

GOD'S BLUEPRINT FOR THE RACES

IN HIS DESIGN FOR THE SALVATION OF MANKIND

Races in Chaos

"Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

The Danger of Miscegenation (INTERBREEDING) in this day and age the spectacular advances made in transportation have brought with them problems unparalleled in human history. The world prior to the twentieth century moved at a leisurely pace, and in consequence the various races seldom, if ever, were perturbed by the question of race relationship. They lived their lives according to their own racial characteristics.

Today these conditions no longer obtain, for no race or nation is isolated. Distance means little or nothing at all when airliners span seas and continents in a matter of hours. The closer proximity of nations now obtaining has brought to the fore the question of race relationship and has assumed such proportions as to occupy the headlines of the newspapers of the world. In addition it has been given top priority in the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization.

Attempts to provide a solution to this world-embracing problem have been made in many quarters, but each proposal has been inadequate to meet the need. Such proposals have invariably been coloured by the particular nation's interest and position in the problem. Thus, if the suggestion has come from the Far East, it is based on Far Eastern ideology, if from the Negroid races it is influenced by their desires. The same applies to European suggestions.

The danger of the impending catastrophic conditions invoked by human endeavour is giving rise to a paralyzing fear which is gripping the hearts of men today. Yet the answer, sadly ignored, stands ready to hand, provided by the Creator of all mankind, Almighty God.

His blueprint for the races is His Word, the Holy Bible, and this time-tested infallible Word has the only solution to this otherwise insoluble problem.

Admittedly, consideration has at times been given to this Source. However, these approaches have again been made with some pre-conceived notion and their interpretations have proved to be little better than those put forward previously.

In this article, the whole Biblical case will be considered. The problem will be approached with one aim: to provide the incentive to readers to open the Bible and read anew God's blueprint for all races and His Salvation for mankind.

Peace, that almost forgotten commodity, will be our experience on one specific day. The Day of the Return of our Lord Jesus Christ Who, sitting on the "throne of his father David" and Whose actions in the functioning of the Kingdom of God in this earth will fulfill the words of the prophet Isaiah, who wrote of Him:

"The government shall be upon His shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever."

The "Prince of Peace", our Lord, Saviour and King, Jesus Christ at His Second Advent, will provide the solution in that the Kingdom will operate on the lines of the Divine Directive of the Father. Of this Directive, the Son of God said: "THY WORD is TRUTH".

God's Word, therefore, is the sole basis upon which this thesis is based.

RACE AND ITS MEANING

IDEALISTIC dogmas concerning the equality of the various branches of the human family and renunciations of the term "race" are without foundation. "Race" is a biological concept, not a sociological one as so many today believe. This fact is slowly forcing itself into the consciousness of thinking people who are endeavoring to pierce the mists which the so-called progress of civilization and the enhancement of socio-cultural influences in human polity have wrought. "Race" has a very specific meaning which demands recognition and definition. It has been stated that this word does not appear in the Bible and is therefore an invention of man contrary to

God's purposes in the earth. It is true that the word does not appear in the Authorized Version of the scriptures as in Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek. The scriptural affirmation of "race" is found in Acts of the Apostles.

“God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us:” (Acts 17: 24-27.) KJV

The Old Testament, too, affirms the usage of the term "race". *"Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations: ask thy father, and he will shew thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee. When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel"* (Deut. 32:7-8). KJV

"Race" from the scientific point of view denotes what man is and is applicable inasmuch as it is responsible for those peculiarities, mental and physical, being transmitted with constancy along the lines of direct physical descent from father to son. The combination of these transmitted physical characteristics is cause for differentiation in the families of the world and their hereditary units. Scientific terminology for these units of inheritance is "genes", many thousands of which are involved in the complex make-up of the external and internal anatomy of man. The "genes" are responsible for almost all of the spiritual and corporeal personality of man.

The peculiar units of inheritance which classify the physical differences in the human family are invariable except when deliberate alien introductions are made. Science has recognized this and vast fields of investigation have been opened up to analyze the physical characteristics which separate the families of mankind. Elucidation of the significance of physical differences and the disrupting of racial purity is now available to man.

Mankind falls into three divisions: Caucasian, Mongoloid and Negroid. The following human characters of racial determination are bases of

anthropological study.

The shape of head, shape of face, eyes, nose, mouth and lips, degree of prognathism, hair, skin colour, bodily proportions.

The Cranial or Cephalic index is the fundamental physical character of race and may only be altered artificially, i.e. through intermarriage or deliberate physical distortion. The Cephalic index is the technical term for the measurement of the skull in determination of racial grouping. Briefly, it is the percentage of the breadth of the skull from ear to ear, to the length, i.e. from the forehead to the back of the skull.

The Cephalic index divides the human family into three classifications: Dolichocephalic; Mesocephalic; Brachycephalic.

When the maximum breadth of a skull is less than 75 per cent of its greatest length, the skull is termed long-headed or Dolichocephalic. When the breadth is 80 per cent or more of the length, the skull is called Brachycephalic or short-headed, and when the ratio of the breadth to length falls between 75 and 80 per cent, the skull is termed Mesocephalic.

These physical characters of racial designation are units of inheritance which are transmitted with invariable regularity from father to son and are only altered through deliberate artificial application.

Among the human characters of racial value is the physical test of skin colour. Anthropologists have long endeavored to find the cause of differences in this field of research. Theories have been propounded as to the effect of geographical environment on skin pigmentation. Varying degrees of depth of colour have been suggested as the possible consequence of exposure to the direct effects of heat.

Contrary to this, however, a consideration of the families of the earth in general indicates no correspondence whatever of skin colour with the isothermal lines. The Chinese, the yellow-skinned Mongols, do not vary in skin colour whether in the hot regions of Singapore in the south or in the almost frigid vicinity of Peking in the north. Heat combined with humidity is yet another theory as to skin colour. This, too, fails to supply an adequate answer. The Negro, perhaps the blackest of the black races, is indigenous to the hot, dry regions just south of the Sahara Desert. In the Congo basin live

many African peoples whose skin texture is much lighter in tint than that of the Negro. The heat-humidity theory is thus refuted. Today, research workers employ spectrophotometry as the basis of an objective and accurate measurement of the colour of the living human skin. Analysis of the results obtained has now provided the biological answer to the question of skin colour. Professor W. Z. Ripley, Ph.D., of Columbia University, provides the following information on skin colour. "Pigmentation arises from the deposition of coloring matter in a special series of cells which lie just between the translucent outer skin or epidermis and the inner or true skin known as the cutis. . . . The difference in colour is due, not to the presence or absence of the cells themselves, but to variations in the amount of pigment therein deposited. In this respect, therefore, the Negro differs physiologically, rather than anatomically, from the European or the Asiatic. Yet this trait, although superficial, so to speak, is exceedingly persistent, even through considerable racial intermixture. The familiar legal test in our southern States in the ante-bellum days for the determination of the legal status of octoroons was to look for the bit of Colour at the base of the finger nails. Under the transparent outer skin in this place the telltale pigmentation would remain despite a long-continued infusion of white blood." ("Races of Europe")

Apart from the Cephalic index and skin colour, other racial differences equally striking are found in certain facial features. Characteristics such as the slanting eyes of the Chinese or the Mongols, the broad high cheekbones of the American Indians, the flat nose and flaring nostril of the Ashanti and the Australian Aborigine.

These are all indicative of racial descent, physical characters transmitted in accordance with the principle of heredity, from the parent stock.

Rated very high in physical characters determining racial origins is the hair, the special qualities of which are very constant in a given race.

Hair may be compared in many ways, such as: general appearance, colour, length, size and shape of the single hairs and distribution, in all of which respects there are important racial differences.

The classification of hair type relative to race is set out hereunder;

Straight hair: Mongoloid (Chinese and American Indian).
Seldom, if ever, found in people of European origin.

Wavy or slightly wavy hair: European peculiarity.

Curly or frizzle hair: Portions of European. Australian, Aborigines.
Woolly hair: Peculiar to Negro races.

Separate tufted hair (lophocomi): Hottentots. Infant Negroes. (Interlaced tufts (eriacomi) are found in adult Negroes in general.)

Hair is thus another feature in the human family contributing to the definition of "race".

Other features of racial differences are ears. Negroes have short, wide ears, whereas the Caucasian (European) has longer and narrower ears. Lips, too, add their contribution. The Negro has a thick, puffy and inverted lip contrasted with the diminished lip thickness of the European. The finger, palm and sole prints, too, are racial criteria. The pattern of fingerprints indicate racial differences. The arch, the loop, the whorl or the spiral each have specified statistics peculiar to racial types. Investigation continues, and as data piles upon data the word "race" emerges as an appellation descriptive of differentiated physical characteristics in the families of mankind. "Race" immediately repudiates the common origin of a unitary protoplasmic cell floating on the oceans of the world. This is the basis of the Darwinian theory of evolution. If evolution is correct, then "race" ceases to apply, for if all stem from the common origin then the fact of hereditary characters such as skin colour, eyes, skull shape, hair and facial features are meaningless. Evolution does not explain how racial characteristics became separated as manifested in the race of the world today. Unproven theories are in conflict with science, Professor Julian Huxley stating in "Science and Religion": "Science insists on continual verification by testing against facts, because the bitter experience of history is that without such constant testing man's imagination and logical faculty run away with him and in the long run make a fool of him."

The attitude of various individuals in the numerous fields of scientific investigation differ according to spiritual persuasion. F. L. Marsh, Professor of Biology, Union College, Nebraska, states: "If evolutionists had not wasted a generation of hard work in trying to pick up a trail which never existed, biology would be at least a generation further along in the

discovery of the laws and processes which do exist."

("Evolution, Creation and Science", page 289.) Thus Prof. Marsh dismisses unproven theory and states the necessity for continued experimentation with subjects of supportable fact.

Proven physiological and biological conclusions may not be discarded and replaced by conjecture and philosophical interpretations of life. In the face of mounting statistical interpretation of modern science, the continued denial of "race" adds confusion to an already confused world. Statements such as "vulgar theory of race", the "delusion of race", "the fallacy of race", are founded on Satanic delusion and are contrary to the purpose of God for the peaceful co-existence of all mankind in the earth. The globe on which mankind lives is reality as is life itself. Satanic machinations have led many to believe in the unreality and lack of permanence of the earth and God's creation of man. Races in chaos is the consequence. This is the sum total of the experience of the world today, a world torn asunder through unbelief of the Word of God and His purpose revealed therein. "The rulers of the darkness of this world" have had a great measure of success. A success spoken of by our Lord Jesus Christ when He told His disciples of the chaos that would obtain at the end of the age.

JESUS AND THE WORLD OF TODAY

AS His public Ministry drew to its close, Jesus began to speak of three events which perplexed His hearers. He had pointed to the great blocks of masonry of the Temple, stating that not one of these should remain in place, and having foretold of the Temple's destruction He had withdrawn to the Mount of Olives. His disciples came to Him and asked: "Tell us, when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and the end of the world?"

(Matt. 24: 3.) The Lord's answer to these questions must have left no little consternation in the minds of His hearers, for He drew a picture of the armies of Rome encircling Jerusalem and the desolation which would follow in the destruction of the city. (Luke 21: 20-24.) He then told them of the world experience of wars and rumors of war, culminating in universal conflict. (Matt. 24: 6-7.) He told, too, of persecutions for the Christian faith. (Matt. 24: 12.) He spoke of the rise of many sects. He warned of the loss of faith. (Matt. 24: 12.) Of the end of all these disastrous happenings He said:

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Matt. 24: 14.)

The end would come and can come only when He returns to the earth, and of this event Jesus spoke in no uncertain terms. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Matt. 24: 27.)

His literal Return is attested to in many passages of scripture. Jesus confirmed this in the Olivet Discourse. The angels of the Lord added their voice on the occasion of His Ascension into heaven. (Acts 1:11.)

In summing up His words, in answer to the disciples' question, Jesus said: "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." (Matt. 24: 35-36.)

