

The Kinist Heresy: A Biblical Critique of Racism¹

[Brian Schwertley](#)

Today, we are going to examine a rapidly growing movement among professing Christians called kinism. Kinist or kinism comes from the word *kin*, such as “kith and kin.” The movement seems to be particularly popular among conservatives and ex-theonomists (I say ex-theonomists because kinism is essentially racist and antinomian). Its appeal lies in the idea that dark-skinned immigrants to the United States, be they African, Mexican or Caribbean, (generally speaking) tended to be socialistic in their outlook, more involved in crimes and a drag on the United States culturally, politically and socially.

Chapter 1: Kinist Misuse of Scripture

Although the kinist literature on the web is almost completely devoid of biblical exegesis of appropriate passages (in fact, their use of passages tells us more about their racist presuppositions than it does about the teaching of Scripture), we will prove that they come to the Bible with a certain worldview or idea and then twist Scripture to make it fit with their concept of reality. We will examine each passage in turn.

Genesis 1:25

The first passage that is found sprinkled throughout their writings as support for their idea that intermarriage between different racial groups or “people groups” is immoral and forbidden by Scripture is from the creation narrative. It says, “And God made the beast of the earth according to its kind, cattle according to its kind, and everything that creeps on the earth according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.” The kinist does not quote the whole verse, but simply seizes on the phrase “according to its kind.” For example, the *Kinist Institute Manifesto* says, “We denounce the sin of miscegenation as a violation of God’s created order which has permanent consequences for every heritable trait. We appeal to God’s creation mandate of ‘kind after kind.’ It is the obligation of both church and state to forbid mixed unions according to biblical laws prohibiting unequal yoking.” (Miscegenation means intermarriage or inbreeding of whites and other races.) The basic idea behind their use of this phrase is that “Africans should mate according to their kind or within their kind”—“whites or Europeans should mate or breed only within their kind” and so on. This raises the question. Is this a legitimate interpretation of this passage or even a legitimate application of this passage? The answer is most certainly *no*.

In Genesis 1:25, Moses is noting that God created each “kind” according to a specific limited sphere of birth, function and existence. A modern way of saying this is that God created

¹ This monograph is a slightly edited transcript of three Sabbath school lectures that, at the time they were given, were not intended to be published in written form. We have made it available to people in written form due to a number of requests to do so. Please keep that in mind as you read this paper.

distinct species in the animal world. Biologically there is a genus or broad class of animals: mammals, reptiles, etc.. Then within a genus or subgenus are species. These are groups of animals which possess in common certain characteristics and, thus, they may interbreed and reproduce those characteristics. Dogs can have different varieties (breeds), but dogs are dogs and they only produce dogs. If mankind disappeared, dogs would eventually go back to their wild, common prototype. This is true of horses, species of fish, birds and so on. Things do not evolve into new species and each species is fixed by God and cannot interbreed with other species. Paul says the same thing in a different way in 1 Corinthians 15:39, “All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of animals, another of fish, and another of birds.” The flesh—the physical make-up—of different species differs considerably and each species is in a different unique category. Thus, for a man to mate with an animal is unnatural. It is an abomination (Lev. 18:23).

With the meaning of this passage in mind we ask, does it have anything to say regarding interracial marriage between human beings. Note the following comments that apply to this debate. (1) First, the different people groups or “races” (so to speak) of humankind can successfully interbreed. They can give each other blood transfusions, organ donations and so on. In other words, Asians, Africans, Europeans, etc. are all of the same kind or species. This point is rather obvious since we all came from Adam and Eve. Therefore, this passage does not support the kinist or racist position, but rather disproves it. As we will see, the great issue in the true biblical religion is not race or ethnicity, but faith and the ethics/worldview that come with the true religion.

In fact, it is noteworthy that modern fascist movements come not from the biblical worldview, but from Darwinism and macro-evolutionary theory. Blacks were thought to be less evolved than whites. Jews and Italians were lower on the evolutionary scale than northern Europeans. The Nazi movement, the eugenics movement, Planned Parenthood and the like, all flow from macro-evolutionary theory.

(2) Second, although the text does not support kinist or racist views, it does teach by implication and application that bestiality and the attempt to blur species through cloning and so forth is immoral. If the kinist used this text properly, he would argue that whites should not intermarry with chimpanzees, orangutans or gorillas. Whites should not adopt the culture or the practices of the baboon or the gibbon. But to use this against interracial marriage between solid Christians or to argue that I must eat sauerkraut and sausage instead of burritos and kung pao chicken is complete nonsense. It is unscholarly rubbish.

Genesis 9:20-27

The curse on Ham (or more accurately the curse on Ham’s son Canaan) reads: “And Noah began *to be* a farmer, and he planted a vineyard. Then he drank of the wine and was drunk, and became uncovered in his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brothers outside. But Shem and Japheth took a garment, laid *it* on both their shoulders, and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father. Their faces *were* turned away, and they did not see their father’s nakedness. So Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done to him. Then he said: ‘Cursed *be* Canaan; a servant of servants he shall be to his brethren.’ And he said: ‘Blessed *be* the LORD, the God of Shem, and may Canaan be his servant. May God enlarge Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Shem; and may Canaan be his servant.’”

Racists have appealed to this passage for more than one hundred and fifty years. The general idea behind this passage is that dark-skinned people descended from Ham and dark-skinned people, especially Negroes or black Africans, have a special curse throughout history. Here are some interesting quotes based on this text. In 1958 the Mormon church wrote, "We know circumstances under which the posterity of Cain (and later of Ham) were cursed with what we call Negroid racial characteristics." In 1929 the Jehovah's Witnesses took this position: "The curse which Noah pronounced upon Canaan was the origin of the black race." Although not appealing directly to Ham, a kinist web site has approvingly posted the following racist nonsense,

The Negroes were "political idiots," and the North by trying to put them into political authority had "sinned against all knowledge."

On the topic of the Negro's natural endowment one finds the beginning of a division of opinion; for though some held that he could never compete with the white man in the arts and sciences, others believed that he had the potential ability to succeed in all of them save that of political management. It is a further commentary on the traditional Southern view of the arts that no embarrassment was felt over conceding the Negro even superiority in music, poetry, and oratory so long as politics remained the white man's preserve. The Southern Bivouac declared that it would not be surprised to see Negroes "in another generation" producing artists, poets, and orators surpassing those of the white race. But it regarded talent for self-government as the peculiar gift of the Aryan. The Negro betrayed his unfitness for rule through "absolute, unqualified veneration for power in its every form and symbol." He could understand only external control. "Nature formed him for obedience, and even when he is riotous and apparently insubordinate it is most generally his expression of contempt for what he deems weakness, and indirect tribute to that which he esteems the real representative of superior controlling force."

More than one writer took the view that it was impossible for the two races to dwell together unless the blacks remained in a condition approximating slavery, and sometimes traditional religion was invoked to sanction such an arrangement. Thus The Land We Love could say of the Negro that "From his history we infer that God has given him a tendency to thrive and multiply in a condition of servitude," and that therefore "the servile condition of the negroes in the South was not contrary to the will of God." If they lived free of white supervision and control, they would assert their natural bent, revert to a primitive status, and so create a county in which no white man would care to remain. De Bow's Review suggested that within the foreseeable future the Negro would drive the white man from his domain and so achieve an all-Negro South. This was accompanied by the realistic observation that no inferior race is ever practically and actually free when in contact with a superior, for the latter is certain to find means of exploiting the labor of the former.

Does the curse on Canaan or the statement of judgment toward Ham justify the position that black Africans would always be an inferior, subject peoples? The answer is definitely not!

This curse which is really a kind of prophecy does not describe the inescapable fate of a whole race of peoples, but rather applies specifically to only one of Ham's four sons—Canaan—which peopled Palestine and what became Carthage. The idea that it applies to all of Ham's sons and, thus, all of Africa is not in the text and therefore must be read into the passage. This view became popular because of the justifications of slavery and the rather common idea in the nineteenth century that blacks were inferior intellectually to whites. The best Hebrew scholars and commentators also condemn the racist interpretation of this passage. H. C. Leupold writes,

Much serious misunderstanding has grown out of a refusal to take this word at its actual face value, especially the word “Canaan.” *Ham* is not cursed, no matter how freely proslavery men may have employed this text. Canaan is the fourth son of Ham (10:6) and so may roughly be said to represent one fourth of the Hamitic race. He alone is under consideration here. The rest of the Hamitic stock, apparently, does not come under consideration because it is neither directly blessed nor cursed. Its influence on the development of the rest of the human race is practically nil and, therefore, need not be mentioned here.

Now the descendants of Canaan, according to 10:15-20, are the peoples that afterward dwelt in Phoenicia and in the so-called land of Canaan, Palestine. That they became races accursed in their moral impurity is apparent from passages such as 15:16; 19:5; Lev. 18 and 20; Deut. 12:31. In Abraham’s day the measure of their iniquity was already almost full. By the time of the entrance of Israel into Canaan under Joshua the Canaanites, collectively also called Amorites, were ripe for divine judgment through Israel, His scourge. Sodom left its name for the unnatural vice its inhabitants practiced. The Phoenicians and the colony of Carthage surprised the Romans by the depth of their depravity. Verily cursed was Canaan!²

Derek Kidner writes,

That the curse fell on Canaan, youngest son of the offender (10:6), who was himself a youngest son, emphasizes its reference to Ham’s succession rather than his person. For his breach of the family, his own family would falter. Since it confines the curse to this one branch within the Hamites, those who reckon the Hamitic peoples in general to be doomed to inferiority have therefore misread the Old Testament as well as the New. It is likely, too, that the subjugation of the Canaanites to Israel fulfilled the oracle sufficiently (*cf.* Jos. 9:23; 1 Ki. 9:21).³

Victor P. Hamilton writes,

Canaan is to be a servant, a slave, to Japheth. Rather than seeing this oracle as an etiology of Israel’s rise to power (the conclusion most often reached when form-critical questions are raised), we prefer to read it as a prophetic, futuristic view of relationships between Israel (and the Sea Peoples) and the Canaanites. In effect it outlines future history, when Israel conquered Canaan and the Sea Peoples were carving out their own niche in Canaanite-held lands.⁴

G. Ch. Aalders writes,

Meanwhile, the actual curse that is pronounced can hardly be applied to Canaan as a person. To be sure, one individual could be relegated to a position of total subjection to his brothers, but the sentence can more fittingly be applied to a wider group of people or a tribe or nation. Thus we could apply the curse to Canaan’s descendants. That this is the case is confirmed by comparing this curse with the blessings pronounced on Shem and Japheth (vv. 26-27). There we note a reference to dwelling “in the tents (plural) of Shem.” This would be descriptive of the tribal group that descended from Shem. Thus, also in the case of the curse of Canaan, we should think of the tribe that descended from him.

² H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1942), 349.

³ Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction & Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1967), 103-104.

⁴ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 327.

How are we then to think of the fulfillment of this curse? Let it be emphatically stated that this does not refer to the slavery of the black person. There was a time when the practice of slavery was readily defended by an appeal to the curse of Ham, but there is not one shred of biblical evidence to support this theory...

