

The very concept of "race" has more to do with biological evolution than it does to do with biblical anthropology. Since all men are descended from Adam and Eve, "race" is simply not a biblical concept. That is why I usually put quotes around the words "white" and "black". I use the terms for the purpose of communication but not because I think they are legitimate categories.[1]

Judging from many of the posts I took the time to wade through, it is clear that the Bible apparently does not inform the understanding of many in the social justice camp when it comes to "race".[2] Acts 17:25-27 says

"...He himself gives to all mankind life and breath and everything. And he made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their dwelling place, that they should seek God, and perhaps feel their way toward him and find him. Yet he is actually not far from each one of us...."

Since such race-obsessed 'reformed scholars' like Kyle J. Howard apparently refuse to accept what Scripture teaches on the subject, perhaps he might learn a thing or two from the unbeliever, Thomas Sowell. Since the words of Scripture are seemingly irrelevant to certain individuals within the social justice camp, Sowell's high melanin count might garner him some respectability among the race-obsessed.

"Why are different groups so disproportionately represented in so many times and places? Perhaps the simplest answer is that there was no reason to have expected them to be statistically similar in the first place. Geographical, historical, demographic, cultural, and other variables make the vision of an even or random distribution of groups one without foundation."[3]

I have referenced Sowell here and elsewhere in commenting on the ambiguity, equivocation, irrationality and emotive rhetoric of the social justice narrative because I value his clarity and careful analysis, and because it would be a bit difficult for Howard and his twitter comrades to accuse Sowell of being a white supremacist. Dr. Carl Wieland (founder of Creation Ministries International) made this observation regarding Sowell's research:

"...Though [Sowell] is not a Christian, I and several others I know among my colleagues regard Sowell as perhaps the most insightful student of humanity alive today. He is one of the few well-known public minds who has a reputation for dispassionately following evidence, regardless of whether that makes him popular with the academic 'herd' or not.

...I think Sowell should be compulsory reading for everyone trying to understand the forces that have helped shape our modern world."[4]

Howard would disagree, since Sowell is not likely to refer racial trauma victims to him for counseling.

Secondly, Sowell has been able to sift through the progressivist nonsense with far greater clarity than Christian social justice warriors, the latter having traded their powers of discernment for political correctness and an agenda to propel certain groups' victimhood status into eternity. Consider Sowell's commentary on the constant appeal to slavery:

"In the United States...many of the social problems of the contemporary black underclass are almost automatically attributed to 'a legacy of slavery.' The prevalence of fatherless families in the black ghettos, for example, has been widely explained by the lack of legally constituted families under slavery. But if one proceeds beyond plausibility and guilt to actually seek out the facts, an entirely different picture emerges.

*A hundred years ago, when blacks were just one generation out of slavery, the rate of marriage in the black population of the United States was slightly **higher** than that of the white population. Most black children were raised in two-parent families, even during the era of slavery, and for generations thereafter. The catastrophic decline of the black nuclear family began, like so many other social catastrophes in the United States, during the decade of the 1960s. Prior to the 1960s, the difference in marriage rates between black and white males was never as great as 5 percentage points. Yet, today, that difference is greater than 20 percentage points—and widening, even though the nuclear family is also beginning to decline among white Americans. Whatever the explanation for these changes, it lies much closer to today than to the era of slavery, however disappointing that may be to those who prefer to see social issues as moral melodramas."*[5]

In other words, if the institution of slavery is to be pointed to as the cause of all the social ills amongst "blacks", the disparities that Sowell addresses should have been much higher in the past (closer chronologically to the practice of slavery) than they are today. Instead, we see the opposite trend.

Sowell also rightly distinguishes between justice exacted by a court of law and the erroneous concept of justice as perpetuated by social justice warriors:

"...Human courts should not presume to dispense cosmic justice.[6]

One of the many contrasts between traditional justice and cosmic justice is that traditional justice involves the rules under which flesh-and-blood human beings interact, while cosmic justice encompasses not only contemporary individuals and groups, but also group abstractions extending over generations, or even centuries."[7]

Regarding current cries about "reparations" for crimes committed by one group of individuals (now deceased) against another group of individuals (also deceased), Sowell has this to say:

