

Vol. 2 Number 6 – Early Winter, 2020



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

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.

.Building the Rainbow of Steel: the Work Continues, a Narrative Analysis of the Second Annual Business Meeting of the Unitarian Universalist Multi-racial Unity Action Council , Dec. 6, 2020

By Rev. Dr. Finley C. Campbell, chair and spokesperson for UUMUAC

Considering that we have almost 80 members, including many founding members, it was rather disappointing that we only had 21 people at our annual meeting. Nevertheless, it was sufficient to have a quorum, and even a few invited nonmembers showed up to see what we are about. And so, we started.

Being that we are a religious organization, yet boldly concerned with racism both within and without the Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, we opened with our traditional Chalice Lighting Service, led by Rev. Richard Trudeau and Rev. Beverly Seese, members of our Board and of our Religious Professionals Task Force, where Brother Trudeau is the chair. We had hoped to have music from the movies *Harriet* and *Selma* to accompany Sister Seese's opening words as she lit the chalice. Unfortunately, this did not go as envisioned, but in the future we will learn how to do this. Music is a vital part of our varied UUMUAC programs. This was followed by a homily by Brother Trudeau which showed the differences between the organic unity between people of different identities based on our Seventh Principles, rather than the mechanical interaction characterizing intersectionality.

We then introduced the current Board of Directors, and considering the struggles we have had since our founding, we have been lucky to have kept a majority of folks so far who have remained involved for the long haul: Dick Burkhart, vice chair and our resident intellectual; Allan Lindrup, jack of all trades, but officially treasurer and our acting recording secretary; Marie Cobbs, corresponding secretary and our practicality guru—"Great to have a vision, but you better have a plan"; Carl Wolf, board member and our profane militant; Rev. Beverly Seese, Board member and our active minister; Rev. Wesley Hromatko, Board member, a retired minister but an active preacher; Rev. Richard Trudeau, Board member and also a retired minister but an active preacher and theologian; Fahima Gaheez, Board member and Director of the Afghan Women's Fund, our international project; Michael Johnson, Board member, of our UU Seven Principles Fellowship in Austin Texas, a pioneering congregation in the Reformation struggle in the UUAC; and me, Rev. Dr. Finley C. Campbell, chair and spokesperson and one of the founders. Since last year two of our other founders, Brian Hedges and Kenneth Christiansen, have had to resign from the Board, but not from the MAC, and we honor their contributions.

Then I gave the following review of our work since our first annual business meeting back in December of 2019 – looking at events both within and outside the UUAC.

The Chair's Review of 2020: Within the UUA and the broader society, we saw sociopolitical trends and their political and economic manifestations, creating the tension between multiracial unity and multicultural separation, often acting together as in the case of the black led multiracial struggle against police brutalitarianism, struggles which still suppress the number of white brothers and sisters and cousins killed by neo-racist police violence.

We watched the 2020 election year roll forward with neo-racist and anti-racist struggles in both parties and yet both parties seeking the votes of a multiracial population. In spite of on-going, dirty imperialist wars in Afrasia (the correct name of the Middle East—especially ruthless terrorist incidents in Afghanistan) and Africa and often populist uprisings in Europe, Asia, and South America, we were nevertheless blessed that no major wars have been unleashed and an uneasy peace abides between the great powers: the United States, the European Union, and the Eurasian alliance of China And Russia.

In March 2020 we were hit with the beginning of Cyrus the Virus and the end of indoor church activities, which are the life force of our congregations. We found ourselves dependent on this previously little known company called Zoom to act as a new form of spiritual and community connection.

Slowly the election becomes the key political reality – with Democratic Party primaries becoming the battleground between those who want to advance the elements of bourgeois socialism and those who do not. The question was who to support in the Democratic Party and then how to defeat Trump? And then the George Floyd incident occurred, and the neo-racist movement was given a new lease on life. Yet, for a moment, in a good cause, a black led, multiracial movement against police brutalitarianism became a worldwide phenomenon. But then it gets hijacked by the Afrocentric neoracists who, using the reality of disparity analyses about the racist impact of the Virus on people of color, divert the energy into the neo-racist ideologies of Critical Race Theory, White supremacy culture, and worst of all, a racialized, multiculturalism primarily benefiting the black members of US American bourgeoisie and its agents.

For Trump supporters who were insulted by the idea that their lives and diabetes and heart disease did not matter, and their deaths at the hands of police did not matter, and that you could burn up a store or destroy someone's car who had nothing to do with the killing of black folks—their degradation did not matter. Or, to hear in the neoliberalist media, the historical distortion that racism is in the DNA of the founding of the New World. And then using this as an excuse for nihilistic or anarchistic behavior against people living in their livelihood merely because they are white.

Precisely because there was no mass slogan that anti-black racism hurts white workers, students, and professionals, the blue wave we expected was reduced to a trickle, and yet when it was over, a mass, multiracial electorate gave the neo-liberalists the largest vote in US American history.

Now we are faced with the dangers of a civil war mentality being stoked up by this egotistical president who by law is still the commander in chief of the US imperialist army—a danger reflected in the barrage of lies coming from his and his cohorts that he really won the election, but it had been stolen from him by the multiracial urban areas in Michigan, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Georgia. So, our UU congregations in Trump territory are being put in danger, not only by potential civil war fanatics, but by the ideology coming from the UU leadership in Boston that we who are white are implicitly white supremacists or, if we are non-white, secretly believers in whites being supreme, making us brainwashed victims — if we don't accept the neo-racist dogmas associated with Critical Race Theory. And so, we are now at a period of time in which a militant commitment to multiracial Unitarian Universalism is not a luxury but a necessity. Most of all, we will need an understanding on how Negrophobic racism hurts the average white person politically, economically, and culturally. Certainly this is now to be the main focus of my academic and theological work from here on out. And I also ask my fellow MAC members to join me in this complicated task.

Now what about UUMUAC? Back in late 2018, a group of us, refugees from the UUMUACaucus, decided to officially become a Council by incorporating, voting in our bylaws, electing a Board of Directors, creating officers, and securing Sec. 501(c)(3) status with IRS. We had come from a year of struggle: being indirectly expelled from the Chicago Area UU Council, voluntarily leaving another group, the UUs for Social Justice of the Chicago area, because we had angered the Chicago Area Liberal Minister's group which upset key UUSJ members.

So here are some brief highlights:

December 2019: our first annual meeting

April 2020: our first Annual Convocation featuring Rev. Todd Eklof, the author of *The Gadfly Papers*. A wonderful gathering of dissidents to share thoughts, compare actions, and to plan for the future. By the way a well-constructed video version of that event is available from our UTube channel.

June 2020: we are, based on unspecified complaints, without a hearing or an apology from the Exhibit Hall chair, unceremoniously expelled from the GA2020 Virtual Exhibit Hall on the opening day. And yet we manage to have our own program each day of the Assembly thanks to our Zoomcasts.

