

A Question of Education: Nebuchadnezzar's education policy (00:47 – 12:20)

Brief Review¹ – Daniel focused on what helped him maintain his faith & witness and talk about God in the public spaces (like King's College). This is immensely important because we are under great pressure in the West to privatize our faith.²

- 1) What are the big issues we've looked at in Daniel?
- 2) Lennox imagines Daniel & his friends coming to their first dinner at King's College.
 - a) What immediate challenges to their faith and witness might they have experienced? What challenges have you experienced?
 - b) How might they have responded to each of these challenges?
 - c) If there is no God, what is the base & standard for judgment ("who said so")? If there is a God, what is the base for morality and judgment?
- 3) How would you respond to the person who says that "all morality is relative" (i.e. that may be right for you, but it isn't right for me)?

A Question of Identity (12:20 – 24:20)

- 4) How was changing their names³ a part of Babylon's "social engineering" program for its captives? What impact(s) would changing their names have had?⁴
- 5) What kinds of "social engineering" and "social conditioning" take place in our day?⁵ Why and how should these be resisted?⁶
- 6) **Read Genesis 11¹⁻⁹**. Why were the people of Babel so focused on building their ancient skyscraper? Why are we?
- 7) What is God's verdict on "the Babylonian way" of making a name for oneself?
- 8) What is God's alternative to "the Babylonian way" of creating one's identity?

¹ **Homework** – Read chapter five where the vessels reappear. What does Belshazzar's use of the vessels of God say about how he valued God? Compare/contrast Belshazzar's response (and God's) in chapter 5 with Nebuchadnezzar's response (and God's) in chapter 3. Why the difference?

² E.g. "Religion should be kept at home, in the private sphere." Polly Toynbee (*The Guardian*, 12 Dec. 2001).

³ Danel ("God is my judge"); Hananiah ("The Lord shows grace"); Mishael ("Who is like God?"); Azariah (the Lord helps)

⁴ Belteshazzar (Bel protect his life); Shadrach (command of Abu); Meshach (who is like Aku); Abednego (servant of Nabu)

⁵ Here is the article Lennox references at 16:10 (<https://time.com/collection/davos-2019/5502592/china-social-credit-score/>)

⁶ <https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/blog/brainstorm/201506/how-phones-are-tearing-us-apart>

KLEIN: When governments start fining churches, every Canadian should pay attention

Author of the article: [Kevin Klein](#)

Published Jul 29, 2025 in The Winnipeg Sun

Police outside a Montreal church. Photo by Supplied /Winnipeg Sun



A church in Montreal was fined \$2,500 last week for hosting a concert by Christian musician Sean Feucht. The City of Montreal claims that the event proceeded without the required permit and ran “counter to the values of inclusion, solidarity, and respect” upheld by the city. That last part should stop us all in our tracks.

We’re not talking about a nightclub or a political rally. We’re talking about a church — a Christian church. And the event in question? Worship. Music. Prayer. It doesn’t matter whether you agree with the performer’s views. What matters is that a government — on Canadian soil — is now telling a religious institution what kind of worship is acceptable and what isn’t. And they’re doing it with fines.

That is a problem.

Let’s strip this down to its core. The city says the church didn’t have the proper permit. Fine. However, it’s also clear that the real issue was not the zoning paperwork. The City of Montreal openly stated that the church’s event was incompatible with its “values.” And it used those values to justify action against a religious gathering.

Since when do municipalities issue “values tests” for church services?

If we go down this path — where cities or government officials can penalize churches for holding views that fall outside a state-approved ideology — we’re in dangerous territory. This is not about Sean Feucht. It’s not about MAGA. It’s not even about evangelical Christianity specifically. It’s about freedom. More precisely, the freedoms of religion and expression are enshrined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Let’s be clear: The church wasn’t inciting violence. They weren’t breaking hate speech laws. The only “crime” here was hosting a concert with religious content that included political or social views the city finds unpopular. That’s not hate. That’s dissent. And in a free country, dissent is not just allowed — it’s protected.

Now let’s contrast this with recent events that received a very different response.

It wasn’t that long ago that pro-Palestinian protesters gathered in downtown Montreal and set Canadian flags on fire — on public property. It was widely reported. There were no charges. No fines. Not even a strong public condemnation from city officials. Why? Because those protests, despite being far more aggressive in nature, apparently aligned better with the city’s “values.”

That’s where this gets dangerous.

We’re witnessing a selective application of standards — one that punishes people based on their beliefs, not their behaviour. This isn’t just about one incident. This is a pattern. Parks Canada revoked Feucht’s performance permit in Halifax over “heightened safety concerns.” Concerts were abruptly cancelled in Charlottetown, Moncton, Quebec City, and Vaughan — all based on anticipated controversy, not actual lawbreaking.

Meanwhile, others — who happen to hold views more in vogue with today’s progressive elite — can do almost anything without consequences. That’s not freedom. That’s ideological gatekeeping.

Canada has always prided itself on being a tolerant society. But tolerance, by definition, means putting up with things you disagree with. It means allowing room for dissenting voices — even uncomfortable ones. You don't have to like Feucht's views to defend his right to speak, or a church's right to host him.

If we let governments start deciding which religious views are acceptable, we open the door to all sorts of unintended consequences. What happens when the next administration decides that a different religion's teachings are incompatible with its "values"? Will they be fined too? Will mosques, synagogues, or Sikh temples be told to file permits — or face penalties — because someone on city council doesn't like their doctrine?

Let's not pretend this is just about procedure. Mayor Valérie Plante's office made that clear. "This show runs counter to the values... championed in Montreal," the city stated. That is the justification. Not safety. Not permit violations. Not noise complaints. Just values.

So now we have a city acting as moral arbiter of acceptable worship. That's not a local issue. That's a national crisis.

In fact, it's the exact kind of scenario the Supreme Court of Canada has warned against. In *Loyola High School v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, 2015 SCC 12, the Court ruled that governments cannot force religious institutions to adopt secular teachings that undermine their beliefs. And in *Trinity Western University v. Law Society of Upper Canada*, though a divided ruling, the Court recognized that religious freedom must be balanced carefully and not dismissed by vague appeals to "diversity" or "inclusion."

We're watching that balance disappear. In the name of inclusion, we're excluding people of faith. In the name of safety, we're banning prayer. And in the name of values, we're silencing churches.

Don't think for a second this won't reach your city or your place of worship. Today it's a church in Montreal. Tomorrow it might be a Bible camp in Manitoba. Or a synagogue in Toronto. Or a Catholic school in Calgary. The precedent is what matters here — not the particulars.

We're living in a time when government overreach is becoming normalized. When fear of offending someone is treated as a legitimate excuse to suspend fundamental freedoms. This isn't progress. This is regression dressed up as virtue.

Freedom of religion means churches get to preach unpopular views. It means believers get to worship in peace — even if their songs and sermons don't align with the current social trends. And freedom of expression means artists, even ones like Sean Feucht, get to perform without being treated like criminals.

No Canadian should be comfortable with what just happened in Montreal. Not because they like the music. But because they value freedom.

This country is built on a foundation of pluralism. We don't all think the same, vote the same, or believe the same. That's the point. Our system was designed to handle difference — not stamp it out. When you start fining churches over ideological disagreement, you're not building a tolerant society. You're building a controlled one.

This is the time to draw a line. Governments should not be in the business of defining which religious gatherings are acceptable. They should not be cancelling concerts because of political pressure. And they certainly shouldn't be punishing churches because someone in city hall didn't like the guest speaker.

The slope is slippery. The damage is real. And if we don't push back now, we may lose the freedom to push back at all.