

Rev. Joe Morecraft, III
Chalcedon Presbyterian Church
302 Pilgrim Mill Road
Cumming, GA 30040

Dr. Morecraft,

I am disappointed with an aspect of your recent Counsel of Chalcedon series entitled “A Christian Approach to Racism” - namely, that it fails to account for how our own Christian forefathers approached the issues surrounding race and kinship. You paint with such a broad brush in these articles that you condemn Christian opposition to miscegenation along with humanism.

You attempt to define the word “racism” as “discrimination based on race with the belief in the supremacy of one race over all others that are seen as inferior.” Where is the acknowledgement that conserving the races that God created and intended has nothing to do with “supremacy”?

You call racism a “heresy” which is “a denial of the fact that ‘the ultimate racial issue of mankind is the issue of covenant headship,’ Romans 5:12f... “

This means that all people belong either to the race of the depraved, whose head is Adam, or to the race of the redeemed, whose head is Christ. All other racial differences are insignificant in the light of this one and only racial issue of ultimate importance. Within the race of the depraved and the race of the redeemed, inter-racial marriages may take place, but no marriages are to take place between members of the race of the depraved and the race of the redeemed, all “unequal yoking” of believer and unbeliever is forbidden by the Word of God.

This is where I believe you run completely off the rails. At no time in human history before the middle of the last century did Christians believe the physical and natural apportionment of people groups to be “insignificant.” St. Augustine, in *City of God*, book XV, Ch. 16, wrote, “The ancient fathers...were concerned that the ties of kinship itself should not be loosened as generation succeeded generation, should not diverge too far, so that they finally ceased to be ties at all. And so for them it was **a matter of religion** to restore the bond of kinship by means of the marriage tie before kinship became too remote—to call kinship back, as it were, as it disappeared into the distance.” R.J. Rushdoony wrote of the “trustee family.” “It is called the trustee family,” he said, “because its living members see themselves as trustees of the family blood, rights, property, name, and position for their lifetime. They have an inheritance from the past to be preserved and developed for the future.” This is why Dr. Rushdoony considered “inter-religious, inter-racial, and inter-cultural marriages” to violate the very reason for marriage, as stated in Deuteronomy 22:10, which is to unite with a common helpmeet to form community.

As Rushdoony taught, God has always worked primarily through families and extended families rather than ecclesiastical or civil jurisdictions. Therefore, it is pernicious to call the blood relations and natural affections which foster cooperation, trust, connectedness, and shared sacrifice among a people “insignificant.” Scripture affirms that the love of one’s “kinsmen according to the flesh,” as the Apostle

Paul put it, can be a guide to virtue and character (Eph. 5:28-29). A strong bond of kinship leads to a strong nation where our children may safely grow to adulthood. And what makes a nation strong? Chief Justice John Jay knew the answer: common ancestors, common language, common religion, common principles of government, common manners, and common customs.

You obfuscate the matter of kinship by claiming that “racists” deny “the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone regardless of ethnic origin.” But you have not proved that desiring to maintain national and ethnic boundaries in any way denies the salvation of anyone. You use Galatians 3:28 to show that we are saved by grace rather than race. In the first place, Christians who condemn miscegenation and one-worldism quite agree “that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Corinthians 15:50). But you are in error if you believe that Galatians 3:28 renders race meaningless. Does it also render sex meaningless since it says “there is neither male nor female”? Of course not. You are mishandling the verse if your point is anything other than soteriological.

If you were merely to advocate spiritual unity “regardless of sex, race, status or nationality” then your statement that “The church of Christ is...a new race...” would make sense. Instead, you call for a physical unity which contradicts God’s judgment at Babel in saving us from ourselves by suppressing the concentration of wickedness.

It is fashionable these days for pastors to teach that Pentecost reversed or undid the judgment at Babel, but this is quite false. As Dr. Francis Nigel Lee has said, “Pentecost sanctified the legitimacy of separate nationality rather than saying this is something we should outgrow... In fact, even in the new earth to come, after the Second Coming of Christ, we are told that the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of the heavenly Jerusalem, and the kings of the earth shall bring the glory and the honor—the cultural treasures—of the nations into it... But nowhere in Scripture are any indications to be found that such peoples should ever be amalgamated into one huge nation.” For proof he points to Daniel 2, where the heterogeneous Roman Empire is predicted to fail and is described as being like trying to get clay and iron to stick together.