September 2020: Our first annual conference, dealing this time with the impact of academic racism on UUism, featuring Dr. Anne Schneider, giving a powerful critique of the fallacies of white supremacy culture theories, plus additional comments by Vice Chair Dick Burkhart and myself.

October 2020: Finally, many years after its initial offering, we had our Conference on neo-racist un/employment and the need for a trade union movement based on multiracial Unitarian Universalism to fight for jobs. We had several excellent presentations on the many issues associated with modern day un/employment including poverty-level employment, the impact of robotic technology, and the lack of a national minimum wage of \$15.00 per hour, with some seeing the need for 6 hours work days for 8 hours pay.

And in between these events at least five *MAC Arrows* have been published, new united fronts have been formed with various dissident groups, a Religious Professional Task Force has been organized, and debates and dialogues reflecting a multitude of voices on the issues connected to the Seven Principles have been led, encouraged, or supported by MAC members around the country.

Out of all this should come our battle cry: we who are committed to multiracial Unitarian Universalism shall not be afraid; for God or History or Evolution is on our side. What I call the Teleological Imperative

Well, after my rhetorical exuberance and yet grounded in passion and the power of our Seven Principles, we heard responses from some of our attendees. One focused on the issue of President Trump's attempt to delegitimize the election. Another dealt with the role of racist ideology on UU members in our various congregations. There was yet the hope that UUMUAC and our companions in the struggle could successfully win other opponents of UUA dogmatism to a common goal of re-energizing our UU principles. A comment was made about two key reports from the UUA, one clearly based on neo-racism called the COIC report, and one aiming to overturn or radically reconstruct the Seven Principles to be subservient to an 8th principle. And once again there was an emphasis on getting our petition drive accelerating.

Then we got down to the heart of the meeting: the business of expanding and improving our organization.

Treasurer's Report: we are blessed to have good stewardship and thus we are about 4000 dollars in the black for our ongoing work.

Nominating Committee Report and Election of Officers for 2021: the following people were nominated and voted in: Finley as spokesperson and chair (he said for a last time), Dick Burkhart as vice-chair; Allan Lindrup as treasurer (and un/official coordinator of a variety of administrative duties, including heading up our MAC outreach and membership efforts); Marie Cobbs, corresponding secretary and coordinating our appeal to the UUA for a hearing about

our expulsion from GA 2020 Virtual Exhibit Hall; Carl Wolf, recording secretary; continuing as At Large Board members: Wesley Hromatko, Michael Johnson, Richard Trudeau, Beverly Seese, Fahima Gaheez, and new member Anne Schneider. A good group reflecting a multiracial, multicultural, international social justice warriors. They were unanimously approved.

Religious Leaders Task Force Report: our first UUMUAC task force, with Rev. Brother Trudeau as the chair. Future plans include a quikbook on sermons, meditations, etc. on the Seven Principles; a forum in February 2021 on those principles, open to laity and clergy; and extending the hand of fellowship to religious leaders of color interested in our mission and vision statement.

Current UUMUAC membership and organizational outreach efforts: our membership now stands at 77, nearly doubling from the 40+ a year ago. And our outreach committee is fulfilling the ambitious goal of creating electronic mailing lists covering every UU congregation and UUA related organization in the US. We thank Allan Pally, John Melson, Ken Christiansen, Doug Cauble, Rebecca Pace, Phiefer Browne, Carol Knight, Elisa Winter, Debbie White, Jack Reich, Marian Hennings and Dick Burkhart with helping Allan Lindrup with this project.

Afghan Women's Fund Report and Discussion: Sister Fahima Gaheez gave a powerful presentation on the current conditions in Afghanistan, pointing out that President Trump's peace plan is getting a lot of people killed. Yet her work continues with slow but steady success because of the support of Afghan villagers and friends in the United States. Her plan now is to build a hundred thousand dollar school in a place called Achin province for young girls and women who are hungry and thirsty for knowledge, who also have the support of their families. She will be sending out fund raising requests and offering mail order sales of merchandise from the Afghan women to UUMUAC members and other supporters. This can be a Xmas fund drive.

The Outlook for 2021.

Board member Carl Wolf presented his perspective. He stated three key points: 1. We should get it in our heads that we are fighting against racism in the best way possible; 2. That the vision of multiracial unitarian universalism resonates with many people, but they need to know that we exist; 3. Only in the practice of civic engagement against racism (what we call bearing witness projects) in all of its forms can we prove that our way is the best way, in contrast to guilt tripping, shame creating, and racial separating. This was followed by a lively discussion on the different tactics we could use in the process. Particularly inspiring were the comments on the energetic development of our Austin Texas chapter and the new Seven Principles UU Fellowship they have created.

Well, the clock was ticking; some folks had already begun to sign out and it was clear that it was time to bring the second Annual Meeting of the Unitarian Universalist Multi-racial Unity Action Council to an end. Closing words were provided by sister Beverly, giving us encouragement and inspiration as we prepared to leave this meeting committed to doing the work by any Seven Principled means necessary.



UUMUAC members Finley C. Cambell and Dwayne Matthews, plus Dwayne's partner, Laura Elliott, at a Swedish-American family reunion.

“The Church of Critical Theory”

a 5 star review by Dick Burkhardt of

Cynical Theories

How Activist Scholarship Made Everything about Race, Gender, and Identity and Why This Harms Everybody

By Helen Pluckrose and James Lindsay (2020)

This outstanding book pulls back the covers from the toxic doctrines underlying Critical Race Theory (CRT) and related Critical Theories of gender and disability. Personally, I think Trump is off his rocker, but every now and then he hits paydirt, even if he's so screwed up that he doesn't know how to follow up. A prime example is when he recently characterized CRT, and the associated Robin DiAngelo-type diversity training, as “divisive anti-American propaganda”.

Pluckrose and Lindsay explain how our core civic values are under assault from cult-like ideologies derived from nihilistic “postmodern” intellectuals from France, like Foucault and Derrida. Many find this very hard to believe, because it is so well disguised from the public, but its results are all too much in the news. These consequences include cancel culture, victimhood culture, and the Red/Blue state culture wars, with Trump ever eager to magnify and exploit the ensuing societal resentments and animosities and political gridlock.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

So how did this all come about? Pluckrose and Lindsay have identified several phases since the WW II era. “Critical Theory was first laid out in detail in 1937 by Max Horkheimer [of the Frankfurt School of philosophy in Germany] who was concerned that traditional theories are only concerned with what is true, not what is right and wrong. ‘Problematic’ ideas, as they came to be called, have to be removed from society for being morally wrong, even if they are true”.

