



Vol. 5 Number 2 – March, 2023

# MAC Arrow

Unitarian Universalist  
Multiracial Unity Action Council  
(UUMUAC)

“For the Unity of the  
light and dark skinned  
people of the world.”

Mailing Address: UUMUAC

1448 E. 52nd St., Box 267, Chicago, IL 60615

Editor’s email: [uusj@sbcglobal.net](mailto:uusj@sbcglobal.net)

## The Mission Statement

It is the mission of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Caucus to carry out and foster anti-racist and multiracial unity activities both within and outside the Unitarian Universalist Association through education, bearing witness and other actions, and expansion of our membership both within and outside the walls of our congregations.

We also seek to defend our UU Principles against those who seek to undermine them.

## The Vision Statement

We envision our congregations, denomination, and society as not being color blind but color appreciative; as judging and treating members of the world’s rank and file by the content of their character, not the color of their skin or their cultural heritage; and as treasuring diversity in the context of the “Beloved Community.” We call this vision Multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

•  
**To unsubscribe please send a note to [uusj@sbcglobal.net](mailto:uusj@sbcglobal.net).**

**Note: Articles reflect their author's views. They do not necessarily reflect a position taken by the UUMUAC Board of Directors**

---

## **How the Chalice Was Poisoned**

**Rev. Richard Trudeau**

It started with a mental virus.

By a "mental virus" I mean a bad idea that becomes widespread. For example, for several years in the 1980s there were pictures of missing children on milk cartons. It had been determined (true) there were thousands of missing and presumably kidnapped children in the U.S. But publicizing their pictures was revealed to be a bad idea when a few people went beyond their feelings, investigated, and learned that virtually all of these children had been taken by a parent during a custody battle.

In the 1990s another mental virus emerged, and I believe this is the root of the turmoil in Unitarian Universalism. The bad idea was--and is--that in the U.S., racism is at crisis level. This was proclaimed by, among others, the Rev. Al Sharpton, who thundered that "racism is just as bad as it ever was, it's just gone underground." Though some were skeptical of Rev. Sharpton in view of the fact that his livelihood depended on his ability to detect racism, he attracted many well-intentioned acolytes who did not bother to verify their feelings with reason or evidence.

Who am I, a Person of Pallor, to opine about racism? Virtually all of my ancestors came from France or the British Isles. I don't have the "lived experience" of being black in the U.S. But I have my own lived experience, that of an intelligent, curious, and observant white person who has been paying attention to racism in the U.S. for 72 years.

On the opening day of first grade (I was 5) my mother said to me, "Now, there may be Negro children in your class. If there are, other children may call them [the n-word]. Don't ever say that! It hurts their feelings." I asked, "Why would kids want to hurt their feelings?" She said, "Some people think that Negroes aren't as good as other people." I asked, "Is that true?" She said, "Of course not."

I remember Brown vs. Board of Education (I was 8), and how horrified I was when I learned that in the South black kids had to go to bad schools. I remember the Montgomery bus boycott, and how it went on for more than a year. I remember the Civil Rights Act, and the Voting Rights Act, and the Fair Housing law. (Years later I served on my

city's Fair Housing Commission.) I have read many dozens of books by African-Americans about what it's like to be black in the U.S.--beginning with Booker T. Washington's *Up from Slavery* in grade school to, recently, books by Ta-Nehisi Coates, Ibram X. Kendi, John McWhorter, Eric Smith, Thomas Chatterton Williams, and Heather McGee.

To the "woke" I say: When you woke up to the reality of racism in the U.S. I was already awake, and had been for decades.

In the 1990s I was confused when UU officials, whom I now understand to have been victims of the mental virus, started speaking of racism as being at a crisis level. This contradicted my own perception that racism had declined continuously, albeit in fits and starts, throughout my lifetime. In that same decade congregants at the churches I served were telling me that their teenage children considered interracial dating to be "no big deal." (My reaction: "Oh my goodness. How wonderful!")

To investigate what UU officials were saying, I asked three black friends to tell me about their experiences with racism. They all said that racism was real and they had occasionally experienced it, but that it had been only an infuriating inconvenience and not the obstacle it had been for their grandparents. They felt they could live wherever they wanted, date whomever they wanted, and go after any job they wanted.

"What about George Floyd?" I imagine someone asking. Yes, what about George Floyd? On the first anniversary of his gut-wrenching killing (May 25, 2020), I asked a fellow UU minister how many unarmed black people he felt had been killed that year by police. "I understand you probably don't know the exact number," I told him, "but what's your feeling about the range? Did the police kill ten unarmed black people in 2020? Or more like a hundred? Or a thousand? Five thousand?"

"Certainly more than a hundred," he said, "but probably not as many as a thousand. I'd guess something like seven or eight hundred."

The answer is 18, according to the *Washington Post*, which has been compiling statistics on this matter for several years. The number of unarmed white people killed by police in 2020 was 26. Since there are only one-fifth as many blacks as whites in the U.S., the black killings are definitely out of proportion--one-fifth of 26 would be 5, not 18. Racism certainly explains some of the discrepancy, but other considerations are relevant also--like the fact (it is a fact) that young black men commit more crimes than young white men.

For a quarter-century the idea that fighting racism should be the principal focus of UU social-justice efforts has proliferated among UUA officials and UU ministers.

Many of these people, while sincere, tend not to validate their feelings with reason or evidence. Others, I think, are opportunists who, abetted by the UUA's faulty democracy, are exploiting the mental virus, and the shame--and resulting paralysis--that many white people feel about racism, to seize control of the UUA, and to corrupt it into an organization that no longer seeks to serve, but to dominate; that no longer seeks to listen, but to dictate; and no longer seeks to support, but to punish.

**[2022: The Year in Review**  
**—a summary of MAC events,**  
**based on a presentation made at the December 2022 Annual Meeting**  
**By Rev. Dr. Finley “Fatha” Campbell, Vice Chair, January – December 2022**

Greetings, my brothers and sisters and cousins in the historical struggle to dismantle racism. It is time for my annual and final year in review, done at the request of the Board for our December annual meeting. But with this, I will be giving up this duty, along with all others related to racial justice activism. Further, I will focus on the variety of activities which constituted this the last year of such activism. In all of my personal recollections, there is the fact that our approach to anti-racism is gaining traction among our members, friends, and others; that is to say, our vision of multiracial unitarian universalism is emerging in a variety of formats as we struggle against the Afrocentric Neo-racist Cabal (ANC) and their allies presently controlling the UUA bureaucracy. So, here we go.

