The Cure for Racism

(June 6, 2020)

For those of you that have been praying for me and my family, because my dad is sick, thank you so much. I'll give you a little bit of an update. My dad is now in hospice at home. He's actually stable at home and doing fairly well. He's mobile, he's getting around the house. And we have an aide come in every night now. Nights are difficult. I was down there for 19 days in Florida, and I was trying to be active caretaker, and those of you that have tried to do that it is very, very tiring. We brought in some people from the outside to help. They're wonderful people. The hospice people are wonderful.

Anyway, I got back from I got back to Charlotte Wednesday morning. And I'm sure I'm going to go back when it looks like he's about to be promoted to be with Jesus. He's looking forward to that. But we don't know when that's going to be. Could be weeks away. We're not really sure. So, thanks for your prayers. They've certainly helped. In fact, when I mentioned it on our Hope One broadcast, and online, and a lot of people prayed, and he improved. He really did. He's actually doing okay right now. And the hospice people are just amazing; just wonderful people. And I'll tell you a little bit more about this next week when I have more time.

I have a very important guest today I want to get to, and I have a few things to say before we bring him on today's program. We're not going to shy away from the toughest issues here on the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist show. The topic we're going to talk about today is very sensitive. It's raw and with that in mind I want to make sure that you do not take any sentence or comment either of us say here on this program today out of context. We're going to attempt to talk about the cure for racism. What is the cure? We can talk all about why there's racism, or how much racism we have. We're not going to spend a lot of time on that. We're just going to talk about the cure mostly. And it's a complex issue. There are multiple facets to it; multiple causes. So again, please do not take any comment out of context. Listen to the entire show.

And as you know, we lost a great Christian philosopher, and apologist, and theologian, Ravi Zacharias, in recent weeks, and I was reading his Logic of God Devotional, the one that we rebroadcast. We had an interview with Ravi last year on that on that devotional, and I happened to be reading a section of it earlier this week, when he made a very important point. He said, and I'm paraphrasing, I'm not remembering this verbatim, but one sign of maturity is when you can temper your emotion by reason. In other words, when you can follow reason, even though your emotion may take you in the other direction. And I think on this issue of racism, there's a lot of emotion that is untethered to reason. And we have to tether our emotions to reason. That's a sign of maturity. So, let's see if we can do that.
I love what Augustin apparently said, it's a paraphrase, but he said, we love the truth or enlightens us, but we hate the truth when it convicts us. We have to be open and fair enough to admit the truth when we see it, even if it convicts us. Now, let's say right off the top, right off the top here that, thankfully, Americans actually are unified on the central issue. What is that? That the George Floyd murder was terrible, and the cops should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Now, whether or not this murder was motivated by race, I'm not exactly sure if it was. You know, we haven't had interviews yet. We don't know. There hasn't been a trial yet. It probably was, but we're not sure. Many people assume it was, but we don't know that yet. But regardless of that, everybody agrees the murder was terrible. And we want to move forward by discussing the cure for racism, whether or not racism was a part of this or not. Although we've made great strides in this country, racism still exists. Now to discuss this cure that me and my guests have, and it's primarily my guest who has thought of this, and you know who I'm going to bring on. He's my friend, the guy that fills in for me when I can't be on this show, quite frequently. He's a brilliant apologist. Cold Case homicide detective J, Warner Wallace.

He's been on this program several times before. He's hosted it several times before. Most of you know who he is. If you don't know who Jim is, just go to coldcasechristianity.com. Coldcasechristianity.com. He has a fantastic presentation on this issue called, Bridging the Thin Blue Line. And in fact, you can see much of the presentation on his YouTube channel.

And before we get into the meat of the racism issue, I got to say that for those of you that are interested this summer to come to CIA, Jim is back. He wasn't with us last year but is going to be back this year in Dallas. I'm looking forward to having him, and of course, Greg Koukl, and David Wood, and Richard Howe, and the entire team, Alisa Childers, Brett Kunkle, Jorge Gil, Bobby Conway; they're all going to be there. I'll be there, of course. And it's this August. If you want to be a part of that you need to go to crossexamined.org and click on events and you'll see CIA, there.

Jim, it's always great to have you on. How are you today?

Jim:
I'm doing good. I think before we even start, interestingly, I was asked to some radio yesterday. And when we talked about it, they kind of said, hey, what do you want to talk about? You can talk anything you want to talk about. What do you want to talk about? I said, well, I think there's the biggest issue in America. Let's talk about racism, right? And they were hesitant to do that. And they told me, well, you know, if we did that, we probably wouldn't want to talk to a white cop about it. We probably would want to talk to somebody from the African American community, which I thought, okay, fine. There's a certain amount of empathy that I think you would expect to be seen from one side that I don't think she would expect to see from this side.
So, I just want to say, first of all, that's remarkable that you would want to even have this conversation. But I am the white guy, who's a cop. But I will tell you that I am not going to share with you today opinions from a white cop perspective, because I don't think they really matter. I think what matters, is there an overarching kind of perspective that covers both sides of the divide that we could refer to? If there is, that's what we should be talking about. Of course, you and I both know that's going to come from God's word, not from Jim's words.

