

## Anatomy of the Liberal Mob

### Part I: The Liberal Viewpoint and a Brief History of Liberalism in the United States

The United States is at war with itself: liberals vs. conservatives. Everyone feels it. The same could be said of the developed world as a whole, but it is more acute in the United States. And to speak of war is more than a metaphor since the signs of war, guns and violence, are part of the unrest.

While most conservatives identify with the Christian faith, liberals are less likely to be Christian. The so-called Nones, those who profess no religious affiliation, have steadily grown in number and identify mostly with liberals. Although there is still a significant religious element among liberals, the doctrinal gulf between Christian liberals and Christian conservatives is huge. The Christian liberal considers God's word in the Bible to be compromised by the mores of the ancient culture. Since our culture is very different today, a traditional understanding of scripture is rejected by them. To be sure, most Christian conservatives do not articulate a fully traditional Christian viewpoint either, but traditional Christian doctrine, when articulated, comes from Christian conservatives. By "traditional" I mean a historic understanding of Christian doctrine traceable to the first century AD and the Reformation period, as espoused by orthodox Lutheran denominations, the Roman Catholic Church, Eastern Orthodox Churches, the Southern Baptist Convention (mostly), and some others. Although there are fundamental differences among these faith traditions, I do not distinguish between them in this paper.

I use the term "liberal" to encompass all progressives, the cultural elite, radical liberals, and the "woke." Later in the paper I use the term "liberal mob" interchangeably with "modern-day liberals" to emphasize the tendency for liberals to operate corporately as an entity.

It is a simplification to categorize people into only two groups, liberal and conservative. After all, there is considerable heterogeneity among those in each of the two groups. Some would not self-identify with either camp. However, regardless of how they classify themselves, if a careful accounting were done, most individuals would identify more strongly with the viewpoints of one of the groups. They may not articulate or even be aware of the positions espoused by their group's trendsetters, but they support them in myriad small actions every day and at the ballot box.

The socio-economic-religious viewpoints held by liberals and conservatives are captured in a set of phrases below. They represent the dominant mindset of each group with a slant toward current thinking among its trendsetters. Each of these viewpoints correlates with differences in religious understanding or lack thereof. At a glance, it lays bare the huge disparity between the two groups. As noted above, the average conservative does not completely support a traditional understanding of Biblical doctrine.

- Political party affiliation:
  - Liberals: Democratic party.
  - Conservatives: Republican party.
- Religious affiliation:
  - Liberals: None, progressive mainline Christian church, or other religion.
  - Conservatives: Member of a Christian church, which may be traditional.
- View of Traditional Morality:
  - Liberals: Traditional morality often oppresses people.
  - Conservatives: Traditional morality supports good behavior in society.

- Freedom:
  - Liberals: Freedom requires liberation from traditional morality and social constructs.
  - Conservatives: Freedom can only flourish within moral boundaries.
- Non-judgmentalism:
  - Liberals: Non-judgmentalism is essential since there are no absolute standards.
  - Conservatives: Non-judgmentalism leads to lawlessness.
- Inclusivity/Diversity:
  - Liberals: An imperative.
  - Conservatives: Secondary to ability-based standards.
- Sex outside marriage:
  - Liberals: A matter of personal choice.
  - Conservatives: Morally wrong.
- Abortion:
  - Liberals: A woman's right to choose.
  - Conservatives: A form of murder.
- Feminism:
  - Liberals: Men and women are interchangeable.
  - Conservatives: Men and women are different, but don't ask me to say so.
- Biological sex:
  - Liberals: An artificial construct; transgenderism is just another choice.
  - Conservatives: Predetermined by genetics.
- Homosexuality:
  - Liberals (two views which conflict): Homosexuality is a free choice. It is set before birth.
  - Conservatives: Uncomfortable with it and/or a sin.
- Racism:
  - Liberals: The United States has always been systemically racist.
  - Conservatives: Racism still exists but the United States has made great progress.
- Victimhood:
  - Liberals: Women and minorities are victims of white men.
  - Conservatives: Victimhood exists but is not widespread.
- United States history:
  - Liberals: A dishonorable past stained by racism and bigotry.
  - Conservatives: An honorable past, though mistakes have been made.
- Big government:
  - Liberals: Necessary to prevent oppression and eliminate inequity.
  - Conservatives: Obtrusive.
- Socialism:
  - Liberals: A good way to counteract class inequity.
  - Conservatives: Leads to laziness and inefficiency.
- Big business:
  - Liberals: Oppresses people.
  - Conservatives: An important source of jobs and trade.