**Part I: Key Events January-March 2022**

Basic administrative activities shaped the fabric of these events, specifically meetings and plannings, represented by the Membership Engagement Committee, the Religious Professionals Task Force (RPTF), the monthly meetings of our Board of Directors and the Chicago Chapter (our only one), and the regular appearance of the ARROW. All this is like a threnody sounding the fact that, as small as we are, we are doing the work, now clearly, now obscurely, in the fight against ideological racism from a multiracial unitarian universalist perspective.

For example: An interesting discussion took place at the RPTF meeting on March 30, 2022. I raised the controversial notion of having a demonstration at the May 15, 2022, Meadville Lombard Commencement Exercise protesting the neo-racist take over by the Cabal. Note: one of the leaders of the Proposed Eighth Principle Movement, Ms. Paula Cole Jones, received a special award at this particular commencement. This was a clear signal of the Cabal's takeover of our chief theological seminary. The idea of a demonstration was nixed, but another suggestion emerged: that we actually have a discussion at some point about developing our own UUMUAC seminary. Note: this idea was also presented as a part of the planning for the North American Unitarian Association (NAUA), being led by Brother Todd Eklof, a member of RPTF. We should support that effort.

By the way, every third Wednesday of the month, except once, the RPTF sponsored our wonderful midweek UUMUAC church or vesper services, led by MAC chairperson  
**Page 4** Reverend Richard J Trudeau. These monthly gatherings give our rreligious

professionals an opportunity to share their spiritual/theological vision about all the contradictions facing us as an association of congregations and as congregants in a time of crisis for our great faith

But our weakness during this period, as during the entire year, remains the same: failure to commit ourselves to building nuclei, chapters, and fellowships as a “MAC-wide” effort.

## **Part II. Key Events: April – June 2022**

Our monthly Board meeting was held on April 1, April Fool’s Day. Three items stand out for me: the loss of some members, bringing us down below the 99 level [now we are up to 113]; discussion of the April 2022 Convocation (we had significant registration), and the rejection of our request for a GA exhibition booth, because UUMUAC was “out of covenant.” This was a decision made without a hearing; indeed, our request for a hearing on our original expulsion from the virtual exhibit hall had been rejected earlier.

Then on April 7, I took off for the beginning of a major adventure as an on-site, racial justice activist. I began in Spokane, Washington as the guest minister and friend of UUMUAC member Rev. Todd Eklof and his wife Peggy. Wonderful Southern hospitality, excellent food: we did some touring of the area – magnificent – and then the April convocation on the ninth.

It was a powerful gathering of our small but dynamic organization, featuring a wide range of our leadership: the Reverends Craig Moro, Finley C. Campbell, Todd Eklof, Richard Trudeau, and such lay leaders as Dick Burkhart and Kelvin Sandridge. The theme was the impact of the Proposed Eighth Principle as a negative force within the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, as a Trojan horse dedicated to the destruction of the citadel of historic Unitarian Universalism.

An alternate approach to the proposed 8th principle was the following: first, it should be seen as a call to action, not a principle; secondly, we would replace the word multicultural with the word multiracial; third, we would add the phrase “accountable to each other” in place of the vague “being accountable”; and, then we would indicate in the rewrite that the process of dismantling racism is a long historical process involving the radical reconstruction of existing political economic systems.

The next day, Sunday, April 10 (still in Spokane), I was blessed to be able to present a sermon at two services – the first one, live only, and second a hybrid, in collaboration with my little brother, Rev Todd Eklof. The topic for the two services was a part of a Palm Sunday presentation based on the scriptural narration dealing with clearing the moneychangers out from the Temple in Jerusalem. Both services received standing ovations.

Here is the outline:

Introduction/ Background:

We are living in perilous times again –The chair of the Progressive Labor Party,

Milt Rosen, once made this prophecy: a worldwide depression II is coming, accompanied by weak and strong forms of fascism worldwide, serving as a preparation for World War III between the Eurasian Imperialists and the Americanian Imperialists, and the triumph of one side over the other will determine the context for an international, revolutionary insurgency against the victors.

In such a framework, I want us to consider the legendary image of Jesus entering Jerusalem to the cheers and acclaim of the oppressed masses of Judea. Palm Sunday offers us a compelling picture of what we have to do to prepare ourselves as folks committed to the Seven Principles. For, only such commitment can prepare us to give leadership to the masses through all phases of this terrifying prophecy. The political economic purpose of Jesus going to Jerusalem was to clear out the money changers from the Second Temple who had made it into a den of robbers and corrupt officials. They were concerned only about making a profit out of the religious beliefs of those who had to exchange their money to take part in the required Temple rituals.

For, without a cleansed temple, no possible institutional change could be created, and if it could not be permanently cleansed, then the temple would have to be destroyed. E.g., the Inland UU Church [8<sup>th</sup> Principalian] vs the UU Church of Spokane [Seven Principilians].

Purpose: the purpose of this sermon this morning is to present an argument as carefully and as courteously as possible, within the spirit of the Seven Principles.

Thesis: It is only those of us who fully appreciate the powerful complexity of the Seven who will have to be mobilized to oppose the corruption in the temple of the Unitarian Universalist Association bureaucracy and eventually cleanse it of that corruption, a corruption symbolized by the proposed 8<sup>th</sup> principle.

#### Blueprint

What are these principles which we are defending against the attack by the proposed 8<sup>th</sup> Principilians?

How should these magnificent Seven be manifested in our lives?

Why are such manifestations important not only to us UU's here at this Spokane UU church, but to committed UU's everywhere, and in indeed followers of other faith traditions, including revolutionary traditions?

Let us examine these points in detail.

Hopefully, Brotha Eklof has saved these sermons for his YouTube channel. I am planning to assemble all my April sermons into a booklet for those who are interested in reading them.