So, first of all, I'm surprised, and actually impressed that anybody would want to hear from a white cop on this issue, even though it seems like that's one of the sides in the debate right now that has been isolated. Right? I don't know that this is actually so much this most recent offense. Largely, I can see why people would want to extrapolate this to the overall issue of racism. But really, it was a cop who committed the offense, right, and so the cop, law enforcement has kind of seen as the tip of the spear of what is seen as systemic racism. So, I get that, and so I think that you know, number one, I just want people to know that I'm gonna do my best. You'll see that I split this right down the middle, and that for that reason, Frank, I typically anger both sides. Because I am going to split it down the middle. And it's hard, you know.

Frank:
It's a great presentation that you give, and as I say, people can see it on your YouTube channel, Cold Case Christianity. It is Cold Case Christianity YouTube channel, or search for Cold Case Christianity. But I will tell you this right now. We are at a point right now in public discourse, where you know, it used to be that we thought if you just didn't agree with us that you were wrong. You're wrong, I'm right, you're wrong. But that has moved now to you're evil and I'm virtuous. And unless you are willing, not only to say, we can't agree to disagree. Instead what has to happen is, we have to agree to agree with our version of whatever the facts are, whatever the narrative is. And if you're even just quiet about your version of the narrative, you're seen as disagreeing. You need to make a public statement in which you agree with me. And both sides are doing this, by the way. And if you don't do it, then you're evil.

Jim:
So, it's in the context of that kind of a setting, that we have to begin this conversation. Let's at least just be aware that that's the setting we're in. And I wrote this presentation as a book and we decided not to publish it, because we realized that this is more divisive than it is healing. And we're trying to figure out how, in an environment in which there's such polarization, could you ever even begin to have this discussion.

Frank:
Well, let's talk about polarization. You know, I was reminded by one of the news channels, just in looking at some of the footage, it made me think of Rodney King in 1992. And of course, you were right in the middle of being a police officer at that time in Southern California, with the riots and everything. How do you think the debate about racism, or you might even say morality in general, has changed in say, the past decade, or so?
Jim:
Yeah, I think we’re more likely, we have a public platform now, in which we can vilify each other. And that public platform has changed everything.

Frank:
It has. And after the break, we’re going to unpack that further. We’re going to look at a little bit of data and talk about, can we use data, should we use data here to deal with this polarization. And ultimately, we’re going to talk about the cure for racism. That’s what we’re doing here today on, I Don’t Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek and my friend and cold case homicide detective J. Warner Wallace. So, don’t miss the rest of this program. We’re back in two minutes.

Ad: Friends, can you help me with something? Can you go up to iTunes, or wherever you listen to this podcast, and give us a five-star review Why? It will help more people see this podcast and therefore hear it. So, if you could help us out there, I’d greatly appreciate it.

Frank:
What is the cure for racism? Frank Turek; you’re listening to the American Family Radio Network and the program, I Don’t Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist. I’m Frank Turek. My guest is cold case homicide detective J. Warner Wallace. And just before the break we were talking about what has changed in the past decade, or maybe two decades, with regard to this issue, and other issues in general. And Jim, you were just talking about how social media might actually cause us to be more polarized. How so?

Jim:
Well, I think what happens is, people have instant access to your daily life, and to your thoughts, to what you value, what you post about. So, I got a call last night from a girl who’s a junior in high school, whose friends have ostracized her because she has not publicly declared her position on this issue. Now, imagine when we were young, growing up, there was no place to publicly declare your position on an issue. Everything was done face to face. It was done privately between friends. But that now has shifted. Everyone’s got a public persona.

And I actually had another teacher tell me that her school system has, you know, really, she’s felt pressure from other teachers to make a public statement about this, to post something about it. And then if you do that, then the question is, well, why was this the first time you’ve ever said anything about it? So, you’re kind of...by the way, what’s making this possible is the fact that we live our lives so publicly on social media, that now people have a sense that they know us, and that they know what we’re thinking today, or what we value today, based on what we’re posting on a regular clip. So, if all the sudden, you’re not paying attention to the most important social issues...now, I will tell you that I typically don’t post about anything cultural, or political, because I think that’s all downstream from the bigger issue, is the gospel true and should we take it seriously? So, most of my posts are people who are writing about issues related to, is the New Testament true, what it says about Jesus, and should we take it seriously. Because I think
everyone agreed on those two issues, all these other issues would be secondary, tangential to the more important issue, is there an overarching authority that we should...