When we put all this data together, our interpretation of “the lowest of slaves” as a designation of a position of subjection under the control of other larger and more powerful nations becomes plausible. The Canaanitish tribes always were in a place of subjection and inferiority to the great powers such as Egypt and the Mesopotamian Empires. We know, in fact, that before Israel occupied the land of Canaan, the area was in complete subjection to Egypt. This, to our minds, would suffice as a fulfillment of Noah’s curse on the descendants of Canaan.⁵

Gordon J. Wenham writes,

“The lowest of slaves,” literally, “slave of slaves”: cf. the expressions “leader of the leaders” (Num. 3:32), “King of kings and Lord of lords” (Rev. 19:16). “To his brothers,” i.e., Shem and Japhet, as vv 26, 27 made clear, “Let Canaan be a slave to them.” How and when this prediction of Canaan’s subjection to Shem and Japhet was fulfilled is another subject of disagreement. Skinner sums up the problem neatly: “Three points may be regarded as settled: that Shem is that family to which the Hebrews reckoned themselves; that Canaan stands for the pre-Israelitish inhabitants of Palestine; and that the servitude of Canaan to Shem at least *includes* the subjugation of the Canaanites in the early days of the monarchy. Beyond this everything is uncertain” (186). Though many fulfillments of Shem’s dominance over Canaan can be seen, it is more difficult to know when Canaan was subject to Japhet.⁶

Matthew Henry writes,

He pronounces a curse on Canaan the son of Ham (v. 25), in whom Ham is himself cursed, either because this son of his was now more guilty than the rest, or because the posterity of this son was afterwards to be rooted out of their land, to make room for Israel. And Moses here records it for the animating of Israel in the wars of Canaan; though the Canaanites were a formidable people, yet they were of old an accursed people, and doomed to ruin. The particular curse is, *A servant of servants* (that is, the meanest and most despicable servant) *shall he be, even to his brethren*. Those who by birth were his equals shall by conquest be his lords. This certainly points at the victories obtained by Israel over the Canaanites, by which they were all either put to the sword or put under tribute (Josh. ix. 23; Judg. i. 28, 30, 33, 35), which happened not till about 800 years after this.⁷

John Gill writes,

...but as both were guilty, as appears from what has been observed on the former verses, and Canaan particularly was first in the transgression; it seems most wise and just that he should be expressly named, since hereby Ham is not excluded a share in the punishment of the crime had a concern in, being punished in his son, his youngest son, who perhaps was his darling and favourite, and which must be very afflicting to him to hear of; and since Canaan only, and not any of the other sons of Ham were guilty, he, and not Ham by name, is cursed, lest it should be

⁵ G. Ch. Alders, *Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 206-207.

⁶ Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 202.

⁷ Matthew Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (McLean, VA: MacDonald, 1706), 1:74.

thought that the curse would fall upon Ham and all his posterity; whereas the curse descends on him, and very justly proceeds in the line of Canaan; and who is the rather mentioned, because he was the father of the accursed race of the Canaanites, whom God abhorred, and, for their wickedness, was about to drive out of their land, and give it to his people for an inheritance; and in order to which the Israelites were now upon the expedition, when Moses wrote this account, and which must animate them to it; for by this prediction they would see that they were an accursed people, and that they were to be their servants: *a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren*; the posterities of Shem and Japheth, who stood in the relation of brethren to Canaan and his posterity; and to those he and his offspring were to become the most mean abject servants, as the phrase implies: this character agrees with the name of Canaan, which may be derived from [the Hebrew]...to depress, humble and make mean and abject...*and Canaan shall be his servant*; the posterity of Canaan servants to the posterity of Japheth; as they were when Tyre, which was built by the Sidonians, and Sidon, which had its name from the eldest son of Canaan, fell into the hands of Alexander the Grecian, who sprung from Japheth; and when Carthage, a colony of the Phoenicians of Canaan's race, was taken and demolished by the Romans of the line of Japheth, which made Hannibal, a child of Canaan, say, *agnoscere se fortunam Carthaginis*, that he owned the fate of Carthage; and in which some have thought that he refers to this prophecy.⁸

The common interpretation, which contradicts the racist understanding of a general curse on Ham and all Africans, is supported by looking at Canaan's descendants. They are the accursed tribes set apart by God for destruction and subjugation by Israel. Exodus 33:2 says, "And I will send My Angel before you and I will drive out the Canaanite, and the Amorite and the Hittite and the Perezite, and the Hivite and Jebusite." The descendants of Canaan were rank idolaters and were known for their disgusting sexual practices: ritual prostitution, homosexuality, bestiality. Canaan's sin and his descendants' sins reflect the perverse behavior of Ham. The curse on Canaan has nothing to do with race or skin color, but *has everything to do with God's law and ethics*. That is the issue. Racists take the focus off of God's moral law and place it on something physical or biological. By doing this they get people away from God's law onto stupid human traditions that are complete nonsense.

Genesis 11:1-9

Perhaps the most important passage used as a proof text by the kinist movement is the narrative dealing with the confusion of languages in Genesis 11:1-9. The kinist has a unique interpretation on this section of Scripture concerning the Tower of Babel. It is their central justification for racial or ethnic separation or segregation and it is their central proof text against interracial marriage. One of their websites says: "*Kinism is the belief that the ordained social order for man is tribal and ethnic rather than imperial and universal. Mankind was designed by God to live in extended family groups.... Blood ties are the only natural and workable basis for a healthy society not subject to the ideologies of fallen man. We believe this is the normative system for our people. We believe that our White people have a God-given right and duty to seek their own prosperity and existence as a distinct nation.*" The assumption of this quote is that one is either in favor of the kinist racist nonsense or else one is in favor of one-world government or some giant humanistic empire. This is the fallacy of *black or white*. The Bible rejects both.

⁸ John Gill, *Exposition of the Old Testament* (Streamwood, IL: Primitive Baptist Library, [1810] 1979), 1:68.

Note also that the kinist assigns to blood ties something that can *only* be achieved by Jesus Christ and His law-word. Applied racism becomes a means of societal sanctification to the kinist. This is unbiblical and reveals a complete ignorance of history. Blood ties do not lower crime rates and stop wars. The high crime rate among non-white immigrants is due to their unbiblical worldview, not their skin color. Real Christian blacks, Mexicans and Vietnamese, etc. do not commit crimes and go on welfare. Real Christians do not use race to favor one group in the church or society over another. Real Christians of like-mind with John Calvin and John Knox, whether they are Chinese or Korean or African, would be a blessing to any society. To argue otherwise is to say that the gospel is less important or less powerful than race. The kinist form of racism ultimately is a denial of the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ.

Another kinist says, “When nations cease to be based on blood heritage rooted in common knowledge, culture and language, they will inherently lose their common faith.” He then refers to the Tower of Babel incident. Once again the kinist has it precisely backwards. The only way to have a common, lasting heritage and culture is to have a common faith. One’s faith determines culture, not the other way around. Culture to a large degree is an external manifestation of faith. If we took some real Christian families from Greece, Africa, Spain and China and put them on an island there would be no oppression, murder or suffering. Nazi Germany demonstrates what happens to a nation or culture that abandons the Christian faith. Soviet Russia is another good example. These nations (Russia and Germany) did not have a race problem, but a faith problem. Culture is an expression of faith; indifferent elements of a culture, like eating rice and fish instead of wheat and beef are adiaphora and irrelevant.

The *Kinist Institute Manifesto* says,

Extended blood ties are the only natural and workable basis for a healthy society -a society not subject to the horrifying ideologies of fallen man, be they socialist or capitalist, autocratic or democratic. We believe that an extended tribalism is the normative system for our people, the White races of Europe, the Americas, South Africa, Australia, Transcaucasia, or wherever our extended family finds itself in its modern diaspora....When Kinism.net publishes materials disparaging of other racial-ethnic groups, it is for the sole purpose of exposing the incompatibility and essential uniqueness of the cultures in question....Since the differences among men are in large part endogenous, it is meet that these differences will show themselves in the fruits of social organization, whether that is difference in wealth, position, or in abilities of all kinds. We honor and celebrate the shared history and distinctives of our people, its ancient heroes, its legends, its celebrations, and all of its variegated glories, while recognizing its failures, its latter day degeneracy, and its need to universally submit to the Law of God....Nevertheless, we stand or fall with no other but the White peoples of Europe, and their standards of beauty, their cultural achievements, the achievements of their civilization, established through the confluence of pagan and Christian traditions, are both irreplaceable and vital to our survival as a people.

Note just how unbiblical these assertions are—“extended blood ties are the only workable basis for a healthy society.” In other words, the gospel of Jesus Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit that flow from His perfect work are not enough to restrain sin, hatred and crime. No, according to the kinist, racial blood ties are what are needed. This once again is a denial of the gospel and the sufficiency of Scripture. Note, America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Europe are having significant problems because they have abandoned Jesus Christ and His law-word. Their insane immigration policies do not help. But if they were Christian and adopted biblical law, immigration would no longer be a problem—Roman Catholicism, Islam, Hinduism and the like

would be against the law (that is, all outward, public expressions of idolatry and false religions are forbidden in a Christian [i.e. Bible-believing Protestant] commonwealth) and only Mexicans, blacks and so forth who renounced idolatry would be allowed to immigrate. Race is not the problem; faith and ethics are the heart of the issue.

Note also the blatant racism in the kinist idea that the difference among men is *endogenous*. This word means they are intrinsic to different racial groups. They flow from internal causes and *thus cannot be overcome by the gospel*. This is totally contrary to the gospel message. The gospel brings Jew and Gentile, slave and free, together in Christ. All believing races are part of the same church and partake of the sacraments together. To have separate tables of fellowship, Paul says in Galatians, is an implicit denial of the gospel (cf. 2:11ff.). If different races can be brought together in the church, then they can in a Christian society also.

Talk of a wonderful confluence of *pagan* and Christian traditions being “irreplaceable and vital to our survival as a people” is unbiblical and has more in common with Nazism than the Bible. Paganism has nothing to offer us; it is idolatry. It is sin. It is offensive to God. All elements of paganism in our culture should be destroyed and replaced with godly counterparts. Once again, we see that the kinist blatantly denies *sola Scriptura* and the sufficiency of Scripture. The elements of culture that are *adiaphora* or indifferent (e.g., chopsticks, wooden shoes, unique foods, architecture, modest clothing styles, etc.) we can hang on to and use to God’s glory. For example, I like to make good use of German beer, fine crafted weapons, sausage and automobiles; but I leave behind Christmas, Romanism and the satanic modernism of recent centuries. Everything is to be used to glorify God. Paganism in any form is satanic excrement.

Now that we have seen some of the *remarkably unbiblical* statements of the kinist movement related to their concept of the Tower of Babel incident, let us look at the text and see if it supports a racist or segregationist agenda. Genesis 11:1-9 reads,

Now the whole earth had one language and 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. Then they said to one another, “Come, let us make bricks and bake *them* thoroughly.” They had brick for stone, and they had asphalt for mortar. And they said, “Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower whose top *is* in the heavens; let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be scattered abroad over the face of the whole earth.” But the LORD came down to see the city and the tower which the sons of men had built. And the LORD said, “Indeed the people *are* one and they all have one language, and this is what they begin to do; now nothing that they propose to do will be withheld from them. Come, let Us go down and there confuse their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.” So the LORD scattered them abroad from there over the face of all the earth, and they ceased building the city. Therefore its name is called Babel, because there the LORD confused the language of all the earth; and from there the LORD scattered them abroad over the face of all the earth.

Not long after the flood, an apparently very large group of people journeyed together from the east and decided to settle in a very fertile area in a plain in the land of Shinar, which would become Babylon. (Babylon is southeast of Mount Ararat.) They became proficient in making bricks and building dwellings. Their sin is described in verse 4: “Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower whose top *is* in the heavens.” This was mainly a decision of the political-religious leaders of which the people heartily approved. The phrase “a tower whose top is in the heavens” simply means a very tall tower. They wanted to build a large ziggurat, which was a symbol of religious and political power in the Middle East as well as with the Indians in

the Americas. Every ziggurat ever discovered was significant to the religious and political structure of that society.

This large group of people was clearly pagan. There is no reason to believe that the godly remnant took part in this blatant rebellion against God. Their great sin and the reason why they wanted to build a large city and a giant ziggurat is mentioned in 4b: “Let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be scattered abroad over the face of the whole earth.”