After warning against any speculation as to the time of His Return, Jesus reaffirmed His Coming. He drew attention to events parallel to that which had transpired at an earlier age, when man was threatened with disaster through the chaos of his own making. This parallel, drawn by Jesus, is most significant, particularly in the light of the events of today in respect of race relationships. Jesus said: "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Matt. 24: 37-39.)

These words of our Lord are not merely expressive of a careless and indifferent form of society obtaining in the world immediately prior to His Return. If our Lord intended to convey this condition to His disciples, He would have directed their attention to the then prevailing way of life. There is a deeper meaning to His words which is revealed by the period to which our Lord referred in paralleling the events. Jesus specifically mentioned a particular time in history when He said: "As the days of Noe were." To appreciate the circumstances which, on the authority of Jesus, would obtain in the world prior to His Coming, the conditions of life in the days of Noe will provide an illustration.

"AS THE DAYS OF NOE WERE"

"For as in the days that were before the flood" are words directing attention to the record in Genesis 6. This chapter may, on analysis, be divided into two sections. One, the conditions obtaining in human society; two, the manner of the construction and the dimensions of the ark. The first thirteen verses are those to which our Lord referred, the overall picture being summed up in the words: "The earth was filled with violence." (Gen. 6: 13)

The circumstances which realized this description, too, are set out in unmistakable terms. "And God looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me; for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold, I will destroy them with the earth." (Gen. 6:12-13)

The superficial conclusion arrived at from these words will attribute the circumstances obtaining to the fallibility of human governmental administration. While in a sense this is correct, the scriptures are more explicit in providing the cause of all the chaos of the ante-diluvian civilization. St. Luke, in his Gospel account of the words of our Lord on the Mount of Olives, states: "And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot! They did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all." (Luke 17: 26-29.)

Luke tells of Jesus likening the days of Noe to those of the days of Lot. The outpouring of the wrath of God, while taking two different forms, namely water and fire, was for the same cause: Violation of one of the basic laws given in Genesis 1. This law was that all created being should reproduce "after its kind".

The epistle of Jude adds further to the picture when, commenting on Sodom and Gomorrah, which our Lord also paralleled with the ante-diluvian times (Luke 17: 28), Jude states: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example,

suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." (Jude 7)

Thus, with the epistle of Jude providing the key to the conditions obtaining in Sodom and Gomorrah, with our Lord providing, the similarity of the nature of the conditions in both eras, Genesis 6 emerges as a grim warning to mankind today.

The sixth chapter of Genesis, while being the subject of much theological controversy, when taken in conjunction with the history of man revealed in the Holy Scriptures, is most explicit. It tells of the lamentable failure of man to live in close proximity with his fellow being without defiling flesh or committing miscegenation. "And it came to pass, when men began to multiply upon the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." (Gen. 6:1-2)

The "sons of God" and the "daughters of men" are two different groups, the cohabitation between which brought about the "corruption of flesh". It should be noted that there is no instance of the corruption of worship mentioned in this chapter. That the corruption of flesh has as its natural consequence the corruption of worship is clearly revealed in Deuteronomy 7:4.

Of the term "sons of God" much theological conjecture obtains as to the correct interpretation. The Bible leaves us in no doubt as to its interpretation. In the Christian dispensation it is a title used to denote those who have accepted and are dedicated to the service of our Lord Jesus Christ. "Born again" men and women are "sons and daughters of God". The Israel nation, redeemed, repentant and restored are the "sons of the Living God" (Hos. 1: 10) It has been suggested that the term used in Old Testament times applies to the "fallen angels" who "kept not their first estate and left their habitation" (Jude 6), or if not fallen angels, then at least the angelic creation referred to in Job 1: 6. Such suggestions detract from the unity and harmony of the Holy Scriptures, for they give license to spiritualizing material happenings and bring confusion into an otherwise perfectly lucid history.

If the "sons of God" were, in effect, angelic beings in the record of Genesis 6, then other portions of the scripture would seem to be at variance with it. "They took them wives of all which they chose" are words of the actions of

these "sons of God", and yet the scripture specifically states that marriage was unknown among the angels. (Matt. 22: 30) Further to this, a "fallen angel" would not, could not enjoy the term "son of God", having transgressed and broken that golden link which binds him to the Father. They would, at the moment of transgression, forfeit that title. In the 43rd chapter of the Book of Isaiah is yet another illustration of the use of the term "sons of God". This chapter concerns the house of Israel who, after being divorced and dishonored (Hos. 1: 9) were Redeemed and the way opened for reinstatement with God. "I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back; bring my sons from far and my daughters from the ends of the earth;" (Isa. 43: 6)

This whole chapter (Isa. 43) deals with Israel, the servant nation, a specific creation of God to meet the requirements of a peace-hungry world. (Rom. 4: 13)

In like manner, the record of Genesis tells of the specific creative activity of God in one line, the Adamic line through Seth, whom God appointed in place of Abel. (Gen. 4: 25)

Thus it was the cohabitation between the God-appointed Seth line and the other families of the earth that created the confusion and violence.

In the midst of an age of moral and physical declension, Noah, who was "perfect in his generations", emerges as the sole descendant of the Seth line worthy of survival. He was blameless in character and conduct and his righteousness and integrity were manifested in his walking with God. While much conjecture obtains as to the ultimate elucidation of the words: "perfect in his generations", the context of the chapter and the conditions obtaining indicate the correct trend of interpretation.

In the "Pentateuch and Haftorahs", a commentary on the early chapters of the Bible, the late Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz, states: "The Rabbis point out that these words may be understood either as praise or as blame of Noah. It may be understood as stating that despite the depravity which raged around him, he remained unspotted and untainted by corruption." Noah was of pure descent from Seth, a fitting person to begin anew in the post-diluvian times.

It was to the days of Noah that our Lord referred as typifying the conditions

which would obtain prior to His Second Coming. Those days were marked by races in chaos; our days, too, are marked by races in chaos. The parallel is too real to permit dismissal. As the circumstances are the same it would be profitable to reconsider the events following God's indignation at this catastrophic violation of His basic command, given no less than nine times in the first chapter of Genesis. Each creature was to reproduce "after its kind".

THE POST-DILUVIAN CIVILIZATION

THE post-diluvian history is one closely akin to that of ante-diluvian civilization. Rebellion against God became the rule rather than the exception. The attempt to build the tower of Babel provides the picture of rebellion rather than that of acquiescence in God's word. Rather than submit to Him, they began to provide against the visitation of His wrath in consequence of their evil thoughts and intentions. ". . . Now nothing will be restrained from them which they have imagined to do." (Gen. 11: 6)

The Tower of Babel was never fully completed. God intervened and "confounded" the language of the people and scattered them throughout the world. This activity of God is followed immediately by the genealogy of Abram and his departure from Ur of the Chaldees to Haran.

Why did God call Abram to a separate life, a life cut off from all associations with his former life? (Gen. 12: 1)

Why, throughout his lifetime and those of his son Isaac and his grandsons Esau and Jacob, did God demand a separated existence? Abram, of the line of Shem the son of Noah, lived in an environment which is graphically illustrated in the 18th and 19th chapters of Genesis. In these chapters is revealed the repetition of the ante-diluvian approach to life wherein: ". . . every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

Of Sodom and Gomorrah, the place of Lot's abode, approximately four hundred years after the great flood and immediately prior to the birth of Isaac, the scriptures state: "And the Lord said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous; I will go down now and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know it." (Gen. 18:20)

The "cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great . . . their sin is very grievous". The conditions thus obtaining are described as "sinful" and "grievous". As has been stated before, the circumstances creating these conditions are clearly set out in the 17th chapter of St. Luke's gospel and the 7th verse of the epistle of Jude. The "corruption of flesh" was again evident miscegenation became rife, culminating in an overall picture of abomination which caused the Lord to speak of it in the terms: "their sin is very grievous". With these conditions obtaining, the Love of God for His world once again came to the fore. He determined to exercise His Sovereignty in the affairs of men. Respecting His gift of free will given at the time of creation, the Lord began to set in motion the wheels for the rehabilitation of man.

THE ABRAHAMIC FAMILY

THE first step in the Plan of God in His cure for the malady of races in chaos was the call of Abram. "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house unto a land that I will shew thee." (Gen. 12: 1) Thus at the very outset of the history of God's intended corrective remedy the pattern was established.

From the prevailing chaos, severance from the abomination of miscegenation-RACE-MIXING, segregation!

This command to withdraw and be separate was a new beginning, a beginning designed ultimately to bring peace and blessing to all the nations of the earth. (Gen. 12: 2-3)

Abram, the Hebrew, and his wife, Sari, were thus chosen by God as the parents of a new people whom God intended to create school and guide in order that His perfect Will should be operative in the earth. Was this new beginning founded on corruption? Were the parents of the new race the product of miscegenation? No!

The ancestry of Abram and the purity of his racial descent from Shem is revealed in the genealogical chart in Genesis 11. The genealogy of Sarai, however, is not given in the scriptures, but Abram himself provides her racial descent as being of the same origin as his own. The narrative in the 20th chapter of Genesis records the sojourn of Abram in the land of Gerar. In answering Abimelech the king, Abram stated:

"She (Sarai) is my sister; she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife." (Gen. 20: 12) Sarai was thus Abram's stepsister of the same race. Thus the beginning of the new people was founded, not on the union of two widely differing ethnic groups but rather in two people of the same racial origin.

During the ensuing 25 years subsequent to his call, Abram received the reiteration of the promise of a son on numerous occasions. The history of the birth of the firstborn to Abraham is recorded in the 16th chapter of Genesis. This account, together with that of the following chapter (17th) adds emphasis to this question of racial purity.

Sarah was 75 years of age and "it ceased to be with her after the manner of women". Well past the child-bearing age, Sarah gave her Egyptian handmaid, Hagar, to Abraham that he might have a son and heir in whom God could declare His purpose. This instance of the birth of Ishmael to Abraham is seized on by many to prove that mixed marriages are not forbidden in the scriptures, but the 17th chapter of Genesis should soon dispel this delusion. It should be clearly understood that the actions of the various characters in the scriptures were, in most instances, the dictates of their own desires. This is the expression of free will. These desires and the consequence of their realization, however, should not be taken to constitute the Will of God. This is established in the case of Abraham. His desire was not the "lusting after the flesh", but in his ardor to be of service to his God and His Plan, he took Hagar and she bore him a son. Even though Abraham was prompted only by his desire to be of service, the fulfillment of his desire was not in accordance with the Will of God. Ishmael was rejected by God as being the son and heir through whom His world rehabilitative purpose was to be continued, and this in spite of Abraham's plea for his son. "And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee! And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant and with his seed after him. And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget and I will make him a great nation. But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year." (Gen. 17: 18-21)

Why was Ishmael rejected as being the next step in God's great Plan? He

was born of Abraham, to whom God had declared His world-embracing intention and through whom this intention was ultimately to be realized. If, as so many believe, there is no difference in race, why did God not use this son of the Egyptian handmaid? He was the seed of Abraham.

This was the very malady which God intended to correct, for in this child flowed the blood of two different races, Hebrew and Egyptian. Ishmael could not be a new beginning but a continuity of existing corruption and a nullifying of the separation demanded of Abraham. Ishmael, the son of Hagar, the Egyptian, and Abraham, the Hebrew, was rejected.

