

The Kinist Review

A Review of Christian Agrarian Letters

Winter 2007

Law, Money, and Usury, *by S.C. Mooney, 7*

Nationalism: Humble Submission,
by Chatham Evans, 18

Kinism: A Speech Delivered to the Virginia League
of the South, *by Harry Seabrook, 27*

Jewish Proponents of Egalitarian Dogma
Themselves Do Not Believe It, *by John Altman, 42*

Ownership vs. Stewardship,
by Rev. John Thomas Cripps, 46

Books: *Robert Whitaker Why Johnny Can't Think, reviewed by S.C. Mooney, 56; Douglas Jones The Biblical Offense of Racism, reviewed by John Aiken, 63; Barnard Malamud The Assistant, reviewed by John Aiken, 67*
Poems: *The Reading, by Wheeler MacPherson, 69*

Volume 1, Number 1

The Kinist Review Winter 2007

Managing Editor & Publisher John Marshall

Associate Editor John Aiken

Poetry and Books Editor David Tanner

Production Assistant Janet Peshek

Published semi-annually by Kinism.net, a partnership for the advancement of research into ethnicity and culture. Kinism.net solicits and accepts contributions from a wide range of sources including foundations, corporations, and individuals. Winter, 2007. Postmaster and subscribers: email change of address, all remittances, correspondence, and subscription enquiries to kinism.net. Copyright 2007 by Kinism.net.

On the internet at *www.kinism.net* and email at *review@kinism.org*

The Kinist Review accepts unsolicited manuscripts and visual media for publication. All manuscripts and other media become the property of the Kinism.net, subject to its sole discretion.

The Kinist Review is set in 24 point Palatino Linotype, and 10 and 12 point Georgia and Sylfaen type.

Contributors To This Issue...

S.C. Mooney is a graduate of Ohio State University and the author of two well received books on biblical economics. He is the father of six children and currently lives and works in rural Ohio. His observations can be found at <http://www.xanthrocroid.blogspot.com>

John Aiken is a writer and blogger and is currently reading graduate English at a university in Ohio.

Chatham Evans is a graduate of Loyola Marymount with a Bachelor of Arts in Economics. He has been married to his wife for nearly fifteen years, and the Lord has blessed them with seven children, all homeschooled from birth.

Wheeler MacPherson is a poet and author who works with Alzheimer's Disease victims. He attended the University of Maryland, but insists he is self-taught.

Rev. John Thomas Cripps lives and works in Mississippi and is the father of six children and a grandfather of six. He is a former Constitution Party gubernatorial candidate in that state, and the former president of the Mississippi League of the South. He is an ordained Presbyterian minister.

John W. Altman is a retired teacher of history, having spent twenty years in the White, private school system in Alabama.

John Marshall is a Florida cracker, and the great grandson of yeoman farmers and Confederates in central Georgia. He is the proud father of three homeschooled children, the husband of Cary for twenty years, and he lives and works in Idaho. John is the managing editor of the Kinist Review, and the administrator of Kinism.net

The First Freedom

Self-Government Begins At Home

Edited and Published Monthly
by Olaf Childress

Hardcopy subscriptions at
P.O. Box 385, Silverhill, Alabama 36576

firstfreedom@gulftel.com

Spirit Water Blood

R. Jamison, et al.

<http://spiritwaterblood.com/>

Law, Money & Usury

by S.C. Mooney

This essay is adapted from an address delivered by S. C. Mooney to a small gathering of Christian Financial Counselors in Columbus, Ohio, November 23, 1991

Psalm 15

*O Lord, who may abide in Thy tent?
Who may dwell on Thy holy hill?
He who walks with integrity, and works
righteousness,
And speaks truth in his heart.
He does not slander with his tongue,
Nor does evil to his neighbor, nor takes
up a reproach against a friend; In
whose eyes a reprobate is despised, But
who honors those who fear the Lord; He
swears to his own hurt, and does not
change; He does not put out his money
at interest,
Nor does he take a bribe against the
innocent. He who does these things will
never be shaken.*

This brief passage of God's Word gives us a concise picture of the righteous man, who will dwell with God. When summing up the qualities of righteousness in a brief paragraph, one would expect that only the most general and important qualities would be included; one would expect that the summation would not be cluttered with trivial matters; one would expect that whatever it *did* say would be worthy of our devoted attention. Yet we find among all of the common virtues that we are not surprised to encounter one quality that stands out and strikes us as somewhat peculiar. Who is the righteous man, who will dwell with God, and will never be shaken? "He does not put out his money at interest." (v. 5a) Modern Christian

response to this text falls into two categories. There are those who are unaware that the Bible says this, and there are those who are aware of it, but have justified their practice of interest-taking contrary to this teaching by some method of "interpretation." This suggests the first of three problems with financial teaching in the Church today: there is a grave deficiency in the handling of Scripture; there is a tacit antinomianism.

I. Antinomianism

There is no use in the Church calling its teaching on financial matters "Christian" if on the one hand it is indistinguishable from worldly financial teaching and on the other hand it stands in sharp opposition to certain hard sayings of Scripture. To be sure, Christians who profess to bring a biblical financial teaching liberally incorporate a religious vocabulary, but in their practical aspects there is no difference between the "Christian" program and the worldly program. In many cases the only difference is that Christians speak about what they are doing with frequent occurrences of words such as "God," "Stewardship," "Prayer," and the like. A truly Christian idea surely will be expressed in such terms, but simply incorporating a Christian vocabulary is not sufficient to make a practice in substance Christian. Jesus warned against the error of applying Christian vocabulary to non-Christian practice, "Why do you say to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' and do not do what I say?" (Luke 6:46)

"He does not put out his money at interest." (v.5a) That is an arresting statement. It tells us that the world is

pursuing financial security in entirely the wrong way. It tells us as well that the truly Christian way is radically different than this. The message is very blunt and plain. Why is it that the financial teaching in much of Christendom seems oblivious to this clear requirement? Part of the reason is because the clarity of it has been muddied by claims that the legal requirement of the Old Testament no longer is binding on us since the Cross. The prohibition of interest-taking in the Old Testament is seen by many as simply an historical, and now obsolete, rule that applied only to ancient Israel. The question posed in the opening verses of Psalm 15 now would be given a much different answer: "O Lord, who may abide in Thy tent? Who may dwell on Thy holy hill?" (v.1) Now many would answer, "He who has received Christ as his personal Savior." Is this a wrong answer? Allowing for a lengthy discussion of possible doctrinal problems involving the concepts of "receiving Christ" and "personal Savior," we may say, no, this is not a wrong answer. But is it a completely correct answer? To the extent that it implies that one's behavior is irrelevant to his status before God, this answer is woefully incomplete.

Some in our day have lapsed into a sentimental view that men need a Savior because they are weak; the Savior is strong and smart, and he will help us to get more satisfaction out of life. However, any who take the Bible at all seriously will recognize that in reality our need of a Savior arises from our sin. "Everyone who practices sin also practices lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness." (I John 3:4) The issue between men and God is that men have transgressed the commandments of God, are guilty before Him according to that standard, and are worthy of death. But even many of those who appreciate the true nature of our need of a Savior yet fail to grasp the full extent of the remedy that our Savior provides. One aspect of this remedy is that because of the Savior's work

on our behalf, having borne the wrath of God in our place, now we may escape the penalty for our sins; now we may go to heaven instead of hell. This is a glorious truth, but a large measure of its glory lay in the fact that it is more the beginning of a new life than it is the end of an old life. "He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him." (II Corinthians 5:21) Once a man has "received Christ as personal Savior," he finds that he must proceed with life. He must *do* something. Now, there are only two ways in which one may live his life. He may do so sinfully or righteously. There are no other alternatives; there is no gray or neutral area. In Revelation 19:8 there is a wonderful image of the Church as a bride made ready for Christ, "And it was given to her to clothe herself in fine linen, bright and clean; for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints." Redemption is a positive and a negative thing. Negatively, our sins have been taken away. But this cannot leave a vacuum. Positively, we must put on a new life of righteousness. We must appear before our Bridegroom properly attired. Having put off sin we must put on righteousness. We may see the same point presented in different imagery in Romans 6:4-11:

"Therefore we have been buried with Him through baptism into death, in order that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with Him in the likeness of His death, certainly we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection, knowing this, that our old self was crucified with Him, that our body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves to sin; for he who has died is freed from sin. Now if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him, knowing that Christ, having been raised from the dead, is never to die again; death no longer is master over Him. For the death that He died, He died to sin, once

for all; but the life that He lives, He lives to God. Even so consider yourselves to be dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus.”

There is only one manner in which we might live before God, and that is “in Christ Jesus.” Sin leads to death, but having died in Christ we now live anew with Him. In ourselves, we cannot keep the Law of God. “. . . the mind set on the flesh is hostile toward God; for it does not subject itself to the Law of God, for it is not even able to do so.” (Romans 8:7) Our redemption in Christ does not mean that the standard of the Law of God is removed. We must bear in mind that this standard in the Law forms the entire basis of the issue between God and men in the first place. It is because of our failure according to this standard that we are in need of a Savior. There would be no need for a Savior to do anything for us if the answer were simply for God to decide to forget the standard. However, this may never be, for the standard is an expression of God’s righteousness, which will not change. The standard holds, and our redemption means not only that the penalty due us for our sin is averted, but as well it means that as we go on in life we may have the power in Christ to live a new life of righteousness. “For what the Law could not do, weak as it was through the flesh, God did: sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh, in order that the requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who do not walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit.” (Romans 8:3,4)

What is the outcome? As we live the Christian life we must be about the business of spinning those gleaming white linen robes that one day we shall wear at the wedding feast. We do not strive for this in our own strength, for we already have become convicted that in our own strength we never can please God. But as God’s own “instruments of righteousness” (Romans

6: 13) we may glorify Him with our righteous acts. We either shame Him and scandalize the Gospel with our sin, or else we glorify our Savior with our obedience to His own standard of righteousness. If we love Him, we will keep His commandments. (John 14:15) It is quite dismaying how some Evangelicals completely ignore the Creation Mandate of Genesis 1:26-28, explain away Old Testament Law as dead, antiquated rules for ancient Israel, reduce the Great Commission of Matthew 28:18-20 to the level of passing out Four Spiritual Laws booklets, and then turn around and wonder, “What does God want me to do?” Whole books are written and seminars are held on, “How to find God’s will for your life.” Men scoff at the plain commandments of God, such as the prohibition of usury, and then turn around and beg God to tell them what to do! Men say that they have “received Christ as personal Savior,” to whom the “personal Savior” says, “Not everyone who says to Me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven; but he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven.” (Matthew 7:21) Or, as John the Baptizer warned the Pharisees who had come for baptism as a show, “Therefore bring forth fruit in keeping with repentance; and do not suppose that you can say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham for our father’; for I say to you, that God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. And the axe is already laid at the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.” (Matthew 3:8-10) Of course, this view raises a number of questions. What about the laws of the temple, especially those pertaining to the sacrifice of animals? Clearly, not every law is binding on us today? How shall we tell the laws that still apply from the laws that have been superseded? And a number of other similarly complicated questions could be posed. It is not the purpose of this essay to deal with these matters. The main point here is to urge the view that the enduring

standard of righteousness is in the commandments of God, and to stimulate serious inquiry into this standard. It is not necessary to grasp full detail of all the complicated issues in order to grasp the general truth that it is God who sets the standard of righteousness and that we continue to bear obligation to this standard even though we are forgiven and redeemed. The Church today in large measure fails to take seriously the standard of righteousness in the Law of God. As a result the message of Psalm 15, particularly as it pertains to financial matters, is mostly ignored. Even where this message is not ignored it nonetheless often is distorted by two further problems, which inhibit correct understanding. To these we must now turn.

II. Monetary Idolatry

Our Psalm tells us that the man who will abide with God is he who does not put out his money at interest. Here is a biblical directive involving “money.” The motivation of financial teaching in the Church today seems to be the goal of discovering what is the Christian thing to do with one’s money. But, failing to start at a deeper level, to discover “What is money?” leaves the Christian with one of two presumptions. He must presume either 1) that money is a static concept; that it is now what it always has been; that everyone knows what that is, or 2) that it is entirely acceptable to allow the current monetary “authority” to define money however they wish, and that when the English Bible says “money” it is hermeneutically sound to substitute the current political reality about “money,” whatever that may be. The trouble with financial teaching in the Church today is that neither one of those presumptions is safe. There is no substitute for a careful and serious inquiry into the nature of money and the radically biblical teaching about money. It is necessary to be “radically biblical” because, while there are numerous studies about the biblical

teaching concerning money, few if any allow the Bible to comment on what money fundamentally *is* in its basic nature. One of the problems of coming to a truly biblical understanding of the fundamental nature of money is that the word “money” is extra-biblical. There is no Hebrew or Greek word that may be translated directly as “money.” The word “money” derives from the surname of the Roman goddess Juno Moneta, in whose temple the emperor had established the royal mint. The mint was for the purpose of striking silver and gold into coins. In the most strictly etymological sense, the word “money” imports “silver and gold coin.” In our day the word “money” is enlarged well beyond this strict sense, and now refers very broadly to that function which silver and gold coins used to serve, and in turn to whatever is employed to serve that function. There is a monetary function observable in Scripture, and so we are not surprised that modern, English translations of Scripture should include the term “money.” But we must not simply assume that one approach to the monetary function is as good as any other. We cannot merely take it for granted that whatever the world is calling “money” today is close enough to what is meant in the English Bible where the word “money” occurs. The idea of “money” is something that we hardly can avoid reading back into Scripture. In order to read the biblical idea of “money” out of the text itself, it first is necessary to be clear on the original terminology. In the Old Testament the Hebrew word that is translated “money” is *keseph*, a word that literally means “silver.” Also, in the New Testament the Greek word most often translated “money” is derived from the root *arguros*, which literally means “silver.”

One of the clearest examples of the monetary function in Scripture is the account of Abraham buying the field and cave from Ephron for a burial site, in Genesis chapter 23. Here property in the field is transferred from Ephron to

Abraham by means of an exchange. Ephron transfers some property to Abraham and simultaneously Abraham transfers some property to Ephron, namely, “400 shekels of silver.” Following the execution of the exchange, neither one remained in debt to the other. The monetary function is to maximize the efficiency of the exchange of property among men. We know, as noted earlier, that God commanded us to fill the earth and to rule over it under Him. We know that we have a standard of righteousness in His Word to guide us in this task. We know as well that the production and employment of a wide variety of goods will help us to do the best job of this. Title in property and the free exchange of property among men are social institutions that were created by God and are implied in His charge to us. He also has given us the means of optimizing the efficiency of the exchange of property. There is the old and familiar tale about how inconvenient it is to arrange direct exchanges of goods not involving money - what is commonly called “barter.” Farmer A needs some shoes, so he offers Cobbler B some quantity of wheat for a pair of shoes. But, alas, Cobbler B does not need wheat, however, he does need a stool. Only slightly daunted, Farmer A takes his wheat in search of a Carpenter who may need it, with whom he may exchange it for a stool, so that he might then take the stool back to Cobbler B, and get his shoes - all before someone else comes along and meets Cobbler B’s need for a stool first. Money streamlines the process of the exchange of goods by means of providing something that everyone desires, and therefore no one must search high and low for someone who will agree to receive it in exchange for anything. But, what shall serve this monetary function?

There are two schools of thought on this question, and then there is the Christian view. Unfortunately, most Christians today are divided between the schools of

thought arising from the unbelieving world. One school says that it really does not matter what is chosen to serve the monetary function, because in the end the whole idea is only the agreement of men. They say bottle caps could serve as money just as well as anything else, so long as everyone agrees. Since many men across a broad spectrum of society must all agree on the same thing for money, this usually results in a political elite declaring what shall be money and then holding everyone else to it. The other school says that money is not something that the state can decree, because decrees of the state cannot create value in men’s hearts, and unless men innately value a thing it cannot possibly serve as money. This school suggests that in an evolutionary process quite similar to their idea of the evolution of the human species, the free exchanges of men over time naturally constituted the isolation of what the free and innate valuations of men regard as “the most marketable commodity.” This, of course, turned out to be gold. The theorists in this school have truly Christian witness points out to the first school that if money is only a paper, legal document, like the Federal Reserve Notes of today, then it is not tangible property; that exchanges involving such so-called “money” are not really exchanges at all, since only one party to the transaction receives property, while the other party receives only a note of debt. At best, transactions involving Federal Reserve Note currency may be characterized as surety arrangements. Popular financial teaching acknowledges the Bible says that surety, while not unlawful, is ill-advised (Proverbs 11: 15). Most Christians rightly are leery about “going surety” when it comes to things like co-signing for a loan, but at the same time think nothing of staking their whole financial security in the surety arrangement of the Federal Reserve System. truly Christian witness points out to the first school that if money is only a paper, legal document, like the Federal Reserve Notes of today, then it is not

tangible property; that exchanges involving such so-called “money” are not really exchanges at all, since only one party to the transaction receives property, while the other party receives only a note of debt. At best, transactions involving Federal Reserve Note currency may be characterized as surety arrangements. Popular financial teaching acknowledges the Bible says that surety, while not unlawful, is ill-advised (Proverbs 11: 15). Most Christians rightly are leery about “going surety” when it comes to things like co-signing for a loan, but at the same time think nothing of staking their whole financial security in the surety arrangement of the Federal Reserve System. Some difficulty in explaining how silver fits into their theory. Historically, silver has a longer record as money than does gold. Also, even though this school is utterly convinced that gold has been demonstrated as universally desirable, they really are not sure *why* men should innately desire this metal.

The Christian view points out weaknesses in both of these schools, but Christians today take almost no opportunity to bring a Christian witness in this field because they already are committed to the doctrines of the unbelieving schools. A truly Christian witness points out to the first school that if money is only a paper, legal document, like the Federal Reserve Notes of today, then it is not tangible property; that exchanges involving such so-called “money” are not really exchanges at all, since only one party to the transaction receives property, while the other party receives only a note of debt. At best, transactions involving Federal Reserve Note currency may be characterized as surety arrangements. Popular financial teaching acknowledges the Bible says that surety, while not unlawful, is ill-advised (Proverbs 11: 15). Most Christians rightly are leery about “going surety” when it comes to things like co-signing for a loan, but at the same time think nothing of staking their whole

financial security in the surety arrangement of the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Reserve System is a quasi-governmental bureaucracy that is in charge of what is called “money” in our land today. It is not really Federal since the twelve banks in the system are owned outright by a consortium of shareholders, many of whom are not even U.S. citizens. There really is no Reserve, since the currency has nothing whatever to do with silver or gold. In the early days of the Federal Reserve System, established in 1913, Federal Reserve Notes were redeemable in gold. Today they are not. The fantasy still persists in a surprisingly large segment of the population that there is some kind of “backing” in silver or gold behind our so-called “money” today. There is not. In the worst possible light Federal Reserve Note currency is an outright fraud. The claim of the text on the paper is that it is a legal document, a legal tender note. But vital data for any note, such as the name of the payee, the due date of payment, and of what payment must consist, is missing. Either it is a fraud because it represents itself as a note when in reality it is not, or else if it is a note, as it claims to be an obligation of the U.S. Government, then in the best possible light one offering this currency is involved with the U.S. Government in a grandiose surety arrangement to pay the debt.

Contrary to clear and sound biblical truth, many Christians today are seeking to build financial security in Federal Reserve Notes, the very thing that may well be the ruin of our entire economy. They are unaware of the history of “fiat” money, i.e. so-called money that is the invention of an elite. Such would-be money cannot survive in the long term. All such monetary experiments historically have ended in a hyperinflationary ruin or a deflationary collapse. God already has provided a thoroughly stable monetary commodity in silver and gold, yet many

in the Church today fail their opportunity to witness to the grace of God in our lives, and preach along side of the unbelievers that gold is a “barbaric relic.” Just like the world, many Christians seek wealth in the creations of men, paper or data entries that these would-be gods would like to call “money,” and shun true wealth in the tangible creations of the only true God. There are some Christians who understand the highly dubious nature of what is called “money” today, and who yet lose an opportunity of their own to preach the truth to the unbelieving silver and gold men. As noted above, the unbelievers today, who nevertheless advocate a silver and gold money, really do not know why men value these metals. One of the reasons that silver and gold are so hated by many is that so much evil has been perpetrated in the world, throughout history, because of men’s idolatrous lust for the so-called “precious metals.” If men seek these metals for any other than the proper purpose, then this esteem of them inevitably turns into yet another idolatry. A Christian witness is sorely needed that men naturally are prone to esteem silver and gold simply because their Creator esteems them (Genesis 2:12) and they are made in the image of their Creator. There is no other explanation, and yet the Christians are silent. Christian silver and gold market technicians speak at the world’s silver and gold conferences, and yet it makes no difference; the unbelievers are not challenged in their idolatrous view of gold.