- Environment:
  - Liberals: More important than resource development
  - Conservatives: Less important than resource development.
- Animal rights:
  - Liberals: Love animals as yourself.
  - Conservatives: Cruelty to animals is wrong.
- Freedom of Speech:
  - Liberals: Freedom of speech is often used as a cover for hate speech.
  - Conservatives: Freedom of speech is a cornerstone of democracy.
- Violence as a means of achieving social goals:
  - Liberals: Violence is wrong but don't ask me to condemn protests for justice even if they become heated. If violence does develop, police make matters worse.
  - Conservatives: Protests which turn into riots need to be handled by the police to prevent harm to people and property.

These are immense differences. The last characteristic, violence as a means of achieving social goals, is especially ominous because it threatens peaceful coexistence. We have seen that recently in the riots, the tearing down of statues and monuments, the movement to defund police budgets, and the anarchy of "autonomous zones." There is also a powerful attempt to erase and re-write history. Witness the renaming of public structures and institutions and The 1619 Project.<sup>1</sup>

Though violence is likely to wax and wane in the short-run, the fundamental disagreement between the two sides is intensifying. Unless something is done to relieve the pressure, life as we know it in the United States is likely to undergo radical change.

**The Vietnam War brought vigorous debate and rebellion to college campuses and a new generation of progressives who rejected the inherited Judeo-Christian legacy of the nation in favor of humanistic ideas.**

Conservative historians tend to trace the beginnings of liberalism to the Enlightenment period when the idea of progress through reason, apart from God, was fashionable. When the very unenlightened French Revolution jolted the world out of its enchantment with steady human progress, scientific progress still drew public attention with its many theoretical and practical achievements. Evolutionary theory was one of these, and it provided a further means of weakening the public's reliance on the Bible. Science filled the gap. Eventually questions about Biblical historicity opened the door to viewing spiritual truth as culturally determined and therefore amenable to alteration as cultural mores changed.

The conservative narrative continues that steady scientific progress in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries reduced the need for hard physical labor by men, labor-saving devices lessened the burden of housework for women, and greater education for both men and women created new job opportunities as the standard of living rose. As the economic importance of men's physical labor diminished, women began to seek a voice in the public square leading to women's suffrage in 1920. The weakening of religious faith in the United States in the twentieth century was encouraged by weak leadership from the church and increasing trust in material things rather than God. By the 1960's, the sexual revolution emerged due to widely available birth control methods and growing feminism. Civil rights protests of that period led to the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, which rightfully addressed racial prejudice, but also led to racial

and gender preferences in college admissions and hiring, the antecedent to today's identity politics.<sup>2</sup> The unlawfulness of sex discrimination, also part of the Civil Rights Act, as well as Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, led to numerous lawsuits by feminists to gain access to formerly male positions. The Vietnam War brought vigorous debate and rebellion to college campuses and a new generation of progressives who rejected the inherited Judeo-Christian legacy of the nation in favor of humanistic ideas. Craven college administrators compromised with them and began to offer politicized courses in the humanities which comported with their worldview. Although the campus upheaval cooled off with the end of the Vietnam War, these same radical students cut their hair, started carrying briefcases, and took their ideas with them to other schools, the church, the media, government, and business. They were not many in numbers, but they were passionate. As their careers developed, so did their influence. As the country became more secular, it became clay they could mold to their liking. It was a quiet revolution that fomented for decades below the attention of most Americans. Meanwhile family structure began to unravel, especially among African-Americans.

The liberal revolution emanated from colleges and universities, and they remain the most virulent centers of liberalism today.

A couple of recent quotes help to illuminate the thinking of liberal intellectuals and those influenced by them.

Gary Saul Morson, professor of Russian literature at Northwestern University, sees parallels between the intellectuals in the United States today and those in Russia at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution. When asked in an interview why the intellectuals in the United States want to destroy the system that enabled their success, Morson replied, "No, you have it wrong. When you're such a person, you don't feel you're at the top. The people at the top are wealthy businesspeople, and you're an intellectual. You think that people of ideas should be at the top."<sup>3</sup>

Reflecting a related sentiment, Angelo Codeville, professor emeritus at Boston University, was asked by Rush Limbaugh why polling shows that 70% of millennials would vote socialist when the country is so prosperous. His answer: "Let me tell you exactly why. Because when they look up at the next rung in the socioeconomic ladder ... they don't see the right cultural models, and they know experientially that if they're going to climb that ladder, they've got to conform themselves to the people who are directly above."<sup>4</sup>

The common thread is that many people are covetous of success and allow self-interest to dictate their world-views. *Faith in God has given way to a humanistic ethos characteristic of liberalism.* This liberalism has now engulfed most of the media and half of government and business. Tech firms are run almost entirely by liberals. The liberal machine has achieved critical mass. The colleges and universities indoctrinate their students with increasingly leftist ideas, and when the students begin working, their path to success is to emulate their mentors, who are mostly liberal.

