You know when you look at Marxism when you look at socialism there is a range of ideas.
You have socialism which Marx viewed as kind of well halfway between capitalism and communism.
Then you have national socialism where basically it's all about your country and installing a social system a socialist system in your country and the primary examples of these are German during World War II where they fed off Hitler and the Nazis. They were National Socialist.
Here’s another group of facists, national socialists, Musolini. And for that matter Japan was that way as well.
Then you have what is called communism and think about communism as this. Communism is worldwide socialism.
The problem with national socialism is once you have tried to establish a socialist government, once you have tried to take over the means of production in one country, if you just have a national socialist system what happens is people who own that property will move to the next country.
The way that Marx got around this is to have worldwide socialism, you have to have it everywhere. You can’t just pick up and leave.

The Frankfurt School they didn’t agree with the Stalinist Leninest approach to Communism. They didn't like Capitolism either.
So they wanted something that was sort of in between.
And they really pushed this idea of critical theory.
And this was one more idea did made its way into the social justice movement as it became more secular.
Some years later in Massachusetts you get this group The Combahee River Collective. Has anyone heard of this? How many?
Here's the thing about the Combahee River Collective.
It was a number of black, feminist, lesbians who thought that the first wave of feminism Focused only on white women and that basically it was insufficient to meet their needs.

And so what they came together and did was they focused on their identities and so someone thinks that actually flew out of their work was this whole idea of identity politics.
How many of you heard of identity politics. So this idea of identity politics is they need to get on the needs of your individual. If your group lobbies those politicians and if your group gets them to you take into account your interest.
And this was something that was eventually taken up by the Democratic Party in this country.
The Combahee River Collective didn’t start this themselves but their ideas laid the groundwork for it. What you had was people who really were a sort of a minority group because basically if it wasn't just that they were women and it wasn't just that they were black women. But it was that they were black women lesbians. And so they developed with the scholar Kimberly Williams Crenshaw in 1989 this idea of intersectionality which basically is a tool that helps analyze the degree to which you are disadvantaged and to the degree to which things need to be turned around for which to give you the kind of justice that was needed. The idea of intersectionality, critical theory, gender politics, all these things worked together for what we see today.

One of the first things that happened was this idea of legal realism. The whole idea of legal realism was to look at law through the lens of science, trying to make the law scientific. Here’s another thing that comes along with it, the idea that you separate law from morality.

Legal realism is a rejection of natural law. Natural law is what was practiced in Europe for hundreds of years and in this country for at least the first hundred years. It was pretty much in use til really almost the 20th century. Natural law seems to XX God who set all of the laws in order. 7

It seems there is an inherent morality in the social order. What legal theory, what legal realism does, is it pulls God out of the system, pulls morality out of the system and it tries to be this scientific, positivistic, legal system which results on the focus on just the interests and means of the community. One of its results that descended from legal realism is this idea critical legal studies.

What happens is they take critical theory which you get from Granche, which you get from the Frankfurt School, and they combine that with legal realism. One of the things that results as critical legal studies.
And basically what it does is it looks at the whole idea of how the status quo people trying to go through Power try to maintain the power structures of the status quo and they look at it in terms of race.
And so one of the things that eventually comes from that is this idea of critical race theory. Okay, so basically you start off with natural law, then you move to legal realism, then to critical legal theory and finally this whole idea of critical race theory. And all these things are making their way into this whole idea of social justice.
So social justice originally like you said before was a Roman Catholic idea. And eventually you had some Protestants who started looking into this area of study as well, this idea as well but one of the things that happens with post modernity is that both critical race Theory and intersectionality and critical theory all make their way into theological thought. In fact, one of the postmodern ideas is Liberation theology. Liberation theology is just another form of Marixsm. It says there is an oppressor, there is an oppressed group. It says that the oppressor cannot know morality. The oppressor can’t know meaning of everything.
When it comes to the Bible one of the things that it said is the oppressor can't really understand what the Bible means. The oppressor can't really know what the true is. Here’s their base card. Jesus preached the Gospel to the poor, the oppressed.  It’s harder for a rich man to go to heaven than a camel to go through the eye of a needle.
So basically what you get in liberation theology is this idea of this two class systems. It’s just like Compton Theory, it’s just like critical theory.

So liberation theology is another idea that gets its start in the Catholic Church and it starts affecting South America primarily. It started with Roman Catholics in South America and then the Methodists, they pick this idea up and it moves into a number of different forms, one of the approaches to liberation theology is black liberation theology. And another is feminist liberation theology. In the case of black liberation theology there is the oppressor and there is the oppressed. In black liberation theology, who is the oppressor? White people. And the oppressed are black people, or people of color.

