

The Kinist Review

A Quarterly Review of Christian Ethno-nationalist and Agrarian Letters,
Edited by John Marshall

Summer 2010

A Kinist Elucidation, by Ehud, 4

Kinism: The One and the Many, by Cincinnatus, 25

Prolegomena to Red Toryism, by Casey LeFroy, 31

England's Reformed Monasticism, by Charles, 38

A publication of the Kinist Institute for European-American Studies,
Atlanta, GA

The Kinist Review is a compendium of Christian ethno-nationalist and agrarian letters and is published by the Kinist Institute for European-American Studies, LLC in Atlanta, Georgia. The opinions expressed by the authors of articles presented in the review are not necessarily those of the Kinist Institute, and should not be construed as articulating the official position of the Institute on any policy or confessional issue. The articles presented in the review are not official policy papers of the institute, but rather are a collection of articles considered representative of the thought of the Kinist community in the main. The opinions expressed in the review are presented for entertainment purposes only, and should not be construed as advocating any particular political or social action, or offering financial or medical advice of any kind. The Institute is a limited liability company operated on a non-profit basis as an advocacy group whose official statement of purpose is published at www.kinism.net

The Kinist Review is published quarterly and is edited by John Marshall. The review is set in 12, 14, and 18 point Georgia type. Printed copies of the review are available for \$10 per copy by sending an email to jmarsh@kinism.net with Review Print Copy in the subject line. Please indicate in the email your mailing address and the issues you wish mailed.

- ◆ Responses and letters may be sent to the above email address, and will be published at the sole discretion of the Institute. Those wishing their response published should place the words Letter to the Editor in the subject line.
- ◆ The Institute does not advocate violence, discriminatory hiring practices, or any violation of municipal, state, or Federal civil or criminal statutes.
- ◆ Unsolicited email manuscripts are accepted and are published at the sole discretion of the The Kinist Institute. Articles should be typed, double spaced, and in ASCII or Microsoft Word format.
- ◆ All manuscripts become the sole possession of the Kinist Institute. The Kinist Review is copyrighted by The Kinist Institute, LLC. Authors retain copyright of article content in its original form, and may submit their articles for publication in other periodicals. The Kinist Institute reserves the right to republish in any form articles submitted to it for publication.

A Kinist Elucidation

By Ehud

In the words of Cornelius Burges:

“Nor haue I beene mine owne iudge, or expounded them out of mine head, but take such expositions as the most Learned Iudicious, Reuerend, and emine-
nene Diuines of this last age, as well as others of lesse note . . .”

I affirm the traditional Christian doctrine of Nations:

God separated the nations by prophetic decree (Gen.9:24-27). But, in Henry’s words, “They strove against divine sentence” (*M. Henry’s Comm.*, Gen.11) in the refrain of Nimrod, “Come, let us make a name for ourselves...” (Gen.11:4) over against their separate and distinct identities, Shemite, Japhethite and Hamite according to which “the nations were divided after the flood” (Gen.10:32) as delineated by Noah and the Holy Spirit back of him. We note that this interpretation follows by “good and necessary consequence” of [from] the fact that the words, ‘let us make a name for ourselves’ precluded the possibility of their simply seeking “notoriety” (as is the popular notion today) amongst outlying peoples as they were all present together. Either Nimrod was denouncing Noah’s prophetic declaration or we really have no idea what he was talking about. And since it’s clear that Nimrod also defied the No-ahic covenant’s demand of humanity’s dispersion and repopulation of the earth (Gen.9:1, 7) in the second half of his call by saying “...lest we be scattered abroad over the face of the whole earth”, we therein have a secondary confirmation of his intent; Nimrod, this “mighty hunter *against* the Lord” was acting in direct defiance of revelation. In one breath the Nimrodian unificationist slogan was the denouncement of both of Noah’s post-deluvian prophecies, proposing the inverse of the revealed social order.

God prefaces His indictment of humanity: “Indeed the people are one...” (Gen.11:6) “It is thus decreed that they must not be one.” (M. Henry’s Comm. on Gen.11) And though God’s confusion of their tongues could have been exacted according to social groupings, by age or any manner whatsoever, He ultimately decreed that the division would rigidly follow and reinforce lines of descent, by “families, tribes and nations” in keeping with Noah’s earlier proclamation (Gen 9:24 -27). Paul says of this that God has set the boundaries between the nations (*ethnoi*, i.e., ethnicities) “So that they should seek the Lord, in the hope that they might grope for Him and find Him.” (Acts 17:26) In this manner, via ethnic nationalism, says Calvin, “God, by his providence reduces to order that which is confused”. Again, by ‘good and necessary consequence’ this means that the alternative—the denial of such divisions and identities or the obfuscation of their boundaries—inhibits the pursuit of righteousness and order amongst the nations. Calvin goes on to call the crossing of these bounds “wicked lust...an assault on heaven... [an attempt at

the] overthrow of God's providence..." (Calvin's Comm. on Acts 17:26) Thus those who work to dismantle the ethnic sovereignties of the Christian cosmos take up the misanthropic ambition of Nimrod, following after Lucifer, the one who ultimately "weakens the nations"(Isai.14:12). Identity and distinction are neither evil nor hateful. On the contrary, it is "hatred [which] obscures all distinctions." (C.S. Lewis, *Of other Worlds*)

But someone will ask, hasn't Christ torn down the "wall of separation", declaring there to be "neither Jew, nor Greek, male, nor female, etc."?

Yes, He certainly has; but we mark well that Christ still calls Gentiles "sheep not of this fold" (Jn.10:16) when speaking to the Israelites. And since we still affirm gender distinctions as a reality of this world we are forced by reason of *excluded middle* to take the concept of our unity expressed in such passages in a spiritual sense *only*. Augustine has explained to us the true nature of 'the camp of the saints':

"As for the words, 'and they went up over the breadth of the earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved City,' this clearly does not mean that they have come, or will come, to one place, as if the camp of the saints and the beloved City are one and the same place. For these are simply the Church of Christ spread all over the world. It follows that wherever the Church is at that time, and it will be ***among all the nations*** - which is the meaning of 'over the breadth of the earth' - there the camp of the saints will be, and there God's beloved City. There it will be surrounded by its enemies - for they also will be present with that City, among all nations - in the savagery of that persecution." (St. Augustine, *City of God*, Book XX, Chapter 11)

Calvin seems to echo Augustine in his explanation of the same matter:

"Now, we see, as in a camp, every troop and band hath his appointed place, so men are placed upon earth, that every people may be content with their bounds, and that among these people every particular person may have his mansion." (Calvin's Commentary on Acts 17:26)

What's more, Calvin, in a thoroughly theonomic fashion, extends the Old Testament principle of ethnic nationalism to the New Testament people of God:

"He then promises that he will cause Jacob to increase and multiply, **not only into one nation, but into a multitude of nations**. When he speaks of 'a nation,' he no doubt means that the offspring of Jacob should become sufficiently numerous to acquire the body and the name of one great people. But that follows concerning 'nations' may appear absurd; for if we wish it to refer to the nations which, by gratuitous adoption, are inserted into the race of Abraham, the form of expression is improper: but if it be understood of sons by natural descent, then it would be a curse rather than a blessing, that the Church, the safety of which depends on its unity, should be divided into many distinct nations. But to me it appears that *the Lord, in these words, compre-*

hended both these benefits; for when, under Joshua, the people was apportioned into tribes, as if the seed of Abraham was propagated into so many distinct nations; yet the body was not thereby divided; it is called an assembly of nations, for this reason, because in connection with that distinction a sacred unity yet flourished. The language also is not improperly extended to the Gentiles, who, having been before dispersed, are collected into one congregation by the bond of faith; and although they were not born of Jacob according to the flesh; yet, because faith was to them the commencement of a new birth, and the covenant of salvation, which is the seed of spiritual birth, flowed from Jacob, all believers are rightly reckoned among his sons, according to the declaration, ‘I have constituted thee a father of many nations.’” (Calvin’s Commentary, Gen.35:11)

It is in fact the ubiquitous attestation of scripture that the races of men will exist eternally distinct from one another, though united in the Faith; the Psalmist speaks of the day when all mankind shall acknowledge the one true God, he shouts “Praise the Lord, all nations [*ethna*]; laud Him all peoples” (Psalm 117:1). Likewise, “All the nations [*ethnon*] whom You have made shall come and worship before You, O Lord” (Psalm 86:9). Christ himself commanded his disciples to go and “make disciples of all the nations [*ethna*]” (Matthew 28:19). James, the half-brother of Jesus, declared before the Jerusalem Council that the Father had revealed through the prophet Amos that He would send his Son (Jesus Christ) “so that the rest of mankind [*anthropon*] may seek the Lord, even all the nations [*ethne*] who are called by My name” (Acts 15: 17). Election does not destroy national identity in this life and the book of Revelation provides clear evidence for the continuance and indestructibility of ethnicity in the eternal state as well: In the New Jerusalem (the Millennial Church or Heaven, take your pick), “the nations [*ethne*] shall walk by its light, ... and they shall bring the glory and honor of the nations [*ethnon*] into it” (Rev. 21:24, 26). Furthermore, John revealed that the leaves of the Tree of Life in the midst of Paradise “were for the healing of the nations [*ethnon*]” (Rev. 22:2). “These passages are impossible to understand without recourse to a doctrine of Christian ethnic nationalism” says Trask (Trask, *The Christian Doctrine of Nations*). And it is taken for granted that all things perceptible to us this side of the veil will be neither muted nor blurred but crystallized and clarified in Heaven. Our ethnicity, as a natural heritage, is an integral part of our respective identities. (Exposition of this paragraph courtesy of Trask, *ibid.*)

Even the Apostle Paul made distinction between his ethnic nation (Israel) and his spiritual nation (the Christians). When brought before Ananias Paul pled his case, calling the non-believing Jews “my brethren” and though Paul cursed Ananias after Ananias struck him, he apologized only after being informed that Ananias was High Priest; he then quoted the Law against himself, saying “It is written ‘you shall not speak evil a leader of your people.’” (Acts 23) Paul, a Galician by nativity, a Roman by citizenship and a Christian by religion, clearly understood himself to owe a certain fealty to his race and the leaders of his race. The sense in which he called non-Hebrew believers his “brethren” was in the spiritual sense while he called the He-

brew non-believers ‘brethren’ in the tribal-national sense because both categories of ‘brethren’ speak to different aspects of the Apostle’s identity. Far from the spiritual docetistically superseding or abolishing the physical, as most moderns allege, Paul affirms and honors both as an integral part of his identity. *So ought we.*

One’s allegiance to their “kinsmen according to the flesh” is the traditional and biblical conception of Patriotism which in no manner diminishes a man’s allegiance to the Church universal; far from it, the Christian faith actually undergirds such allegiances as the God-ordained familistic social order for mankind. Dennis Wheeler enlarges upon the putative first century conception of Patriotism and its affirmation by St. John:

“In the NT, there is a differentiation between a nation and a geopolitical empire. John 11:48: “If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.” Israel was a separate nation within the Roman Empire.