The financial teaching in the Church today largely is in the grip of monetary idolatry, whether the idolatry of men, the would-be money creators, or the idolatry of gold, the evolutionary “most marketable commodity.” There can be no true financial security in a world that does not accept the truth about the most rudimentary financial concept: the idea of money. The ideas of the two schools of unbelief have been stewing for centuries. There is no possibility that any answers

will emerge from either of them. Christians alone are in a position to bring the witness of truth to this field, and to glorify God with the truth about money; that God has instituted among men the exchange of property for mutual service in their common endeavor to achieve rule over the earth in His name; that He has provided real property in silver and gold for the purpose of achieving the highest efficiency in this process of exchange, which even in employment of these metals is the final exchange of property - not the giving of property in consideration of a debt or a credit; and that He has placed within our hearts the natural or innate esteem of these metals, so that the money would be a uniform institution among men. Christianity alone has this saving message for the financial world and yet many Christians are busy instead studying the idolatries of unbelief.

III. Usury

The third problem with the financial teaching in the Church today is that it subscribes to the Babylonian, rather than to the Biblical, doctrine of interest. To return once again to our theme text: the righteous man, who will abide with God, is he who “does not put out his money [silver] at interest.” (v.5a) We now understand from the foregoing what is meant by the term “money” in this verse. We now are ready to explore the full extent of the directive that is presented here. In view of the critique provided above of antinomianism, let us take this passage seriously as having an important message with direct application to us. This message usually is missed today either because it is ignored or because it has become the victim of “interpretation.” Though we may be less prone to ignore this word, it remains to explore the errors of various faulty interpretations. The question of usury or interest has been debated - even among the unbelieving - for literally thousands of years. The first thing that Christians need to understand about

interest-taking is that the Church stood united firmly against it for fifteen hundred years. The early councils of the Church, in addition to producing the renown creeds, also pronounced on a number of ecclesiastical and social issues. Many of them openly condemned interest-taking. Up until just several hundred years ago it was the common understanding, not only of the clergy, but also of the general membership of the Church, that the Bible condemns interest-taking. This was not a condemnation of certain types of interest-taking, or a condemnation of “usury” as opposed to “interest,” but it was a self-conscious condemnation of the general practice of requiring in repayment of a loan of anything *any* amount in excess of what was loaned. In sorting out how the Church got from there to where it is now we must delve into the very meaning of the term “interest,” and the dual concepts of “usury” and “interest.”

A common impression today is that “usury” means “exorbitant interest.” This is not inaccurate in terms of the popular usage of about one hundred years ago, however, the word has a long history that must be taken into account when reading older English translations of the Bible, such as the King James, published in 1611. The term “interest” does not occur in the King James Bible. At that time it was just coming into usage, and at first meant “a compensatory payment.” In this era everyone understood the word “usury” to mean exactly what we now mean by the word “interest.” For example, Nehemiah 5:11 in the King James makes it clear that English-speaking people four hundred years ago understood that one percent constituted “usury.” In the biblical languages, there is no such thing as what we now have in the way of a dual terminology such as “usury” v. “interest.” Any discussion or interpretation of the biblical requirement that is couched in this dualism (e.g. “usury” is “interest” that is taken from poor people) not only is not faithful to the true biblical concept of

“usury,” but also is impossible to express in the biblical languages and would not have been possible to express in the English language four hundred years ago. The truly biblical concept is a single, simple concept that we may express by our modern word “interest,” or the older word “usury,” so long as we understand that these mean exactly the same thing as interchangeable terms.

By way of the unbiblical dualism, various interpretations of the biblical prohibition of interest have sought to carve out an area of interest-taking that is reserved for Christians to pursue. Certain types of interest-taking are supposed to be of the sinful kind (which the interpreters enjoy calling “usury”), while other types are supposed to be perfectly normal, righteous behavior (which, of course, is called “interest”). This is done, for example, by appeal to Exodus 22:25, “If you lend money to My people, to the poor among you, you are not to act as a creditor to him; you shall not charge him interest.” The interpretation proposes that what is condemned here is only interest taken from “poor” people. The conclusion is drawn that interest taken from “rich” people is fully allowed. Aside from the problem of how to know who is “rich” and who is “poor,” this conclusion is unwarranted simply because it is not entailed in the premises. That is, even if there were an airtight means of distinguishing “rich” and “poor,” and even if Exodus 22:25 really was a prohibition of usury only in the case of loans to the “poor,” it still is completely invalid to conclude from this that any other sort of interest-taking is allowed. A statement of what must *not* be done does not, by itself, imply what *may* be done. For example, consider v. 22 of Exodus 22, just three verses up from the prohibition of usury, “You shall not afflict any widow or orphan.” Who will seriously suggest that we may conclude from this that affliction of married women and children with

parents is permitted? If an act is condemned in a highly particular case in Scripture, this in no wise gives us any grounds on which to draw the conclusion that this same act in all the many cases not mentioned must be allowed.

Another hermeneutical stumbling block is the provision in Deuteronomy 23:20, that interest may be taken from “foreigners.” This provision is coupled with another directive against the oppression of “strangers,” and the conclusion is drawn that interest taking cannot be inherently oppressive since oppression of strangers is prohibited in Leviticus 19:33,34, and interest-taking of strangers is permitted in Deuteronomy 23:20. In this case the premises of the argument are faulty, since the interpretation is built only upon the English as found in the King James translation. A casual survey of the original Hebrew terms reveals that the “strangers,” who are not to be oppressed in Leviticus, are quite different folk from the “foreigners,” of whom we may take usury in Deuteronomy. In the Leviticus text the term used is *ger*, and is sometimes given as “sojourners” in newer translations. In a parallel text, in Exodus 23:9 we read, “You shall not oppress a *ger* ... for you also were *ger* in the land of Egypt.” The *ger* were what we usually think of today as a “foreigner,” i.e. someone from another country. *Ger* were not hostile to those in whose land they dwelt. As a condition of residing in another land they agreed to abide by the laws of that land. Thus Israel accommodated non-Israelites so long as they lived according to the laws given by God. It was their faithfulness in holding to the laws of the God of Israel which bound Israelites from oppressing them. On the other hand, the “foreigners” spoken of in the Deuteronomy text were the Hebrew *nokri*. In all usage of this term in the Old Testament the *nokri* were known to be the wicked, detestable heathen, whom God Himself swore to purge out of the land of Canaan. They were the enemies of Israel, whose nations Israel was charged

by God with overthrowing. The term is a complete connotation of evil. It is even translated a couple of times as “adulterous woman” in the New American Standard.

What is immediately evident from this is that the premises of those who wish to prove that usury is not inherently oppressive are misconstrued. The prohibition of oppression against the peaceful, law-abiding *ger* in Leviticus 19, joined with the provision for exacting usury of the wicked, detestable *nokri* in Deuteronomy 23, does not at all prove what the interpreters had hoped to prove. Rightly construed, the identity of the *nokri*, in light of the permission to exact usury, actually proves the opposite of their interpretation. It was precisely because usury is inherently oppressive that the permission in Deuteronomy 23:20 was granted. Since Israel was devoted to complete and unrelenting warfare against the *nokri*, the oppression that usury truly represents was a fitting aspect of this aggression. God told the Israelites, “I will not drive them out before you in a single year, that the land may not become desolate, and beasts of the field become too numerous for you. I will drive them out before you little by little, until you become fruitful and take possession of the land.” (Exodus 23:29-30) The oppression of usury was one way of keeping these heathen in check while the time-consuming process of expulsion took place. Rather than creating for us a concept of lawful usury, a correct understanding of the provision of Deuteronomy 23:20 gives us a very serious warning about how we are to treat our brothers, and those who may not be our brothers in a spiritual sense, but who are like the *ger* and dwell peacefully among us. Usury is warfare. Most Christians today would find it abhorrent even to consider mounting a holy Christian war against the enemies of our faith. Let us be equally horrified to consider participating in the warfare of usury against our own

brethren and against the peaceful *ger*, whom God says we must not oppress.

One final hermeneutical problem that we must address is a very common misunderstanding of the so-called "Parable of the Talents." As this parable lies in the heart of what is perhaps the most popular attempted justification of usury today, there surely is no need to recount the story line. The important question is, "Did Jesus really approve of usury in what He said to the wicked and lazy slave?" Taken by itself, his statement, "Then you ought to have put my money in the bank, and on my arrival I would have received my money back with interest," (Matthew 25:27) surely reads like an approval of usury. However, there is no warrant for taking this or any other statement of Scripture by itself. We must bear in mind that Jesus was speaking in a role as a human master to one of his servants. His statement is made in reply to some statements made by the servant. The servant said, "master, I knew you to be a hard man [in the Greek *austere*, i.e., harsh, burning], reaping where you did not sow, and gathering where you scattered no seed." (v.24) The servant is calling his master, played by Jesus, a harsh and thieving man. Do we simply accept this characterization as true? In reply the master begins, "You wicked and lazy slave..." (v.26) Ought we not to be more inclined to accept the master's characterization of the servant than to accept the servant's characterization of the master? This slave was lazy because he did nothing with the money that was entrusted to him. He was wicked because he slandered his master in a feeble attempt to justify his laziness. The statement of the master that is taken by many as an approval of usury really is the consequent of a conditional, "*Then* you ought to..." The antecedent of this conditional is "You knew that I reap where I did not sow. ...?" (v.26) The master is not approving usury any more than he is approving that slave's characterization of himself. He is saying,

in effect, "If that is what you really thought of me, then this is what you would have done." The Luke version is particularly clear about this, "By your own words I will judge you, you worthless slave..." (Luke 19:22) This parable is not a justification of usury at all. The master's statement that as a "sound bite" may appear to be approving of usury really is but a challenge to the insincerity of the wicked slave who wished to pretend that the master was a thief. The misunderstanding of this parable that turns it into an attempted justification of usury is fairly new. Even John Calvin, who fell victim to the two other hermeneutical errors just discussed, was not ensnared in this one. The sin of usury is the most dramatic way in which the financial practices of the world slaps Christianity right in the face. This presents the simplest and clearest way in which Christians can witness to the truth of Christianity and bring glory to God in the arena of financial practice, yet we find that there is an almost complete failure to bring this witness. And worse than that, the anti-Christian, Babylonian practice of usury actually is represented by many Christians as a biblical thing. Christians who do this slap the parable of the talents in the face when they characterize usury as "good stewardship," completely ignoring what the master himself said was good stewardship earlier in this very parable. Two times the master said to the servants who had "traded with the money," "Well done, good and faithful slave." Why do not Christians spend more time exploring what the Master Himself said was "good and faithful" handling of money, instead of focusing in on a hypothetical statement of what some wicked and lazy slave would have done in his own fantasy world? In keeping with a Babylonian value system, "trading with money," which involves work, effort, risk, and so forth, is shunned in favor of usury, which is the safe, effortless, risk-free exploitation of other's work, effort and risk for your own gain. The Christian way is for each man to "work

in quiet fashion, and eat [your] own bread.” (II Thessalonians 3: 12)

There are other efforts also to re-interpret the biblical condemnation of usury so to make Scripture seem instead to approve it. Here the main points of the three most popular such attempts are reviewed briefly. Surely, this will be insufficient to completely change the outlook of some who already may have firmly held convictions favorable to a dispensational dismissal of Old Testament Law, modern concepts of money, and the practice of usury. However, it is to be hoped that these remarks might be found sufficient to stimulate many to serious study of these things. Surely our conduct must be guided and measured by some standard of righteousness. Is not God’s Law alone our standard? Surely we may not avoid the reality of money in everyday life, and, indeed, we are constrained to give the matter of money a great deal of our

thought and effort. Is it not essential for us to search out a radically biblical idea of money? Surely by God’s common grace many who are of the world devise sound methods of financial dealings, and just as surely there is much coming from the world that is quite wrong. Is it not proper that we must “...examine everything carefully; hold fast to that which is good; abstain from every form of evil” (I Thessalonians 5:21-22)? The Church today in large measure has turned away from the biblical Law of Money and Usury, which wonderfully is summarized in a simple and straightforward reading of Psalm 15:5a. Contrary to the message of this text, so many today indulge in the Babylonian practice of usury, all the while calling it “good stewardship.” Repentance and return to a truly biblical standard sorely is needed if the Church today is to practice Christianity in all avenues of life and to present a truly and fully Christian witness to the world.

Nationalism: Humble Submission

(To Our Divinely Appointed Estate and Purpose)

by Chatham Evans

Blessed is the nation whose God is the LORD; and the people whom he hath chosen for his own inheritance.

(Psalms 33:12 KJV)

How I long for the day when this precious truth is acknowledged by my nation! How I wish that my people would acknowledge that they have been chosen by God, and that my nation would live in humble acknowledgment of our creator, in such a way as to express our gratitude for what our God has done for us. This verse, rightly understood, drives men to their knees in worship, for the nation that hears and understands these words cannot but face the knowledge that the LORD is God, and we are not. Such a nation would be driven to say, with Isaiah, “Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts.” (Isaiah 6:5 KJV)

But alas, this verse is not acknowledged by my people, and is in fact greatly misunderstood. As an example, this verse prompts many to ask the question – “How can we seek to turn our nation to the LORD?” Although the question seems straightforward enough, it is a misleading one that belies significant misconceptions that are common in modern thinking.

The first misconception is one of the nature of national election. The blessings attendant to the nation whose God is the LORD have nothing to do with a nation

“turning to the LORD” of its own volition. Rather, these blessings have everything to do with God’s choice of a particular people. We are speaking here of the doctrines of grace applied to a group of people, rather than as individuals. Call it corporate Calvinism, for it is not the nation that chooses the LORD, but it is the LORD who has chosen the nation. (John 15:16)

The choice of a nation to seek after God has nothing to do with any inherent goodness of the nation. None of the peoples of this earth are righteous, and none seek after God. (Romans 3:10,11) An unregenerate nation can never be convinced to honor God, and any righteous choice a nation makes is evidence of God’s work of regeneration within that nation. God causes us “both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” (Phi 2:13)

To illustrate, my personal choice to seek God is a result of God changing my will and enabling me both to desire and to do his will. Likewise, my nation’s choice to seek God will be a result of God changing my nation’s will and enabling us corporately to desire and to do his will. There is no room for boasting, for we can not pat ourselves on the back for the desires to seek and honor him. Any such desires that we may possess were given to us; they are the gift of God. Any national righteousness we may display is the work of God, both the willing and the doing, and we don’t get credit for any of it. God never forces us to do anything against our will, but he does change our will and I am glad for that.

John Calvin emphasized this in his commentary on Psalms 33:12 when he wrote,

“But lest it should be thought that men obtain so great a good by their own efforts and industry, David teaches us expressly that it proceeds from the fountain of God’s gracious electing love that we are accounted the people of God. It is indeed true, that, in the person of Adam, men were created at first for the very purpose that they should be the sons of God; but the estrangement which followed upon sin deprived us of that great blessing. Until God, therefore, freely adopt us, we are all by nature wretched, and we have no other entrance to or means of attaining happiness but this, that God, of his own good pleasure, should choose us who are altogether unworthy. It appears, accordingly, how foolishly they corrupt this passage, who transfer to men what the prophet here ascribes to God, as if men would choose God for their inheritance. I own, indeed, that it is by faith that we distinguish the true God from idols; but this principle is always to be held fast, that we have no interest in him at all unless he prevent us by his grace.” (Calvin’s Commentaries)

Why is this important? It is important because our view of God’s sovereignty over the nations has great implications on how we view Christ’s great commission to make disciples of the nations. An Arminian or Pelagian view of national election will lead to a Willow Creek national policy. In this view, the method of teaching the nations becomes more important than the gospel of which we are to teach them. Instead of trusting in the power of the gospel, the seeker-sensitive nation will put its trust in a slick presentation, a non-offensive watered-down message, and a preference for consensus over righteousness.

This philosophy of Arminian nationalism bears fruit around us in those that trade holiness for pragmatism. The Arminian nationalists among us talk little of holiness, separatism, and purity. Rather, they speak of catholicity (and a wrongly understood catholicity, at that), of long marches through

institutions, and of claiming a pagan culture and its curses. To them, the fact that our nation is addicted to television and being manipulated by an antichrist culture is not reason to unplug the drug and expose the man standing behind the curtain. Instead, these so-called culture-reclaimers have an unnatural desire to be the manipulators, and “Christianize” the entertainment that pulls fathers’ hearts from their children and pulls children’s hearts from their fathers. They want to take the Wizard’s place instead of bringing him to justice, but this is not their greatest sin. No, their greatest sin is that they would aid and ally with the Wizard himself in order to make incremental gains.

Our emphasis must be upon our God, his law, and his gospel, not upon gaining control of television networks and godless institutions. As a nation, we must eschew any compromise or alliance with God-haters. Our nation must value obedience, not consensus. Good national policy is measured not in how many allies it makes, but with what nations and on what conditions it makes those alliances. Let us consider our nation’s alliances in light of the biblical question –

“And Jehu the son of Hanani the seer went out to meet him, and said to king Jehoshaphat, Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the LORD? therefore is wrath upon thee from before the LORD.” (2 Chronicles 19:2 KJV)

Jesus pointed out that the key to bearing fruit was not the branch, but the vine that the branch was connected to. Bearing national fruit is both a natural and inevitable consequence for us if we abide in Him, but it is impossible for those nations that do not, which serves to remind our nation that even pointing other nations to the true vine is vain, if we have neglected our own attachment to Christ.

Consider what Charles H. Spurgeon wrote of Psalms 33:12:

“Election is at the bottom of it all. The divine choice rules the day; none take Jehovah to be their God till he takes them to be his people. What an ennobling choice this is! We are selected to no mean estate, and for no ignoble purpose: we are made the peculiar domain and delight of the Lord our God. Being so blessed, let us rejoice in our portion, and show the world by our lives that we serve a glorious Master.” (Spurgeon, *The Treasury of David*)

Observe that Spurgeon encouraged his nation to rejoice in their estate and their purpose, and may the reader remember to consider these things in the corporate context in which they were written. Too often do Christians ignore the national implications of the scriptures and attempt to claim them as individuals. Spurgeon’s teachings here do not discourage nationalism, they glory in it. Likewise, I want to encourage the reader to rejoice in his national estate and purpose, and to consciously reject the contempt which the modern humanists would have us display for our heritage.

But before we can even begin to contemplate our precious national estate and the noble national purpose that Spurgeon spoke of, it is necessary to ask a preliminary question - what, specifically, defines a nation? For how can national matters be comprehended by those who do not know what a nation is? The unbiblical definition of what constitutes a nation is another significant misconception which prevents us from understanding the Bible’s teaching about nations.

To definitively establish what constitutes national identity, we must look to God’s word. God gives us the origins of the nations in the book of Genesis chapter 10, where it is explained that the descendants of Noah’s three sons multiplied and inhabited the earth according to their families, tongues, and nations. The Hebrew word that is translated into our English word nation is *goy*, and is also

translated as *Gentile*. That word *Gentile* is very confusing to many, so I should add that it does not necessarily refer to non-Israelite peoples. It simply means a people. When Isaac’s wife Rebekah was pregnant with Jacob and Esau, the LORD said to her: “Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger.” (Genesis 25:23 KJV) Both Jacob (Israel) and his brother Esau were described as *goy*, or nations, because their descendants would have a national identity based on their lineage. Paul would later use these two nations to illustrate God’s sovereignty in national election, in the book of Romans.

In Genesis chapter 11, God explains the rationale and the means by which he took additional steps to separate the nations:

“And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them throughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar. And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech. So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.” (Genesis 11:1-9 KJV)

God saw that the massing together of the nations of the earth was not good, for this estate lacked any social or political mechanisms for the restraint of the wicked imaginations of men. I do not question God's judgment in this matter, but submit to it. His solution to this lack of societal restraints upon wickedness was to confound man's common bond of language, thereby forcing them to separate and scatter according to their ethnic groups, or nations.