Post WW II, Michel Foucault proceeded to cast even more doubt on truth: “Power decides which statements are able to be considered true, in one way or another, and thus we ought to be radically skeptical of all truth claims” since the “political process is going to be inherently biased and corrupt”. Thus, Foucault assumes a fascist, Trump-like conception of power, making “knowledge and power literally the same thing”. This phase, called postmodern philosophy, continued until around 1980, emphasizing deconstruction of language (Jacques deconstruction of language (Jacques Derrida) and the rejection of “metanarratives” of truth, like Christianity, Marxism, and Liberalism (including reason and science).

The middle phase, roughly 1980 to 2010, featured the creation of identity politics focused on identities like race and gender, termed “applied postmodernism” by Pluckrose and Lindsay. Most of postmodern philosophy was inherited, except the identities in question were assumed to have a stable, independent, knowable reality that can't be deconstructed. In the current phase, roughly 2010 to the present, fully developed “critical theories” came to be taught as “truth” for activist “Social Justice” agendas. Pluckrose and Lindsay call this “reified postmodernism”, meaning elaborations of applied postmodernism with the Theory becoming reality in the eyes of its adherents.

CRITICAL THEORY AS RELIGION

This applied Theory is “what in other eras might have been called speculation, or even indeed philosophy” (p 49). Yet Critical Theory goes further: it has come to function as a religion in the sense of the Ben Clements legal definition: “Religion can be defined as a comprehensive belief system that addresses the fundamental questions of human existence, such as the meaning of life and death, man's role in the universe, and the nature of good and evil, and that gives rise to duties of conscience.” The belief system is centered around a victimhood culture for each identity.

For Critical Race Theory typical doctrines, or creeds, are that all whites are racist (= oppressors), as an original sin to be confessed, and that we live in a white supremacy culture. Any "white" person who objects is branded as suffering from a pseudo-medical/moral malady called "white fragility", basically a sinner who is relegated to second class citizenship, subject to "cancellation" (= excommunication) in extreme cases. The primary "duty of conscience" is to defend the purity of the doctrines, like belief in God in traditional Christianity, against perceived heretics, such as vocal scientists, scholars, or humanists.

This religious movement has now spread from its stronghold in US universities to closely aligned institutions such as non-profits and government agencies. An example I know well is the coup at the Unitarian Universalism Association, decades in the making, finalized over the last 3 years. This has been a top-down hostile takeover, imposed without debate, "hostile" since the principles and themes of applied postmodernism, as described below, are a direct assault on key principles and practices of the Association (even legal due process), principles derived from liberal philosophy and democracy as developed since the Enlightenment.

APPLIED POSTMODERNISM

Given this overview, let's back up to look at postmodernism in more detail. Following Pluckrose and Lindsay, a deep theme of the "postmodern metanarrative" is "**Denying universal or objective reality**" (Steiner Kvale). That is, knowledge, truth, meaning, and morality derive only from what is perceived and expressed locally, grounded in the subjectivity of group "lived experience" and language.

Some consequences of this theme applied: Group differences are fundamentally irreconcilable, leading to inevitable conflict, resolved only by the regional dynamics of power. Global and national law, even declarations of human rights, are illegitimate for resolving such conflicts, as the power dynamics will just lead to more oppression of marginalized groups. "Incrementalism" will never succeed - the only real solution in revolution.

Here are three pillars of applied postmodernism as identity politics (Walter Anderson):

1. "**Social construction**" of identity. That is, social conventions and ideologies far outweigh other sources of identity, such as biological differences and economic class.
2. "**Relativism**" of morality and ethics. That is, traditional religious, philosophical, or civic norms have no legitimacy for determining standards of morality or ethics, only what is socially constructed by your identity group

"Deconstruction in Art and Culture". That is, looking for hidden or subtle identity-based themes or depictions in cultural media.

Lindsay and Pluckrose have distilled these concepts into Two Principles and Four Themes (p 31):

1. **The Postmodern Knowledge Principle** that knowledge and morality must be constructed, according to one's own situation, without regard to universal goals or standards. This constitutes "radical skepticism", an explicit rejection of John Rawls' concept that **a just society is one which has been constructed in accordance with the principle that a supermajority of citizens find acceptable, no matter their status or identity**. Cynical theories ignore the enormous progress of the US over the last 250 years, viewing Rawlsian justice as a pipedream at best. They reject the **correspondence theory of truth** that, at least as provisionally established by the scientific method, "there are objective truths and they can be established by their correspondence with how things actually are in the world" (p 33)

The Postmodern Political Principle that society is formed of systems of power and hierarchies that operate out of self-interest, carrying out power plays to keep certain groups subjugated, ignoring principles of justice and future generations. All structures which exercise power, including social, educational, legal, and scientific institutions and practices are presumed to operate as a conspiracy to enable "oppressors" to dominate "victims", with evidence and reason being as suspect as any political, economic, psychological, social, or cultural ideology.

The four themes:

1. The theme of "**blurring of boundaries**". This includes intentional complication of theories and categories to disrupt reason and knowledge. Myriad redefinitions of words like racism are a prime example., as are the numerous varieties of gender. The unfortunate, but predictable consequence, has been to open the door to sophistry, prejudice, and dogma, as in the work of DiAngelo.

2. The theme of "**the power of language**". The focus here has been on Derrida's deconstruction of language, especially the search for hidden meanings within the context of a presumed hierarchy of oppression, or victimhood culture. This justifies concepts from "microaggressions" to "white supremacy culture", from the personal to the civilizational, neither requiring hard evidence or rigorous scholarship.

3. The theme of "**cultural relativism**". Since "no set of cultural norms can be said to be any better than any other", all cross-cultural critiques are automatically invalid. In addition, these cultural norms and practices are accessible only to insiders – outsiders will inevitably misunderstand and misrepresent them. In fact, this is attacked as "cultural appropriation", rejecting the validity of "honoring or learning from other cultures". This also explains why identity politics and tribalism are sometimes promoted even over strong opposition from identity groups themselves. A prime example is that the vast majority of immigrants to the US want to assimilate, especially to get a good education, to enable both social and economic success, despite the edicts of prominent Critical figures like Ibram Kendi.

The theme of "**loss of the individual and the universal**". Thus the survival or welfare of humanity as a whole has no significance, nor do individual human rights. Life is all about the winners and losers among groups, a zero-sum game.

KEY FIELDS OF CRITICAL THEORY

Lindsay and Pluckrose proceed to explore how these principles and themes play out in chapters devoted to prominent areas of Critical Theory: Post-colonial, Queer, Race & Intersectionality, Feminism & Gender, Disability & Fat studies.