My wonderful Spokane adventures had a cost. Time difference, the dry climate out there, and returning to Chicago at about 5:00 AM in the morning, tired me out, and so for three days. I really felt my age: back pain, cancer driven fatigue (Lawd, I am tired), and an urge to retire from active UUMUAC duties. As a result, I had to reschedule my Nature of Racism class and my MAC activist's workshop. Clearly, looking back on those three

days, it was an omen.

But thanks to the tender loving care of my comrade wife, or rather my comrade in arms, Sistah Bobbi Lammers Campbell, I was able to take part in the three-day Indiana gathering of MAC and non-MAC UU's centered in Kokomo, Indiana under the leadership of Brotha Carl Wolf of the First Unitarian Church of Hobart and Sistah Beverly Seese, Senior Minister at the Kokomo Unitarian Universalist Fellowship. (April 15 - April 17).

Here was the vision as declared by Sistah Beverly:

To all our dear Indiana UUs and friends,

The UU Fellowship of Kokomo in cooperation with the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Council (UUMUAC) invites you to a gathering over the weekend of April 15-17, at this central Indiana location for a "Weekend of Discernment"; with no registration fee. We would like to meet together and work to understand what the conflicts are, and how we can foster some reconciliation regarding the racial tensions that exist in our congregations, our communities, and around the nation.

The vision of UUMUAC is to promote multiracial unitarian universalism which we see as vital for saving the liberal humanist content of Unitarian Universalism. Our national UUA officials have decided on an aggressive, anti-racist approach that has divided and alienated UU members all around the country. Long-time members are leaving the church and cutting their financial support. Some congregations are splitting or disassociating with the UUA.

Several ministers have been kicked out of the Ministerial Association because they expressed differing opinions on the best approach to this challenging time in our association. This is the time to meet together and listen to one another in order to find ways to mend this rupture in our Blessed Community. ... Beverly H. Seese is the 11-year minister at the Kokomo Fellowship, a 2011 graduate of Meadville Lombard, and a member of the board of UUMUAC, [and can be contacted] at [beverly.seese@gmail.com](mailto:beverly.seese@gmail.com) for information of possible follow-up.

Dr. Campbell is one of the founding members of UUMUAC, and remains on the board [will be participating]. Other UUMUAC members will [also] be participating in person and by Zoom to help facilitate information and discussion sessions. You can find Board Member names and other information on the UUMUAC website. UUMUAC now has 113 members, including several congregational ministers across the country, and continues to grow.

We believe that our religious principles have been attacked by some of those in leadership in the UUA, who do not welcome alternate voices regarding the ways to approach the problems of racism in our society, or those who have serious concerns about "Critical Race Theory". We believe fervently in the Unitarian Universalist 1st principle and have a diverse multiracial membership.

Speaking of Sister Beverly Seese, here is an expanded version of what she presented at our Indiana Weekend.

“A member wondered if I am advancing a new vs old UU approach to the stresses, we all see within our denomination.

My Position, Rev. Beverly Seese

I am not promoting a "divorce" between new and old approaches in the Unitarian Universalist Association.

I am a progressive; I want us to continue to improve the ways we interact with other UUs and with all the people in our communities and the world. I maintain strong respect for and value our Liberal Religion. (See [sermon by Rev. Rick Hoyt McDaniels](#))

Unitarian Universalism is a liberal religion, not because of our progressive politics but because of our commitment to the ideals of liberalism. Liberalism in the classic sense is not an ideology, but a method for resolving conflict, gaining knowledge, and advancing toward truth. Our liberal approach to religion and to all that concerns us as religious people is a precious inheritance. Rev. Rick Hoyt-McDaniels

But some of the spokespersons of the new approaches do not seem concerned with adhering to our UU principles, not to mention appropriate civil discourse.

Civil discourse is engagement in conversation intended to enhance understanding:

It is discourse that "supports, rather than undermines the social good."

Civil discourse has also been defined as "robust, honest, frank and constructive dialogue and deliberation that seeks to advance the public interest by an assortment of national leaders", a definition presented in 2011 during a conversation at the U.S. Supreme Court.

Uncivil discourse is "language characterized direct insults, willful misattribution of motive without due reason, and open contempt".

I have observed over the last few years:

Increasing intolerance of some participants' dissenting voices in National Zoom meetings while accepting crude and derogatory language from those hosting the meetings, Deletion of all "Letters to the Editor" in the *UU World* (Is someone afraid of criticism?),

Condemnation of carefully thought-out books and pamphlets written by ministers and other leaders in our association, slander and threats of de-fellowshipping of ministers and other leaders for disagreeing with controversial actions and statements of our UUA Leadership.

I believe that such a destructive divide has developed between these perspectives of our religious community, that it is not wise to continue butting heads over different approaches. Too much harm is being done to all members and all our congregations and to UUA standing in the wider religious world.



It seems more productive to take some sort of "trial separation" where the opposing sides set up different leadership bodies and stop hurting one another with their accusations. There needs to be a time for healing and then counseling for the estranged parties.

Anyway, I took part in the Kokomo events and then gave a sermon on Resurrection Sunday entitled: Rolling Away the Stone of Hypocrisy—The Coming Resurrection of Unitarian Universalism.

My thesis was that one of our tasks as members of UUMUAC was to reveal the ethical corruption at the heart of neo-racism in the UUAC – hypocrisy.

I later spoke at two non-UU events in the last week in April – a chapel talk on the role which multiracial unity played at my alma mater (adopted) Wabash College in Crawfordsville, Indiana, with 200 students, faculty, and staff members present, being sponsored by the Sphinx Club. I left Wabash at 5:30 am Saturday to speak at a memorial service for one of the key members of the old InterNational Committee Against Racism, Comrade Joan Raisner (60 foix present). The spiral hath come round, and I am here – it was through Joan that I entered fully into racial justice activism.

So, that ended an intensive tour in which the vision of multiracial unitarian universalism shaped all the activities – the personal, the existential, and the political. But given my age, 88, I doubt if I will ever do that kind of organizing again.

In June we participated as much as we were allowed to do in GA2022. We had been declared “out of covenant” for our support of the Fourth Principle martyr, Rev. Todd Eklof. A group I call the Unitarian Universalist Liberation Front consisting of UUMUAC, the Gadfly Caucus, and the Fifth Principle Project, had a series of manifestations to do some consciousness raising. We ran two independent candidates for the UUA Board of Trustees. This simple exercise in the democratic process generated a lot of anger on the part of the Afrocentric Neo-racist Cabal. Nevertheless, we had nonviolent information sharing at designated locations near but not in the Conference Center itself.