What was their sin? First, it was pride. The city and the tower would be a permanent monument to their power and achievement. They were seeking the glory of man instead of the glory of God. Second, it was a direct contradiction of and thus a high handed rebellion against God’s command to disperse and cover the face of the whole earth. God tells them to disperse and they say, “We will not. We will build a localized unitary civilization. We will build a giant empire here and now. Dominion over the whole earth means nothing to us.” They placed themselves directly against God’s stated plan for mankind.

In fact, the singular city of man and the giant singular tower (a religious/political structure) were in essence to be visible symbols of their unity. Leupold says, “The tower was to provide the rallying point and to be at the same time a token of their union of purpose.”⁹ They sought unity and security in man’s ingenuity and effort instead of obedience to God’s Word. They believed they could attain salvation through human autonomy and works instead of faith in God and His Word. They desired an apostate, anti-God—religious, cultural, political and linguistic unity. Man wanted to make a name for himself autonomously apart from God’s law, revelation and plan. Although they were rank pagans, they were self-conscious humanists. By uniting mankind into a monolithic force in one giant city-state, they were seeking the unity of their god—humanity.

Thus, third, it was a form of idolatry—an early form of humanism. Gary North writes,

Again, citing Rushdoony: “The Tower of Babel was an attempt to force this apostate thesis of ultimate oneness and equality onto all mankind. There was to be no division among men, and no separation or discrimination, only an absolute unity. The religion and virtue or ethics of Babylon was to be the fact of humanity, and community was simply in the common fact of humanity. In the City of God, community is through the Redeemer in God; in the City of man, the Society of Satan, the ground of communion is a common humanity irrespective any religious or moral differences. All differences must be suppressed in favor of the anonymity of union. The good life and the full life are in and through the State. The theological requirements for the unity of the godhead require this faith in the unity of humanity, its one true god. Hence, ‘Let us build us a city,’ a one-world order, and usher in paradise apart from God.” He [Rushdoony] continues: “In terms of all this the meaning of the proclamation ‘Let us make us a *name*,’ becomes clear: let us be our own blessing, our own Messiah, savior and god. Let us be our own creator, our own ultimate source of meaning and definition. Let there be no value above and beyond us; let man be the source of the definition, not the subject of it. Let man be beyond good and evil, and beyond meaning, since he is himself the source of all definition.”¹⁰

What was God’s judgment or method of dealing with this rebellious situation? In verses 5 and 6a the Triune God observes the situation and notes this unity, “Indeed the people are one and they all have one language.” Then in verse 6b God addresses the situation “and this is what they begin

⁹ H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1942), 387.

¹⁰ Rousas J. Rushdoony, “The Society of Satan,” *Christian Economics* (Aug. 4, 1964) as quoted in Gary North, *Genesis: The Dominion Covenant* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1982), 150-151.

to do; now nothing they propose to do will be withheld from them.” Yahweh states that nothing will be able to restrain this evil plan and its consequences unless this building project and this quest for a humanistic unity are halted. God makes it clear that this humanistic, idolatrous, and godless one-world government civilization must be stopped in order for God’s plan for mankind to go forth. (We must note the broad context. God had recently destroyed the human race for its supreme wickedness. God wants to restrain man’s wicked plans without once again bringing total destruction.) This was in reality a very merciful judgment.

This was a judgment with permanent effect. The separate languages resulted in separate people groups or separate tribes, city states and eventually separate nations. Separate languages, tribes and nations will exist at the second coming of Christ.

It was a brilliant judgment. God could have destroyed the partially built tower and leveled their city. But that would have only solved the problem temporarily. Towers and cities are easily rebuilt. But if the leadership and workforce are divided into separate linguistic groups who cannot communicate with each other, the unity necessary to contribute to the work and finish it is destroyed. The confusion no doubt brought fear and great bewilderment and the different linguistic groups went their separate ways. God’s purpose in thwarting a great pagan, godless empire and in spreading humanity over the whole earth was accomplished.

All of this raises the question: does this section of Scripture condemn interracial marriage as the kinists believe? And does it teach that each racial group must remain completely separate because that is God’s plan for humanity? In answer to this racist nonsense, note the following.

First, the great sin of this passage was the pride of autonomous, godless men seeking security, safety, salvation and meaning through *a humanistic unity and humanistic religion and philosophy* instead of faith in God and obedience to His law-word. *The unity of human language was not intrinsically sinful or wrong.* God created the original human language; and man spoke this language for two thousand years before this time without one reference to it as a sin, and without one reference to God’s displeasure with mankind having a single language. God was always concerned with violations to the His revealed will.

Second, the changing of a solitary language to many languages was a means to an end. Once again, God did not have an ax to grind against one language but confounded the language to divide this evil, unified mass of humanity. To turn this passage into a lesson on interracial relations misses the whole point. God is against man seeking a unified, anti-God one world empire. The many languages stop evil men from achieving this end. This passage does not condemn a Christian in an English nation from learning French, or Dutch or German or even Swahili to God’s glory.

Third, this passage does not speak to the issue of race at all. God changed the languages. There is nothing in the text about a changing of skin colors, hair types or facial features. God did not in an instant make up different races. Different racial features took several centuries of people groups living in isolation in radically different climates with breeding continuing within a specific geographical area. If the kinist wants to argue that different language groups should not intermarry they can try to make that case, but the Bible teaches there is only one race—the human race. By adopting the language of the macro-evolutionists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and then applying it to different nationalities (which treats the various people groups as intrinsically different with regard to their being), the kinist is in line with secular humanistic racist propaganda. Such thinking, obviously, has nothing to do with the Bible.

Keep in mind, the means God used to scatter people over the earth was to “confound their language.” Note there was no mention of marriage, different races or skin colors here. In fact, if

anything was going to help bring nations together again, it would be a reversing of the confusion of language. Thus, to be consistent, if kinists believe nothing should be done to advance a one-world government, then they should not study or teach foreign languages.

Interestingly, Paul and many of the apostles were bilingual and had no problem living according to the *non-sinful* aspects of Greek, Roman or Jewish culture. Paul worked with Barnabas, a Jew, and Timothy, a Gentile. He was not a segregationist either racially or culturally. The issue for Paul was sin or violations of God's moral law. When the Jews separated themselves from the Gentiles at the fellowship meal in Antioch, they were strongly rebuked by Paul for segregationism in the church. Such a practice was an implicit denial of the gospel and the oneness of the body of Christ.

In fact, linguistic analysis (which is a hard science) has both supported the Tower of Babel judgment and demonstrated the absurdity of racism—especially racism based on skin color. At Babel God apparently created the main branches of languages from the one trunk of the original created language. One of these language branches is called Indo-European. Out of this one language several languages evolved over time. We know this by comparing these languages and noting striking similarities. These similarities do not exist between Indo-European and African languages or the Semitic languages. In the Indo-European language group are the Germanic languages (this includes everything from West German, North German, Dutch, Friesian, Flemish, Swedish, Danish, Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon which became English), the Italic (Latin became Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan), the Balto-Slavic (Russian, Polish, Czech, Romanian, Bulgarian, Lithuanian, etc.), Iranian (old Persian, Persian, Avestan), Greek (Hellenic, there was classical Greek, Koine Greek, Byzantine Greek, then modern Greek), Armenian, Albanian, Celtic (Irish, Breton, Gaelic, Welsh) and the Indian (Sanskrit, Middle Indian, Bengali, Hindustani). What is particularly interesting is that the Aryan Indians are linguistically more closely related to Germans than Germans are to the Celtic peoples. Thus, the dark-skinned Indians are more closely related to Germans than are the Irish and the Welsh and the Scottish. Thus, the idea that dark skin is a sign of a curse is complete nonsense. Dark skin is simply better suited to hot, tropical, sunny climates. (The idea that dark skin is a sign of the curse comes from the view that the word Ham means black, or sunburned. This is nonsense. The meaning of the name Ham is not clear.)

Fourth, the whole kinist use of this passage is based on a logical fallacy. The assumption is that any interracial marriage or any cultural mixing (i.e. the non-sinful elements of a culture [e.g., wooden shoes, tacos, stir-fry, burritos, etc.]) is sinful and leads to a one-world government. This is sheer nonsense. It is one thing to work for an anti-Christian one-world secular humanistic super state. It is something different to use Chinese silk or play the sitar or African bongos or marry a Christian that is Korean. Instead of demonstrating that intermarriage between races is sinful or that all cultural mixing is sinful, the racist or the kinist simply assumes with no proof whatsoever that when two Christians of different races get married they contribute to the death of that culture or are furthering Satan's goal of a monolithic anti-Christian state.

Chapter 2: Specific Scriptural Refutations

Not only does the racist and or kinist use of Scriptures as proof texts completely fail to prove their position, but there is abundant proof from Scripture that race alone apart from considerations of faith is not some kind of barrier between Christians or believers. We will look

at several general passages on this and then we will look at interracial marriages of believers as well. This also refutes racist or kinist heretics.

Biblical Examples that allow for the Absorption of Non-Jews into the Covenant People with Full Rights as God's People

In the Old Testament the central issue was faith not blood; the covenant not race. It is crucial that we do not fall into the heresy of the Pharisees which saw a great importance in race or descent from Abraham. While a direct genealogical line from Abraham to David to Christ was crucial, in both Testaments any race could adopt a biblical worldview and culture, join themselves to God's people and intermarry with ethnic Jews. The important issue is not race, but rather faith in Jehovah and His Word. Note the following.

(1) When God called out Abraham, his extended household, which included 318 fighting men, their wives and children and probably a large number of servants, were all circumcised and placed under the covenant. Their race is not specified, but the covenant people were not simply direct descendants of Abraham.

(2) In Exodus 12:38 we read, "A mixed multitude went up with them [the Jews] also, and flocks and herds—a great deal of livestock." There was a motley group that accompanied the Israelites in the Exodus from Egypt. Although this group would all die in the wilderness with the possible exception of Caleb the Kenizzite (Gen. 15:19; Josh. 14:6), their children entered the promised land and were absorbed into the non-Levitical tribes of Israel. The fact that this group is called a mixed multitude indicates that "some were Egyptians, and some of other nations that had resided in Egypt, and who on various accounts, might choose to go along with the children of Israel; some through intermarriages with them, being loath to part with their relations...others on account of righteousness, being proselytes of righteousness, and others through worldly interest, the land of Egypt being by the plagues a most desolate place."¹¹

Some kinists attempt to get around these kinds of passages by arguing that non-Jewish peoples who converted to Jehovah did not intermarry with Jews and were not absorbed into the Jewish nation. They had their own separate communities and remained separate racially. If this scenario really happened, then what happened to these communities? Did they all apostatize and fall away? Were they simply lost to history? Did millions of people vanish or move away? Kinists are quick to attempt to circumvent the clear teaching of Scripture with arbitrary assertions. But, they do not think things through. If there were very large communities of non-racial Jews living segregated from the Jews in the suburbs or in ghettos or on the outskirts, then they would be known to history. But, they are never mentioned. The reason is they never existed. They were all absorbed into the nation and lost their separate racial and national identity. For them *faith and salvation was more important than blood and the fatherland*.

(3) That non-Israelites—even Egyptians who were descendants of Ham—could join Israel and be absorbed into the covenant nation is proven by the Law (as we will see in a moment) and historical examples. Take Caleb, for example. He is clearly identified as a Kennizite. The Kennezeitites were a prominent Edomite clan that claimed Eliphaz, the oldest son of Esau (Gen. 36:11, 15, 42; 1 Ch. 1:36, 53), as ancestor. Jephunneh, the father of Caleb, was a Kennizite (Nu. 32:12; Josh. 14:6, 14). At some point in their history, they settled in the Negeb area. While it is true that they were still essentially Semites, this point is irrelevant in that only

¹¹ John Gill, 1:377.