By 1980 "the main barriers to social equality in the West were lingering prejudices" (p 47) and institutional practices, instead of legal barriers and cultural norms. Hence the focus on subtleties like "implicit bias", "microaggressions", etc., also on ideological elaboration and purity tests. All this served to command attention and develop followers, feeding off guilt over both past injustices and recent incidents, both receiving far more publicity. Attacks against established scholars and activists for their "privilege" reduced competition and accountability. The morality of "victimhood culture" mushroomed to challenge the "dignity culture" of the last two centuries

Feminism & Gender theory: This began as more of Marxist critique, "through which Western patriarchy is largely as extension of capitalism" (p 53) but was soon reformulated under the influence of Derrida and Foucault, with gender becoming more of a socially constructed performance, independent of biology, with definitions dispensed with to "blur boundaries".

There were traditional broad-based "liberal feminists" (equal opportunity, affordable child care, etc.) through the 80s, then "materialist feminists" focused on patriarchy and capitalism, then "radical feminists" with men / women cast as oppressors / victims, and now "intersectional feminists" with a multitude of competing identity subgroups. Increasingly, failing theories have been complexified, and recast to make their assumptions matters of faith, to make them less falsifiable and divert criticism.

"The intersectional approach [to feminism & gender] appears to operate like a kind of circular firing squad, continually undermining itself over petty differences and grievances. It does this through calls for the various oppressed tribes to support each other: under the banner first of "allyship" and later "solidarity" – both of which are then Theorized as problematic in "centering" the needs of more privileged allies at the expense of oppressed minorities groups of ever increasing specificity" (p 136), an exhausting game of factional infighting to keep up with.

"Nowhere in gender studies can one find men or masculinities being studied through any lens but feminism" (p 154). There has even been a proposal to categorize "traditional masculinity" as a psychological illness. "The current analytical framework does not allow for the possibility of a situation in which gender power imbalances do not exist or one in which they disadvantage men".

"Scholars are severely limited in the extent to which they can even do gender studies unless they are trans women of color...This results in large sections of academic papers dedicated to scholars performatively acknowledging their positionality and problematizing their own work...hindering from producing scholarship of value" (p 157).

Race & Intersectionality theory: The intersectionality of identities is the current basis for "identity politics", with identities becoming objectively real, with meaning and consequence, instead of arbitrary social constructions, as in earlier postmodern philosophy. Yet the postmodern focus on the "power of language" theme is retained through such concepts as "verbal violence, safe spaces, microaggressions, and trigger warnings" (p 60). The "loss of the individual and the universal" theme is reflected in the assumptions of deeply ingrained prejudice and oppressor/victim power plays.

Whereas early CRT had more of a focus on "material", or practical goals such as legal policy, later CRT is mostly based on propagating its own ideology and race consciousness, especially diversity training and education, with the former being ineffective, even counterproductive, according to many studies, while the latter has often been taught as "truth", which is educational malpractice.

Delgado & Stefancic in their standard CRT textbook, write openly that CRT "questions the very foundations of the liberal order, including equality theory, legal reasoning, Enlightenment rationalism, and neutral principles of constitutional law" (p 115). This leaves the doors wide open to double standards, prejudice, dogma, and propaganda, based on simplistic, cynical, and counterfactual assumptions about ubiquitous racism and white supremacy. Thus, Lindsay & Pluchrose conclude that CRT "sounds rather racist itself".

A fundamental issue is that "if we train young people to read insult, hostility, and prejudice into every interaction, they may increasingly see the world as hostile to them and fail to thrive in it" (p 132). It "puts social significance back into racial categories and inflames racism" ... "It also sees racism as omnipresent and eternal, which grants it a mythological status, like sin or depravity" ... "everything that the marginalized individual interprets as racism is considered racism by default" (p 133).

"Some studies have already shown that diversity courses [of the DiAngelo type] have resulted in increased hostility towards marginalized groups" ... "It is even less helpful to tell them that their own good intentions are proof of their latent racism". "Such attitudes tear at the fabric which holds contemporary society together" (p 134). Intersectionality has become so problematic that even its creator, Kimberle Crenshaw, is now concerned: "that intersectionality had both expanded beyond and also become a way of talking about complicated intersections of marginalized identities rather than doing anything to alleviate oppression" (p 131).

CURRENT THEORY

Critical Theory has "turned from being largely descriptive to highly prescriptive" (p 61), more like politics and religion than social science or anthropology. This is often critiqued from the Right as "political correctness" enforced by "social justice warriors" vaunting their "virtue signaling". When a political stance is taught at university, it is apt to become an orthodoxy" (p 64). Even worse, Critical Theory has an agenda called "research justice", which attempts to suppress or invalidate scholarship if organized by people of the wrong identity, or even if it does not give proper weighting to such things as anecdote, beliefs, or emotions, versus scientific studies.

"This shift away from class and toward gender identity, race, and sexuality troubles economic leftists, who fear the Left is being hijacked by the bourgeoisie within the academy, driving working class voters into the populist right" (p 153). Trump has proved this point. Even worse DiAngelo regards "individualism and color-blindness" as "ideologies of racism" (p 207). A prime example would be her rejection of the first principle of the Unitarian Universalist Association: "The inherent worth and dignity of every person", which applies to individuals independently of any race or category. What would be acceptable to Critical Theorists? - "The inherent worth and dignity of members of marginalized groups". Otherwise you're on your own, morally speaking, without any thought that when their power plays are actually successful, then the oppressor / victim roles have been flipped (a fundamental contradiction of cancel culture).

LIBERAL PHILOSOPHY

The book ends by making a strong case for a revival of liberal philosophy as an adaptive, evolutionary strategy (not a system), that can get sidetracked but will always get back on course if not destroyed (replaced by a fascist regime, a theocracy, etc.).

"liberal philosophy sees knowledge as something we can learn about reality, more or less objectively. It embraces accurate categorization and clarity of understanding and exposition. It values the individual and universal human values. It encourages disagreement and debate as a means to getting at the truth. It accepts criticism, even of itself, and is therefore self-correcting. It is inherently constructive because of the evolutionary processes its engenders. No individual or group is supposed to get special treatment." (p 237- 238). Nevertheless, when socio-economic imbalances develop, liberalism recognizes the need for regulatory correction, just as the ancient Greeks realized that "democracy would fail if not properly managed" (p 239).

"Liberalism is perhaps best understood as a desire to gradually make society fairer, freer, and less cruel, one practical goal after another. This is because it is a system of conflict resolution, not a solution to human conflicts...it is always a work in progress" (p 239). Liberals believe in reform, not revolution, because the results are in: it works better" (p 246). 'Nazism, the Holocaust ... show that liberalism has not always been victorious or prevailed... but life will be much better when it does'. "By seeking to expand our circle of empathy ever wider, liberal humanism has achieved unprecedented human equality. It did so by exploiting the better part of our nature – our empathy and sense of fairness."