If, as you say, “the new Jerusalem will be one city inhabited by many perfected races,” does it make sense to work against God’s purpose in the world by blending all races and nations into one? Boundaries are quite healthy; fences make the best of neighbors. The second half of the Ten Commandments is primarily concerned with trespassing or coveting what belongs to a neighbor. In this context, obedience to God is defined in terms of respect for the boundaries of our fellow men. The Apostle Paul extrapolates this principle when he states that the “boundaries of their habitation” incline men to “seek after God” (Acts 17:26-27).

Surely you understand this because you acknowledge that “differences between individuals and races remain important on this side of eternity, since what God has created differently in this world cannot be irrelevant or negligible.” You acknowledge that God Himself created “interdependence of the races, of the families of Shem, Ham and Japheth, each with its own distinct contributions to make to the whole, so that without those contributions, all of mankind suffers.” If such a Trinitarian interdependence is the design of God, by what stretch of the imagination is miscegenation warranted, and how can race ever be called “insignificant”? After all, what on earth does the word “diversity” mean if it does not imply at least some degree of separation?

You are critical of apartheid and segregation without ever considering the very good reasons for them. Almost 40,000 White women are raped each year in this country by black men, and statistically zero black women are raped by White men. Why is segregation considered more hateful than rape?

Such systems result from an unbiblical nationalism that believes that citizens of a nation should all be of the same ethnic group.

It is incumbent upon you to prove from Scripture that nations should *not* be of the same ethnic group. With all due respect, I believe you found this idea not in Scripture but in the 20th century. General Wesley Clark said much the same thing when Bill Clinton bombed Serbia: "There is no place in modern Europe for ethnically pure states. That's a 19th century idea, and we are trying to transition into the 21st century, and we are going to do it with multiethnic states. Our goal is that after this year, it will no longer be possible for those who support ethnically separate communities to believe that they can succeed."

It was also in the 19th century that Theodor Herzl plotted to found the nation of Israel as a "*Volkische Staat*" for his people, the Jews. Despite the fact that indigenous inhabitants were expelled to make room for them, Israel's right to exist as an ethno-state is now accepted worldwide and protected by foreign militaries. Is it your position that the nation of Israel is founded upon an "unbiblical nationalism"?

Strong's Concordance, the Oxford English Dictionary, and all of human history define the word "nation" as a race or tribe.

Consistent Christians however cannot hold this view because they know that a nation is defined by its covenant to its God, not its race. Israel, as a model for the world's nations, was multiracial, but it was committed to the Lord by covenant, and that covenant was its unifying bond as a nation.

If a nation is defined solely by its covenant to God then we should be erasing borders and effectively destroying nationalities, which, as already stated, is contrary to God's purpose in the world. At what point did the gospel become anarchic? And which of our Christian forefathers would have agreed with you? Which has historically been better for family, clan, and church cohesion; the modern imperial state or the ancient ethno-state? In Isaiah 14:12, Satan is identified as the one who has "weakened the nations [races and tribes]." Why should Christians assist him? And where is the proof that Israel was multiracial? It was defined not only by covenant to the Lord but by blood lineage through Jacob. To say that Shemitic cousins were allowed to marry into the Hebrew tribes is hardly to prove the point that the nation was multiracial.

Under a system of forced assimilation, you correctly lament that "the black man and woman are required to give up their identity and integrity as black people, to destroy all ties of loyalty to one's family, history and locality." You write that "God is not color blind. He gave the human race its vast array of colors because He thinks they are all beautiful colors..." You oppose all attempts "to deprive a man of his color, thereby making him white in your eyes. That is racism." My question is very simple. Do the White man and woman have identity and integrity as White people, just as the black man and woman have "identity and integrity as black people"? Do we have ties of loyalty to our family, history and locality? If so, how does this fit with your contention that race is "insignificant"? And what should we call a man who spurns the gift of kinship by mixing his blood with a foreign race but an abuser of the Fifth Commandment?

For the reasons stated and more, Jared Taylor is certainly correct “that race is a real, biological phenomenon; that racial differences go beyond gross morphology; that racial loyalty is as natural as family loyalty; and that if whites, even with noble intentions, dismantle their own racial loyalty while other groups maintain theirs, they risk dispossession.” If such a terrible thing occurs, blame will fall squarely on the shoulders of Christians who could have easily put a stop to it but chose instead the path of political correctness.