Most of all, we had a wonderful, but technically limited, hybrid meeting on Saturday night after the so-called Ware Lecture where we had rented a hall with food, drink, and fellowship combined with Zooming. The plan was to get evaluations of what had been going on, to respond to the Kendi Ware lecture (or rather an interview), and to discuss the UUA Board of Trustees election process. Despite our success in raising over \$2500 in three days in order to have this on-site hybrid gathering, only twelve people showed up physically, though we had another 20 to 25 over Zoom.

The fact that we had such a small turnout from the rank-and-file delegates symbolized to me the declining interest in debate, discussion, and dialogue among many attendees to the General Assembly, a declining interest in being truly engaged as UU’s. It was reported that there definitely was a sense of intimidation among those foix who were willing to talk to us.

Many things were put forward at our version of GA2022. But for me the main

thing that we had to worry about was the coming destruction of Article 2, the foundation of the Merger of '61. My plan was, at some point, to have a broad-based discussion on what the heck is this Article 2 and what parts should be modified. For example, I believe that we should reinstate the nondiscrimination clause whose elimination I allowed to happen without a fight at the Providence Rhode Island GA many years ago – and, we should add to the sources Islam; e.g., the Judao-Christian-Islamic traditions.

### **Part III: July – December 2022**

We finalized the upcoming Michael Servetus/InterNational Conference Against Racism, reduced the registration fee from \$250 to \$150, and worked out the program for this very exciting conference. Eventually, four people committed to being there physically with another eight by Zoom, with a few others registered to provide financial support for the conference. (For a more expanded report, see the January, 2023 ARROW).

During this period of time, our various subgroups continued to meet on a regular basis. For example, our monthly Religious Professional Task Force had now grown to a solid group of approximately nine members, more or less, committed to UUMUAC. For many of us here-tics the RPTF had emerged as an alternative to the Unitarian Universalist Ministerial Association (UUMA). Our Membership Engagement Committee, which met frequently but irregularly, has committed itself to engaging our members in more direct participation in the running of our organization, and hopefully building nuclei, chapters, and fellowships.

Our only fully functioning chapter, the Chicago Area Chapter (CAC) of UUMUAC, had its first major multiracial unity outing of 2022. We celebrated my 88<sup>th</sup> birthday, on September 10 (I being born of 23rd, 1934. We had 21 people – white, Latin, black, Native American – who attended, bringing multiracial unity to the predominately black steppers ball held regularly on the West side of Chicago. We took part in the dancing, the eating, and the fun. We were a rebuke to the BLUU (bluu) position that white brothers and sisters are not welcomed in all black environments. CAC's December multiracial unity outing was a celebration of the 1956 victory over Jim Crow policies in all public transportation, a victory led by the Montgomery Alabama Mass Bus Boycott Movement, a multiracial movement, by the way. This celebration features a movie *The Defiant Ones* illustrating the unity of light and dark-skinned people of the world.

On November 17 the MAC Board had a well-attended Article 2 open forum with over 60 attendees, including two new ministers. The consensus was that we will seek to mobilize all our modest resources to opposing the changes thus far being proposed. People were encouraged to have discussions groups at their local congregations or with their friends to inform people of this great danger to our faith.

To conclude: while this is a more detailed version of what I summarized at our December business meeting, it gives an indication of what UUMUAC has been able to accomplish in our struggles against the neo-racist ideologies permeating the anti-racist/anti-oppression programs of the UUA. But we still have much to do, summed up in the following vision: **It is time to make multiracial unitarian universalism an international force, along with others committed to multiracial unity, multicultural synergy, and international**

**force, along with others committed to multiracial unity, multicultural synergy, and international solidarity. We have a world to win—but only if we build nuclei, chapters, and yes, fellowships dedicated to this vision.**

**Letter on the persecution of the Rev. Dr. Kate Rohde  
by Dick Burkhardt**

Below is the final version of the “Letter on the persecution of the Rev. Dr. Kate Rohde” that I sent to the leadership of the UUA (Board, President, Exec VP, MFC, UUMA): [contact-board@uua.org](mailto:contact-board@uua.org), [sfrederickgray@uua.org](mailto:sfrederickgray@uua.org), [cmcdonald@uua.org](mailto:cmcdonald@uua.org), [mfc@uua.org](mailto:mfc@uua.org), [president@uuma.org](mailto:president@uuma.org) )

“ I’m sorry to have to write this letter. I’d hoped that some in the leadership UUA might be having second thoughts about condoning the self-righteous bigotry coming from certain quarters. But the persecution continues, and is it vicious, targeting some of our most honorable and senior ministers. In this instance I am protesting the targeting by the Ministerial Fellowship Committee of a retired minister whom I’ve known and respected since my student days at Reed College, the Rev. Dr. Kate Rohde.

As her testimony makes clear, it is not just her 3 accusers who are guilty of gross misconduct: “As one who was once a trusted investigator writing reports for use in adjudication in child welfare, the document I received was improper: unclear about the charges and their import, lacking in proof for the charges, and containing more than fifty pages of extraneous, irrelevant, prejudicial, accusations, and false and speculative comments. Nor did they prove the truthfulness of the allegations and the investigators refused to engage me on questions of whether the assertions were true nor did they give me an opportunity to address specific concerns with specific evidence. I had no opportunity to confront the accusations nor the accusers. I have written legal evidence that shows that none of the statements alleged to be defamatory, are, in fact, defamatory.”

This quote shows the malicious behavior of Kate’s 3 accusers, demonstrating that they are unfit for the ministry. A full of investigation of these 3 is in order, and, barring extraordinary circumstances, they should all be defellowshipped. But even more disturbing is the gross misconduct by the Ministerial Fellowship Committee itself. A key feature of the “democratic process” (our 5<sup>th</sup> UU principle) is legal due process where applicable, and when it is something as serious as fellowship status, the safeguards and fairness built into legal due process are essential.

