christian hymns by the assembled delegates."

They sang 'Onward, Christian Soldiers,' 'The Battle Hymn of the Republic,' and finally the revivalist hymn, 'Follow, Follow, We Will Follow Jesus,' except that 'Roosevelt' replaced the word 'Jesus' at every turn."[8]

What is more concerning than unregenerate politicians carrying on a tradition of invoking the name of Christ to further a particular social agenda as de Blasio did this past Sunday, is that professing *Christians* would invoke the name of Christ to further a particular social agenda, or even fall for this tactic of politicians and theological liberals, in effect conflating the gospel of salvation with social activism. Sadly, it is true that

"Social justice is all the rage these days. Even within the reformed camp, the balance between social concerns and the gospel is shifting much more quickly than one would have previously imagined. Social justice has, for all intents and purposes, eclipsed the pure gospel of historic Christianity so much so that we no longer know where the gospel story concludes, and its impact on me as a new person in Christ, in my culture, begins." [see *American Evangelicalism: In crisis and confusion*]

This trend can be traced back to the subversive theology of Walter Rauschenbusch (1816-1918):

"Rauschenbusch...insisted that the Kingdom of God is the Social Gospel.... All evangelical doctrines, with their emphasis upon the future life and individual salvation, were to be revised in terms of the idea of the Kingdom of God with its emphasis upon this life and the social salvation of the masses...."[9]

The Social Gospel...was...a dominant influence not only in Protestantism, but in the Progressivism of Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson and American liberalism in general in the early decades of the twentieth century.... It was the gospel which many political leaders of the day claimed as their own and on which many members of Congress, and other agencies of the state and federal governments, were nurtured....

It was the mainspring behind the formation of the Federal Council of Churches in 1908, for this organization was brought into being to be the voice of the Social

Gospel not only among the denominations but in national affairs as well....

In the name of progress, Protestants were being used to advance programs which were not only unconstitutional in character but represented a type of liberalism which was actually socialism, or even communism, in its basic philosophy.”[10]

In his extensive research on the Federal Council of Churches (FCC) in the early to mid-twentieth century, Martin Erdmann uncovers that

“Without adhering to basic Scriptural concepts...the Council’s social appeals were couched in biblical terminology. Although mentioning the sin problem frequently, it was usually in the context of sins against society rather than sin against God. Regeneration was masterfully redefined as a new social awareness. The substitutionary atonement of Christ upon the cross was deemed insignificant and was rarely if ever mentioned. The Reformation dictum, that humankind can find peace with God only by being justified by faith, was simply ignored as without relevance. The residue of evangelical concepts which could be found in their gospel messages were mostly based on Arminian theology. Some Council members favoured a semi-Pelagian or Pelagian approach in evangelism....[11]

As the New Deal program was made public in the period of March to June 1933, the FCC approved unreservedly the measures taken by Roosevelt. During the first two years of the Democratic administration, from 1933 to 1935, the enthusiasm of the Council’s leadership for the New Deal grew until it knew no bounds. President Albert Beaven challenged the churches to participate in the radical changes being effected in the political, industrial, and economic life of the nation....

Beaven...separated, for example, the right to own property from human rights. Questionable as this separation is, both in its logical and theological presuppositions, American liberalism has embraced it as the primary principle of its social and economic policy for over a century. It has exercised an irresistible attraction to all varieties of liberal thought.”[12]

The Federal Council believed that the establishment of a collectivist society in America would be the particular form in which the kingdom of God would appear on

earth.... A new social order in its emphasis on the class war was considered of much greater relevance to the majority of economically oppressed Americans than the message of the cross which was hardly, if ever, mentioned.”[13]

Both “social justice”, and the “social gospel”, are nothing other than various expressions of *socialism*, which is why the terms, concepts, and utopian ideals should be either avoided or refuted. Christians, of all people, should be able to see through the elitists’ nonsense. Bill de Blasio cares nothing for *individual* students’ *actual* achievement in academics. He is a collectivist, as his previous policies and inane socialistic babblings testify. This is simply another example of a corrupt criminal politician capitalizing on a culture’s obsession with social justice to suit his own political ends.