The Keil & Delitzsch Commentary on the Old Testament provides this most insightful analysis of what God did in confounding the speech of the Babelists –

“We must not conclude from this, however, that the differences in language were simply the result of the separation of the various tribes, and that the latter arose from discord and strife; in which case the confusion of tongues would be nothing more than *'dissensio animorum, per quam factum sit, ut qui turrem struebant distracti sint in contraria studia et consilia'* (Bitringa). Such a view not only does violence to the words “that one may not discern (understand) the lip (language) of the other,” but is also at variance with the object of the narrative. When it is stated, first of all, that God resolved to destroy the unity of lips and words by a confusion of the lips, and then that He scattered the men abroad, this act of divine judgment cannot be understood in any other way, than that God deprived them of the ability to comprehend one another, and thus effected their dispersion. The event itself cannot have consisted merely in a change of the organs of speech, produced by the omnipotence of God, whereby speakers were turned into stammerers who were unintelligible to one another. This opinion, which is held by Bitringa and Hoffmann, is neither reconcilable with the text, nor tenable as a matter of fact.

“The differences, to which this event gave rise, consisted not merely in variations of sound, such as might be attributed to differences in the formation in the organs of speech (the lip or tongue), but had a much deeper foundation in the human mind. If language is the audible expression of

emotions, conceptions, and thoughts of the mind, the cause of the confusion or division of the one human language into different national dialects must be sought in an effect produced upon the human mind, by which the original unity of emotion, conception, thought, and will was broken up. This inward unity had no doubt been already disturbed by sin, but the disturbance had not yet amounted to a perfect breach. This happened first of all in the event recorded here, through a direct manifestation of divine power, which caused the disturbance produced by sin in the unity of emotion, thought, and will to issue in a diversity of language, and thus by a miraculous suspension of mutual understanding frustrated the enterprise by which men hoped to render dispersion and estrangement impossible.”

In the midst of the building of the tower of Babel, God not only recognized the significant problem of the lack of familial, lingual, and national boundaries, but saw fit to write his opinion and solution for that problem in his word for the benefit of you and me, the sinful descendants of those sinful men. We dare not ignore this, and we dare not repeat the sins of our fathers by attempting to rejoin what God has separated for the purpose of restraining the sinful imaginations of man.

There are those that make the outlandish claim that God reversed the judgment of Babel at Pentecost. By this they mean that we are now free to ignore national and ethnic distinctions, and seek to join all the peoples of the earth into one body on a religious basis. They would have us lay aside our God-given ethnic identity for a propositional identity, and join the attempt to build their new Babel on the plains of the new Shinar. Yet however foolish the claim that Pentecost reversed Babel may be, it is simply a straw-man argument, for the nations did not originate in the judgment of Babel. The nations predated Babel (as we previously noted in our discussion of Genesis chapter 10), and the judgment at Babel was not the initiation

of national and ethnic boundaries, but an enforcement and strengthening of those boundaries. Thus even if the argument of the neo-Babelists that Pentecost reversed Babel is correct, it would merely mean that the additional barriers added at Babel would be removed, not that ethnic and national identity would disappear. Of course, only those extremely desperate in their attempts to justify ethnic amalgamation are silly enough to suggest that the differences in language, emotion, thought, and will among the various nations of the world have actually disappeared. Obviously they have not! Furthermore, those components of ethnic identity do not disappear upon conversion to Christ. Only the intentionally blind (and those who follow them) persist in this neo-Babelist folly in the face of the overwhelming evidence all around them.

Though the scriptures are sufficient to give us an understanding of what defines a nation, we can see the truth of what constitutes national identity even in modern dictionaries. Take a look at this entry, for example, and note especially the roots and synonyms of the word:

Nation, *n.* [F. nation, L. natio nation, race, orig., a being born, fr. natus, p. p. of nasci, to be born, for gnatus, gnasci, from the same root as E. kin. [root]44. See Kin kindred, and cf. Cognate, Natal, Native.]

1. (Ethnol.) A part, or division, of the people of the earth, distinguished from the rest by common descent, language, or institutions; a race; a stock. Syn: people; race. See People.

Going back in time now to when the dictionary reflected the truth of God's word, Webster's 1828 dictionary says this regarding the word nation:

"Nation, as its etymology imports, originally denoted a family or race of men descended from a common progenitor, like tribe, but by emigration, conquest and intermixture of

men of different families, this distinction is in most countries lost."

Indeed, this distinction has been largely lost, and may we mourn this loss of national distinction, for in its place we have accepted the pottage of abstract creedalism as the basis for our identity. Yes, let us mourn, and as Samuel Francis admonishes us, may we be profoundly offended at this –

"The whole concept of a nation or state basing itself on a 'creed' or 'ideology' or abstract doctrine of any kind (including religion) ought to be profoundly offensive to real conservatives, since it means that the whole of the national life as well as its foreign policy must be subordinated to the implementation of the abstraction at the expense of the actual institutions and way of life that really defines the nation and its culture. A credal or ideological nation is tantamount to totalitarianism, which is why those who advocate such a regime can see no distinction, let alone any antagonism, between its state and the "people" or "nation" the state rules. In such a system, there is no distinction between state and nation."

Recognizing the truth that Francis so ably conveys, some of the bolder among us are willing to part with the red stew of ideological identity. But it is not enough to reject the faulty thesis of the propositional nation – we must establish an antithesis. As Gary North has often stated – "You can't beat something with nothing."

Recognizing this, some offer the working definition of a nation as "blood and soil," a particular people in a particular place. Blood and soil is a somewhat helpful antithesis in that it provides objectivity. And these objective concepts are in full view in this quotation from John Jay regarding his nation:

"Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people, a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language,

professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs, and who, by their joint counsels, arms, and efforts, fighting side by side through a long and bloody war, have nobly established general liberty and independence.” (Federalist No. 2)

The characteristics of the nation Jay describes can be objectively discerned - “this connected country”; “a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion”; etc. There is no doubt where that land was and there is no doubt who that people were: White European Christians. They can be objectively discerned by their physical characteristics as well as their behavior.

Take away those particular people and that particular place, and nothing remains of the nation. A new people could form a new nation in that place, but the original nation would be gone. This scenario could very well describe the current status of America. The United States of America is more akin to the United Nations - a cacophony of voices representing an innumerable number of dissimilar nations attempting to obtain power in the mobocracy. At some point, the question arises as to whether a nation should stop expending its energy on attempts to control the mobocracy, and instead seek to recognize and make known its own national identity.

Yet the notion of blood and soil, while somewhat helpful, is still not an entirely accurate way to define a nation. The antithesis to all things humanist is Theonomy, for God and His law are the only source of objective truth, and God’s word is the standard by which all ideas can be evaluated. They will either stand on the rock, or be dashed to pieces by it. According to the biblical definition of a nation, the soil, or particular place, is simply not an integral part of a nation’s identity. It may be strongly associated with

a nation’s identity, but a nation is first and foremost defined by its blood. The nation of Israel, for instance, retained its national identity in Egypt, in the Sinaitic wilderness, in the land of Canaan, in captivity in Bablyon, and dispersed abroad in the Roman Empire. The nation was never defined by its geography, but by its genetic progenitor.

Thomas Sowell described this truth when discussing the people of Australia, when he stated that

“Australians are Europeans, regardless of what geography may say. Not only their language and physical appearance, but also their fertility patterns, technology, philosophy, social customs, and institutions of government make them part of a culture that exists 10,000 miles away, and foreign to the culture of their neighbors in Papua New Guinea or Indonesia.”

Although by usage the word nation has come to have different shades of meaning, including ‘country’ or ‘state’, which reflect geography and/or ideology; the word primarily denotes what we typically think of as ethnic groups. Even the modern egalitarian dictionary we quoted earlier reflects this. The word in our New Testament that is translated as nation is in fact the Greek word *ethnos*, from which our word *ethnic* comes. There is simply no denying that your nation is your ethnic kind. You might also think of your nation as simply your kindred, or your kinfolk, by which I mean your (really) extended family.

Understanding what constitutes national identity gives us a fresh insight into the socio-political conditions of the world today. For instance, the whole scheme of gerrymandering in America really exposes the fact that the peoples inhabiting the United States are not a nation but a plethora of nations, each with their own particular people in their own particular part of this North American Continent. The congressional districts of the

American democracy then, represent an attempt, whether consciously or subconsciously, to demarcate the thousands of tiny nations which are distinctly defined by their own blood and which occupy their own soil, each clamoring for representation among a monstrous conglomeration of many bloods and many soils.

This can never work. Such a situation will result in either a dictatorship or dissolution (the socialist pledge of allegiance notwithstanding). Otto Scott pointed this out in a lecture called People and Population, which he delivered to the League of the South:

“Now to know how we got into this pit, I think is helpful, because we have to devise answers and responses to the people that are now trying to call us all rebels for saying ‘the white race,’ for being against immigration, for saying that it is not possible for any nation to have a multiple number of religions and ethnic groups who maintain their separate identities all the time. It’s not possible for such a society to endure. It will tear itself apart.”

In the same lecture, Scott used Spain to illustrate the powder keg created by neo-Babelist attempts to create a “multi-cultural” society when he noted that, “Spain had three races and three religions for 700 years and it wound up in an explosion,” and that Spain did not become great until they “finally drove out the Jews and the Arabs (and the Arabs never complained about it).”

Modern America, like most modern countries, is an empire, which is by definition a conglomeration of nations. We read in Webster’s 1828 Dictionary that,

“It often happens that many nations are subject to one government; in which case, the word nation usually denotes a body of people speaking the same language, or a body that has formerly been under a distinct government, but has been conquered, or

incorporated with a larger nation. Thus the empire of Russia comprehends many nations, as did formerly the Roman and Persian empires.”

The reality of distinct nations existing under the umbrella of one government is illustrated in the Bible during the time of Christ, when the nation of Judea was under the imperial government of Rome, yet it was still identified as a distinct nation. (cf. John 11:48, 18:35) The Bible is full of teachings about empires and other political structures, but by refusing to submit to God’s definition of a nation, we have blinded ourselves to many of the teachings therein that are most needful for our nation to prosper.

Southerners may recognize that Lincoln’s War was all about the creation of an empire through the subjugation of multiple nations under one political umbrella, but the American empire did not begin there. The empire can be traced to the Hamiltonian “federalists” who executed a national *coup d’état* when they formalized their victory over the Jeffersonian agrarians in a national Constitution that failed to define either the nation it was written for or the God that nation served.

The only true distinction modern America currently has from balkanization is the concentration of power in the hands of a few, for the ethnically balkanized nations of the American Empire have been deceived into believing that they have the power through the voting franchise, and that the few are servants to the many. The reality is that the few control and manipulate the many, but eventually some of the many shall open their eyes to realize that the emperor has no clothes.

And what shall the posterity of John Jay’s nation do when their eyes are opened to their national identity? Personalize this question, ye men of the West! I enjoin you to embrace your identity, and as Spurgeon

enjoined us, to rejoice in it and consider your national estate and your national purpose. We must not be embarrassed of what God has done in separating man into nations, nor attempt to rejoin them. This is neo-Babelism, and a wicked rebellion against his will. As Charles Hodge points out,

“... [the] differences between the Caucasian, Mongolian, and negro races, which is known to have been as distinctly marked two or three thousand years before Christ as it is now... these varieties of race are not the effect of the blind operation of physical causes, but by those causes as intelligently guided by God for the accomplishment of some wise purpose... God fashions the different races of men in their peculiarities to suit them to the regions which they inhabit.”

Whereas God has separated the nations “for the accomplishment of some wise purpose,” we would be well served to return to the book of beginnings and review the building blocks with which any proper understanding of national purpose must be built.

Man was created by God to keep and to dress the garden of God. (Genesis 1 & 2) He was commanded to “Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.” (Genesis 1:28)

After the fall, man was expelled from Eden, but his task was the same. (Genesis 3) Adam’s descendants (apart from Noah, who was perfect in his generations, or genealogy) multiplied of course, but they did so in wicked rebellion, for they multiplied not according to their families and kindreds, but in lustful miscegenation. (Genesis 6:1-4) They exercised dominion over the earth, but they likewise did so in wicked rebellion, and God himself noted that “every

imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” (Genesis 6:5)

God displayed his wrath upon rebellious man in the great flood, sparing only righteous Noah and his family. (Genesis 6:8-8:22) When the waters of the flood subsided, God repeated his dominion mandate to men, commanding them to be fruitful, to multiply, and to have dominion over the earth. (Genesis 9) As the sons of Noah multiplied in the earth, God separated them “every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.” (Genesis 10) However, the nations of men again rebelled against God’s design in uniting themselves in the plain of Shinar, and collaborating to build the tower of Babel.

In response to this, God created additional barriers to internationalism in order to make it more difficult for the nations of the earth to amalgamate in opposition to his divine purposes. Concerning this, Rev. Joseph Morecraft III teaches us that, “It appears to be the will of God to use nationalism to restrain human revolt against God... According to Psalm 2:3f, the anti-Christian powers of the world are united in futile conspiracies to overthrow the political and moral law-order of Almighty God and His Christ... God always brings His judgment upon such attempts, Gen 11:7f; Psa. 2:4f; and many times He uses the faithfulness of Christians to bring down their efforts, Isa. 40:25f, coupled with the suicidal nature of their own course, Prov. 8:36, and the providential intervention of God.”

Let us accept the calling of the faithful Christians that Rev. Morecraft spoke of, whom God uses to bring down the efforts of the anti-Christ conspiracy. Let us not fear to proclaim the truth of what nations are, nor the truth that God has divinely separated them. Let us not fear to submit to God’s will and accept our national identity. It is when we accept and embrace these things that we can discern and truly

carry out God's purpose for our nation. That purpose is substantially the same as it was in the beginning – to be fruitful, to multiply, and to exercise dominion over the earth. That purpose must be understood in the context of God's law and gospel, for God obviously is not honored when we commit the sins that brought wrath against our forefathers – disobedience to his law and refusing to honor the barriers that God erected to restrain wickedness. Yet that is exactly what the empires of the world have always sought to do.

The empire rips apart the heritage of all the nations it seeks to subsume. It causes unnecessary tension between ethnic groups by appointing multi-ethnic political leaders. God instructed the nation of Israel not to set a foreigner over them. Why? Because no foreigner can truly be a federal head to a people other than his own. This causes a dilemma, because a leader must be able to identify fully with the people he represents, something he cannot do unless he repudiates his own. The nationalist asks the obvious questions - how could he, and why would he want to? The empire is the truly racist institution, for it effectively requires every subsumed nation to curse their ancestors and transfer their allegiance to the neo-Babelist ideology of the emperor.

Nationalism would have no person do that, but instead encourages each ethnic group to govern themselves and to seek God as a separate and distinct people, and to use their racial giftedness for the purposes God had in mind when he ordained that the peoples of the earth inhabit the land according to their nations. No one should be ashamed of who they are, or who their parents are, or who their nation is. All peoples of the earth should celebrate kinship.

An inherent flaw of those opposed to nationalism rests with those who expect a foreigner to have either the desire or the capability to lay aside the loyalty that rightfully belongs to their family and their kindred, in order to give that loyalty to another people. This is the philosophy that should be called racist, for that is what it truly is, in stark contrasts to true nationalists who would have all nations to govern themselves.

Humanistic egalitarianism is at war with the law of God and the boundaries he has set for the nations of men. In contrast, Christianity must boldly proclaim the antithesis of this - nationalism; which is simply to make peace with God's law and God's appointed boundaries, in humble submission to God's wisdom and will.

Kinism: A Speech Delivered to the Virginia League of the South

by Harry Seabrook

In the preface to his book, *A Defense of Virginia and the South*, R.L. Dabney writes:

“To the conquerors of my native State, and perhaps to some of her sons, a large part of the following defense will appear wholly unseasonable. A discussion of a social order totally overthrown...will appear as completely out of date to them as the ribs of Noah’s ark, bleaching amidst the eternal snows of Ararat, to his posterity, when engaged in building the tower of Babel.”

You have heard today about the danger facing us, the potential death of the West, and our defense of kinism is wholly unseasonable to those who welcome the impending genocide. It is they who deny that race is real, assert that even if it is real, it’s not important; and even if it’s real and important, it’s wrong to discuss it. They have been trained to identify racism as the greatest problem facing us, and to deny, in the very next breath, that races exist. Well, one of the problems we face is that most people don’t know how to define a word like racism. I submit that racism is the belief that races other than one’s own are sub-human, or the belief that one’s race will be the only race in heaven. Kinism, on the other hand, is the benign awareness that homogeneous social structure breeds trust, and therefore safety. I further submit that the founding race of any nation has the right to determine its ethnic composition and its citizenship. As Jared Taylor reminds us: “If it is ‘racist’ to prefer the company of people of one’s race, to prefer the culture created by one’s race, and to want one’s

race to survive and flourish, then virtually everyone of every color is ‘racist’, and the term has no useful meaning.”

The Virginia League of the South statement on kinism begins this way: “It is time to discuss the racial issue intelligently. Ignoring it will not make it go away.” Amen! As Scott Trask says, “A common race is the foundation of any true nation, while a common religion is the foundation of a common moral code.” Our race does not buy us a ticket to heaven, but if common stock is the foundation of our nation, it is, as Trask says, “more important even than a common language, culture, political allegiance, or locale. The Bible praises homogeneity as a blessing, and posits it as the basis of love, friendship, social peace, and national harmony. The Bible also sanctions love of nation and fatherland, a virtue antagonistic to indiscriminate and large-scale immigration... The modern desire for global unity, amalgamation of peoples, destruction of territorial boundaries, English as a universal language, and construction of a world government is difficult to see as anything other than a sinful desire to rebuild the Tower of Babel and create an autonomous humanistic order independent of God. It is a rebellious project that defies God’s plan for world order based on discrete nations each residing within its own lands... [This] project for global unity sullies the beauty and diversity of God’s human creation, in that it suggests that the existence of different races, which vary markedly in physical appearance, is a mistake that man

is to remedy by racial intermarriage. In this warped version of creation, God is the bungler and man the redeemer.” Such lies emanate even from churches and what are called “conservative” political parties. We have Billy Graham saying that Christians have a duty to foster total racial integration “in our homes, in our worship services, even in our marriages.” And we have “B-1 Bob” Dornan, former Republican congressman from Southern California, saying: “I want to see America stay a nation of immigrants, and if we lose our Northern European stock—your coloring and mine, blue eyes and fair hair—tough! So what if 5,000 years from now we’re all going to have a golden tan... We’re all going to be blended together because of travel, and because of the information highway.” Now you know why the Amish refuse to drive cars. Trask continues:

“It therefore seems a bad joke to speak of Christian conservatives or the Christian Right, for there is nothing conservative about acquiescing in a demographic revolution to turn whites into a minority... European Christians should be on their guard against socialists posing as Christians, for the socialistic dream of racial reconciliation and world unity leads to nothing less than the extinction of Europeans as a separate people and the destruction of their civilization. Christians must stand in defense against those who would—in the name of Christ—have us abandon our lands and our people.”

“The America of our grandchildren will be another country altogether,” says Pat Buchanan,

“a nation unrecognizable to our parents, a giant Brazil of the North... By 2050, there will be scores of millions of people living here whose loyalty is to a foreign country... If, by 2050, the America we grew up in has become a Tower of Babel of squabbling minorities that is falling apart, it will be because of the treason of the elites, and our lack of will to overthrow them.”

The new Tower of Babel is being erected at an alarming pace. Let me read to you some quotes by some of the men promoting world citizenship and pushing the idea that our country is a Dream, an Idea, a Proposition, and an Experiment rather than a particular place founded by particular people.

Bill Clinton says: “We want to become a multiracial, multiethnic society. This will arguably be the third great revolution...to prove that we literally can live without...having a dominant European culture.”

Democrat Presidential Candidate Wesley Clark says : “There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That’s a 19th century idea and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and we are going to do it with multiethnic states. Our goal is that after this year, it will no longer be possible for those who support ethnically separate communities to believe that they can succeed.”

The Humanist Manifesto II:

“We deplore the division of humankind on nationalistic grounds. We have reached a turning point in human history where the best option is to transcend the limits of national sovereignty and to move toward the building of a world community in which all sectors of the human family can participate. Thus we look to the development of a system of world law and a world order based upon transnational federal government.”

The American Jewish Committee: “Americanism is the spirit behind the welcome that America has traditionally extended to people of all races, all religions, all nationalities.”

“Something is happening,” says Ben Wattenberg. “We are becoming the first universal nation in history... If you believe, as the author does, that the American drama is being played out toward a purpose, then the non-Europeanization of

America is heartening news of an almost transcendental quality.”

From King George the Lesser’s inaugural speech, January 20, 2001: “America has never been united by blood or birth or soil. We are bound by ideals that move us beyond our background, lift us above our interests, and teach us what it means to be a citizen.” Andrew Sandlin of the Center for Cultural Leadership: “Blood and soil mean much less here than ideas. Not race or place, but ideas, have always been at the root of what it means to be an American.” Jesse Jackson: “To be an American is not a matter of blood or birth. Our citizens are bound by ideals that represent the hope of all mankind.”