Let's put it this way. Here's one of the things I worry about, Frank. And you and I have talked about this a little bit, is that we talked about the analogy that, you know, if you're sick and you come in the doctor with cancer, that you're gonna have a conversation with the doctor and two things are going to be brought up. Number one, how did I get this? And two, what do I do going forward? Now, I think it is important, and I've thought a lot about this now, I think it is important to answer the question, how did I get it, for a couple of reasons. Number one, if I said I got cancer, and I've been smoking two packs a day for 20 years, well, it's a cautionary tale that you shouldn't smoke two packs a day anymore. You'd better stop because I can't cure the cancer if you're gonna keep on feeding it with two packs a day. It's also a cautionary tale for your kids. Your kids should not smoke two packs a day.

But I suspect in that room with the doctor, that you're probably going to spend more time talking about the cure than you are about how you got there. Right? I think how you got there is important, so I don't want to minimize how we got here. Because let's face it, we are a country that at one time had legalized slavery. Are we gonna deny that? I mean, are we gonna say, that's not part of our history? Are we gonna say that that has not had an impact on an entire people group historically? You'd be a fool to deny this.

Frank:
And even after that, we had Jim Crow laws.

Jim:
Absolutely.

Frank:
We had community, I'm trying to think of the actual name of it now, community...why is it escaping me? Where communities would actually line neighborhoods to say that only whites could be in this neighborhood. If you're a black person, you can't buy a home in this neighborhood. Was it redlining? That was it. That went on until, like, a couple of decades ago almost, you know.

Jim:
Ok. So, you cannot argue. To deny that, to deny how you got the cancer, you'd be a fool. And so, I don't want to minimize that. Because sometimes I'm afraid, if we minimize that, we sound like we don't care about that. And that is not the case. I think we have a great deal as a nation that we can be ashamed of, right. At least some portion we could be ashamed. Okay, I got that. Now, the question is, we're in that doctor's office. Are we interested in the cure? Are we interested in it? Where do we go from here? So, I think that conversation has to have both elements in it, but it has to be appropriately proportioned, right.
A lot of what we're talking about is, what do we do now? And this is why people are holding protests, because they're doing both. They're complaining about the past and they're pushing for something new in the future. But I think, of those two things, the most productive thing we can do is, admit that we have a past and then move toward a cure. And so, that's what I think we're talking about here today. But I am concerned, though, that as we push toward a cure, that there's a sense in which we don't care about how we got here. And that is not the case.

Frank:
Yeah, let's just spend a few minutes on this. I mean, we could get into stats. There are stats all over the place. Depends on how you look at them, as to, you know, each side is going to try and say, my series of stats, the way I'm presenting them, proves my case. Talk about that a little bit, because that can lead to polarization, and a lot of times, despite what stats you might have, the other side's not going to move at all.

Jim:
Sure. What I see is that one side will say, look, the statistics show that we are abused at a rate much higher than any other group in the country. Okay. I get that. Then you have the other side saying, well, no, no, no, you're exaggerating that, or you know, the reason why you are maybe in contact with the police more often is because you're committing crimes at a higher rate. Really? Okay. Can we agree on this? Each side, police officers and the African American community, would we agree that whatever abuses are occurring on the police side, do we think that's happening for more than half the police officers in America? 800,000 police officers in America?

Frank:
No, it's not even close.

Jim:
And, by the way, the point of abuse has to be measured based on number of contacts. Number of contacts. That's how it has to be measured, because in the end, you're going to get so many calls for service every night, and you're going to have x number of self-initiated field contacts every night. Those numbers mean, that for 800,000 on a nightly basis, we'll have several million contacts with people. And some percentage of those are going to go south. Now that's the question we got to ask. Do we really think that more than half of those are going to go south? No. Would we agree that there's a small percentage of police contacts where abuse occurs? And so, what we're doing is, we have a large group in which it doesn't occur and a small one in which it does.

Would you also agree that in the African American community, I don't care what statistics you use, and I've collected these, it is a very, very small percentage of the African American community that's even involved in crimes. I'm talking about the percentage of people in the community that are involved in crimes. So, what's happening here is that both sides are saying, hey, you know what, I'm willing to judge the vast majority of you based on the activity of a few of
you. For example, if you said, hey, you cannot judge all protesters based on the very small percentage, and I tell you, it is a very small percentage that are involved in the looting and in the rioting, okay. So, I don't think it's fair to judge the entire movement of protests based on the actions of a few, any more than it's fair to judge the entire body of police officers based on the actions of a few. I don't think it's productive for us to argue about whether the numbers are, you know, you're off by 5%, or you're off by 10%. That is not helpful.

