

Critical Race Theory Worldviews and Critical Theories

I. Introduction

- A. Critical Race Theory is the direct result of Critical Theory. As previously discussed, Critical Theory sets up the framework and skeleton, it is up to the people to put on the meat. Critical Race Theory was born out of a movement within the legal realm, and eventually has made its way to all facets of society and every institution. Whenever you hear the phrase “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion”, you have found somewhere Critical Race Theory has reached.
- B. Critical Race Theory is an intellectual movement, ideological framework, and worldview in which to examine current power structures and dynamics in societies and to identify and root out means of racism within them.
- C. Like its foundation of Critical Theory, Critical Race Theory establishes its worldview in terms of power dynamics and privilege. Everything in culture is grouped into categories of oppressed (people of color) and oppressors (whites). To better understand the way in which this practically works, we must look at the origins of Critical Race Theory.

II. Origins

- A. Critical Race Theory began, as an outgrowth of what is known as Critical Legal Studies, in the 1980s.
- B. Critical Legal Studies was a movement that began in the 1970s and was a critique on the legal system. It essentially accused the legal system of social bias and that the laws were created for the benefit of those who created them in the first place. “As such, CLS states that the law supports a power dynamic which favors the historically privileged and disadvantages the historically underprivileged. CLS finds that the wealthy and the powerful use the law as an instrument for oppression in order to maintain their place in hierarchy. Many in the CLS movement want to overturn the hierarchical structures of modern society and they focus on the law as a tool in achieving this goal.”¹

¹ https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/critical_legal_theory

- C. However, Critical Race Theory saw a deficiency within Critical Legal Studies. Founders, such as Alan D. Freeman and Derrick Bell grew frustrated with perceived little change from the Civil Rights movement and likewise criticised Critical Legal Studies as not recognizing the centrality of race within law. ²
- D. Thus, Critical Race Theory began as a study within the context of law, as the creators were all law professors or practitioners at the time. Their focus was not merely reform, but a complete radical change from the current system that they believed was unfixable. Critical Race Theory quickly became a means of activism and is the underlying foundation of the social justice movement that we see today. Much of the core components of the social justice movement find their roots within Critical Race Theory and its primary tenets.
- E. Derrick Bell is often touted as the face of Critical Race Theory. Derrick Bell was an American lawyer in the 1970s and became the first african american tenured law professor at Harvard. In 1992, Derrick Bell would leave Harvard over the lack of representation amongst the staff at the school, particularly women of color. ³ “In 1980, Bell was appointed dean of the University of Oregon School of Law. He resigned in protest five years later after an Asian woman was denied tenure. He returned to Harvard to teach in 1986 and later led a five-day sit-in in his office to protest the school’s failure to grant tenure to two professors whose work involved critical race theory.” ⁴
- F. The reason his time at school is important is because Critical Race Theory would really find its footing within the context of education. As Derrick Bell and others began to teach Critical Race Theory, students would listen and adopt this worldview, go on to become teachers themselves in life, and teach this worldview to others. More and more institutions of education would go on to adopt policies regarding Critical Race Theory. This is why you see many schools setting up “equity councils” and hiring staff to determine if policies, procedures, and practices at a school or organization are inherently racist and biased against people of color.
- G. From the National School Boards Association “We affirm in our actions that each student can, will, and shall learn. We recognize that based on factors including but not limited to disability, race, ethnicity, and socio-economic status, students are deprived of equitable educational

² Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993, p. 6

³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Derrick_Bell

⁴ <https://today.law.harvard.edu/derrick-bell-1930-2011/>

opportunities. Educational equity is the intentional allocation of resources, instruction, and opportunities according to need, requiring that discriminatory practices, prejudices, and beliefs be identified and eradicated.”⁵

- H. From the study of law into education, Critical Race Theory found its legitimacy within the realm of academics. Specifically, the publishing of studies in regards to Critical Race Theory and its relationship into every facet of society, were given marks of approval, credited, and published in scientific review journals. Published studies are a big deal and often have to go through a rigorous process of being peer reviewed before a journal will even accept the study, let alone publish it and distribute it to other colleagues and those that study in a certain field. The act of publishing material often gives great credibility to the study and especially the findings of such a study.
- I. Critical Race Theory papers were beginning to be accepted, peer reviewed, and then published in major and credible scientific journals and other academic sources. These studies have given activists the credibility required in order to have “scholarly” conversations in protests, debates, talks, and other forms of ideological dissemination. Once these studies became published, it would open the floodgates for many others, and eventually fields of study into each facet and niche within Critical Race Theory. It is now possible to major in and become a professor in “Whiteness Studies”, which is “a growing field of scholarship whose aim is to reveal the invisible structures that produce and reproduce white supremacy and privilege” as an example.⁶