Black liberation theology says the oppressor is the white people can't know the truth in regard to the Bible. White people can’t know right from wrong. And white people can't really even understand the meaning of the Bible. It’s interesting how you're seeing some of those fleshed out today. Last year there was a book titled “Can a white person be saved?”
Well can one? I hope so.
So let's look at feminist theology with Liberation theology for a moment. Okay, you want to take a guess who the oppressor is in this case? Men and the oppressed are women. So, if you are a man you can't know truth. If you are a man, you can’t know morality.
But these are some of the ideas that come with all of this and then unfortunately, you see all of this stuff intersectionality, critical theory, liberation theology, and it’s all made its way into this drive for social justice, but when you look at the Biblical word for justice it is used often in a word pair of justice and righteousness.
It's the whole idea of being right with God and right with man and right with the natural order. The same God who gave us the Word gave us the natural order and the social order and to be righteous is to be line with all those things.
When you get to the New Testament Greek word deca. It means to be made right with what is right. What is right is also what is natural.

One of the things that is happening with the whole social justice movement is this idea that nature doesn't matter.
How many genders are there? According to some today there’s like 50 or 60.

.
Here's a really amazing thing, the archaeologist don't find 50 genders. They find only men and women.
So here’s the thing folks. Is there Injustice in society? There is. Because we live in a sinful, fallen world.
And In the best that this world has to offer is still pretty messed up. And if you're looking for a perfect Justice if you're looking for perfect righteousness you’re not going to find it until Christ comes in flames.

And here's the really amazing thing. When you look at the Book of Revelation 20, Jesus Christ comes down He reigns in Jerusalem for a thousand years a thousand years. A thousand years of perfect justice, a thousand years of righteousness and then it says Satan is released for a little time. You know what happens? People rebel.

You want perfect justice and righteousness in the system? Let me tell you you're not going to get that through big government, you’re not going to get that from little government either.
Jesus Christ came and was born in a manger, lived in poverty. He suffered and bled and died to restore justice and righteousness. Not right now but in His timing.
Now, do I say should we not try to make things right? I’m not saying that at all. We should make things right.

When you look the whole view of social order in ancient Israel, one of the things that they understood is each individual was responsible for justice and righteousness.

In the household, the father was in a lot of ways the chief priest and he was the chief justice in the household. It was his job to make sure there was justice and righteousness in his own family.

In the same way, the king was the head magistrate in the city and it was his job to ensure there was justice and righteousness.

There’s a saying the best of men are men are best. No matter how good you are or at how good you are or how good I think I am, I am need of clay.
And as much as you may be able to see Injustice in other people, sadly, there's a lot of Injustice with you as well.
So here's the thing folks. It is one thing to try to make things right yourself. But here's the best thing that you can do. You can share the Gospel of Jesus Christ with this fallen world. To the degree that you share the Gospel with others and they come to Christ and they strive to live for justice and righteous, we have a more righteous society. Not perfect. But don’t think that you can do it through politics, don’t think that you can do it through economics. What does Jesus say about the poor? They will always be with us.

These are just a few ideas that you can take with you. Yes, we live in a fallen world. Yes, we should do our part to make things as right as possibly we can. But in the end it is God who is going to make things perfect. It is our Lord Jesus Christ who is going to make everything so that there is justice and righteousness everywhere.

Questions:

When look at social gospel, do you see this modern social justice group is a continuation of a Richard Elam style of social Gospel or are there big distinctions?

Here is one of the things of the social gospel movement, which is part of the progressive a large part of the progressive XX.  You know a lot of the social gospels didn’t actually preach the gospel, and in some cases they were just downright heretics. Denying the deity of Christ, denying the inerrancy authority sufficiency of scripture. As time has gone on, the progressive movement and social justice with it have only gotten more secular, have only become more immoral. You cannot separate justice from morality. You just can’t do it. That’s what they tried to do with legal realism. Just as you cannot separate morality from economics. And you cannot separate morality from politics. I much the same way, you can’t separate God from those things either. What’s happened for this push for social justice really since the progressive period is they have moved God and they have moved reality out.

It’s not really a continuation. It's the logical progression.

Having Christ should make a difference in how you live and how you interact with others and how you interact with the world. But the primary thing is our relationship to Him.

Look, I study Christian ethics. I study economics. I study politics and public policy.
And you know, I think a Christian worldview offers so much.
Augustine in his book “The City of God” talks about these politicians should listen to what we Christians have to say. But here's the problem. If we make public policy primary rather than secondary, all we will do is help people get to hell in a more comfortable way. We’ve got to make our primary focus the Gospel.

The social justice movement just like the social gospel. They both forgot the Gospel.

Question about the passage of Critical Race Theory:
Okay, you want to know what they've neglected to mention in that definition. It is a useful analytical tool if you are a Marxist. Just in case you missed that, you are a Marxist.