John 18:35 ‘Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me; what hast thou done?’

An even better verse is found in John 11:50, where Caiaphus declares: ‘it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish.’ Two things: we are not to believe he was speaking of the Roman Empire when he used the word ‘nation,’ but of the Jewish nation which existed within and was governed by the Roman authorities. And the next verse says he didn’t speak this of his own initiative, the implication being that *God put the words in his mouth.*

So the distinction is drawn between a nation and a government. And the same distinction is drawn between a nation and an area... peoplehood revolves around family—blood lineage and marriage—a common language and mind-set, resulting in a common culture.” (Wheeler, *The Presbyterian Race Debate Part I*)

This kin-group/ identity emphasis exists from the beginning in the division set between Sethites and Cainites, it is asserted afresh in the tripartite segregation of Mankind through Noah’s sons, the Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob all observed this principle in their insistence that their sons wed none but kindred, it was codified as a prerequisite to Israel’s national existence in their various insularity statutes and this principle of identity as an aspect of the covenant is nowhere rescinded or abrogated in the New Testament. As I’ve said, the writing of the Apostles is found completely harmonious with this concept.

As to the “wall of separation” specifically, Beare tells us that the inscription which covered the Temple at regular intervals read, in both Latin and Greek:

“No man of another race is to proceed within the partition and enclosing wall about the sanctuary.”(Beare, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, pg.655)

In this sense, pertaining specifically to the Temple as the representation of Man's communion with God, I affirm that men of all nations have access to God's mercy by Grace through Faith in the atoning work of the greater Temple, which is Christ. His Commonwealth rests over the nations without muting or blurring their unique qualities one to another any more than it blurs the distinction between individual households.

This is albeit, radically at odds with the modern interpretation which takes the demolition of the 'wall of separation' to mean that all national, ethnic and cultural (and some even say familial) boundaries have been expunged. But I contend that this *new* interpretation was taught us not by scripture but by the Secularism of Robespierre and Marx. The Church never believed such things in any appreciable numbers prior to the Civil Rights Movement.

Dennis Wheeler takes Stigers' as the distinctly Trinitarian view:

"Philosophically, the [new] American policy of integration is essentially unitarian in principle, as opposed to being trinitarian. It holds up as an ideal the unity of mankind, whereas the Bible teaches us that the diversity of mankind is also a valid concept, not to be tampered with. To quote Harold Stigers from his commentary on Genesis: 'It may be said that, in general, nationalism is best for the world in its present state of sin and that to destroy those national boundaries is contrary to God's present will. It may also be said that God's wrath will fall on those people who by creating empires provide conditions that facilitate the increase of sin and so weaken men. God even causes empires to come to an end to hold down the increase of sin.'" (The Presbyterian Race debate Part I)

And John Vinson goes on to sum up the Trinitarian theory of nations well:

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

The 'universal brotherhood of Man', the leveling fusions of Bolshevism and the Imperialism which they produce are archetypical "raging of the nations and the imagin-

ing of a vain thing” (Psa.2:1; Acts 4:25) the likes of which “the millstone cut without hands” smashes to dust (Dan.2).

It is in the forgoing frame of reference that David considered homogeneity a national blessing (Psa.144) and Moses emphatically describes heterogeneity as a national curse (Deut.28).

The Kinist view of boundaries is the only coherent socio-political treatment of the *one and the many*, acknowledging equitably the rights and sovereignties of all people groups with their geographic, cultural and hereditary distinctions, over against the modern demand for global homogenization introduced by Bolshevism. In this sense it is the only view which moves not thy father’s nor thy neighbor’s boundary stones (Deut. 19:14; 27:17; Job 24:2; Prov.22:28; Hos. 5:10) and it is therefore the only view which truly comports with the Golden Rule: Do unto others as ye would have done unto thyself. (Matthew 7:12.)

Kinism is also the only view which acknowledges the concept of ‘nationhood’ as it has patently been defined historically, lexically and biblically—*on an ethnic basis*. And the only alternatives to it are either a universal open-borders arrangement based upon economic expediencies (Marxism) or some *propositional nation theory* (Franco-Enlightenment Statism). It is a choice between hanging and firing squad; either option is antithetical to any Christian world order.

I affirm that Race and hereditary characteristics are real:

Really, this tenet requires little proving as it is apparent to all that races do in fact exist both in and out of the Church; race is not merely a “social construct”. The light of nature provides us a profound inductive witness of this fact by way of history, cultural comparison and statistical analyses of everything from relative disease susceptibility to and native I.Q. variations between races. To deny such is the height of intellectual dishonesty and those who do so suffer the searing of their own consciences for their religious dedication to Liberalism. The founder of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church agrees:

“Very different is this Christian conception of brotherhood from the liberal doctrine of the "brotherhood of man." *The modern liberal doctrine is that all men everywhere, no matter what their **race** or creed, are brothers...*The greatest menace to the Christian Church today comes not from the enemies outside, but from the enemies within; it comes from the presence within the Church of a type of faith and practice that is *anti-Christian to the core...*one thing is perfectly plain--whether or not liberals are Christians, *it is at any rate perfectly clear that liberalism is not Christianity... it proceeds from a totally different root, and it constitutes, in essentials, a unitary system of its own.*” (G. Machen, Chpt. 6 of *Christianity and Liberalism*)

Dr. Machen reckoned both inter-religious and inter-racial 'brotherhood' to be patently anti-Christian. And his is, as I endeavor to show, certifiably the historic and biblical view of the Church.

“Noah commends his sons Shem and Japheth in his prophetic insight, what was to happen in the far-distant future. Hence it was that he also cursed his middle son... (Gen.9:24-27) because he had sinned against his father...*the historical fulfillment of these prophecies has come about in the posterity of these sons... Noah's middle son, separating himself, as it were, from both others, and keeping his position between them, is included neither in the first-fruits of Israel nor in the full harvest of the Gentiles*, and he can only stand for the hot breed of heretics. They are hot, because they are on fire not with the spirit of wisdom but with the spirit of impatience; for that is the characteristic fervor in the hearts of heretics; that is what makes them disturb the peace of the saints...those who boast the name of Christian and yet live scandalous lives... for this , we may be sure, is the time when 'Japheth lives in the houses of Shem' and the wicked brother lives between them... *we all* hold confidently to the firm belief that these historical events and the narrative of them have always some foreshadowing of things to come and are always to be interrupted with reference to Christ and his Church, which is the City of God. It has never failed to be foretold in prophesy from the beginning of the human race, and we now see the prophecy being fulfilled in all that happens.” (Augustine, City Of God, Book XVI, chpt.2)

Augustine says that *all of the early* Church understood the descendents of Shemites, Japhethites and Hamites as unique in their religious predispositions and ethical tendencies and that while the Old Testament almost exclusively corresponded to Shemites, the New Testament almost exclusively corresponds to Japhethites. Phillip's episode with the Ethiopian Eunuch notwithstanding, the New Testament bears this out as it chronicles the unique receptivity of Japhethites to the Gospel and the Apostles' conviction that their missionary work lay primarily in Japhetic lands.

Henry heartily agrees:

“He blesses *Japheth*, and, in him, *the isles of the Gentiles*, which were peopled by his seed: *God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem...* then we should read it, *God shall persuade Japheth* (for so the word signifies)... and the Christian church, *mostly made up of the Gentiles [Japhethites]*, shall succeed the Jews in the privileges of church-membership; the latter having first cast themselves out by their unbelief, the Gentiles [Japhethites] shall dwell in their tents.”(*M. Henry's Comm. on Gen. 9:24-27*)

But Merrill Unger is more direct still, saying simply:

“The *Japhethites* have been grafted into the good olive tree (Rom. 11:17) and Shem’s spiritual heritage through Abraham has become ours...[and Ham’s only significance was to show that] the moral character of a nation cannot be understood unless its source is known...to show the source of their moral pollution.” (*Unger’s Bible Handbook* on Gen. 9 & 10)

Every translation since the Vulgate bible has, after the precedent of the Latin term *Gentilitas*, delineated Japhethites singularly as “The Gentiles” (Gen.10:5) and consequently, as the peoples of “the isles” who “await His Law” (Isai: 42:4) and they who would eventually be grafted into the city of God (Rom.11:17). “The lack of any blessing upon Ham is significant... (pg. 7) Paul never visited Africa... Paul could confine himself to Asia and Europe.” (Frederic Perry Noble, Head of Presbyterian Missions to Africa 1890, *The Redemption of Africa Vol. I*, pg. 23)

And Eusebius finds it indispensable to confirm the nature of these prophecies of Noah, Moses and Isaiah, saying, ‘The apostles passed beyond the sea as far as the the Brittanic isles.’ (*De Demonstratione Evangelii*, Lib.III). Turtullius likewise confirms this, attesting that the Apostles traveled past ‘all the boundaries of Spain...Gual and parts of Britain inaccessible to Romans but subject to Christ.’ (*Adv. Judeos*, Chpt.VII. *Def. Fidei*, p.179) Origen also confirms this, as do Jerome, Arnobius, Chrysostome, Gildas, Polydore Vergil, Sabellius and Ebrard. *The emphasis of the apostolic missions was European because Europe was peopled by Japheth.*

At this point someone will undoubtedly ask, “Are Hamites, that is to say, Africans, precluded then from becoming Christians?”

Certainly not. Phillip did after all think it efficacious to witness to the Ethiopian Eunuch and tradition has it that the Apostle later visited the good Ethiop in Abyssinia but this occasion of a true African convert remains exactly as it appears in scripture, *an exception*. By and large, even the most orthodox Black Christians attain to no higher theology than *Liberationism* and anyone intrepid enough to survey the religion of *Reformed Blacks of America* will find that the greatest “conservative” Black Theologians of the Reformed churches agree with Allan Boesak that “**...racism is an inevitable fruit of the Reformed tradition... (p.86) [and they hope to give us] what the god of the white missionaries could not give...because that god was too much the god of whites... [This, Boesak says] is what [we] hope African Christianity can bring to West Europeans and North Americans... (p.51) [and that any whites who disagree with their redistributive social ambitions commit] blasphemy, heresy.”(Allan Boesak, *Black and Reformed* p.96) For them, Christianity almost always amounts to a social gospel which grants**

them (so they assert) unresisted and unrestricted access to all lands and possessions of Japhethite peoples. And any who oppose their forced Redistributivism are declared anathema, outside the faith. Even the greatest Christian thinkers among them take the Civil Rights Movement as the apex of the Reformation: They summarily banish Luther, Calvin, the Puritans and all of our heroes to the outer darkness for their “racism”. They, more monolithically than any other group, represent the very Liberalism which Dr. Machen said emanated ‘from an entirely different root’ than Christianity. But this is nothing new; according to Isaiah, Blacks are...