"...Where issues of group 'reparations' have been raised—reparations to blacks for slavery or to the indigenous American Indian population for the dispossession of their ancestors and the collateral damage that went with it [, here] again, the issue encompasses what can be called inter-temporal group abstractions, rather than simply flesh-and-blood contemporaries. Seldom is the claim made that black Americans alive at this moment are worse off than if their ancestors had been left in Africa. Any attempt to make that case with statistics on income, life expectancy, or numerous other variables would collapse like a house of cards. Ultimately, of course, what matters are not such objective data but how the individuals involved feel and react. Here no one can say—or rather, those who choose to make ringing denunciations cannot be conclusively contradicted by objective evidence, since objective evidence is irrelevant to how they feel. However, it may be worth noting that the number of contemporary black Americans who have immigrated to Africa does not begin to approach the number of contemporary Africans who have immigrated to the United States. Nevertheless, it remains painfully clear that those people who were torn from their

homes in Africa in centuries past and forcibly brought across the Atlantic in chains suffered not only horribly, but unjustly. Were they and their captors still alive, the reparations and the retribution owed would be staggering. Time and death, however, cheat us of such opportunities for justice, however galling that may be. We can, of course, create new injustices among our flesh-and-blood contemporaries for the sake of symbolic expiation, so that the son or daughter of a black doctor or executive can get into an elite college ahead of the son or daughter of a white factory worker or farmer, but only believers in the vision of cosmic justice are likely to take moral solace from that. We can only make our choices among alternatives actually available, and rectifying the past is not one of those options."[8]

Critical race theory, words, and the New Covenant

Black's Law Dictionary defines 'Critical Race Theory' this way:

"A reform movement within the legal profession, particularly within academia, whose adherents believe that the legal system has disempowered racial minorities; having adopted the term in 1989, critical race theorists observe that, even if the law is couched in neutral language, it cannot be neutral because those who fashioned it had their own subjective perspectives that, once enshrined in law, have disadvantaged minorities and even perpetuated racism."[9]

Do you want to know what really "perpetuates racism"? Social media posts like this:




Kyle J. Howard

@KyleJamesHoward

Follow



Many of us engage issue as men who've live under yoke of fear that our lives could be over if any white person wanted it to. All it would take is a simple claim & the white imagination would do the rest. When we engage, we do so despite it being costly.🤔



I Believe You, Despite It Being Costly: Sexual Abus...

kylejhoward.com

6:45 PM - 3 Oct 2018

2 Retweets 19 Likes



💬 1

↻ 2

❤ 19





Ray Chang

@tweetrachang

Follow



Over 4,000 men have signed
[@johnmacarthur](#)'s social justice
document.

This should grieve us all as it seeks to
promote a type of false unity based on
racial supremacy (though it will try and
deny it) while fundamentally ignoring the
call to love others as Christ loved us.

5:08 PM - 6 Sep 2018

39 Retweets 260 Likes



10

39

260





Kyle J. Howard
@KyleJamesHoward

Follow



A black Christian doesn't submit to powerful/influential white men telling him to shut up about racism and its impact within communities of color. They respond by saying, "YOU SOCIAL JUSTICE WARRIOR!"

Y'all do know that the heart & spirit behind that is "shut up, n* [REDACTED]" right?

7:03 AM - 4 Sep 2018

6 Retweets 81 Likes



14 6 81

These posts speak for themselves, and examples could be multiplied.

But what are we to make of the claim of critical race theory that "...even if the law is couched in neutral language, it cannot be neutral because those who fashioned it had their own subjective perspectives that, once enshrined in law, have disadvantaged minorities and even perpetuated racism"? Note that, consistent with postmodern thinking, words, apparently, cannot be trusted. A law "couched in neutral language" cannot be trusted to mean what it says because of an assumed and unproven hidden agenda of lawgivers collectively seeking to disadvantage minorities and perpetuate racism. That the world follows after such foolishness is no surprise, but Christian leaders should not be so suspicious of words.[10]

Tim Keller, whose worldview has unquestionably been shaped by Marxist Liberation

Theology, responded to the Statement on Social Justice and the Gospel, not by criticizing what it actually says, but what it "does". Like so many others who refuse to sign the Statement but can offer no definitive critique of its affirmations and denials, Keller just doesn't seem to like it because of how it might make someone feel.

"See, there's what it says—is it true, and then what is it trying to do.... What concerns me most about it is not so much what it's saying but what's it trying to do.... It's not so much what it says but what it does. It's trying to marginalize people who are talking about race and justice, it's trying to say you're really not biblical, and it's not fair in that sense. So that's the reason why—if someone starts to go down it with me and says, 'Would you agree with this? Would you agree with this?' I would say, 'You're looking at the level of what it says and not at the level of what it's doing. I think what it's trying to do is it's trying to say don't make this emphasis, don't worry about the poor, don't care about the injustice, it's not really that important, that's what it says. Even if I could agree with most of it, I don't like it, so that's gonna be my statement. It's what it's doing that I don't like" (source).