Let's put it this way. I have looked at the statistics for law enforcement contacts versus complaints of abuse. And let's assume that all the complaints of abuse are true. I can multiply that by 10, you still have about 90% of police contexts in which nothing inappropriate ever happens. I've looked at the statistics for arrests based on the African American community. You can multiply that by 10 and you still have 90% of people who are not involved in criminal behavior. What in the world are we willing to divide when we both agree you should not judge 90% of a group based on the behavior of 10% of the group Queen? Can we all agree on this?

Yeah, yeah, I think we everyone should be able to agree that in any endeavor, you're gonna find some bad apples, right? You're gonna find them in the police, you're gonna find them in clergy, right. You're gonna find them in business, you're gonna find them in education, you're gonna find them in every realm of society, because we're all fallen people. So, there's going to be some evil done to, maybe even a great extent, by a very small group of people. Everyone does evil to a certain extent, but there's going to be people that are bad apples in those professions, no matter what they are. They're in police, they're in the African American community, they're in the white community, the Asian community. They're everywhere. So, there's always going to be some of that.

Well, in the end, we call this nut picking, right. When you take a look at the extremes, the people who are abusing, and you say that is representative of the whole. Well, you're picking out the nuts to say that the entire group is like that. So, we call this nut picking. And I think that both sides do this. And I think once we admit that, this is why I don't make a case to defend cops. Because the same case, I think, can very easily be made to defend the other group of African Americans who you think are getting arrested. That number is so much lower than people think it is when they push back.

Frank:
That's an important point, Jim.

Jim:
I hear this all the time.

Frank:
It's an important point to say that what this guy did to George Floyd is not representative of the vast, vast, vast majority of cops. And I think too many people see that and they think all, well
maybe they don't think all cops are like that, but they think that's a majority of cops. It's just not the case, correct?

Jim:
Well, it's not. And I will tell you, as somebody who's worked in Los Angeles County, right, which I think has got its own history of abuse within local agencies related to the African American community. There just is. So, I always put it this way. If you said, are there racist cops? Yes. Like, no kidding. I mean, to say there are no racist cops, you're an idiot.

Frank:
Right.

Jim:
The other extrapolation, though is, is that all cops are racist. That is, I think, a step too far. That's a huge step too far. So, the point I'm trying to make is that I hear one side saying, hey, all cops are racist. I hear the other side saying, well, all African Americans are involved in crime. Okay? Are you kidding me? I mean, this is as stupid in both directions as it can possibly be. And so, we have to at least recognize that both sides have to admit that, even though they're legitimate complaints, whatever they may be, they represent a very fractionally small percentage of the overall group. And it is true this way. But we are polarized on this.

Look, if you wanted to bridge any divide, the first rule of bridge crossing is that you have to leave the edge that you're standing on to enter the bridge. You have to leave your side in order to cross a bridge. And if we're going to bridge this divide between these two groups, both sides, what tends to happen is we think, oh no, you guys need to leave your edge and come over here on my edge. And unless you do that publicly, and are willing to admit that you are wrong, and you should have done that publicly years ago, you cannot bridge this.

Well now the rule of bridges is that you have, you have to leave your side in order to cross the bridge. And both people need to cross a bridge in order to bridge the divide. So, I think we're going to end up standing somewhere in the middle. And we're going to trust that the bridge is strong enough to hold us once we get there. So, what bridge we use is super important. What bridge is going to actually unify us? That's the biggest question we can ask.

Frank:
Well, that's the bridge we're going to get into right after the break. And in fact, Jim’s presentation, we're talking to J. Warner Wallace, this presentation, Bridging the Thin Blue Line, is something you can see on his YouTube channel. And it's something we're going to talk more about right after the break. In fact, it's not just racism that's the issue. There's actually a bigger issue above racism that we're going to talk about and Jim's gonna reveal it right after the break. Don't go anywhere. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek. My guest, J. Warner Wallace of coldcasechristianity.com. We're dealing with a sensitive issue today, so don't take any comments out of context. We're back in two minutes.
Ad: Friends, Frank Turek here. I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist is a listener supported radio program and podcast. So, if you like what you hear here, would you consider donating to crossexamined.org? 100% of your donations go to ministry, zero percent to buildings. We're completely virtual. So, if you can help us out, we greatly appreciate it. Thank you so much.

Frank:
What is the cure for racism? That's where we're heading today on this program. You're listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek and the American Family Radio Network. My guest, cold case homicide detective, J. Warner Wallace, of coldcasechristianity.com. And Jim, we're talking about racism, but you say there's actually a bigger issue involved here, that racism is sort of a subcategory of another ism. What is that other-ism?