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.: “The American Creed envisages a nation composed of individuals making their own choices and accountable to themselves, not a nation based on inviolable ethnic communities.” Theodore Roosevelt, who advocated the anti-Christian idea that all should possess “exactly the same rights, not merely legal, but social and spiritual” said: “Americanism is a question of principles, of idealism, of character: it is not a matter of birthplace or creed or line of descent.” George William Curtis said: “A man’s country is not a certain area of land, of mountains, rivers, and woods, but it is a principle; and patriotism is loyalty to that principle.” Adam Clayton Powell said: The “best thing that could happen would be the passing of the white man’s world [which] has stood for nationalism, oppression, and barbarism.”

Rabbi Abraham Feinberg: “The law should encourage, not forbid, the intermingling of bloods... The only way we can accomplish...a Final Solution to racial prejudice, is to create a [mixture] of races... The deliberate encouragement of interracial marriages is the only way to hasten this process... we will never completely eliminate racial prejudice until we eliminate separate races.”

Brock Chisholm, former Director of the U.N. World Health Organization: “What people everywhere must do is practice birth control and miscegenation in order to create one race in one world under one government. The ideal skin for a human being is a coffee-colored skin.”

Nicole Mullen, a contemporary Christian singer, took his advice. She sings of her family: “Mama looks like coffee, daddy looks like cream, baby is a mocha drop American dream...” According to Sean Hannity, Jesus Christ died on the cross for interracial dating. Bill O’Reilly has said that the government should sponsor interracial dances. You get the idea.

This indoctrination is producing the desired effect. As Michael Olwen says,

“The White Race makes up only 8% of the world’s population, and is declining at that, yet it is more likely to practice vasectomy, tubal ligation, or other means of birth control than any other group. Further, even if the average White Man is physically intact, he is still as much of a eunuch as the guard of an Ottoman harem, perhaps even more so. His castration has been subtle but sure; his neutering has been both mental and spiritual. He is a human steer, placidly standing in his field chewing his cud, carefully not giving offense to the bulls who rut with the cows that were once his. Quiet, calm and cooperative, he will stand back from the trough while they eat his food, and when that final truck comes, he will climb aboard with little urging. Disembarking and making his way down the bloody chute, he may, with his final thought, dare to wonder what that man with the bloody apron is doing standing at the end with the sledgehammer in hand.”

I think Michael Cardinal von Faulhaber said it well:

“From the Church’s point of view there is no objection whatever to racial research and race culture. Nor is there any objection to the endeavor to keep national characteristics of a people as far as possible pure and unadulterated, and to foster their national

spirit by emphasis upon the common ties of blood to unite them. From the Church's point of view we must make only three conditions: First, love of one's race must not lead to the hatred of other nations. Secondly, the individual must never consider himself freed from nourishing his own soul by persevering use of the means of grace which the Church provides. The young man who is always hearing about the blessedness of his own race is apt too easily to conceive that he is no longer bound by duties to God and His Church, duties to humility and chastity. Thirdly, race culture must not assume an attitude of hostility to Christianity."

This is all very true, but sadly, politically correct Christians are willfully ignorant of race. Sam Francis writes:

"Almost literally every time I have argued or debated about race in a public forum, I get a response from whites of quoting the Bible verse of Galatians 3:28 — 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for you are all one in Christ Jesus.' This verse apparently has become the basic text for Christian universalism and race denial, although if it were interpreted as literally as those who use it for that purpose do, it would also deny the existence of sexual differences, a conclusion that is not only absurd but would appear to gut the Christian argument against gay marriage."

And this is exactly correct. The very same interpretation that denies racial distinction also logically undercuts rejection of feminism and sodomy. According to Dr. Ron Rumburg, "Galatians 3:28 is perhaps the most abused text in modern times. Klyne R. Snodgrass in an article asserted,

"This text, like some others, has become a hermeneutical skeleton key by which we may go through any door we choose. More often than not, Galatians 3:28 has become a piece of plastic that people have molded to their preconceived ideas'... It is a long way from no difference in salvation in the spiritual realm to destroying all differences in race, authority or sex in the physical world. The

result of such an interpretation would be anarchy."

Michael Hill observes that, "The central creed of modern democracy is based on the false notion that all men are created equal, and all enjoy the same universal, mechanical rights of man. This Jacobinical creed is preached from the pulpits and taught in the seminaries of America as if it had its origins in God's holy writ; nothing, of course, could be further from the truth."

Everyone has heard the term "melting pot." What you might not know is that it was coined by a Jew named Israel Zangwill, who wrote that America had become a "melting pot...[of] the races of Europe." You can see how the meaning has been changed. Now men are taught that the bond of kinship is easily interchangeable. The truth is that nations are born of likeness but die of diversity. A Harvard professor named Samuel Huntington has written a book called *Who Are We?* Now, healthy nations don't even need to ask such a question. They know who they are. But nations who sell their birthright to the lowest bidder and preach lies such as "diversity is our greatest strength" must inevitably ask such questions. They have forgotten who they are. Huntington argues that there is an "Anglo-Protestant core" to our country, which is controversial enough, but he writes in the Foreword to his book: "This is, let me make clear, an argument for the importance of Anglo-Protestant culture, not for the importance of Anglo-Protestant people." He must think our culture just boiled out of the ground one sunny day. Of course it's an argument for the importance of Anglo-Protestant people!

When we say we love the South, we mean that we love the Southern people. And make no mistake — the Southern people are white Christians descended from the north and west of Europe; the very same

Americans who founded and sought to preserve the old republic. Take them away and the South ceases to be Southern. Likewise, when white Christians have ceased, Western Civilization will have ceased. There is nothing particularly wrong with Mexicans, Asians, and blacks, but don't expect them to carry our heroes, myths, and traditions into the 22nd century. They have heroes, myths, and traditions of their own. No one else is going to maintain the culture we inherited from our ancestors. No one else is interested. Mexicans, Asians, and blacks are not going to be impressed by anyone waxing nostalgic about the good old days of Anglo-Protestantism, and they certainly could not care less about the Confederacy.

Tom Fleming is correct:

“Politicians in Washington tell us we should be loyal to what they call ‘the American way of life’; if that phrase means anything, however, it should refer to the customs, religion, and culture of the British and European settlers who came to the New World and replanted their traditions in fresh soil, where they yielded a rich harvest. If we are to trust the politicians, we should be loyal to the Christian religion, Western culture, European peoples, and the Anglo-American language, political institutions, and legal traditions. But all of these are under constant assault from the state and federal government agencies that are now demanding our loyalty. Christians cannot pray in the schools they pay for with their taxes or pretend that their traditions are equal (much less superior) to the religions and cultures of devil-worshippers, cannibals, polygamists, female-circumcisers, wife-burners, and child-sacrificers. Americans not only must bow to the superiority of non-Western cultures; they also have to import their representatives in such large numbers as to threaten the bare survival of their own people and culture.”

Srdja Trifkovic writes:

“The notion that there are lands, countries, and nations - specifically, in Europe and North America - that should be defended by

virtue of being ‘ours’ seems both strange and subversive to the members of the elite. They share Samuel Huntington’s dictum that the core concepts of our civilization are supposed to be individualism, liberalism, constitutionalism, human rights, equality, liberty, the rule of law, democracy, free markets, the separation of church and state. They reject the suggestion that Christianity, the shared ethnic and linguistic origins of the European family, and that family’s common historical experiences are at all relevant...”

John Jay, signer of the Declaration of Independence and first Chief Justice of the United States, wrote: “Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people, a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs,” without whom a common, let alone a free, government could not have existed. We used to be a nation bound by common purpose, common religion, common language, common race. We shared the same culture, traditions, history, aspirations, interests, and roots. We held firmly to English concepts of the rule of law and the Puritan work ethic. But today we are in decline because there are too many Christians who think pagans are their equals. There are too many sons of the pioneers who think that all other people in the world are Americans in embryo. There are too many who see nothing wrong with selling our birthright for a heathen pledge to a heathen flag. To be an ‘American’ these days, one must be disinherited, deracinated, and have filled out the proper forms.

“Without a common culture to unite us,” writes Mike Tuggle, “US citizens’ have no more in common than the random assortment of residents at a New Jersey extended stay motel. Who are we? What are our values? What will we fight for? The idea that we are now a ‘proposition nation’

inspired by the nobility of an abstract notion of universal brotherhood will work no better here than it did in the old Soviet Union... Love of one's own people always trumps empty abstractions." As Jared Taylor says, "We cannot expect people who have nothing in common with each other but the legal abstraction of citizenship to work or sacrifice for the common good." We have nothing in common but a government that supplies us with worthless currency. We have become a giant mall for mankind and a polyglot boarding house for the world. There are a lot of people complaining about the harmful effects of multiculturalism and multilingualism. Well, folks, guess what leads to multilingualism and multiculturalism: multiracialism. Let's not be those who hack at the branches rather than strike the root of the problem.

In the British magazine *Prospect*, David Goodhart writes:

"Thinking about the conflict between solidarity and diversity is another way of asking a question as old as human society itself: Who is my brother? With whom do I share mutual obligations? The traditional conservative Burkean view is that our affinities ripple out from our families and localities, to the nation and not very far beyond. That view is pitted against a liberal universalist one which sees us in some sense equally obligated to all human beings from Bolton to Burundi... [Burkeans] argue that we feel more comfortable with, and are readier to share with, and sacrifice for, those with whom we have shared histories and similar values. To put it bluntly - most of us prefer our own kind."

I'm sad to say that I was told by a Reformed pastor that God intends to remake the family. He quoted Matthew 10:34-36: "Whoever loves father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me, and whoever loves son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me." In fact, the Bible doesn't say a word about remaking the family. Matthew 10:34-36 means

exactly what it says - that the love for our families is not to be greater than our love for the Lord. Yet even the wicked care for their own according to the flesh. Even the infidel cherishes his family. What man is there among you who, if his son asks for bread, will give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish, will give him a serpent? "But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his household [referring to both an immediate and extended family], he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever" (1 Tim. 5:8).

Though the Bible tells us that God divided humanity into "nations," which is a racial term, like the word *natal*, the neo-Babelist believes that geography rather than race determines citizenship. "Cross that boundary and you're an American! Pass our multiple choice quiz and you're an American!" They reason that the Old Testament people of God had a national identity, but today the church has only a spiritual identity. They don't care about maintaining an ethnic balance, as our forefathers did, because they don't care about the future of our people. They deny that our people (by blood) are our people! And the immediate assumption is that those of us who acknowledge the divisions that God Himself imposed on mankind want to keep the gospel to ourselves. This is ludicrous.

As Douglas Wilson says, "You do not teach children to appreciate other cultures by teaching them to despise their own. A child who loves and honors his own mother is far more likely to appreciate that someone else loves and honors his own mother." This is very true, although as Hermann Goering said, "When I hear the word culture, I reach for my pistol." We're talking primarily about race, which British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli called the key to world history. Contempt for your own race leads to contempt of all races, which is hatred of men and revolution against God.

So national unity is inseparably bound to ethnic unity. Genesis 10:5 bears this out when it says that “the Gentiles were separated into their lands, everyone according to his language, according to their families, into their nations.” The Apostle Paul was a Cilician by birth, a Roman by citizenship, a Greek by language, and a Christian by faith. But how did he describe his nationality? Did he say that he belonged to a world race of Christians? No, he claimed to be “of the nation of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews.” The Bible tells us that there will be multiple nations in heaven rather than one nation of the Christians of the world. There are nations in the earth, according to Psalm 102: “The nations will fear the name of the LORD, all the kings of the earth will revere your glory.” There are nations in heaven, according to Revelation 21: “The nations will walk by its light, and the kings of the earth will bring their splendor into it... The glory and honor of the nations [plural] will be brought into it.” These two passages sound the same.

As Charles Hodge said: “The differences between the Caucasian, Mongolian, and negro races, which is known to have been as distinctly marked two or three thousand years before Christ as it is now...these varieties of race are not the effect of the blind operation of physical causes, but by those causes as intelligently guided by God for the accomplishment of some wise purpose... God fashions the different races of men in their peculiarities to suit them to the regions which they inhabit.” Alexander Solzhenitsyn believed “that the disappearance of nations would have impoverished us no less than if all men had become alike, with one personality and one face. Nations are the wealth of mankind, its collective personalities; the very least of them wears its own special colours and bears within itself a special facet of divine intention.” As John Vinson says, “Nationhood is not an arbitrary human arrangement, but a principle of

divine order. The separation of vastly different peoples helps reduce conflict and promote fruitful diversity. Massive uncontrolled immigration defeats God’s order. Love and compassion fare poorly in chaos - and also in the tyranny that follows chaos.”

John Calvin said it well: “Just as there are in a military camp separate lines for each platoon and section, men are placed on the earth so that each nation may be content with its own boundaries. [In this manner,] God, by his providence, reduces to order that which is confused.” Clyde Wilson tells us that “harmony among men is a product not of uniformity but of genuine, mutually respectful diversity... [R]espect for other cultures, and the peaceful coexistence of cultures, are only possible among people who are themselves conscious participants in their own, necessarily particularist culture. There is no universal culture. How could there be, when there is no such thing as a universal man?”

Even Alexander Hamilton, who was not a Southerner, said: “The safety of a republic depends on the energy of a common national sentiment; on uniformity of principles and habits...” It would be best “to render the people of this country as homogeneous as possible,” for this “must tend as much as any other circumstance to the permanency of their union and prosperity... The influx of foreigners must, therefore, tend to...corrupt the national spirit...” From one blood God created all men. Does this mean that all races should be allowed to intermarry, simply because they can? The races of Seth and Cain intermarried in Genesis 6, simply because they could. God was so displeased with this miscegenation that He destroyed the world because of it.

Ken Ham, author of the book *One Blood*, says there is no such thing as interracial marriage because there is no such thing as biological race. There is only a race of Christians and a race of non-Christians.

The great R.L. Dabney affirmed “that ‘God made of one blood all nations of men to dwell under the whole heavens,’” but he said that nothing except amalgamation or subordination “can prevent the rise of that instinctive antipathy of race, which, history shows, always arises between opposite races in proximity.”

R.J. Rushdoony comments on 2 Cor. 6:14: “Unequal yoking plainly means mixed marriages between believers and unbelievers is clearly forbidden. But Deuteronomy 22:10 not only forbids unequal yoking by inference, and as a case law, but also unequal yoking generally. This means that an unequal marriage between believers or between unbelievers is wrong. Man was created in the image of God (Gen. 1:26), and woman is the reflected image of God in man, and from man (1 Cor. 11:1-12; Gen. 2:18, 21-23). ‘Helpmeet’ means a reflection or a mirror, an image of man, indicating that a woman must have something religiously and culturally in common with her husband. The burden of the law is thus against inter-religious, inter-racial, and inter-cultural marriages, in that they normally go against the very community which marriage is designed to establish. Unequal yoking means more than marriage. In society at large it means the enforced integration of various elements which are not congenial. Unequal yoking is in no realm productive of harmony; rather, it aggravates the differences and delays the growth of the different elements toward a Christian harmony and association.”

God did not even want his twelve tribes to intermarry, even though they all had the same religion. The case of the daughters of Zelophehad in Numbers 36 leads to this decree: “Let them marry whom they think best, but they may marry only within the family of their father’s tribe. So the inheritance of the children of Israel shall not change hands from tribe to tribe, for every one of the children of Israel shall keep the inheritance of the tribe of his

fathers.” Modern Christians, thoroughly immersed in the cult of Martin Luther King, have no explanation for why God would restrict marriage between believers. Trust me, I’ve asked them.

Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses all married close kin. When Abraham commanded his chief slave, “I want you to swear by the LORD, the God of heaven and the God of earth, that you will not get a wife for my son from the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I am living, but will go to my country and my own relatives and get a wife for my son Isaac,” he did not mention a word about theological belief or godly fidelity. His relatives were pagans! Still, he exclusively limited the search to kith and kin. Culture is by definition exclusive. (The word multiculturalism is an oxymoron.) A race, if it wishes to preserve its culture and its life, must be exclusive and homogeneous as well. If not, the desire to persevere is lost. A sure sign that this has happened is when very few children are being born, which is the case today.

Richard Weaver writes of Yankee tyranny: “The instrumentality of union, with its united strength and its subordination of the parts, is an irresistible temptation to the power-hungry of every generation.” Did you get that? The parts must be subordinated (and eventually dissolved) in order for the whole to be ascendant. This is exactly what we hear from the race-mixers, and our response to them is identical to the response of Alexander Stephens: “If centralism is ultimately to prevail; if our entire system of free Institutions as established by our common ancestors is to be subverted, and an Empire is to be established in their stead; if that is to be the last scene of the great tragic drama now being enacted: then, be assured, that we of the South will be acquitted, not only in our own consciences, but in the judgment of mankind, of all responsibility for so terrible a catastrophe, and from all guilt

of so great a crime against humanity.” It’s not surprising that in the 1950s Weaver wrote in *National Review*: “‘Integration’ and ‘Communization’ are, after all, pretty closely synonymous. In light of what is happening today, the first may be little more than a euphemism for the second.” Martin Luther King was a Communist, and he wrote in the *New York Post* in 1958: “I’m sure integration will lead to interracial marriage.”

“Historically,” writes Pastor Matt Trehwella, “all the states in America had laws outlawing the marriage of blacks and whites. In the mid-1800’s, certain states began allowing interracial marriages or miscegenation as long as those marrying received a license from the state... Black’s Law Dictionary points to this historical fact when it defines ‘marriage license’ as, ‘A license or permission granted by public authority to persons who intend to intermarry.’ ‘Intermarry’ is defined in Black’s Law Dictionary as, ‘Miscegenation; mixed or interracial marriages’... Not long after these licenses were issued, some states began requiring all people who marry to obtain a marriage license. In 1923, the Federal Government established the Uniform Marriage and Marriage License Act... By 1929, every state in the Union had adopted marriage license laws.” Just allow that to sink in. Marriage was a function of the church until the state got involved, and the state only got involved to fulfill the illegal 14th Amendment, which was a result of Lincoln’s subjugation of the South. Now, here is where the dominoes begin to fall.

According to the *New York Times*, “In 1948, when the California Supreme Court threw out the state’s law against interracial marriage, 31 of the 48 states had similar laws. According to a 1958 Gallup poll, only 4% of whites approved of marriage between blacks and whites. Then, in 1967, the U.S. Supreme Court overturned state anti-miscegenation statutes, declaring that race-mixing is a

constitutional right. That case, *Loving vs. Virginia*, was brought by Mildred and Richard Loving, a married couple convicted of miscegenation in 1959 before a trial judge who declared, “Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, malay and red, and he placed them on separate continents. And but for the interference with his arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix.” The Lovings were given a choice of spending a year in jail or leaving the state for 25 years. They left, but they sued, ultimately leading to the Supreme Court ruling of 1967. In 1968, a Gallup poll found that Americans, by more than 3 to 1, still disapproved of marriages between whites and blacks. The 2003 Gallup poll shows that 70% of whites now approve. Additionally, 66% of white respondents said they would have no objection if a child or grandchild chose a black spouse.

William Eskridge, a Yale law professor, says, “views on same-sex marriage will follow the same path as those on interracial marriage.” Sadly, he is correct. Christians with such flexible principles will not bother to mount a sustained defense of marriage at this late hour. Many Christians would like to connect sodomite marriage to that other great act of judicial tyranny, *Roe vs. Wade*. They forget about the *Loving vs. Virginia* decision which outlawed the ban against miscegenation, and they forget about it precisely because they think it was just. My friend Greg McDivitt pointed out to me that the Massachusetts court cited *Loving* 25 times in their decision legalizing sodomite marriage but mentioned *Roe* in passing only four times. The very heart of the decision was based on the illegal Fourteenth Amendment, which was cited 13 times. So if you’re looking for a logical progression, it is to be found in the religion of Equality: citizenship was granted to former slaves, therefore interracial

marriages may not be forbidden, therefore sodomite marriages may not be forbidden.

I said that two-thirds of white respondents to polls say they would not object if a child or grandchild chose a black spouse. But this is not what they desire, of course. Parents invariably and instinctively want their children to find spouses who are similar. I'm unaware of a single exception. Let us resolve to obey the fifth commandment, and let us hear no more from pastors who encourage children to disobey their parents. Let us heed the warning of G.K. Chesterton: "Don't ever take a fence down, until you know the reason it was put up."