In wrapping up this brief criticism of the progressive, socialistic, unbiblical and unconstitutional ploys repeatedly thrust upon us by political and religious visionaries, an excerpt from Vladimir Bukovsky’s *To Build a Castle* may be of interest:

“This dream of absolute, universal equality is amazing, terrifying, and inhuman. And the moment it captures people’s minds, the result is mountains of corpses and rivers of blood, accompanied by attempts to straighten the stooped and shorten the tall.

I remember that one part of the psychiatric examination was a test for idiocy. The patient was given the following problem to solve: ‘Imagine a train crash. It is well known that the part of the train that suffers the most damage in such crashes is the carriage at the rear. How can you prevent that damage from taking place?’ The idiot’s usual reply is expected to be: Uncouple the last carriage. That strikes us as amusing, but just think, are the theory and practice of socialism much better?

Society, say the socialists, contains both the rich and the poor. The rich are getting richer and the poor poorer. What is to be done? Uncouple the last carriage, liquidate the rich, take away their wealth and distribute it among the poor. And they start to uncouple the carriages.

But there is always one carriage at the back, there are always richer and poorer, for society is like a magnet: there are always two poles. But does this discourage a true socialist? The main thing is to realize his dream; so the richest section of society is

liquidated first, and everyone rejoices because everyone gains from the share-out.

But the spoils are soon spent, and people start to notice inequality again — again there are rich and poor. So they uncouple the next carriage, and then the next, without end, because absolute equality has still not been achieved. Before you know it, the peasant who has two cows and a horse turns out to be in the last carriage and is pronounced a kulak and deported. Is it really surprising that whenever you get striving for equality and fraternity, the guillotine appears on the scene?

...It is difficult for man to resist this dream and this noble impulse, particularly for men who are impetuous and sincere. They are the first to start chopping heads off and, eventually, to have their own chopped off.”[14]

Take a stand against the rising tide of social justice in the church. Sign the *Statement on Social Justice and the Gospel*.

[1] https://youtu.be/SSHKeqG_dQ4?t=204

[2] Attanasio, Algar & Golding, *New York Post*, Monday, June 4, 217(201):1—5, 2018. See also <https://nypost.com/2018/06/06/de-blasios-plan-to-ditch-admission-test-for-top-high-schools-w-ins-approval/>

[3] Hmmm... funny how that so-called “separation of church and state” thing works. I wonder if Bethel Gospel Assembly had its 501(c)(3) tax exemption revoked due to Bill’s political proselytizing. Well, if the “Reverend” Al Sharpton can do it, why not de Blasio?

[4] As cited in: Cuddy, D.L., *The Road to Socialism and the New World Order*, Bible Belt Publishing, Oklahoma City, OK, 2008, p. 68.

[5] Sowell, T., *Discrimination and Disparities*, Basic Books, New York, NY, 2018, pp. 18—19.

[6] Sowell, pp. 100—101.

[7] Sowell, pp. 104—105.

[8] Rothbard, M.N., *The Progressive Era*, Mises Institute, Auburn, AL, 2017, p. 317.

[9] Singer, C.G., *A Theological Interpretation of American History* (4th ed.), Solid Ground Christian Books, Birmingham, AL, 2009, p. 158.

[10] Singer, pp. 160—161.

[11] Erdmann, M., *Building the Kingdom of God on Earth: The Churches' Contribution to Marshall Public Support for World Order and Peace, 1919-1945*, Wipf and Stock Publishers, Eugene, OR, 2005, p. 155.

[12] Erdmann, p. 158.

[13] Erdmann, p. 307.

[14] This quote was provided by Tom Woods in “Equality: the bloodiest idea of all time”
<https://mailchi.mp/tomwoods/htrd-318437?e=6a392015c6>

Header photo source

Share this:

- [Click to share on Twitter \(Opens in new window\)](#)
- [Click to share on Facebook \(Opens in new window\)](#)