Jim:
That is other-ism. You just said it. It is other-ism. That's exactly what it is. And I'll tell you why. I recognized this years ago as a kind of an anecdotal joke. I was showing my handgun to my German relatives. And, you know, they live over in Germany, they're my wife's family, and they come over. And I'm showing them we just moved from a Colt. We were carrying Colts for a while, and now we started carrying a Glock. And well, they looked at that Glock and they said, it's junk. It's Austrian, okay. It's an Austrian gun, okay. Well, they happen to live about 100 miles, or less than that, north of the Austrian border in southern Bavaria, okay. And that's a border that was really only there since World War II, okay. It's been redrawn a couple of times. And the people groups on both sides of that border are nearly identical in language, and food, and culture, and clothing, you name it. They're very, very, very similar. From the outside, you probably wouldn't be able to tell the difference between these two groups. Yet they are divided because there's a line in the dirt that was drawn after World War II that now divides them.

We will find a reason to divide from others, even if we are nearly identical by race. This is also happens, by the way...I work gangs for two years in South Central Los Angeles and I can tell you that we used to use, back in those days because we didn't have digital technology, we would have printed gang maps that would divide and show you where Crips and Bloods had drawn territory. When these groups sometimes had family, they were genetically the same, they had family, cousins, on one side of the of the divide or the other, that belonged to a different click. And culturally, ate at the same restaurants, even tagged similarly. The only difference was color, blue or red, that they had divided themselves over. So, all groups do this. We have a tendency to divide from people who look different than us.

As a matter of fact, there's been a ton of research on this; how we are doing drawn to people who look like us. Also, in terms of, if you look at the Public Religion Research Institute did a study in which they determined that in Caucasian people, 91% of the closest friends and family members of Caucasian people are typically Caucasian. They're white. Only 1% are typically
black. In black communities, 83% of closest friends and family members are African American and only 8% are white. Now considering that they are a much smaller group, and are surrounded by many more Caucasians, that's about the same percentage.

And you can tell this. Look at anyone's wedding photos. If you look at your wedding photos, you will see that they are largely monochromatic. So, if I look at an Asian wedding, just Google an Asia wedding, you're gonna see mostly Asians in the audience. Muslim wedding, mostly Muslims in the audience. You will see that we have a tendency to look for spouses, for example, that match not just our physical appearance, but other things. They have a study in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences that said that, we are more likely to bond with people who share similar facial expressions to us. There's a Psychology Today study that says, you're more likely to marry someone who looks like you or your family. You are also more likely to engage people who, if you did a personality test, you know, the old personality tests we would do. You didn't realize why you're actually connected to people who share your personality type. Like, we are drawn, and there are tests, and study after study. There's even a study that shows, from University of Michigan, that you are far more likely to share more markers in your DNA with people you're married to than with people you're just friends with. You seek out even a genetic companion who is similar to you.

I have a great friend who's a surgeon and she does pediatric reconstruction of ears. If you only have one ear, she can build a second ear for your child. And it's such a high demand of her clients because kids want to look like everyone else. And if you look different, you're shunned. It's another issue of other-ism. If you have you appear to be otherly, you are not part of the group. Why is it when kids get chemotherapy that all their friends do what? They shave their heads, right. So, they want to show them that they're not different.

It turns out we have a tendency to repel those who are different than us and it's been clinically studied. This other-ism is at the base of every other-ism; racism, sexism, classism, ageism, ethnocentrism, sizeism, whatever you want to call it. I've seen this, for example. When you get a group that maybe is a bunch of guys who are maybe a little bit overweight, and one of them starts to lose weight and get in shape, he starts to become shunned by the other group, right. Well, why? Because you no longer like us. We have this innate desire to push away those who are somehow other than us, is the real problem. So much so, that if you had a group of people who were all identical, they were all the same sex, same size, same hair color, even required to wear the same haircuts and wear the same clothes, we would still look for some reason to divide. Maybe you live on one side of the street. I'm on the south side of the street, you live on the north, all those north siders are weird. You know, you'd find some way to divide from one another because this is an innate nature, innate characteristic of our fallen nature.

You know, I worry about the power, let's say, that government might have in solving this problem.
Frank:
Well, let's talk about that, because, Jim, this is something that I've been looking for online. People who are protesting, they want the government to do something, and my question always is, what do you want the government to do about this? At least legally, at this point in our country's history, we're at least supposed to be, according to law treating everybody in a colorblind manner. That's what we're supposed to be doing. Now, whether we do that or not is another question. But, what can the government do about...other-ism is a bigger issue, but in particular, what can the government do about it at this point?