"Since liberalism became a kind of official party line," recognized Richard Weaver, "we have been enjoined against saying things about races, religions, or national groups, for, after all, there is no categorical statement without its implication of value, and values begin divisions among men. We must not define, subsume, or judge; we must rather rest on the periphery and display 'sensitivity toward the cultural expression of all lands and peoples.' This is a process of emasculation." He said that to deny what he called "the continuum of race" is to dishonor our forefathers and reduce ourselves to the level of animals. Russell Kirk said the same thing: "To presume that a mystic 'equality' entitles the mass of mankind to tinker at pleasure with society, to play with it as a toy, to exercise their petty ingenuity upon it, is to reduce mankind to the only state of life in which anything resembling equality of condition actually prevails: savagery." Weaver continues:

"The ancient feeling of brotherhood carries obligations of which equality knows nothing. It calls for respect and protection, for brotherhood is status in family, and family is by nature hierarchical... It is eloquent of that loss of respect for logic to which we owe so many disasters that the French Revolution made equality and fraternity coordinates... How much of the frustration of

the modern world proceeds from starting with the assumption that all are equal, finding that this cannot be so, and then having to realize that one can no longer fall back on the bond of fraternity!... Nothing is more manifest than that as this social distance has diminished and all groups have moved nearer equality, suspicion and hostility have increased. In the present world there is little of trust and less of loyalty. People do not know what to expect of one another. Leaders will not lead, and servants will not serve..."

We equated equality and fraternity. We lost our social bond, and egotism set in. Trust and loyalty faded. We syncretized race, culture, and religion, and we became imperialists and collectivists. The bureaucratic hierarchy of socialism is necessary in a Jacobin world, Weaver said, because equality can never truly be attained. So rather than let society collapse, the social engineers will take an unnatural hierarchy to a natural one. Countries with diverse populations require authoritarian governments as the only alternative to anarchy. However, as Weaver says, the "basis of an organic social order is fraternity uniting parts that are distinct." And this is kinism in a nutshell. It is not only for whites; it is for all people in the world, and it has as its ultimate goal the unified purpose of mankind, which is to glorify God.

Weaver refers to the one and the many, which is a concept we first discover in the Bible. There is one God but a plurality of persons. There is one body of Christ, but it has many members. So let us hear no more about "the mystery of the gospel" from those who seek to amalgamate through miscegenation. There is no mystery at all in "the one and the many" if the "many" no longer exists. If all members of the body of Christ suddenly turn into the liver, can we say that a body remains? Is abolishing races (which are said to not exist by these people) the proper way to promote racial harmony? Is it hatred for the Father, Son, and Holy

Ghost to refuse to merge into one undifferentiated God? Unity in diversity is a mystery that we are only able to grasp through the Spirit of God, and we will be punished if we disregard His work of creation. God is judging America today and decimating our race because we care so little about preserving his created order. If we do not repent, He will take from us what we have and give it to another nation who will obey his law.

To again quote John Vinson:

“The man who claims to love everyone equally will have little left to give anyone in particular, and no one really will benefit from his love. Nationality and kinship are God’s way of assigning specific and limited responsibilities to men, so that they may focus their energies for the benefit of their respective societies. The final result is improvement for all humanity... The Christian can affirm that generalities such as ‘mankind’ are real, just as particulars such as nations and individuals are real. Eastern religion denies the real world by denying the reality of particulars. A number of modern philosophies say that particulars are real and generalities are not. Only Christianity strikes the proper balance, consistent with the world we see. If men lose sight of this balance, they will err to the side of ignoring nationality and endorsing world government, or to the side of deifying their nation and despising all others. God envisions the world as a great symphony. Different peoples play different parts, all contributing to one divine harmony.”

“Equality may exist only among slaves,” said Aristotle. “Equality is a slogan based on envy,” said Alexis de Tocqueville. “It signifies in the heart of every republican: ‘Nobody is going to occupy a place higher than I’.” As R. Carter Pittman said, “It is inequality that gives enlargement to religion, to intellect, to energy, to virtue, to love and to wealth. Equality of intellect stabilizes mediocrity. Equality of wealth makes all men poor. Equality of religion destroys all creeds. Equality of energy renders all men sluggards. Equality of

virtue suspends all men without the gates of Heaven. Equality of love stultifies every manly passion, destroys every family altar and mongrelizes the races of men. Equality homogenizes so that cream does not rise to the top. It puts the eagle in the hen house so that he may no longer soar.”

Michael Andrew Grissom warns us: “Until the White man of the South learns to draw a line over which none dare step, he can expect only additional abuse... And this defeat of the West will have been accomplished, not by superior strength or civilization...not by the ‘forces of history,’ but simply by the feckless generosity and moral cowardice of the West itself.”

Kevin MacDonald affirms that whites are now “a declining, apologetic people, ashamed of their history and not sure even of their claim to lands they have occupied for centuries.” Americans have been lulled to sleep. As Srdja Trifkovic writes in *Chronicles*, they do not realize that the invaders of their country have purposed “to partake in their wealth, know their women, and eventually take over their lands - and they nurture a healthy contempt for a society willing to grant them every indulgence without a fight... Both the loss of the will to define and defend one’s native soil and the loss of the desire to procreate send an alluring signal to the teeming favellas and kazbahs: Come, for no Western nation has the guts to shed blood - alien or its own - in the name of its own survival.” But when our declining race learns to love itself once again, “Communities linked to their native soil and bonded by kinship, memory, language, faith, and myth would be revived, and hostile alien ghettos would be expelled. And, in adversity, the eyes of men would be lifted, once again, to Heaven.”

In Acts 17:26, Paul says that God sets boundaries among the nations “so that they should seek the Lord, in the hope that they might grope for Him and find Him.”

But today the curse of Hosea 7 has come true: "Ephraim has mixed himself among the peoples; Ephraim is a cake turned. Aliens have devoured his strength, but he does not know it..." Deuteronomy 28 tells us what awaits us if we do not turn from this path: "The alien who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and lower. He shall lend to you, but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail. Moreover all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to keep His commandments and His statutes which He commanded you... The LORD will bring a nation against you from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies, a nation whose language you will not understand, a nation of fierce countenance, which does not respect the elderly nor show favor to the young. And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land, until you are destroyed; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you. They shall besiege you at all your gates until your high and fortified walls, in which you trust, come down throughout all your land; and they shall besiege you at all your gates throughout all your land which the LORD your God has given you... You shall be left few in number, whereas you were as the stars of heaven in multitude, because you would not obey the voice of the LORD your God." Let us make the prayer of Lamentations chapter 5 our own:

Remember, O LORD, what has come upon us; Look, and behold our reproach! Our inheritance has been turned over to aliens, And our houses to foreigners. Our fathers sinned and are no more, but we bear their iniquities. Servants rule over us; there is none to deliver us from their hand.

We have ignored the biblical Law of the Stranger. According to Rushdoony, "the term stranger has reference to someone residing within the country who is of another tribe, nation, or race. The reference is not to travellers passing through." Now read Deut. 17:15: "you may not set a foreigner over you, who is not your brother." This is entirely a racial statement, and the implications for the integrated society are staggering.

Ernest van den Haag wrote in National Review in 1965: One "need not believe that one's own ethnic group, or any ethnic group, is superior to others...in order to wish one's country to continue to be made up of the same ethnic strains in the same proportions as before. And, conversely, the wish not to see one's country overrun by groups one regards as alien need not be based on feelings of superiority or 'racism'... the wish to preserve one's identity and the identity of one's nation requires no justification...any more than the wish to have one's own children, and to continue one's family through them need be justified or rationalized by a belief that they are superior to the children of others."

According to Rushdoony,

"Every social order institutes its own program of separation or segregation... The claim of equality and integration is thus a pretext to subvert an older or existing form of social order... But integration and equality are myths; they disguise a new segregation and a new equality... Segregation, separation, or quarantine, whichever name is used, is inescapable in any society... From the days of the Assyrians, who moved nations and peoples about to homogenize their empire, to the 20 th century, [attempts at integration] have been failures. People do not inter-marry unless a common faith, culture, and standard brings them together. Then, they cannot be kept apart... Where there are religious and social reasons against mixed marriages, nothing can further such marriages as long as the faith and the society are strong. If these factors are invalid or

disappear through disbelief, nothing can prevent integration in the short or long run.”

Now, this underscores the utter failure of the modern Christian who has adopted the pluralism of the Republican Party. “The real problem with the religious right,” says Sam Francis,

“is that, in the long run, its religious vehicle won’t carry it home. If it ever ended abortion, restored school prayer, outlawed sodomy and banned pornography, I suspect most of its followers would simply declare victory and retire. But having accomplished all of that, the Christian right would have done absolutely nothing to strip the federal government of the power it has seized throughout this century [or] prevent the inundation of the country by anti-Western immigrants, stop the cultural and racial dispossession of the historic people, or resist the absorption of the American nation into a multicultural and multiracial globalist regime. Indeed, the Christian Right for the most part doesn’t care about these issues or even perceive them as issues, and in so far as it does, it not infrequently lines up on the wrong side of them.”

Let’s begin to correct this by admitting the truth. Whites don’t want to live around blacks, browns, reds, yellows, or any other color of the rainbow. They never have, and they never will. Get used to it. If you really want to make the world a better place and foster a loving environment, learn how to work within these limitations rather than attempt to re-engineer human nature.

As Jared Taylor says:

“Most white Americans can think of any number of communities or neighborhoods in which they might want to live. Not one is likely to have a non-white majority. Likewise, most whites cannot name a single non-white community in which they could bear to live. Furthermore, if one were to ask whites what countries they might move to if given a choice, almost all will mention a European country, Canada, Australia, or New Zealand. All are white... Not even the most deluded white liberals live in Harlem or Watts or South Central Los Angeles, or in

any of a thousand other neighborhoods that have been transformed by non-whites. Despite their pronouncements about the vital importance and desirability of integration, virtually no white is willing to take the most obvious step towards making it happen: buy a house in a black neighborhood... People have every right to expect their children and their children’s children to be able to grow up and walk in the ways of their ancestors. They have a powerful, natural desire that their grandchildren be like them—that they speak the same language, sing the same songs, tell the same stories, pray to the same God, take pride in the same past, hope the same hopes, love the same nation, and honor the same traditions. The crucial elements of peoplehood cannot be preserved in the face of a flood of aliens, especially when the central institutions of the nation itself preach fashionable falsehoods about the equivalence of all races, cultures, and peoples... Our country has established a gigantic system of laws, diversity commissions, racial watchdog groups, EEO officers, and outreach committees as part of a huge, clanking machine to regulate and try to control racial diversity—this dangerous, volatile thing that is supposed to be such a source of strength. People are so exhausted by this source of strength that they run from it the first chance they get. Families, churches, clubs, and private parties—which are not yet regulated by the government—tend to be racially homogeneous. Nothing could be more obvious: Diversity of race or tribe or language or religion are the main reasons people kill each other on a large scale. Diversity—within the same territory—is strife, not strength.”

Those who seek amalgamation are enemies of mankind, because violence will only increase as a result of their folly. This is precisely why Thomas Jefferson said: “[W]hen freed, the Negro is to be removed beyond the reach of mixture... Justice is in one scale, and self-preservation in the other.”

In conclusion, Americans used to consider racial purity to be very important. In fact, the first naturalization law in American history confined citizenship to whites. But

the cosmopolitan state has redefined citizenship, changing it from an ethno-racial claim to a matter of political designation, from a real nation to a proposition nation. Today, the nation is defined by adherence to ideology rather than by descent. Today, the rights of citizenship are based not on blood but on the ability to pay taxes. Edward Gibbon wrote that Rome sank “into a vile and wretched populace, which must, in a few generations, have been totally extinguished, if it had not been constantly recruited by the manumission of slaves and the influx of strangers.” This is our trouble today, and like Rome, the empire of America will not survive. Nations are built on blood; empires are built on ideas. Therefore, it is not true that a Southerner is anyone who believes in Jeffersonian democracy or waves the Confederate flag.

Whites are now in the minority in California and Texas. Whites are a minority in Florida public schools. Whites will be a minority in the state of Georgia in just 16 years. Nationwide, whites are projected to be a minority in the year

2050. Friends, the time to do something about this is not in 2040. The time is now.

“In our not-too-distant agrarian past,” writes Mark Godfrey,

“the American innately understood that the possibility of existence was afforded by three things: tradition (which is inherited knowledge as common possession), community (which is a shared, regulated intercourse with one’s kinsmen), and an intimate, symbiotic relationship with the land. These are the common blessings of general providence, and they are available to all men. These are the pillars of kinism... In our haste to homogenize the world according to humanistic and materialistic (and ultimately classically pagan) standards of culture, we have forgotten the very integrity of culture, how it inheres in a people in the form of basic traits and tendencies...”

Folks, our nation is white and Christian. If it ceases to be either, it is no longer our nation. If our political parties fail to support our race and our religion, they are worthless. I want to close today by reciting a poem by Rudyard Kipling called *The Stranger*:

*The stranger within my gate.
He may be true or kind.
But he does not talk my talk -
I cannot feel his mind.
I see the face and the eyes and the mouth,
But not the soul behind.*

*The men of my own stock
They may do ill or well.
But they tell the lies I am wonted to,
They are used to the lies I tell.
We do not need interpreters
When we go to buy or sell.*

*The Stranger within my gates.
He may be evil or good,
But I cannot tell what powers control -
what reasons sway his mood;*

*Nor when the Gods of his far-off land
Shall repossess his blood.*

*The men of my own stock,
Bitter bad they may be,
But, at least they hear the things I hear
And see the things I see;
And whatever I think of them and their likes
They think of the likes of me.*

*This was my father's belief
And this is also mine:
Let the corn be all one sheaf -
And the grapes be all one vine
Ere our children's teeth are set on edge
By bitter bread and wine.*

Jewish Proponents of Egalitarian Dogma Themselves Do Not Believe It.

By John Altman

[By arrangement with The First Freedom]

For years they told us it wouldn't happen. There was nothing to worry about. All the Negro wanted, they assured us, was equal opportunity in the workplace and equal political rights.

The arguments of Southerners and other Americans in defense of racial separation, utilizing the history of nations and the instinctual urges of biology that recognize no color line, fell on deaf or heedless ears. The subversives, the cynical, and the un-American among us, of course, knew better.

Now, 50 years after the Brown decision, which initiated the desegregation debacle, it is almost impossible to go anywhere in public and not witness the most flagrant example of race-mixing. A half-century and more of Marxist social science, expounded in treasonous universities and public schools, mandated by a corrupt federal court system, and disseminated by an alien news and entertainment media, has finally produced its chef-d'oeuvre, the racially-mixed couple, strolling hand in hand along chief thoroughfares, and now so commonplace as to elicit hardly the slightest notice. Who is not aware – and made constantly aware – through their TV screens of marriages and other interracial intimacies between wealthy Black celebrities and White women, which conveys the intended message that these are occurrences as common and normal as any other? Not infrequently, the repugnant spectacle is compounded by the presence of a mongrel offspring; and, since the miscegenation laws of the States have

been struck down by judicial decree, it is a scene, sad to say, that will be encountered with increasing frequency. It is a human tragedy which, if ignored or left without remedy for too long, will have dire consequences for our culture and civilization. But the dupes, liars and traitors of America, caring nothing for this, have had their way.

It was not always so. From the beginning of our colonial experience, long before the advent of the Franz Boas school of equalitarian social anthropology and the socialist faculties of American universities, nearly all Americans believed in the necessity for the biological and social separation of the races. Even if – as most Americans now embrace as an article of faith – our institutions of government rest upon an assumed “equality before the law,” yet, absolute, total equality of the races was always and continues to be a hopeless dream. Social equality with the Negro in particular, and political equality hardly less so, were for generations viewed almost universally by Whites in every section of the country with abhorrence and foreboding.

What informed Southerner is not well acquainted with the sentiments of the early national leaders on this subject? Mr. Jefferson had declared that “Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them.” While he hoped for the eventual emancipation of all slaves in the United

States, he also believed it absolutely imperative that these with all free Negroes should be deported either to Africa or the West Indies. This, he felt, would serve the purpose not only of their freedom, but for White self-preservation as well. Even Mr. Lincoln, "The Great Emancipator," believed the Negro to be an inassimilable element in American life, and was adamantly opposed to social equality for him. Above all, he regarded sexual mixture of the two races as a calamity. Up until the time of his assassination, he continued to be a strong proponent of Negro colonization.

The reasons for this are not difficult to understand. To earlier generations of Americans, who were busily engaged in carving a civilization out of the wilderness, the very notion of equality was utter nonsense. What could not be lightly dismissed was the accumulated wisdom of the ages confirming the Negro's incompatibility with the White race, manifested by practically every testimony, evidence and studied observation available. Upon the minds of every thinking and concerned American was the question of what would be the final disposition of the Negro problem. Mr. Henry Clay of Kentucky asked, "What is the true nature of the evil of the existence of a portion of the African race in our population? It is not that there are some but that there are so many... who can never amalgamate with the great body of our population." He, too, was a proponent of their removal and colonization.

And, happily, the early Americans did not have the benefit of the "expertise and insight" of such "celebrated" social scientists and equalitarians of the Boas School as Herskovits, Klineberg and Montagu. Or, as the late British journalist and historian, Ivor Benson, wrote: "...The Boas doctrine is not a matter of science at all... Moreover it could be shown quite easily that all these Jewish proponents of the egalitarian dogma themselves do not

believe it, since it is the exact opposite of what is practiced by the community to which they adhere so loyally and uncritically."

And what is the natural corollary of this doctrine? It became apparent in the early years of the 20th century with the publication of the pamphlet, *A Radical Program for the 20th Century* (1912) by one Israel Cohen, a Jew in England. "In America," he wrote, "we will aim for a subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the Whites, we will endeavor to instill in the Whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes.

"We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment. With this prestige, the Negroes will be able to intermarry with the Whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause." The "cause" becomes quite clear when it is understood that Mr. Cohen was England's leading Communist theoretician and writer during this time. Could there have been a more clever and diabolical stratagem for the dysgenic destruction of a nation?

The noted Southern author and son of a Virginia Confederate soldier, Thomas Nelson Page, sounded a warning near the turn of the century, when he spoke of "the peril of contamination" and "the evil of race-degeneration from enforced and constant association with 'a different' race." Well he knew that the natural evolution and character of a race could not be changed in the space of a few hundred or even thousand years. And who would be so foolish as to tamper with the genetic elements basic to the very existence of advanced cultures and civilizations in the name of "social progress"? But, alas, "Infinitus est numerus stultorum." (Infinite is the number of fools!)

And it is the difference that counts. “Scientifically, historically, congenitally,” Mr. Page wrote in his warning to us, “the white race and the negro race differ.” He is referring to differences in intellect, differences in behavior, morality, physical characteristics, etc., verified not only by the evidence of our senses and the record of history, but now by the findings of science, much to the discomfort of all egalitarians and Marxists who, with their leveling pseudo-science and propaganda, have done their best in one century to destroy Western culture and civilization. Who but a fool or a subversive now believes the two races to be equal? Unfortunately, they are to be met with bountifully on nearly every American university campus, the sad products of indoctrination by a deliberate, subversive academic agenda. Without a doubt, the propaganda for racial equality is the greatest hoax of the 20th century. Now that it is being conclusively established by credible scholars that heredity, not environment, is the prime determinant of intelligence and its constant variance between the races, both quantitatively and qualitatively, what a vindication of those who for years stood fast in the face of vilification, social and economic reprisal, never doubting for a moment that science was being made the handmaiden of liberal-Marxist ideology!

Political equality for the Negro, likewise, was never contemplated by the Founders and early settlers. The very idea, much less the certainty, of their limited Constitution being construed to justify such things as civil rights acts, affirmative action, quotas and racial integration of State-controlled schools to enforce racial equality would have most certainly disbanded the Constitutional Convention or prevented its undertaking in the first place.

Writing 70-80 years before the age of “political correctness,” Mr. Page was nothing if not candid in stating the Negro’s incapacity for enlightened self-rule. He was of the opinion that “the negro race does not possess... the elements of

character, the essential qualifications to conduct a government, even for himself,” and that “if the reins of government be entrusted to his unaided hands, he will fling reason to the winds, and drive to ruin.” Like all of his Southern contemporaries, as well as nearly all the men of talent and genius in our history up until World War I, Mr. Page envisioned the march of Negro progress as a gradual evolutionary process, sustained by a benevolent paternalism, and without which the desired outcome in the interest of both races would be much in doubt. “Where the negro has thrived,” he wrote, “it has invariably been under the influence and by the assistance of the stronger race. Where these have been wanting, whatever other conditions have existed, he has invariably and sensibly reverted to the original type. Liberia, Hayti, Congo, are all in one line.” Were Mr. Page alive to witness our country today, it is hard to believe he would not have included certain large American cities, including the nation’s capital. He concludes: “To us of the South it appears that a proper race pride is one of the strongest securities of our nation. No people can become great without it. Without it no people can remain great.”