Rusty Reno, the editor of *First Things*, sees the current state of liberalism as a consequence of the American quest for freedom.<sup>5</sup> I believe that is an accurate assessment until the twentieth century, during which the quest for freedom increasingly became a justification, or rather a cover, for something more insidious. The problem with the standard conservative narrative for the development of today's liberalism, and its overarching characterization as the quest for ever-greater freedom, is that it fails to call out the godlessness of the core movement which enabled the development of modern liberalism. The cause of freedom, so legitimate and evident in casting off British tyranny, the curse of slavery, and racial prejudice during the civil rights movement in the 1960's, is a default explanation which no longer applies. In its place is an agent for change whose insidious nature is merely cloaked under claims for freedom, especially freedom from oppression and victimhood. Under that cloak lies feminism. It is the taproot of liberalism.

## **Part II: Feminism is the Taproot of Liberalism**

God created man and woman equal before God but with complementary roles.<sup>6</sup> Vengeful Satan hated God's creation and its culmination in mankind. He knew that the introduction of sin would have catastrophic consequences for the relationship between God and humanity and between man and woman. So he played on Eve's desire to be like God – a susceptibility to the allure of power. Adam, apparently wishing to please his mate and not thinking about the consequences, joined in the disobedience to God. That single act, so simple in action and terrible in consequence, cast humanity out of perfect union with God and required the death of God's Son to repair the breach.

After the fall, in Genesis 3:16 (ESV) God tells Eve that "...Your desire shall be against your husband, and he shall rule over you." And in Genesis 3:17 God punished Adam for disobedience, saying that cursed is the ground on account of him. The original sin of the fall also laid the groundwork for further discord by introducing a chink into our spiritual DNA: the latent desire for a wife to have power over her husband, or more generally, for women to have power over men.

While this chink created the potential for marital and societal discord, the originally intended (pre-fall) headship role of men in marriage was partially sustained after the fall by practical realities. Work required heavy physical labor from men and managing a household required hard work in the form of the feminine arts of cooking, cleaning, sewing, and child rearing from women. Men were well-suited to this arrangement because of greater physical strength and hormonal differences which facilitate hunting, farming, and aggressive activities like war. Likewise, the child-bearing capability of women and the bonding which occurs during nursing naturally encourage household activities. By divine intent the faithful men of the Bible were invested by God with leadership roles as fathers, apostles, elders, rulers, battle commanders, teachers, administrators, herdsman, and farmers. The faithful women were wonderful mothers, wives, consolers, teachers of children and other women, and advocates for the faith. These roles naturally fit with God's complementary roles for the two sexes.

Because God is a God of order, it only makes sense that men and women would also be mentally hardwired by design for a role relationship consistent with God's complementarity of the sexes. That is, wishing to aid men and women in their roles, he also gave them mental characteristics<sup>7</sup> fitting for those roles. No sensible person doubts that men are typically stronger than women. If God gave men the physical characteristics well-suited to taming the physical world, does it not make sense that he would give him related mental characteristics, such as forcefulness and drive? And similarly, for the sake of concord, does it not make sense that women would have mental characteristics complementary to those of men, such as nurturing and consoling? It follows that these different mental characteristics of men and women must necessarily find expression in daily activities for emotional well-being.

With man and woman each fittingly integrated in mind and body, we have the timeless image of the strong, intent father with his nurturing wife and children at his side, the epitome of the harmonious family unit, the fundamental unit of civilization.<sup>8</sup> Women were proud of their femininity and the skill and energy required to raise a family. Men worked hard to defend their honor which was inseparable from a natural concept of manhood passed down through the millennia. In defending their honor, they also defended women, children, and their country. It worked.