Jim:
Well, okay, so my concern is that government's laws and procedures, and they are outside-in approaches where we are trying to control bad behavior, but we don't end up changing things from the inside-out. In other words, I can be limited by what I can do legally, but I still may curse you in my heart. I just cannot publicly do this, or I have some limits and how I might be able to do this, but it doesn't change the nature of your heart. And this is an inside-out...

Now, I will say this, from a law enforcement perspective specifically, for a year I was in charge of our agency's ethics program. And they asked me to develop a program that we could teach to our officers. The point of concern I have, from a policy perspective and law enforcement is the point of hiring, and the point of training. So, for example, you can have all the best training in the world, in which you teach people not to put their knee on someone's neck for eight minutes. Okay? But if the heart of the person, when you hired him, was such, he'll find a way around that. He'll find a way to stretch that rule, he'll find a way to abuse that, right. So, I know that when I look at that, it's a point of higher issue.

Now, here's what I think is interesting. In my agency, remember, no Christian worldview could dominate that agency. As a matter of fact, most people in the agency were not Christians. Very, very few were and so I'm trying to import a Christian worldview into a hiring process that's not even allowed by law state law to ask the kinds, of questions at the point of entry, that I think would reveal character. Like, for example, can you name five things you did in the last year in your community that weren't all about you, in which you didn't really benefit. They were sacrificial acts on your part. Now, that's a really important question, and it reveals character. It's not a question you probably could legally ask in a hiring process. And it's one my wife would tell me, well, when you were hired, you weren't a believer. And she's right.

But again, what we typically do is we say, hey, there are certain physical requirements of the job. If you're 5'3", 120 pounds, it's hard to navigate some of these things you're going to be asked to navigate; breaking up firesights, and, you know, handling domestic violence calls. So, sometimes what we do is we see that 6'4", 280 pound football player comes in and we think to ourselves, okay, that dude could do the job.
Frank: Right.

Jim: But he may not be the best person for the job. And so, we can easily assess his physical ability. It's much harder to assess who they are, morally. And you do your best to do it. But I'm not even sure like, what would you suggest we could do differently. But I do think that those two points, hiring and training, are where policy changes could make an impact. Because in the end, if someone's got a long history of personnel complaints, from the time they got hired, until the time something really bad happens, that should be seen as a signal. So, also a policy that monitors that kind of level of complaint would also be...but I can just tell you, Frank, there are so many variable issues there that's difficult to do. Do I think policies should be in place? Yes. Do I know exactly what I would suggest in those areas? That's much harder.

Frank: I have not seen much actually proposed. Specifically, what policy changes do we want to cure this racism problem, if indeed we have a significant racism problem in the police force? There is a racism problem. We all admit that, because there's racism everywhere, to a certain degree, because there are human beings everywhere. So, there's gonna be some of them that are racist. The question is, how do we deal with it from a policy perspective? And I really haven't seen many really specific good suggestions. Maybe they're out there. Maybe I just missed them. But it doesn't seem like there's much more government can do that they're already doing. We already have laws in place against racism. In some cases, we have affirmative action. So, the question is, what can we do from a government perspective? And I don't see a lot, to be honest.

Jim: Well, I could say a couple of things. A couple of things you could do. You could standardize within an industry the way that complaints are handled. So, for example, if you're an officer and you've had three personnel complaints of abuse in the last year, pretty much how an agency responds and navigates that is pretty broad, depending on the agency and where you are in the country. There is no overarching approach to what you do. You know, does that mean that, after the third complaint, I'm going to have some kind of counseling, I'm going to maybe spend a month out of the field. I mean, it's gonna be different depending on the agency.

Now, we're able to argue about what it should be universally, but I can tell you that I don't think those things are universally dealt with right now. There is no set of guidelines that every agency would use. So, you might have a guy that could have seven complaints and still be working in the field the next night and some agencies, where after the second complaint, somebody is pulling him aside and saying, what is your deal? So, it's going to depend on the agency. So, I think some standardization of that would be helpful, some standardization of what it is we're looking for in terms of character. What is the kind of moral sign, or kind of earmark signs of good character before you hire somebody? Those kinds of things would be helpful, as well.
And then of course, there’s the most expensive thing, which is training. And I’m not talking about training for tolerance. I’m talking about just tactical training. If you’re going to wrestle somebody into submission, what does that look like? And that’s expensive. And that’s another step you have to take.

Frank:
Well, we’re gonna get to what we believe is the real cure. There are some things we can do through government, as Jim just mentioned. There may be minor things, compared to the problem. What’s the ultimate cure for racism and other-ism? We’re going to talk about it right after the break. You’re listening to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek and J. Warner Wallace. Our website is crossexamined.org. See you in two minutes. Don’t go anywhere.