III. Foundations

- A. Since Critical Race Theory is the “meat” upon the framework/skeleton of Critical Theory, much of the same foundations are present. However, there are nuances to Critical Race Theory’s foundations that are worth identifying and expressing as we begin to move through the nuances of Critical Race Theory and Social Justice in ensuing classes.

⁵ <https://www.nsba.org/Advocacy/Equity>

⁶ <https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-5>

1. Race Still Matters:

a) One of the primary tenets of Critical Race Theory is that race still matters. Remember, this movement was born out of Critical Legal Studies and critiqued it for not recognizing the centrality of race within these legal biases. Critical Race Theory cannot exist without the conversation and preservation of race as a legitimate identifier within society. Within Critical Race Theory, race is central and paramount, especially in identifying who is an oppressor and who is oppressed. A clear cut means of understanding this is grasping that within the worldview of Critical Race Theory, all white people are oppressors and all people of color are oppressed, especially black people. From scholars within the Critical Race Theory field, "All whites are racist in this [systemic] use of the term because we benefit from systemic white privilege."⁷

2. Centrality of Narrative and Storytelling as a Method of Analysis:

a) The second tenet of Critical Race Theory is similar to the tenet of Critical Theory called "Lived Experience". This tenet of Critical Race Theory is typically called "Storytelling" or "Counter-Storytelling" and is used as a means of voicing the lived experiences of people of color as a counter to perceived usage of data that may suggest the contrary to their experience of racism. In other words, if a study appears that says this country, for example, isn't as racist as people say it is, it is then up to "Storytellers" to tell their stories of how they have experienced racism. It is essentially the method in which the narrative of lived and experienced racism is paramount to anything that may be contrary to that. Critical Race Theory contends that this method of storytelling is as factual, relevant, and empirical as any other form of data, and inherently cannot be biased or wrong. "In addition to counterstories being a theoretical contribution of CRT, they are also a methodology of sorts that challenges discrimination and works toward social justice by 'talking back' to rationalist and social-scientific research that supports racialized and marginalizing notions about people

⁷ Critical Race Theory - White Paper - Antonio Tomas De La Garza and Kent A Ono.

of color...Counterstories rely on the power of people's 'voices'...'voice' results from the shared experiences of the structures of systems of power. People of color are unified (not essentialized) by their experiences of navigating the structures of power that marginalize them." ⁸

3. A Critique of Liberalism:

- a) Liberalism defined here is "a political and economic doctrine that emphasizes individual autonomy, equality of opportunity, and the protection of individual rights (primarily to life, liberty, and property), originally against the state and later against both the state and private economic actors, including businesses." ⁹ Critical Race Theory does not critique liberalism in aspects of progressivism, but rather in reaction to liberals focused more on incremental changes rather a total societal shift.
- b) Remember, founders of Critical Race Theory were impatient with the progress of society following the Civil Rights movement. In his book, Racial Realism, Derrick Bell even argues "that people of color ought to abandon the ideal of equality as it is impossible to attain in the United States. Instead, people of color should seek to confront their victimizers and recognize that the fight itself is a manifestation of our humanity which survives and grows stronger through resistance to oppression, even if that oppression is never overcome." ¹⁰ Alan Freeman in a talk titled "Race, Class, and the Contradictions of Affirmative Action" said, "The theme for today's panel grew out of my dissatisfaction with the way people on the left have dealt with the question of racism. Racism has been discussed as just another form of oppression. Slogans such as "End Racism, Sexism, and the Oppression of Minorities" are offered without an effort to penetrate the issues relating to the interdependence of these problems and problems relating to the perpetuation and maintenance of the class structure generally. Problems of interdependence, once considered, may well affect one's strategic choices, or

⁸ Critical Race Theory - White Paper - Antonio Tomas De La Garza and Kent A Ono.

