

## RACE MIXING IS A PLAGUE AGAINST PURITY AND AN ABOMINATION TO GOD.

### HOW CIVILIZATIONS FALL?

I have pointed out that disobedience to nature's law is disobedience to God. The success or failure of men on the world stage can be judged in terms of their obedience or disobedience to natural law. When men (men of every race) live in obedience to natural law, specifically in that they recognize and respect the territorial imperative designated by God in creation (Deut 32:8; Acts 17:26), they are culturally prosperous and in harmony with themselves and nature. When clear demarcation lines are violated, there is war, chaos, and cultural diffusion until one culture or another is destroyed.

Nature and nature's God have placed a natural and wholesome antipathy between races of men. So long as they maintain their own territories, such antipathies will not necessitate bloodshed. It is no surprise, then, that when God told Israel to enter and conquer Canaan, He gave them specific instructions to "utterly destroy them" (Deut. 7:1-6) and to drive out the inhabitants of the land. Canaan was a land inhabited by the Canaanite descendants of Ham, but the land was clearly preordained and intended for the people of Israel, as can be demonstrated by Scripture. In the same way, Europe, Australia, the U.S.A. and all White civilizations were intended for that race. Historical and empirical examples prove this out. History has also demonstrated the machinations of natural law, in that, when White civilizations have tolerated flagrant violations of the racial and territorial imperative, those White civilizations have no matter how great crumbled and decayed.

No White civilization has ever survived the infusion of non-White racial stock into its society. Non-White immigration, whether it be in the form of forced servitude, or voluntary, eventually results in miscegenation. It is axiomatic (self-evident). The history of the world is positively littered with the archeological remnant of great White civilizations that have succumbed to internal cultural and racial decay due to large scale admixture. Examples are the Royal Dynasty of Sumer (c. 3100-2300 B.C.), Egypt (c. 2950-526 B.C.), Assyria (c. 2400-607 B.C.), Babylon (c. 2000-537 B.C.), Persia (c. 2000-331 B.C.), Israel (1453-585 B.C.), Carthage (814-146 B.C.), Greece (c. 750-168 B.C.), Parthia (c. 720 B.C.-227 A.D.), Rome (c. 500 B.C.-330 A.D.), and now South Africa, Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Europe, Britain, and America will soon follow.

All of these civilizations either collapsed or will collapse for the very same reason. They all suffer from the same hubris and arrogant pride as exhibited by Whites to this day. All were magnificent civilizations from which flowed the cultural genius of the founding race. Science, philosophy, agriculture, art and architecture thrived in these civilizations when they were culturally homogenous. But when they falsely believed that they could survive multiculturalism, they died rapid and merciless deaths. America will be no different if we do not take action to change it.

The Founding of a Christian Nation: It does no good to postulate about the future of a country unless we first look at its past. Only then can a diagnosis be made with any degree of accuracy. America's first permanent settlement was Jamestown, Virginia, in 1607, and it started with 104 colonists, all of which were White, Anglo-Saxons. The colonies that followed never intended that the new nation should ever be anything other than White. The issue of race simply did not exist. It was taken for granted and was the furthest thing from the minds of the colonists. In that era, the issue of race simply did not exist, and people did not mix racially. It was very rare and frowned upon. The issue that concerned the minds of the colonists was wholly religious in nature. They fled an oppressive system that asserted its claim that church was subservient to and operated under the aegis of government, or the state. The colonists believed, and rightly so, that the state and its government should be subservient to the church; Christ as King, His people as subjects. At least one of the early American colonies can be described as being theopolitical in nature. That is, they understood that within Christianity there can be no separation of politics from religion. They believed that government should operate wholly on the Biblical paradigm.

In the New Haven Colony, colonial law came substantially from the Scripture. The people believed that Biblical law was all that was needed to govern themselves, so they adopted the law of God without any innovation: MARCH 2, 1641/42: "And according to the fundamental agreement, made and published by full and general consent, when the plantation began and government was settled, that the judicial laws of God given to Moses and expounded in other parts of Scripture, so far as it is a hedge and a fence to the moral law, and neither ceremonial nor typical nor had any reference to Canaan, hath an everlasting equity in it, and should be the rule of their proceedings." (Records of the Colony and Plantation of New Haven from 1638 to 1649, by Charles Hoadly, p. 69.) This means, of course, that the whole Law of God (Commandments, Statutes and Judgments) were adopted as all that was needed to run the colony. One other such entry said, APRIL 3, 1644: "It was ordered that the Judicial Laws of God, as they were delivered to Moses...be a rule to all the courts in this jurisdiction in their proceedings against offenders." (ibid, p.130.)