But when physical labor ceased to be the grist of industry, Satan saw his opportunity to destroy the complementarity of the sexes. The dormant chink in the male-female relationship could now be exploited. Liberal women began to seek more power as the importance of men's physical strength diminished. They saw what men had in the public sphere, wanted to be more

like them, and have the same roles. Much like Adam in the Garden, men fecklessly acquiesced to this usurpation in roles. The right to vote gave women political power, and the unlawfulness of sexual discrimination in business and civic organizations meant the breakdown of the classic male and female spheres. Sensing the opportunity for rich settlements and more power for their causes, lawyers, plaintiffs, and liberal politicians began the wholesale dismantling of men's role in society.

Although this dismantling did not occur overnight, the change in the relationship between men and women in the last sixty years has been immense. The emotional needs of males and females – served when we live according to our design – have been severely frustrated by the feministic ethos in which we now live. Boys in school, for example, are increasingly restrained from expressing their natural exuberance, which is interpreted as a lack of cooperation or bullying. Drugs may be prescribed to curb unwanted behavior. Recess is carefully monitored and has been eliminated in some schools. Girls are pressured into playing sports and studying subjects that they may not naturally desire. Campuses are notorious for suspending due process in favor of the liberal accuser. There is no question that some men have behaved badly toward women, especially with respect to sexual exploitation and domestic violence, yet the pendulum has swung almost completely in the direction of vilifying men. The workplace has become a minefield of political correctness which must be carefully navigated by men to avoid disciplinary action. Increasingly, young men do not recognize the desirability of fatherhood and its responsibilities, and young women often prefer a career to marriage and children. There are few traditional role models to guide men and women.

Feminism stands in opposition to God's complementarity of the sexes, both in the church and in society, and is therefore a sin. Feminism makes the radical assertion that men are interchangeable with women in all roles. To the extent that this assertion is accepted, other sins can be justified. If men and women are interchangeable, what difference does homosexual marriage make? Why do children need a father if a mother is able to substitute for a father, and so on. As noted above, the driving force behind feminism is the desire for power by liberal women, just as Eve desired it, though feminism wraps itself in a banner of freedom and equality. Because sharing is incompatible with a lust for power, feminism is trending toward a more virulent form which asserts superiority over men. The goal is the feminization of society and the complete elimination of patriarchy.<sup>9</sup> As the liberal Shriver Report put it, we are living in a "woman's world" and "emergent economic power gives women a new seat at the table – at the head of the table."<sup>10</sup>

**Criticism is the most difficult to bear if you fear it may be true...feminism cannot bear to hear of intrinsic differences between men and women.**

Rusty Reno maintains that societal rejection of traditional norms and codes of behavior has been particularly hard on working class Americans and the poor, who need the structure that these provide.<sup>11</sup> The critical role of fathers is downplayed or rejected.<sup>12</sup> The result is broken families, alcoholism, unemployment, drug use, and suicide among this large demographic. The liberal elite, on the other hand, have a support system consisting of high achievement which encourages caution, safe choices, and a non-judgmentalism that allows them to glide through life without rocking the boat. Their souls, however, are darkened by their idolatrous pursuit of success. For many liberals, regardless of economic class, identity politics has substituted for identity with the family.<sup>13</sup>

With the law on its side, and having identified itself with freedom and equality, feminism has

steamrolled all opposition. Liberal women find the power alluring, and liberal men, either because they wish to be validated in some sin of their own, or because they desire the upward mobility that subscription gives them, support it. Conservative men and women have not fought it, either because they are sympathetic to feminist goals or have been intimidated into submission. Society levees heavy penalties against those who reject it.

Criticism is the most difficult to bear if you fear it may be true. And indeed, feminism cannot bear to hear of intrinsic differences between men and women. You may recall the outrage surrounding then President of Harvard, Larry Summers, in the early 2000's when he suggested that men outperform women in science and math because of biological differences.<sup>14</sup> Larry Summers was eventually forced to resign. Today he would not have survived a week. More obvious are physical differences, yet military combat roles are open to women despite studies showing their presence in military units reduces unit effectiveness.<sup>15</sup>

Seeking to expand its reach in recent decades, both politically and in the workplace, feminism has recruited other sinful causes. Radical race, homosexual, abortion, and trans-gender causes have formed an unholy alliance with it under the name of diversity. It is hard to find a feminist who does not support these causes or visa-versa. To offend against one is to offend against all. All of the destructive attitudes about sex outside of marriage and a mélange of other sins are complicit. Expect more sins to gain acceptance. Let us hope that manipulation of human genetics never becomes available.

Because all of these sins reinforce each other, liberals today act as an entity, a liberal mob. Most liberals do not voice support for extreme tactics, but they are part of the support structure of liberalism. They may not be the hand supporting the knife, so to speak, but they are the heart or lungs which enable the corporate whole of the liberal mob to thrive. Just as Christians have many different talents and roles in the invisible church, so liberals have many members acting in different roles in the liberal mob. For that reason, in the remainder of this paper I equate modern-day liberals to the liberal mob.