⁹ <https://www.britannica.com/topic/liberalism>

¹⁰ Racial Realism, Derrick Bell, p.381

remedial programs, or efforts at struggle. Such problems, then, are the target of my questions this afternoon.”¹¹

- c) Within the ensuing talk, he would go on to criticize how each prevailing view of racism of his day ultimately missed the core of how Critical Race Theory viewed racism. What may not be understood is that proponents of Critical Race Theory argue that any action to end racism is disguised by oppressors to satiate the woes of the oppressed, which brings us to another tenet of Critical Race Theory.

4. Interest Convergence:

- a) This tenet of Critical Race Theory explains that white people are often the main benefactors of any change within society. As stated before in the talk produced by Alan Freeman, he went on to say, “An adequate contemporary theory of racism must explain both the progressive efforts that have been accepted, and the tenacity with which the conditions associated with racism remain in place. Such a theory would offer a context for understanding the affirmative action issue. I suggest, contrary to some of the traditional Marxist views of racism, that at least since the 1950's it has been in the interest of America's ruling classes to pretend to be ending racism in this country.” Within the scope of Critical Race Theory, proponents argue that Affirmative Action ultimately led to the benefit of white people rather than people of color.
- b) Within this tenet, Interest Convergence, Critical Race Theory posits that in every and all cases in which the oppressive whites attempts to deal with the issues of racism, it will always be for the benefit of themselves rather than people of color. Alan Freeman would go on to say, “From this perspective, the goal of civil rights law is to offer a credible measure of tangible progress without in any way disturbing class structure generally. The more specific version of what would be in the interest of the ruling classes would be, to use a cumbersome but accurate phrase, to “bourgeoisify” a sufficient number of minority people in order to transform

¹¹ Alan Freeman, Race, Class, and the Contradictions of Affirmative Action, p. 270
<https://escholarship.org/content/qt71n8n36k/qt71n8n36k.pdf?t=nrwp36>

those people into active, visible, legitimators of the underlying and basically unchanged social structure. “¹²

- c) One of the major issues with this ought to be apparent. Even within this worldview, there is no true “allyship” and more importantly, no true and total repentance. This will play a greater role in our discussion of the Social Justice Gospel.

5. Commitment to Social Justice:

- a) “Critical Race Theory scholarship is often referred to as a political and intellectual movement; as such, many CRT theorists position themselves in opposition to dominant ideological and discursive frames.”¹³
- b) Like Critical Theory’s tenant of eradicating all instances of oppression in human society as the primary duty of humanity, Critical Race Theory is exercised and applied in all forms of activism in regards to Social Justice. You cannot ultimately be a proponent of Critical Race Theory if you are not presently engaging in a form of activism and seeking societal transformation in your daily existence. No one can usually and naturally always be in a state of “activism”, however the idea carries that Social Justice is paramount and ongoing.
- c) Because the oppression of white people will always persist unless they are torn from their positions of power or thus have proven themselves to be 100% unbiased allies who have zero interest in their own benefit, Social Justice will remain ongoing. Society can always be a little more just, a little more equal, a little more inclusive, and so the commitment to Social Justice is ongoing as well. This was also a core basis for how Derrick Bell and his colleagues began their work, “Rather than continue to place their faith in reform through the legal system, CRT’s founders began to use their scholarly work as a form of activism.”¹⁴

¹² Alan Freeman, *Race, Class, and the Contradictions of Affirmative Action*, p. 273
<https://escholarship.org/content/qt71n8n36k/qt71n8n36k.pdf?t=nrwp36>

¹³ Critical Race Theory - White Paper - Antonio Tomas De La Garza and Kent A Ono.

¹⁴ Ibid.,

6. The Importance of Interdisciplinary Means:

- a) Critical Race Theory is not focused solely on racism within the legal system. Critical Race Theory seeks to demonstrate that the same prejudice, racism, and oppression exists in all forms of society and its institutions. That requires that Critical Race Theory branch out from the legal realm into the education, policy, culture, music, religion, etc. Remember, Critical Theory was based on the position that Marxism and Karl Marx fell short of identifying the root issue and likewise identifying the core solution. For Karl Marx, it was about destroying capitalism in favor of socialism. Critical Theorists argued that oppression was in culture through hegemonic pillars of that culture. Their solution was to invade all forms of society and to overturn it with the oppressed cultural narrative. For Critical Race Theory, in careful parallels to Critical Theory, it is their job to identify whiteness in all of American Society. Once they prove that whiteness indeed has established the cultural hegemony and is being oppressive, the real work can start.
- b) So, Critical Race Theory is never just concerned with just one area of focus, it is concerned with all of society. That is why the issue of power dynamics is so pervasive. Critical Race Theorists are convinced that everything oppressive in America is by nature oppressive due to its intrinsic link with whiteness. To be American in the hegemonic sense is to be white and to be oppressive.