Forgive me for my lack of sophistication, but I was under the impression that words had meaning.

The late John Robbins called our day the 'Age of Irrationalism'. Without going on too much of a tangent, here's some proof that Robbins was right:

Tim Keller is an old-earthier. That is, he does not regard the Genesis creation narrative and the genealogical records in the Bible as contributing anything toward arriving at an approximate age of the earth. Instead, old-earthers insist that the rocks "tell" us they are billions of years old. So, according to Keller, objects—not propositions—tell us things, while words don't tell us anything, they do stuff.

So while Keller is reading rocks and watching words do whatever it is they do, the small remnant of rational humanity shouldn't have much difficulty comprehending **what the Statement actually says**, and find difficulty locating evidence that the drafters are saying "don't worry about the poor, don't care about injustice", as Keller alleges.

In all seriousness, it is important to emphasize that Keller is here admitting that it is not the

content of the Statement that bothers him but how it makes him or others feel. Sadly, it seems he is not the only one to have such an objection to the Statement. Al Mohler says:

"I can't associate with any assertion that we do not have a massive problem in the society and in the church with claims of racial superiority and with historic patterns of claims of white racial superiority, and with the fact that remnants and ongoing manifestations of those claims of white racial superiority continue.

...I don't believe I could possibly, honestly give assent to a Statement that could be read and has been interpreted by some as denying this reality and the continuing urgency of this reality" (source).

Thankfully, Dr. Mohler is not reading rocks and watching words do a dance, but he likewise cannot sign the Statement, and apparently not because he rejects points of doctrine articulated therein. It is because the Statement *"could be read and has been interpreted by some"* as denying the ever-present reality of racial superiority in the church. Not unlike Keller, Mohler doesn't seem to be able to point to specific racist elements embedded in the Statement, but is apparently concerned about how it *"could be read"*. But not only should the Statement be taken to mean what it actually says, Mohler of all people is at a special advantage in that he knows many of the framers of the document personally, and I am truly doubtful that he believes their intention was to either promote racism or hide some known, ongoing presence of white supremacy in evangelicalism.

I would not urge that Dr. Mohler go against his conscience and sign a Statement with which he cannot *"possibly, honestly give assent"* (even though, again, his reservations appear to have nothing to do with the Statement's actual contents). I will urge, however, that Dr. Mohler provide examples—even one example—to sustain the allegation that there exists today in the church *"remnants and ongoing manifestations of claims of white racial superiority."* Surely, if white supremacy is systemic, if it constitutes a *"massive problem in the church"*, it should be easy to provide *numerous* examples of such manifestations. Yet, despite this recurring mantra of those in the social justice camp (and Mohler's apparent capitulation to that claim), we have yet to be shown where such specific cases exist in contemporary evangelicalism.

Here's my challenge to Dr. Mohler: Please provide evidence of ongoing manifestations of white racial superiority. Then, when you have provided us with at least one specific example

of white supremacy in the church and/or evangelical institutions (which still would not constitute a *systemic* problem) please confront that individual or group of individuals and *call that party to repentance*. Exhort those evangelical white supremacists to acknowledge and admit their sin and turn from their wicked ways.

If no specific examples can be provided of such rampant white supremacy in the church, then Dr. Mohler and the social justice twitter twits should be called on to retract their sweeping allegations toward the drafters of the **Statement** and other evangelicals who refuse to accept such unsubstantiated indictments against the bride of Christ in the twenty-first century.

To be sure, I am not suggesting that none of the Christians in the social justice camp have experienced some form of racism from another professing Christian. I am not suggesting that racism has been eradicated from society. But the fact that racism still exists among men is not the point. So does sodomy, which has probably been around even longer than racism. No particular sin is going to disappear from this fallen and sin-cursed creation (Rom. 8:22). You're going to have to wait for the New Heavens and New Earth in order to experience such an environment. The point is that allegations of systemic racism in the year of our Lord 2018 rampant within the body of Christ are being spread without reservation and without evidence. Someone needs to inform these accusers that, unlike economic inequality, bearing false witness actually *is* a form of injustice.

In the name of equality, the only thing the SJWs are being indiscriminate about is their broad-brush allegations that white evangelicals are hard-wired to discriminate against minorities.