If you still doubt that feminism is the taproot of liberalism, which makes feminists the central force of the liberal mob, join me in a “thought experiment.” The nice thing about a thought experiment is that you can supply necessary preconditions at will and then run in your mind a simulation to probe the outcome. Of course, the simulation has to be run correctly to yield an accurate result. Let's try one of these, and you be the judge.

Suppose by some magic that all women, liberal or conservative, in the United States woke up tomorrow with the belief that feminism is evil, and they vow to distance themselves from it.

Now imagine an office setting in business, government, academia – it doesn't matter. That very day, with their new attitude, these women begin to mention in casual conversation with their male coworkers that they prefer that the men take the lead in projects, that they aren't interested in getting ahead, and if married that they would like to be stay-at-home spouses and moms. How do you think the men would react? My simulation says that the men would walk around confused wondering if it was a trick or if they had misheard something. They probably wouldn't even mention their observations to other men, thinking it a fluke. If this continued for a couple weeks, by then the men would have compared notes and started to gingerly engage the women in cautious conversation about the subject, still afraid they might be turned in to the diversity officer if they said the wrong thing. A few liberal men, hoping to score points, might try to persuade the women out of their new-found viewpoints, but getting no traction, they too would start to scratch their heads. The men who were deeply involved in various sins, homosexuals for example, would start to worry and chafe at the situation, sensing that they were losing allies. Just as bad from their perspective, traditional sex roles emphasize the importance of “straight” sexuality and marriage. However, most of the other men in the office, after the passage of a few more weeks, would have begun to adjust to the new situation. Some men would argue

against it at home because they like the extra income, but I suspect most would eventually recognize how wonderful traditional roles are. A national debate would ensue and feminism would start to fade from the country, and with it many other evils of the liberal mob. These other evils would be left to fend for themselves, or try ineffectually to shore up what was left of the mob. Radical race proponents would try very hard, but without the feminists, they too would need to step back. This would create an opportunity for a reasoned dialogue about racial injustice.

**...the liberal mob is continually evolving and seeking new sins to co-opt under its diversity and victimhood banner...**

Now, run a different simulation in which homosexuals conclude that their lifestyle is a sin and intend to leave it. The result would be very different. Feminists and other liberal mob members would likely argue with them and there might be negative employment consequences for their rocking the boat. Not only would the liberal mob be losing members, one of its purposes would be questioned. It wouldn't like that. Not too much would change between men and women. Reigning feminism and most of the other evils of the mob would continue as before.

What these simulations simply show is that feminism is the primary support structure for the other sins in the liberal mob; it has the numbers and penetrates into nearly every crevice of society.

Because the liberal mob is continually evolving and seeking new sins to co-opt under its diversity and victimhood banner, it has cancer-like qualities. It metastasizes. It is also polymorphic, exhibiting different faces at different times.

Consider the rate of its metastasis: Over the period of the 1960's through the 1980's, the liberal mob went from a loose association of feminists, advocates for free sex, and pacifists to a clearly discernable political bloc, prevalent in academia but also evident in the media. In the 1990's, it presented as virulent feminism, homosexuality, and radical views of race. With regard to race, what began as a legitimate effort in the 1960's to address systemic racism mutated into an emphasis on victimhood and a de-emphasis on the importance of the stable family unit with a father and mother. In the classroom, especially in the humanities, diversity studies have supplanted true scholarship.

In the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the mob evolved to strongly advocate for "homosexual marriage" and transgender rights. In the last decade, it denied the genetic basis of sex, considering it to be a matter of choice, condoned sex changes for children, and in some schools promoted a bewildering set of pronouns to cover every personal conception of sexuality. More recently it has argued that even concepts like "hard work" and "self-reliance" constitute a form of racism. Free speech is under attack.

The liberal mob spurs on its members through an active exchange of outrage on social media. The greater your outrage, the greater your voice in the mob. This dynamic follows a pattern which can be described algebraically. (If you dislike algebra you can skip this part which I offer somewhat tongue-in-cheek.)