7. Whiteness as Property:

- a) "Following the period of slavery and conquest, whiteness became the basis of racialized privilege - a type of status in which white racial identity provided the basis for allocating societal benefits both private and public in character. These arrangements were ratified and legitimated in law as a type of status property. Even as legal segregation was overturned, whiteness as property continued to serve as a barrier to effective change as the system of racial classification operated to protect entrenched power."
- b) Whiteness then is an object that can be protected. Essentially, white people will have their privilege, whether explicitly codified in law or not.

- c) Why this is a core tenet of Critical Race Theory, is that whiteness is the object of focus in which proponents seek to drive out of all forms of power and authority. Since white privilege is pervasive and overbearing, then it is the duty of Critical Race Theorists and social justicians to rid whiteness from this society and do that by the complete upheaval of it from all of society and to replace it, not regulate it or reform it, with that which is more equal to all shades of humans.

IV. End State

- A. Like with all ideologies that talk about transforming the world, there is an ultimate end state to the work of Critical Race Theory. As previously discussed, Critical Theory's ultimate end state is never explicitly stated, however the effects of such a framework are easily seen.
- B. Critical Race Theory's work will never be done as long as racism exists. In the context of America the end goal is a total reconstitution of this nation and its institutions. Any hint of "whiteness" appearing within any institution or organization must be ground flat and recreated from the ground up with people of color and their oppression in mind.
- C. This is why you see that even after major steps have been made in favor of Critical Race Theory's view, in terms of equity and inclusive, reform of company policies, training and education being widespread, councils and boards specifically designed to examine organizations and schools (for instance) and their policies, months dedicated to Black History, LGBTQ, and other races history are instituted in National Holidays, it still isn't enough.
- D. To be clear, in instances of protest that spring out at the death of a person of color by the hands of police, are not necessarily to be frowned upon because people are, by their national right, able to protest such matters. it is the underlying intention of organization's leaders to propagate their agenda and ideology through these instances.
- E. It is not fair to state that all Black Lives Matter protests are actively engaging in Critical Race Theory by their volitional will. There undoubtedly are many who have never even heard of the term. However, organizational leaders know exactly what they are doing by their own testimony. Articles and interviews of BLM leaders, for example, have clearly stated their agendas.

- F. Patrisse Cullors, a co-founder of Black Lives Matter, stated that “The first thing, I think, is that we actually do have an ideological frame. Myself and Alicia in particular are trained organizers. We are trained Marxists. We are super-versed on, sort of, ideological theories. And I think that what we really tried to do is build a movement that could be utilized by many, many black folk...”¹⁵
- G. These same leaders also call their movement a spiritual one, “Part of our calling as people who do this work for Black lives is to lift our people up, both in their living, but also in their death, the need to lift our folks up feels so incredibly spirit-driven for me... Uplifting the names of victims goes beyond creating hashtags...It is literally almost resurrecting a spirit so they can work through us to get the work that we need to get done.”¹⁶
- H. Perhaps one of the more dangerous underlying issues, however, may be indeed the foundation of Critical Race Theory being rooted in Marxism. Remember, Marxism states that the ultimate end of these epochs is revolution. We are in the midst of a cultural revolution. The next step after that is a physical one, should God allow and have ordained one to exist.

V. Critical Race Theory’s Conflicts with Biblical Truth

- A. While there are measures of truth to Critical Race Theory, there are many more conflicts with Biblical Truth. Critical Race Theory is fraught with assumptions that must first be true in order for their theory to hold. Additionally, Critical Race Theory’s terms may be familiar but the way in which they define these terms stand in contrast to the bible.
- B. Sin of Whiteness vs Original Sin:
 1. Critical Race Theory basis on moral wrong is predicated on whiteness inherently being oppressive specifically to, and only to, people of color. To be white is inherently to be in sin and to be sinful. All aspects of American society are also bathed in this sin of whiteness, since all institutions are built upon white people’s racism and oppression against people of color.
 2. However, the Bible speaks of nothing in regards to the sin of whiteness. Whiteness is not an act of sin. Regardless of potential rebuttals of, “whiteness is a term to characterize a specific form of racism”, denies the central point that the Bible has defined sin for us, and whiteness does not exist. Additionally, charges laid on

¹⁵ <https://nypost.com/2020/06/25/blm-co-founder-describes-herself-as-trained-marxist/>

¹⁶ <https://religionnews.com/2020/06/15/why-black-lives-matter-is-a-spiritual-movement-says-blm-co-founder-patrisse-cullors/>

people for perceived acts of racism are ultimately unverifiable in the majority of cases. How is one to determine whether something is inherently and definitionally racist? What really is racism? Is racism only a one way street of whites against people of color? If so, then is there at all a remedy for such sin? Does the bible even speak on racism?

