

"Mother, don't be JUDGMENTAL."

To you, is today Columbus Day or (as the UCC Calendar has it) Indigenous Peoples' Day? Depends on whether you're judgmental about Columbus, who protected some stone-age people against their cannibal neighbors & opened a hunter-gathered, low-agriculture society to civilization (literally, the culture of cities). He was funded by the gold-hungry gov't. of Spain, but his own motives were the expansion of knowledge & the extension of the gospel. His men's lust (stealing uncivilized women) quite naturally turned the friendly uncivilized males into terrorists (called "savages"), whom only then he abused. Static societies suffer when confronted by dynamic societies. True then, true now (static Muslim societies repeatedly, manifoldly, largely unintentionally humiliated by the dynamic "West")....

....but the logic of being judgmental against Columbus fails in face of the question *Would static societies have been better off, in light of the human potential, if they had never confronted dynamic societies?* And another, in the same light: *Are their descendants better off than were their ancestors?*

But if we are to be judgmental against Columbus, why not just drop Columbus, why not just drop C.Day: why substitute I.P.Day? Answer: Because only dropping C.Day would not satisfy the multiculturalists' desire to denigrate Western civilization (esp. the U.S.) & elevate the (formerly called) natives. Nor are these multiculturalists satisfied to stop at egalitarianism, all cultures equal; for them, the West / America / the white male, as world-oppressor, is inferior.

A humorous-sad confirmative story, from two weeks ago: I asked a Cape Codder his name & he said "Jim." Your last name? "Standing Bear; I'm a full blooded Cape Cod Indian." Your religion? "The religion of the People." Who are the People? "'People' is the Eng.translation of every Indian tribal-name." (Aside: When Massasoit's terrorist son "King Philip" was slaughtering whites in the hope of killing them all, he wasn't killing "people"--nor were the tribes when they were warring among themselves before the whites came.) Do you have a last name other than Standing Bear? "Yes" (he hesitated to say it, but did). What was your religion as Jim_____? Again hesitantly, "Baptist." As Baptist, did you know the Baptist Indian princess Evening Star? "Yes." Like Black Elk, she was (as I remember her telling me) both a Christian & an observant Indian: are you? "No, one religion is enough; & we Indians were more spiritual than the white invaders." (His parents were faithful Baptists, then UCC; & died under the care of Hospice, which he was unaware was Christian in birth.) (He is proud of the Cape Cod Indian Meetinghouse, which he was unaware was built as a Congregational church by Christian Indians.) Do you sometimes go to church? "Yes, but I'm proud of being an Indian--no longer ashamed, as I was before we revived the old religion." Jim is judgmental against whites, Christians, & Indians who do not practice the old religion.

Under this multicultural fragmentation, re-tribalization, the American reality is less & less "e pluribus, unum" (from many, one), more & more "e uni, plurimum" (from one, many). And it's a **meltingpot** problem: new immigrants, instead of melting, are clumping together uniculturally. Formerly, they were Americanized by our public schools, which emphasized AngloAmerican history/literature/religion; that was the "state" influence; the "church" influence was evangelism, assertive witness to nonChristians. Now, no longer does the "state" try to Americanize immigrants or even birth-Americans: multiculturalism, in spirit & curriculum, has crowded out the old Americanizing spirit & curriculum. (David McCullough, two days ago, in closing the National Book Fair in D.C., expressed regret at the present neglect of America's roots: our history is neglected, & even our great literature [of which he mentioned first, Bunyan's PILGRIM PROGRESS].) Multiculturalists are for multilingual education, for (they say) English is no better than any other language, & furthermore is the language of the oppressor--obscuring the reality that English is (1) the language of our country's formative literature & laws & (2) the language all children in the U.S. must master if they are to survive & thrive here & (3) increasingly, the world-language.

Now, "meltingpot" is a worn-out metaphor, eroded by the quip "They never melted. True, they never became a lumpless puree, rubbed through a conformist sieve; but they did meld into a lumpy (ethnic-cultures-maintaining) stew, the best-tasting (from the standpoint of freedom) in the world. But let's try another metaphor, the **compostpile**: how does it differ from....