That the Negro race has achieved much in this country in the past 139 years is undeniable. The accomplishments and success of many, many individuals of this race have been nothing short of phenomenal. But it should not be forgotten that whatever progress the Negro has made, it has been in a Western culture and setting with all the opportunities and advantages that otherwise would have taken immeasurably longer – if ever – to materialize in his indigenous surroundings. And if the equalitarians were honest, they would admit that the racial and cultural decline that 20th century America has undeniably undergone is due largely to their own Marxist agenda that has heralded the mixing of the races as its centerpiece. How completely at odds with this are the ideas

and aspirations of another great Southerner and American – a contemporary of Mr. Page – who at about the same time advised and encouraged both races to live in such a way that “In all things that are purely social we can be separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.” Excepting some plan of voluntary and permanent separation of the races which would be agreeable to both, does not this seem to be the only sensible and practicable course for a stable and prosperous America?

As he spoke of the probable future of the new government, Benjamin Franklin, in the Constitutional Convention, expressed his belief that it would likely “be well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other.” What better way to corrupt a people and their government than through miscegenation and racial suicide? Is there any nation or area of the world containing two such diverse races living in proximity for any considerable length of time that has not experienced a mixture of the two to a degree inimical to one or both? The accomplishments and prosperity of America were not by happenstance. They were the results almost exclusively of the boundless imagination and energy of the White race applied over a 375 year period to the abundant natural resources at hand. The Indians before them had achieved

nothing in 25,000 years of occupancy of a virgin continent.

It is the opinion of some that the United States is fast approaching the point of genetic disaster. What are the consequences? A noted contemporary has declared that “We are steadily becoming a people of average, lower intelligence, feebler character and reduced stamina. What we are witnessing is retrogressive evolution, an evolution in reverse, backward and downward. But any people long subjected to such a process must sooner or later fall to pieces from internal weakness and decay, or become the victim of a foreign conqueror.”

Do we foolishly suppose that we are not the objects of the most intense scrutiny as to our racial composition and behavior by would-be conquerors? The enemies that we, ourselves, have so foolishly created and supported throughout the world and their treasonous allies among us know only too well that a degenerate, mongrel America, divided against itself, will lack the will and the ability to resist their aggressions. But it need not be. A great nation requires a great people; if we are to be great again, we must regain that position through a racial consciousness, solidarity and integrity.

It was William Penn who said that men generally appear to be “more careful of the breed of their horses and dogs than of their children.” An unfortunate truth which points up an even greater truth: that the wellspring of our liberty and prosperity is not in our hallowed declarations and charters, but in our genes.

Ownership vs. Stewardship

by Rev. John Thomas Cripps

Webster defines ownership as: “Property; exclusive right of possession; legal or just claim or title.” You can get an expanded definition in *Black’s Law Dictionary* which reads in part, “He who has dominion of a thing...which he has a right to enjoy and do with as he pleases, even to spoil or destroy it.”

I would like to ask a question: are we owners of ourselves, our children, our land, our homes and furnishings, our bank accounts, etc.? The answer is no! The Scriptures teach us that God is the absolute owner of all things – He alone has dominion – and He has a right to enjoy and do with his possessions as he pleases – even to spoil or destroy. We *could* speak here about the doctrine of God’s elective grace – but that would not be the purpose of this essay.

What we must recognize is that God is sovereign over his created order and therefore he is the absolute owner of all things. He is the Creator – he is the Ruler – He is the Owner of all things. Being Ruler, He has established a law-order that we are to be obedient unto.

The absolute ownership of all things by God is firmly established in scripture. There is no equivocation: Psalm 24:1, “*The earth is the LORD’S, and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein.*” [Quoted in New Testament – 1 Corinthians 10:26].

Psalm 89:11, “*The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine: as for the world and the ullness thereof, thou hast founded them.*”

Deuteronomy 10:14, “*Behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens is the LORD’S thy God, the earth also, with all that therein is.*”

1 Chronicles 29:11, “*Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all.*” Job 41:11, “*Who hath prevented me, that I should repay him? **Whatsoever** is under the whole heaven is mine.*” There are many other Scriptures as well that confirm God’s absolute ownership of all things.

The truth is we are not absolute owners of property but rather stewards entrusted by God. That is part of our covenantal relationship to God. Yes, humanly speaking – man to man – and in man’s courts we are said to be owners. But we are owners in this world as respects other men – not the absolute owners. We are entrusted with possession – we are caretakers and managers. A proper understanding of this truth is important for us as we seek to be weaned from the spirit of worldliness and covetousness that infects the modern church. Being greatly influenced by this doctrine may even be life-changing for some. What is a steward? Webster defines him as “A man employed in great families to manage the domestic concerns, superintend the other servants, collect the rents or incomes, keep the accounts, etc.”

There are several examples of stewards in the Bible. Eliezer, for example, was the steward of Abraham. You may remember Abraham entrusting Eliezer to travel to

Nahor in search of a wife for Isaac. Joseph, while a ruler in Egypt, had a steward who, among other things, put the silver cup into Benjamin's sack as requested. Jesus spoke of stewards in several parables. In the Parable of the Husbandmen in Matthew 21, God is portrayed as a householder – the great householder. As in other great houses or mansions – the management or oversight of work is committed to a steward or stewards.

1 Chronicles 28:1, *“And David assembled all the princes of Israel, the princes of the tribes, and the captains of the companies that ministered to the king by course, and the captains over the thousands, and the captains over the hundreds, and the **stewards** over all the substance and possession of the king...”*

In this verse we read that the substance and possessions of King David were entrusted to a plurality of stewards. Each would take charge of his appropriate area being responsible to govern it according to the will of his master and unto his honour. Also, we learn that ministers of the gospel are referred to as stewards. Noah Webster gives a further definition of the minister of the gospel as a steward: “A minister of Christ, whose duty it is to dispense the provisions of the gospel, to preach its doctrines and administer its ordinances.” We read in 1 Corinthians 4:1-2, *“Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.”* Paul wrote to Titus in Titus 1:7, *“For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God...”*

When we consider the duty of stewards in the general sense it helps us to understand the duty of ministers as stewards of the gospel. In the general sense – a steward is one who dispenses necessities. This is also true of the stewards of the gospel who

dispense the means of grace: the Word, communion, prayer and admonition. In the general sense – a steward is one who is given the keys to the house. Matthew 16 tells us that this is true of the Gospel steward who opens and shuts – who binds and looses. In the general sense – the steward is not the owner and so is responsible to make an accounting when his master calls for it. He is responsible to invest the Master's talents well and to properly dispense the Master's goods. This is again true of the Gospel steward. He is not the Master – only the appointed dispenser of his Lord's goods. And he is responsible as one who must give account – for the proper investing and distribution of the Master's goods.

A Gospel steward, then, is very similar to an earthly steward. He has certain duties and responsibilities similar in essence to those of an earthly steward and must therefore meet certain moral qualifications and possess certain skills as well. A steward must be a man of integrity for he is entrusted to carry out the will of his Master in the organization and ordering of things – the elders in the church – the fathers in the household – individuals concerning material things under their trust. It is important that a steward be faithful and loyal. He must also be wise. Please turn to Luke 12:42-43 where we read: *“And the Lord said, Who then is that **faithful and wise steward**, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.”*

He is to be faithful in management of self – of time – of gifts, of those under his charge, of Master's goods, wealth and property, of distributing the Master's allowance. Further, he is to be faithful in the little things.

He is to be faithful to build up and not destroy. Permit me to digress somewhat

for a moment and talk about what I like to call the “Law of the Fruit Trees.” Deuteronomy 20:19-20 reads, *“When thou shalt besiege a city a long time, in making war against it to take it, thou shalt not destroy the trees thereof by forcing an axe against them: for thou mayest eat of them, and thou shalt not cut them down (for the tree of the field is man’s life) to employ them in the siege: Only the trees which thou knowest that they be not trees for meat, thou shalt destroy and cut them down; and thou shalt build bulwarks against the city that maketh war with thee, until it be subdued.”*

Theologians through the centuries have marked a profound principle in this passage: THOU SHALT NOT DESTROY. Waste and wanton destruction of property is forbidden by God. You are not even permitted to wantonly destroy that which belongs to your enemies. In a siege you could use non-fruitbearing trees to build bulwarks but not fruit trees. Fruit trees represent cultivated, fruitful land – a subduing of the earth which is part of the dominion charter – the Creation ordinances in Genesis.

Let me make a note about the parenthetical thought contained in Verse 19 translated as: “for the tree of the field is man’s life.” Calvin and other theologians translate it “Are the trees of the field people, defenders of the city, that you should lay siege to them?” You see we can war against man but not against the earth. God prohibits total war and the scorched-earth policy of wicked military leaders. Robert Lewis Dabney writes at length about the wanton destruction of property by the Union army after the invasion of the South. This was unbiblical warfare in the extreme!

As stewards of the earth – we are not to destroy but rather build up. We are to be proactive and responsible in our treatment of God’s property. Rather than: Thou Shalt Destroy – we should say: Thou

Shalt Plant, Thou Shalt Build! We are to exercise dominion and subdue the earth. We do not accomplish that by destroying.

Now, you might be thinking – well I don’t do that – I don’t wantonly destroy things. However, we may through neglect and sloppy stewardship destroy. On the subject of fruit trees – I personally let six fruit trees on my farm die last year through neglect. It was a true case of sorry stewardship. Further, Christians, like the world, are really bad about wasting things. We waste food, we throw away clothes that are no longer in fashion, the list is endless. We are a wasteful people. The disposable nature of much modern merchandise is extremely wasteful.

Before leaving this digression, let me make another point along these same lines. God has a concern for all of his creation – for the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air – as well as the fruit trees. Deuteronomy 25:4, *“Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. The labourer is worthy of his hire.”* In the Fourth Commandment, the domesticated animals are given a sabbath right along side man.

Exodus 23:5, *“If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.”* An animal in distress must be attended to (cf. Deuteronomy 22:4). Exodus 23:4, *“If thou meet thine enemy’s ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again.”* Stray animals are to be returned to their owner – even if he is an enemy. Even the little birds do not escape the notice of God. Deuteronomy 22:6, *“If a bird’s nest chance to be before thee in the way in any tree, or on the ground, whether they be young ones, or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young, or upon the eggs, thou shalt not take the dam with the young.”* (See also Matthew 10:29-31).

So there is much to be faithful in. We said also that the steward must be wise: He is to be wise in planning and organizing –

for he is an overseer. He is to be wise in scheduling time, that time be redeemed not wasted. In Matthew 25:26 we read about the steward that hid the Lord's talent. *"His lord...said unto him, Thou wicked and **sllothful servant**, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed."* He is to be wise in determining the true needs of himself and those under his charge. We say true needs because we all live in a very worldly and materialistic society. While our Lord intends that we live a joyful and prosperous life – we have to remember our duty to distribute. Richard Sibbes said: *"A man may know that he loves the world, if he be more careful to get than to use."* That is why we must learn Biblical contentment and be wise in determining what is a true need. As Paul wrote to Timothy in 1st Timothy 6:6-8, *"...godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content."* He is to be wise in forecasting the provision of necessities beforehand that he may be able to bring out of his store those things which the needs of the house shall require – things both old and new. 1st Timothy 5:8, *"But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."* He is to be wise in the care and maintenance of his master's goods. The battlecry once more is "Thou shalt not destroy" – the "Law of the Fruit Trees." He is to be wise in the management of gifts. 1 Peter 4:10, *"As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as **good stewards** of the manifold grace of God."* He is to be wise investing his master's talents to the best profit. For even though he may intend much faithfulness – he will be called a **waster** of his master's goods. We learn that we are to be productive and fruitful in our endeavours that we may return our Lord's investment with increase.

He is to be wise in the dispensing of his master's wealth and bounty in due sort, due measure and due season. In due sort: Our Lord has determined that a tenth of your increase goes to his church. He has also determined that you are to give special offerings according to your ability. Further you have been instructed that you are to give alms – that you are to help the truly poor and needy and the widow women. In due measure: The tithe is fixed but your other dispensing requires wisdom that it be done in proper measure. The difficulty for most is in setting priorities and finding balance in their stewardship. This is much more important than most Christians today realize – you are to give unto every man his due (just portion both in quantity and quality) – not as you see it – but as our Lord sees fit. In his bag must be fair weights and measures. In due season: It requires much wisdom at times to determine the proper season for giving. Pray and seek to obtain such wisdom.

Now let's read the entire passage from Luke 12:42-48: *"And the Lord said, Who then is that **faithful and wise steward**, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath. But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; The lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers. And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. **For unto whomsoever much***

is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more."

How faithful and wise are you in the stewardship of that what is committed unto you in trust? If you have been truly blessed and have prospered abundantly – how have you distributed the bounty? Stewards have been entrusted with a key to the Lord's treasure house – do you open the door to help others or do you greedily try to hoard that which is not your own?

We have talked about stewardship in general – let's now look at stewardship in a more personal way:

You first must take a look at the stewardship of yourself. You do not own yourself. You are God's property. God has entrusted you to care for your own body. He has graciously given nutritious food and abundant water that you may receive proper sustenance. He has given homes, clothing and other material things intended for your comfort and care. But do you abuse these gifts? Do you refuse to take care of your body? God has made you the steward of your body. You are to feed your body faithfully and wise in due sort, due measure and due season. As to due sort – you have to examine yourself and determine whether you choose food based mainly on a love of taste or nutrition. As to due measure and due season – you have to examine yourself and determine whether your portions are reasonable or inordinate and whether they come too frequently. If you consistently overeat you rob your Master by wasting his substance and you hurt yourself by the damage done to your body. Further, by not being in the best of health you lower your ability to be an effective hard-working steward for your Master.

Maintenance of one's body may also require exercise if your labour is rather sedentary work. The faithful and wise

steward will examine himself to see whether or not his body is being kept in fit shape. It is true that a fitness craze has for years been sweeping the country necessitated by the fact that most Americans are overweight and an alarming number are obese. But this craze is rooted in body worship, not stewardship. Remember 1st Corinthians 10:31, "*Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.*" Colossians 3:23, "*And whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men.*"

God gave you an ability that no other creature possesses – a gift of amazing intellect – skill in logic – ability to judge between good and evil. You are to be stewards of your minds – it does not belong to you – you don't own it. You are to use your mind for his glory. 2 Timothy 1:7, "*For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a **sound mind.***"

You are not to let your mind atrophy by CONSTANT exposing to mindless television, degrading music, useless Internet surfing, unedifying novels, curious magazines and newspapers, uninformative video and computer games, unenlightened daydreaming, foolish talking and jesting which are not convenient, etc.

We all know that we are to "love the Lord with all thy mind" as well as heart, soul and strength. The Scriptures also teach that we are to have: a ready mind, a willing mind, a sober mind, a pure mind, an uncorrupt mind, humility of mind.

Ephesians 4:23 teaches that you are to, "*...be renewed in the spirit of your mind.*"

You are to exercise your mind unto godliness. You are to work to improve your thinking and memorization skills. You need to stretch your mind by systematic exercise of meditation and deep thought.

You need to challenge your mind by seeking to learn things over and above your present knowledge and ability. You must learn to feed your mind with edifying and instructive thoughts. You are to meditate on the beauties of God's law. Hebrews 8:10, "*For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind...*" Philippians 4:8, "*Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, **think on these things.***"

Christ has a peculiar right of ownership in his people because they are his purchased possession. 1st Corinthians 7:20-23, "*Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. For he that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant. **Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.***"

1st Corinthians 6:20, "*For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.*"

Being redeemed from the slave market of the vilest of taskmasters you are now to live unto and serve the Lord Jesus Christ. You are not to do as you please but seek to do the will of the Master. This includes not only your actions but also your words and thoughts. You are to bring your very thoughts into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

2 Corinthians 5:14-15, "*For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead: And that he died for all, that they which live **should not henceforth live***

unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again."

This has relation to the sensual self as well. 1st Corinthians 6:19, "*What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and **ye are not your own?***" 1 Corinthians 6:15, "*Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.*" Your body and spirit are one – you cannot pollute your body without spiritual consequences. You do not own either one. Remember, just as we must feed the physical self a diet of nourishing food – we must also feed and nourish the spiritual self. This is part of the stewardship of self.

We do not own our land! We read in Leviticus 25:23, "*The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.*" Property tax is unbiblical because civil government has no authority to levy a tax on God's land. They do so by arrogated power. Being outside of the covenant they have no regard for the law of God and God's divine right of ownership. If God owns your land what is your responsibility? It is simple – you are to make the land fruitful. Land is a talent that must be returned with increase. Do you take good care of your land? Deuteronomy 23:12-14 teaches us that we may not even defecate on our land without covering it up. We may not do as we please with our land!

You do not own your homes – and neither does the bank. You do not own the things that are within your households. You are merely stewards using your Master's wealth to further your well-being and the well-being of his kingdom. Haggai 2:8, "*The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the LORD of hosts.*" Do you take good care of your homes and household effects?

Your increase of wealth is not yours – and so your income is not your own. Income tax is unbiblical because civil government has no authority to levy a tax on the fruit of a man’s labour. Man is labouring for his God not Cæsar. The increase belongs to the Master – you are merely a steward of it. The only Biblical tax (if you want to call it that) on income is the tithe. You give a tenth to the church for the ministry of the word and sacrament. This is not a gift out of the goodness of your heart. It is the Lord’s money and the tax he has assessed for the well-being of the ecclesiastical sphere. 1 Chronicles 29:13-14, *“Now therefore, our God, we thank thee, and praise thy glorious name. But who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? for all things come of thee, and of **thine own have we given thee.**”*

Here the steward dispenses 10% right off the top before he distributes to the remainder of his charge. If he doesn’t – he is said to rob God. Malachi 3:8-9, *“Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? **In tithes and offerings.** Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation.”* If the servant is unprofitable who hides his talent – how much more so he that steals it and spends it on himself?

Proverbs 3:9-10, *“Honour the LORD with thy substance, and with **the firstfruits of all thine increase:** So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine.”*

Besides the tithe, you are to give additional offerings for the building and maintenance of places of worship. Over and above the tithe you are to give to other charitable causes. You cannot be stingy with that which does not even belong to you. Though you labour – you labour as slaves unto our Master. You negotiate the best agreement with employers and perform the work for your Master. When

you receive pay – you receive it on your Master’s behalf and dispense according to his rules. We could go on and on – the increase of your crops and cattle (and fruit trees) is not yours.

Many will not like this doctrine. They will seek to find some way to ease things in their conscience. Some will declare that this is all legalistic mumble-jumble. Many believe the tithe was only for the Old Testament Jews – as if in the New Testament churches are to stand outside with buckets and catch cash as God rains it down from heaven. Some who tithe will say that God only requires 10% from us leaving us to do what we will with the rest. But that presupposes that we own the rest and we have seen that God is the absolute owner of all things.

Yes, there are many who will hate this doctrine. However, those who love God’s Word and have a deep experimental knowledge of this doctrine will experience the most liberating freedom. It may be hard for some to understand but a proper view of the stewardship of property is actually very liberating.

When you consciously look at the things you hold in possession: You do not seek to overstep your bounds and accumulate more and more and more and more and more and more stuff – all of which requires attention and the time of the steward. You weigh every purchase – every disbursement of funds. You appreciate more the things that you do have and give those things greater attention than you would have before. That means better care and maintenance – better upkeep than you would have had time to give. Fewer things are wasted by neglect. You look at these things less selfishly. You recognize that you will not take anything with you to heaven – they are not yours anyway and they will be left to a successive steward.

We really need a deep understanding of the application here – if our income is not

ours, we ought to be very careful how we spend it! You must examine your heart – excuse my repetition but: Do you recognize God’s ownership of things? Do you willingly and cheerfully give tithes and offerings? Do you ungrudgingly give to others in need? The principle behind the Parable of the Good Samaritan is: “Don’t Pass Him By” – Do not stand idly by when someone is in need. (Luke 10:30-37). Do you assist in any way to feed the hungry – to clothe the naked? Do you give to missionary endeavours? Do you bury the talent and give our Lord no increase? Worse yet do you steal the talent and spend it on your own pleasures?

Do you use all of this entrusted wealth for building your own empire – do you revolt against your Master and King? Rather than building up for him and seeing to the care of his kingdom – do you seek to have your own private dominion? Examine your heart and be truthful to yourself.