Welcome back to, I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist, with Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. My guest is J. Warner Wallace, the cold case homicide detective. We're talking about, what is the cure for racism? And I could tell you one worldview that is not the cure for racism, and that is Darwinism. In fact, what was the title, the complete title of Charles Darwin's Origin of Species book? Here's the complete title. It's not often spoken of. Here's the title. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. Yes, Darwinism, according to Charles Darwin, was basically believing in there were certain races more superior than others. In fact, in Darwin's book, The Descent of Man, I think that was 1871, 12 years after Origin of Species, Darwin himself makes distinctions between the races. He talks about the Caucasian race being at the top. Now despite this, to Darwin's credit, he was against slavery. However, many today have actually used his theory to claim there is no God. And of course, if there is no God, there are no human rights, and there's no objective way to make any case that racism is wrong, or anything is wrong, for that matter. If there's no God, everything's just a matter of personal opinion.

And so, we’ve talked about this ad nauseum on this program, and Jim has talked about it in his books and on his podcast, as well. Without God, there's no way to ground rights in anything, whether it has to do with racism, whether it has to do with murder, whether it has to do with stealing. Nobody has any rights if there is no God. Everything's just a matter of opinion. And by the way, let me say this, atheism does not prescribe any morality. There’s just no way to justify morality. So, atheism can’t work as our cure. Islam won't work, because if you're not a Muslim, you don't have the same rights as you do if you are a Muslim. Hinduism, that won’t work because there's a caste system in Hinduism. That is basically racism that certain people have certain rights and other people don't in the society.

There is only one basis, one major worldview that can grant us human rights, and that's the Christian worldview. It's the basis for human rights and for the equality of the races. In fact, there really only is one race, the human race, and the entire human race is made in the image of God. And Jim, this is the solution that you ultimately drive to in your presentation called,
Bridging the Thin Blue Line, so pick it up there. Why is Christianity and the gospel our ultimate cure for racism and other-ism?

Jim:
Well, I think part of it is that it truly recognizes our condition, like where we are, right. I'm never surprised, when I work cases, at the level of depravity that I encounter in humans. And I've worked cases involving every race, right. I mean, so it's not like, you know, these are all...most of my work in cold case homicides, in my community, most of these are Caucasians who are doing this to each other. But you know, it's like, please, this is a common problem we have and it's the problem of sin, which scripture is replete with all of this, right. All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God.

So, what it does, first of all, is it recognizes what the problem is. It's our fallen nature that...and, by the way, what's at the core of other-ism, it's pride. It's that, I like me, and I like you less. I like people who are like me. I like people who are not like me less. That's pride. And pride is at the root of a lot of sin, as well. And what the gospel does is it recognizes our need for a savior. In other words, not just that there is a savior, but that we have a need for a savior. And that is something that is can't be underestimated.

Also, though, it unifies us in the sense that scripture consistently describes us without distinction, without recognition of color. Most people, when I show them the long list of Zaporas, and Bathsheba, and the Queen of Sheba, and Simon of Cyrene, and people don't realize that all of these people were people of color.

Frank:
Right.

Jim:
Because they're not described that way in Scripture. Every nation is acceptable to God. You know, God shows no partiality, but in every nation, anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him (Acts 10:34). So, it's that that there is no color distinction on the pages of Scripture. We are unified in the sense that in God's eyes we are all acceptable. Why would we not be acceptable to each other, if we are already acceptable to him? So, it has to be able to unify us.

And the last thing it does is it guides us toward a solution, right. Because, in the end, there is only one solution. And that is that we have to stop looking on the outward appearance and start looking on the heart. And 1 Samuel says that, that man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks in the heart. That's the way forward, is that we have to see that we are all...look, in the end, if we all accepted a Christian worldview in which we will stand in front of the judge, ultimately, to answer for this issue, and others, and we will be asked, did we see each other as brothers and sisters? Or did we see each other as adversaries? We're gonna be judged. That that should guide us toward a solution.
And, by the way, we need to make this decision quickly. I call those trajectory decisions. Just as the decisions you make early in life have adverse or positive trajectory on where you end up in life. And so, we need to teach this to our kids. And we need to make sure that we make that decision right now.

I know we're going to run out of time here at some point but let me just say that a Christian worldview camps, because we know we need a savior...the first thing I experienced as becoming a Christian was a deep sense of shame. In other words, not only I ignored the existence of God, but I ignored my own condition. And the stuff that I should have been ashamed of, I hadn't been. And then suddenly, I had a moment in which I felt the weight of all the stuff that I should have been ashamed of all along. It seems to me that the way that that protests, and the way that movements are effective in changing culture, is to understand the role that shame plays. In other words, the most powerful picture out of the civil rights movement, to me, is that eight year old, or six year old African American girl who's being walked into the school grounds in Little Rock, Arkansas, accompanied by the National Guard. And you watch that, and you think to yourself, this girl is so innocent. She's really small. How in the world could you not be ashamed that she has to be guarded? One side was able to effectively shame the other to bring them to their senses. And Martin Luther King did this when he was able to point to a higher standard.