Think (1) innocent until proven guilty, (2) unbaised and respectful proceedings, (3) the necessity of demonstrable and objective evidence, not hearsay or subjective feelings or imagined or irrelevant issues, (4) the right to cross examine accusers under oath and to present evidence contrary to accuser claims, (5) the right to legal representation, and more.

The violations on all these points by the Ministerial Fellowship Committee were both very serious. Therefore I strongly recommend an investigation of this committee and its staff, in addition to the 3 accusers , to identify those most responsible for this blatantly unjust persecution and to remove them from the committee, also possibly to be defellowshipped themselves given the severity of this misconduct.

Of course, some of the rules adopted by the UUMA and the MFC need to be changed as well since they do not reflect the necessity of legal due process in many of today’s cases, nor even the standards of good psychology, such as the “principle of

charity” (assuming good intent until there is objective evidence to the contrary). However, people of good will can maneuver around bad rules to bring about more equitable and fair outcomes, so unjust rules cannot be used as an excuse.

In addition, older rules reflect an older era where most complaints had some legitimacy, typically involving illegal behavior or severe sexual improprieties. Today many complaints are illegitimate, based on radical ideologies and bogus claims of harm - claims not backed up by objective evidence, such as demonstrably false accusations and malicious intent. That is, the cancel culture from the larger society, especially from some universities, has now taken hold in the UUA due to the failure of the UUA leadership to enact safeguards against such bigotry.

In fact, the Ministerial Fellowship Committee itself would be the natural place to filter out the all-too-many ministerial candidates who are into self-righteous bigotry rather than commitment to our 7 principles. All the more reason to clean house at the MFC and find replacements who have some legal training in addition to demonstrated devotion to our 7 principles and knowledge of church governance and conflict resolution.

I know that many others, who know Kate, or who are now learning about this latest outrage, are very disturbed about the direction of the UUA.”

### ***Policy Based Antiracism vs. Consciousness Based Antiracism:***

#### ***What Works Best?***

**Copyright Dr. Kenneth Christiansen 2023**

Presented at the UUMUAC Convocation on Repairing the UUA’s  
Approach to Racial Justice.

Richard asked me if I would talk about the different forms of antiracism. This came about after a Zoom conversation where a lot of frustration was being expressed. Have we had any Zoom conversations where there wasn’t any frustration being expressed?

My perception is that the frustration we feel has something to do with the moral high ground question. How many of us gathered here today have felt belittled or put down by someone in UUA leadership, nationally or locally, who talks and acts like they have the right and obligation to put us in our place? Did the absolute moral high ground they claimed by any chance have anything to do with all the baggage attached to the color of each of our skins?

As Richard mentioned in the introduction, I have written many words about *Asset-Based Anti-Racism vs. Guilt Based Anti-Racism* over the past 13 years. What I am presenting today is about the same realities from a different perspective. I am attempting to understand the way people whose ideas I question are thinking.

Religions have ultimate concerns. In my analysis, antiracism is the ultimate concern for the current class of leaders of the Unitarian Universalist Association. Not just any approach to fighting racism. Not the approach proven most effective for fighting racism. Rather, an approach that has split many congregations and driven many out of the

ministry.

It doesn't have to be that way!

To understand what is going on with the today's UUA Antiracism Program, it helps to look at alternative ways racism and antiracism can be understood in general and how they have been understood in the UUA historically. A first and most basic question is, where is racism located? Is it located in policies and laws that need changing? Or is it located in people? A person can say that racism is located in both policies and people. However, antiracism projects tend to focus on only one of these choices.

Groups and individuals working in the tradition of Martin Luther King find racism in laws and policies that are objectively discriminatory. They identify goals, then organize people to assert enough pressure over short or long periods of time to change bad laws and policies. That is how the Civil Rights legislation of the 1960s was established. Black and white leaders who were committed to positive change marched together for voting rights, for open housing, for an end to employment discrimination, for educational reform, for better policing, and for many other causes.

The cost was steep. Both black and white Freedom Riders suffered life-changing physical injuries at the Birmingham Greyhound Bus Station. Both black and white people were murdered during the Selma to Montgomery march for voting rights. Both black and white people continued to apply pressure until life-changing Civil Rights laws and policies were enacted. This is a key point I have made before and want to make again. All black and white people who supported the cause were considered assets to the cause. That's true for many efforts utilizing the methods of Dr. King today including the Church Based Community Organizations in which many UUs participate.

And, lest we forget, both white and black people opposed the Civil Rights Movement. White people who opposed the movement are obvious. They identified as white supremacists. They utilized tactics including murder and mayhem. Murder and mayhem are still with us. Symbolic violence in the form of racist signs above freeways and racist slogans projected on buildings and sports stadiums have happened recently in many places including in my city, Jacksonville, Florida. Even more important, white supremacist racism lives in all too many well-funded, dog whistle style political campaigns.

Black people who opposed the Civil Rights Movement and its integrated tactics were located in the Black Power and Black Nationalist Movements of the 1960s and are still with us today in the Unitarian Universalist Association. John Lewis, writing in *Walking With The Wind: A Memoir of the Movement*, speaks very painfully of the split in SNCC, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, when white SNCC members were driven out of the organization. This was the spring of 1966. The Black Power Movement insisted on re-segregation for the purpose of building up the black community without white interference.

At about the same time, a group called Black Unitarians for Radical Reform (BURR) was founded at the First Unitarian Church of Los Angeles. Mark Morrison-Reed shares many details about all the groups that formed during this time period in his very important work, *Black Power and Unitarian Universalism: Revisiting the Empowerment Controversy*. Members of Black Unitarians for Radical Reform played key roles in this controversy. They were instrumental in the formation of the Black Unitarian Universalist Caucus

.Caucus (BUUUC) and the Black Affairs Council (BAC). All three of these organizations were segregated and dedicated to black self-determination.

Now we come to something that puzzled me for a long time. At the same General Assembly that voted to give \$1,000,000 to the newly formed Black Affairs Council, the Black Unitarian Universalist Caucus adamantly opposed any funds being voted for the continuing integrated antiracism efforts of newly formed Black And White Action (BWA) organization. Why? Only three years earlier over 200 white clergy and many white laypersons had joined Dr. Martin Luther King in Selma. Two were killed. That integrated effort extended voting rights to black people for the first time. Why was segregation so important now?