3. The fact remains that the Bible does not label racism in any of its verses. Race is not a legitimate biblical category. Race is a social category created by humans, but the Bible does not recognize race on the basis of skin color. The Bible does talk about tribes and nations, peoples, and countries. But skin color is never an identifier for a specific group of people. What the Bible does speak against is prejudice. Specifically, prejudice is a sin when it is unjustified. Here is an example of a blanket statement made upon a whole people group in the bible.
 - a) Titus 1:12-13 “ One of them, a prophet of their own, said, ‘Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons.’ This testimony is true. For this reason reprimand them severely so that they may be sound in the faith,”
 - b) Cretans, not cretins, is simply the name of people who were citizens of Crete. Whether we as readers would know or not, Cretans had a reputation of being evil lazy liars. Was it wrong for Paul to give such a statement in the first place? No. Paul in this passage was identifying the type of people Titus was going to shepherd and have to pick from to establish some as elders in churches he would establish there. The major point was to demonstrate the type of person you aren’t to be in the midst of the culture in order to be distinct from them as born again believers.
4. Prejudice becomes sinful when we cast judgement prior to gaining knowledge for the purpose of using that to show inequity to that person. In other words, you treat someone worse or better based on that pre-judgement.
 - a) James 2 tells us not to show any partiality and gives the example of putting a rich man in the best seat during a worship service and putting the poor beggar in an unhonorable seat. Both types of prejudice were wrong, both demonstrated partiality, and both are sinful.

5. Lastly, the Bible only characterises people by “race” in one way, with two subcategories. Race is to mean all of humankind. We are all stamped with the same image of God (Genesis 1:26-28). In Genesis 11, during the building of the tower of Babel, God went down causing a great confusion among the human race (man) by mixing up their language. They could no longer understand each other because they were all speaking different earthly tongues. After that happened, God scattered them to various places. What initially separated humans with each other was not skin tone, it was language. But even before that, Cain killed his brother Abel with hate in his heart and forethought. It indeed was the first murder in all the earth and it was committed because Cain was evil and of the evil one (1 John 3:12) and hated his brother for Abel’s good deeds before God being accepted and his rejected. God even put enmity between Adam and his wife Eve.
6. This brings us to Romans 5 in Paul’s discourses of the act of sin in Adam and the act of righteousness in Christ. We are all human beings made in God’s image, but some are in the family of Adam and others in Christ. Romans 5:12 “Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all mankind, because all sinned” and Romans 5:15 “But the gracious gift is not like the offense. For if by the offense of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, overflow to the many.”
7. Race is biologically non-existent.
 - a) A Researcher by the name of Elizabeth Kolbert wrote an article titled “There Is No Scientific Basis for Race - It’s A Made Up Label”. In this article, she demonstrates that the “race” label has no basis in genetics. “Researchers who have since looked at people at the genetic level now say that the whole category of race is misconceived. Indeed, when scientists set out to assemble the first complete human genome, which was a composite of several individuals, they deliberately gathered samples from people who self-identified as members of different races. In June 2000, when the results were announced at a White House ceremony, Craig Venter, a pioneer of DNA sequencing, observed, ‘The concept of race has no genetic or scientific basis’By analyzing the genes of present-day Africans,

researchers have concluded that the Khoe-San, who now live in southern Africa, represent one of the oldest branches of the human family tree. The Pygmies of central Africa also have a very long history as a distinct group. What this means is that the deepest splits in the human family aren't between what are usually thought of as different races—whites, say, or blacks or Asians or Native Americans. They're between African populations such as the Khoe-San and the Pygmies...All non-Africans today, the genetics tells us, are descended from a few thousand humans who left Africa..."¹⁷

