

# All Men Are Created Equal; All Ideologies Are Not

This article is from the “Edifying the Body” section of the Church of God Big Sandy’s website, churchofgodbigandy.com. It was posted for the weekend of April 18, 2020. A version of the article was posted at townhall.com on April 17.

**By Ian Haworth**

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, Calif.—Since infancy, the vast majority of us are brought up to believe that we are all the same. As David Brooks put it, “the gospel of multiculturalism preaches that all groups and cultures are equally wonderful.

In our current political climate, to suggest otherwise is akin to applying tar to one’s own skin and rolling around in a pile of feathers.

The problem with the idealistic notion of “global” equality is that the premise that “we are all the same” is patently absurd. In the same way that John Lennon’s “Imagine” offers a ridiculously oversimplified explanation of the barriers to peace—as if we can achieve peace by simply eradicating “countries, religion, possessions, and greed”—the notion of equality is drastically (and dangerously) oversimplified.

It is important to clarify that, on an individual level, we are all equal in the eyes of God. We all have inherent value as individuals, and we all possess fundamental and inalienable rights. No individual should be persecuted or discriminated against for any immutable characteristic.

The subtle problem is that the waters between individualism and collectivism are routinely muddled for political advantage, meaning that people often confuse the notion of individual equality with group equality.

This leaves us vulnerable to blindly accept what is demanded by those who worship at the altar of intersectionality that all “people” are “equal” without question, without defining what the terms “people” and “equal” actually mean.

The core issue here is that the assumption of equality is made as if it is some axiomatic truth of our world, without explaining which metrics should be used to judge such equality.

For example, humans are equal in terms of their elemental value in the eyes of God, but does this mean that they are equal in terms of their moral character?

Unless we disagree that Adolf Hitler and Martin Luther King Jr. existed at opposite ends of a moral spectrum, the notions that all humans are equal in this sense is laughable. This counterexample proves that there does exist some metric by which we are able to compare individuals along a spectrum.

It is important to highlight the nuanced point that acceptance of this is not evidence in favor of discrimination. It is evidence, however, that total and unquestionable tolerance of all ideologies ignores the moral spectrum on which we all exist. By existing on this spectrum, we must accept that the comparison of such ideologies is at least possible.

With that in mind, with what metric are we able to conclude that all ideologies are equal?

There are countless metrics we can use to compare such entities. Some are irrelevant to applying some form of moral comparison and are often used by bigots as a foundation for hate and ridicule.

However, the fact is that some metrics are relevant, and this statement is far from controversial. To argue otherwise is to suggest that the society of modern-day France is morally equivalent to various ancient civilizations which routinely partook in human sacrifice.

Unfortunately, this clear moral difference between ideologies is not limited to ad absurdum comparisons between modern and ancient societies. Stark differences exist today, and yet the conversation on this matter has been bullied into silence by those who are attempting to leverage the power of globalism and intersectionality.

This has, in turn, conceded a difficult but crucial topic of debate to the extreme edges of our political spectra. For example, there are many who suggest that any claim of moral difference between any ideologies is proof of membership to the alt-Right—a group who delight in their lone ownership of this topic.

It is crucially important that we turn the ideological tide and allow ourselves to have discussions of this nature—in good faith—and wrestle back control of such debates from those who hope to harness them for evil. The consequences if we fail are clear for all to see.

Today, as we wage war against the coronavirus pandemic which has swept the globe, we are being faced with the outcome of our self-induced blindness to the immorality of some of the world's worst political systems.

Some are only just waking up to the fact that the Chinese Communist Party is a bad actor on the world stage. Those who are aware of modern Chinese history already understand that the Chinese government's role in the pandemic is simply the latest example across decades of moral depravity.

- Mao Zedong, whose "corpse still lies in the grandiose Chairman Mao Memorial Hall in the center of Tiananmen Square," was responsible for the deaths of tens of millions of his own people, whether through persecution, political violence, or starvation.

- Then came the One Child Policy. Enacted in 1980 and ending in 2015, the Chinese government program led to countless forced abortions, child abductions, and sterilizations.

■ More recently, at this very moment there are an estimated one million Uighur Muslims detained by the Chinese government in “re-education camps,” with 80,000 forced to work in labor camps.

All of these atrocities were implemented by the same Chinese Communist Party which holds power today.

Why, then, do we willfully ignore their crimes?

Why do we accept the notion that the mere existence of criticism of China’s government is an expression of bigotry?

Finally, why do we allow politicians to align with some of the worst regimes on our planet—including China—for their own personal or political gain?

Fundamentally, it’s because we have accepted the lie of global ideological equality, and have swallowed the fallacy that the Chinese Communist Party is anything other than an evil, despotic, and morally debauched regime.

This false definition of equality can no longer be accepted without question. It is not evidence of bigotry to suggest the existence of moral differences between ideologies, and we shouldn’t forfeit the control of such conversations to the elements of our own society which seek to hijack them for their own advantage.

Finally, unless we start to accept this reality and act accordingly by guarding against the inevitable outcomes of the policies of nations such as China, we will continue to fall victim to our own ignorance, our own naiveté, and ultimately, our own moral and intellectual inability to seek the truth.