Having adopted the Judicial Laws of God, the colonists set about using them in every day affairs. They seemed to be quite serious about it as can be seen by the following example of a servant who was found in violation of Leviticus 18:23, which states, "Nor shall you mate with an animal, to defile yourself with it. Nor shall any woman stand before an animal to mate with it". It was recorded that, "One Hackett, a servant in Salem, was found in buggery with a cow upon the Lord's day." ("The Polite Americans; A Wide Angle View of Our More or Less Good Manners over 300 Years," Gerald Carson, p.7.) And so, in accordance with Biblical law, both the man and the cow were put to death.

### **Negroes Brought to America**

It wasn't until 1619 that the first Negroes were brought to the new world on a Dutch slave ship. Slavery was a common practice in those days, though not strictly limited to negroes. There were many White slaves as well. In the book "Why Civilizations Collapse" by Drew L. Smith, he explains why White colonists did not perceive a threat from negro slaves. He says, "The slowness with which negro slavery developed in America...was undoubtedly a factor that contributed to its acceptance by the colonists." He continues, "Moreover, the average colonial could never quite visualize the negro becoming a real danger to his civilization. The lowly status of the slave, and his complete subjugation to White control, placed him in such a position in White society that to consider him ever attaining a position of equality with White people was unthinkable." Indeed, it was unthinkable, at first. But ultimately Whites began to see a threat, numerically, at least. Slavers began to see such a profit in Negro slaves that they came in droves. Once colonists began to notice this, they made attempts to curtail it. In 1698, South Carolina passed special laws to encourage the importation of White slaves as opposed to Negroes. In 1708, Rhode Island, in an attempt to discourage importation of Negro slaves, laid a tax on all Negro slaves, followed by New York in 1709, Pennsylvania in 1712, and New Jersey in 1713. Ultimately, Georgia and Virginia passed laws forbidding importation of negro slaves altogether. Additionally, once the land became thoroughly saturated with Negro slaves, it became necessary to pass laws that severely punished miscegenation (race mixing). Virginia and Maryland passed such laws in 1664 and Massachusetts in 1705-06. Eventually every state passed such laws. It was a practice that was looked upon with disgust and revulsion, and such laws were written to PUNISH what was already forbidden by Biblical Law. Drew L. Smith (ibid. p.64) says, "it was felt that those few Whites who were without race pride should not go unpunished."

The sad truth is that as men destroy or violate the clear demarcation created by God for our good we come into close contact with each other in violation of God's intended purpose. As will be the end result with prolonged exposure, men begin to "play God" and miscegenate. It should be pointed out that when a White slave owner mixed his seed with a female slave, the act was, scripturally speaking, no different than "one Hackett, a servant in Salem, [who] was found in buggery with a cow." The act remains a violation of Biblical Law and the punishment the same: death scripturally speaking. By the time the people of the colonies decided to declare themselves free of English rule, the country was a well established ethno-state. Though slavery continued, laws were established to prevent racial intermarriage, and there was an informal policy of ethno-centrism. For example, only White men were fully men, Negroes being considered 3/5 of a man for legal purposes, and were considered chattel property of Whites. The wording of the Declaration of Independence, which included the phrase "all men are created equal" was clearly never intended to mean that negroes were equal to White men, but rather to illustrate that colonists were equal in every regard to their English brethren. As proof, consider that the draftees were of 100% Anglo-Saxon descent, many of which were slave owners.

The U.S. Constitution, written in 1787, is another document prepared by a 100% Anglo-Saxon convention. The "people" referred to in the preamble of the Constitution, and to whom the document applies, are specifically WHITE PEOPLE. The question of whether or not either of these documents give protection or rights to the Negro was dealt with in the Dred Scott case, wherein Chief Justice Taney stated, "It is too clear for dispute that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included, and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration."

Subsequent American history is testimony to the valiant struggle of Whites to maintain cultural control over their society. In retrospect, it becomes clear that the initial sin of violating the territorial imperative set in motion an historic battle of a good and wholesome people, on one hand, fighting to maintain a Christian society by setting legal boundaries to control mixture and maintain homogeneity and make the best of a bad situation. On the other hand, there has always been a large segment of society who reject God and Godly principles, labeling them "evil" and "discriminatory." These people, whom I call **racial abnegators**, live their entire lives in a debased state of defiance to nature and fight for the death of purity. In 1911, Representative Seaborne Roddenberry, of Georgia, attempted to pass a ban on interracial marriage by virtue of a Constitutional Amendment. He saw that several states could not be trusted to maintain anti-miscegenation laws, so he sought out constitutional protections. In his appeal to Congress, he stated, "Intermarriage between Whites and blacks is repulsive and averse to every sentiment of pure American spirit. It is abhorrent and repugnant. It is subversive to social peace. It is destructive of moral supremacy."