“a people terrible from their beginning forward.” Gill says this is “due to their black colour and grim looks...their vast armies... [and their physical heritage *via*] Nimrod” (*J. Gill’s Comm. on Isai.18:2*)

But Origen said the same thing long before Gill:

“The Egyptians are prone to a degenerate life and quickly sink to every slavery of the vices. Look at the origin of the race and you will discover that their father Cham, who had laughed at his father’s nakedness, deserved a judgment of this kind... Not without merit, therefore, does the discolored posterity imitate the ignobility of the race.” (Origen on African heritage and color in Gen. 9)

So again, do all or any of these things imply a necessary preclusion of Hamites from Heaven?

Hamites are no more precluded from the Faith than are Cretan-Jews. Both groups are categorically spoken of in highly negative generalities biblically (Isai. 18; Tit.1:10-16). Calvin agrees, saying:

“Nor are these vices charged against one or a few persons, but he condemns the whole nation.” (Calvin’s Comm. on Titus 1:12-13)

And on this subject Wheeler adds:

“The reason Paul used the phrase ‘this witness is true,’ is because he was afix-in’ to quote someone who belonged to a people that were known liars. If believing this were a sin, it would seem more realistic for Paul to reprove his lis-

teners for holding generalized beliefs about various groups. But no, he actually validates the practice.” (Dennis Wheeler, *The Presbyterian Race Debate* Part I)

Though Paul seems patently to practice what is now considered “the sin of racism” he yet directs Timothy to “Therefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be made sound in the faith.” The Apostle therefore presupposes the possibility, however remote, of their regeneration and sanctification without backing down from honest appraisal of their ethnic inclinations. To give fair treatment of both requires naught but honesty and courage.

On this basis, modern cries of “racism” ring hollow as there is no extant definition of the concept which would not indict Paul, Isaiah, and the Holy Spirit back of them (not to mention the entirety of the pre-1950s Church).

I affirm the traditional Christian doctrine of the Trustee Family:

In the introduction of this subject I defer to my better, the good Rushdoony:

“St Paul referred to the broader meaning of these laws against hybridization... (Deut.22:10), in II Corinthians 6:14: ‘Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?’ Unequal-yoking plainly means mixed-marriages between believers and unbelievers are clearly forbidden. But Deuteronomy 22:10 not only forbids unequal religious yoking by inference and as a case law, but *also unequal-yoking generally*. This means that an unequal marriage between believers or between unbelievers is wrong. Man was created in the image of God (Gen.1:26), and woman in the reflected image of God in man, and from man (I Cor.11:1-12; Gen.2:18, 21-23). ‘Help-meet’ means a reflection or mirror, an image of man, indicating that a woman must have something religiously in common with her husband. The burden of the law is thus against inter-religious, *inter-racial*, and *inter-cultural marriages*, in that they normally go against the very community which marriage is designed to establish. *Unequal-yoking means more than marriage. In society at large it means the enforced integration of various elements which are not congenial*. Unequal yoking is in no realm productive of harmony; rather, it aggravates the differences and delays the growth of different elements toward a Christian harmony and association.” (R.J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, pg.256-257)

This interpretation seems the natural and harmonious reading of Moses and Paul so long as we take Paul’s treatment of the matter as being anything other than an ab-

rogation of the case-law in question; and it seems apparent that Paul's only intent is to make *a fresh application* rather than an *abrogation-redefinition* of the law as there is no hint of negation in Paul's writing regarding the foregoing principle of unequal yoking generally. (Rushdoony's take of the Mosaic Law will be treated below)

Of course, someone will still insist that “The only requirements for a Christian marriage be ‘one Christian man and one Christian woman’.”

The problem is that *no one really believes this*. Not even the most strident advocates are willing to be consistent with such an egalitarian definition of marriage because if a man took the requirements for marriage as spiritual in nature only, such a fellow would have no legitimate basis for opposing the union of his eighteen year old (or sixteen, if you're in Texas) Christian son to a fifty year old Christian woman (or any other such vulgarities). Regardless of the man's professed egalitarianism, he would reflexively find himself either discouraging or outright forbidding his son from proceeding with such a marriage. Such a man would quite hypocritically argue, “You're at entirely different places in your lives...you have so little in common, etc.” In short, the man would find himself fiercely arguing that the couple were ‘*unequally yoked*’ in a general sense. This generic principle of unequal yoking applies across a broad spectrum of considerations (linguistic, social, cultural, racial, etc.). Montagues ought not marry Capulettes irrespective of conversion status; this remains *a self-evident truism* which flies in the face of the post-civil rights era Church's definition of marriage. Everyone knows, whether or not they admit it, that we ought to seek *similarity* in our bridegrooming after the exemplar of the first marriage (Matt.19, Gen.2:18-20).

And even in its most literal sense, we still recognize it as inhumane to yoke an ox with a donkey: Though they might plod in the same direction, at the same pace, at the behest of the same master, their gate remains distinct one from the other and it is therefore injurious to both creatures. And if we are enjoined to make such considerations of our beasts, how much more ought we to give such consideration to the yokings of our children?

Henry opines on the burden of these laws from the parallel passage in Leviticus:

“Here is, I. A law against mixtures, v. 19. God in the beginning made the cattle *after their kind* (Gen. i. 25), and we must acquiesce in the order of nature God hath established, *believing that is best and sufficient, and not covet monsters. Add thou not unto his works, lest he reprove thee*; for it is the excellency of the work of God that nothing can, without making it worse, be either put to it or taken from it, Eccl. iii. 14. As what God has joined we must not separate, so *what he has separated we must not join*.” [Deut.32:8] (*M. Henry's Comm. On Lev.19*)

Henry clearly sees some moral implication to the principle of unequal yoking, joining that which by nature God has separated, in the general sense. He tells us that the burden of the Law be against “all needless mixing”; this is in keeping with Rushdoony's assessment that the emphasis is against “uncongenial mixing”. This principle is expressed across a broad continuum of case laws from the most mundane horticultural

tural matters to issues of inheritance and nationhood.

Rushdoony and Henry both connect this principle closely with the Creation Image/identity ordinance but for the purpose of brevity I'll not entertain that implication at length here; suffice it to say that God created man in His image, commissioned Man to identify and categorize biological things on the basis of morphology, drew Woman from Man's own flesh (as a reflection of the man), and the first banishment-separation of Mankind was punctuated by God's setting of a mark upon Cain that Sethites might know him as "other". The implication is that by following the same morphological observations prescribed by God to Adam, Sethites knew to keep certain bounds between themselves and Cainites (as Dabney says, all things commanded to Adam are normative to Mankind as requisites to stewardship and dominion). And Augustine alludes to this when he connects the segregation of Noah's sons with the segregation of Adam's, saying, 'It has never failed to be foretold in prophesy from the beginning of the human race, and we now see the prophecy being fulfilled in all that happens.' (*ibid.*)

On the matter of *infamy codes* connected with the principle of unequal yoking Henry continues:

"Others think they [Non-Israelites] are excluded only from marrying with Israelites [this is over and against other sorts of unequal-yoking]. Thus the learned bishop Patrick inclines to understand it; *yet we find that when this law was put in execution after the captivity they separated from Israel, not only the strange wives, but all the mixed multitude*, see Neh. xiii. 1-2...It is plain, in general, that disgrace is here put, upon *bastards* and eunuchs, v. 1, 2. By bastards here the Jewish writers understand, not all that were born of fornication, or out of marriage, but all the issue of those incestuous mixtures which are forbidden, Lev. xviii. [The word herein translated, 'Bastard' is *Mamzer* in Heb. It is defined as "mixed, mongrel, mixed-peoples, alien, alienated, incestuous, one born of an illicit union"] And, though it was not the fault of the issue, yet, to deter people from those unlawful marriages and unlawful lusts, it was very convenient that their posterity should thus be made infamous...yet it is here promised (v. 5) that if they took care of their duty to God, as far as they were admitted, by keeping his sabbaths and choosing the things that pleased him, the want of this privilege should be made up to them with such spiritual blessings as would entitle them to an everlasting name..." (M. Henry's Comm. On Deut. 23)

Though Patrick sided with the Rabbis of his time in their insistence upon a purely patriarchal form of Kinism (without regard to matrilineal descent), Henry retorts that *we have a superior interpretation of these laws granted us by the infallible prophetic authority of Ezra and Nehemiah, who insisted not only on the exclusion of the foreign women but the mixed children as well* (some of the mixed assembly were by this time possibly three generations dilute). To be a Bastard/ *Mamzer*, was and is,

irrespective of religion, to be an illegal alien without any 14th Amendment option of naturalization.

So it is that the mixed peoples (*Mamzerim*) expelled in the days of Nehemiah became the Samaritans—though they worshipped the God of Israel, they had no “heritage, right or memorial” (Neh.2:20) with Israel because they simply weren’t Israel by definition. Thus, after having publicly read the Law and the genealogies, “those of Israelite lineage separated themselves from all foreigners” (Neh. 9:2).

The Lord Himself affirms this distinction when speaking to the Syrophoenician woman saying, “Let the children first be filled: for it is not good to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs.” (Mark 7:27) which is to say that it be immoral to look after the welfare of foreigners ahead of one’s own people just as it would be to consider another man’s children ahead of your own. We do not take Christ as engaging in gratuitous racial taunts but simply asserting His Patriotism, and special love of His kinsmen as an extension of His own natural family. His use of the term ‘dogs’ is taken as hyperbole meant to construe the distance of priority between His ‘kinsmen according to the flesh’ and the stranger. And this is not out-of-keeping with other such assertions made by Christ—He likewise drew such a distinction of priority in His calling upon children to “hate” their parents (Luke 14:26) by comparison to their love of God.