....a garbagepile? The latter merely rots down into a stinking, disease-breeding goo. But a few days ago I dug up from our three compostpiles five wheelbarrow-loads of "black gold," compost, & spread in on a garden in anticipation of spring planting. It had all been kitchen-&-garden garbage, refuse. How the transformation? Every week or so I throw a few shovels of formerly-dug black gold on the compostpile, add a little water, & let the soil microorganisms turn the chaos into fine black gold. Immigrants are (in the limited sense of this metaphor) garbage endangering the health of our American society, but can become black gold if acculturated (a less-loaded term than "Americanized").

Even more ominous than the immigrant-garbage threat is the rot among native-born Americans who are underAmericanized....

....as, e.g., youth in inner-city Atlanta. Immigrant Muslim Somalis moved there, then moved to small towns where their children could mix with American Christian children, whose values are similar to their own. Big trouble. (I've no criticism of the Somalis,) but I have of the promiscuous youth-culture our traitorous antiAmerican media promotes--a youth culture that is judgmental toward America's religiomoral heritage.

Meanwhile, "liberal" Christians mess around with the biblical language, thinking to stand on higher moral ground. The soloist in church yesterday objected (after the fact) to her sheetmusic's having converted, in a song about Jesus, all the masculine pronouns (many "he" & "his") to "God"/"God's." "Next time," said she to me, "I'll sing it the way the writer wrote it!" Think of the "inclusive-language" stupidity of refusing to refer to Jesus as "he"! Or God, for that matter. But such antibiblical tabooing is soon on history's ashheap.

This Thinksheet's title is what a youngish man said to his mother when she complained that his extra woman had destroyed his nuclear family & estranged him from his extended family: he wanted his mother to know that he was occupying higher moral ground than she. A former member of a famous football team, he'd grown up in the permissive youth-culture of the '60s-'70s, in which he'd experienced a change of "values"* from that of his parents' conservative Christianity. His distraught mother had come to me with the plea, "Can you help me to understand forgiveness? Can I forgive him?" What would you have said to her? Instead of making it too easy for you, by giving you a verbatim, I'll tell you the factors in my response:

1 She should have compassion on him as a victim of the youth-culture into which he was thrown in highschool, then university--the culture those Somalis fled so their children wouldn't wind up in the society-destroying morass in which this ex-footballer is living.

2 Forgiveness being two-way, she can be prepared to forgive (i.e., she can have the prayerful will to forgive, she can be prepared to forgive), but she can forgive only if her son repents: repentance-forgiveness is an existential unit. Forgiving the impenitent is immoral nonsense, as (Mt.6.15) unforgiveness toward the penitent is unforgivable. (An atheist whom I got to come to study & church yesterday said a gift is two-way, & inclines him to surrender atheism.)

3 As a victimizer, the son can't be forgiven unless/till he repents. The tough love of shunning, family ostracism, disinheritance--as the acting out of the distance--may incline him to "return" (Hebrew for repentance), closing the distance (the word Jesus dramatizes in the Prodigal Son parable).

"Judgmental," according to this year's edition of the Merr.Web.Coll.Dict., first appeared in 1909 as "of, relating to, or involving judgment." My opinion is that it wasn't till the '60s that it came to mean "a tendency to judge harshly" & thus a moral defect. The Web gives 67,272 references, including sermons.* Jesus says (Mt.7.1) not "Judge not" but "Condemn not"--against hypocritical judging.

* In a Roman Catholic church (1) I experienced Sid Simon as he laid his "Values Clarification" on a group of 6th-graders. He intended consciousness-raising about one's/others' values, but an unintended consequence is relativism: You've your values, I've mine. In effect, that's what the footballer said when his mother said, "Son, you've done wrong." Specifically what he said was this: "Mother, that's only your opinion." No sin, so no shame.