Canaan received the curse, not all the descendants of Ham. We are told explicitly in Numbers 13:6 that Caleb's family was incorporated into the tribe of Judah.

(4) There is also Rahab the harlot, who because of her faith in God betrayed her own people and joined herself to Israel. In Matthew 1:5, we are told that she married Salmon, a man of Judah, and begot Boaz. We are not sure of the racial characteristics of the residents of Jericho at the time of its conquest. The city had been conquered a number of times and had at one time been completely dominated by Canaanites. It is likely that Jericho was a rag-tag combination of Canaanite with perhaps some nomadic Semitic blood. But, the point is that Rahab was absorbed into the tribe of Judah, even though she was not a Jew. This example is such a clear case of a godly Jew (Salmon) marrying outside of his race that kinists claim that Rahab was a Jew who just happened to live in Jericho. Aside from the fact that this assertion is purely arbitrary and has no basis in Scripture or a shred of support from biblical scholars, it contradicts the account in Joshua. Rahab was not a godly Jewess who lived undercover in Jericho, she was a whore. She made a living through pagan ritual prostitution. To argue that she was a Jew is ludicrous.

In addition, if you read what Rahab says to the spies in Joshua 2:9-13, it is crystal clear that she was not a Jew:

And she said unto the men, I know that the LORD hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you. For we have heard how the LORD dried up the water of the Red sea for you, when ye came out of Egypt; and what ye did unto the two kings of the Amorites, that were on the other side Jordan, Sihon and Og, whom ye utterly destroyed. And as soon as we had heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man, because of you: for the LORD your God, he is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath. Now therefore, I pray you, swear unto me by the LORD, since I have shewed you kindness, that ye will also shew kindness unto my father's house, and give me a true token: And that ye will save alive my father, and my mother, and my brethren, and my sisters, and all that they have, and deliver our lives from death.

Note: a) Rahab contrasts *us* (the people of Jericho) with *you* (Israel). b) Her knowledge of Israel and their God is only hearsay from what has happened. Clearly she had no prior knowledge of the true God. c) She speaks about *your* God (i.e. Israel's God). She does not yet regard herself as one of God's people. d) She begs them to allow her and her family to join themselves to God's people and avoid God's judgment on Jericho. If she and her family were Jewish this conversation would have not taken place. The kinists are grasping at straw in order to support the unsupportable. By the way, Matthew Henry says she was a woman of Canaan, as does John Gill and Matthew Poole.

This example alone completely destroys racist ideas against interracial marriages between people of the same faith, who live in obedience to God's law-word. The racist or kinist must assert the absurd otherwise their whole racist paradigm falls to the ground. The example of Rahab the harlot accords well with Paul's statement in Romans 2:28-29: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."

(5) We also have the example of Uriah the Hittite. Hittites are Indo-Europeans who came from Asia Minor. They at one time conquered the northern area of Syria and incorporated it into their territory. They were not Semitic, although there may have been some intermarriage with

Canaanites and Semites in the Syrian dependencies. Uriah the Hittite was an officer in David's army who was one of the elite corps called "the thirty." Many scholars do not believe Uriah was his original name, but he changed his name to Uriah (which means Jehovah is light) when he became a full Israelite citizen. He adopted the name to indicate that he was a worshiper of Jehovah. Interestingly, his wife Bathsheba was the daughter of Eliam who was also a member of the elite "thirty" (2 Sa. 23:34). That Uriah was a godly man is without question (see 2 Sam. 11:11). So there is the example of Uriah the Hittite who married into the tribe of Judah, who owned property in the capital and was an important military official. He is even mentioned by Matthew as the husband or former husband of Bathsheba in the genealogy of Christ (1:6). Now if interracial marriage was wrong, and other races could not become part of Israel's nation and culture and people, then how can Uriah the Hittite be explained?

If the racist kinist paradigm were correct, would not King David who wanted Bathsheba for himself have pressed the issue of the immorality of Bathsheba's marriage to a non-Jew, a non-Semite? Yet, we see none of this because the racist kinist view is not taught in the Scriptures. We should rather follow John the baptizer who explicitly told the Pharisees and Sadducees that descent from Abraham was worthless if it is not accompanied by obedience to the covenant law that flows from genuine conversion (i.e. regeneration and saving faith). "Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance: And think not to say within yourselves, 'We have Abraham to our father': for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham" (Mt. 3:8-9).

(6) There is also the example of Ruth the Moabite who married Boaz, a godly Jew and was a direct ancestor of Jesus Christ. The racist kinist will argue that this marriage and incorporation was okay because Ruth was fellow Semite—they were technically of the same people. This argument which is racial and therefore racist is easily refuted by the text. Ruth and Naomi did not think in terms of race, but rather in terms of faith in the true God. Listen to Ruth's argument as to why Naomi should take her back to Israel:

And she [Naomi] said, "Behold, thy sister in law is gone back unto her people, and unto her gods: return thou after thy sister in law." And Ruth said, "Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: Where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried: the LORD do so to me, and more also, if ought but death part thee and me."

Note that both Ruth and Naomi do not think like kinists. If Ruth were a kinist we would expect this kind of argumentation: "Look, Naomi, I am a Semite like you. Your people are my people. We are one blood. You must take me in for we are of the same race; and, because we are the same race I can intermarry with Jews. Kith and kin baby—all the way."

No. Ruth and Naomi did not think that way. The assumption behind Ruth's amazing statement is that people are defined by faith. "Look, Naomi, I know my people are a bunch of unbelieving idolaters; that, therefore, they are not the covenant people. But, I believe in the God of Israel. Therefore, your people [the Jews] shall be my people. I can join your people by a profession of faith and by submitting to your law."

The kinist goes to Scripture not to be instructed by it, but rather comes with a set of racist presuppositions. Thus, he must repeatedly ignore its great exaltation of Christ's grace and mercy in saving and integrating heathen non-Jews like Rahab and Ruth into the nation and the crucial role of faith in these passages. Instead, the passages are twisted and perverted to accommodate a

racist paradigm. The lesson of these non-Jews coming into the covenant nation is that *faith is far more important than race or nationality*. As Paul says,

...For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed... And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? As he saith also in Hosea, "I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved" (Romans 9:6-8, 23-25; cf. 9:26-33).

John Murray writes,

The Israel distinguished from the Israel of natural descent is the *true Israel*. They are indeed "of Israel" but not coextensive with the latter. It is in accord with our Lord's usage to make this kind of distinction within a designated class. He distinguished between those who were disciples and those *truly* disciples (cf. John 8:30-32). He spoke of Nathanael as "truly an Israelite" (John 1:47). If we use Paul's own language, this Israel is Israel "according to the Spirit" (Gal. 4:29) and "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6:26), although in the latter passage he is no doubt including the people of God of all nations. The purpose of this distinction is to show that the covenantal promise of God did not have respect to Israel after the flesh but to this true Israel and that, therefore, the unbelief and rejection of ethnic Israel as a whole in no way interfered with the fulfillment of God's covenant purpose and promise.¹²

Galatians 3:6-9 says,

Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham... There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

"Clearly, the apostle once again stresses the fact that 'belonging to the seed of Abraham' is not determined by physical descent but by faith (Ridderbos, *op. cit.*, p. 150) 'In Christ' the wall of separation between Jew and Gentile no longer exists.... Throughout the whole vast earth the Lord recognizes *one*, and *only one*, nation as his own, namely, the nation of believers (1 Peter 2:9). These are Abraham's seed."¹³ Further, Paul connects the covenant promise not to Israel indiscriminately but to Christ directly: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ" (Gal. 3:16). (We will discuss Ruth some more in conjunction with our consideration of the law's provisions.)

(7) The book of Esther records that during the exile a large group of Gentiles joined themselves to the Jewish people. Esther 8:17 says, "And in every province and city, wherever the

¹² John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 65), 2:9-10.

¹³ William Hendriksen, *Galatians and Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967-68), 1:151.

king's command and decree came, the Jews had joy and gladness, a feast and a holiday. Then many of the people of the land became Jews, because fear of the Jews fell upon them." Note the text says they became Jews. That is, they embraced the Jewish religion, submitted to the rites and ceremonies and were circumcised. They went through the necessary process to become part of the Jewish people. D. J. Clines writes,

Here they are the various nations of the Persian empire. Their conversion to Judaism cannot be represented as insincere, for there is still no advantage to be gained in being a Jew; the first decree still stands, and the second decree gives the Jews rights only against those who attack them. Their **fear** is not that they will suffer at the hands of the Jews, for they are safe if they are not enemies of the Jews. Their fear must be a religious awe such as falls upon the inhabitants of Canaan (Jos. 2:9) and Transjordan (Exod. 15:16) and Egypt (Ps. 105:38). This uninvited proselytism is presented by the narrator as the climax of the success story that has occupied the chapter...that the unseen hand of God should so conspicuously rescue the Jews from disaster that even Gentiles should discern where the divine favour lay and spontaneously convert to Judaism—what more fitting climax to the story of the rise of a Jewish girl to the Persian throne?¹⁴

This passage in Esther reminds us of the great prophecy of Zechariah 8:23: "Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you."

The Provision of God's Law for the Incorporation of Non-Jewish Peoples

He that is wounded in the stones, or hath his privy member cut off, shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD. A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the LORD. An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the LORD; even to their tenth generation shall they not enter into the congregation of the LORD for ever: Because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came forth out of Egypt; and because they hired against thee Balaam the son of Beor of Pethor of Mesopotamia, to curse thee. Nevertheless the LORD thy God would not hearken unto Balaam; but the LORD thy God turned the curse into a blessing unto thee, because the LORD thy God loved thee. Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever. Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother: thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land. The children that are begotten of them shall enter into the congregation of the LORD in their third generation (Deuteronomy 23:1-8).

Here is a section of Scripture that explicitly contradicts the racist concepts of nationalism and the church found within kinism. In verses one through eight we have a discussion dealing with the right of full citizenship in the congregation of Israel. Before we comment on how it disproves kinism we need to make some observations.

Regarding the Ammonites or Moabites, there seems to be a complete prohibition on them ever joining the assembly of Israel. This seems to contradict the book of Ruth and her marriage to Boaz that we considered earlier. The Talmud and a number of commentators following the

¹⁴ D. J. Clines, *The New Century Bible Commentary: Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 1992), 318-319.

Talmud argue that the prohibition of citizenship only extends to the males of these lands but not the females. The problem with this interpretation is that in Nehemiah 13, Jews who had married *women* of Ashdod, Ammon and Moab had to put away their wives.

Another offered solution is that Ruth and her children were extraordinary instances and that God whenever He pleased could make certain exceptions in this law. This would then seem to apply to cases of great faith and notable occasions. There is not the slightest hint of anyone objecting to David as the King because his grandmother was a Moabite. Moreover, the book of Ruth presents Boaz as an intelligent, godly man whose act of kindness and marriage to Ruth is commendable. Thus, we need to proceed with extreme caution in our interpretation of Deuteronomy 23:3ff.

In addition, it is noteworthy that the account in Nehemiah 13 makes it perfectly clear that these foreign women were *pagan* (i.e. unbelieving) women. Nehemiah 13:27 says, "Should we hear of your doing all this great evil, transgressing against our God by marrying pagan women?" Ruth was a Moabite by birth but she was no longer a pagan woman. We must be careful not to interpret Scripture in a manner in which it contradicts itself. Also note Nehemiah 13:30, "Thus I cleansed them of everything pagan."

Still others argue that although full citizenship could be denied for 10 generations, true converts could attach themselves to the nation without full rights. (Does one define *forever* in terms of 10 generations? [the word "forever" in Hebrew can refer to an indefinite lengthy period of time] Or does 10 generations symbolize forever [i.e. time without end]?)