The principle of national and filial priority is also espoused by the Apostle when he says that “He who takes no care of his own, especially those of his own household, is worse than an unbeliever...” (I Tim.5:8) ‘His own’ (*idios* in the Grk., “of unspecified affinity”) is clarified by its subset, ‘his own household’; this means that we have a greater responsibility for ‘our own’ parents, cousins, great uncles, etc. than do those more remote to them. This principle extends unobstructedly to one’s *ethnos*, as is proven by John’s usage: “He came unto *His own* and *His own* received Him not.” (John 1:11). John clearly extends the idiom to a people group as a concentric outgrowth of the family. And Cyprian connects this with the identical sentiments penned by Isaiah:

“That every person ought to have care rather of his own people, and especially of believers: The apostle in his first Epistle to Timothy: ‘But if any take not care of his own, and especially of those of his own household, he denies the faith, and is worse than an infidel.’ Of this same thing in Isaiah: ‘If thou shalt see the naked, clothe him; and *despise not those who are of the household of thine own seed.*’” (st. Cyprian, *Tract I On Envy and Jealousy*)

But Augustine elaborates this connection further:

“For the examination of a number of texts has often thrown light upon some of the more obscure passages; for example, in that passage of the prophet Isai-

ah, one translator reads: ‘And do not despise the domestics of thy seed;’ another reads: ‘And do not despise thine own flesh.’ Each of these in turn confirms the other. For the one is explained by the other; because ‘flesh’ may be taken in its literal sense, so that a man may understand that he is admonished not to despise his own body; and ‘the domestics of thy seed’ may be understood figuratively of Christians, because they are spiritually born of the same seed as ourselves, namely, the Word. When now the meaning of the two translators is compared, a more likely sense of the words suggests itself, viz., that *the command is not to despise our kinsmen*, because when one brings the expression ‘domestics of thy seed’ into relation with ‘flesh,’ kinsmen most naturally occur to one’s mind. Whence, I think, that expression of the apostle, when he says, ‘If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them;’ that is, that through emulation of those who had believed, some of them might believe too. And he calls the Jews his ‘flesh,’ on account of the relationship of blood.” (St. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* book II, chpt. 12)

Augustine recalls to us the pledge of St. Paul’s Patriotism wherein the Apostle yearns to suffer the punishment due his “kinsmen according to the flesh” if it might affect upon their redemption (Rom.9:3, 11:14). This, Augustine construes as the Apostles’ conformity with the principle of Isaiah’s admonition (Isai.58:7). And really, if we disallow Augustine’s and Cyprian’s view (ethno-nationalism) here we have no rational frame of reference for what would otherwise be, if it were possible, relegated to nonsensical ramblings in scripture. If Augustine has parsed these texts incorrectly, we are yet to perceive any coherent context for Isaiah’s, St. Paul’s or Christ’s overt nationalistic sentiments. *They stand nonetheless.*

Henry once again reinforces this principle of familial proximity/ priority even in the finer nuances of the Law as it extends to issues of “favored nation status” in our foreign relations policy:

“We should think that the Edomites had been more injurious to the Israelites than the Ammonites, and deserved as little favour from them (Num. xx. 20), and yet ‘*Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite, as thou must an Ammonite, for he is thy brother.*’ Note, *The unkindness of near relations, though by many worst taken, yet should with us, for that reason, because of the relation, be first forgiven.*” (*M. Henry’s Commentary* on Deut. 23)

But overall, we recognize the deuteronomical case laws as outworkings of the Decalogue, *the Ten Commandments applied*. If so, it behooves us to ask from which commandment the principle of unequal yoking, in its various forms, descends; fortunately little inference is here required as St. Paul has confirmed that it has to do with marriage (II Corinthians 6:14). This means the principle of unequal yoking is a consequent of the seventh commandment prohibition on Adultery and this really makes the most sense as it is the only one having at all to do with proper versus improper

fusions of anything.

And such being the case, it is then natural that the myriad laws amid which we encounter the principle are found to have one uninterrupted thematic continuum—familial, hereditary, horticultural and other assorted ‘yokings’. The laws against unequal yoking precede the treatment of Bastards and Eunuchs organically, as one uninterrupted thought (Deut. 22 & 23 approximately). Bastard (*Mamzer*, ‘mongrel’) was a term denoting the illegitimacy and impurity of the resultant offspring of various sorts of unequal (adulterous) yokings.

This explains why the Septuagint translators opted to use *moicheuo* (an inflected form of the Greek word *moich*) in Exo. 20:13 in the place of our word, ‘Adultery’. *The Theological Dictionary of The New Testament* by Kittel (English translation by Bromiley) defines *moicheuo* thus:

“Of the intermingling of animals and men or of different races.”

We find an historical survey of lexicography thoroughly supports this definition. It is an inflected form of this exact word that was used by Aristotle to describe admixtures between dissimilar families of birds over against “true-bred” species (Aristotle, *Historia Animalium* XI.32.6-10). A.L. Peck therein translates it as “mixed and adulterated”.

And it is also noteworthy that Jerome carried the same connotation into the Vulgate Bible, using the Latin term *non moechaberis* in Exodus 2:13 and *non adulterabis* in Romans 13:9 where Paul quotes from the Septuagint. *Non moechaberis* is a transliteration of the earlier Greek word which depends wholly upon the Greek definition but *non adulterabis* is a derivative of the Latin word *adultero*, which *The Oxford Latin Dictionary* defines as:

“To mix substances with each other; adulterate; to spoil/damage the purity or strength, to corrupt or falsify.”

Of course there is the question then of why our English translations bear the term “adultery” rather than ‘adulteration’. The answer to this is really quite simple: They were originally synonymous as variant iterations of the same concept derived of the same root Latin word (previously mentioned). *The Oxford English Dictionary* actually lists the recently obsolete definition of Adultery as:

“Adulteration, debasement, corruption.”

It footnotes the fact that early Christian writers used the term to describe any sexual relations “of a Christian with a Jewess”. And it cites Ben Johnson, who, in 1609 (two years prior to the printing of the King James Bible) used the word *adultery* as a

synonym for ‘adulteration or debasement’. Infact, all the related family of English words point in the same direction:

Adulter: “to corrupt, debase, adulterate.”

Adulterant: “that which adulterates, adulterating.”

Adulterate: “spurious, counterfeit, of base origin, or corrupted by base admixture.” (verb) “to render spurious or counterfeit, etc.

Adulterer: “one who adulterates, corrupts, or debases.”

Adulterous: “pertaining to, or characterized by, adulteration; spurious, counterfeit, adulterate.”

But Herrell has pointed out perhaps the most interesting facet of this etymology found in *The Oxford English Dictionary* is that the footnote inserted under the definition of the verb form of *adulterate* says: “repl[aced] by *To commit adultery*.” *Adulterate* and *to commit Adultery* were originally interchangeable, which explains Johnson’s assertion that *adultery* be synonymous with ‘adulteration or debasement’ at the time of the earliest English translations. But that’s just to say that all three—Greek, Latin and English translations—agree on this matter; *Moicheuo*, *Adultero* and *Adultery* (adulteration) all mean the same thing.

So we see that it really isn’t a problem of bad translation of the text—the translation is perfectly sound here. The problem is that we’ve quite recently (in the last 300- 400 years) changed the once universally understood definitions of those words.

But of course, in the Reformed tradition we do not accept definitions by their secular usage but by their biblical usage; with that said, we turn to observe St. Paul’s quoting from the Septuagint in Romans 13:9, using the term “*moicheuo*” and it must be asked—if he, being a highly educated Hellenic, knew the classic definition of that Greek word (as used by Aristotle among others) and as one with apostolic/prophetic authority, knew the intent of the Law—why did he not correct or at least augment the translation there and then? He could have used another word if he so wished. Clearly, it must be argued that he accepted the translation as correct. When he penned those words his readers, without the benefit of any redaction or qualification from the apostle, would naturally be inclined to understand it in the plainest (*Koine*) sense. What they would understand him to say then is “You shall not *adulterate*.” (*i.e.* “You shall not mix those things which are by nature, religion, covenant, culture or kind, separate.”) And he lets stand both the translation and the likelihood of the readers’ taking it in that sense.

And it is then in keeping with such a view of the Law that the Apostle would admonish the Corinthians against joining Believers to Unbelievers (II Corinthians 6:14), the members of Christ to a harlot (I Cor. 6:14-16), and various other inappropriate fusions of pagan practice with Christian worship. He even compares such things with the elemental divisions imposed at creation when he asks “what communion hath light with darkness?”

It may be said that their Cosmopolitanism required reproof in regard to several categories of adulteration even if race is not specifically enumerated among them.

Here, one is likely to ask why amongst all the categories of adulteration addressed by the Apostle we find none addressing race specifically.

Though I would say his admonishment to take care of ‘one’s own’ (among other racially aware statements) fits the bill, I acknowledge the fact that the New Testament levels no *overt* prohibitions on the matter. A couple things may be said of this: One, we know race-mixing was taboo amongst the Romans and Greeks who occupy the backdrop of the New Testament; Horace even praised this feature as a quintessential aspect of Roman law and thought:

“The pure home is not mongrelized by illicit sexual intercourse/ law and custom have driven out forbidden mongrelization/ mothers are praised for their resemblance of their offspring/ vengeance closely follows guilt.” (*Ode 4:5:21*)

Moreover, early Christian writers agreed with this:

“If it is a source of joy and glory to men to have children like to themselves—and it is more agreeable to have begotten an offspring then when the remaining progeny responds to the parent with like lineaments—how much greater is the gladness in God the Father, when any one is so spiritually born that in his acts and praises the divine eminence of race is announced!” (St. Cyprian, *Treatise No.10 on Envy and Jealousy*)

And two, it is a mainstay of Reformed thought that a thing legislated in the Old Testament, if not abrogated in the New, stands. Call them what you wish—Laws against hybridization, unequal-yoking, bastardization, or adultery—none are annulled in the New Testament.

Seminally, it can not be overlooked that Paul’s treatment of those various matters are typically compared by the Apostle himself, to *marriage*. His generic treatment of

these various incongruencies among Christians manifestly relies therefore upon the seventh commandment.

Henry again concurs on this principle of adulteration/ unequal yoking in its general sense:

“Nehemiah had the vexation, notwithstanding this, to see some of his own people treacherously corresponding with Tobiah and serving his interest;...

Many in Judah were in a strict but secret confederacy with him to advance the interest of his country, though it would certainly be the ruin of their own. They were *sworn unto him*, not as their prince, but as their friend and ally, because both he and his son had married daughters of Israel, v. 18. *See the mischief of marrying with strangers; for one heathen that was converted by it ten Jews were perverted*. When once they became akin to Tobiah they soon became sworn to him. A sinful love leads to a sinful league.” (M. Henry’s Comm. on Deut. 23)

He closes this passage with a normative warning against any and all adulteration, be it marital or national, as it invariably leads to divided loyalties and a compromising of security in all spheres. He even goes so far as to say that *the exceptional foreigner*, even if converted to our religion, will still carry with them ‘a sinful league’ which draws away ten of ours for their one.