These were strong words which were not the least bit out of sync with public sentiment at that time, and, sadly, this amendment failed to pass Congress. Irregardless, many states still had bans on interracial marriage, and it remained largely the policy of the states in this country for the next 300 years!

### **Loving vs Virginia**

In 1958, two Virginia residents, a White man named Richard Loving, and his "childhood sweetheart", a negress, left state and went to Washington D.C. to get married. It was illegal to do so in their home state. When they returned to Virginia, however, they were arrested under § 20-58 of the Virginia Code, which smartly covered as a crime exactly such behavior as that exhibited by those two above. The crime of miscegenation in Virginia was a felony. §20-58 of the Virginia Code states: "If any White person and colored person shall go out of this state, for the purposes of being married, and with the intention of returning, and be married out of it, and afterwards to reside in it, cohabiting as man and wife, they shall be punished as provided in § 20-59 and the marriage shall be governed by the same law as if it had been solemnized in this state. The fact of their cohabitation shall be evidence of their marriage." Section 20-59, which defines the penalty for miscegenation, provides: "If any White person intermarry with a colored person or any colored person intermarry with a White person, he shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by confinement in the penitentiary for not less than one, nor more than five years."

At the October term of 1958, the Lovings were indicted, and on January 6, 1959 they pleaded guilty and were sentenced to 1 year in jail (the marriage being voided by Va. Code Ann. 20-57 which states, "All marriages between a White person and a colored person shall be absolutely void without decree of divorce or other legal process") but the judge suspended their sentence for 25 years on the condition that the Lovings leave state. The opinion of the trial judge was as follows:

"Almighty God created the races white, black, yellow, malay, red, and he placed them on separate continents. But for the interference with this arrangement there would be no cause for such marriages. The fact that he separated the races shows that he did not intend for the races to mix." This judge in 1959 understood what all un-reconstructed Whites know instinctually, and stated it unabashedly in his opinion to the court. This was common knowledge in the 50's.

In contradistinction to that, we can look to the Justice of the Peace named Keith Bardwell, who just recently (Oct.17, 2009) in Louisiana, refused to marry an interracial couple. This man, for 34 years, served as a Justice of the Peace and never once performed a single interracial marriage. He

claims to have performed hundreds of black marriages, but on principle refuses to join interracial couples. He says that in such unions children suffer. This man told the truth, and for that he is now being demonized and called a horrible racist. My how our society has changed!

In the 14 years leading up to the Loving vs. Virginia case, 15 states dropped their bans against interracial marriage. Afterward, 15 more states dropped their bans. The last two hold outs, remarkably, (and nobly I might add) were South Carolina, who in 1998 dropped its historic ban against marriage "of a White person with a negro or mulatto, or a person who shall have one eighth or more of negro blood," and Alabama, who overturned its law banning miscegenation in November of 2000!

Now in America, there is literally no restriction on marriage which is based on Biblical morality. The issue of race and marriage is passé and has been replaced with the issue of same-sex marriage. All pretenses at morality has been abandoned, and where once noble Whites worried about suitable marriage for their children, they now worry about whether or not we'll have enough children to sustain ourselves as a race.

How did we go from on one hand having national policy rejecting as "repugnant" and "averse to the pure American spirit" the act of miscegenation, to one of attacking as "racists" those sane few who either read their Bibles and reject the anti-God abomination of race mixing, or simply understand that as a nation of race mixers, we must necessarily become culturally bankrupt?

### **War of the Pulpit**

Ideological revolutions are won or lost depending on the vulnerability of the pastors. In the book Cultural Reconstruction, it was noted that the religion of a people is always at the vanguard of every cultural revolution. If the pastors are strong in the WORD, they will make a stand against evil no matter how unpopular their stance. But a weak and compliant preacher will fail the people every time. When this happens nations collapse.

Liberalized clergymen have been at the helm of the push for equality and integration over the last 300+ years of American history. Those who were not actively involved remained deathly quiet for fear that they would be labeled "racists." Evil is a subtle tonic. It did not ask clergymen to fall in lockstep without first offering them an alternative belief system to that "rigid" and "demanding" one found in God's Law. That belief system is what I call anti-belief: Antinomianism.

Antinomianism teaches that faith in Jesus frees men from the strictures and demands of the law, and that men are "dead" to the law. It is not a new teaching, for such changes in doctrine take time. The Scripture says that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, and antinomianism, over time, has become the foremost teaching in American churches. It can be summed up in the words of John Agricola, who in 1537 said, "Art thou steeped in sin, an adulterer or a thief? All who follow Moses must go to the devil; to the gallows with Moses!" Agricola pushed the idea that to obey the Law of God could only result in going to "the devil." The law became evil under this kind of thinking.