Let's equate the current level of virtue in conservative society to the prevalence of Christian values and practices among conservatives. We call this current level of conservative virtue "**CV**." The liberal mob advocates for a lower level of virtue since it rejects most Christian values. Let's call this lower level of virtue "**MV**" for mob virtue. The difference, **CV-MV**, is the virtue gap. Note that the virtue gap consists of two terms (**CV** and **MV**), so a change in either **CV** or **MV** will affect the value of **CV-MV**. The mob expresses outrage proportional to **CV-MV**. That is, the greater the difference between conservative virtue and mob virtue, the more outraged the mob



will be because it hates the conservatives' Christian virtue. This outrage is used by the mob to make claims about victimhood. Victimhood demands more diversity from conservative society as a counter-measure to victimhood. Now if diversity is used as a criterion by an administrator seeking to fill a position, some other criteria must necessarily be displaced. Ability, experience, and legitimacy as criteria must be sacrificed to some degree. That means a lowering of standards as they were once understood. Simply being different, i.e., diverseness (which may include perverseness) does not confer any capability.<sup>16</sup> A lowering of standards means that the quality of work will suffer among those hired or selected on that basis. If the quality of work suffers, performance will suffer by any objective standard. For someone so hired, this failure to perform will lead to frustration and anger and likely lower income over time. Since the affected individual will not want to look to his or her own deficiencies as the cause, he will readily accept an alternative explanation such as victimhood to account for his shortcomings. Because he is a victim, he can now indignantly call for even more diversity to increase the number like him. He can also encourage special categories of work to examine, study, or mitigate the alleged exploitation, thus creating a less-demanding haven for his labor. All of these diversity-increasing activities decrease the value of **MV** since they inevitably decrease virtue in the mob through advocacy for new sins as intentionally sinful members are added. Thus, there is a positive feedback loop of reduced virtue in the mob **MV** increasing the value of **CV-MV**. This higher value of **CV-MV** translates into fresh outrage to rally the mob. Over time, however, because conservatives keep giving ground and losing virtue, the value of **CV** in conservative society also decreases. As this happens the **CV-MV** signal is diminished. To counter this, the liberal mob is always looking for new sins to draw into its alliance, study, and use to promote a reduced value of **MV** to ensure an adequate level of outrage from **CV-MV** to promote its activities.

There can be temporary interruptions in outrage if conservatives are silent as they have been recently about the riots. If conservatives do not express themselves publicly against the violence, **CV** can be temporarily suppressed since a failure to oppose the violence implies an impotent virtue. A lower **CV** reduces the value of **CV-MV**. That tamps down the magnitude of the outrage from the mob because the conservatives are not as much of a lightning rod. Joseph Sternberg observed recently that liberals have not had enough outrage to maintain their status in the mob and have had to resort to carting around whole wheelbarrows of depreciated outrage.<sup>17</sup> They fume in every direction about additional grievances (which leads to lower **MV**) in an attempt to boost the supply of fresh outrage.

**Clearly the country needs Christian leaven...to prevent the liberal mob from descending into ever-greater depths of abomination...**

It is ironic that the Christian virtue in conservative society which the liberal mob deplores is needed for maintenance of its structure. It needs virtue among conservatives in order to rail against it. (It also needs it because **CV** maintains the quality of life for everyone, though the mob would never acknowledge that.) If conservative society becomes completely indistinguishable from the liberal mob, the current mob structure and dynamic will begin to break down since **CV-MV = 0**. Society as a whole will be corrupt. Because the lust for power will remain, one would expect a power struggle within the mob, which now constitutes society. The stronger will feed on the weaker.

The liberal mob has evolved into a monster which condones violence to further its ganglionic reach and attempts to silence, shame, and harm all its opponents. The end state of liberalism, in which all moral restraint is cast off in the name of freedom, leads to the tyranny of nihilism. We are close to that point.

In the same Limbaugh interview mentioned above, Angelo Codevilla lamented, "... the one thing which is surer than it ever was is that unfortunately, very unfortunately, the Republic that we have known and enjoyed, that has made our lives incomparably better than any on earth, ever, is over. It's done with. Something else will replace it. God knows what it will be."<sup>18</sup>

Although this is a dire statement, I believe he is correct. Let's look at some different scenarios.

### **Part III: The Need for Christian Leaven**

The first, and most likely scenario in my opinion, is that the liberal mob keeps amassing power and increasingly encroaches on religious and civic freedoms. Shockingly inappropriate government and corporate leaders become the norm. There are scattered protests against the mob from conservatives, but increasingly Christians are marginalized as religious rights are nullified. In response, some Christians start to migrate to safer areas. Most urban areas slowly decay as the country's moral woes lead to disorder and economic problems. Eventually factions within the liberal mob turn on each other, one of them gains the upper hand, and order is restored by the victor. Christians by this time are openly persecuted, regardless of where they live.