Ishmael was thirteen years of age when God stated His rejection of Abraham's firstborn. Abraham himself was ninety-nine and Sarah ninety. Well may Sarah have laughed when God declared that she would bear the promised son whom He would use and predestine according to His purpose! But God had waited until all the normal passions and lusts of life had died within Sarah before He intended that she should conceive and bear the promised son. A new beginning was made, not tainted by the prevailing conditions of life, but brought into being expressly at the creative word of God a new pure creation Isaac in whom and through whose seed "all the nations of the earth shall be blessed." (Gen. 26: 4)

Full realization of God's intended purpose came to Abraham when the estrangement between his wife and her handmaid Hagar culminated in Sarah's demand that both the bondmaid and her son be cast out of Abraham's family. "And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son. And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called." (Gen. 21: 11-12)

Accordingly, Abraham sent Ishmael and his mother away from his following, and only as the descendants of Ishmael impinge on the history of the progeny of Isaac are they mentioned in the Holy Scriptures. Abraham's understanding of God's purpose in the rejection of his firstborn son is apparent in the 24th chapter of Genesis. This chapter concerns the admonition of Abraham to his servant pertaining to the selection of a wife for Isaac. "And Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all that he had, Put I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh; And I will make thee swear by the Lord, the God of heaven and the God of the

earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell: But thou shalt go unto my country, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac." (Gen. 24: 2-4)

This statement by Abraham does not limit the prohibition against intermarriage to one particular race as a casual reading of the above verses would seem to indicate. The word "Canaanite" had long since ceased to be expressive of racial designation and was ascribed to all races living within the geographical boundaries of what today is known as Palestine. Thus Abraham's admonition to his servant was against any thought of procuring a wife for Isaac in the land wherein all races mixed so freely.

The national life of the Canaanites, governed as it was by their reverence of pagan gods and the license granted by this, will be dealt with in a later chapter. Abraham's servant was true to his word and traveled northwards to Nahor in the vicinity of Haran, from which Abraham was called by God. (Gen. 24: 10) Here Divine guidance is evident. The choice of a bride for Isaac was not left to the discrimination of the servant. God led him to Rebekah the daughter of Bethuel who was the son of Milcah the wife of Abraham's brother Nahor. (Gen. 24: 15) Recognition of Divine guidance was given by the servant in his praise for the God of Abraham. "And he said, blessed be the Lord God of my master Abraham, who hath not left destitute my master of his mercy and his truth; I being in the way, the Lord led me to the house of my master's brethren." (Gen. 24: 27)

Thus in the selection of Rebekah as the mother of the children of Isaac, the hand of God can be seen guarding against the contamination of the race.

To Isaac, God confirmed His purpose in the reiteration of the Covenant promises made to Abraham. (Gen. 26: 3) The twins, Esau and Jacob, born to Isaac were raised in the same prohibition against defiling their segregation. When adulthood had been attained this fact is clearly set out in the selection of a wife for Jacob. "And Isaac called Jacob, and blessed him, and charged him, and said unto him, Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan. Arise, go to Padan-aram, to the house of Bethuel thy mother's father; and take thee a wife from thence of the daughters of Laban thy mother's brother." (Gen. 28:1) ". . . Jacob obeyed his father and his mother, and was gone to Padan-aram; And Esau seeing that the daughters of Canaan pleased not Isaac his father; Then went Esau unto Ishmael, and took unto the wives which he had Mahalath the daughter of Ishmael,

Abraham's son, the sister of Nebajoth, to be his wife." (Gen. 28: 7-9)

Esau therefore in taking the daughter of Ishmael transgressed the command to remain separate, and corruption entered his line. The descendants of Esau, or Edomites as they are referred to in the scriptures, settled themselves on the south-east border of Palestine and on numerous occasions impinged on the history of Israel. Their final impingement was when they were subdued by the remnant which returned from the Babylonian captivity of Judah and were absorbed into the Jewish peoples. This will be dealt with in detail in the chapter concerning the Jews.

Jacob did not defile his separation and obeyed his father and came to Laban entering into his service for seven years for the hand of Rachel.

Jacob's years at Haran (Gen. 29) are marked by the duplicity of Laban in substituting Leah for Rachel. A further seven years of service were given for Rachel and the scriptures record the birth of the twelve sons to him. Thus the scriptures reveal the beginning of the expansion of the instrument through which God intended to demonstrate His blueprint for life.

Of the twelve sons born to Jacob, one is singled out as being his father's "best beloved", Joseph. (Gen. 37: 3) The history of Joseph and the jealousy of his brethren is well known, as is the story of his sale to the Ishmaelites. (Gen. 37: 25) Joseph, betrayed and cast out by his brethren, was carried down into the land of Egypt where he was bought as a slave by an Egyptian captain of the Pharaoh's guard. After being tested and tempted by his master's wife, Joseph was cast into prison, from whence he rose to a place of prominence through his interpretation of the Pharaoh's dream. His voice was heard throughout all the land and he became second only to the Pharaoh in authority.

Joseph married Asenath, the daughter of Poti-pherah, priest of On (Gen. 41: 45), an event which has raised the question of the continuance of the purity of the line of Abraham through Isaac.

THE EGYPTIAN PEOPLES

THE marriage of Joseph to Asenath was no refutation of the carefully preserved racial line of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The assumption that Asenath was a black-skinned woman of Egypt would contradict the whole

scriptural narrative up to this point. Why, if Hagar's son Ishmael was rejected, was the marriage of the very flower of God's plan to a black person permitted? This was not so. Asenath was a white woman of the line of Mizraim the son of Ham. This statement immediately raises the subject of Ham and his supposed parentage of the black races of the world. The scriptural narrative on which this supposition is based is the instance of Noah's drunkenness immediately after the flood. A consideration of the verses of the 9th chapter of Genesis concerning this event would prove profitable at this stage. "And Noah began to be a husbandman and he planted a vineyard: And he drank of the wine and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. And Shem and Japheth took a garment and laid it upon both of their shoulders; and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness. And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem and Canaan shall be his servant." (Gen. 9: 20-27)

There is no word or suggestion in the scripture to justify the supposition that the curse of Noah embraced a change of skin pigmentation. Further to this, the statement of Canaan being "a servant of servants" was of a social rather than a biological nature, as the words themselves imply. The supposition of the *curse of Noah* being a change in skin colour is an illogical intrusion of conjecture into a perfectly lucid history. Consider the implications arising out of such a theory.

It should be noted that there is no mention of the duration of the curse. The word "forever" is conspicuous by their absence. The curse therefore was redeemable. Consider now the record in St. Luke's gospel, chapter 4, and verses 17 to 21. "And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written. The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. . . . And he began to say unto them. This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

"Deliverance to the captives ... set at liberty them that are bruised."

In our Lord, all races have glorious liberty from the consequences of sin. The Salvation of the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" is free to all. Repentance and acceptance of Him who's Precious Blood was shed for all, nullifies the sins of the believer. This is the great Truth of the Holy Scriptures. There have been, and still are, many truly converted Negroes whose life work was dedicated to the service of the Lord. But they have remained Negroes both in physical make-up and skin colour. Surely if the colour change were the consequence of Noah's curse for the sin perpetrated by Ham, this curse would be removed at the moment of the rebirth in acceptance of Christ!

The Negro remains Negroid as he was created by the Father of all mankind, Almighty God.

The scriptural references pertaining to the synonymy of Curses and Ethiopian may not be overlooked. Cush was the first son of Ham (Gen. 10: 6), and significant is the fact that only one son, the youngest, Canaan, was mentioned in connection with the curse. Ethnological designation of certain African tribes as "dark Caucasian", too, may not be overlooked. Equally important is the name "Hamitic" as separate to pure-bred Negro.

"Caucasian" is the ethnological designation for the white races, and the reference to "dark Caucasian" immediately raises the question of origin. As the name applies to certain tribes in the vast continent of Africa, a consideration of the indigenous people of the land will provide the basis from which the "dark Caucasian" stems.

The name "Negro" is a distinctive appellation for one of the basic racial groups of the world. His natural habitat was and still is the wide strip of land extending from the west coast of Africa to the Sudan. The northern and southern boundaries were roughly the Sahara Desert and the Congo.

Other indigenous tribes of Africa were the Bushmen, the Hottentots and the Pygmies. The intrusion of the name "Hamitic" as applicable to certain African tribes is descriptive of the Cu****e migration and invasion of Negro-land at the end of the pluvial age, circa 2,300 B.C. This invasion of the Cu****e descendants of Ham added a new physical element into Africa,

and this by virtue of miscegenation. Why the eldest son of Ham should be responsible for miscegenation remains a mystery, for it was Canaan and not Cush who was cursed. The racial admixture of the Cu****e descendants of Ham with the indigenous Negro peoples created the many and varied physical aspects of the so-called Native or African today. Skin texture was altered, creating a wide range from light brown to red-black, but the dominant racial characteristic of the Negro, his hair, remained as a witness to the origin of species.

Thus the names "dark Caucasian" and "Hamitic" are derived from the miscegenation of Cush when they invaded the "dark continent". Mizraim, the second son of Ham, is nowhere associated with miscegenation and is not cursed nor involved with the curse of Canaan.

Professor Eugene Pittard, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Geneva, in his ethnological introduction to history entitled "Race and History", provides an authoritative beginning to a brief consideration of the races of Egypt in respect of the subject of the racial origin of Asenath, the wife of Joseph. Professor Pittard presents the findings of Champollion, the well-known Egyptologist, of the picture of the races of Egypt. The picture is derived from the tombs of Biban el Moluk (Valley of Kings). This depicts four distinct families of the human race as occupying the land or impinging on the history of the land. The following is an extract from Professor Pittard's book taken from page 413 under the sub-heading of "The Egyptians".

"Champollion has given the well-known picture of the human races of ancient Egypt after the paintings in the royal tombs of the Valley of Kings. These men, led by the shepherd of the Horus peoples, belonged to four distinct families. The first, nearest the god, were of a dark red colour, well proportioned and with gentle physiognomy, slightly aquiline nose, long plaited hair and clothed in white. Legend has given these folk the name of Rot-en-ne-rome, the human race, the men par excellence, that is to say—the Egyptians. There is no doubt whatever about him who comes next: he belongs to the Negro race, known under the general theme of Nehasi.

The next one presents a very different aspect: his skin is fresh-coloured, verging on yellow; he is bronzed, with a strongly aquiline nose and a thick black pointed beard and wears a short garment of many colors. This race bears the name Aamu (Asiatics). Finally, the last has the skin colour we call

fresh-coloured or white-skinned in its most delicate tint, and is very tall and slim; he is clothed in an undressed bullock hide; this race is called Tamahu (Europeans)."

Egypt, rich in the treasures of the history of man, has of recent years yielded many of its secrets. The sequence of the occupancy of the different races is slowly being unraveled. Professor Pittard provides this sequence as follows: First, the Red race occupied the land from the south, the Sudan. Second, the Negroid race forced the Red race out, hence their migration to the Americas. Third, the Asiatic migration and peaceful settlement among the Negroid race. Fourth, the invasion of the White race and the division of the land into what was known as Upper and Lower Egypt.

The name Mizraim became associated with the land of Egypt with the influx of the White race. Both secular history and the Holy Scriptures use this name or other derivations to designate the land. The scriptures use it no less than 86 times (Unger's Dictionary). Herbert Bruce Hannay in his book "European and Other Race Origins", and Professor T. K. | Cheyne in his "Land of the Mizrim" tell of the introduction of the Mizraimites into Egypt. Of the descendants of Mizraim, Hannay states that they were a "white-skinned, ruddy-complexioned, black-haired but also often fair- or red-haired, straight-profiled, regular-featured race". Of the advent of the people into Egypt, Hannay states: "In the advent in the Nile Valley of the fair Mizraic settlers, they found the country inhabited by a small, short, dolichocephalic, dark- haired, black-eyed, glabrous, brunet race."

Of the invasion of the Mizraimites, apart from the invasion itself, very little is recorded. The Egyptian record provides the king lists of those who ruled the land as a whole up to the sixth dynasty, but after this a period of darkness covers the names of the rulers and nothing is known of them. Of the conditions obtaining in the land, however, a struggle between two opposing factions is mentioned. The strangers from the north seeking to penetrate into the heart of the country and the inhabitants holding them at bay. The end came when an agreement of peaceful co-existence was established. The Mizraimites settled themselves in the north, occupying the region of the Nile delta, where they established and built the sun city of Heliopolis, which in the scriptures is referred to as On. A great temple was also erected in this city and the worship of Ra, the sun god, eventuated from this. Hannay points out that the name Ra may have been derived from the name Mizraim, or Miz-ra-yim as it is sometimes written. Hannay states:

"Thus Mizraim or Mizrayim perhaps means nothing more or less than 'the children of Ra', i.e. of light or the sun."

Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Mizraimites built the city of Heliopolis and the temple.

The Egyptian record, referred to in M. E. Harkness' book "Egyptian Life and History", tells of the end of the peaceful co-existence and the rising tide of uneasiness and conflict. How this was quelled is not given, but one Metkherra Mentuhotep, a Mizraimite, emerged as the ruler of both Upper and Lower Egypt, establishing a central government at Thebes which had been situated in Lower Egypt. On his death he was succeeded by Amenemhat 1st, whose record of conditions during his lifetime is preserved to us on a leather scroll. The writing tells of internal strife and a continued conspiracy to dethrone him. This conspiracy came from those "who live in the south". Amenemhat was succeeded by his son Usertasen, who erected a memorial within the precincts of the temple at On, the purpose of which is not described. This memorial is today to be seen on the Thames Embankment and is known as Cleopatra's Needle.

During the reigns of the succeeding kings of Egypt to the 14th dynasty, Egypt is depicted as a land of many people's living in concord with each other. The tomb of Rekh-ma-ra has yielded a coloured portrait of the races inhabiting Egypt during his lifetime, and they are the Negro, the Libyan, the Mizraimite and the Asiatic. These people were all called Egyptians, this being an appellation of domicile rather than a racial designation.

The 14th dynasty was brought to an end by the invasion of the Hyksos peoples. Much consideration is given by students to this invasion of the Hyksos, for the Egyptian record falls silent with their arrival, and with the exception of the comment of the 15th and 16th dynasties under their reign, nothing else is known of them.

Exactly what brought about a change in the 17th dynasty is not revealed, but the record recommences with a double or joint state, the Hyksos kings ruling in the south from Memphis and the Mizraimites ruling from Thebes. The coalition did not last, however, and when Aahmes the Mizraimite ascended the throne at Thebes he overthrew the Hyksos and the "double crown" of Egypt came once again into the hands of Mizraim.

The religious worship of Egypt had a wide variety of expressions. While the temple at Heliopolis continued throughout the turbulent centuries with its worship of Ra, other expressions of Deity were founded by the varied population.

Into these circumstances Joseph came when he was sold to the captain of the Pharaoh's guard. The ruling house was of the Mizraimite line as was the priesthood of the temple worship at Heliopolis or On. Joseph, after his elevation to virtual ruler, married the daughter of the priest of On, a Mizraimite. Recapitulating the description of the Mizraimites who invaded Egypt, as given by both Hannay and Professor Cheyne, they were "white-skinned, ruddy-complexioned, black- and often red-haired". With this description and the history provided above, the daughter of the priest of On was acceptable as part of the people through whom God's blessing would ultimately come. Biologically, both Joseph and Asenath were the same.

To Joseph the sons Ephraim and Manasseh were born by Asenath the daughter of the priest of On. Today two obelisks from the temple of On are landmarks in two separate lands peopled by a people who bear all the marks of identity of Ephraim and Manasseh. Today on the Thames Embankment and in Central Park, New York, these two monuments of stone are a reminder to our nations of God's faithfulness to us.

Joseph, firmly established in the land of Egypt and having, under the guidance of God, stored up food against the famine which ravaged the whole of the Middle East, now awaited the consummation of God's purpose in sending him down into Egypt.

His brethren came first, and ultimately Jacob himself arrived in Egypt to be greeted by his son, and provision was made for their sojourn in the region of the Nile delta, the land of Goshen. "And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph, saying, Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee: The Land of Egypt is before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and brethren to dwell; in the land of Goshen let them dwell..." (Gen. 47: 5-6)

There was more to the offer of the Pharaoh than the promise of good, fertile land. It should be recalled that this was the land of Goshen and a people of their own race. This would explain how, in the short period of 400 years (Ussher's chronology) the population of Israel rose to nearly to millions. Jacob brought 70 souls (Gen. 46: 27), and at the "numbering" of the

children of Israel in the wilderness of Sinai they totaled 603,550 males from and over the age of 20. (Num. 1:2 and verse 46) The wives and children were not numbered. "And Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the country of Goshen; and they had possessions therein, and grew and multiplied exceedingly." (Gen. 47: 27)

During this period of Israel's growth the throne changed hands and a new line ruled the land. The "Pharaoh who knew not Joseph" afflicted the children of Israel. The new dynasty was not of the Mizraimite line and the pent-up feelings of the Negroid races was expressed in this affliction. "And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour: And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: all their service, wherein they made them serve was with vigor." (Ex. 1: 13-14)

The oppression of the children of Israel in Egypt was the last phase of the preparation of God's instrument nation. Having been created and schooled in the most rigid form of segregation, they were now learning the purpose in this. *It was not for racial domination.* In the hard school of the Egyptian experience Israel learned the lesson of oppression. When this lesson had been absorbed and the abhorrence of oppression and tyranny had become a part of the soul-life of this people, God moved in their liberation.

The future national existence of Israel was a life governed by the overall factor of separation and segregation. There was to be no question of a "Herrenvolk". The very soul of this people would now rebel at any thought of the subjugation of peoples.

A peculiar people, a separate people, an isolated nation created to demonstrate the righteousness of God in race relationships. "When thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness. . . . And the work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever." (Isa. 26: 9; 32: 17)

MOSES THE LAW-GIVER

MOSES, the leader, the law-giver of Israel, married an Ethiopian woman. "And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman." (Num. 12: 1.)

Much confusion reigns concerning this marriage of Moses, and information surrounding the exact origin of his wife is lacking. In most Bible dictionaries the similarity between Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro the Midianite, and the "Ethiopian woman" are taken to mean the one and same person. Unger's Bible Dictionary states that the reference to Moses' wife as being an "Ethiopian" does not necessarily mean the modern Ethiopia but could mean the Arabian Ethiopia. The point as to the origin of Moses' wife, however, is merely academic. It does not alter the fact that he married a woman who was not of Israel or the same race, and therefore, in a sense, the condemnation of Miriam and Aaron was just. This condemnation was rewarded by God, Who told both Miriam and Aaron, in effect, that they should rather concern themselves with their own calling and leave Moses and his life to Him. (Num. 12: 6-7)

MOSES' SONS

After Moses had killed and buried an Egyptian because of his maltreatment of an Israelite, he fled to Midian. (Ex. 2: 15) Here he married Zipporah, who bore him a son Gershom. Eliezer, the second son, was born at some later date not given. After Moses had received his commission from God, given at Horeb, he took his wife and two sons and set out for Egypt. (Ex. 4: 20) Zipporah and her sons, however, did not arrive in Egypt. En route Moses was in danger of death, but on the circumcision of his son, was spared. The sons and his wife had much to do with this threat as the subsequent events seem to suggest. They were sent back to Jethro and Moses continued down into Egypt alone. He was rejoined by his family at Rephidim (Ex. 18: 2) After this reunion Zipporah and her sons are not again mentioned as having any portion in Israel and certainly no place of authority. When Moses died, Joshua took over the leadership and Moses' sons passed into obscurity.

THE LAWS OF ISRAEL

Israel now having reached maturity in so far as numbers were concerned were now invested with the title deeds of nationhood when the Divine Constitution for national and individual life was given to them. At the foot of the Mount of God, all Israel received this Constitution with the words of acclamation: "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." (Ex. 19:8)

The Divine Constitution of the Lord was never designed to bring this people under the strict discipline of the Law but was rather words of mercy for the guidance and well-being of the nation. These were directives to provide against the natural hazards of life which the nation would encounter almost every day. Of this directive the scriptures say:

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward." (Psalm 19: 7-11)

The Law of the Lord is not only recorded in the first seventeen verses of the 20th chapter of the Book of Exodus, which verses deal with the Ten Commandments. This is but one section of the Law. The directive of God is fully set out in the remainder of the Book of Exodus, the Book of Leviticus, the Book of Numbers and the Book of Deuteronomy. It is an all-embracing Constitution for life.

In the Law, the prohibition against miscegenation is given as a reiteration of the first command of God to His creation in Genesis 1. As has been stated before, the injunction to reproduce "after its kind" is given no less than nine times in the first chapter of the Bible. In the codification of the Law, the same injunction is reiterated.

In Leviticus 19: 19 the words indicate the universal nature of the prohibition against the mixing of species. "Ye shall keep my statutes. Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed: neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee."

Almost the exact words are reiterated in the Book of Deuteronomy. "Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with divers seeds: lest the fruit of thy seed which thou hast sown and the fruit of thy vineyard be defiled. Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together. Thou shalt not wear a garment of divers sorts, as of woollen and linen together." (Deut. 22: 9-11)

It may be suggested that in these verses there is no specific mention of the prohibition against the intermarriage of races. Consider the matter again. If, in the sight of God, the admixture of the lower order of animal and plant life is repugnant, how much more and with how much greater force must the same principle apply to His creation of man and particularly Israel. *"For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God."* (Deut. 7: 6) To man, whom God loved so much as to give His only begotten Son that he might not perish, the same principle must apply a thousand-fold more in intensity.

ISRAEL AND THE "DOCTRINE OF BALAAM"

HAVING received from God His blueprint for both national and individual life, Israel was commanded to go forward and take possession of their promised inheritance. This they failed to do and were then commanded to wander in the wilderness until a new generation be born who would obey. The generation that came out of Egypt died and a new generation was instructed in the lesson of Sinai. (Deut. 4)

They were commanded to go forward, and this they did, traveling in a north-easterly direction. Here they met with opposition from the Amorites, through whose territory they had to pass. In the ensuing battle Israel won the day, and the land, which had originally belonged to the Moabites, came into Israel's hand by right of conquest. Still striking a northerly route, Israel came to the borders of the Moabite country, where Balak the Moabite king watched with a great amount of apprehension. (Num. 22: 3) This formidable foe, which had conquered his erstwhile enemy, Sihon the Amorite, now stood at his doors. '•• Attributing the might and prowess of the Israelites to supernatural agencies, Balak sent for Balaam, a man of renown, to bring down the curse of the gods on these people.

Balaam came but was unable to curse Israel, for the Lord was with them. (Num.24: 1)

Of Balaam, Dr. Scofield has this to say: "Balaam is the typical hireling prophet, seeking only to make a market of his gift." This fact is very evident in the 22nd, 23rd and 24th chapters of the Book of Numbers. Try as he may, he was unable to fulfill the task given him by Balak, and on each occasion he was forestalled. The supernatural manner in which God used

this man to bless Israel in place of cursing them is set out in the above-mentioned chapters. Balaam, however, instructed Balak as to the method by which the children of Israel might be tempted to refrain from wasting his land. This method was the inducement to intermarry.

"Behold these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord." (Num. 31: 16)

Thus the "doctrine of Balaam" mentioned by our Lord in His Revelation to John (Rev. 2: 14) was the evil doctrine of miscegenation. Twenty-four thousand of the children of Israel succumbed to the doctrine of Balaam and God's wrath was turned against both these and the people of Moab for the abomination. (Num. 25: 9) The 31st chapter of the Book of Numbers gives the history, in detail, of the execution of God's wrath, with Balaam himself ending his life at the point of an Israelite sword. (Num. 31: 8)

The thorough cleansing of the land of Moab went on until every "Man, woman and child" was driven out of the land (Deut. 2: 34) and the tribes of Reuben, Gad and the half tribe Manasseh took this land, east of the Jordan, for their inheritance.

It should be noted that of the original Moabite inhabitants none remained in the land. Though this is so, the land retained the name, "the land of Moab", and is referred to as such in many instances of scripture, giving rise to apparent obstacles in the question of racial purity. This subject will be considered in a later chapter dealing with the genealogy of our Lord.