A key feature of liberal philosophy is "secularism". This means that "no matter how certain you may be that you are in possession of the truth, you have no right to impose your belief on society as a whole" (p 263), that is, outside your "church". This applies not just to traditional religions but also to ideologies and belief systems like Critical Theory. Thus the rest of us have "the inalienable right to reject your moral injunctions and prescriptions without blame" (p 263).

Instead Critical Theory "seems to be reversing" hard won progress against social injustice by "re-inscribing negative stereotypes against women and racial and sexual minorities", in addition to divisive tribalism" (p 261). Meanwhile, with moderate voices of criticism silenced or ignored, "the most extreme voices" will gain popular support for speaking "obvious truths" (p 262). In fact, we've just seen this in a Trump attack on the evils of diversity training based on Critical Race Theory. In addition he promoted "patriotic education" to counter left-wing depictions of America as a "wicked and racist nation", with the Left itself depicted as bent on "division by race", power hungry for "cancel culture" and "toxic propaganda".

Introduction and UUMA Resignation Letter by Rev. Craig Moro

Introduction

A few days after September 11, 2001 I was invited to speak to a nearby UU congregation at an evening event. I was serving a different congregation at the time and had my hands full with church work. I also had a 4 year-old child, a strep infection, and a fever but I agreed to speak because it seemed like the right thing to do. I had taught seminary and university classes, led weekend workshops and Sunday services focused on Islam on the West coast and in central Illinois for years. The congregation felt desperate to know more about Islam and Muslims and I shares what I could in a long evening of answering questions, as I grew more and more hoarse. I felt an obligation to do so. I received no payment. The congregation's gratitude was enough.

Since then I have been a frequent guest in that pulpit and always found the congregation to be very enthusiastic and welcoming. In recent years, my invitations increased in frequency, and I was asked many times for copies of my sermons. In the spring of 2020, the congregation's minister suddenly retired and I was asked to do this year's stewardship sermon and help kick off this year's canvass. Over the summer, the congregation contracted with a recently fellowshipped minister to serve part-time (via Zoom, from a Midwestern state) *whose salary is being paid with funds raised in that canvass*. In August, I was asked to speak at one September service and was sent an agreement in the form of a contract. My sermon was ready to go when I received a note from the minister saying:

"Thank you for agreeing to preach at _____ in September, sadly we have to rescind that offer to you. I know you have been a guest our congregants have enjoyed in the past. With all the changes at _____ over the last year or so, the Board has affirmed their dedication to following UUMA guidelines and covenants. My new contract holds that clause too. To that end, we cannot have ministers who are not following the UUMA covenant in our pulpit. As you have withdrawn your membership to the UUMA we cannot have you as a guest minister any longer."

It is true that—less than 48 hours earlier—my signature had appeared on the group letter of resignation that many readers of this website's postings will have seen. However something did not add up, so I sent a note to that church's Board and Worship committee requesting clarification and documentation:

"It is true that requirements to abide by UUMA guidelines and/or hold membership in the UUMA are frequently included in contracts to serve as a church's settled or contract minister. However, I have never heard of such a requirement for pulpit guests. To my knowledge, you never shared such a policy with me nor asked me about my relationship with the UUMA before, nor do I understand how lay leaders or visiting non-UU ministers would be able to speak under such a rule.

The note from your minister bases withdrawal of your kind offer to speak on the authority of this policy. It may be that the minister's characterization of requirements to preach at your church is accurate but for my peace of mind I would like to see some form of dated documentation of adoption of the policy just so I can be sure that it was in effect when you sent my contract, and not simply created to exclude signers of the resignation letter in the few days since it was sent. (To be clear, it is more than an "offer" or "invitation": it is a contract. A copy is attached.) I had already done substantial work on the service when I received the minister's note, work for which I will now not be compensated (nor would I accept any compensation under these conditions).

[I have copied the] Board on this note, because the minister speaks as if the Board shared actively in the decision to enact what might be interpreted as a breach of contract. To honor my part in that contract, I am attaching the sermon that I would have given on 9/27. "

I attached a copy of the group resignation letter along with the sermon and the copy of our speaking contract. The minister refused to provide (or allow the Board to provide) documentation of the alleged "policy" because, of course, no such policy existed. I am now permanently banned from a pulpit where I had long been graciously welcomed.

After this incident, which strongly reminds me of how the Boston Minister's Association treated the Rev. Theodore Parker back in the 19th century, I decided to send a personal resignation letter to the UUMA to lay things out more clearly. I hope that you will find something of value in the excerpts pasted below.

From the Rev. Craig Moro's resignation from the UU Minister's Association:

Persons, Theories, and Acts of Violence

I see no evidence that the UUMA is currently able to respond to or even respect persons as persons. It is clear to me that currently the UUMA and a majority of its members place ideology before humanity. Loyalty to a particular theory or worldview that has no relationship to Unitarian Universalism now comes before all. If one disavows or even questions that theory or worldview—billed as Critical [fill in the blank] Theory—one is instantly subject to urgent, frantic, and violent response.

I cannot recognize what used to be a collegial organization called the "Unitarian Universalist Ministers Association" in the **policing** organization that currently uses that name. In recent years I have watched several times as officers of this organization have pressed the knee of authority on the necks of certain targeted minority members—coldly, mercilessly, with no real doubts and no honest reflection. I watch in sickened horror and find that I can't breathe, or sleep.

Let's make no mistake: actions such as public censure and removal from a Good Offices position or from ministerial fellowship are executed as a sort of death sentence. These are attempts to kill our colleagues, institutionally. Even if the executing officers should claim that this is just a "little bit" of death, or only a "kind" of death, it is disingenuous to imagine that such acts of institutional violence do not affect their victims' health and well-being. (The executioners should stay alert for rebounding effects on their own cells and tissues.)

One victim of this organization's recent police actions now has an ulcer. Another has advanced liver cancer. I see these as the direct results of institutional violence, that "little bit" of death delivered by the pressure of an authoritarian knee on a human mind and body. I would gladly support any legal action—class or individual—that may be taken against such an organization by its victims or their survivors.

Universalism and Unitarianism

To the executive officers of this police organization, I say that to create any kind of *death-in life* is Hell itself, for that is what Hell is. The task of Universalism is to de-create Hell wherever it is a work in progress, not to abet in its construction. Universalism rejects the targeting of one human being by another in the name of righteousness. It rejects imprisonment, exile, or the silencing of those who hold minority opinions or points of view. Your actions are alien to Universalism and the joy that's at its core—the joy that abides beyond the work while making that work possible. You are possessed by a spirit that is joyless, humorless, merciless.

Like all the great Abrahamic religions, the Unitarian way of faith rejects idolatry as the master sin and the root of human bondage. After idols of clay or stone come idols of paper and language. You have anointed a few recent texts and theories with no less status than that of *scripture*, holy writ. They are interesting contributions to a discussion of social problems, yes. But for

you they are TRUE, completely true in every word, and to challenge their truth is to sin. [As it was with the doctrine of the Trinity that we were once commanded to revere.] You are more loyal to a handful of pet theories than you are to persons. You have made an idol of these texts and sacrificed my colleagues on its altar. Your actions are alien to Unitarianism.