Now does this mean you are not to spend money on recreation or entertainment altogether? No, the Lord allows you a reasonable allowance for things that please you. The Lord wants you to take a godly delight in the good things of this world. You may have hobbies, you may entertain yourself with this or that – the point is you are not to spend inordinately on these things – it is not your money. And yet Christian homes are full to overflowing with commercial goods, trinkets and bric-a-brac.

Christian homes are full of so many things that are unimportant – you cannot possibly give them the proper oversight and maintenance they require. Things rust, decay, and rot. Parts wear out and parts break. Land becomes overgrown, erodes and so forth. Everything in your entrusted possession either needs: cleaned, washed, dried, scrubbed, mopped, wiped, dusted, vacuumed, sprayed, painted, varnished, oiled, greased, cut, trimmed, raked, tilled,

shoveled, limed, manured, upgraded, fixed or replaced.

The preacher wrote in Ecclesiastes 3:6 that there is, “*A time to get, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away.*” For many Christians today, it is a time to cast away. A time to search through the home and remove any accursed thing that may be found within your doors. It may be time to cast away from your presence the things that are time-wasters – things that disrupt a healthy and effective physical, spiritual, mental and social lifestyle.

As slaves our time is not our own. We should expect then that the Master would give us directives on how to spend our time. Indeed, we are required to labour 12 hours in the day six days a week (Psalm 104:23, Luke 13:14). We are required to rest from that labour one day a week and give that time to the worship of our Lord (Exodus 20:8-11). We are to give ourselves to daily sleep but not an inordinate amount (Proverbs 20:13). The question is: Will ye rob God of his time? Will you give yourself to honest labour, godly Sabbath observance, and proper sleep? Or will you use up your time in unedifying pursuits, inordinate entertainment and excess sleep?

Do you give any time to your church or community or is all your time bottled up in your own affairs? Many will say that they don’t have time in this hectic rat-race world. If so, it could be they need to take a closer look at where their time is spent. Again the great difficulty with most people is setting priorities and learning to balance the tugging dimensions of life.

One parable in particular that I want to discuss is the *Parable of the Unjust Steward* due to the difficulties most people have with understanding it.

Luke 16:1-8, “*And he said also unto his disciples, There was a certain rich man,*

which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods. And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? Give an account of thy stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward. Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do? For my lord taketh away from me the stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. So he called every one of his lord's debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore. And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light."

On the surface this parable appears to contain some difficulty from a moral perspective. It would appear that the master is approving the dishonest conduct of his steward – but that is not the case at all. In this parable the steward has carelessly wasted the goods committed to his care and management. This fraud had been concealed from the master until someone brought to his attention and he demanded an accounting. The steward appears to deny nothing as he makes no defense or takes no action to be acquitted. He accepts the fact that he is busted and out of a job.

He would, of course, be required upon leaving to present an up-to-date accounting to be handed over for the master to present to the replacement steward. In this course of action, the unjust steward very cleverly, yet dishonestly secured favour from the

debtors by reducing their debt. In this he robs his master and makes a gift to the debtors. This was for future use when he is cast out on the streets and in need of a home. This action did not pass the master's notice and he marveled at the ingenuity of the prudent steward, though we see no evidence that he was pleased with the steward's conduct. After all, his position was terminated. It seems apparent that he was commending the steward as far-seeing. When it says that he had done wisely – this refers to wisdom in attending to one's own interests. It is the same Greek word used in the Septuagint in Genesis 3:1, "*Now the serpent was more **subtil** than any beast...*"

One lesson to glean here is the diligence of this worldly man in his worldly pursuits. He was so energetic and practically wise with the wisdom of this world. It is a rebuke to the slothfulness of Christians who show little vigour in their pursuit of heavenly things. And do we waste our Master's goods?

In the following Verses 9-13, another difficulty appears – but when properly understood brings the entire lesson into perspective: "*And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations. He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."*

There appears to be a difficulty when Christ instructs us to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness. But the difficulty is removed when we put it in the context of the unjust steward. The mammon – the riches of this world are used unrighteously by the men of this world. We are to use riches but not be enslaved to them for no man can serve two masters – you cannot serve God and mammon.

Money is not evil in and of itself – it is the use of money – man putting his evil heart to money that makes it the mammon of unrighteousness. We are to use money with an eye to the future as did the steward – only in a faithful context. Proverbs 16:7, *“When a man’s ways please the LORD, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.”*

Spend your money in such a way that your expenditures shall be a friend to you - not a witness against you in another world (Ryle). Moral of the story: the unjust steward handled the property committed to his care in such a way that he secured for himself a home when he would be called from his former place. Similarly, Christians are to use material possessions in this present world to advance them toward their future home. If a wicked man can secure a home using wicked means how much moreso ought an honest man secure a future home in a lawful way?

We are not to emulate the unjust steward in his dishonest use of his master’s

property – but we are to imitate him in being prudent to secure a future home. We are to learn that mammon may be used but must be used for good. We learn that as just stewards working for the Just Master we must be faithful in all things. He is that is unfaithful in the little things in also unfaithful in much. If you are not faithful in the unrighteous mammon why do think you can be entrusted with true riches? I Corinthians 4:2, *“Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful”*. It will be a woeful day if we forget the trust which was committed unto us and suppose we could do what we want with what we call our own.

How you react to this doctrine is a good test of your Christianity. Do you rebel against stewardship? Do you wish to be owners not stewards – that you may do what you wish with your wealth and possessions – that you may acquire and dispose at will? Remember once more the words of the English Puritan, Richard Sibbes: “A man may know that he loves the world, if he be more careful to get than to use.” Stewards distribute – if all our attention is in acquiring all and distributing none – we are worldly.

Choose ye this day whom ye shall serve. Isaiah 26:13, *“O LORD our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us: but by thee only will we make mention of thy name.”*

Books

Johnny's Dilemma: Science Versus The Priesthood?

by S.C. Mooney

In his forward Joseph Sobran says that *Why Johnny Can't Think* is an odd book - if it could even be regarded as a book. I am not sure what he meant by adding that caveat, but I certainly can agree with his evaluation of oddness. I find it impossible to state one sweeping view of the book, and rather am constrained to discuss it from various points of view, ultimately approving on one level and critical on another.

Technical

From the standpoint of technical production, this book has many unfortunate shortcomings. There are various grammatical flaws, such as non-sentences, using which instead of that, wrong words, wrong derivation (such as putting "rebellious" instead of "rebelliousness" on p.120), and extraneous words. There also are stylistic flaws, such as wrong punctuation, capitalizing "Political Correctness" sometimes and not other times, referring to Hitler as "the god of Political Correctness" on one page (45) and then referring to him as "the Satan of Political Correctness" on the very next page (46), and using the phrases "respectable conservatives" and "conservative respectables" apparently interchangeably. And then there are various purely technical problems, such as unbalanced quotation marks, using the apostrophe and double-apostrophe in some places and the more stylized curly marks in other places. In some places the tilde character (~) appears scattered through the text (e.g. p. 69 and 174), which looks to me like an OCR process gone awry. To be really picky, I also noticed extra spaces between words and double periods: like this.. These kinds of flaws

are especially unfortunate in a book with a title such as *Why Johnny Can't Think*. These kinds of problems by themselves leave the book unnecessarily vulnerable to exactly the sort of "stonewalling" and "interference" Whitaker predicts he will receive from the Left: "Leftists are going to stonewall and dicker over every word I say and every instance I cite. They are going to fight to avoid discussing the obvious reality I am referring to." (p.183) So, why make their tactics any easier? Difficulties described above provide them with something to wag their heads about ("this guy is going to teach us how to think!?) instead of dealing with the substance of his message. This book needs a lot of editing, proofreading, and general cleaning up. [We have since learned that these typographical errors have been corrected in later editions -Ed.]

Message

The substance of Mr. Whitaker's message comes through loud and clear: Professors and journalists are people just the same as other people and therefore have biases; however, they enjoy the privilege of being allowed to ignore this fact; things that professors and journalists say often are unmitigated nonsense; yet people generally do not respond to it as such due to their devotion to the idea of reality

Why Johnny Can't Think, by Robert W. Whitaker; Kudzu Media 2004, 217 pages, \$13.95.

imparted to them by professors and journalists; conservatives often are tempted to gain some esteem by engaging professors and journalists in serious discussion of their ideas; however, this necessarily is premised upon the professors and journalists being taken seriously; the best response to the ridiculous nonsense espoused by the professors and journalists is the derisive laughter that it deserves and, on the other hand, the fury engendered by the truly horrible consequences of attempted implementation of the ridiculous nonsense. Mr. Whitaker's bottom line is "revolution." Revolution is a theme that is repeated often throughout the book. I endorse the general substance of this message. Mr. Whitaker correctly has assessed the state of "higher education" and of the mass media. He also correctly has prescribed the only possible solution. I would recommend this book as a very useful and effective exercise in sounding these themes. The professors and journalists, and those masses who are in their hip pockets, will treat themselves to totally ignoring this book; we who already see the matter in terms which Mr. Whitaker rehearses will find this a very entertaining telling of the story; but those among the "respectable conservatives" - i.e. those of a conservative bent of mind who nevertheless take Leftism seriously - are the ones for whom this book presents the greatest challenge. This book, if read thoroughly, will usher the "respectable conservative" into a crisis: he will be pushed into either a more staunch conservatism that laughs at the ridiculous nonsense of the Left, or a greater defense of their respect of the Left and hence into Leftism itself. This book will make it very difficult for them to remain in the twilight between the two.

Method

I stress that my endorsement is of the "general substance" of Mr. Whitaker's message, as stated above. I find that I

cannot endorse this book completely, implicitly, without reservation. While I am sympathetic with the general substance of his message, I have serious reservations with his method of arguing his case. My reservations go well beyond the technical issues reviewed above, and involve very basic issues. Mr. Whitaker is a human being, and so comes to every matter with a bias the same as professors, journalists, and everyone else. In this book he paints with a very broad brush. As a result his general theme comes out, and as I said I generally am in agreement with it. But, what also comes out is something of his basic idea of reality. Since it was not his purpose to state with any precision a comprehensive world and life view, the reader may glean only a caricature of this view through what is said. What I have gleaned stands in stark contrast to a historically and biblically Christian world and life view. Therefore, while I agree with Mr. Whitaker's assessment of the problem and prescription that nothing short of revolution will suffice as a remedy, I must say that the case he has made for these things is not the strongest case that could be made because it is not a self-consciously Christian case. Let me continue at some length with particular examples. Mr. Whitaker states that "Political Correctness" has become a religion, with Professors as Priests and Universities as Seminaries. He is careful to stress that he does not mean that "Political Correctness" is like a religion, but that it actually is the religion of our time. I quite agree with this assessment, however, it becomes clear that Mr. Whitaker and I have reached a common view of this matter via two completely different routes. Late in the book, on page 166, Mr. Whitaker finally makes it clear what he considers to constitute religion: "A religious faith is a belief in things without evidence."

In summary Mr. Whitaker's position may be stated as: Leftism espouses unmitigated, ridiculous nonsense; de facto there can be no evidence that ridiculous

and nonsensical ideas are true; if people believe these ideas without evidence, or contrary to evidence, this is because they have a religious devotion to these ideas. This is precisely the same reasoning utilized by the Left (and others) to totally dismiss Christianity. I posit that this all rests upon a fundamentally misconstrued concept of religion. Lest I extend this treatise beyond all proper proportion, I will omit a lot of background and references and simply state the point that by way of etymology and historic usage the term religion imports a basic idea of who Man is and what Man must do. As such a religious faith is not really a belief in things without evidence, rather it is a belief in things that define what constitutes "evidence." There is indeed a monolithic bias in "higher education" and mass media. This bias consists of the universal negative proposition that Man is not the creation of God. Consequently, in their view, God's Word and Law do not define what Man must do. What makes this a religious faith is not so much that it is held without – or contrary to – "evidence," but that it is a foundational presupposition concerning the identity and duty of Man. It seems that Mr. Whitaker finds it necessary to stress the religious nature of "Political Correctness" due to the fact that most people would reject this view. People generally regard professors, journalists, and the ideas they espouse as neutral with respect to religion, and Mr. Whitaker rightly sees the importance of his readers knowing the truth that "Political Correctness" actually is a religious faith. However, given the manner in which Mr. Whitaker construes religion, one cannot help but to conclude that he considers religion generally to be wrongheaded. Being religious at all constitutes Mr. Whitaker's major indictment against "Political Correctness." According to him, religion is belief without evidence. Evidently he would seek to replace every instance of this with belief according to evidence. That is, he would wish to banish religious faith altogether and leave only

rational faith. However, this is an impossibility. The real question is not: religion vs. no religion; the real question is: which religion. Rightly construed, religious faith is unavoidable. One cannot proceed in any intellectual or practical endeavor apart from a fundamental view of the identity and duty of Man. Something must be grasped as such, and whatever is grasped constitutes a religious faith. I join with Mr. Whitaker in pointing out that the "Political Correctness" pretense to religious neutrality is bunk, however, I differ with Mr. Whitaker in why stressing the religious nature of "Political Correctness" is important. Mr. Whitaker says the problem is that "Political Correctness" asks us to subscribe to certain ideas without "evidence." I say that everyone, even Mr. Whitaker, must subscribe to some ideas ahead of even knowing what constitutes "evidence," and the problem with "Political Correctness" is that it does this falsely.

The general discussion of religion suggests other areas where Mr. Whitaker presents less than the best possible case for his position. For example he touches briefly on the "Nature / Nurture" debate. This is a dialectical tension arising directly from denial that Man is the creation of God. He is not clear in pointing out the essentially unbelieving nature of the dilemma as it is constructed in current debate, and, indeed, seems to indicate in places that he favors the "Nature" aspect of this tension. In the end Mr. Whitaker's treatment is very sketchy, and he does not provide much by which we might assess his own view of this matter. Elsewhere, though, he does give us something to grasp in a number of analogies he draws to make his main point clearer. It would extend the present remarks way out of bounds to attempt to treat each case. For a case in point I shall examine in some detail his analogy involving medical science (p.91-109). Mr. Whitaker's general argument here is that the rocky road of transition

from ancient medical ideas involving the “Four Humors” to the modern ideas involving bacteria is analogous to the Priesthood of the Professors vs. those who would dare to cross them. Various quotations from these pages summarize his approach: “I see leftism the same way I see the medicine of the year 1800.” (p.91) “...as long as people took the same approach to nineteenth century medicine that conservatives do on social issues today, the patient was dead meat.” (p.92) “As long as you depend on reading Thucydides or theology or Deep Thoughts shared with liberals to take care of anything, you can kiss the patient goodbye. But each time we look at the disease for what it is, we see the bacteria and the poisons in the system. AND NOTHING ELSE.(sic)” (p.92-93) “To stop talking about Humors and get University doctors to wash their hands required moral courage, not high intellect.” (p.94) “Millions died while Medical Authority and Intellectuals fought for the Humor Theory of Disease, for which there was no evidence except the fact that Authority supported it.” (p.97) The problem with this approach is that the analogy does not work. Professor-Priests of today espouse things that every thinking person ought to know are not true. Rightly, the pabulum of the Professors ought to be greeted with laughter. However, medical science in the 19th century still was in a process of transition. Ideas that now sound like ridiculous nonsense to us were not so easily seen as such by those who were in the throes of “paradigm shift.” A little elaboration is required. The reference to washing hands in the foregoing pertains to the story of Dr. Semmelweis, who showed in 1847 (Mr. Whitaker inaccurately reports 1848) that washing hands and surgical instruments dramatically reduced deaths from fever in hospitals. This was in a day that had no hard, scientific knowledge of bacterial causes of disease and still was in the grip of the momentum of the ancient idea of the “Humors.” The Theory of the Four

Humors was developed by Hippocrates (though Mr. Whitaker seems to attribute it to Galen) in a day when there was very little practical knowledge of human physiology and when the quest to systematize knowledge was governed by abstract ideals as opposed to practical observation. In the history of science it was Hippocrates and others focusing upon what we would now call medical science who first began to take an inductive approach to gaining and systematizing knowledge, though it was not until the Middle Ages before the inductive method would revolutionize science. Concepts such as the Four Humors (by which is meant four basic bodily fluids: blood, phlegm, yellow bile, and black bile) were not ridiculous nonsense for which there was no evidence. A theory of disease based on the Humors, i.e. that these Humors ideally are to be in harmony and that disease results from an imbalance of them, was not a notion that everyone knew was untrue but which the “authorities” pressed upon everyone as a means of gaining a monopoly of power; it was not, in context of its intellectual milieu, ridiculous nonsense that ought not to be taken seriously and instead ought to receive our derisive laughter. It is true that Semmelweis was persecuted and that advances in medical science were hard won. But, let us be clear on why this was so. Mr. Whitaker states that, “...the Medical Authorities were unanimously against Semmelweis.” (p.97) This is a gross overstatement. As I said, Mr. Whitaker paints with a very broad brush. Semmelweis’ work caught the attention of many and indeed was furthered and implemented within his own lifetime. He hesitated to publish his findings because he knew that it showed up the Director of the Hospital and felt it likely that this would not be taken kindly. His troubles grew out of this particular personal and professional conflict. But is this not Mr. Whitaker’s very point: the Professors at all costs wish to maintain their status and the truth be damned? However, in our day

everyone knows that the Professors opt for status over truth and this is not discussed because no one wants to risk being the first one to cry out that the emperor has no clothes. In Semmelweis' day the Professors no less pursued status, but it was not necessarily pursued knowingly at the expense of truth. Mr. Whitaker refers to many throughout the history of science who posited some sort of "Germ Theory" and characterizes them as exercising common sense and being vilified by a medical elite who abhor common sense in deference to orthodoxies for which there is no evidence. However, in context, it was the "Germ Theory" for which there was no evidence.

Mr. Whitaker says of Semmelweis' proposal to wash hands: "It was too simplistic, too obvious." (p.97) Simplistic it was. However, it was far from obvious. It was not until optics technology was sufficiently refined in the 17th century that it could be proven that bacteria exist. Still, it could not be automatically taken for granted that these newly discovered microbes caused illness. It was not until the 1880s that German Doctor Robert Koch devised a method (Koch's Postulates) of proving a definite connection between a particular bacteria and a particular disease. The point to bear in mind is that this was in a day in which proof was required. Proof was not required because a "Politically Correct" elite chose to believe unmitigated nonsense involving "Humors" and sought to persecute common sense, self-evident truths such as the "Germ Theory." Proof was required precisely because "Germ Theory" was *not* self-evident. Proof is what it would take to jolt the course of medical science out of one paradigm and into another. A paradigm inadequately devised is what causes the need for a new paradigm. Once the "Germ Theory" was proven and accepted, it became all the rage: a new orthodoxy that must not be questioned. Indeed, Mr. Whitaker seems to defend the "Germ Theory" as the only sensible theory

of disease, presumably because it tore down the old "Humors" orthodoxy in the same way he wishes now the "Political Correctness" orthodoxy to be torn down. But we must exercise great care in what we install to replace the old orthodoxy. That which brings about the demise of an old paradigm is not thereby automatically a correct paradigm. Ships captains knew for hundreds of years - and every school-child now knows - that citrus fruits cure scurvy. But after the "Germ Theory" took hold it became a new orthodoxy that must not be questioned, and the "medical establishment" - heirs of the "heroes" such as Semmelweis that Mr. Whitaker lauds - began to presume a bacterial cause of every disease and, for example, did not give up looking for a bacterial cause of scurvy until well into the 20th century.

It may seem off-topic to protract a discussion of the history of medical science in this context, however, we cannot escape this tedium if we are to grasp the problems that are inherent in Mr. Whitaker's use of an analogy involving the history of medical science. The analogy does not work in consideration of the actual history of medical science, and the only way it can be made to work is to distort the history of medical science so the "Humors" advocates are characterized as willfully believing stupid nonsense and stubbornly opposing clear and "obvious" truths such as the "Germ Theory." This simply is not the way it happened. Further of Mr. Whitaker's comments make it clear that his view of the history of medical science depends upon his view of the history of science generally, and his view of the history of science generally involves the "Politically Correct" bias that the Church blocked the way of scientific advancement. For example, Mr. Whitaker states that, "In the Middle Ages anyone who saw the universe through a telescope had to adjust his findings to suit the Bible." (p.100) This simply is not true. And again, on page 103, we read, "In order for

astronomy to begin to be a real science, we did not need another expert on proving that the Bible was right and the earth was the center of the universe.” These are views Mr. Whitaker evidently learned from the Professor Priesthood and indicate an extent to which he has failed to “outgrow his college education.” The Bible does not teach that the earth is the center of the universe, and to the extent that the Church blocked scientific advancement it did so due to the Aristotelianism it was devoted to in the Middle Ages and not due to anything required by Biblical Doctrine.