A second scenario – less likely but still possible – is that the liberal mob moves too fast and that there is a major conservative backlash with an emerging leader, either a government figure or a vigilante. How this scenario plays out depends on whether this figure operates within or outside of the law and how the military responds, but one can imagine him rallying conservatives and leading a powerful counter-offensive against the liberals. If the liberals win, the first scenario would effectively be the result. If the conservatives win, the problem is *then what?* What do conservatives do with the vanquished mob when it comprises most of the country? Martial law would be required to maintain order and rebuild society.

The third, and least likely scenario, is that a very charismatic conservative leader emerges who is smart, Christian, persuasive, and able to formulate sensible, durable solutions to the country's problems and convince enough people to go along with him. A Christian revival ensues. Let's pray for this outcome.

The foregoing scenarios relate to the developing political backdrop of the country. Given these scenarios, how should we as Christians conduct ourselves?

Clearly the country needs Christian leaven. Without it, there is nothing to prevent the liberal mob from descending into ever-greater depths of abomination, and taking society with it.

As the liberal mob threatens and intimidates, we Christians must be as bold in our witness to truth as our courage and circumstances permit – both in church and among our many contacts in life. That means speaking against the sins of the mob, not in rancor but in love. I am amazed how powerful even one opposing voice can be in the face of evil. But we should also be prepared to talk about the alternatives to the liberal prescription. It is one thing to point out evil, but if we can't articulate a way out or an alternative to it, we will seem impractical.

If people are deep in the word of God, everything will have a natural tendency to fall into place for happy productive lives. The ideal family model is a traditional Christian home consisting of husband, wife, and, if so blessed, children. Fathers are as essential as mothers in the upbringing of children. The father should be the sole or primary breadwinner and take very seriously his duty to be the spiritual leader of the family. This model may not be possible in all cases, but it remains the ideal. Those who are single should encourage this model by their viewpoints and actions.

There is no place for feminism and other evils in this model. Traditional roles must be upheld. If you can't or won't do this, then you are contributing to the problems of the country.

As a starting point in discussions with skeptical Christians, and certainly with unbelievers, it is

worth pointing out how sour male and female relations have become compared to those of prior generations. There is so much conflict and competition between the sexes. Clearly something is wrong. Before there was a thrill and excitement to courtship. Sexual expression was postponed for marriage which only added to the anticipation and bonding. Married or not, men and women had well-defined roles which allowed each to excel in his or her own sphere. There was enormous joy for a married man to love and provide for his wife and children, and for the wife to love and serve her family full-time. Those who were not married compensated by having more time to serve their communities and church. The obvious question: But what about a career outside the home for married women? Women are missing out! Answer: Not really. The importance of a career outside the home for happiness is greatly over-rated. Ask any man about his career. He may point to activities and accomplishments, whether small or great, that he is happy about, but if he really thinks about it, the most cherished moments in his life will be bound up in his experiences with other people. If he sank a fabulous putt in front of millions on television and savors it in his mind, I doubt it was the public adulation which is the basis of his joy. More likely it was because he relished recounting the experience privately with a friend, quite possibly his wife. If all he had was public acclaim to remember, he might even feel a gnawing irritation about all the putts he missed. Women excel in such relationships and have more time for them if they are homemakers. Their families call them blessed for their dedication. One doesn't hear much about the late Phyllis Schlafly these days, but her books speak to the joys of homemaking as a career. C. S. Lewis considered a homemaker working to nourish and care for her family to have the most important job in the world.<sup>19</sup>

The importance of Christian education and catechesis must also be mentioned. The indoctrination of the young begins early at most public schools. Support Christian education and help infuse it with Godly instruction which prepares students for the realities of the world.

These are surely trying times. One evening I went to bed and tossed and turned thinking about the sorry state of the world. I asked God for peace and guidance. The next morning in Bible class, I opened my Bible and my eyes landed on this verse:

“and if he rescued righteous Lot, greatly distressed by the sensual conduct of the wicked (for as that righteous man lived among them day after day, he was tormenting his righteous soul over their lawless deeds that he saw and heard); then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from trials, and to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment”. (2 Peter 2:7-9 ESV)

Now I know that I am not a righteous man apart from Christ, but we are all counted as righteous through faith in Jesus Christ. God will rescue us from the coming trials!