In nature, pairings of kind after kind result in harmony and balance. Not surprisingly, God sometimes uses nature as a guide for how we are to live. For instance, “even nature” teaches that men should not have long hair, according to 1 Corinthians 11:4. One animal that is not discriminatory at all in finding a mate is a dog, which is called filthy in Scripture. As you know, this was the nickname for unclean Gentiles.

Your quote of E.L. Hebden-Taylor makes my case:

The consistent Christian gladly accepts all the diversities and differences which abound in the creation and in human society, realizing that all these have been created after their own kind, Genesis 1:24-32, and yet also recognizing that they all find their ultimate unity in the sovereign counsel and providence of Almighty God.

You indicate agreement with this, stating that “the solution” to racism “lies in the concept of RACIAL DIVERSITY IN COVENANTAL UNITY” (emphasis yours). This is very well stated and is fully expected from any consistent Trinitarian. “Within the boundaries of obedience to the covenant of God to which all are equally obligated to submit, it is possible to allow full freedom of each race to develop in accordance with their deepest aspirations through faith in Christ... In the church of Christ there is COMMUNION NOT EQUALITY, COMMUNITY NOT UNIFORMITY” (emphasis yours). Wonderful! But here is where you go off the rails again:

In the covenant of God there is no racial segregation or racial integration, because in Christ racial differences are insignificant, for all believers equally participate in the blessings of redemption and of the covenant... But the question is: What about interracial marriages? Should parents disallow their children to marry persons from other races? On the basis of the principles and laws of the Word of God, our answer must be that “for parents to forbid such marriage solely on the basis of race is sinful.”

On the contrary, I may refuse my daughter’s hand in marriage for any reason whatsoever, the suitor’s race included. It is incumbent upon you to prove otherwise from Scripture. A good place to start is with Abraham, who went to his own pagan kin to find a wife for his son Isaac. And let’s not forget Noah, who was “perfect in his generations.” A perfect segregationist, that is.

Christian young adults should marry only in the Lord...

It is true that all people should marry according to the will of the Lord, but you assume the words “only in the Lord” to mean “only to a Christian, of any race.” This is not what the text means at all. Nor does “obey your parents in the Lord” (Ephesians 6:1) mean that a child should only obey a Christian parent.

A very foreboding lesson is found in an Old Testament interracial marriage. Moses’ second marriage was to a black woman, an Ethiopian. We are told that Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Cushite [Ethiopian] woman whom he had

married, Numbers 12:1, Jeremiah 13:23. We know that the woman had been made part of the covenant due to the Lord's declaration in the same context that Moses is faithful in all My household, vs. 7. Miriam and Aaron are bitter and rebellious because the woman is a foreigner—she is of another race. The consequence of this bitterness and rebellion is that the anger of the LORD burned against them, vs. 9. Moreover, in what is perhaps an ironic judgment, the Lord punishes Miriam with leprosy which made her as white as snow, vs. 10.

This would be a cute story if it had any basis in fact. Saint Augustine, John Calvin, Matthew Henry, and, as far as I know, every other commentator, denied that this passage is about anyone other than Zipporah, the first and only wife of Moses, because there is nothing prior to Numbers 12 about her death. Zipporah was a Midianite cousin from the land of Cush, not a black Ethiopian. The 1599 Geneva Bible agrees: "Zipporah, Moses' wife, was a Midianite, and because Midian bordered on Ethiopia, it is sometimes referred to in the scriptures by this name." Why would you base theories that have permanent consequences for our posterity on a fanciful interpretation of an obscure passage?

And please remember, if you will, that this is the same Moses who wrote that a priest of Israel is to marry a woman only of his own tribe (Leviticus 21:14). It is the same Moses who wrote that a "mamzer" (defined by Strong's Concordance as "mongrel") could not enter the congregation (Deuteronomy 23:2).

Finally, you explain how the church is going to cure "racism":

The family may punish racist practices in the home and the church may ultimately excommunicate someone who, given objective evidence, expresses racism in his heart by the practice of racism in his actions or business.

Quite frankly, it disgusts me that a word invented by a Communist, Leon Trotsky, has been elevated to the level of a sin, and that pastors are excommunicating those who are hopelessly mired in the 19th century. Dr. Morecraft, if R.L. Dabney were alive today and asked to join your church, would you refuse him? He disagreed vehemently with what you have written in these articles. Does that make him a "racist" worthy of excommunication?

Thank you for taking the time to read this, and I hope you'll be able to answer the questions I've posed. I greatly enjoyed meeting you when you officiated at the funeral of our dear mutual friend and brother, Dennis Wheeler.

Respectfully,

Harry Seabrook