ISRAEL AND THE HOLY LAND

Israel now stood poised and ready to enter their promised inheritance. To this generation of Israelites God had stated, in unmistakable terms, the circumstances pertaining to the occupation of the holy land. *"When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgasites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them; Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter*

thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. For they will turn away thy son from following me that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the Lord be kindled against thee and destroy thee suddenly." (Deut. 7: 1-4)

This instruction to Israel might seem to be most cruel and not in keeping with the modern concept of God Who gave His Son for the world. As has been previously stated, the Canaanite way of life is so constituted a threat to Israel and God's purpose as to warrant the Patriarch Abraham's denunciations of them and the prohibition against intermarrying with them. What was it that made the inhabitants of Canaan so repugnant to Israel?

Their national life, as is the case of every nation of every era, was governed by the religious attitude of the people.

The religion of the Canaanites would impinge on the mission of Israel should intermarriage or any other relationship be established. Hence the words of the Lord, "*... for they shall turn away thy sons from following Me that they may serve other gods.*"

What was the nature of the gods of Canaan?

Unger's Bible Dictionary provides a graphic illustration of the Canaanites' religion and is set out hereunder.

"Canaanite Religion, a new vista of knowledge of Canaanite cults and their degrading character and debilitating effect have been opened up by the discovery of the Ras Shamra religious epic literature from Ugarit in North Syria. Thousands of clay tablets stored in what seems to be a library between two great Canaanite temples dating from c. 15th-14th centuries B.C., give a full description of the Canaanite pantheon. Canaanite fertility cults are seen to be more base than elsewhere in the world. The virile monotheistic faith of the Hebrews was continually in peril of contamination from the lewd nature worship with immoral gods, prostitute goddesses, serpents, cultic doves and bulls.

El, the head of the pantheon, was the hero of sordid escapades and crimes."

In addition to this picture, another may be added. The offering of children,

by their parents, as a living sacrifice to be burnt on the altars of the many gods is yet another facet of the depraved nature of the orgies of the Canaanite religious order.

It was against contamination with this degenerate, degraded and depraved people, whose life was governed only by the desire to satisfy the fleshy lust that the Lord warned.

With the Lord's warning still ringing in their ears, Israel went forward in execution of God's commands. Jericho fell before the power of Almighty God, the truth of the scriptural narrative attested to today by the archeological discoveries made in Palestine. The battle for the Holy land had started. Israel swept all before her, but soon she tired and began to relax and settle down, making permanent homes in the land. Their task was incomplete. The Canaanites were still in the land in numbers equal to, if not superior, to those of Israel. Israel began their national life in the Holy land in failure. They had not fulfilled their obligation to God. His word, recorded in Deuteronomy 7, passed unheeded. This failure of Israel was the subject of the last counsel of Joshua (just prior to his death) when he said:

"Take good heed to yourselves that ye love the Lord your God. Else if ye do in any wise go back and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, even these that remain among you, and shall make marriages with them, and go in unto them, and they to you, Know of a certainty that the Lord your God will no more drive out any of these nations from before you; but they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you." (Josh. 23: 11-13)

Israel ignored this last counsel of Joshua and, taken in conjunction with the transgression of the Laws of the Lord, ended in their removal and captivity.

If Israel had but been obedient to God and lived and demonstrated His blueprint for life, how different the history of the world would have been. No chaos, no strife, no insecurity and certainly no problems of race relationships.

To this last state it might be said that one could not simply destroy all with whom the nation came in contact. Granted, but God never stated that this was to be so. He stated: ". . . in thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of

the earth be blessed." Israel's relationship to the other nations is clearly set out in the Books of the Law of the Lord.

ISRAEL AND THE STRANGER

CLEAR and concise are the instructions to Israel pertaining to the treatment of any stranger who might seek asylum or come within the scope of Israel's functioning. This stranger, no matter what the colour of his skin, was to be treated in accordance with the principles laid down by God at Sinai.

A consideration of these principles is of particular interest today in the light of the contact between almost every race on the earth. *"The Lord your God is God of gods and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty, and a terrible, which regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward: He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and the widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment. Love ye therefore the stranger: for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."* (Deut. 10: 17-19)

Yet another command is laid down in the law of the Lord to Israel pertaining to the stranger in Leviticus 19:33. *"And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."* (Lev. 19: 33-34)

Those who are ever advocating the intermarriage of the races as the only solution to the world problem are quick to seize on such scriptures to justify their counsels.

The stranger shall be treated as "one born among you".

This statement does not give license to state that there is no prohibition against miscegenation. The Law, while demanding the fair treatment and the love of the stranger, does so within the limits laid down in the same Law.

The Law lays down the provision that it should be read in the hearing of the whole population of Israel, including the stranger, a practice which was carried out as stated in Deuteronomy 31: 10. *"And Moses commanded them*

saying, at the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men, women and children and the stranger that is within thy gates, that they may learn and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law: And that their children which have not known anything may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God." (Deut. 31: 10-13)

Thus the stranger, while being treated as "*one born among you*", is required to attend the reading of the law to observe and obey all that is written therein. The portion concerning the prohibition against intermarriage, or intermixture of species, has already been considered, and this should be recalled in terms of the stranger. He would be obliged, in terms of the law, not to intermarry with Israel' just as the Israelite was commanded to refrain from cohabiting with the stranger.

To what extent may the stranger participate in the national life of Israel, and what is his status?

The stranger is equal with the Israelite in so far as the subject of justice is concerned. This is the only equality which he may enjoy. "*One law shall be to him that is home- born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you.*" (Ex. 12: 49)

This great fact is everywhere to be seen where the Anglo-Celto-Saxon peoples are found. The statue of Justice with her eyes blindfolded, the scales in the one hand and the sword of execution in the other, typifies the Israel law of the stranger and his relationship to justice. "God is no respecter of persons." (Acts 10: 34) "*Ye shall not respect persons in judgment.*" (Deut. 1: 17) "*It is not good to have respect of persons in judgment.*" (Proverbs 24: 23)

Thus the stranger, whoever he may be, is entitled to justice and mercy, in terms of the law, but here his equality stops.

In the Mosaic dispensation and in terms of the ecclesiastical law (the law of commandments contained in ordinances) the stranger was not permitted into the fullness of the worship of God. Upon circumcision, he was permitted into the outer court, the "court of the Gentiles", but this was as

far as he was permitted to go. (Ex. 12: 48)

The benefits of the economic system of the Law of the Lord is not to be his. The year of release of indebtedness, in which every seven years the creditor in Israel was commanded to release all his debts, was not applicable to the stranger. *"At the end of every seven years, thou shalt make a release. And this is the manner of the release; every creditor that lendeth ought to his neighbour shall release it; he shall not exact it of his neighbour, or his brother; because it is called the Lord's release. Of the foreigner thou mayest exact it again: but that which is thine with thy brother, thine hand shall release it."* (Deut. 15: 1-3)

The reason for this is surely apparent, for then exploitation would occur and the economic system of Israel would be a farce. However, the stranger, in terms of the Law, may not participate in this benefit to Israel.

Concerning the food laws of the nation relative to the stranger, a most startling statement is introduced in the 14th chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy. After setting out in detail the foods which Israel may and may not eat, the 21st verse reads: *"Ye (Israel) shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself: thou shalt give it unto the stranger that is within thy gates that he may eat it; or thou mayest sell it unto an alien."* (Deut. 14: 21)

Recalling the Egyptian experience and the exploding of the "favorite or Herrenvolk" idea, this scripture provides the vital key as to the great affinity between the races of the world.

The words recorded are most significant in indicating the fundamental biological difference which exists between the races of the world.

Here is a Bible refutation of the statement that all men are one and come from the same foundation stock.

In Southern Africa this great truth is demonstrated almost daily, and many farmers who employ large numbers of African helpers can attest to the following story.

A Rhodesian farmer, having purchased a prize beast for the purpose of improving his herd, one day missed this beast. Determined to find it, he set out with an African helper and mid-morning came across the carcass of the

beast. It had died of the dreaded cattle disease anthrax. In such cases the law requires that the carcass be either burnt or buried six feet under the ground with lime as an aid to decomposition. The farmer duly gave the necessary instructions and the carcass was buried. The reluctance of the Africans to carry out these caused him to become suspicious and the following day he returned to find that the beast had been disinterred. Questioning the Africans, he found that they had removed the dead animal and that evening had had a great feast. They *suffered no ill effects*. It should be stated, however, that in certain instances Africans have been known to have died after eating diseased meat, but the cases have been few and far between. In most cases there are no after-effects. Had the farmer participated in the feast, his life would have been very short-lived. Why, then, may an African eat dead or diseased meat with impunity and an Israelite be forbidden the same flesh? From whence comes the old adage, "one man's meat is another man's poison"?

The answer is supplied in Deut. 14: 21. That Israel was forbidden to eat of things that "*die of itself*" is no prohibition to a ruling class of a moral nature but rather a warning against a hazard which, while having no adverse effect on the "stranger", would be fatal to the Israelite. The above story, attested to by scores of South African farmers, is a mute testimony to the fact that the prohibition is biological, not moral.

Further, instructions to Israel pertaining to the stranger and the manner in which he was to be treated is demonstrated in 2nd Chron. 2: 17. "And Solomon numbered all the strangers that were in the land of Israel, after the numbering wherewith David his father had numbered them; and they were found an hundred and fifty thousand and three thousand and six hundred. And he set threescore and ten thousand of them to be bearers of burdens, and fourscore thousand to be hewers in the mountain, and three thousand and six hundred overseers to set the people a work." (2nd Chron. 2: 17)

In the scriptures it is stated that the stranger may be used for work of any nature allocated by the king or governing body. This was healthy for the national economics of the nation wherein able-bodied persons who had joined themselves to the nation were to assist in the many facets of national life. But they were to have no place in any section of the nation's administrative or governing body.

That Israel failed to observe the laws of God pertaining to the stranger is very evident.

By virtue of the non-observance of the Law of the Lord Israel suffered the consequence in her national life. Disregarding the warning of Joshua previously mentioned (Jos. 23: 12-13), Israel found herself in the unenviable position of having the national cultures of the strangers impinging on her way of life, an intrusion which was detrimental to the purpose of God in the Israel nation. Of these conditions and the consequence to Israel, Isaiah states: *"Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire, your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers."* (Isa. 1: 7)

Hosea states of Israel: *"Ephraim, he hath mixed himself among the people; Ephraim is a cake not turned. Strangers have devoured his strength, and he knoweth it not; yea, gray hairs are here and there upon him and he knoweth it not."* (Hos. 7: 8-9)

Jeremiah's lamentation over Israel sums up the position.

"Our inheritance is turned to strangers, our houses to aliens." (Lam. 5: 2)

Israel's experience in the Promised Land was ruin.

This is set out most graphically in the 4th chapter of the Book of Hosea. *"Hear the word of the Lord, ye children of Israel: for the Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land. By swearing and lying, and killing, and stealing and committing adultery, they break out, and blood toucheth blood. . . . My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children. . . . For Israel slideth back as a backsliding heifer: now the Lord will feed them as a lamb in a large place."* (Hos. 4: 1-2, 6, 16)

Israel broke the Law of the Lord in its many phases, but even though it is stated that she committed adultery, nowhere is it stated that the nation was guilty of miscegenation. If this had been the case there could have been no hope for the realization of the purpose of God, reiterated in the oft-

repeated promises to the patriarchs, *"in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed"*.

The major cause of Israel's downfall was, as has been stated in the Books of Isaiah (1: 7) and Hosea (7: 9), the way of the stranger intruding into the national life of Israel. To prevent the final and ultimate corruption of the people God removed Israel from that environment and thus saved them from becoming as the nations "round about them".