The Joachimite Heresy is another example of bad doctrine that has infected the church. It teaches that there are three ages of man. The first age was the age of the Father; the age of justice and law. The second age was the age of the Son; of Christianity of the church, and of grace. The third age is the age of spirit; when men become gods and a law unto themselves. It is a play on the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but just another form of antinomianism.

The fallacy of this teaching is that since law is dead, men can no longer sin. When men become immune to sin, they are free to do anything they please without concern for judgment. This is evil.

Antinomians have essentially done away with the entire Old Testament. Today, it is not at all uncommon to see a Christian with a copy of the New Testament only, and most have never read the Old Testament, having been taught it is obsolete in our age. The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible has this to say in regard to this notion:

"The time honored distinctions between the OT as a book of law and the NT as a book of divine grace is without grounds or justification. Divine grace and mercy are the presupposition of law in the OT; and the

grace and love of God displayed in the NT events issue in the legal obligations of the New Covenant." I do not believe that Christians can understand the New Testament without having first read the Old. Attempting to understand Scripture without first studying law is to deny Scripture and reject God.

There is no stronger recipe for disaster than to push antinomianism in a society governed by egalitarianisms. I do not like to oversimplify in an article, but there comes a point where an article will never end unless its content is limited. I believe that, like an octopus, or a hydra, evil works many fronts at once to achieve its goals. Within Christianity, Satan appears as an angel of light to fool the spiritually weak. Change within the church and its doctrine is dialectical in nature. It is a slow process of incremental change. Allow me to use this similarity to express how such change works:

"During the recent occupation of the SORBONNE a student obliterated a large "No Smoking" sign near the entrance to the auditorium and wrote: "You Have The Right To Smoke" in its place. In due time another student added: "It Is Forbidden To Forbid." This slogan has caught on and is now appearing in many places which have been taken over by the students. In foot high letters in the Grand Hall of the Sorbonne, someone has written: "I take my desires for the truth because I believe in the truth of my desires!"

Careful study will reveal just such a dialectic at work in the church. It began with one or two individuals introducing an idea based on their rebellion to law. In time others add on to this rebellious idea until it becomes doctrine, and ultimately, as is the nature of revolutions, sloganeering and philosophy.

In Christian America the slogan is "Diversity is Our Strength!", but this is the end result of a long struggle against truth. The media helped to precipitate change through the use of subliminal messaging and finally advocating open rebellion against traditional Christian morals and values. It is rare that one can watch television these days where you do not have to see White women slobbering on Negroes or homosexual love scenes. Our society is spinning out of control in rebellion against God.

Our educational institutions have taught for years now the theory of evolution and the concept that race is not real. They teach that race is only skin deep and that we all share the same basic DNA. This is a lie, of course, but a complicated one that can be counted on to tickle the ears of 21st century probabates.

And, of course, the courts are at the very helm of the war on White Christian culture. Never in history has there been a more frantic push against God and Morality. The Supreme Court has almost single-handedly executed genocide on Whites and their fragile culture in the last 70 years.

In 1946 the courts commanded the integration of the military. In 1954, Brown vs Board of Education caused the integration of public schools. In 1964 there was the Civil Rights Act, and, eventually, Loving vs Virginia allowed the death of purity as policy. This is just a few of hundreds of such cases where Whites have been attacked by the court. Each and every day there is another case reported in the mainstream press glorifying this "progress" in the war against morality.

Now ask yourself why. Why the push for lawlessness and multiculturalism? If Christians think about it, they will see clearly that a mongrelized society is an Abomination to God! If we can all be made to believe that we can legally race mix and remain Christians, we will end up as Sodom and Gomorrah: a society completely dead to God and rejected by Him. Christians who have taken the time to read this article should see that over a period of time our nation has been desensitized and re-educated into a nation of anti-Christ. We have gone from being a homogenous society unashamed to protect our culture and with the ability to see what is obvious (there is no such thing as equality!) to a society of people who jockey for position to marry our beautiful daughters off to the nearest Negro!

The Scripture is unchanging. It is not subject to the whims of man! It clearly tells Christians to come out from among them and to be separate. It tells us not to be unequally yoked with unbelievers! Trust God and His natural life order, and preserve your family in purity against that day of redemption.

Race mixing is a plague against purity and an abomination to God! Shun it and those who practice it. Do not enter a church with a multicultural congregation, for you will not find God therein! May the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob bless you with truth. Amen.

RACE MIXING IS A PLAGUE AGAINST PURITY AND AN ABOMINATION TO GOD.