Question about which seminaries are teaching it:

I taught Southwestern for 12 years. I still have a bunch of friends who are on faculty.
There's nobody I know at Southwestern who's actually teaching critical race Theory. Nobody who's actually teaching intersectionality.
Sadly, I can't say that for Southeastern.
Walter Strickland teaches critical race theory and you look at black theology and some of the things that he has said frankly I am surprised that he is still on the faculty. From Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, you have Curtis Woods and you have Jarvis Williams. Jarvis Williams is a New Testament professor. From all accounts Jarvis in his courses doesn't really teach New Testament, he  just teaches Critical Race Theory.
You have Kevin Smith. Kevin is also as Southern. When I was still teaching at Criswell College, Kevin ended up being editor of this book called “Removing the stain of racism in the SBC.” I got an article they asked me to write on ethics in the state of racism in the SBC. What I did not realize was that some of the writers would have some of the views that they had.
The one from Southern and Southeastern. Those are places where it’s most problematic.

Question about faculty teaching critical race theory at NOBTS:

So, I don't know. I know bunch of people there at New Orleans. I don't know of anyone who's actually teaching that.
I’ve known Jamie for years. I don’t think Jamie would go for that. But then I never imagined that Danny Akin or Al Mohler would support this type of thing.

Question about if pursued seminary and if critical race theory taught, what should stance be as student or faculty member:
When I was a student at Southwestern, it wasn’t the most conservative place back then. My attitude then was number one, show my professors respect. Number two, learn what you can learn and be sure not to swallow anything that is dangerous.

When you look at liberation theology and other things that are being taught, what they do is change the meaning of the Gospel. What happens is the Gospel is about what’s eternal and they turn it into what’s temporal. What you have is a different Gospel. I think in a lot of ways you really can’t communicate with them because they have changed everything into something else, they have transformed it.

Joseph Fletcher’s idea of situational ethics. Says that the right thing is for you to do is the most loving thing. What does that mean? It's all relative. I don't think that Joseph Fletcher was the driver between the move to legal realism. Legal realism gets its start in the Progressive Movement in the 1880s and Fletcher was 1950s. Fletcher had some influence later on but at the end of the day, I think that basically what you have legal realism is just part of the larger philosophy of modern philosophy of modern philosophy of positivism.

Question: On the Social Gospel, there is a study with Roshenbush. Well in modern times, there's the impression or the interpretation that simply giving a cup of cold water is the gospel.
Scripture goes on to say in the lord's name which implies you need to knead physically, but you also try to make the spiritual need of sharing the gospel. Would you follow that line of thinking?

Here is what is important. You don't win somebody to Christ by pouring some water. You win people to Christ not by the force of argument. One things when I teach apologetics I would remind people you can’t win people to Christ by the force of argument. You win people to Christ by the love of Christ. Which is why you do the act of kindness. You live the live where people ask why do you live as you do. When people get to that point, they are not trying to argue with you. They are just trying to understand you. When you do these acts of kindness, they ask why you do this. And you give them the Gospel.

Question about if see this as a lesser in or greater than issue in SBC than a decade ago.

So that is an interesting question. I remember talking to Richard Land who was president of the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission before Russell Moore.
And here's one of the things that he said which really surprised me. He said this is a problem. But when you keep it in perspective, it's not as bad as it was during the conservative resurgence. We were dealing with people who didn’t believe in the Bible. We were dealing with people in some cases who didn't even subscribe to the deity of Christ. At least we agree on the authority and sufficiency and inerrancy of the Bible. We have that going for us. But as he was saying from Mark Cussic, maybe they are speaking a different language. In some ways it’s not as bad as it was but in other ways it is.

Question about if you were gentlemen at Southeastern not teaching New Testament if he was here tonight and was given same assignment, where would he take this:

He would be taking you down the road of James Comey, who really developed the field of black liberation theology from the University of Chicago. And he would be espousing critical race Theory.
With the all of what?
Somehow they think that that is a key to turning around the situation.
I don't think it is in by any stretch of the imagination.

In Resolution 9 they said that critical race theory is a useful analytical tool.
It is not a useful analytical tool to get people saved, I can tell you that.
When you look at critical theories the only thing that they were really concerned about is changing society in a Marxist direction.
Some would say hey Richard. Yeah, you're pointing to the Granshee and you’re pointing to the Frankfurt School and all this other stuff, but you're guilty of the genetic fallacy. The people who are pushing it, they still have the same goals of the redistribution of wealth. Well, if still have the same goals of those who started then I'm not guilty of the genetic fallacy. I'm dealing with the reality.
And you know, I’ll be blunt, I think all those people should be removed from their positions. Plain and simple.