I see nothing Unitarian, Universalist, or collegial in the police organization you are creating, one that crushes its minority members with a majoritarian—not “democratic”—knee. I can no longer allow my name or my money to be used in support of such an organization. When a collegial body worthy of the name *Unitarian Universalist Ministers Association* appears again I will happily seek membership. In the meanwhile, I will seek an alternative.

Dissent and True Collegiality

I and many dissident colleagues have been concerned about the above changes in the attitude and praxis of the UUMA. We see it doing things that are unprecedented in modern UU history, echoing the actions of the 45th president of the US. It has instituted practices such as “outing” and public censure. It has failed to condemn the seizure and discarding of multiple copies of a colleague’s book at the 2019 GA. It has failed to honor the legitimacy of multiple points of view on difficult subjects. (In fact, when that colleague’s district Good Offices representative attempted to moderate a conversation, he was removed from his office in Trump-like fashion by the UUMA. We are also witnessing a deeply racist tendency to assign distinct mental, spiritual, and moral qualities to persons who happen to share certain physical characteristics, on the par with the notion that all green-eyed persons are envious.)

Dissenters are by definition those who do not assent or agree. Resignation from an organization is a well-known act of witness by which dissenters express their disagreement. Hence our letter. (Although only 13 signed, we represent a group of about 100 who are in regular communication with each other, including past holders of high offices in the UUA and UUMA and some of our most published writers. Many could not resign at present due to contract stipulations or out of simple fear of the violence that you, again like Donald Trump, seem ready to enact or encourage. Many lay people are also establishing networks of communication addressing these concerns.)

UUMA members who felt alarmed by our act of witness, moving with frantic urgency, immediately posted a long letter that completely ignored the content of our dissenting statements. They also made thinly veiled accusations of racism against the dissenters, ignoring the long careers in justice work of many of us, including 59 years of service by the Rev. Charles Gaines, who was on the bridge at Selma with the Rev. James Reeb when he was attacked and killed by *real* racists. See: <https://www.uuworld.org/articles/2018-service-award-gaines> I cannot compare myself with Rev. Gaines, but I will mention that my own actions include the initiation of a project for translating UU principles document into “exotic” languages personally arranging for the Thai, Farsi, and Hmong translations; these have been followed by Arabic, Italian, and French. This allows roughly a billion more persons (who share a wide range of physical and cultural features) to read our core document in their native language: <https://www.uuworld.org/articles/principles-sources-more-languages>

We dissenters made our decision to resign after more than a year of repeated good-faith efforts to persuade the UUMA to reconsider and change course. Information about this is readily available in public documents. Unitarian Universalists usually pay special heed to small groups of dissenters rather than maligning them. We therefore count on increasingly widespread support as the facts become clear, we explore new avenues for sharing them, and journalists get wind of what’s been going on.

We are currently laying the groundwork for what I expect will become an alternative—not competing—collegial association based on classic Unitarian and Universalist ideas and the liberal Enlightenment values that birthed our modern world. We will seek to operate in an atmosphere of open conversation and calm deliberation, rather than the frantic urgency

and cancel culture of the current UUMA. Academics and musicians often have a choice of professional organizations in their respective fields. UU ministers and the UU movement as a whole will benefit from having such a choice as well.

Argument Against the Proposed 8th U.U. Principle

By Dick Burkhart

What will come up at the 2021 GA is a proposal from the Article II Study Commission (the UU principles and sources article), presumably on the proposed "8th principle". This could be passed by a majority vote for further debate and possible amendment, but could only be adopted by a 2/3 vote in a subsequent GA (it's called a "C" bylaw). I expect that the proposed 8th principle could be quite contentious, as it's subject matter (race and multiculturalism) is actually covered by our first principle in a much more universal way. The new, more narrow wording not only makes assumptions of questionable validity, but opens the door to a plethora of new "principles" that reflect particular agendas more than universal values.

The questionable assumption is that "*racism and other oppressions in ourselves and our institutions*" exists in the UUA of such significance as to require a whole new principle rather than a re-thinking of existing policies. The "Commission on Institutional Change" was set up to find and expose the required evidence, but in my judgment it failed spectacularly. It had one general survey question, whose wording was so vague as to be meaningless, and apparently only a few dozen detailed reports of incidents, which could have happened over the last several decades (and the COIC worked on this for 3 years). In addition, none of the incidents were investigated to get the "other side", so we don't know how many were actually due to racial prejudice versus misunderstandings, differences of class, or other factors. Such objective investigations would have been very informative and useful in my opinion., leading to wiser changes in policy. Instead we have a situation of bearing down harder on what has failed for 20 years, namely policies of disrespect and labeling based on Critical Race Theory. I highly recommend Irshad Manji's new book "Don't Label Me – How to do Diversity without Inflaming the Cultural Wars". It's all about "pluralistic" identity, genuine listening, and building trust, even with the supposed "enemy".

Another very problematic word in the proposed 8th principle is the word "accountably", as in "accountably dismantle racism and other oppressions...", not to mention how you would "dismantle" something that's hardly there, "dismantling" meaning, in the lexicon of Critical Theory, "to tear down" the underlying system (not fix a problem) in some unspecified but presumably very disruptive way. My first thought was that we already know that the UUA is democratically accountable to its member congregations and ultimately to all UUs, so is the presence of the word "accountably" suggesting something different? Yes, it turns out. In Critical Theory, it means accountable is to an identity group, not democratic accountability to the membership.

In this case, the UUA website says “White UUs hold themselves accountable to communities of color” such as a “People of Color Caucus within congregations, districts, etc.”. Would such a caucus be democratically elected by, and held accountable to, their community? No. Instead they are supposed “to discern” .. “the needs and concerns” of their community, with no specified mechanism of accountability, just as the accountability of the white UUs has no specified mechanism, despite the vast array of such mechanisms tested in the history of democracy. And in practice it turns out that the elite, self-appointed activists in these caucuses have often been out-of-touch with their community. A prime example, is the current campaign to “defund the police”, where surveys show that the vast majority of blacks want better policing, not fewer police. And would most UU people of color actually support actions like those taken against Todd Eklof if they knew the facts? I doubt it. In other words, the word “accountably” introduces a whole new governance system without any debate or even awareness, as very few UUs would have a clue about these esoteric meanings or their implications.

The UUA’s White Supremacy Culture Theory (WSC) as a Religion

by Dr. Maskil David Cycleback

(Cycleback is author of the university textbook *Cognitive Science of Religion and Belief Systems*)

This is an edited copy of a letter I wrote to my congregation, Westside in Seattle.