And “Finally, brothers, whatever is true, whatever is honorable, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is commendable, if there is any excellence, if there is anything worthy of praise, think about these things.” (Phil 4:8 ESV)

“... in your hearts honor Christ the Lord as holy, always being prepared to make a defense to anyone who asks you for a reason for the hope that is in you ...” (1 Peter 3:15 ESV)

**John F. Lang, Ph.D.**

- 
1. Robert L. Woodson, “The 1619 Project Hurts Blacks,” *The Wall Street Journal* (online) <https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-1619-project-hurts-blacks-11567033108>, (August 28, 2019).
  2. Mike Gonzalez, “We Might Get Fooled Again,” *The Wall Street Journal*, section A (July 10, 2020), p. 15.
  3. Barton Swaim, “Violent Protest and the Intelligentsia,” *The Wall Street Journal* (online)

- <https://www.wsj.com/articles/violent-protest-and-the-intelligentsia-11591400422>, (June 5, 2020).
4. Rush Limbaugh, "My Conversation with Angelo Codevilla," *The Limbaugh Letter* (online) [http://www.thelimbaughletter.com/thelimbaughletter/december\\_2019/MobilePagedArticle.action?articleId=1541236#articleId1541236](http://www.thelimbaughletter.com/thelimbaughletter/december_2019/MobilePagedArticle.action?articleId=1541236#articleId1541236), (December 2019).
5. R. R. Reno, *Resurrecting the Idea of a Christian Society* (Washington: Regnery Faith, 2016), p. 23.
6. See, for example: Gary Zieroth, "The Vocation of Man in the Church and Home," *The Lutheran Clarion*, in three parts beginning with Vol. 12, September 2019, Issue 1; Paul Harris, "Stand Here Fathers," *The Lutheran Clarion*, in three parts beginning with Vol. 10, November 2017, Issue 2; Heath R. Curtis, "Natural Law and Women in Combat," *The Lutheran Clarion*, Vol. 9, March 2017, Issue 4; David O. Berger, "Commentary on and Analysis of the CTCR Report: 'Women and Military Service: a Lutheran Perspective,'" *The Lutheran Clarion*, Vol. 10, July 2018, Issue 6; John F. Lang, "Divine Difference," *The Lutheran Clarion*, Vol. 11, September 2018, Issue 1; George W. Knight III, *The Role Relationship of Men and Women* (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1985); *Women Pastors?*, eds. Matthew C. Harrison and John T. Pless (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2012).
7. Suzanne Venker and Phyllis Schlafly, *The Flipside of Feminism* (Washington: WND Books, 2011), pp. 146-148.
8. Phyllis Schlafly, *Who Killed the American Family?* (Washington: WND Books, 2014), p. 1.
9. Suzanne Venker and Phyllis Schlafly, pp. 141-166.
10. The Shriver Report as quoted in Phyllis Schlafly, *Who Killed the American Family?*, p. 29.
11. Reno, p. 39-64.
12. "The Catastrophe of Fatherless America," *American Family Association* (online), <https://afa.net/the-stand/family/2020/06/the-catastrophe-of-fatherless-america/> (June 18, 2020).
13. Mary Eberstadt, *Primal Screams: How the Sexual Revolution Created Identity Politics* (West Conshohocken: Templeton Press, 2019).
14. Suzanne Goldberg, "Why Women are Poor at Science, by Harvard President," *The Guardian* (online), <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2005/jan/18/educationsgendergap.genderissues> (Jan. 18, 2005).
15. Jim Michaels, "Marine Study Finds All-male Infantry Units Outperformed Teams with Women," *USA Today* (online), <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2015/09/10/marine-study-finds-all-male-infantry-units-outperformed-teams-women/71971416/>, (September 10, 2015).
16. A diversity of skills is important to most decision-making bodies, and their members should be chosen to provide it, but a devotion to this type of diversity should not be used as a reason to promote sin, such as placing women in men's roles. None of this is to say that race should never play a role in hiring decisions; for example, in ethnic ministries it makes sense that the ethnicity of those being served be well-represented among church workers if possible. For a discussion of the errors committed for the sake of diversity, see Heather Mac Donald, *The Diversity Delusion* (New York: St. Martin's Publishing Group, 2018).
17. Joseph Sternberg, "A Wheelbarrow Full of Outrage," section A, *The Wall Street Journal*, (June 19, 2020), p. 17.
18. Limbaugh.
19. "Letter to Mrs. Johnson, March 16, 1955," *The Collected Letters of C. S. Lewis*, ed. Walter Hooper, vol. 3 (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2004), p. 580.