- b) While much of the article relies on information in an evolutionary sense, oftentimes we see the "evolutionary argument" speak of biblical events. "In what was, relatively speaking, a great rush, the offspring of all these migrants dispersed around the world."¹⁸
8. This brings us to the context of the church. The identifier of black and white, asian or hispanic, may be useful to some in the world, but the church is different. The prime verses are Paul's declarations in Galatians 3:27-28 "For all of you who were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" and again in Colossians 3:10-11 "and have put on the new *self*, which is being renewed to a true knowledge according to the image of the One who created it—a *renewal* in which there is no *distinction between* Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, *and* free, but Christ is all, and in all." This inscencence upon calling each other your black brothers in Christ or white sisters in Christ, I fear I must say, is unbiblical and holds you bound to these ties that are no longer yours in Christ. You may be earthly citizens of America, in one sense, like Paul who claimed his roman citizenship when he felt necessary, but that same Paul would also say in Philippians 3:20-21 "For our citizenship is in heaven, from which we also eagerly wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; who will transform the body of our lowly condition into conformity with His glorious body, by the exertion of the power that He has even to subject all things to Himself."

¹⁷ <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/2018/04/race-genetics-science-africa/>

¹⁸ *Ibid.*,

C. Commitment to Social Justice vs Commitment to the Gospel:

1. Critical Race Theorists commitment to Social Justice and cultural reform is not compatible with a commitment to spreading the gospel. This is not to say that social reform is completely useless or unhelpful, nor is it to say that social reform doesn't help people to some degree. But it is this targeted focus of Critical Race Theory that what must come first is social reform, and a Christian cannot engage in that mentality. The emphasis of the Bible is the spreading of the gospel. The consequence of that gospel is that Christians will take care of each other and also those of the world, as they are able too.
2. For example, we are for justice, but justice as defined by the Bible. We are for societal reform, but we know that any reform is only lasting when it's through the changed hearts of people by the only gospel that can save and change a person. What would it profit the world if peace on earth was gained, yet all their souls were lost?
3. Any movement that does not have Christ and His gospel at the center is destined to eventually fall. What proponents of Critical Race Theory don't grasp, is the power of the gospel. If someone says "we must change society, then we can worry about giving them the gospel next" makes the gospel secondary to social justice. True justice is not accomplished without the gospel, and we cannot understand true justice if we ignore what the bible says.
4. Many will use the verse of Micah 6:8 "He has told you, O man, what is good. And what does the LORD require of you, but to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?" A powerfully profound and practical verse, but it is hastily stapled to the social justice movement as if that is what God intended to mean when the Bible says "do justice". As we will discover more in depth in a later lesson, biblical justice at its core, as was stated in the previous point, impartiality.
5. Exodus 23:1-3 is a heavy example, ""You shall not give a false report; do not join your hand with a wicked person to be a malicious witness. You shall not follow the crowd in doing evil, nor shall you testify in a dispute so as to join together with a crowd in order to pervert *justice*; nor shall you show favor to a poor person in his dispute."
 - a) We often can easily understand a rich man paying off a judge with a bribe to get his way, and would rightfully call

that injustice. But here the Bible stresses the balance and even goes as far as to say about the poor, “nor shall you show favor to a poor person in his dispute.”

- b) The idea carried here should be evident. In matters of civil dispute, even if the person is poor, we are not to show impartiality to their case as if they are innocent just because of the *social standing*.
6. Social Justice perverts this, and states that simply on the basis of the minority status of people of color, then their case must be heard in a different light, every time. Facts are secondary, evidence may be contrary but ultimately cannot be used because they have a different shade of skin color. We are also likewise not to favor those of whiter shades of skin color simply because of their social standing as well. Before God’s court of justice, all are equal, and all will be dealt with impartiality, both “the great and the small” (Revelation 20:12)
 7. This point cannot be missed. And even more so, God is first concerned about their spiritual status. You may ask “so if I see a hurting person in the street do I have to give them the gospel before I help them off the ground”? Of course not and that is not what is being advocated for. The good samaritan saw the bleeding and dying man and helped him. But don’t misunderstand the point of that passage. Jesus was addressing religious hypocrites who due to their religious standard would’ve passed over the dying man, as evidenced in the parable. But it doesn’t follow that because the man’s wounds were dressed, that the gospel takes a back seat. This story is meant to be so incredibly lavish that anyone who reads it goes, “I can’t do that!” The point of the parable was for Jesus to demonstrate to the man who asked the question that he wasn’t good enough to get into eternal life. It wasn’t to tell us to go give money to those in need and to feed them, we are given commands to have compassion and to care for people elsewhere, but this parable was to demonstrate the lavish and outlandish love required for someone to fulfill the command to love God and to love your neighbor. The point was to show everyone, “you can’t love like this, that’s why you need to be saved.”
 8. The Bible does tell us to care for the widow and the poor (James 1:27), to stand up for justice and rebuke the oppressor (Isaiah 1:17), and we are also told not to show favoritism to the poor nor the