Times were changing. In 1970, Heyward Henry, the leader and primary spokesperson for the Black Unitarian Universalist Caucus 1967 to 1970, became the first Chairman of the Congress of African People, a major Pan-African movement nationally. In 1972, a faction of the Black Unitarian Universalist Caucus succeeded in changing the group's name to the Black Humanist Fellowship. New bylaws did not mention the Unitarian Universalist Association. A lawsuit ensued between the new Black Humanist Fellowship and the Black Affairs Council over the money remaining from the funds given to the Black Action Council by the UUA in 1968, 1969 and 1970. The lawsuit wasn't resolved before the funds were depleted.

In keeping with traditions of Black Nationalism, Heyward Henry changed his name to Mtangulizi Sanyika. Closer to the present, he became a leader in Black Lives UU. Some of you may remember him from the speech he gave at the 2017 UUA General Assembly on black self-determination. That speech was replayed in many UU congregations as a White Supremacy Culture teach in.

Why look at this history? Because it formed the basis of the UUA antiracism program today. White people were and are present in the UUA in overwhelming numbers. Given the commitment that black self-determination requires segregated spaces, the question arises, what do you do with the white people? The focus is no longer on reforming racist laws and policies. Rather, the focus is on reforming white people.

Looking at the current UUA Antiracism Program, it is easy to sum it up as guilt-based antiracism. Saying anything critical about the program is defined as HARM for which a person must apologize – or leave, or get kicked out of the organization. White Supremacy Culture is the assumed energy source for all white people. Decentering white people includes giving up the power to do good. If white people are any good at all, they will join in the chant to Defund The Police.

Defund the police? Where did that idea come from? It is part of the total system change that is going to come about by changing peoples' consciousness. Or so they think.

I was confused when I heard a speaker at the 2020 General Assembly refer to the 1960s Civil Rights Movement in a derogatory way as "incrementalism." The speaker explained the goal of the UUA antiracism program as creating the "beloved community." That meant ending systemic racism in its totality. How was this to be accomplished? I felt the need then, and still feel the need, to understand where they are coming from, what they are thinking.

It is informative to listen to Rev. Joseph Barndt. Rev. Barndt has had a long career as head of Crossroads Ministry for 18 years, then with the People's **Page 14**

Institute for Survival and Beyond. Both of these organizations played big roles in shaping the UUA antiracism program.

Rev. Barndt's latest book is co-authored with Barbara Crain Major. Both are community organizers. Crain Major is black. Barndt is white. They explain, "... racism is a deeply spiritual issue. Yes, it is also an economic, sociological, and psychological issue ... But we believe that at its very deepest, racism is a spiritual disease, a sickness of the spirit of a people, a relational condition that affects the stability of our common lives and our very ability to be in community."

If racism is a spiritual disease, doesn't it follow that we need a spiritual answer, a spiritual antidote? Spiritual things happen in people's consciousness. Barndt and Major call for "an organized anti-racism movement" that "can uproot racism in the systems of this nation." They elaborate, "The United States of America was constructed with the conscious and intentional ideology of racist white superiority, and we can consciously and intentionally deconstruct race and reconstruct anti-racism within every system in this nation."

Did you hear the bravado, the confidence in that last sentence? "... we can consciously and intentionally deconstruct race and reconstruct anti-racism within every system in this nation." These words, this formulation of the issues, helps me to understand what leaders of the Critical Race Theory based antiracism movement are thinking. They think they can bring about total change in our society by changing people's consciousness. I suppose if you could change everyone's consciousness you could do that. If we ask, how has that worked out recently, the picture isn't pretty. For instance in the 2022 elections, a focus on the phrase "Defund the Police" in campaign ads helped elect many politicians who want the police to have unlimited money and power. I think we can agree that the attempt by many adherents of Critical Race Theory to change everyone's consciousness about race by convicting all white people of their guilt has backfired royally in the political systems of this county.

We really do need to learn about bad things that have happened in the past and are happening now to successfully make changes that bring about greater justice. The question is, can we look at the facts and the issues together, set common goals, then work together to change what we can change? That is a good description of Policy Based Antiracism, otherwise known as Asset-Based Anti-Racism – Anti-Racism where every supporter is seen as an asset regardless of racial or ethnic or gender identification.

The opposite approach is to imagine that we can bring a total end to racism, total systemic change, by changing white people's consciousness. To change consciousness, you first need to convict people of the need for change. As an Evangelical preacher might say, first you must convict them of their sin, then show them the path to salvation. With Consciousness Based Antiracism as with the Evangelical message about sin, we are talking about the assignment of guilt. And it just doesn't work out as advertised.

Much more needs to be said, but I am stopping here for today.



**Comment on the “Rules of the Ministerial Fellowship Committee”,  
as revised for the February 13, 2023, meeting of the UUA Board**

By Dick Burkhart

**First**, I would like to note that the UUA Board did not publish this document and ask for public comment before adopting it.

**Second**, these rules facilitate the abuse of power based on bias, prejudice, and bigotry. There is no statement that these rules must be interpreted and implemented, as guided by the 7 principles of the UUA, in accordance the ethics of legal due process. For example, there is no requirement that the consultant who investigates a complaint be unbiased on the issue at hand, let alone an expert in the ethics of due process and human relations. These consultants should have a credible record on such matters, which could be questioned by the accused and be the basis of an appeal.

**Third**, any appeal should be to a body that is demonstrably independent of the UUA, a body with even higher qualifications and record of evaluating evidence objectively, not the to the UUA Board of Review, which could be heavily biased, based on the biases of the Nominating Committee. The accused should be able to appeal to this outside body at any time by citing failures to follow reasonable due process: “innocent until proven guilty”, unbiased proceedings, appropriate legal representation, requirements of objective evidence and cross examination, etc.

**Fourth**, the statement that “non-compliance may be grounds for termination of fellowship” has a strong totalitarian flavor and becomes directly totalitarian when the accused decides to refuse further cooperation as a protest against violations of legal due process or the lack of an unbiased and reliable appeals process. That is, the accused may feel, correctly under the current rules, that he or she is being subjected to a “kangaroo court”.