Whatever interpretation one holds the prohibition is not based on race (indeed the Moabites and the Ammonites were Semites closely related to Israel being descended from Lot [Gen. 19:30-38]). The prohibition is based on *ethics* not race. The Moabites are criticized for their attempt to use Balaam to bring down the curse of God on the Israelites (see Num. 22-24). The Ammonites are criticized because in a time of real need they harshly refused to offer hospitality (bread and water) to the Israelites. Thus, even though Semitic and much closer to Israel racially than the Egyptians, they receive harsher judgment.

The treatment of Edomites and Egyptians was to quite different. P. C. Craigie writes,

Edomites and Egyptians were not to be abominated, and could be granted access to the assembly of the Lord in the course of time (vv. 8-9). The verb *abominate* indicates an attitude directly opposite to the loving kindness (*hesed*) to be expressed and experienced within the covenant community. Neither Edomites nor Egyptians were to be abominated, but they were to be treated with some respect. The Edomite was a *brother* of the Israelite; according to Hebrew tradition, the Edomites were descendants of Edom/Esau. The sojourn in Egypt, though in its latter days a time of hardship, had nevertheless been the period in which the growth toward Israel's nationhood had begun (26:5). Thus, for varying reasons, Edomites and Egyptians were to be treated differently from Ammonites and Moabites. If either Edomites or Egyptians took up residence in Israel, then the children of the third generation of immigrants could be granted admission to the assembly of the Lord. After the lapse of three generations, there would be no doubt that the Edomites and Egyptians resident in Israel were genuine in their desire to become full members of the worshipping family of God.¹⁵

What the kinist or racist needs to explain is why are the Egyptians, which are descendants of Ham, not only treated much kinder than the Moabites and Ammonites who were Semites; but also how is it that Egyptian Hamites are allowed to be full Israelite citizens after only 3

¹⁵ P. C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 298.

generations? It is obvious from this section of Scripture that race is essentially irrelevant whereas ethics or the lack thereof especially in reference to the treatment of God's people is very important. The kinist attempts to deal with this devastating proof against their position by arguing that the Egyptians were Hyksos-Semites and this allowed them to be engrafted into Israel. This argument is pitiful for the following reasons.

First, while it is true that the Hyksos rulers bore Semitic names, the Hyksos domination was brief (about 150 years) and it was a small ruling class, not a mass migration of Hyksos into Egypt. In addition, the Hyksos were allied with the Nubians (a black empire) and if the kinist wants to assume assimilation between the Hyksos and the Egyptians, then there is no reason to rule out assimilation with the black Nubians also. In any case, the Egyptians were predominately Hamite in their stock, so the kinist must admit that race was not a crucial factor. In addition, many reputable scholars place the Hyksos in a time frame that makes the kinist argument irrelevant.

Second, the kinist argument is based on the assumption which we have already disproved that all the descendants of Ham were under some kind of curse. That is not true. The racist interpretation of the curse on Canaan lies behind a lot of their thinking.

Third, if the kinist or racist argument is that the Egyptians became acceptable for Israelite citizenship quickly because of Hyksos intermarriage and genetic mixture of Hamite and Hyksos peoples, then American blacks should be acceptable to them as well because the vast majority of blacks that descended from slaves have Scottish, Irish or English blood in them due to the sexual escapades of white slaveholders. In addition, how can the racist kinist worldview be applied to nations such as America that have been a melting pot of different races for 350 years? Should we turn over the nation to American Indians who are a different race and were here long before the Spanish, English and German peoples? How do you define the racial makeup of a person who is black, Chinese, Bulgarian, Portuguese and Swedish? I know people like that.

Interracial Marriage in the Old Testament

One of the most offensive, unbiblical aspects of the racist kinist movement is their teaching that no interracial marriage is permitted even among solid professing Christians. This view as we shall see is unbiblical and absurd.

Since we have already noted the marriage of Rahab the harlot who was likely a Canaanite and Ruth the Moabitess, we will consider a few more. Joseph, whose two sons became tribes of Israel (Manasseh, the firstborn, and Ephraim) was married to an Egyptian, Asenath, the daughter of Poti-Pherah priest of On (Gen. 41:46). This name is not Hyksos or Semitic but Egyptian. Two tribes of Israel were half Semitic and half Egyptian; that is, Hamite blood flowed through their veins. I do not know how a kinist would explain how half ethnic Egyptians could be the basis of Israelite tribes. To an orthodox Christian it does not really matter because having the faith of Abraham is the crucial issue.

Then we have the marriage of Moses, who God used to write down His law, to an African, an Ethiopian (Nu. 12:1). When Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses' authority and used Moses' wife as an excuse, God struck Miriam with leprosy (Nu. 12:10).

The kinists, following Calvin and a few others, identify this wife of Moses as the Midianite (Ex. 2:16ff) and thus they argue that Moses married a Semite. This interpretation is highly unlikely, however, for the following reasons. First, although Habakkuk 3:7 and a few Assyrian texts seem to identify Midian and Cushan, Cush normally refers to Ethiopia. This is

certainly how the word is used in Genesis. Thus we should not assign a different meaning to the word in Numbers also written by Moses. A. Noordlzii adds this important information:

Moses has married a Cushite woman. The rabbinical tradition has changed this into “a beautiful wife” to clear Moses of marriage to an Ethiopian (Onkelos, Rashi). Calvin and others believed that this refers to Zipporah (e.g., P. Heinisch, *Numeri*, p. 52; H. M. Weiner, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 1928, p. 309). But neither solution is possible. “Cush” is the Hebraization of the Egyptian Kosh, the name of the region between Assuan and Meru, north of what we call Ethiopia; this region has been inhabited by Nubian tribes with an African culture since 2200 B.C. It is indeed true that in the Old Testament a portion of southern Arabia is called Cush (see 2 Chron. 14:9; 21:16); but the Midianite woman Zipporah came from the northern region of the Sinai peninsula (Exod. 3:1; 18:1), and according to 1 Kings 11:18; Habakkuk 3:7 from near Paran. Moses has thus married a second time, probably a woman who belonged to the “many other people” of Exodus 12:38 (Rashi claims that Moses first divorced Zipporah). The Midrash states that the Cushite woman was Tharbis, daughter of the king of Ethiopia, from Meru (Josephus, *Antiquities*, II, 10. 2).

Miriam and Aaron complain to Moses about this marriage (both, in spite of the singular verb; cf. Jer. 12:4b; Esth. 7:3b; 9:29a). But apparently Miriam was the instigator, while Aaron once again gives evidence of a weak character (cf. Exod. 32:2ff., 22ff.; Num. 16:11). Miriam cannot have been upset because Moses married a non-Israelite woman, since Zipporah was also an “alien.” Nor can she have been hurt in her national pride, since such marriage were not at all uncommon in Israel (see 1 Chron. 2:34). I conclude from verse 2 that Moses’ marriage to the Cushite woman was nothing more than an excuse.¹⁶

R. K. Harrison writes,

kus has been identified with a region of continental Africa, either Ethiopia (KJV) or Nubia by some authorities, but alternatively with the territory of the Kassites (Akk. *Kassu*) in Mesopotamia by others. According to Isa. 18:1 Cush was on the Nile, while in Esther 1:1 Cush represented the southern boundary of Egypt. If the “land of Cush” (Gen. 2:13) did indeed refer to Kassite holdings, it is rather curious that the Kassites are not mentioned elsewhere in the OT, whereas the peoples to the south of Egypt were. If the woman whom Moses had married was indeed a descendant of Cush, she could trace her line back to Ham, son of Noah (Gen. 10:1). The Hamites lived principally in Nubia or Ethiopia.¹⁷

Second, the Zipporah argument does not make any sense whatsoever. If it was Zipporah, Moses’ first wife, then Miriam was complaining about a woman that Moses had been married to for decades. But, if Zipporah had died and Moses married an African woman, the complaint fits perfectly. In addition, the expression “whom he had married” or more literally, “for he had taken a Cushite wife” sounds as though this was a recent event. Keil & Delitzsch write,

Miriam found an occasion for the manifestation of her discontent in the Cushite wife whom Moses had taken. This wife cannot have been Zipporah the Midianite: for even though Miriam might possibly have called her a Cushite, whether because the Cushite tribes dwelt in Arabia, or in a contemptuous sense as a Moor or Hamite, the author would certainly not have confirmed this at all events inaccurate, if not contemptuous epithet, by adding, “for he had taken a Cushite wife;” to say nothing of the improbability of Miriam having made the marriage which her

¹⁶ A. Noordtjiz, *Numbers* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 106-7.

¹⁷ R. K. Harrison, *Numbers* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1990), 194-195.

brother had contracted when he was a fugitive in a foreign land, long before he was called by God, the occasion of reproach so many years afterwards. It would be quite different if, a short time before, probably after the death of Zipporah, he had contracted a second marriage with a Cushite woman, who either sprang from the Cushites dwelling in Arabia, or from the foreigners who had come out of Egypt along with the Israelites. This marriage would not have been wrong in itself, as God had merely forbidden the Israelites to marry the daughters of Canaan (Ex. xxxiv. 16).¹⁸

Another argument is to admit that she was a Cushite but then to say that does not make it right. But, if it was wrong, then did not Miriam and Aaron have a legitimate complaint? Would not God honor his law-word? Kinist attempts to circumvent the passages that clearly teach the lawfulness of interracial marriages are desperate and foolish. If Joseph can marry an Egyptian, Moses an African, Boaz a Moabite, Bathsheba a Hittite, etc. without God's disapprobation because faith makes a person a true Jew (Rom. 9:6-8; Gal. 3:6-9; 6:16; Eph. 2:15; 1 Pet. 2:9-10, etc.), then it cannot be wrong today. Racism and bigotry should have no acceptance whatsoever in the church of Christ.

Chapter 3: New Testament Evidence and Philosophical Considerations

In our two previous lectures we defined kinism and spent a good deal of time looking at how they interpreted Scripture in order to justify their views. We noted that they not only violate standard Protestant procedures of interpretation but also came to conclusions that contradict virtually every orthodox scholar or commentator since the Reformation began. The great issue in the Old Testament was faith, not race. One could become part of the covenant people if one believed in the God of Israel, had a credible profession of faith and submitted to circumcision (i.e. males). We also proved beyond a shadow of doubt that interracial marriages were fully acceptable as long as one married a believer. There are so many examples of godly people marrying a believer of a different race in Scripture that only someone who is completely blinded by unbiblical presuppositions could deny its lawfulness. Since the past two lectures dealt almost exclusively with Old Testament passages today we focus on evidence against kinism/racism from within the New Testament. We will see that the New Testament Scriptures support what we have been teaching against racism from every conceivable angle.

Interracial Marriage in the New Testament

In the one specific passage on who a believer is allowed to marry in the epistles, Paul says that a Christian can marry anyone they want to as long as he or she is a Christian: "A wife is bound by law as long as her husband lives; but if her husband dies, she is at liberty to be married to whom she wishes, only in the Lord" (1 Cor. 7:39).¹⁹ If it were unlawful for Jew to marry a

¹⁸ C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 1:3:75.

¹⁹ The vast majority of commentators take the expression "in the Lord" as referring to someone united to Christ by faith. Paul insists that believers only marry persons who are already converted to Christ (see Matthew Poole, 3:563; Charles Hodge, 134; Christian Friedrich Kling, 164; A. R. Fausset, vol. 3, part 2, 304; Leon Morris, 122-123; James Moffet, 101; Simon J. Kistemaker, 255; W. Harold Mare, 10:237; etc.). A few commentators prefer the idea that "only in the Lord" means essentially according to the fear of God or in a Christian manner (cf. John Calvin, 1:270; John Gill, 8:655; and R. C. H. Lenski, 331). Charles Hodge notes that even if one takes the view that "in the Lord" means in a Christian manner, it would still forbid intermarrying with the heathen.