This removal of the House of Israel has been regarded by many as the termination of the Israel nation and indicative of the failure of God's plan. The word "failure" should never be associated with God, for He has no failures. Israel failed God, it is true, but to doubt God's foreknowledge of their failure and His provision for this is to deny His Omnipotence. God foreknew Israel's failure, and the record of Deuteronomy 4 provides evidence of this foreknowledge. This chapter has been considered previously as that which instructed the new generation of Israelites in the wilderness as to the Law of the Lord. After reiterating the blessings for obedience and the consequences of disobedience, the scripture continues: *"When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shalt be obedient unto his voice; (For the Lord thy God is a merciful God) he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he sware unto thee."* (Deut. 4: 30-31)

Israel failed to meet the requirements of the Law and, in His mercy, God removed them from that environment which was conducive only to degeneration and ultimate decay.

THE JEWS

Distinguishing between the House of Israel and the House of Judah is necessary.

THE above history is that of the House of Israel as distinct from that of the House of Judah. The original twelve tribes had been divided into two unequally divided peoples. Judah and Benjamin constituted one kingdom, designated as the House of Judah, and the remaining ten tribes constituted the other kingdom and were referred to as the House of Israel. The House of Israel, last referred to in the 2nd Book of Kings, chapter 17, passé out of

the history of the Holy Scriptures but remains the subject of the greater portion of prophecy in which the *"holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost"*. The House of Judah, however, remained in the Holy land for a further one hundred and thirty years before she, too, was removed. Whereas, the deportation of the House of Israel had been accomplished by the Assyrian king that of Judah became one of the first acts of the newly-risen empire of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian king, invaded and afflicted the land of Judah in 604 B.C. Judah's captivity was stated as being for a specific period, namely, seventy years (Jer. 25: 11), whereas that of the House of Israel is not mentioned other than that of the "Seven Times" of Leviticus 26. This period was one of 2,520 years.

Abraham was not a Jew.

Secular history reveals that the promised period of Judah's captivity ended when Cyrus, the Persian king, invaded and captured Babylon. It is from this period and the events arising from the capture of Babylon that the name and people of the Jews first came into being. The name "Jew" is an abbreviation of the name "Judah". The oft-repeated statement of "Abraham the Jew" is therefore without foundation, he being the great-grandfather of the man from whose name the word "Jew" stems.

A consideration of the first and second chapters of the Book of Ezra reveals the beginning of the history of the people of the Jews. "Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, the Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? His God be with him and let him go up to Jerusalem which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel, (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem. . . . Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin and the priests and the Levites, with all those whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem." (Ezra 1: 2-3, 5)

The above scripture indicates the names of the tribes of those who returned under the edict of Cyrus. The second chapter of the Book of Ezra is devoted to enumerating the people. In this chapter there is no trace of any of the names of the tribes constituting the House of Israel. "The whole congregation together was forty and two thousand three hundred and threescore." (Ezra 2: 64)

These people of Judah and Benjamin began building the temple and after much hindrance it was finally completed with Ezra satisfied with all that had been accomplished. Well may he have been pleased. The House of Judah, having experienced the consequence of transgression of the Law of the Lord and having bitterly lamented their captive state in Babylon (Psalm 137: 1), surely they would abstain from all wrongdoing? Ezra's peace of mind was shattered when the princes came to him saying, "... the people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations, even of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians and the Amorites.

For they have taken of their daughters for themselves and for their sons: so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of those lands." (Ezra 9: 1-2)

Here, in undeniable terms, is set out the miscegenation of Judah, an act which had its natural biological consequence of change of physical structure. Of this biological change Isaiah had written, "*The shew of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not.*" (Isa. 3: 9)

Ethnological authorities are all agreed on their findings pertaining to the Jews. All are in support of this statement regarding the change of physical appearance as the consequence of miscegenation. Professor A. H. Sayce in his "Higher Criticism and the Monuments" states emphatically that the people of Judah, prior to the return from captivity, were a pure Nordic people. This fact has been verified by Sir Flinders Petrie in his study of the physical characteristics of the prisoners depicted on the walls of the temple at Karnak. The picture portrayed in this temple indicate the captives taken by Pharaoh Shishak in his invasion of Palestine during the reign of Rehoboam, the son of Solomon. The caricature of the captive of Judah was that of a pure Nordic man. Professor Sayce comments on the fact of the absence of the typical "Jewish" features.

Professor Eugene Pittard in his "Race and History" quotes at length his findings as an anthropologist on the Jewish question, and the meticulous care of all his observations are set out in detail. The pigmentation of the skin, the type of hair, the physical appearance of his features are all analyzed and summed up in his words of "lack of uniformity".

Dr. William Ripley, anthropological lecturer in Columbia University, New York, in his "Races of Europe", states, after an exhaustive study of the question of Jewish origins, "Our final conclusion, then, is this: It is paradoxical, yet true, we affirm. The Jews are not a race, but only a people, after all. In their faces we read its confirmation: while in respect of their other traits we are convinced that such individuality as they possess—by no means inconsiderable—is of their own making from one generation to the next, rather than a product of an unprecedented purity of physical descent."

Thus the impurity of the Jews from the racial viewpoint, while being attested to by ethnological authorities, is categorically stated in the Holy Scriptures as the product of mixed marriages.

A question may arise as to the consequence of this intermarriage. Why, if in the sight of God miscegenation is abominable, why was the nation permitted to continue? In former times, as in the case of Israel and the Moabites (Num. 25), the transgressing peoples were put to death for this practice. Why were the Jews permitted a reprieve? "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city." (Dan. 9: 24) The period of the nation's existence was predetermined in terms of the words "seventy weeks", a period of 490 years.

Josephus, the great Jewish historian, provides a graphic illustration of the ensuing uncertainty and chaos in the Jewish "seventy week" nation. To all this was added the problem of Esau-Edomite infusion in 125 B.C. During the time of John Hyrcanus the Jews were faced with the renewed hostilities of the Idumeans, the mongrelised descendants of Esau. Hyrcanus led the Jews against these Idumeans and reduced their chief cities and incorporated the mingled seed of Esau into the Jewish state. From that time onward the Idumeans also took on the name "Jew". Josephus states: "Hyrcanus took also Dora and Marissa, the cities of Idumea, and subdued all the Idumeans; and permitted them to stay in that country if they would circumcise their genitals and make use of the laws of the Jews; and they were so desirous of living in the country of their forefathers that they submitted to the use of the circumcision, and the rest of the Jewish ways of living; at which time therefore this befell them, they were hereafter no other than Jews." (Josephus Ant. 13)

THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL

While the Jewish nation ran its predestined course, the House of Israel, on the downfall of the Assyrian Empire, had migrated northward and joined themselves to a wandering group of peoples designated as the Scythians. Having joined themselves to this nomadic group made up of several racial groups, Israel kept themselves aloof from them. Herodotus, the Grecian historian, comments on the puzzling fact of one section of these "barbaric" peoples remaining separate and practicing a most strict form of segregation. They abhorred the free and easy way of life of the bulk of the Scythians, and the admixture of their own people with them, from the marital point of view was severely punished. In volume 4 of Herodotus, page 67, these words are recorded. "They (the section under consideration) rigidly maintained their own customs and severely punished those who adopted foreign usages."

Of the divorcement of Israel from among the Scythians the Apocrypha has this to say: *"Those are the ten tribes, which were carried away prisoners out of their own land in the time of Osea the king, whom Shalmaneser the king of Assyria led away captive, and he carried them over many waters and so they came unto another land. But they took counsel among themselves that they would leave the multitude of the heathen and go forth into a further country where never mankind had dwelt. That they might there keep their statutes which they never kept in their own land."*

Israel did not intermarry with the Scythian peoples, and rather than become as the Scythians they decided to leave and forage for themselves. They moved across the Caucasus Mountains into the Crimea, in which have been found Hebrew tombstones, and settled down in the north-west regions of the Black Sea.

Secular history records the rise of the Grecian empire under Philip of Macedonia and Alexander the Great. During their sojourn there both Alexander and his father made incursions across the Danube River but each occasion is marked by their rebuttal and the people left to their own devices.

The short-lived Grecian Empire fell with the rise of Rome, and soon the lands bordering the Mediterranean Sea echoed to the tread of the legions of the all-conquering Roman Empire.

PALESTINE AND OUR LORD

WITH the rise of the Roman Empire, events were moving to a climax in Palestine. In the unsettled conditions of Judea, Jesus was born. Of the genealogy of our Lord much has been said. Aspersions have been made to the effect that He was either black or coloured and that should He appear today He would be rejected on the grounds of the colour of His skin. In a recent publication entitled "Christian Convictions on the Racial Problem" it was stated that the racial purity of our Lord was very much in question.

Such irresponsible conjecture indicates a lamentable lack of scriptural understanding.

If the racial purity of our Lord is questionable, why, then, the genealogical line given in both St. Matthew's Gospel and that of St. Luke? If there were no importance attached to His family line, why bother about such things as genealogical tables?

Both genealogies surely provide enough material for any to study and justify such claims as "coloured or black", but none has been able to pinpoint any of the forbears of our Lord as being of mixed origins. The scriptures issue the challenge to disprove the racial purity of our Lord, but none has dared authoritatively to refute what has been recorded. Statements built on conjecture abound, and these are put forward as fact. The scriptures, however, do not allow for conjecture and surmise. They are most emphatic. Our Lord is clearly shown as being white and of the House of David, being often described as the Son of David, as in Matt. 1:1. Of David, the scripture has this to say. "When the Philistine looked about and saw David, he disdained him; for he was but a youth and ruddy and of fair countenance." (1 Sam 17: 42) Recalling the anthropological evidence as to the racial designation of the captives of Judah depicted on the temple walls at Karnak, namely, that Judah was pure Nordic in origin, this picture of David adds emphasis to that statement.

In the Song of Solomon is an account of the son of David where Solomon is described as "white-skinned" with "raven- black hair". Tamar, the daughter of David, is described as being "very fair" (2 Sam. 13), all of which should be considered when the ancestry of our Lord is questioned.

If the assertions to the effect that our Lord was either coloured or black are

to be taken as fact, then the words of Jesus Himself must be rejected, for He promised to be the guide of His people unto the end of time. (Matt. 28: 20.)

If this is so, then the black or coloured races should then have been the cultural leaders of the world, the servants of God carrying His Gospel of Salvation to the white races. Contrary to this, it has been the reverse. The white races and one nation in particular, has been engaged in this task and fulfilled the word of Jesus in His promise, "*Lo I am with you even unto the end of the world.*" (Matt. 28: 20)

Black our Lord could not have been; coloured or impure, impossible. The Scriptures state ". . . in him is no sin" (1 John 3: 5), and while many today hesitate to define the word "sin", the Scriptures clearly state ". . . sin is the transgression of the law". (1 John 3: 4) Thus in Christ Jesus there was no transgression of the law in any of its aspects. Paul, in his epistle to the Ephesians, speaks of our Lord ". . . having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself or twain one new man so making peace." (Eph. 2: 14-15)

"The law of commandments contained in ordinances." These are words pertaining to the Old Testament ritual of the "shedding of blood" by which the remission of sins was obtained. The fact that our Lord fulfilled this portion of the Law is in itself indicative of His purity. He was the "Lamb of God", without "spot or blemish", meeting all the requirements of the law of commandments contained in ordinances. (Lev. 4: 3)

If He were not perfect in all respects, His sacrifice would not have been acceptable, just as in the Old Testament times the imperfect substitutionary animal was not acceptable as a "sin offering". Scriptural fact speaks louder than any theological conjecture. Jesus Christ, our Lord, King and Saviour, was perfect in all respects. Perfect in character, perfect in mind and perfect in body, acceptable to the Father Who gave Him to be the propitiation for sin. (1 John 4: 10)

Building yet further on scriptural fact pertaining to the Mission of our Lord, the theory of the abolition of the Law by Jesus is shattered by the words of the Lord Himself. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all *be fulfilled.*" (Matt. 5: 17-18 See also 19)

There is no higher Authority to which one could appeal than Jesus Christ our Lord. *"All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men."* (John 1: 3) *"For by him were all things created, that are in the heaven, and that are in the earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist."* (Col. 1: 16-17)

The Wondrous Majesty of the Personage of the Christ is here revealed and it is on the Authority of His Personage that the words are spoken: *"Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle of the law shall in no wise pass till all be fulfilled."*

As has been previously stated, Paul, in his epistle to the Ephesians, told that which our Lord fulfilled: *"... the law of commandments contained in ordinances."* (Eph. 2: 15)

Having met our need and in our stead the requirements of this ecclesiastical section of the Law of the Lord, *"... this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, sat down on the right hand of God."* (Heb. 10: 12)

Jesus, having once died for sins, abolished the need for the further "shedding of blood" and thus "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" was fulfilled, *but this is all.*

Until the heavens pass and the earth cease her orbit around the sun, the Law of the Lord will remain in effect.