great (Leviticus 19:15). Peter when he met the man Cornelius as God was demonstrating that He was going to save Gentiles, Peter after hearing the testimony of Cornelius said in Acts 10:34-35 " ...“I most certainly understand *now* that God is not one to show partiality, but in every nation the one who fears Him and does what is right is acceptable to Him.” Not even in salvation does God show partiality!

9. The cause of the Critical Race Theorist is one of partiality. It demonstrates that all white people in America are judged in prejudice for the color of their skin to be forever condemned as oppressors, and likewise that all people of color are destined to be oppressed and viewed as lesser beings in society. Social justice will not save a single soul from an eternity in hell. Do not weaken the gospel because it “doesn’t end racism in America today, social justice does.” Any prejudiced man or woman who has believed in the name of Christ will change and that change will be lasting and evident and better still, it will glorify God all the more.

D. Critical Race Theory on Objectivity vs Bible on Objectivity:

1. To say that objectivity is a myth simply because evidence that goes contrary to your view is presented, is logically and consistently weak. The fact that this opposition to objectivity is given such credence by proponents of this movement should tell you how little credibility they have. That would be like if Ken Ham in his debate with Bill Nye said “I don’t believe in objective fact because it oppresses the Christian religion” during their discussion on the issue of evidence. It would be a laughing stock and given no time of day to even be responded to.
2. It is simple insanity to reject objectivity. Objectivity in this discussion simply means something that is true outside of yourself. When presented with potential evidence concerning critiques of Critical Race Theory, as previously discussed, proponents will simply label objectivity as a means of oppression towards people of color. It is easy to use that logic against the movement. If Critical Race Theorists suggest that all white people are inherently racist, are they saying that is an objective and absolute fact or simply subjective to the movement? Is it only objective when it agrees with their worldview?

3. An objective verse in scripture is John 14:6 "I am the way, the truth, the life, no one comes to the Father except through Me." Either it is true that Jesus is the only way to salvation or He isn't. Objectivity inherently isn't oppressive. No one is oppressed because Jesus says His is the way to salvation. Truth, as defined in the Bible, is liberating!
 - a) John 8:31-32 "So Jesus was saying to those Jews who had believed Him, "If you continue in My word, *then* you are truly My disciples; and you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free."
 4. Again, clear biblical teaching stands in contrast to Critical Race Theory. Either objectivity (truth outside of you) is oppressive or it is liberating. This state of oppressiveness or liberation is not conditioned upon your feelings or reflections of that truth. It is a matter of the quality of the object being discussed.
 - a) For instance, the fact that the world calls God a moral monster, does not make God a moral monster. God's character and morality as a reflection of Himself is not changed nor swayed because of beliefs and statements such as these. God remains pure despite a person's response to Him. In Him there is no variation or shifting shadow (James 1:17)
- E. While there are more factors of disagreement between Critical Race Theory and the Bible, these will be addressed in other lessons at greater length in detail, such as oppression, racism, prejudice, equity, justice, and more. What I hope you are taking away from these critiques is not a commentary on intentionality. There are families and people whose loved ones have been taken for no good reason. Yes beloved, injustice is real and it is painful. As Christians we are to hear the plight and plead the case of the widow, but we are not to show undue partiality because of their pain as well. This is at the core a matter of careful examination and balance, one that only God can do perfectly, yet one that God instructs us to undertake. While even honest believers in Jesus Christ may disagree on points presented in this lesson, what ought to be more apparent is a spirit of unity between us. It must not stand that the church is divided, and the world must see first and foremost our love for Jesus Christ and our love for each other. We must be about unity. But we likewise cannot say "peace, peace when there is no peace.", yet I must implore you that we are

different. There is peace because Jesus paid on the cross for that peace. As we have been reconciled to God, Jesus tells us to reconcile with our brother. If our brother has anything against us, we must first reconcile with them before we offer our sacrifices to God in worship.