Greek or Roman or vice versa, then given the fact that many churches had both Jewish and Gentile members and virtually every substantial city in the Roman Empire had a Jewish community in it, we would expect Paul to forbid interracial marriage if it were wrong. But following the teaching of the Old Testament, Paul does not have a problem with it at all. For the apostle, the issue is faith. If Paul was a kinist, we would expect him to say, “You can marry anyone you want as long as they are a Christian of your own race or ethnic group.”

The kinist has an argument for this passage that goes something like this, “This passage does not contradict our position at all because Paul is only giving a brief statement here and is not giving a full exposition on who a Christian can marry. After all, the apostle says nothing about marrying one’s mother, or aunt, or sister or daughter. You surely do not believe someone can marry his blood relative as long as they are a Christian do you?” Of all the attempts of kinists to circumvent this passage, this is their best argument. It, however, does not prove their case at all. Why is it unnecessary for Paul in this verse to stop and give a brief dissertation on the biblical prohibitions on the degrees of consanguinity? It is not needed because it is so clearly dealt with in the moral law of God (see Lev. 18). When Paul or anyone else says marry a Christian, it is assumed they are speaking of someone with a credible profession of faith and not someone living in scandalous or habitual sin. In addition, there is a very important difference between the biblical prohibitions on the degrees of consanguinity and the kinist/racist prohibitions on interracial marriage. The prohibited degrees of consanguinity are clearly set forth in Scripture while there is nothing at all forbidding the marriage of two *believers* of different ethnic backgrounds. Moreover, in our last lecture we surveyed the many godly people who married non-Hebrews (e.g., Moses who married a Cushite; the wife of Caleb; Salmon who married Rahab the harlot; Boaz who married Ruth; Joseph who married an Egyptian; Bathsheba was married to Uriah the Hittite; etc.). We also noted the law’s provision for the incorporation of non-Jewish people into the covenant nation (Dt. 23:1-8). Moreover, we disproved the kinist perversion of Nehemiah 13 by pointing out that this chapter identifies the foreign women as practicing pagans not believers (Neh. 13:27). If the kinist wants to circumvent the explicit teaching of 1 Corinthians 7:39, he must have solid exegetical proof not simply racist fantasies.

Theological Considerations

There are a number of sections of Scripture in the New Testament that either imply or state in plain terms that Christ by His perfect redemption has eliminated the old divisions between Jews and Gentiles. Some of these passages deal not only with the fact that Jew and Gentile are saved in the same way (i.e. through faith in Jesus Christ *alone* apart from the works of the law), but also the result of that salvation on the body life of the church (i.e. the New Testament church is no longer associated with one nationality, but is now multinational and multiethnic). Jews and Gentiles are *part of the same local churches with full equality* and status. They all worship together, eat together, fellowship together, take the sacraments together and are all one body. No one that believes in Christ is to be excluded from the local body life of the church based on race or ethnicity. (This teaching is anticipated in Christ’s statement in Matthew 21:43, “Therefore I say to you, the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a nation bearing the fruits of it.” The word “nation” or “people” (*ethnos*) refers to the church consisting of Jews and Gentiles. It is the great spiritual nation of all those who believe no matter what nationality. It is “the holy nation,” “the peculiar people” (1 Pet. 2:9).

In the kinist/racist paradigm, there is equality when it comes to salvation, and there may even be a kind of equality between churches of different ethnic groups, but (in their view) God intended for all races to worship separately in their own black or Mexican or Asian churches. They turn ethnic and cultural differences into existential absolutes that must be maintained. (This comes from their perverted understanding of the phrase “according to one’s kind” in Genesis 1:21, 24, 25 and their bizarre understanding of the Tower of Babel incident.) In this section we will look at some of the best passages against racism and kinist “separate but equal” ideas.

Acts 2:5-11

A section of Scripture that speaks tangentially to the kinist doctrine is Acts 2:5-11, where God filled the disciples with the Holy Spirit and they were enabled by the Holy Spirit to speak in foreign languages that they themselves did not know. The account notes that diaspora Jews and proselytes from virtually every nation or ethnic group within the civilized world heard the apostles speaking their own language. This incident implies that the work of Christ applied in history will, in a certain sense, eventually counter the division of mankind at the Tower of Babel. This does not mean that different languages or nations will be abolished but that the enmities, diverse worldviews and hatreds will be eliminated by the Spirit’s application of the death and resurrection of Christ to the world. The middle wall of partition has been broken down at the cross and thus we are to consider people of other races, nations and languages who are Bible-believing Christians to be our brothers. They are one with us in Christ and our relationship to them is far more intimate, precious and important than even our closest heathen blood relatives. We are all citizens of heaven while they [our heathen relatives] are children of hell.

Ephesians 2:11-22

All of this is set forth specifically in Ephesians 2:11-22:

Therefore remember that you, once Gentiles in the flesh—who are called Uncircumcision by what is called the Circumcision made in the flesh by hands—that at that time you were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of separation, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, *that is*, the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances, so as to create in Himself one new man *from* the two, *thus* making peace, and that He might reconcile them both to God in one body through the cross, thereby putting to death the enmity. And He came and preached peace to you who were afar off and to those who were near. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father. Now, therefore, you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, having been built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief *cornerstone*, in whom the whole building, being fitted together, grows into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are being built together for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit.

At one time the Gentiles were strangers or aliens from Israel. The Gentiles were in a very low, unprivileged position. They were “Christless, stateless, friendless, hopeless, and Godless.”²⁰ They were strangers from the covenant made with Israel. But through the sacrificial death of Christ, Gentiles have been made fellow citizens with all the Jewish saints. “In any part of the Christian church all national distinctions are swept away, and we are no more foreigners and strangers, but fellow citizens of the saints and of the household of God.... God has leveled up the outcast and despised Gentiles and has admitted us to all the privileges of his ancient covenant, making us heirs of Abraham.... He has given us all the blessings which belong to Abraham’s seed, because we too possess like precious faith as the father of the faithful himself had”²¹

1 Corinthians 12:12-25

Paul says that the Gentiles are no longer aliens or strangers from the covenant nation. The middle wall of partition (the ceremonial law) that separated the two peoples is gone. The two are now *one new man*. They are now *one body*. They are all part of *one temple* that is growing in history. One man, one body, one temple—all signifying the organic unity of the church of Christ. The apostle emphasizes this point in 1 Corinthians: “For as the body is one and has many members, but all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also *is* Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free—and have all been made to drink into one Spirit” (12:12-13). Paul goes on to explain how each person has a particular function in the body for the greater good of all and that no one should have a negative view of any part of the body no matter how seemingly insignificant; and then says, “that there should be no schism in the body, but *that* the members should have the same care for one another” (12:25).

Jesus Christ brings a unity and harmony between different racial groups by His Spirit. There are distinctions in gifts, callings and functions in the one body, but there are no ethnic or racial distinctions where believers are separated from each other. They can all serve as church officers, all receive the sacraments together, all eat the love feast together, all fellowship and pray with each other and all sit together to hear the preached Word. Their spiritual unity in Christ has overcome ethnic animosities and segregationism. Paul specifically mentions Jews and Greeks because these groups were not friendly to each other in the ancient world. The Jews would not allow a Gentile to even enter their home. They would not eat with a Gentile. The Jews regarded themselves as a superior race or people; the Gentiles were considered to be on a lower level.

The kinist cannot circumvent this passage because when Paul talks about gifts, he makes it quite clear that the diversity existing in unity must take place at the local church level. Thus the kinist contention for “equal but separate” is clearly unscriptural. Kistemaker writes, “Here Paul stresses the unity of the church in its diverse forms. He notes the racial, cultural, and social differences that existed in the Corinthian church: there were Jews and Greeks, slaves and free. Regardless of their status and position in life, these people came together to worship God in one church. If the church should practice discrimination, it would be in direct conflict with the law of love. All people who are spiritually renewed in Christ are equal to one another.”²² Charles Hodge

²⁰ William Hendriksen, *Exposition of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958), 129.

²¹ C. H. Spurgeon, as quoted in Gordon H. Clark, *Ephesians* (Jefferson, MD: Trinity Foundation, 1985), 90.

²² Simon J. Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 430.

concurr: “*Unto one body means so as to constitute one body (eis, unto, expressing the result). No matter how great may have been the previous difference, whether they were Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, by this baptism of the Spirit, all who experience it are merged into one body; they are all intimately and organically united as partaking of the same life.... And this internal spiritual union manifests itself in the profession of the same faith, and in all acts of Christian fellowship.*”²³

This profound theological discussion leads Paul to the logical conclusion “that there should be no schism [or division] in the body” (12:25). The different ethnic groups and social classes that make up the local congregation must express their Christian love and concern for each other by avoiding disruption and disunion. The kinist apologist is advocating a position that is diametrically opposed to the explicit teaching of Paul. The kinist’s racist paradigm places a no admittance sign on the “white” congregation’s door to blacks, Mexicans, Asians, Indians, etc... The kinist definition of peace and unity is radically unbiblical and unloving because it is subordinated to segregationism. The idea of love as service, law-keeping, fellowship and mutual aid is replaced by, “You are a Christian; a child of God saved by grace alone. Just make sure you keep yourself, your children and your kind far away from us white Christians.” The kinist has so perverted Christian theology that he lives in an Orwellian world where love is hate and hate is love; where God saves people of different nationalities in order to segregate them from each other as though different cultures carry a contagious disease to each other. Paul emphatically rejects such nonsense. Schism means division and division within local congregations is sinful and results in alienation of feelings. The kinist speaks of love and equality while treating other racial groups with contempt. How they justify this view when many churches during the apostolic period in the Greco-Roman world consisted of Jew and Gentiles of various ethnic backgrounds is puzzling. (Note, for example, Paul’s greeting of the saints in Rome, [Rom. 16:2-16], where he uses Greek, Roman, Latin names and where he specifically mentions Jews [e.g., “Herodian, my kinsman,” v. 11]. While we cannot be completely sure about ethnic background from names because various ethnic groups would often use more than one name [in addition, people would adopt names to fit in better with the Greco-Roman culture]; nevertheless, the list demonstrates that churches in the apostolic era consisted of a varied ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The kinist could respond by saying that Europeans, Jews and Romans are all white so this argument is irrelevant. If they do, then they have exposed themselves as racists who base their views primarily on skin color. Moreover, according to tradition, Rufus [v. 13] was one of the sons of Simon the Cyrene, a citizen of North Africa. The greeting indicates a fully integrated church community with Europeans, Jews and Greeks all working and fellowshiping together. In the greeting we see that at least five house churches are addressed [vs. 5, 10, 11, 14 and 15]. Both the churches and what we would call a presbytery were fully integrated racially.) The kinist is simply taking a *pagan, white-racist, southern-cracker* concept of culture and imposing it on society and the church. They are the white versions of Malcolm X on this issue.

Galatians 3:28

Another passage that speaks to the issue of how different racial groups should be viewed by the church is Galatians 3:28, “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.” Note that this statement comes after a section where the law as a tutor (the Mosaic administration of the covenant of

²³ Charles Hodge, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 254-255.

grace) is said to be abolished with the coming of Christ. The law with its ceremonies and strict rules of separation has been done away because the kingdom has been removed from the nation of Israel and given to the multinational church. We are all sons of God through faith and the moral laws that are the standard of our sanctification are the same for all peoples. The proof of this is that men of every nation have been baptized into Christ and have put on Christ. What is important is not one's nationality but whether one is clothed with Christ and His righteousness. For the purpose of this study we will only consider the division of ethnicity or nationality.

Paul's statement is structured both negatively and positively. The first half speaks negatively of boundaries that divided people in the ancient world. There are three contrasts of inequality. These three pairs of opposites are intended to cover the three main divisions of human life: one's ethnicity or nationality; one's economic status; and one's gender. The second half speaks positively of the new redemptive reality that all believers participate in because all are one in Christ Jesus. Let us consider each of these categories in turn.