## **Unprincipled Unitarian Universalism**

**Those are my  
principles, and  
if you don't like  
them ... well, I  
have others.**

**~ Groucho Marx**





**By James Anderson**

The new radical rewriting of Article 2 is convincing evidence that UUA leadership remains dissociated from general — and shrinking — congregational membership. Many congregants consider Article 2, specifically the 7 Principles, to be foundational statements that drew them to Unitarian Universalism and continue to inspire them. Apparently UUA leadership is gambling that these congregants are either in the minority or don't really hold a serious commitment to the 7 Principles. (Or, maybe, they intentionally want to drive them away.)

It's hard to take exception to the language and the sentiments of this rewrite; even though, compared to the existing Principles it comes off more like a mushy, platitude salad, but, to be fair, platitudes are often very fine sounding and attractive. Who could object to centering everything on the word "love?" And, if you did, you could be easily susceptible to charges of "hate;" this is how those promoting the word "love" push their propaganda; if you dissent then you can be attacked for supposedly being on the side of the word "hate."

"Love" is certainly a popular word. I remember a cult back in the 70's popularly known as the "Love Family" or (less snuggly) "Church of Jesus Christ at Armageddon." Their kind of "love" was all-encompassing; you gave up all individuality and agency to join — all your worldly possessions, your friends and family and even your name, resulting in "Temperance Israel," "Patience Israel," etc... the cult leader was "Love Israel." What you got, in return was being enveloped in a very, very tight knit community where you no longer had to use your critical thinking skills or make any difficult decisions about your life. It was a deeply covenantal community. Life was easy, and you certainly didn't have to worry about being lonely or isolated.

So, yes, "love" is a word that can have many differing definitions and ramifications. I would have thought that the ministerial leaders on the Article 11 Study Commission might have considered refining the ambiguities. But, then, I probably misunderstand their process; reason, they claim, is one of the "cornerstones of white supremacy culture" so it may be the case that refining the concept of "love" was not something they were willing to do.

So what kind of love is this new radical restructuring of the foundational Principles of the UU faith centered around?

Is it the kind of “love” UU leadership showed towards dissidents like Rev. Dr. Todd Eklof or Rev. Dr. Richard Trudeau or Rev. Dr. Kate Rhodes? Is it the kind of “love” that GA attendees showed toward Board of Trustees candidates Jay Kiskel, Rev. Beverly Seese or Rebecca Mattis?

Or is it a kind of parental patronizing love which finds its fulfillment in rescuing designated victims persecuted by designated dominant oppressors?

Is it the kind that employs thought police?

*The Ministry of Love was the really frightening one. — 1984*

There is a definition offered in the official documents discussing this radical [restructuring](#): *Our commitment to personal, institutional and cultural change rooted in anti-oppression, anti-racism, and multiculturalism values and practices is love in action. This is a kind of “love” that demands “[accountability](#)” changes to Article II, include in the Principles a clear and direct statement that accountable systemic anti-racist and anti-oppressive actions to build Beloved Community are part of what it means to be Unitarian Universalist.*

This is starting to sound like a kind of asymmetric “love;” a disturbing kind of love that limits the free agency of the “beloved.” It is beginning to sound like the kind of “love” between a narcissist — who demands to be “centered” in the relationship — and a codependent enabler whose life is centered around trying to fulfill the impossible task of satisfying the narcissist’s demands.

These dynamics and this kind of “accountable love” based upon specific demands for action is deeply disturbing. This proposed drastic removal of the heart of Unitarian Universalism; the reason I, and many, many others like me, was drawn to this community — the 7 Principles — is grievously short-sighted. UUA leadership, if they have any sense at all, will note that I am clearly not alone in these feelings; it is foundational to the reasons many UU’s are continuing to call themselves Unitarian Universalists. Seeking to dismantle

and destroy those foundations is a terrible mistake. (Or is it?)

And those who resist this “accountable love” — as well as being tarred with the gaslighting notion of being “unloving” — are seen as curmudgeons who are just resistant to change. After all, one of the “values” in the pretty love-flower is “transformation” — which isn’t a value at all; it is a process which can have many varying outcomes, like, for example, being transformed from “health” to “illness.” And the gaslighting around this is remarkable. It is as if the promoters of this drastic transformation came into your church building wearing hardhats and carrying clipboards. They have been studying the engineering, they say, for more than two years and their proposal to dismantle, excavate and remove the entire foundation of the building needs to be implemented forthwith. You, naturally, object vociferously. “Why are you afraid of change,” they say, “Didn’t you have your building painted in 1987? Didn’t you make substantial changes to the landscape shrubs around the entry in 2012? Why are you so resistant to change!?”

This kind of manipulation is par for the course that gave us the so-called “hiring controversy” in 2017, the “white supremacy teach-ins” that followed, the 8th Principle promotion, the COIC report and now the attack on/elimination of the Principles. Bad faith just oozes from it all.

The congregation I am still associated with selected a Ministerial Search Committee a few years ago, members of which were chosen by the community as their best, most trusted representatives. This Committee successfully completed their task and the community has been pleased with their new minister. But, during this process, the Search Committee crafted a description of the congregation, which included this: *some comments framed as opinions are actually oppressors and we could be better at calling them out. When the conflict is whether a marginalized group is being oppressed by the statements of a dominant group the response of, ‘We are each entitled to our own opinion’ can feel like a tool of oppression.*

I found this statement, personally, to be disquieting. It is in direct conflict with my own deeply held life-long philosophy. I reject simplistic labelling of people and deplore the shallow segregation of unique and varied individuals into “marginalized” and “dominant

groups.” And this is virulent these days in UUism. Here’s an offering called “Beloved [Conversations](#)”: *Within, our program’s first phase, focuses on the internal work that each of us needs to do as we engage in deeper personal understanding, explorations of race and racism, extracting our souls and spirits from white supremacy culture, and work for racial justice. This work is different for white folks and for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC+) and is done entirely in different courses: Gathering Our Selves for BIPOC+ and Un/Learning for Liberation for white people.*

This kind of segregation and the apparent necessity for white people to engage in “Un/Learning” seems very much in line with the kind of controlling “love” that involves gaslighting and “decentering.” The movie “Gaslight” (1944 film that gave Ingrid Bergman a “Best Actress” Oscar) is an excellent portrayal of this kind of “love.”