"There are hundreds of paths up the mountain, all leading to the same place, so it doesn't matter which path you take. The only person wasting time is the one who runs around the mountain, telling everyone that his or her path is wrong. "-- Hindu Proverb

"The rise of fundamentalisms of every kind—fundamentalisms of the mind, fundamentalisms of religion, fundamentalisms of politics—should both alarm and galvanize us, for fundamentalism is antithetical to freedom."-- Starr King President Rosemary Bray McNatt in 2011

"It's a religion."-- Columbia University Professor John McWhorter

This essay looks at how numerous academics, experts and Unitarian Universalists consider Critical Race Theory (CRT) and the Unitarian Universalist Association(UUA)’s White Supremacy Cultural theory (WSC) a religion or quasi-religion. WSC is derived from CRT (Takahashi 2017). My conclusion is that, within the context of UU, WSC is a religion, and, more specifically, a fundamentalist religion. This essay also looks at the implications of this to UU and UUs.

I start by saying that UU and Westside are interfaith. While I vigorously reject religious and secular dogmatism and fundamentalism, I have a great interest in and appreciation of the world’s religions and belief systems. I have gained philosophical, psychological and spiritual insights from the swaths of religious and secular beliefs. Along with philosophy and science books, my

bookshelf includes John Hick, the Zohar, the Upanishads, Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, Rumi, Huston Smith and the Egyptian Book of the Dead. This essay is no damnation of religions themselves, and Westside includes and welcomes Christians, atheists, Buddhists, Jews, agnostics and mystics.

All religions and all belief systems, including secular, have their insights and severe limits, their positives and negatives, their truths and falsehoods, their particular perspectives and finite scopes, their liberation and their oppression. All should be kept in proper perspective and seen for what they are.

The problem is when a religious or secular belief system is treated as dogma, proclaimed as “the one truth and the one true way,” when it is used as the final arbiter and word for everything, when people are told that all should follow it. Dogmatism and fundamentalism are incompatible with UU. UU has no state religion. Most people joined UU because of its lack of dogma and fundamentalism, because it is a place that allows laity to think for themselves and come to their own personal answers.

Numerous academics and experts, including within UU, have compared Critical Race Theory and the White Supremacy Culture theory (CRT/WSC) to a religion. Writes journalist Art Keller, “It is not a particularly unique observation to notice that the Critical Social Justice movement, particularly the part that embraces Critical Race Theory, bears tremendous resemblance to a secular religion.” (Keller 2020)

WSC is full of Abrahamic ideas of original sin, spiritual awakening, blasphemy, thought and expression control, suspension of disbelief, believers versus unbelievers and moral versus immoral, repentance, admission of sin, submission to authority, binary black-or-white thinking, calling those who do not fully subscribe to the theory immoral (“racists,” “upholders of white supremacy”). The UUA, UU World and UUA leaders regularly describe it in religious terms. Some UUs, including ministers and some at Westside, have compared the WSC model and the new UUA to Catholicism and Calvinism.

Sociology professors Bradley Campbell and Jason Manning, write: “I think it’s similar to a lot of utopian political movements in having similarities to religion. Those at the forefront of the movement, who wholeheartedly embrace an oppression/victimhood worldview derived from Critical Theory, and who see it as providing a basis for a call for repentance and change in their own lives and the lives of others, and as a call to restructure social institutions, seem to have embraced something very much like a religion.” (Cambell & Manning 2018)

In the following short video titled “How Anti-Racism Hurts Black People,” Columbia University professor John McWhorter explains not only how he believes the current CRT form of anti-racism is a religion, but how it hurts racial justice. A promoter of critical thinking, McWhorter is firmly against all forms of illiberalism, fundamentalism and dogmatism.

He says, "Anti-racism, as currently configured, has gone a long way from what used to be considered intelligent and sincere civil rights activism. Today it is a religion. And I don't mean that as a rhetorical faint. It is what any naive anthropologist would recognize as a religion."

Video: John McWhorter, "How Anti-Racism Hurts Black People": <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mT2rIJe9cuU>

In the below article, "Kneeling in the Church of Social Justice," Professor McWhorter goes into more detail about how it resembles a fundamentalist religion, specifically calling out recent illiberal trends in the UUA.

He writes, "Unitarianism has been all but taken over in many places by modern antiracist theology, forcing the resignation of various ministers and other figures. The new faith also manifests itself in objections to what its adherents process as dissent."

Essay: John McWhorter: "Kneeling in the Church of Social Justice": <https://reason.com/2020/06/29/kneeling-in-the-church-of-social-justice/>

Author of the landmark social psychology book *The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements*, Eric Hoffer wrote how fanatical movements tell their followers to reject logic and reason, and chastise and shame dissenters or even those who merely ask questions. Notice this with the UUA and fundamentalist promoters of WSC. Hoffer also wrote how the movements do not see people as individuals but as categories. Again, a hallmark of the CRT/WSC models.

Wrote Hoffer, "Mass movements aggressively promote the use of doctrines that elevate faith over reason and serve as fact-proof screens between the faithful and the realities of the world. The doctrine of the mass movement must not be questioned under any circumstances."

Fundamentalism and dogmatism are a psychology, and fundamentalists and zealots are a psychological-type. Fanatics on the far left and far right come from the same psychological cloth. A UU said that the political spectrum really is a circle not a line, and that the further one goes to the left the further one moves to the right. Illiberalism and dogmatism used to be associated with the far-right, but are commonly found today in many far-left movements.

The following essay, "The Righteous and the Woke – Why Evangelicals and Social Justice Warriors Trigger Me in the Same Way," was written by the psychologist Dr. Valery Tarico who was raised an Evangelical Christian and studies evangelical movements. She says that the current fundamentalist far-left CRT/WSC social justice movements remarkably resemble the fundamentalist evangelical Christianity she was raised in and ultimately escaped.

Essay: Dr. Valery Terico: "The Righteous and the Woke – Why Evangelicals and Social Justice Warriors Trigger Me in the Same Way: <https://valerietarico.com/2019/01/24/the-righteousness-and-the-woke-why-evangelicals-and-social-justice-warriors-trigger-me-in-the-same-way/>

In the essay, Terico writes, "It occurred to me recently that my time in Evangelicalism and subsequent journey out have a lot to do with why I find myself reactive to the spread of Woke culture among colleagues, political soulmates, and friends. Christianity takes many forms, with Evangelicalism being one of the more single-minded, dogmatic, groupish and enthusiastic among them. The Woke—meaning progressives who have "awoken" to the idea that oppression is *the key concept* explaining the structure of society, the flow of history, and virtually all of humanity's woes—share these qualities. To a former Evangelical, something feels too familiar—or better said, a bunch of somethings feel too familiar."