The division between the Jews and Gentiles is placed first. This was the main issue affecting the Galatian churches and Paul places it in the forefront. The apostle uses the word *ellen* which "in the NT always means a Greek of Gentile origin."²⁴ "*Greek* is here put, as usual, for Gentile, and one department for the whole class."²⁵ The Judaizers following the doctrine of the Pharisees had perverted the promise to Abraham and his seed into a doctrine of redemption partially because of one's race instead of faith in the Seed (singular) *alone*. Thus, they saw a fundamental inequality spiritually between themselves and the Gentiles that was intrinsic to their ethnic groups. This confidence and pride in their descent from Abraham, as a reason why God was somehow obligated to save them, contributed to the Jews' rejection of Christ alone received by faith alone. In addition, "neither Jew nor Gentile," speaks to the Old Testament ceremonial laws interposition as a wall of separation that kept the Jews separated and distinct from the surrounding heathen nations. With the coming of the Messiah the middle wall of separation has been abolished, *the church is now a truly multinational organization and the two have been made into one new man in Christ* (read Eph. 2:14-22).

With this one brief statement Paul essentially reiterates everything he has said up to this point about faith being the sole instrument which appropriates Christ and His perfect redemption. If both Jews and Gentiles are saved by faith alone apart from the works of the law, then neither has an intrinsic advantage. Also, the ceremonial system that kept both Jews and Gentiles apart (unless a Gentile was circumcised, joined himself to the Jewish nation and essentially became a Jew) was in effect only until Jesus came and died on the cross. With this change from the Mosaic administration to the New Covenant era the Jews have no advantage whatsoever over the Gentiles. Consequently, the Judaizers' attempt *to separate the two groups and impose the Mosaic system* is an explicit contradiction of what Jesus has accomplished by His death and resurrection and by the sending of the Holy Spirit. Since all who believe are clothed with the perfect righteousness of Christ, the attempt to make Gentile believers into Jews is wrong and unnecessary and foolish.

By way of application, note that Christ is presented as the one genuine solution to racism and idolatrous nationalism. The modern "solution" to the problem of racism and national and cultural differences is sought in pluralism, relativism and so-called "multiculturalism." The general underlying idea behind secular humanism is that all religions, viewpoints and cultural expressions are equally true, but also equally false. Thus, *true unity for man is sought in statism.*

²⁴ Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 157.

²⁵ John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles to the Galatians and Ephesians*, 112.

The state imposes unity upon disorder by bureaucratic law. The basic presupposition behind such statism is that unity under the messianic state is much more important than anyone's own particular worldview. (Ancient Rome was similar in that all religious groups and cultures were tolerated as long as the supreme Lordship of Caesar over everything was acknowledged.) Consequently, in modern post-Christian America the prevailing thought about Christianity and the Word of God is that such things are fine as long as they are kept behind the four walls of a church building or in a prayer closet.

Although statist legislation has discouraged blatant discrimination and hardcore racism is not near as prevalent as it once was, today there is not a true unity and harmony between racial groups. Segregation, mistrust and enmity are engaged in by both sides. The sins of the past have not been forgotten or forgiven and racial groups have only a shallow surface peace. But Christ, by His redemptive work, brings a true unity to men. A unity not imposed from the outside by the bayonet and barrel of a gun but by the Holy Spirit. What is important is not one's birth or nationality or skin color, but one's *rebirth*. The European, African, Asian and American who has faith are all clothed with Christ and united into one body by faith. This kind of unity from the heart is sincere and cannot be contrived. The Holy Spirit raises our dead hearts, imparts the gift of faith and links all of us with Christ and thereby links us with one another. Thus we can see that racism in any form in the church is a grievous contradiction to our profession and who we are in Christ. "For a Jew to confess himself to be a Christian, and then to refuse to eat with Christians from the Gentiles, or to regard himself as being in any way superior to them in moral worth, is an abomination to the Lord."²⁶ Likewise, the segregation of African-Americans from whites or vice versa in the church is exceptionally wicked. It is an implicit denial of Christ's work and the unity of His body. It is to say that being clothed with the perfect righteousness of Christ is not enough for fellowship.

It is important to note that the statement "there is neither Jew nor Greek" relates to our redemption in Christ and does not mean that national borders and cultural differences are swept aside by the coming of the kingdom. The various musical styles, clothing, architecture, foods, languages and customs that are not sinful will remain. The Christian church is not a melting pot that merges all cultures and nationalities into one. Instead, it takes all these unique and rich cultures and purges them of idolatry and anything that is contrary to God's holy law. All men who believe are saved before God and are brothers in Christ. Thus, no one is to lord it over others as if their nationality was superior. The association of Christianity with Europeans and colonialism is unfortunate and erroneous.

The kinist has developed a concept of race and culture that is completely at odds with Scripture, logic and history. Most ethnic or cultural distinctions such as the kind of foods people eat, clothing styles, musical instruments, kinds of gardening, boat construction, particular weapons of warfare and so on are not *specifically* regulated by the moral law of God. Therefore,

²⁶ William Hendriksen, *Galatians and Ephesians*, 150. The penetration of racism in the church is exhibited by the following excerpt from a nineteenth-century southern Presbyterian sermon: "You slaves will go to heaven if you are good, but don't think that you will ever be close to your mistress and master. No! No! There will be a wall between you; but there will be holes in it that will permit you to look out and see your mistress when she passes by" (Cited in John B. Cade, "Out of the Mouths of Ex-Slaves," *Journal of Negro History* 20 [July 1935]; see Philip Graham Ryken, *Galatians*, 150). The statement reveals not only a very strong bigotry, but also the placing of economic interests over the gospel. The preacher sets forth legalism to keep the slaves in line (e.g., "you slaves will go to heaven if you are good"). Men do not go to heaven by being good, but by believing in Christ. Racism is very common today in many "black" churches where it is acceptable to make general statements about bigotry and inferiority of whites. One minister even repeatedly referred to Europeans as white devils, etc..

they (generally speaking) are things indifferent (*adiaphora*) and fall under the general teachings of Scripture. If people who are Irish or German want to eat Chinese food or African cuisine they can, as long as they do not steal the food or commit gluttony. If a Scottish woman wants to wear a Japanese dress or an African scarf there is nothing unlawful about it at all. Nationalities and cultures have never been unchanging air-tight categories, but have been changing and borrowing from each other from the beginning.

The Romans borrowed heavily from Greek culture and the Romans adopted virtually every military innovation they could get their hands on. Europeans took Chinese technology and developed modern guns and artillery. The Romans adapted clothing styles of the Celts for colder climates. In America many things that we eat and use came from African culture: peanuts, peanut butter, watermelons. Coffee, tomatoes and potatoes come from the indigenous peoples of South America.

In fact, the whole concept of race, or ethnic identity, is really only a general, changing category itself. The modern Jew from Europe has little to no Semitic blood. Most African-Americans in America are a *mixture* of European and African blood. Many have *more white* ancestors than black. Which nationality are they obligated to identify with? Mexico and Central America has a people of Spanish and Indian background. In Brazil there is a mix of Portuguese, Indian and black. In the Caribbean, we have Spanish, French, Scottish, black and Indian mixed together. In the United States, we have virtually every conceivable mix under the sun. It is simply impossible to divide people up according to race and segregate them without being totally arbitrary and inconsistent. Would a kinist allow a dark-skinned American believer who is only *one-third* African and two-thirds Aryan worship in his white church or would they set up some new mulatto churches? What about a Christian who was mostly African with some white ancestors that looks white? There are such people. Would they also be excluded from a “white” church? The Nazis in Germany in the 1930s tried to answer these kinds of questions “scientifically” and produced a maze of absurd, arbitrary laws and regulations. The Bible does not deal with these kinds of questions because in Scripture the issue is *faith*, not race. Timothy had a Greek father and a Jewish mother and Paul did not care. Titus was a Gentile and Paul had him as a partner in the work of the ministry. It is perhaps for these reasons that kinist literature is so general and non-specific in particular applications. The main issue for kinists is not careful exegesis or analysis but simply: “Keep those dark-skinned people away from us white people.” It is a justification for racism that is so poorly thought out and so lacking in exegesis that it depends on slogans and *ad hominem* attacks on their opponents. The church of Christ must respond to this blatant racism by teaching the truth and disciplining those who do not repent. We must not allow racism to gain a foothold in our churches. We must not serve the holy supper to bigots.

Chapter 4: The Definition of the Church

The kinist heretic strikes at the very heart of the Bible’s doctrine of the church by adding his own southern white cracker traditions onto the teaching of Scripture. In the New Testament it is the church—the one people of God—versus the world. The church is never viewed as separated by races. After he quotes Exodus 19 verbatim Peter adds, “...who were once not a people but are now the people of God, who had not obtained mercy but have now obtained mercy” (1 Pet. 2:10). This is applied to all the members of the Christian church—we (the one body) are a holy nation, a special priesthood. The church is compared to a kingdom or a nation that is distinct and separate from all others. In the book of Revelation, the church is the New

Jerusalem which comes down from heaven (Rev. 21:1-27). Those who are excluded are *only* those people who have *not* believed in Christ and repented of their sin (Rev. 21:27). Who are the ones that live in this *one city*? We are told *all the nations* of those who walk in the light of the lamb (Rev. 21:24). Moreover, when John sees a vision of heaven he sees “a great multitude which no one could number, of all nations, tribes, peoples, and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, with palm branches in their hands” (Rev. 7:9). God saves people of different nations to bring them all together as one, not to keep them segregated into separate people groups.

One in Separation from the World

The churches are not to be separated from each other by race, but are commanded to be separated from *the world*. Paul says Jesus “has delivered us from this present evil world” (Gal. 1:4). In Colossians he says that God “has delivered us from the power of darkness and has translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son” (1:13). John tells us, “Do not love the world or the things in the world” (1 Jn. 2:15). The author of Hebrews says that Abraham waited for a city “whose builder and maker is God” (Heb. 11:10). By faith he left behind his country and heritage because he understood that what was important was his spiritual seed (11:12) not his race. He understood that we “are strangers and pilgrims on the earth” (11:13). Therefore, he desired “a better, that is, a heavenly country” (11:16). By faith Rahab and Ruth left behind their countrymen to join themselves to the people of God. Their faith took precedence over their blood.

The New Testament rejection of the world is implied in the biblical antithesis between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent: “And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed” (Gen. 3:15). According to the Genesis narrative there is the *one* promise for the *one* people of God. This is the one central promise that unfolds unto all the other gracious promises. But the flipside of the one promise (for the one people of God) is the historical-covenantal seed of the devil who opposes God and His people. The kinist teaching largely ignores this antithesis as it exalts heathen culture and heritage over the biblical teaching on the one promise and the one true people of God.

One in Citizenship

The church is one in that we are heavenly citizens who have bowed the knee to Christ as our King. We are a people who are bound together by a common allegiance to the exalted Savior; to His absolute authority, to His perfect law; to a sanctified manner of living. Although we may live in different lands with different political leaders and different cultures, we are one in our worship and honor of Christ. His law-word always is the supreme authority. We all place Christ’s law above all human laws. When our nation’s laws contradict the Word of God with the holy apostles we must say, “We will obey God rather than men.” When the kinist argues that we should honor our people’s pagan past and that we should continue to follow the heathen sacred days or reverence the old sacred pagan sites, they have shown that in many ways they have not yet separated themselves from this evil world. All of these observations are basic to biblical Christianity.