To illustrate the non-validity of the Law, and particularly that pertaining to the prohibition against intermarriage, Paul's writings to the Ephesians and to the Galatians are often quoted. In the first instance, that of the epistle to the Ephesians, Paul states: *"For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of the partition between us."* (Eph. 2: 14)

In this quotation there is certainly no justification for the non-validity of the law, even though a superficial scrutiny and casual reflection on the

words "hath made both one" might seem to indicate this. Consider the context again.

Paul is speaking of the results of the Sacrifice of Christ and its effect on the temple worship. This is evident in the words ". . . *and hath broken down the middle wall of the partition between us.*" This "middle wall" refers to the structure of the temple in which the non-Israelite and unclean persons were permitted to enter. The entry to the outer court, referred to as the "court of Gentiles", could only be affected by those "strangers" who, on acceptance of the Israel faith and upon circumcision, were adopted into the Israel family. Failing to comply with these requirements meant preclusion from any portion of the worship of God.

"And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the Passover. There shall no stranger eat thereof." (Ex. 12: 43)

This prohibition applied to those "strangers" who merely sojourned with Israel for a brief period. If the stay was to be permanent, then circumcision was to take place, after which the "stranger" was permitted to enter the outer court of the Gentiles but may come no further. The wall dividing the non-Israelite from the Israelite in worship was thus broken down by the Calvary Act. No longer was there to be seclusion of worship, and all, irrespective of nationality, are able to worship God through acceptance of Jesus Christ our Lord. This is all that is implied in Paul's statement recorded in his epistle to the Ephesians, chapter 2: 14.

The Epistle to the Galatians. *"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."* (Gal. 3: 28)

This portion of Paul's letter to the Galatians is most used in attempting to break down the rigid segregation laws of the Law of the Lord, which laws must obtain *"till heaven and earth pass away"*.

Consider for a moment what is meant by those who utilize this scripture to indicate a breakdown of the prohibition against integration.

"There is neither Jew nor Greek." Whether one is born of Chinese, Indian, African or European parentage, all becomes nullified in the acceptance of Christianity. The differing racial characteristics which indicate racial origin

become lost and biological affinities become dissolved.

"There is neither bond nor free." The Biblical interpretation, according to Unger's Dictionary, of the word "bond" means one of two things. Firstly, willing service in order to pay a debt; and secondly, a form of slavery. As there is no slavery today, the first definition must apply. On acceptance of the Christian faith all debt is cancelled out and the debtor is freed from his liabilities. The prisoner, too, serving a sentence for some crime, must then be released and is free!

"There is neither male nor female." On acceptance of the Christian faith one must lose one's sex. Throughout the world are many "born again" men and women, but these have not lost their sex.

The above may seem ridiculous in the extreme, but equally ridiculous is the assertion that Paul's writing to the Galatians breaks down the Laws of God.

The scripture under consideration provides the assurance of all believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, irrespective of race, of a place in His Glorious Kingdom when He Returns to set in motion the Kingdom of God on the earth. The context of Paul's statement is spiritual, not social.

Many an over-zealous "one-Worlders" has seized on the scripture recorded in the Acts of the Apostles to nullify racial differences. *"And hath made of one blood all nations for to dwell on all the face of the earth."* (Acts 17: 26)

The inclusion of the word "blood" in the authorised version is an interpolation, as Dr. Scofield indicates in the margin of the Bible. The revised version omits the word entirely, as does Ferrar Fenton. Fenton quotes the passage as, *"... because he made by One every race of men to dwell upon the whole face of the earth."*

This interpretation would be in keeping with the context, for Paul was declaring to the Athenians the power and personality of God. In the verse under consideration he was telling of the creation of the world by One Who is Christ.

"For by him were all things created ... all things were created by him and for him." (Col. 1: 16)

Thus, again, there is no justification for the assertion that the Christian dispensation is one of nullification of the Laws of God. Christ did not abrogate the laws. He ratified them.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND RACIAL DISTINCTION

JESUS said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." (John 5: 19)

The implication of these words weigh heavily against all conjecture. Jesus did not *abrogate that which the Father had done*.

The Father confirmed the continuity of racial Israel in the closing chapters of the Old Testament in the words:

"For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." (Mal. 3: 6) As with the nation, so with the Divinely given national constitution. *"Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel."* (Mal. 4: 4)

If, as so many infer, the New Testament were in truth an abolition of all racial distinction, why does the racial designation of Israel keep cropping up? Why does Jesus refer to Israel as the object of His commission?

Weymouth's translation of Matthew 15: 24 is most significant. *"I have only been sent to the lost sheep of the House of Israel."*

The commission of Jesus to His disciples at the very outset of their missionary work, too, is not without significance. *"Go not, He said, among the heathen, and enter no Samaritan town but instead of that, go to the lost sheep of Israel's race."* (Matt. 10: 5-6)

These "lost sheep" were not a future generation as yet unborn. They were the Israel nation, lost through transgression, but about to be brought back again, redeemed from the consequence of transgression. The 34th chapter of the Book of Ezekiel leaves no doubt as to the identity of Israel as the lost sheep to whom our Lord was referring.

The great Apostle Paul too, dispels the delusion of the abolition of racial

distinction. *"I say then, Hath God cast away His people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew."* (Romans 11: 1-2.)

Such scriptures fall on deaf ears, for there are those of the Christian community who, heedless of what the scriptures say concerning the matter, persist in their propagation of the dangerous "**one-world**" theory. To such, the accusation of the Ever-living Christ to the Christian Church at Pergamos remains the same.

"These things saith he which hath the sharp sword with two edges; I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is: and thou boldest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth. But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel. . . ." (Rev. 2: 13-14)

The "doctrine of Balaam" has been considered previously as that doctrine which utilizes miscegenation to accomplish its ends. The Church at Pergamos was accused of this abominable practice and the accusing finger of Christ points down the corridor of time to those today who, like Balaam, advocate this same evil doctrine.

THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION AND THE LAW

Today there are many interpretations of the works of our Lord, not the least of which is this question of the Law. Almost two thousand years have elapsed since the time of our Lord, and time has, in some instances, distorted in the minds of many the reality of His Mission and Purpose. What effect did He have on those living in His time and the period immediately afterwards? Did they believe that He abrogated all that the Old Testament had taught?? What did Paul, whom so many use as an antagonist of the Law, think of the matter? *"Do we make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea we establish the law."* (Rom. 3: 31)

In the infancy of the Christian dispensation Paul, as did all believers, recognised the ratification of the Law by our Lord. This was the manner in which the message of Christ was taught to the Israelites in dispersion. This was the message of James to his kinsmen when he wrote: *"James, a*

servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting." (Jas. 1: 1)

This was the message of Peter. *"Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the spirit unto obedience and the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you and peace be multiplied."* (Peter 1: 1-2)

This was the message of Ulfila, the Cappadocian missionary who, in A.D. 356, preached to the Israel people in dispersion. The bulk of these people were still situating in the north-west region of the Black Sea. While their rejection of Christ was of an Aryan nature, they nevertheless received the message.

These people were called barbarians by the Romans. While they might have seemed barbaric to the pagan Romans, what in fact was their mode of life? Secular history provides only the Roman point of view according to the Roman way of life. Contrary to this, Herodotus provides a picture of a people ferocious in battle and utterly merciless in times of war, but at the same time a people governed by an instinctive sense of fair play. Discipline was their watchword and segregation their law.

These were the people who, after being pushed from the region of the mouth of the Danube River by the Huns in A.D. 376, plundered Rome and pushed north-westwards into Britain from the middle of the fifth century A.D.

BRITISH NOT A MONGREL PEOPLE

The fantastic influx of peoples into the countries of north-west Europe and the British Isles from A.D. 450 to A.D. 1066 would seem to indicate many racial groups on the move. That this is not so is elucidated by most ethnologists.

Professor H. F. K. Gunther, the noted German ethnologist, in his book, "The Racial Elements of European History", states: "The racial composition of England is worthy of special mention, for the opinion exists about the English people that it owes its capacity to much racial admixture. Whatever peoples, whatever individual Viking bands may have trodden English

ground—Celts, Angles, Jutes, Danes, Norwegian and Icelandic Vikings, Normans—they were always predominantly Nordic peoples. . . . English history is rich in the movements of peoples; in movements of races it has little to offer."

Professor Huxley in his "Racial Origins" says: "The invasion of the Saxons, the Goths, the Danes and the Normans changed the language of Britain, but added no new physical element."

Professor Freeman in his "Origin of the English Nation" states: "Tribe after tribe, Angles, Saxons, Jutes, Frisians, poured across the sea to make new homes in the isle of Britain. Thus grew up the English nation—a nation formed by the union of various tribes of the same stock. The Dane hardly needed assimilation. He was another kindred tribe coming later than the others. The Norman, too, was a kinsman."

There can be no question as to the common racial origin of those various tribes which invaded not only the British Isles, but also the Scandinavian countries. There were no ' indications of a mongrel people invading the countries of north-west Europe.

FURTHER RACE MIGRATIONS

The invasion of the Normans in 1066 was the last recorded migration as such. There is, however, yet a further race migration which took the form of colonization on the occasion of the formation of the British Empire. Elements *of the same racial grouping* spread abroad from the countries which they had claimed as their own. South Africa is one case in point. When the French Huguenots fled from religious persecution in Europe they joined with British settlers to form what has today become the Union of South Africa. The original settlers, irrespective of land of origin, France, Holland or Britain, were racially the same people. Since then, however, there have been other settlers of Germanic origin, racially antagonistic and opposed to the Anglo-Saxon settlers. This has led too much of the estranged conditions which today are rife in the land and illustrates, on a small scale, the modern consequence of accumulated animosities due to the continued discordant contact of alien races.

THE WORLD OF TODAY

TODAY, the races of the world are bristling with animosity. Heedless of the scriptural directive for each and every race to develop along its own lines, under the guidance of the modern development of the House of Israel and God's blueprint, the solution to the problem of race relationship is lost in the maze of misdirected, uninformed policy. Without the Divine Directive of God, it is small I wonder that the present history of the world writes, as a sub-heading to our times: "Races in Chaos".

The so-called modern approach to the Word of God with its doubts and denials, its allegations and conjectures, have contributed in no small measure to the racial disorder of our age. With the banishment of the Old Testament narrative to the realms of fable, legend and myth, this modern world is left to its own devices in order to formulate its "peace policy".

The general trend in the formulation of this seems to be centered on a corrupt distortion of the ideal of the "brotherhood of man". This "brotherhood" can, and will be realized only when Christ returns and applies the Biblical Law governing the relationships of the races of the world.

The words "corrupt distortion" is instigated by the viewpoint, propagated by so many, of the equality of the races of the world. From the anthropological point of view there is no such thing. Physiologically, the coloured and white races of the world differ in many respects. These facts should always be borne in mind and the different racial characteristics studied, when the subject of peace policies is considered. The ultimate goal should be the unity of man, not the uniformity of man. The so-called "peace-makers" of the world seem bent on achieving the last in order to attain the first, hence our age of chaos.

The "one-world" policy is rigorously pursued irrespective of the implications. Before advocating the "one-world" theory, a consideration of the opinion of the racial groups should be investigated. How, for instance, do the coloured races feel and what is their attitude toward complete integration and miscegenation?