And by the way, peaceful demonstrations can do this. I believe that, because they've done it in the past. What we have to be careful is, if you want to move the movement forward, you cannot do anything that brings you shame. Because then the other side is going to say, well, you should be ashamed of that. Well, maybe we should be ashamed of this, but you should be more ashamed of that. And then we play this more game back and forth.

So, it seems to me that the Christian worldview does a lot for us because; number one, it teaches us about shame and the value of, hey, whatever the other side does that's between them and God, but whatever I do on this side, that's between me and God. Right. I attended a workshop a couple years ago in Washington, DC, talking about law enforcement reformation. You know, reforming the system. And so, I'm there as part of this group. And one person brought up the issue of fatherlessness in the African American community. Well, that doesn't play well. There is no reason to bring up whatever you think your issue is. You think the issue is this, I think the issue is that. Because it turns out the gospel addresses both issues anyway. So, I could spend time saying, well, the problem over there is the use of systemic racism, and the problem over there is they say, oh no, it's about fatherlessness. Well, it turns out that the gospel addresses both systemic racism and fatherlessness. It addresses both. I don't need to nitpick about whatever you think the cause is, because the gospel actually addresses whatever the cause might be, because all it is rooted in sin.
Frank:
And what I was about to say before is, we don't want to be hyphenated brothers and sisters. You know, we hyphenate our citizenship now. We've got African Americans, we've got Italian Americans, we've got Irish American, you know, all this kind of thing. And in Christianity, we're just Christians. And as Paul famously said in Galatians, three, there is neither Jew nor Greek, there's neither slave nor free, there's neither male nor female, for you're all one in Christ Jesus. And that's the attitude we have to take.

Are we really going to judge people based on the amount of pigmentation they have in their skin? I mean, really, is that what we're going to do? I mean, King was right when he said that, I have a dream that one day we're going to judge people based on the content of their character, not the color of their skin. And in Christianity, Christianity says that that's exactly the case, that we need to look at the inside of people, and if they're saved with Jesus, and even if they're not saved, they're made in the image of God. And so, we need to treat everybody with that kind of respect. Unless we're made in the image of God, unless there's a God who has established through his nature that we are made in His image and there is a real right, and any deviation from that right, from his nature is wrong, we can't really move forward, can we?

Jim:
Well, I tell you that we should be ashamed of the church. I'll be honest with you.

Frank:
Oh yeah.

Jim:
But I came to the church late. I came at the age of 35. And what I see right now, for example, there are many places in the country in which the church is voluntarily segregated to a level that's unlike almost any other institution. You go in some small towns, there's a black Baptist Church, and there's the white Baptist Church, and they are a block away from each other. Right? And I'm thinking to myself, really.

Now we have a good friend, Derwin Gray, who's got a church that's pretty mixed. It's pretty cool. He does a great job and I asked him, how did you achieve this when I don't see it in other churches. He said, well, we model it from the stage. Our leadership is diverse. Our worship teams are diverse. Our ministries are diverse. And because we model it...now that's another example of other-ism. In other words, people come, and they end up copying what they see from the stage so they can be like that. Again, this is how we're drawn, so we could, as a church, change this. And it's going to require us, though, to make efforts to model it from the stage, right.

And so, I think of all the groups we probably have as much responsibility, or maybe more, if we're saying the gospel is the cure. It starts with the G.O. It's not government, it's gospel. If
that's the case, then we have to be able to model that from the stage at which the gospel is proclaimed.

Frank:
Get the crossexamined app, ladies and gentlemen. Go back to 2016 and look at my conversation with Derwin Gray on, Christ Versus Racial Hostility. We could have recorded it yesterday. And Darwin talks about some ideas in that regard on how to do that. Also go to the Cold Case Christianity page and YouTube channel and you can watch the entire Bridging the Thin Blue Line that Jim Wallace today has been talking about.

Jim, great having you on again. Thanks, so much brother.

Jim:
Thanks for having me. I appreciate it.

Frank:
That's the great J. Warner Wallace, ladies and gentlemen. Check out his website coldcasechristianity.com. Don't forget about CIA this August. Sign up at crossexamined.org. See you next week. God bless.

If you benefit from this podcast, help others find it. Just go to iTunes, or any other podcast service you might be using to listen and leave us a five-star rating on the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast with Dr. Frank Turek. It will take you less than five seconds. You can also help a lot by leaving us a positive review for others to see. This podcast is available on iTunes, Spotify, Google Play, Stitcher, TuneIn and many other audio content delivery apps. Thank you and God bless.