It was commensurate with a cursory observation with the naked eye for the Ancient man to suppose that the earth lay at the center of the universe. He could observe the heavenly objects in motion about him, but could not observe the motion of his own platform of observation. Also, it was commensurate with the thoroughgoing Humanism of his philosophy to make this assumption. Keener observation revealed anomalies, such as retrograde motion, that presented some difficulties for the geocentric assumption, but solution of the difficulties was sought in terms of Geocentrism, for the anomalies could not constitute proof that the earth was in motion unless no geocentric solution could be devised. The Copernican revolution occurred once increasingly sophisticated optics allowed the anomalies to mount up to a point where it began to appear that positing the motion of the earth presented the best solution. But even then the actual motion of the earth was not observed or proven. It was not until 1838 that optics and technique were refined to the point that stellar parallax was first observed, which could constitute proof of earth’s motion. The idea of parallax can be illustrated in this way: stretch your arm out straight and extend your index finger vertically; with one eye closed position the tip of your finger onto some stationary reference - a picture on an opposite wall, a doorknob,

etc; now, without moving your arm or finger, close the open eye and open the other eye. The position of the finger with respect to the reference object has changed. This is similar to stellar parallax: your two eyes view the finger and the object from slightly different places, like two different positions of a moving earth, and thus give differing accounts of relative positions, like two stars that might appear slightly closer together or further apart. Astronomers reasoned that if the earth were in motion, then at different times the relative positions of the stars ought to appear different, but for centuries no such variation could be observed.

Was the idea of the earth at the center of the universe stupid, ridiculous nonsense that Medieval Professors insisted on believing contrary to the obvious fact of Heliocentrism? No, it was not. Yet, if Mr. Whitaker’s analogy holds, then we must all laugh in the face of all Ancient and most of Medieval science the same as we must all laugh in the face of our contemporary Professor Priesthood. Mr. Whitaker characterizes the advancements of medicine and science generally as won by courageous men who threw off the authority of the Bible, and in the same way he encourages us to throw off the authority of the Professor Priesthood. A major problem with this analogy is that the Professor-Priesthood bases its “Political Correctness” in the very same throwing off the authority of the Bible that Mr. Whitaker says is our model for their defeat. Probably the most important reason why this analogy does not hold has to do with the role of Christianity in the origins and development of Modern science. Mr. Whitaker casts the Medieval scientists as backward due to their slavish devotion to the authority of the Bible. In reality it was slavish devotion to the authority of the Bible that brought science out of almost two thousand years of Aristotelian stagnation and launched it onto a new course of truth. So long as Man and the Universe were what Aristotle

taught they were, science stagnated. It was when scientists began to view Man and the Universe according to Christian Doctrine that science finally grasped the key to understanding things. Mr. Whitaker states that moving from Ancient error - such as Geocentrism and the Four Humors - into modern truth - i.e. Heliocentrism and Germ Theory - required not "high intellect," but "moral courage." (p.94) In a way this is correct; but not in the way that Mr. Whitaker intended. He suggests that Modern scientists reached the heights that we now know only once they had the moral courage to dismiss the ridiculous nonsense of Ancient science in the same way that Post-Modern students now need to dismiss the ridiculous nonsense of the Professor Priests. However, the real moral courage exhibited in the Scientific Revolution was quite a different thing. It was the courage to set aside millennia of Humanist tradition typified in the authority of Aristotle, and to take a fresh look at Man and the Universe in terms of

the Doctrine of Creation. "High intellect" was needed as well in order to grasp all the data there was available in perception (observation) and to process the full implications of this data. Denial of Christianity and denial of the role of Christianity in the birth and development of Modern Science is the rudimentary Doctrine of the "Politically Correct" orthodoxy. It is dismaying to see Mr. Whitaker stand with the Professor-Priests in their core Doctrine. Sharing this core, in the end the issue between the Professors and Mr. Whitaker can only amount to a disagreement over the best expression of Humanism. The revolution for which Mr. Whitaker yearns can arise only from the revolutionary core Doctrines of Christianity: Creation, Sin, and Redemption, which can grip the heart and mind only through the crisis of repentance. This revolution penetrates to the deepest possible core, and so has comprehensive, limitless out-workings in individual and cultural human life.

“Racism”, The Invented Sin

by John Aiken

In *The Biblical Offense of Racism*, a 17-page monograph in which “racism” is considered an unbiblical offense against God, Douglas Jones fails to give a bounded formal definition of the very term he attacks. Since to Jones this key term is a sin which, as he explicitly states, can and ought to lead to excommunication, it would be wise for Jones to let possible future offenders know precisely what sin they are committing.

This short-sighted failure to define a major term exemplifies the presuppositional faults of Jones’ tract, which largely depend on contemporary 21st century American cultural notions and not Biblical principles.

Jones spends the first half of the monograph putting forth a case against secular racism, arguing that even many non-Christian multiculturalists are actually racists who portray themselves as non-racists. For example, though Spike Lee would claim that it is unethical to treat certain humans differently than others for capricious reasons (e.g., race), he breaks his claim by hiring black actors to act in black character-roles. Also, though unbelievers declare that the “human condition” must be held sacred no matter a person’s perceived race, this proposition fails because unbelievers have no standard for sacredness and therefore are merely concocting a morality that they cannot justify. As Jones claims, we can rightfully conclude that “the non-Christian worldview must logically and horribly embrace racism”

Jones attempts in the second half of the monograph to prosecute a biblical case against racism, religious and secular. All men descend from Adam, he says, and all nations will be represented in heaven.

The Gospel must be preached to all races and so “there is no religiously important category for race in the Biblical scheme” (11). The sixth commandment prohibits undue hatred in one’s heart, and prejudicial loathing of certain groups violates Paul’s numerous exhortations to lead a humble and selfless life.

Here, Jones comes closest to forming an actual definition of “racism,” which is some combination of harboring “hateful attitudes” towards racial groups and arrogantly believing that another’s race is “inherently inferior” to one’s own race. The final portion of this monograph deals with state and church applications of Jones’ argument.

Though Jones’ tract is short and cannot deal extensively with its topic, one of its shortcomings is that it treats “racism” far too simplistically. Jones’ assertion that belief in one’s inherent superiority is a marker of racism doesn’t ask in what *ways* one feels one’s race is superior to another. If someone claims that race X is superior to race Y, our first question ought to be “Superior in what way?” No Irishman who makes a claim of total superiority for his race can glance at a list of wide receivers

The Biblical Offense of Racism, by Douglas Jones; Kudzu Media 2004, 217 pages, \$13.95.

in the NFL and honestly continue to hold that belief. Similarly, no Ethiopian can view the list of Noble Prize winners for Physics and assert that East Africans are “inherently superior.” If Jones is attacking these types, he is targeting a tiny collection of fools.

Along a similar line, few Christians hold the belief that only members of their particular racial group can be saved by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. The Gospel message is intended for a multitude of believers from all races. Jones is correct to understand and quote Psalm 22: 27-28: “All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the Lord’s: and he is the governor among the nations.” The emphasis on the plurality of nations in Psalm 22 is quite clear, but in order for there to be a plurality there must be some degree of separation.

Jones overstates his case for unity among humans by ignoring the natural order of diversity. What Jones presupposes throughout his monograph is a forced unity without distinctives, a neo-Babelist praise of oneness in Adam and Christ without recognition of God’s own prescribed separation and division. In one section Jones argues that modern genetics demonstrates our likeness to one another yet we also know that genes divide, adapt, and change, creating unique characteristics and problems. In fact, Jones ignores an obvious material reality: races become distinctive through group intermarriage [endogamy] and via tribal and cultural communion. Fathers and mothers pass on both genetic characteristics and cultural heritages to their offspring, and as this process perpetuates, real racial distinctives arise. This branching-off of the human species is inherent in the order of creation and indeed is emphasized in the Bible itself through its extensive genealogies.

While foolishly loving one’s genealogy over loving God Almighty is abominable (this is another potential definition of “racism”), the testimony of the heritage of the Israelites and even the genealogy of Christ himself show that a Christianly pride can be taken in one’s own family line. Far from an arrogant claim of “superiority,” this racialist feeling can manifest itself in a Scriptural way. The existence of racial groups via the process of continued intermarriage in intimate group settings actually resembles the common manifestation of God’s covenant. Fathers raise their sons and daughters in the ways of the Lord, and as the sons and daughters turn into fathers and mothers of similar kindred, they too will raise their children to love the Lord their God. Race is essentially an extended family, and God’s covenant augments the notion of this extended family.

It is not surprising to see the covenant spread tribally over time, which historically has had tremendous success for the Christian faith. The continued existence of the Coptic and other Arabian churches, even in harsh political climates, testifies to the benefit of tribal solidarity in a Christian covenant setting. Also, European descendents should pay honor to their forefathers, remembering the 5th commandment, in due deference to their ancestor’s general commitment to God’s Holy Law and Testaments. Our faith was not given to us randomly by strangers or men of some distant race, and we did not come to the Lord as separated individuals.

Jones, however, very nearly asks us to forget the distinguishing features of certain “nations” even as he utilizes the very notion of multiple nations. If, as Psalm 22 attests, Christ rules over all nations, He rules over a plurality. This plurality is reaffirmed in Acts 17:26, which Jones quotes to prove that all nations come from one blood. However, he ignores the last phrase of that verse: “And [God] hath made of one blood all nations

of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.” At the same time this verse demonstrates our human unities with respect to Adam, it points to the “bounds of their habitation,” or the drawing up and distinguishing of nations. At Babel, God separated man according to language, which gave a material-cultural distinctive that practically forced the establishment of tribal/racial groups. Tribal intermarriage and the creation of racial groups is substantially easier when a common language is shared.

A common claim of many who argue as Jones does is that Pentecost has overturned Babel, creating a social and material unity between all the peoples of the Earth via the reception and outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Yet, in this argument, unity is overemphasized and negates plurality (in a sense, it is a Unitarian argument rather than Trinitarian one) While the Holy Spirit helps racial groups co-exist peacefully, we have not seen post-Pentecost a reversal of language mutations or genetic divisions. Barriers erected via language differences and unique attributes provided by genetic division create distinctives that have allowed tribal/racial groups to develop over the millennia. If global capitalism powered by rapid transportation possibilities (e.g., mechanized planes, cars, and boats) ceased today, we would likely see the end of intercultural contact and mass immigration, and the redevelopment of communities based on group intermarriage. Jones is arguing with the material conditions of his time, and does not realize that, biblically, no transgression has taken place if racial groups still desire to exist as distinctive tribes and manifest this desire via law, polity, and social practice.

Yet Jones’ philosophy leads him to make presumptuous statements, the worst of which is that the act disallowing

interracial marriages is an affront to God Almighty: “For parents to forbid [...] a marriage solely on the basis of race is sinful” (16). This declaration is legalistic and wrong, since it adds to God’s Law. Jones’ primary argument is that banning interracial marriages is a violation of the sixth commandment, a desire to hate and ultimately kill others. But as I have noted, there is a tribal pride that respects other tribes but also cares deeply for one’s own tribe; this in fact is a way of honoring the fifth commandment, of loving and respecting one’s own forebears. Both Abraham and Isaac knew this. When Abraham seeks a wife for Isaac, he forbids his son from marrying any Canaanite (believer or unbeliever) and instead chooses a mate from his own family, who were pagans (Genesis 24:3). Isaac also forbids Jacob from marrying Canaanites (Genesis 28:1). According to Jones, what these Old Testament patriarchs did, by asserting their federal headship in this way, was an abomination.

More Biblical examples fall against Jones’ assertion. Samson’s parents lament the fact that Samson desires to take a Philistine as a wife: “Is there never a woman among the daughters of thy brethren, or among all my people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines?” (Judges 14:4). This desire does not come from a hatred or wish to unlawfully kill Philistines, and ultimately Samson’s lust for exotic women ruins him. Also, Nehemiah sees the problem with the Babelist unification of mankind, and he despises the fact that the Israelites have intermarried with foreign women, creating children who cannot speak “the tongue of Judah,” and who consequently worship foreign gods (Nehemiah 13:24)

Further, Phinehas reacts violently against the intercommunion between Israel and the Midianites (Numbers 25). Both Nehemiah’s and Phinehas’ actions were

vindicated by God; Phinehas even kills over an interracial marriage and is blessed by it, an act that does not fit Jones' point about the sixth commandment very well. As both of these stories show, the pattern of interracial marriage resulting in a lapse into idolatry is quite common and is in fact one reason why such marriages should be carefully guarded against.

Jones neglects to have a nuanced view of the Bible, the covenant, and relationships between human beings. He would potentially excommunicate a businessman for refusing to sell to a certain racial group (18), and would call a father who did not want his daughter to marry a foreigner "sinful." These absolute commands ignore situations where such actions could be warranted, and this is

probably why God did not make these negative commands Himself. Rather, as Abraham and Isaac show, fathers have an obligation to honor their forefathers by carefully considering the spiritual, material, and cultural results of a marriage. Acting under modern constructs of "anti-racism," families are left helpless to bow to a Babelist unity that despises distinctives and dishonors every tribe that God has created a boundary of habitation for. "Nations" is a plural word throughout the Bible, but the material result of Jones' philosophy is the creation of one nation and a reversal of the effects of Babel. At the very least, we must be extraordinarily careful before we decide to completely reverse something that God, for His good pleasure, has so long instituted.

From Christian to Judeo-Christian

by John Aiken

The word “Judeo-Christian” is a mighty fortress for most conservatives. A signal word for moral values and traditional society, both politicians and evangelical leaders invoke the “Judeo-Christian” worldview to demonstrate opposition to a supposed secular contingency of leftists and liberals. Despite its popularity nowadays, the word cannot be found with reference to anything relating to moral values prior to the 1960s. What was once “Christian” a few decades ago is now “Judeo-Christian,” the shift in terms occurring post-Holocaust to include Jews into a newly assimilated “Christian” group of Catholics and Protestants.

Perhaps the perfect story to demonstrate the transition from “Christian” to “Judeo-Christian” is Bernard Malamud’s 1957 novel *The Assistant*, a story about Jew-Gentile relationships and the aftermath of the Holocaust. Set in 1950s Brooklyn, it follows Morris Bober, a Jew who owns and runs a grocery store on the lower East side. Morris suffers endlessly. He cannot pay his bills, he suffers from stiff competition, his health is poor, and his 22-year old daughter has not found a husband. To suffer in this way, the novel argues, is to be Jewish. Suffering defines Jewishness.

The novel’s central relationship is between Morris and Frank Alpine (a direct nameplay on Francis of Assisi), who is a young Italian Catholic with a guilt complex. After robbing Morris’ grocery store anonymously, Frank begins hanging around the store and eventually is employed for no pay, because Morris is seriously injured during the robbery. The store’s profits increase, thanks to Frank’s

hard work, or so Morris believes. And yet Frank, for all his charity, steals from the cash register regularly.

Initially Frank harbors hostile feelings towards Jews, but gradually he learns to appreciate Morris. Neither character is outwardly religious, and Morris routinely breaks the Sabbath and kosher laws. This confuses Frank, who after seeing these transgressions doesn’t understand what a Jew is. This leads to the book’s central conversation:

“What I like to know is what is a Jew anyway?” (Frank)

...

“The important thing is the Torah. This is the Law – a Jew must believe in the Law.”

“Let me ask you this,” Frank went on. “Do you consider yourself a real Jew?”

Morris was startled, “What do you mean if I am a real Jew?”

“Don’t get sore about this,” Frank said, “but I can give you an argument that you aren’t. First thing, you don’t go to the synagogue – not that I have ever seen. You don’t keep your kitchen kosher and you don’t eat kosher. You don’t even wear one of those little black hats like this tailor I knew in South Chicago. He prayed three times a day. I even hear the Mrs. say you

The Assistant, by Bernard Malamud;
Perennial Classics 2000, 217 pages,
\$13.95.

kept the store open on Jewish holidays, it makes no difference if she yells her head off.” (117)

Morris can only respond that if the Jew forgets the Law, he fails to be a “good Jew and a good man.” Eventually Morris dies and the officiating rabbi confirms Morris’ words about being a Jew: “When a Jew dies, who asks if he is a Jew? He is a Jew, we don’t ask. There are many ways to be a Jew ... Yes Morris Bober was to me a true Jew because he lived in the Jewish experience, which he remembered, and with the Jewish heart ... He followed the Law which God gave to Moses on Sinai and told him to bring to the people ... He suffered, he endured, but with hope” (218).

After Morris’ death, Frank takes over the dilapidated grocery store, guilt-ridden and tormented by his continuous theft. Barely able to make a profit, working ninety hours a week, Frank becomes emaciated. He develops the same habits that Morris once had. He suffers endlessly. In the novel’s final paragraph, Frank, the lapsed Catholic, enters the hospital during Passover and undergoes a painful circumcision operation. He becomes a Jew.

One other major storyline is Frank’s obsession with Morris’ daughter Helen, an early 20s spinster who reads Don Quixote and Dostoevsky on subway rides. Unable to attend college, Helen (a deliberately Greek name) wages away at a bra manufacturing plant. Frank woos her, though neither Morris nor Mrs. Bober would approve Helen’s marriage to a Christian, nominal or sincere. Eventually Frank wins Helen, but she refuses to consummate the relationship. One evening, Helen is assaulted in a park. Frank saves her from her attacker, but

then takes advantage of her. She can only permit it to happen, and then exclaims “Dog – uncircumcised dog!”

The novel is filled with Holocaust references, beginning with the opening paragraph, where Morris enters into the dark night, meeting his first customer of the day, who is referred to as the “gray-headed Poilishch” (1). Characters are referred to not by name but by ethnicity. Thus Morris has German customers. His chief competitors are Norwegian. His regular morning customer is Polish. And Frank, to Mrs. Bober, is the “goy” who is kissing her daughter. Finally, Morris suffers several near-death injuries, most notable of all an accidental gassing when he leaves the furnace on without lighting it, which is Malamud’s allusion to concentration camps.

The merging of religions and the definition of “Jew” dominates the book’s storyline. Frank Alpine’s initial anti-Semitism, his crimes against Morris, his conscious guilt, his lust for Helen Bober, his rape of her, his suffering as the worker of a Jewish grocery store, and his circumcision and conversion – all allegorize the transformation from “Christian” to “Judeo-Christian.”

But the two religions do not co-exist; one dominates the other. When Frank asks Morris what he suffers for, Morris responds doubly, “I suffer for you ... I mean you suffer for me” (118). Malamud suggests that the Jew once suffered in the Christian era; now, post-WWII, the Christian now suffers along with the Jew. And the Jew is defined only by being a Jew, by honoring a Law of his own making. Judeo-Christianity, therefore, as symbolized by Frank Alpine, is a Christianity of its own making, and not a historically recognizable faith or tradition.

A New Poem

by *Wheeler MacPherson*

The Reading

Through the metal detectors, past the racks
Of new arrivals, nodding at the gray-haired
Men in drowsy contemplation of
The plastic-bound periodical pile,
Then on between the self-help and the seven-
Day returns, toward the reference stacks –

Got my foolscap and my new gel pen;
Always-jammed copier wants my quarters.
Returning from my scanning scribbling pawing
Expedition through the spines, I hear
The fussing of a baby somewhere on the
Borders of my Dewey-dirtied mind.

There she sits, one of ours, in the
Age when peace should be descending on
This queen who never will enjoy the rest
She thought she earned by honor and by will:
Rough grandma with too-long permed hair draped
Across the collar of her Carhart jacket –

Cigarette creases mitered into her frowning
Face, staring into the monitor, piloting
The mouse with one hand and performing part-time
Soothing with the other, rocking the child
In the carrier on the floor at her
Feet. The child is not like me, not like

Her, and I 'll bet he's not like the absent mother.
The squalling curls up from a brown, brown face; the
Sound cuts in front of me, imposing on me,
Elbowing, taking liberties, demanding,

Entitled, not like Our Sounds. And grandma drags
Her eyes up to mine, and offers that smile that sprang

Proud from a wide spot in the road somewhere,
Someplace where grace gets said and two jobs get worked
And no one laughs at macaroni from a Box.
And I know this ain't what she wanted
From her labor,
And she knows she taught someone
Better. And her eyes shine down, down

To her future, her breath already spoken for,
Years to be burned, raising this little stranger
While the childmother runs out the reel on her gifted
Life, mocking without knowing, betraying blood and
Soil on the altar of what she learned from school and
Tube and church and choking family silence.

-Wheeler MacPherson

.

The
Kinist Review

Next Number Coming In
Summer 2008

Download Available at
www.kinism.net