Dr. Dick Burkhardt, a longtime UU social-justice activist has compared CRT/WSC to a fundamental religion, and one that is antithetical to UU and the 7 Principles. He wrote, "The real problem is its fundamentalism, with fascist aspects (thought control, punishment of dissidents, oligarchical governance). That is, CRT is simply incompatible with our 7 principles."

Burkhardt also points out that these far-left, fundamentalist movements, such as WSC and CRT are statistically fringe and subscribed to by a very small minority of people, including within Blacks and POC (Mouk 2018). A small group of self-described radicals in the UUA is not a proxy for Black or POC Americans.

My conclusion is that the question of if CRT is a religion in general is debatable. However, within the context of UU, the White Supremacy Culture model is a religion. It shares so many aspects of Abrahamic religion (original sin, awakening, anointed peoples, moving beyond reason and logic, etc). The model is considered and described in religious and spiritual terms. It is taught as church doctrine in UU seminaries. Further the dogmatism and fundamentalism of the model makes it a fundamentalist religion akin to Catholicism or Calvinism.

Not so long ago the UUA and UUA leadership stood up against the dogmatism, fundamentalism and illiberalism that it now embraces

Just nine years ago the Starr King UU Seminary President Rosemary Bray McNutt wrote the following UU World essay titled, "The threat of fundamentalism: Unitarian Universalists must boldly participate in the religious marketplace of ideas."

2011 UU World Essay: "The threat of fundamentalism: Unitarian Universalists must boldly participate in the religious marketplace of ideas.": <https://www.uuworld.org/articles/threat-fundamentalism>

Quotes from the essay include:

"The rise of fundamentalisms of every kind—fundamentalisms of the mind, fundamentalisms of religion, fundamentalisms of politics—should both alarm and galvanize us, for fundamentalism is antithetical to freedom."

"When Sister Elizabeth Johnson's books are censored because the Roman Catholic Church finds them unsupportive of doctrine, we should make ourselves known as a supportive presence and affirm the freedom of inquiry upon which all of us depend."

How times have changed in the UUA. The UU Ministers Association has recently gotten rid of due process, the right for a minister to have legal representation, and numerous dissenting ministers have either been expelled or quit the organization. A longtime UU minister who quit the UUMA wrote the following open letter to the UUMA titled "Dogmatism and Fanaticism in the UU."

Essay: UU Rev. Mark Gallagher: "Dogmatism and Fanaticism in the UU": <https://trulyopenmindsandhearts.blog/2019/10/28/dogmatism-and-fanaticism-in-uu/>

I treat the WSC theory as I treat any religion or belief theory, Catholicism to Islam to World Pantheism. As with any religion or theory, it offers a useful lens and some important insights, but also has major problems and shortcomings.

Problems include its reductionism, racial and ethnic stereotyping, sexism, lack of logical cohesion, binary thinking, hypocrisy, and, of course, its dogmatism, fundamentalist and rejection of critical thinking, reason and science. In the name of anti-racism and anti-oppression, the model is bigoted against other groups.

A common complaint against the current UUA and its new theology is its overt ageism. Constitutional law professors Daniel Farber, of the University of California-Berkeley, and Suzanna Sherry, of Vanderbilt University, have written about the model's antisemitism and anti-Asian biases, along with its undermining of community democracy and dialogue (Farber and Sherry 1997). John McWhorter has said that the White Fragility theory is "how to be racist in a whole new way" (McWhorter 2020) and the University of Chicago's Richard Posner decries its stereotyping of Blacks (Posner 1997).

CRT/WSC's rejection of liberalism, freedom of expression and thought, its use of dogmatism and fanaticism, all make it incompatible with UU. Anti-liberal and liberal religion are by definition mutually exclusive. The only way CRT/WSC can be UU dogma and primary institutional framework is if UU is no longer a liberal religion.

Can individual UUs subscribe to the CRT/WSC theory and can WSC as a theory be used as one of the many lenses at Westside? Of course. UU and Westside are interfaith, and, as said,

a UU can be Christian, Jewish, Hindu or atheist, communist or capitalist. Westside has had sermons, classes and discussion groups on Christianity, Islam, science, Taoism and Buddhism. I've attended classes at Westside on Islam and Pre-Easter Jesus, and Westside has a Buddhist meditation group and secular humanism covenant group. However, this is much different than saying UU or Westside is now a Christian religion, Orthodox Jewish religion or atheist religion, or that the whole of UU or Westside will now be based on Catholic or Orthodox or anti-theist doctrine that laity must now subscribe to.

It is also a matter of how you consider and use the religion (or secular belief or theory or model). I have favorite Jesuit, Orthodox Jewish, Hindu and atheist theologians and philosophers without subscribing to any of those religions. I know each religion has its limits, artifice and problems, and separate the wheat from the chaff. I am a fan of the British philosopher of religion and Christian Minister John Hick without believing in Jesus as Lord or the Holy Trinity or agreeing with everything Hick wrote. One can love Rumi poems while not being Muslim and rejecting the problematic parts of Islam. One can be a Christian and a UU, but an Evangelical fundamentalist would not fit in most to all UU congregations.

My hope is that the UUA can return to a rejection of dogmatism, fundamentalism. I hope it once again promotes UU as a liberal religion that appreciates the diversity of religious and secular views.

Considering the illiberal, dogmatic and some even say fanatical turn in the current UUA, Westside should strongly continue and protect its liberal, interfaith tradition, and reject dogmatism, fundamental and fanaticism, including whether it comes down from Boston or ever appears within Westside.

References

Campbell & Manning (2018), "The Rise of Victimhood Culture," Palgrave Macmillan

Farber D and Sherry S (1997), "Beyond All Reason: The Radical Assault on Truth in American Law. Oxford University Press

Keller Art (2020), "Critical Race Theory is a Victimization Cult", newdiscourses.com/2020/06/critical-race-theory-victimization-cult/

McWhorter J (2020), "The Dehumanizing Condescension of White Fragility", theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/07/dehumanizing-condescension-white-fragility/614146/

Mounk K (2018), "Americans Strongly Dislike PC Culture," theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2018/10/large-majorities-dislike-political-correctness/572581/

Posner R (October 1997). "The Skin Trade,." The New Republic, 217

Takahashi L (2018), "WHY LOOK AT RACISM IN THE UUA?", uua.org/sites/live-new.uua.org/files/coic_talk_race_uua_112017.pdf

Smash Racism! Build Multi-Racial Unity!



John Brown's body lies a-rotting in the grave, but WE go marching on...

**Celebrate the 120th Anniversary of
John Brown's Raid Against Slavery**

RALLY AT HARPER'S FERRY

HARPER'S FERRY, WEST VIRGINIA

Saturday, Oct. 27, 1979

RAIN INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST RACISM

P.O. Box A-3338 - Chicago, Ill. 60690 (312) 224-67