Racial segregation is based upon a simplistic reduction of very complex issues that have plagued humankind since we separated from chimps millions of years ago. Humans like to label, it makes it easier to navigate complex social relationships and humans can be very, very mean to those they consider “other.” In light of this, I work very hard to implement the First Principle in my life and to treat everyone as possessing inherent worth and dignity. I am also deeply aware of my inherent tendencies to do otherwise. I try to avoid ideology that relies upon labelling and is shallow, mean-spirited and intellectually vacuous. Unfortunately this kind of ideology is very, very common throughout human history.

So, owing to my own internalization of the First Principle as applied to myself as a human being possessing inherent worth and dignity, I object to being labelled. And I object to UUism’s descent into a realm of slogans and labelling wherein I find myself labelled by those who know nothing about me. And, as a consequence of that labelling — which I reject — I am then being urged to read books and attend workshops focussed upon “helping” me overcome these labels; labels that have been falsely imposed upon me and which are irrelevant to my personal spiritual development. It is absurd to be offered an opportunity to do the “work” to remove these inapplicable ideological labels placed upon me by those who know nothing about me or my personal path of self-awareness.

The process goes something like this:

- 1. We know nothing about you but, upon looking at you, we have labelled you as an oppressor; a member of a “dominant” group.*
- 2. We are generously offering you a chance to get us to lift this labelling we have placed upon you without your consent and without any deeper personal understanding of you.*
- 3. If you do the “work,” read the right books and take the right workshops we will alter our label and judge you as a “good” member of the oppressive dominant group.*
- 4. However, that label is not as conspicuous as your appearance so, unless you continue to prove that you are a “good” dominant oppressor to those who aren’t familiar with the “work” you have done, the books you have read or the workshops you have attended...*
- 5. You will be required and expected to continually prove your “goodness.” Furthermore, your opinions — unless carefully framed in the language you are expected to adopt from those books and those workshops — will be judged as “tools of oppression.*

Is it any wonder that I find I cannot be a Unitarian Universalist and still be true to myself. I was initially attracted to UUism because I resonated with the 7 Principles and the Sources; especially the “free and responsible search for truth and meaning” — which has been stripped of its individualism and appended to the platitude salad under the “value” of “Pluralism” after the first draft left it out completely. And, in the new draft, there is no mention of the 5th source: *Humanist teachings which counsel us to heed the guidance of reason and the results of science, and warn us against idolatries of the mind and spirit.*

In fact this new foundational restructuring is exactly the kind of “idolatry of the mind and spirit” that source is warning us about (no wonder they left it out). This sort of extreme excision is going to drive away many who cherish free, critical seeking after truth, like myself. But then perhaps this is intentional. Perhaps the goal is to create a lean, mean, anti-racist activist machine and those who prefer different approaches can just go [away](#): *there are little offshoots of people who are protesting our Unitarian Universalist emphasis on racial justice. Well, that’s fine — just don’t call yourself UU. Go be something else. I’m not interested in keeping people that aren’t trying to be kept.* Dr. Takiya Nur Amin (content

*director of the BLUU Organizing Collective Board)*

The First Principle — eliminated in the first draft — has now been appended under the “value” of “Equity” but stripped of its prominent and powerful position as the First Principle and reworded as “every person has the right to flourish with dignity and worthiness.” (I’m surprised they didn’t change “truth” to “truthiness” when they tossed in some words of the 4th Principle.)

This is the general direction of institutional capture that the illiberal activists presently in control of the organization are going in. They are secure in the knowledge that their dominant position is enthusiastically supported by a majority of delegates at the annual GA — delegates who enthusiastically supported a Statement of Conscience decrying the “evils of systemic white supremacy” within Unitarian Universalism. It may even be an intentional disruption and destruction of the organization. Rev. Dr. Sofia Betancourt (the sole candidate for UU President put forth by the UU Board of Trustees — in direct conflict with the UU Bylaws) speaks of a Phoenix rising from the ashes in a talk she gave called “[Tongues Wrapped in Fire](#).” I think we should take this very seriously. *[s]he would see this country burn if [s]he could be king of the ashes — Lord Varys (Game of Thrones)*

Perhaps the intention of this radical rewrite — along with the many transformations that have been happening over the years — is to destroy the organization, “dismantle white supremacy,” and see a glorious, pure anti-oppressive activist collective rise from the ashes... after all the old, white deadwood has been burned away.

This whole thing is incredibly detrimental and counterproductive to the laudable goal of countering systems of racism that are still present in our society; UU’s enthusiastically declaring themselves to be awash in White Supremacy Culture does nothing to further this goal. In what sense does this anti-racist “work” being done by white UU’s give a Person of Color something they need? How does this feed them spiritually? What kind of Person of Color would have a spiritual need to covenant with a congregation of white liberals anxiously watching their every word and action for possible racism and micro-aggressions? (There are some disturbing answers to that question.) It is an uncomfortable but accurate truth that many

class areas, need Persons of Color in their pews to provide visual evidence that the church has succeeded in doing their anti-racism “work.” But, again, how does this fill the spiritual needs of Persons of Color.

As the saying goes “Birds of a feather flock together.” Some of the most segregated congregations in the US are Black churches. They do not agonize over why they are unable to attract white-skinned people to their pews. Martin Luther King famously said (on Meet the Press in 1960) “*eleven o’clock on Sunday morning is one of the most segregated hours, if not the most segregated hours, in Christian America.*” He went on to say — about his Black church — “*I don’t have any white members...I might say that my church is not a segregating church. It’s segregated but not segregating.*”

MLK was not happy about this situation, but he openly acknowledged what we all know about human behavior. We have hard-wired tribal, xenophobic tendencies that make us feel more comfortable being around people who are like us. Fully eliminating these tendencies is an impossibility; we can only hope to ameliorate their darker impulses through wise discernment, self-compassion and grace. No matter how much anti-racist “work” we do we will continually face those tendencies in ourselves and in all other humans — including Persons of Color.

It would be more productive to accept these realities and stop the penitential anxieties. People, all people — including Persons of Color — are drawn to communities that exhibit self-acceptance and are positive about their faith. This is a far more attractive quality than anxious, moralistic self-criticism.

Jettisoning the foundational 7 Principles of Unitarian Universalism really only demonstrates that Unitarian Universalism is the kind of faith that will abandon its principles.