We see this very effect in the modern American experience as Non-Whites, irrespective of conversion status or espoused ‘Americanism’, categorically reserve great scorn for all of our old national heroes: Be it the Pilgrims, the Virginia Colony Planters, the Founding Fathers, the Frontiersmen or the Western Homesteaders— Non-Whites, even if Christian, generally disdain them all. The reasons for this are manifold and beyond the scope of this paper but the fact can not be ignored that multiculturalism and multiracialism carry with them a great compromise of loyalties. Even when ‘conservative’ Christians, Non-Whites’ vision for America is one of perpetual Statist revolution. They love America only insofar as it bears no resemblance to what it used to be. This is why and how Barack Obama has successfully campaigned under a political platform summed up in one word: “Change”. This perspectival dissolution is precisely the sort to which Henry refers and which Nehemiah mitigated through stringent application of God’s Law—because acquiescence to the ‘exceptions’ in such matters only provide a foothold for the national revolution and desolation of Deuteronomy 28.

But it is the alternative to the dissolute society which is laid before us in scripture:

“To return to the Biblical doctrine, a wife is her husband’s help-meet...a true help-meet is a man’s counterpart, that a cultural, racial, and especially religious similarity is needed so that woman can truly mirror the man and his

image.(pg. 351) Basic to family law is the inner bond of blood and faith.(pg. 360) The family was basic to Biblical society and culture; the godly family had to be perpetuated, and the ungodly family cut off. The bastard was cut off from church and state, insofar as any legal status was concerned, to the tenth generation (Deut.23:2). He might be a godly man but he was not a citizen. (pg.375)...bastards could not be recognized as legitimate...The creation and perpetuation of godly families is thus basic to the law (pg.380). Biblical law is designed to create a familistic society...[marital infidelity is] treason to the family and introduces an alien loyalty to the home, as well as alien seed (pg.395).’In the trustee period, adultery, along with one or two other crimes, is the most infamous act against the whole society-kinship group...’(by Zimmerman) (pg.396) ‘Adultery...threatens the security of the bloodline...’(Cole) (pg. 397) A third type of divorce is implied, enforced by authorities, as with Nehemiah, in cases of consanguinity and mixed-marriages: Mixed marriages banned: Deut. 7:1-3; cf. Ex.34:12-16; Num. 25:6-8. (pg. 403) Marriage is held in faithfulness to the creation ordinance.” (pg. 409) (R.J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*)

And:

“The trustee family has the most power and scope. It is called the trustee family 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. The trustee family is the basic social power ... The head of the family is not the head in any personal sense but as *family* head and as a trustee of powers....especially with all relatives, for “if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house [or, kindred], he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel” (1 Tim. 5:8). The authority of the husband, and of the wife, is not personal but theological and is a trusteeship for God, first of all, and then the family. ...When conservative Christians think of the godly family, they tend to think of the domestic rather than the trustee family; as a result, the individual man is exalted as head of the household rather than placed strictly in a trusteeship, in a position of custodial powers. ...The atomistic family has no future. The godly family commands the future. The future family is under God, the trustee of children, property, inheritance, welfare, and education. It governs the basic areas of social power in terms of God’s law and grace.” (R.J. Rushdoony, “The Trustee Family” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction: Symposium on the Family*, Vol. IV, No. 2, Winter 1977-78, 12.)

This Trusteeship of one’s inheritance is a responsibility entrusted not only over real estate but all of a Christian family’s holdings— faith, culture, riches and yes, blood—that is to say, *heritage*.

I affirm the traditional Christian Doctrine of Government:

Regarding the matter of proper government Rutherford (a preeminent Westminster Divine) argues that the nature of Federal headship laid before us in scripture allows for three forms of government: Monarchy, Democracy or Aristocracy (Republic), yet, *he lays down one principle not subject to debate; he says that Christian government must be by Representatives of close blood relation to a people in order to be Lawful.*

“[B]y nature’s law family-government hath its warrant;...By what reason a family hath a power of government, and of punishing malefactors, that same power must be in a society...for the power of punishing ill-doers doth not reside in one single man of a family, or in them all, as they are all single private persons, but as they are in a family...warranted by a law of nature... (Q.II, pg.3)

Duet.17:15 Demands that for the purposes of governance God’s people are to ‘*choose one from amongst [their] brethren only* and ...the fifth commandment layeth obedience to the king on us no less than to our parents... (Q.III, pg.4)

Men who will judge betwixt their brethren...1 Sam.x.21, Saul was chosen out of the tribes according to the law of God: Deut. XVII., *They might not choose a stranger...The law of God provided one of their own, not a stranger to reign over them.* (Q.IV, pg.8)

...every foal to its dam...the primary law of nations is indeed the law of nature, as appropriated to man...fatherly government being the first and measure of the rest, must be the best; for it is better that my father govern over me than a stranger govern me, and, therefore, the Lord forbade his people to set a stranger over themselves to be their king. The Prelate contendeth for the contrary,... [but a man’s] father was born only by nature subject to his own father, therefore,...there is no government natural, but fatherly and marital,... (Q.XIII, pg.51-52)

...God hath made them heads of the tribes and princes of the people...it is well said that he [the king] is a son to them, and they, his maker...What the king doth as king, he doeth it for the happiness of his people. *The king is a relative.*” (S. Rutherford, *Lex, Rex*, Q.XXV, pg. 120-124)

Deuteronomy 15:17 is the most oft-quoted verse throughout Rutherford’s *Lex Rex* and he uses it as the dividing line between natural godly government and all the unnatural expressions which, by definition can be nothing but occupational Despot-

isms. As he says, God has decreed that the king must be ‘a relative’ of the people; ‘strangers’ need not apply.

It then goes without saying that in order for the king to be ‘a relative of his people’, the people in question must have some limited and finite ethnic identity. Homogeneity is thus a precondition to any form of Christian government.

And of course, Rutherford’s employ of the term ‘stranger’ is in keeping with the scriptural usage as well:

“The word ‘stranger’ has several forms and connotations in Hebrew. There is a tribal connotation in Numbers 3:10, an ethnic connotation in Exodus 23:9, a familial connotation in Deuteronomy 25:5, and a case could even be made that there is a solely religious connotation in Exodus 12:43. But one is hard-pressed to find a reference to a stranger that is not at least partly based on blood.” (Harry Seabrook on *a letter to Gary North*)

For the yoking of a stranger-king to one’s people is the tacit acceptance of your people’s dissolution, an act of national suicide in denial of the fact...

“He divides to nations their inheritance, and will have every one to know his own, and not to invade another’s property...The great God, in governing the world, and ordering the affairs of states and kingdoms, has a special regard to his church and people, and consults their good in all.”(M. Henry’s. Comm. Deut. 32)

Ehud is the author of a popular weblog at www.ehudwould.wordpress.com, and is a leading contributor to Kinist apologetics. The essay *A Kinist Elucidation* is reprinted here with the permission of the author.

Kinism: The One and the Many

By Cincinnatus

“And He has made all nations of men of one blood to dwell on all the face of the earth, ordaining fore-appointed seasons and boundaries of their dwelling ...” (Act 17:26)

Adam was created directly by God in the express image and likeness of God. The Godhead conspired to create, and after naming man, declared that the express purpose in their creation of man was the ruling, classifying, dominance and administration of creation. Although God created man in His own image and His own likeness, Adam has left to us—his children—a legacy of death and a fallen nature. After the fall, Adam and Eve gave birth to children that were born in their own image and in their own totally depraved likeness rather than the direct likeness and image of God.

This is an account of the births of Adam: In the day of God's preparing man, in the likeness of God He hath made him; a male and a female He hath prepared them, and He blesseth them, and calleth their name Man, in the day of their being prepared. And Adam liveth an hundred and thirty years, and begetteth a son in his likeness, according to his image, and calleth his name Seth. (Gen 5:1-3)

We are, therefore, born into a covenant of death under a covenant head who has passed unto to us nothing but sin, death, and decay. We are all, by virtue of this inheritance, corrupt and headed for perdition. We, the many, of every tribe on Earth, are of the Adamic kind and in need of the one—represented in Scripture by Seth—to save us from our sins. Scripture tells us of the battle between these two seeds: “And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed; He will bruise your head, and you shall bruise His heel.” (Gen 3:15) Furthermore, Scripture states:

“Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us (for it is written, "Cursed is everyone having been hanged on a tree"); so that the blessing of Abraham might be to the nations in Jesus Christ, and that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Brothers, I speak according to man, a covenant having been ratified, even among mankind, no one sets aside or adds to it. And to Abraham and to his Seed the promises were spoken. It does not say, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, "And to your Seed," which is Christ. (Gal 3:13-16)

This is the universal human legacy, bequeathed to us by our common ancestor: spiritual warfare fought, by proxy, through human beings and human bloodlines. Still, the fact remains that God is no respecter of persons and we are all unrighteous

in His sight and we all, who are elect, undeservedly receive mercy and grace from His hand. The Law says to us:

“You shall not bow yourself down to them, nor serve them. For I Jehovah your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the sons to the third and fourth generation of those that hate me, and showing mercy to thousands of those that love Me and keep My commandments.” (Exo 20:5-6)

There is, therefore, a human race that is unified by a depraved descent, a depravity so total that the race is without the capacity to perceive its state and without the faculties or ability to change its miserable condition. However, there is—within the human race—also particular individuals, some of which are destined for eternal life.

What we have learned so far about humanity stands as a perfect example for us of the problem that philosophers call the one over many. The Medieval Schoolmen referred to this as the problem of universals. There is, with respect to humanity, a God-given unity in our race; a unity that allows us to predicate things about the entire race. The human kind is composed of individual beings that are genuinely participate in a larger, broader group, circumscribed in its entirety by the traits it received from Adam. What we are able to predicate about our covenant head—what is universal to the human kind—we gather from what the Scriptures say, or predicate about Adam. Adam is the one that resides atop the many.

Nevertheless, the essence of humanity cannot itself be either entirely universal or entirely particular. If universality were an essential part of human nature then a particular individual could never fully exemplify it, and, if human nature were particularity, then there could be no universal nature to speak of. That is to say, human beings participate in a shared essence, but they are not a seamless monolith. This fact is the basis for the non-Scriptural, philosophical warrant for consideration of human kind as an organic whole composed of organic, tribal parts.

The Kinist believes that a human being participates in a general human nature by his identification with a tribal particularity because he cannot perfectly exemplify particularity individually—by doing so, he would cease to participate in a shared essence—and he cannot perfectly exemplify universality individually—by doing so, he would invalidate his individuality. Therefore, consideration of the human race as a tribally [subdivided] composite maintains the essential dialectical tension of the concept of humanity and enables predication about individual human beings—and groups of humans—that is truthful and rational. We have Scriptural warrant, by deduction from the genetic lineages that feature prominently in the first chapters of the book of Genesis, for this same truth as it is stated above.

