

The Intolerance and Lies of Open-Mindedness

We've all heard it: we don't accept a particular viewpoint so, therefore, we are closed-minded bigots trapped inside some blind faith and hope fostered by an ancient, cultish superstition. Those who make such charges are, of course, the open-minded, loving, tolerant, compassionate people who are willing to accept others for who they are and what they believe - except those who disagree with them.

Surely one who thinks things through can see the irony in this. The viewpoint isn't even subtle: open-mindedness is to be equated with the progressive, morally-liberated mindset. If you don't accept their way of thinking, you are closed-minded. It's okay for the open-minded, liberated, progressive thinkers to insult, call names, use vulgarities, and show obvious contempt and hatred for those who are more conservative than they are. Those stupid conservatives are the closed-minded ones, remember.

If open-mindedness is such a virtue, as is claimed by these self-proclaimed free-thinkers, then why are they so intolerant toward those who disagree with them? This just highlights the fact that the version of open-mindedness and tolerance they advocate is a lie. It's a sham, and it's geared more toward trying to shut up the opposition rather than actually demonstrate true open-mindedness and tolerance. No truly open-minded person would condemn others for believing in God and holding to a strong code of morality fostered by standards higher than themselves. Even if these liberated ones don't agree, they should still defend, with the same passion as they defend others, the more conservative person's right to believe, practice, and teach their views without demonstrating such malicious hatred. Their vehement opposition to those more conservative betrays their claim to open-minded tolerance.

Why is it more virtuous to show open-mindedness and tolerance toward one group of people (say, homosexuals) than it is another (say, Christians)? Why is it more appropriate to condemn Christians than it is to condemn those of another lifestyle? If we choose the morally-liberated, free-thinking path, and in the process turn around and condemn, judge, and vilify those more conservative, then we have bought into a lie and are no better than what we think we are opposing. Why is it better to be compassionate toward one group but not the other? Why is it morally acceptable to bash Christians while claiming the high ground of open-mindedness? The answers to these questions will likely not be forthcoming, especially from those who have essentially trashed any universal standards. They are open-minded only because they say they are. In reality? Not so much.

The fact is that everyone has drawn a line in the sand. I respect that. What I don't respect is the denial of a line, then the insulting intolerance of those who claim to be so compassionate. It doesn't work. And the sad part is, they just don't see it.

To those who disagree with me, I would say this: Be honest. If you hate Christians, then you are free to say so. I respect your free will and free speech. As a Christian, I'm even willing to take abuse for the cause of Christ. But don't turn around with some nonsense of being tolerant and bigot-free. That game is tiresome and demonstrates a lack of reason. The true motive, therefore, cannot be open-mindedness and tolerance, the very things you refuse to demonstrate toward those who disagree with you.

- by Doy Moyer

Rejecting the Counsel of God

The Scriptures say, speaking of John's baptism, "The Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him" (Luke 7:30). If to fail to be baptized by John, as these people did, was to reject the counsel of God against themselves, what do you suppose it will be to reject the baptism of Jesus? The one was a servant, the other the Son. "If the word spoken by angels (messengers like John) was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed to us by them that heard him?" (Heb. 2:3) In the estimation of the apostle it was a much more terrible thing to reject the teaching of Jesus than of the messengers that came before him.

- by J.A. Harding

Kicking the Tires

Can you imagine buying a used car 'sight unseen'? No way! Before you invest your hard earned money you want to check it out. You'll want to take a test drive, look under the hood, scrutinize the maintenance record, and talk to the former owner. No one is going to trick you. No sir!! You simply wouldn't buy a used car without 'kicking the tires' first.

Now, let us ask you about something much more important than cars. Let us inquire about your religion. How did you reach the decision about where you worship? What standard did you use to decide which religious organization you would be a part of? If we could get everyone to be honest about it, we'd find that many have made this important choice without nearly as much investigation as they would put into buying a used car. And that's really a shame.

With your eternal soul at stake, you desperately need to make sure that the religious group you are part of is faithfully and accurately following God's word. Do they use the Bible as their sole authority? Will all of their practices stand up to a thorough investigation? Does everything still look good, even after you've 'kicked the tires'?

- by Greg Gwin