In the Union of South Africa the races concerned in the matter are the Bantu and the European. What is the opinion of the individual within both races concerning the subject?

The European attitude is well known and is summed up in one word. Undesirable!

The Bantu attitude is similar, stemming from an inherent distaste for the breaking of natural laws. Have the "one-Worlders" approached the Bantu people and asked their opinion on the subject of miscegenation?

A typical Bantu family were interviewed on this subject and their reactions are recorded hereunder.

Willie Rasebotsa, Basuto, born in Tzaneen, Northern Transvaal. "I object to intermarriage with the white people because of the children. If the children are partly white, there would be no place for them in the kraal. The white man, too, would not want them. They would become a lost people. This we do not want. As for mixing the white man and the African together, this can never be. We have our own customs and you have yours. The two will never be the same. We do not want to be a black white man we want to stay as we were made by God."

Gethey Rasebotsa, Zulu, born in Vryheid, Natal. "It is very bad for the black man and the white to marry. My daughters will never marry a white man. We Zulus do not want coloured children. Only a bad African will marry with the white people, and I think, too, that only a bad European will marry a black wife."

Judith Masuku, an unmarried Zulu woman, also stated: "I like it better for the black man to stay black—a coloured man is no good because it is not my nation. Because of the children, I don't like it."

From the above emerges the fact of the inherent racial pride of the Bantu peoples and their abhorrence of the pollution of the nations. In their tribal state they, too, practice a form of segregation in order to prevent intermarriage with certain tribes within the Bantu family. The Zulu, claimed as the aristocrat of the South African Bantu, while permitting a fusion with specified tribes, are most stringent in their prohibition against intermarriage with the Bantu people of Nyasaland. Their abhorrence, too, of the intermarriage with the Indian population of Natal is manifest.

Equally repugnant is the thought of intermarriage to the Indian of India, who practices a more rigid form of segregation than is applied in the Union

of South Africa. The caste system of India is an illustration of this.

The different races of the world have each developed their own characteristics and cultures. They are proud of their achievement. They do not want to lose this and become a pseudo-white man and adopt an alien way of life.

The "one-Worlders" should consider these matters - before advocating a world of one colour and the breakdown, of the essential inherent racial characteristics.

It is inevitable that certain individuals within the racial groups of the world will disagree with the retention of racial S purity. Social status and general environment invariably affect the attitude and reasoning of the individual. This I being so, an impartial source of information will provide its view on the subject of the mixing of races.

BIOLOGICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL FACTS

Professor R. Ruggles, PH.D., LL.D., F.L.S., in the "Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland", states: "I have expressed the view that miscegenation in general is to be deprecated when occurring between an advanced and a much more backward race."

Addressing the second International Congress of Eugenics in Baltimore in 1923, the noted Norwegian physiologist, Dr. J. A. Mjoern, stated: "Hybrid offspring are inferior to either parent. They are often mentally and physically unsound; they are more liable to be a burden on the State, from both moral and physical affinity; they are more subject to tuberculosis and similar diseases."

Professor N. S. Shaler asserted similar findings at a later congress when he added: "It is not only a general belief that hybrids of blacks and whites are less prolific and more liable to disease than the pure bloods of either stock, but also that they seldom live long."

The problem as to the consequences of the intermarriage of the different races is comparatively new and geneticists in their laboratories have turned their attentions to rapidly breeding forms of animal and plant life in order to obtain information and data on the question of the crossing of species.

That animal and plant life react to crossing in the same manner as do Homo sapiens is a fact attested to by most physiologists. Professor Ruggles stating: "Crossing of races and gentical segregation appear to have played exactly the same part in man that they have among animal species." ("Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.")

To await the effects of deliberate crossings in man would be too lengthy an affair, in consequence of which men of science have studied the effects of animal and plant life and have provided such considered opinions as those of Professor Ruggles, Dr. J. A. Mjoern and Professor Shaler.

Observations made in various biological tests of crossing of species have produced many notable features.

Professor P. C. Koller in his contribution to the "Journal of Genetics" itemizes the structural changes which take place when the species are crossed. Varying degrees of sterility have been noted in the male offspring. After commenting on this, Professor Koller continues: "The question arises, are there, or are there not, other differences especially structural in nature, between the races besides the gene or genes which control sterility in the hybrid male?"

Other biologists have supplied the answer to this, and the reply is yes. In 1934 Painter, an eminent physiologist, discovered a new method of chromosome analysis which has enabled the biologists to study and analyze the behavior of the chromosomes in the salivary gland. This behavior in the hybrid offspring is infinitely different to either parent stock. Thus changes in physical structure down to the minutest detail are observed. Are these changes advantageous or detrimental?

Dr. M. Steggerda in his contribution to the "American Journal of Physical Anthropology" has provided statistics of measurements taken of the offspring of the union between the white man and Jamaican. The hybrid is like neither of the parent stock in build nor in colour. The fallacy that the offspring inherits the best qualities of either parent is exploded in this survey. The bodily proportions of the tall Jamaican is lost, the astuteness and mental capabilities become dulled. The picture becomes one of deterioration rather than of accentuated vigor in all respects. The mentality of the racial hybrid is a problem which defies statistical analysis owing to

the fact of environment. By virtue of social position, the half-breed is denied the opportunity of showing his capacity. The outward show of restlessness and resentment colour the whole of the hybrid's mentality. An inferiority complex is the overruling factor which renders the task of accurate analysis virtually impossible. An attempt has been made by the United States Army to measure the ratio of intelligence between the White, the Negro and the half-breed, but results have been too inconsistent to issue facts. Factors such as the degree or amount of intermarriage and the generations involved all add to the difficulty of analysis.

By virtue of the general abhorrence of intermarriage and the social consequences of this in the last century, few records are available today wherein may be traced, from father to son, the actions of the product of intermarriage. One record, however, has survived and is quoted in a publication entitled "Applied Eugenics" by Popenoe and Johnson. The extract from this paper provides a graphic illustration of the reality of the laws of heredity.

"From one lazy vagabond nicknamed 'Juke', born in rural New York in 1720, whose two sons married five degenerate sisters, six generations numbering about 1,200 persons of every grade of idleness, viciousness, lewdness, pauperism, disease, idiocy, insanity and criminality were traced. Of the total seven generations, 300 died in infancy; 310 were professional paupers kept in almshouses; 440 physically wrecked by their own "diseased wickedness"; more than half the women fell into prostitution; 130 were convicted criminals; 60 were thieves; 7 were murderers; only 20 learned a trade, 10 of these in State prisons; and all at a cost to the State of over 1,250,000 dollars."

These facts emerged as obtaining in 1877. By 1915 the Jukes family had reached the ninth generation and had spread over many districts, the sum total of descendants being 2,820, of whom half were living. Of these descendants a in 1915, "Applied Eugenics" states: "They showed once more : the same feeble-mindedness, indolence, licentiousness and dishonesty, even when not handicapped by the associations of their family name, and despite their being surrounded by better social conditions."

The Jukes appear to be assimilated in the general trend of practices in the period subsequent to the termination of the first world war. This history of the Jukes family could be dismissed were it not for evidence provided by

physiological and biological science.

In summing up the question as to the desirability of I crossed species and the so-called "vigour" of the hybrid offspring, the general consensus of opinion is expressed in the words of Professor Ruggles when he stated: ". . . miscegenation in general is to be deprecated when occurring between an advanced and a much more backward race."

Many spiritually-minded biologists have made statements concerning the effects of intermarriage between the races of the world. They have intimated that the fact of structural changes and sterility occurring may well be the warning of God against the attempt to disrupt His perfect creation.

Intermarriage and cohabitation between the families of the earth has no authoritative backing. Science does not support it and Almighty God certainly does not advocate it as the means to achieving world harmony and peace.

Those who, in the face of the evidence of scripture, anthropologist, physiologist and biologist still persist in propagating the uniformity of the races as the means to achieving unity in man are, by their policy, courting disaster. This policy in the end will find the world peopled by one conglomerate mixture of unstable, immoral, disease-prone people.

Is this their happiness?

The picture is surely repugnant to all, irrespective of skin colour. While some recognize and acknowledge the abomination of miscegenation, they nevertheless pursue their policy of complete integration. Where will this lead? The danger of integration lies in the fallen nature of man and how gullible is man to believe that the consequences of integration will stop when the social barriers are down.

Integration is the first step to miscegenation.

With the barrier of social segregation down, those who are held in check by the possible social outcome of the cohabitation with other races will now freely mix and a section of hybrids will eventuate whom neither the while nor the coloured races will own. Just as in the case of the direct propagation

of miscegenation, the advocating of racial integration, in view of the nature and character of man today, can only culminate in the misery and suffering of an unwanted mixed breed of people.

CONCLUSION

THE problem of race and race relationship grows daily more urgent and demands solution. The continued exploitation and oppression which arises out of the greed of man is to be strongly deplored. The mishandling and misunderstanding of the under-developed races, due to a disjointed knowledge of these people and particularly of the Holy Scriptures, adds to the burden of the world.

The latest endeavour of man, the United Nations Organization, has failed lamentably to produce a working solution, and consequently the chaos and antagonism of the races mounts perceptibly each day. Man is incapable of providing the necessary blueprint whereby the races of the world may live in harmony and peace.

What, then, is our future? Is the world to continue to be torn asunder by the repeated failures of human experimentation?

What of the Creator of mankind? What of Him Who gave His only begotten Son for the world's peace? What has He for the world? God created the earth and filled it with life. He created the races of the earth and endowed each of them with differing talents according to their needs. "And God saw everything that he had made, and, behold it was very good." (Gen: 1: 31)

Each race had, and still has, its peculiar talent, the operation of which could and will provide for the harmony of the world. Satanic intrusion disrupted the harmony which obtained in the perfection of God's creation.

The restoration to this former state was God's purpose in the creation of a living witness to His intention for all the families of the earth. Israel was formed as an instrument to demonstrate God's Will to all mankind. The formula for life and its principles were given to Israel, for mankind, at Sinai. They failed to apply these principles, while we, as the modern development of this same House of Israel, still fail to demonstrate the ultimate functioning of the Will of God.

The chaos of today will continue to mount until circumstances force our nation to call on God as she has done on so many occasions in the past. The alleviation of the world's suffering is within the hands of Israel. The Power of Prayer, so wonderfully demonstrated in two eras of conflict, is ever available to all. That this Gracious Gift of God will be used by Israel is attested to by the writings of Ezekiel the prophet.

"Thus saith the Lord; I will yet for this be enquired of by the house of Israel, to do it for them." (Ezek. 36: 37)

God's answer to the prayer of faith will be manifest in a wondrous way.

From the ashes and ruins of Armageddon will rise the glory of a new age. Christ will come and on *"His shoulder shall be the government of the people."* The laws of God, the principle for life, inscribed on the heart of the nation (Heb. 8: 10), the Kingdom of God will be in operation on the earth. This is the goal for which Jesus told us to pray. *"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven."*

Until the dawning of that great Day, Jesus, in His Olivet Discourse, declares an intensification of the conditions now prevalent in the earth. Throughout the gloom and despair of the picture of the end of the age, however, shines the radiant promise of His Glorious Return: *"He shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you."* (Acts 3: 20)

The providence of God in the functioning of His Kingdom will meet each and every desperate need of the day.

Does man need security? The Kingdom of God provides security.

Does man need liberty? The Kingdom of God provides liberty.

Does man need justice? The Kingdom of God provides justice.

Each and every phase of life of every race is catered for in the Kingdom of God on the earth. The functioning of this Kingdom will alleviate all anxiety, insecurity and uncertainty in the realization of the application of the Divine Principles of God's Perfect Will.

The answer, therefore, to the problem of race relationship in which every

race shall live in peace, harmony, justice and mercy is to be found in the Divine injunction: *"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness and all these things will be added unto you."* (Matt. 6: 33)

Written by William G. Finlay