Adam's progeny immediately begin differentiation—a kind of speciation—into the many tribes whose stories and characteristics are recounted for us in the opening chapters of Genesis. Cain and Abel took up differing professions and inherited dif-

ferent personalities and traits and represent, for us, variation amongst the human kind, that draws into sharp relief the perennial philosophical problem of the West. Cain's descendants also go on to divide in the same fashion, yet somehow, remain of *Cain*. The one constantly and endlessly seems to procreate and divide into the many without a complete severance.

The Scriptures declare plainly this truth to us when they state that everything produces *after its kind*. Cornelius Van Til has said of the problem under consideration that, "The whole problem of knowledge has constantly been that of bringing the one and the many together." The history of Western philosophy generally testifies to the accuracy of this assertion. We are chiefly concerned, as Kinists, about [with] how this problem relates to theology, and more specifically, to theophilosophic anthropology. We believe that God—His Law—must rule every aspect of our lives, even down to features of demography that modern man considers merely accidental, inessential, and mutable in humanity. We do not believe that modern man adequately and righteously addresses this question and that he sinfully responds to God's demands in this area in various ways.

The modern "left" rejects God's word to us in this regard by irrational revelry in and exuberant glorification of [absolute] particularity. This position is summed up adequately in their slogan: "Celebrate Diversity." Like all human beings that labor in willful rebellion against God, they are inconsistent. They generally seek to maintain that despite the vast diversity of the human race, we are fundamentally the same. They know that there is a one over many problem and they side with the many.

The modern right—"conservatives" is what they are generally, [but] erroneously called—responds to the problem in an equally sinful way from another direction. They insist that what is fundamental and unifying about man be exalted. They worship abstractions—principles like freedom and unrestrained commercialism—and seek to mute the particular through insistence on a higher-order predication about mankind that does not manifest itself in the particulars. Their creed is summed up adequately in the doctrines of classical republicanism, a tradition with deep roots and adherents of towering intellectual stature, who are nevertheless as lost as their idiotic counterparts on the "left."

Neither side in the debate recognizes that the essential feature of the Adamic kind is unrighteousness. The grand, unifying feature of human nature is its inclination to rebellion. The two traditions are reduced to complete absurdity in the synthesis that is Babylonian America. They've come to simultaneous fruition in the neo-liberal and neo-conservative movements: a militaristic, materialistic, consumerist, hedonistic glorification of a shopping mall existence that insists above all on the tearing down of the ancient landmarks and a orderless [chaotic], borderless, directionless earth populated chiefly by Epicurean libertines.

What is the response of the Kinist to this utter madness? Our refrain is that God has established the borders of our habitations and that His Law is His Word to us

and that it should be established as the standard and rule of all human activity. God insists this is the case and requires nothing less of our kind. God requires that human kind hold the one and many in dialectical tension. As Kinists we humbly acknowledge that there is no neutrality available to man and that there is no adiaphoratic retreat where we may not consider the whole counsel of God. In short, we have [either] theonomy or [the illusion of] autonomy in all areas of our lives, including political demography. The solution to the problem is contained in our presuppositional starting point. As Christians, and Kinists, we must presuppose the ontological trinity as our starting point. Turning again to Van Til we read:

... If we hold with Paul (Rom. 11:36) that “of him and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever,” we see clearly that the existence and meaning of every fact in this universe must in the last analysis be related to the self-conscious and eternally self-subsistent God of the Scriptures.

Applying this to the question of man's knowledge of facts, it may be said that for the human mind to know any fact truly, it must presuppose the existence of God and his plan for the universe. If we wish to know the facts of this world, we must relate these facts to laws. That is, in every knowledge transaction, we must bring the particulars of our experience into relation with universals. So, for instance, we speak of the phenomena of physics as acting in accordance with the laws of gravitation. We may speak of this law of gravitation as a universal. In a similar way, if we study history instead of nature, that is, if we study the particulars of this world as they are related to one another in time as well as in space, we observe certain historical laws. But the most comprehensive interpretation that we can give of the facts by connecting the particulars and the universals that together constitute the universe leaves our knowledge at loose ends, unless we may presuppose God back of this world.

It is of the greatest moment to make clear that the ultimate subject of our predication is not the universe, reality, or being in general, in which God is the universal, and historical facts are the particulars. If such were the case, God and the universe would be correlative to one another. And it is precisely in order to set off the Christian position against such correlativism that the equal ultimacy of the one and the many within the Godhead, prior to and independent of its relation to the created universe, must be presupposed. As Christians, we hold that in this universe we deal with a derivative one and many, which can be brought into fruitful relation with one another because, back of both, we have in God the original one and many. If we are to have coherence in our experience, there must be a correspondence of our experience to the eternally coherent experience of God. Human knowledge ultimately rests upon the internal coherence within the Godhead; our knowledge rests upon the ontological Trinity as its presupposition.

The Kinist understands that the human race is a reflection—a derivative—of the one and many that exists eternally inside the Godhead. The non-Christian takes the position that we observe directly the only one and many by our sense experience rather than indirectly by derivation from the eternal and necessary one and many contained

within the ontological Trinity. He has no God to presuppose back of this world and consequently his worldview reduces to absurdity and irrelevance.

The non-Christian seeks, therefore, to eliminate the tension that is extant in the universe—by the very nature of the ontological trinity—by creating an alternative presuppositional starting point. The non-Christian seeks to account for the amazing diversity of the universe, naturalistically, by resort to a common ancestor for all living things and by simultaneously embracing the unity and diversity of all living things destroying the possibility of predication in the process. The many simply springs forth from the one in a miraculous and irrational fashion in the mind of the non-Christian. He can give no true account of the universe this way.

Having established the nature of humanity, Kinists presuppose, along with Paul, that God has righteously made many nations out of one blood, that these nations represent another derivative one and many, and that these racial distinctions are bound up within the very *ordo salutis*. The passage under [in] question goes on to state: “to seek the Lord, if perhaps they might feel after Him and find Him, though indeed He is not far from each one of us.” -implying that the division of the races is a providential necessity which God has instituted in His plan of salvation. We find abundant evidence in the Scriptures that this is indeed the case from the initial division of the tribes of man found in the book of Genesis (Gen 10:32 “These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations. And from these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood.”) to the glorification of all the believers of all tribes that occurs in Revelation.

The Kinist insists that we not join together what God has separated. God declares that we acknowledge this reality in our missions:

“And He said to them, So it is written, and so it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be proclaimed in His name among *all nations*, beginning at Jerusalem. And you are witnesses of these things.” (Luk 24:46-48)

And also:

“And Jesus came and spoke to them, saying, all authority is given to Me in Heaven and in earth. Therefore go and teach *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things, whatever I commanded you. And, behold, I am with you all the days until the end of the world. Amen. (Mat 28:18-20)”

The preached word is to be declared to the nations. Many are called in this fashion and of them, God has chosen some individuals. Although salvation occurs in specific individuals, the Lord deals with us in a corporate (through the visible church) and tribal (by acknowledging the reality of tribe) fashion and the Scriptures reflect this fact. The Lord doesn't instruct us to invite all nations to come and hear but to go to

all nations and preach and make disciples. The Lord also says in the Psalms that it is *the nations* that rage! We also know from the Scriptures that we participate in the universal human kind through this other-than-universal—derivative—kind; our race, our tribe, our nation. There is a natural harmony that humanity resonates at when we adhere properly to our God-given boundaries, boundaries that are more than territorial and deeper than mere resource competition.

The Scriptures say of Cain—a type representing reprobate man—that he dwelt in the Land of Nod. The word *Nod* means vagrancy, wandering and exile. How do we reconcile this with the simple fact that Cain was a builder of a city? Cain, paradoxically, had roots in the land of exile. He immediately set to work to building a city in a land away from the presence of God.

City building is the sin of the Babylonian:

“And the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it happened, as they traveled from the east, they found a plain in the land of Shinar. And they lived there. And they said to one another, Come, let us make brick and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and they had asphalt for mortar. And they said, Come, let us build us a city and a tower, and its top in the heavens. And let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be scattered upon the face of the whole earth. And Jehovah came down to see the city and the tower which the sons of Adam had built. (Gen 11:1-5)

This Babylon prefigures the modern megalopolis. This is humanity as it now exists in America, [. This is] a dissonant and unsettled human arrangement. It sinfully seeks to imitate, poorly, the ontological Trinity by forcing the unity and “oneness” of geographical proximity, ideological conformity[, and eventual biological unity] onto the many particular kinds of humans that inhabit the city. It is an ugly, disorderly cacophony that is only sustained by tyranny.

Tribal humanity is the humanity that ought to be. Humans generally settle naturally—when not coerced into other arrangements—by Founder Effect. When Cain leaves to settle East of Eden he demonstrates this fact by being the originator of a line of tool makers and users. Cain's line is a [the] line full of *homo faber*, and his descendants are fabricators, manufacturers, musicians and husbandmen. Each particular line of Cain's descendants has their own specific type of Founder Effect and specialization—the division of labor—occurs through a type of speciation.

Cincinnatus is an author, blogger, and is currently pursuing an advanced degree in philosophy. His blogging archives will soon be featured at Kinism dot net. He lives and works in California.

Prologomena to Red Toryism : A Total Antidote to Neo-Conservatism

By Casey LeFroy

What kind of animal is Red Toryism? What truck would The Cause have with the crimson devil? Quoting the words of TS Eliot on the subject, a man befriended and lauded by no less than this our patron saint, Russell Kirk notes that:

In December 1928, Eliot published in his magazine his essay '*The Literature of Fascism*'-- which he rejected, along with the literature of Communism. "A new school of political thought is needed," he wrote, "which might learn from political thought abroad, but not from political practice.

What has prevented us from doing just that, so far? George Parkin Grant, the great Dread Tory of Canadian fame, noted in *English-Speaking Justice* that English and American thinkers had cut themselves off in a depressing parochialism when they facilely identified totalitarianism with Nietzsche, Rousseau, and the Continentals, and opted hands down for English liberalism rooted in Locke. Conservatives were also affected, being an offshoot of the classic liberal-democratic tradition. Although Conservative roots are sunk deep in the classically liberal tradition, that of (largely unknown) Swiss theorists like Vinet, English Whigs as represented by Lord Acton, and the latest American reinterpretations offered by men like Richard Weaver, they have gone along by degrees in accepting both John Locke's "blank-slate" epistemology as well as his pared-down Kantian contractualism.