One in Adoption

The church is one in all its privileges as well. All Christians have been regenerated, justified and sanctified. They have all been adopted into God's own family. God is our Father and no matter what nation we live in or what ethnic group we belong to, we are all brothers and sisters in Christ. Jesus, Paul says, redeemed "those who were under the law that we might receive the adoption as sons" (Gal. 4:5). He says we were predestinated by God the Father "to adoption as sons by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to His good pleasure" (Eph. 1:5). It was by God's grace, according to His sovereign good pleasure, to take Africans, Europeans, Aborigines, Indians, Semites and save them by the blood of Christ and make them one spiritual family. The kinist teaching is an implicit denial of our adoption in Christ. It teaches that what God has brought together in Christ must be kept separate by race and culture. It teaches that blood ties and heredity are of more significance than baptism in the Holy Spirit. It regards the fact that we are all sons of God through faith (Gal. 3:26); and heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ as less significant than some stupid pagan traditions handed down through time by unbelievers who hate God and worship idols.

One Father Abraham

The church is one in that Abraham is the father of all who believe whether Jew or Gentile. In Romans 9:6-8 we read, "But it is not that the word of God has taken no effect. For they *are* not all Israel who *are* of Israel, nor *are they* all children because they are the seed of Abraham; but, '*In Isaac your seed shall be called.*' That is, those who *are* the children of the flesh, these *are* not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted as the seed." In this passage, Paul answers the question as to how could God's promises to Israel be fulfilled when most of the literal descendants of Abraham apostatized. Since most Jews rejected their Messiah, has the Word of God taken none effect? Paul answers this question by pointing out that being a physical descendant of Abraham, a national Jew, does *not* make someone Abraham's seed. The promise has not failed because coming from the loins of Abraham does not do you any good unless you have the faith of Abraham. Only believers, not those born of the flesh, are counted for the seed. Thus, in the grand scheme of things, God has absolutely no regard for culture, heritage, blood or genetic background when faith in Christ is not there. Now if this point is true when it comes to God's chosen people who had the oracles of God, the land, the temple, the language, the traditions, the physical lineage, the history and a unique culture, then is it not also true of unbelieving pagan nations whose backgrounds are nothing but unbelief, idolatry and scandalous sin? God destroyed Israel and burned Jerusalem to the ground because the Jewish nation did not kiss the Son and give Him homage and obeisance. Jehovah promises, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, *and* all the nations that forget God" (Ps. 9:17). Given these undisputable biblical truths, what are we to make of the kinist teaching that God has a great regard for preserving all the different pagan cultures and races of the earth; that preserving these different cultures is so important that it even takes precedence over the unity of God's people—His church; that all the different people groups are so valuable to God that we should even preserve and honor pagan historical events, monuments, holy days and cultural practices? The teaching in Scripture on Israel according to the flesh and how God looks at nations that do not bow to Christ obliterates the kinist paradigm.

What did God do to the seven Canaanite nations that lived in the land of Palestine? Did He preserve their culture for future generations? No. Israel was supposed to destroy these wicked nations and remove the monuments of idolatry from the land forever. Culture to a certain extent is religion externalized. Thus, in a sense, the gospel will destroy old law orders and cultures and replace them with a distinctly Christian culture. Will the Japanese still eat different foods and wear somewhat different dress than Americans or Peruvians? Yes, of course. But these are incidentals or indifferent matters of a culture. As each nation in this world covenants with Christ and adopts a biblical law order and the majority of people hold to a biblical world and life view, the important aspects of a society and culture will be the same. By exalting cultural expressions of the *natural man* in order to uphold racist views of separation, the kinist essentially downplays the impact of the gospel on different nations. He, to a certain extent, denies the victory of the gospel as he externalizes pagan world views and thinking. Kinism cannot lead to a Christian culture because it absolutizes race at the expense of God's law and the church's vital unity. It ultimately leads to a humanistic culture by divinizing the white race.

The kinist does not understand the radically unbiblical nature of his system. He apparently does not understand that culture is a product of ideas and faith. He does not see the fact that ultimately culture is the social and material consequence of religion, of one's ultimate view of God, the world, law and sin. Consequently, he ends up exalting paganism and syncretism in the name of Christianity because he does not understand the fact that there can be no neutrality. He ignorantly embraces Celtic and Aryan pagan barbarianism as antidote to one-worldism and socialism, when the gospel and God's law-word applied to life is the only true answer to multiculturalism and secular unity. The Christian is to transform pagan culture, not worship it, emulate it or merge with it. The kinist unwittingly places culture before faith and thus doctrinally offers a pagan cart with no horse. Rushdoony writes, "Culture is an act of faith and the application of standards and ideas to the disciplines of life and to life itself. When a culture denies its faith, it also negates its life and practice...the basic capital of any society is in the realm of faith and ideas, and, inescapably, because man is a unit, his faith and ideas have very practical consequences: they create a culture. God declares that this premise of all stable culture is to 'walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments' (Lev. 26:3). When men deny God, they thereby deny themselves also, and finally have nothing, because apart from God all things collapse into meaninglessness and void."²⁷ The kinist offers a kingdom built on two mutually exclusive foundations: one of stone, the other of pagan quicksand. He, like the mystics and Nazis before him, can fantasize about our ancient pagan Aryan past, but he cannot avoid the fact that Scripture teaches that such a foundation will only destroy Christian culture and civilization.

All Things to All People

A section of Scripture that proves that Paul regarded customs or local cultural practices of different ethnic groups as subordinate to the gospel and relatively unimportant is 1 Corinthians 9:19-23:

For though I am free from all *men*, I have made myself a servant to all, that I might win the more; and to the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might win Jews; to those *who are* under the law, as under the law, that I might win those *who are* under the law; to those *who are* without law, as without law (not being without law toward God, but under law toward Christ), that I might win

²⁷ Rousas John Rushdoony, *Law and Society* (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1982) 151.

those *who are* without law; to the weak I became as weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all *men*, that I might by all means save some. Now this I do for the gospel's sake, that I may be partaker of it with *you*.

This passage is interesting in that Paul in verse 20 says, "to the Jew I became as a Jew," meaning "I conducted myself as a Jew." Was not Paul already a Jew of Jews, born of the tribe of Benjamin (see Phil. 3:5f.)? He certainly was. But the apostle was writing from the perspective of a Christian who had been made a new creation (2 Cor. 5:7) and thus was no longer defined as a Jew or a Greek, but as a Christian. When preaching among the Jewish communities, Paul followed their customs even though he was not obligated as a Christian to do so. He was so dedicated to winning over the Jews that he had Timothy circumcised (Ac. 16:3) to avoid offending them, even though Scripture did not require it. If Paul were a kinist would he not revel in Jewish culture instead of treating it as a mere incidental?

Paul knew he had perfect liberty in Christ, but he obeyed Jewish law to be in a better position to encourage Jews to convert to Christ. When the apostle was among the Gentiles, he set aside the Jewish customs in order to win over those without the law. He did not observe the Jewish food laws, the ceremonial Sabbath days, nor concern himself with whether men were circumcised or not. Paul became culturally a Gentile in every way except anything involving sin. That is, he was under the law of Christ which is inclusive of the whole moral law of God. Culturally, as far as customs go, Paul could be a Greek or Roman or a Jew. He did not treat ethnic customs as the kinists do, as important and watertight barriers that must be maintained and that must not be crossed over by other races or ethnic groups. Paul's Jewish enemies who observed what he was doing believed that his conduct among the Gentiles made him a Gentile. Paul not only preached the gospel to the Gentiles and taught them the whole counsel of God, but also *lived and worked among them for years*. Moreover, some of his partners in the ministry were Gentiles. The apostle is a model for every Christian who wants to win people to Christ. Paul adapted himself to different situations in *every culture*. With the Jews he lived as a Jew, and with the Gentiles as a Gentile (within the boundaries of Christ's law-word). And to the weak, he became as weak, so that he might become "all things to all men." Paul's opponents were probably very active in accusing the apostle of being disloyal to the Jewish nation and culture. They likely accused him of being an unstable hypocrite who was constantly changing his ethnic loyalties. But they did not understand how the coming of Christ had changed things, that the top priority for Christians was bringing the gospel to every nation, people group and culture. A Christian could move into and blend with any nation or culture that he wanted to, as long as he was faithful to the moral law. The kinist must deny the obvious biblical fact that Christians of every race, nation and culture can move freely in other nations and cultures and live among different peoples for the sake of the kingdom. If the Western nations, which at present are predominately white, continue down their current path of secularism and apostasy, we may need Korean and African missionaries in our own country. And as long as they are Reformed we should welcome them with open arms.

Paul Confronts Peter for Acting like a Kinist

In the book of Galatians, we have an incident between Paul and Peter that explicitly contradicts the whole kinist way of thinking. Galatians 2:11-16 reads,

Now when Peter had come to Antioch, I withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed; for before certain men came from James, he would eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews also played the hypocrite with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter before *them* all, "If you, being a Jew, live in the manner of Gentiles and not as the Jews, why do you compel Gentiles to live as Jews? We *who are* Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law no flesh shall be justified.

This confrontation takes place in Antioch in Syria the third largest city in the Roman Empire (estimated at 480,000 inhabitants with 65,000 Jews). Scholars believe that the first Christian churches were founded in Antioch by Greek proselytes who had fled the persecution of the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem. The church itself in Antioch contradicts the kinist paradigm in that it had large numbers of both Jews and Greeks as members. The Greeks were of European stock while the Jews were Semitic. They were peoples from two different continents which had two completely unrelated language groups. If the apostolic church held to the kinist paradigm, such fully integrated churches would not even have existed and there would have been no need of a confrontation between Paul and Peter because the Jews would have had their own separate congregations.

What happened in Antioch is proof that kinist doctrine was unacceptable to God. Peter came to Antioch from Jerusalem and observed a church where both Jewish and Gentile believers ate together at the same table. The church was functioning as a fully integrated body with no racial separation at all and Peter had no problem with that at all. This ought to be expected, for God had revealed to Peter that the Gentiles were no longer to be regarded as unclean (Ac. 10:13-28) and the Gentiles were baptized with the Holy Spirit (Ac. 10:44-48) indicating an equal status with Jews in the church. But, when a group of Judaizers came from Jerusalem, who claimed to be disciples of James, visited the church in Antioch, Peter contradicted his earlier behavior by separating himself from the Gentiles. The verbs "withdrew" or "began to draw back" and "separated" are all in the imperfect tense. These verbs suggest that the withdrawal did not happen all at once, that it took some time for the Judaizers' pressure to have its effect on Peter. In verse 12, we are told that Peter feared those of the circumcision party. Peter's bad kinist-like example led other Jews astray, so that even Barnabas was involved in Peter's uncharitable behavior.

Note Paul's reaction to Peter's hypocritical behavior. He withstood Peter to his face (that is, he confronted him in person) and he confronted him publicly. A public sin merits a public admonition. Paul severely rebuked Peter not simply because his behavior was uncharitable and showed a lack of love and unity of the body; but also because it was an implicit denial of the gospel. "If you, being a Jew, live in a manner of Gentiles and not as Jews, why do you compel Gentiles to live as Jews?" Peter's behavior implied that the Jews were superior to the Gentiles, that if the Gentiles wanted full status in the kingdom of God, they would have to adopt the Jewish culture.

All of this raises some good questions. If it was wrong for Peter, an apostle, to divide the body of Christ because of race or ethnicity, even though the Jews had been a separated people for thousands of years, how can the kinist teaching be biblical?

Conclusion

In our study of both Testaments, we have seen that the kinist teaching is clearly contrary to the explicit teaching of Scripture. It is nothing more than a human tradition rooted in racism. It is our hope and our prayer to God that Jesus Christ the King over all nations and head of the church will root this divisive, racist heresy out of professing Christian churches. In our day—when the church is under attack by secular humanists, a revival of paganism and witchcraft and militant Islam—it is crucial that we maintain the biblical antithesis with the world and not set up a racist antithesis between brothers in Christ.

Copyright 2011 © Brian Schwertley

[HOME PAGE](#)