How about this: If you are a Christian of *any color* and you harbor racist thoughts and attitudes, you need to repent. If you are truly born again, pray that God would hasten your sanctification and purge the sin of racism from your heart. But, if you are a Christian of *any color* and are not harboring racist thoughts and attitudes, please do not repent on behalf of your cells and their failure to produce an abundance of melanin, for to do so would be to accuse God of making a mistake when He knit you together in your mother's womb (Ps. 139:13).

I am also not suggesting that every proponent of this movement has reduced the biblical gospel to social reform and turned evangelism into political activism. But even those who appear to grasp the gospel of grace and likely possess an orthodox theology appear to be

deficient in at least two things: One, they fail to understand that all of humanity came from Adam and Eve. And two, the Old Covenant—which was made between God and an ethnic, national elect people for a specific purpose (which did not limit eternal salvation to physical descendants of Abraham only)—was superseded by the New Covenant—tearing down any distinctions between ethnic Jew and Gentile and secured salvation for all of God's elect, from *every tribe, tongue, people and nation* (Rev. 5:9). However accurate their theology may be at other points, such social justice warriors simply cannot grasp (or are unwilling to accept) this key component of the New Covenant, sufficient to undermine the entirety of their "John MacArthur is a racist" campaign.

All calls for separating from "white evangelical spaces" and seeking out churches with black leadership, or demanding that the collective majority of white folk repent of their whiteness and/or the sins of others long deceased, cannot find their justification in the Scriptures, and are in fact, racist. Such ideas are rooted in the social gospel and liberation theology, not the biblical gospel and Christian theology, things which Howard should know a few things about.



Howard boasts of his three earned theological degrees but felt the need to also study "our own history and the global church" so that he could minister in "non-evangelical spaces". I'm going to go out on a limb and guess that Howard's use of the word "our" in this context is not a reference to church history, or the history of Adam's race, but to the so-called "black" race. So it would seem, studying "*our* own history" and ministering in "non-

evangelical spaces" culminates in the perpetuation of a victimhood mentality despite biblical teaching to the contrary.

If Howard's "ministry" involves emphasizing hard and fast distinctions among "races" and perpetuating division between "oppressed races" and the "oppressor race", perhaps he should consider tearing up his theological degrees and take up a study of evolution or Marxism, you know, something more supportive of his psychologized, racist worldview. In light of the gospel, no such class or skin color distinctions can be justified.

Are Christian leaders like Keller and Mohler able to see how identifying with one's "race" rather than one's identity in Christ is completely unbiblical, or have they fallen for the guilt manipulation tactics under the guise of "social justice"?

"Racism is one of the most primitive forms of collectivism; its history is almost as old as mankind.

...The Biblical message is one Gospel for all, both Jews and Greeks: one Lord, one faith, one baptism. According to the Bible, the only thing that matters is not one's ancestry, race, or heritage, but one's ideas: one's faith. Ideas—not blood, genes, heritage or ancestry—make the man. As Scripture says, a man is what he thinks (Proverbs 23:7), not what he eats or who his granddaddy was.

[In writing to Philemon and the church in his house] Paul and Timothy are dealing with people of diverse races, backgrounds, and economic status on the basis of their ideas: the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Their community is one based on shared propositions, not shared family or national histories. Their fellowship is in the truth (which is only and always propositional), not in blood. Timothy and Paul address or call each other and all these people 'beloved' and 'brothers.' What makes them beloved brothers is not a common bloodline or ethnicity or nation, but their common faith, their common doctrine, the Gospel of Jesus Christ."[11]

[Part 3]

[1] The fact that various cultures exist throughout the world is obvious, but "culture" and "race" are two completely different concepts.

[2] The Bible clearly does not inform their understanding of economics either, but I will not take that subject up in this post.

[3] Sowell, *The Quest for Cosmic Justice*, Touchstone, New York, NY, 1999 p. 37.

[4] Wieland, C., *One Human Family: The Bible, Science, Race & Culture*, Creation Ministries International, Powder Springs, GA, 2011, p. 246.

[5] Sowell, ref. 3 pp. 16—17.

[6] Sowell, ref. 3, p. 18.

[7] Sowell, ref. 3, p. 31.

[8] Sowell, ref. 3, pp. 31—32.

[9] Garner, B.A. (ed.), *Black's Law Dictionary*, West Group, 1996, p. 159.

[10] See Clark, G.H., *Language and Theology*, The Trinity Foundation, Unicoi, TN, 1980.

[11] Robbins, J.W., *Christianity and Slavery: Paul's Letter to Philemon*, The Trinity Foundation, Unicoi, TN, 2007, pp. 15—16.

Share this:

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