Tempted as I am to digress on how Calvinists who know the first chapter of Romans could ever side with Lockean tabula rasa epistemology, it is worth noting that conservative opposition to examining the liberal definition of man has more to do with temperament than intellectual conviction: it simply does not sit well with the deeply conservative temperament, rooted in provincial traditions and local places, to consider placing themselves to some degree, however small, within the "Red" camp, however construed. Add to this, the re-incubation in American self-reliance over centuries, and the suggestion becomes intolerable. Red Toryism smacks of high treason to the Cause. But what, precisely, is the state of the "Cause" at this date? Where, and in what state, lies our defunct Nargothrond? Can we ever recover "It", committed (as we are) to a belief that contractual calculation of self-interest in a comfortable preservation sustained by technology is the fundamental secular "destiny" of man?

We find ourselves in the strangest type of position: interested in preserving continuity and liberty, concatenated side-by-side through church, family, and local community, we are thereby (successfully) characterized as (at best) living dinosaurs or at worst as pernicious fossils. The logic of our basic assumptions pulls us towards "progressivism", even if it is a prudential variety more respectful of older ways and holdovers from that ancient European past. Our political opponents, the *faux lib-*

eraux (neo-"liberals") have presented us gleefully with a *fait d'accompli*, a global-unitary-Hegelian-superstate run by an oligarchy on the basis of a consumptive massed industrialism, wherein significant elements of favoured minorities are bribed through massive redistribution to support the furthering thrust of progress in a "long march through the old institutions". We are told that the new era dawning upon us will supersede the past just as Christianity replaced paganism. The hour of the perfectly unfettered individual is right around the next corner. Only the mad, un-blessed, and blind could object to it! *Economically, neo-conservatism has successfully defended a libertarian approach to business, and politically, the new liberalism has successfully upheld the ultimate and burning relevance of mass diversity.* The result has been rampant individualism, even in our camp.

The triumphant Left informs us (when it deigns to address us) that (just) as there can never be a perfect society, yet (just so) there can never be an end to the growth of the corporate state in the name of that perfect and infinite Justice. The efficient causes of technology and the formal causes of liberalism are all that matter in this equation. Any other causation, particularly the transcendent, is tolerated at best, and certainly not welcome in the State. Nor are they merely opposed final causes or common-sense static facets in the polis. The deep immanence of material causation is also only "matter" to be worked over- there is no piety here towards older culture-ways, particularly those of the white peoples. "Justice will progress by degrees, infinitely, at the behest of the State, and thanks largely to Science". That is the official line, from now, until the end of time. The dies are cast. Any resistance to this model is viewed as either pathological or a new reason for pursuing a more ultimate victory over the benighted forces of traditional reactionism. Resistance is futile. We are benevolently encouraged to assimilate our cultural and biological distinctiveness to the Hive. Astonishingly, by and large we largely do so. The ground grows thinner under our feet every year.

This last reason is perhaps the most powerful argument for why Conservatism needs to change. Frankly, there are (currently) no other feasible peaceful and large-scale alternatives to the process above besides something very akin to "Red Toryism". If the reader knows of one, I would be happy to hear of it.

It is first of all posited by its theorists (Phillip Blonde at ResPublica, notably) that there is no possibility of preserving the "Good Life" in any form from within the crypto-prescriptive modes of modern liberalism. Failed conservatism cannot succor a disastrous liberalism - they share the same pedigree. Modern conservatives just want to "slow things down" a bit. They share too much with the enemy in the way of faith in technology to offer anything but prudential caution. We live in a modernized fashion, and the center moves farther left every year. Negative critiques against the self-induced illusion of the sorcery-state (that things are progressing *anywhere*) are useful, yet at some point (presumably) conservatives will have to begin to abandon purely temperamental responses, necessary as they are in private life. They must begin to propound theoretical alternatives. Weaver, Nisbet, Rieff, Kirk, and even Eliot will have to begin to make way for a programme based on something other than

angry reaction, healthy as such a reaction initially is. Edmund Burke had concluded something along these lines when he wrote, "When all the forces of history seem to conspire against one, no matter in how honorable a cause, it will eventually be not only impious, but perverse and obstinate, to continue the fight."

In Technology and Empire, George Parkin Grant remarked of this pedigreed liberal monster that it was curious that Hegel managed to take two classical value-systems with rigorous codes of transcendent morality (Greco-Roman Classicism and Christianity) and make a synthesis of the two which had neither rigor nor transcendence. Progress is forever. It is the final dialectic. We know already that all the current "answers" are dishonest, inconsistent, unimaginative, and proto-fascist. Classic liberalism is also running out of ground. Theodore Dalrymple, Dinesh D'Souza, John Derbyshire, Mark Steyn, Jonah Goldberg, or even Ann Coulter and Glen Beck have gotten this far in critique. The neo-conservatives gave us their co-optive vision of the American century, with the USA as a kind of world capital of the new global Empire based on debt and trade. Is this what we want? Phillip Blonde, along with Milbank's school of radical orthodoxy, are going a bit further in a more fruitful direction. Red Toryism is the only viable and fully theoretical response to Modernity which we have available to us.

Setting aside factionalism, Blonde has asked if it is possible (let alone desirable) to have a sustainable State without "intermediate institutions", or a Market indifferent to the "permanent things", or a livable Society blind to the ancient "glory of Europe". For this is precisely what many libertarian thinkers, free-market defenders, and status quo apologists on the Right *deeply* believe. They assume that man can live as a nomad (and Monad), an atom within the blind forces of the Free Market and a gigantic State intent on protecting huge financial interests, practicing their conservative beliefs in private. They share these assumptions with their violent factional enemies. This is not an "alternative" to the Left - this is an increasingly meaningless and minor debate about the details of precisely *how* Fanon's and Che's Revolution will be managed indefinitely *for the profit of the elite*, and in any debate like this, those who are more consistent will eventually prevail. No wonder young people aren't attracted to the cause. Here is Harvey Cox, in *The Atlantic*, under *The Market As God*:

The Market, for example, strongly prefers individualism and mobility. Since it needs to shift people to wherever production requires them, it becomes wrathful when people cling to local traditions. These belong to the older dispensations and -- like the high places of the Baalim -- should be plowed under. But maybe not. Like previous religions, the new one has ingenious ways of incorporating pre-existing ones. Hindu temples, Buddhist festivals, and Catholic saints' shrines can look forward to new incarnations. Along with native costumes and spicy food, they will be allowed to provide local color and authenticity in what could otherwise turn out to be an extremely bland Beulah Land.

The Left's chief sin was not in the first place a "red" ideology, but impiety towards God and towards the incarnated cultural forms Christians had built up over time.

They rejected transcendent Forms, hard-earned local liberties, and revelatory traditions. They were overmastered by the same illusion under which neo-liberalism yet labors - that economics was everything. Rosenstock-Huessy remarks in his Out of Revolution that capitalism's great sin was in not grasping that the wage-laborer only functioned because of the transcendent ethos that came with him intangibly, largely a product of pre-capitalistic conditions, and for which the employer was able to avoid paying, even as he consumed them. As long as robber barons built hospitals and libraries with their loot, as long as homogeneous immigration supplied fresh cultural mettle, and as long as voluntary associations filled the gaps left by industrial ravage, things looked fairly rosy. That ceased around 1900. Democracy entered its post-Christian phase. Technological manipulation gained the upper hand as immigration from Europe slowed and Europe began to burn. Here is Eliot again:

A real democracy is always a restricted democracy, and can only flourish with some limitation by hereditary rights and responsibilities The modern question as popularly put is: 'democracy is dead, what is to replace it?' whereas it should be: 'the frame of democracy has been destroyed; how can we, out of the materials at hand, build a new structure in which democracy can live?' For the question of questions, which no political philosophy can escape, and by the right answer to which all political thinking must in the end be judged, is simply this: What is Man? what are his limitations? what is his misery and what his greatness? and what, finally, his destiny?"

These last are not questions for the free market, or its self-anointed therapists, or the masses, to try to answer. Man, the dollar-using animal, Man the consumer, cannot answer, or even comprehend the question. And without an answer, as well as a government framed to consider such "limits of the plannable" (or the tangible), arguments for private property are ultimately deceptions. The Left sees this quite well. Will individuals remain entitled to even their own DNA under such a regime? "Red Toryism" realizes probably not, and lays plans accordingly. What would it mean for a conservative to become a Red Tory?

Phillip Blonde has proposed, for example, that citizen-groups meeting certain standards of expertise and efficiency could offer budgetary challenges to definable spending areas currently administered bureaucratically. This might be a bus line or a division of narrow services within the State. Since presumably the group would come from the people underserved by the government in that particular area, but would represent real initiative and ability as a smaller group, they would then be allowed to self-administer the services in an effort to provide the actual services legitimately needed, at under the current cost. The people actually needing and using the services would, through service over time, begin to buy back the bureaucratic apparatus and "devolve" the State. And at some point, they might even be able to begin to generate enough positive revenue to operate independently. The revenues of the State would then amount to a safety-net and a public no-interest loan, intended to teach people how to fish, rather than distributing wholesale for nothing. Rural energy or agricultural cooperatives do exactly this, and extremely efficiently and knowledgeably, all

the time, every day. This is back-engineered self-government, the same thing that a "left-libertarian" party like the Free Vermonters argues. And if nothing else, it begins to reduce the sheer scale and top-heaviness of centralized power by cutting out the *chinovniks*.

This is nothing different from Disraeli's old "One Nation" idea in Britain. It does not represent a revolutionary challenge to anything other than entrenched oligarchical elites, who will be deprived of sinecures and power. So it dovetails perfectly with the old conservative idea that excellence, virtue, and effort ought to have a political reward, disseminated on various scales throughout the body politic. In a Red Tory government, the adjective "Red" represents the keen insight that a well-ordered state will not be micro-managed from the top and/or allowed to deteriorate into festering open wounds, but will be given into the hands of natural leadership. I hate to quote Jefferson, but this was his original idea - the emphasis is upon natural *aristoi*. Let those who know, in their area, govern. The thing is to make it work and to end the control from the top. The only way to end this state of affairs permanently is not through reaction, but by dis-enfranchising the political factions currently mis-managing it, and to deliver power to the best people one can find. The by-product will be to restructure it profitably and locally. Under current conditions, supporting a Free Market means playing into the hands of entrenched interests, like central Banks. As Blonde puts it, the State and the Market have visibly failed. Red Toryism desires "a civil state, a moralized market, and an associative society". Whatever conduces towards those ends is politically desirable, provided the means are appropriate.

And being "Red" won't only mean recognizing that the central State will continue to have to loan money while such a re-structuring occurs. In addition to emphasizing the principles of subsidiarity, local units, and organic federalism as explored by modern thinkers such as Alain de Benoist (via the old Dutch Calvinist Althusius), the "Red" stands for hierarchy, excellence, dignity, and the old ways, as well. Red will stand for the old Christian ideals of sacrificial monarchy, in which the heads of states carried their sceptres like a cross. The government, in otherwords, isn't a caucus of diverse plutocrats who manipulate the machinery and levers of an increasingly dysfunctional State, but known servants answerable to higher principles and a higher power for the worth of their position. Only a check-and-balance federalism built on Christian principles of subsidiarity, responsibility, and local consent can provide the framework to ensure the modern situation is devolved and doesn't reappear. Our Founding Fathers aimed for much of this in the Constitution. Again, Eliot, in Idea of a Christian Society:

"The organization of society on the principle of private profit, as well as public destruction, is leading both to the deformation of humanity by unregulated industrialism, and to the exhaustion of natural resources, and that a good deal of our progress is material progress for which succeeding generations will have to pay dearly... (p.48)

“Was our society, which had always been so assured of its superiority and recititude, so confident of its unexamined premises, assembled around anything more permanent than a congerie of banks, insurance companies, and industries, and had it beliefs more essential than belief in the compound interest and the maintenance of dividends?” (p.51)

Indeed. Empire may or not be tenable within a Red Tory system, but certainly the kind of massed, technological democracies practiced today represent a form of black magic, hatred of personhood and body, and loathing of the actualized local which Red Toryism is uniquely qualified to challenge. It will effectively begin to deny, to the face of the enemy, that the formal liberalism and the efficient technological causations which it practices represents *in toto* or even piecemeal a sustainable, moral, or rational model for civilized human survival. It will do this by proposing a phased and transitional devolution of the mega-State, aimed at re-awakening local possibilities in the context of far deeper causations than scientism and multiculturalism. Such a re-organization will provide a wonderful opportunity for permanently discrediting these monstrosities. We want our State back. And our society. And our market. We want them back because they have not delivered democracy, individual rights, nor prosperity. It is not written in the stars nor in history that these goods are permanently bound to the calculation of the cybernetic helmsmen-elite who currently manage our thoughts and actions in the privacy of their own desktops. We are bound with webs of illusion carefully built up which gained currency during the halcyon days following 1945, webs which are now unraveling. We need not despair, because it is not history that has reached a dead end, but the minimalist conceptions of the good and the polis which have prevailed during technological plenty and ideological confusion. The resources are there. There are people who can manage them responsibly.

People are more ready than we realize. Our heritage is deeply imbued with alternative conceptions and aspirations that suggest that we are temporarily astray from the path of genuinely humane and rational civil orders. It only remains for us to begin to listen to the democracy of the dead. Actual working democracy operated well because its assumptions were not democratic, and indeed could never be. It is time to restore the commonwealth by embracing the fullness of our European, federalist, Christian, and Platonic heritage. So the answer to the question is that to be a Red Tory is simply to embrace every aspect of the old antique European commonwealths in its totality through time, to adopt them to novel situations and problems, and to build again the edifice which was once the common good. Phillip Blonde is summoning the ghosts of Europe to aid him:

The truth is - and this is a truth recognized by Burke - is that human beings are individuals always born into relationships. We are always-already (unless we are feral) in society but not eclipsed or diminished by it. All social contract theory is in this sense wrong - we are born already in ethos and already enmeshed in culture code and practice, and we do not need a state or a contract to tell us where we are...because we acknowledge (that there is a common good) we can make common

cause with those that differ and create a free and equal society based on such a debate.

And in this debate, provided we divest ourselves of purely classical or neo-liberal thinking (even if it calls itself "conservative"), laying hold of a deeply and purely Conservative tradition (no matter if it appears "red" in some aspects), we will be much more effective, indeed, pre-eminently and deadly so. The debate was never held, and we do not even know our own champions. We have not yet begun to fight, and there are signs that we are now awake.

Casey LeFroy is a blogger, and is pursuing a masters degree. He is a graduate of Hillsdale College and currently lives and works in Arkansas.

England's Reformed Monasticism

By Charles

The national idea has an early origin in Christianity, but it is especially so for Protestant ecclesiology. Only in the last century has it been marginalized. The roots of the national idea date back to the Byzantine era where the emperor stood as Davidic King, regulating both civil and ecclesiastic bodies. Where soul and body are 'whole yet distinct', the roles of bishop and prince likewise interpenetrated. This especially was so when one faltered, the other came to the rescue, assuming the former's functions until crisis passed. Christendom's conciliar basis grew these 'equal yet distinct' principles, giving rise to collegiality and territory in the church. The overlapping of ecclesial with civil allowed the Roman diocese to become a common ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and dioceses containing imperial cities like Rome, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Antioch acquired leading (patriarchal) status. At Nicaea the most prestigious were recognized as a 'pentarchy', and, from the primitive pentarchy, national churches and their ethnarchates developed.

However, by the end of the first millennium, collegiality amongst provincial bishops and their pentarchs was undermined by a series of ambitious Popes (Gregory VII to Benefice VIII (c. 1075-1302)). This peculiar succession of Popes claimed extraordinary, if not infinite, power over fellow bishops and princes, undermining the conciliar unity of Christendom. Amidst the Papacy's campaign for greater power, clerical celibacy proved especially important in weakening the independence of Western bishops who often married into royal dynasties. The relation of Western bishops to secular power was therefore disrupted by celibate clergy, and those bishops pledging fealty to Rome's were bestowed the *pallium* yoke. While much more could be said about the rise and fall of first millennium national bishops, the early Reformation had a keen sense of what was lost. Thus, Reformers harkened back to the undivided church, particularly the example of Constantine and ecclesiastical pentarchy, reversing Papal intrusions through the rights of national churches and their princes.

Reforming the Monastic

King Henry VIII's dissolution of English monasteries, c. 1536-41, is pivotal to the reorganization of the national church in northern Europe. Amongst "Nordic Catholics" the national principle was loudest upon Luther's *Plea to the German Nobility* (1519), asking magistrates to facilitate Reformation. In 1529 the German Princes did so, presenting their Protestio¹ to Charles V at the Diet of Speyer where the precept

laid forth was, "the faith of the prince is the faith of the realm." Fifteen years later, Henry VIII was the first King to apply the same logic to his an entire realm², confiscating English monastic estates in the process. The Papacy owned a majority of land in England, and this involved substantial chapels and chancels which tied England's countryside culturally to Rome. Henry's seizure thus removed the Pope's obtrusive presence. Surprisingly, the dissolutions financially profited Henry very little in terms of net wealth. Papal estates were commonly sold or gifted away to local aristocracy. By the end of Elizabeth I's reign (Henry's daughter), the pattern of native repatriation was finished, the *pallium* yoke was cast off, and the English ruled their own church again.

For English *ecclesia*, Henry's dissolutions had two-fold results. First, the devotional life of England was shifted from the chancel toward the hearth. Monks and abbots who were disenfranchised often had a choice of lifelong pensions (paid by Henry), or they might be transferred to secular vocations as parochial clergy. Not only did this give the English Reformation continuity with its past, dampening the effect of ceremonial ruptures from medieval tradition, but many divines belonging to the same period (1536-1580) were themselves ex-monks who adapted monastic prayer to parishes and dioceses, facilitating what Tawney aptly called, "the monastery turned inside-out." In 1535 Henry VIII wrote his own primer for public consumption, and the notion of a simplified Benedictine Rule for domestic piety become foundational to Common Prayer. Led by Thomas Cranmer's reforms, the new 'public nature' of monastic hours spread throughout England. The Benedictine habit also appears in early Appointed Bibles³. Domestic prayer as an Anglican 'rule of life' was best exemplified by Nicholas Ferrar's Prayer Book devotions at Little Gidding, where his family recited the Psalter daily.

Second, the end of mandatory celibacy wove the English clergy into England's domestic tapestry. In 1549 celibacy was abolished as a requirement to holy orders by Edward VI⁴. Curates who earlier hid their concubines regularized otherwise illicit sexual relations. The progeny of divines and rectors that resulted often intermarried, forming generational alliances that gave birth to a number of famous clerical families amongst whom were the Wesleys, Matherses, and Temples. Thomas Cranmer himself married into Osiander's (Lutheran) household, and a number other notable unions followed. Even more influential were marriages between royals, e.g., Elizabeth II to Frederick V (of Heidelberg). Such alliances tended to strengthen Protestant identity, and by royal patronage Protestant families secured cures which often passed from father to son. Many clerical families possessed more than one parish, hiring curates to fill posts while arch-parsons tended other chapels and glebes.

In England the restoration of laity took an Erastian form⁵. Following the primitive Byzantine and ancient Israelite example, the King's supremacy began with his crown and household, and from it the rest of the graded community acquired rank. The Erastian community is outlined in England's Prayer Book, ordering the laity from greatest to least, starting with King, passing on the rest of the crown's progeny, then the bishops, next the chief Lords, then common magistrates, and, finally, 'the people.' The King was the household which included all others, bound not only by marriage and oath⁶ but also divine providence. The vestments and ceremonial of the King suggested a great God-parentage, supreme abbacy, or arch-wardenship⁷ if not an episcopate of his own.

Cranmer's overall idea of the people becoming a 'new religious' not only increased lay dominance but allowed England's secular hierarchy to absorb medieval orders. This was a unique feature to English Protestantism, attributable to the top-down nature of reform where Henry VIII left hierarchic church ordering generally untouched. As the King reassigned Papal endowments, as natural recipients, the nobility expanded their roles as wardens and stewards in the older system, giving them great powers in the chapels as well as charitable institutions like schools, hospitals, etc., dotting the countryside. The rise of vestries and stewards taking charge of social welfare on county levels⁸. Erastianism was mirrored in colonial America, especially in the Carolinas and Virginia. And, like England, where squire influence percolated up from the gentry-dominated vestries into the House of Burgesses (Parliament). Not surprisingly, Virginia's government functioned much like England's, where the deliberations of clerical synods were presented to Parliament and King for finalization. The chief-most patron within the constellation of sworn men was ultimately the Crown, and by the Acts of Supremacy (1533-34) the throne nominated and licensed bishops. Of course, appointing bishops and university deans gave the King pivotal authority in the Church, and the arrangement worked generally well given the King protected the Protestant faith.

Rebuilding Kin(g)ship

Kinists might draw many examples for ethnic churches from history. Most recent are those stemming from the magisterial Reformation and especially England. Unfortunately, by waves of revivalism, the princely model has been largely forgotten, and along with it the idea of society as an ordered communion. Rather than guard and extend princely structures, modern-day Protestants have driven ecclesiology into an egalitarian and humanist cul-de-sac. Part of this is due to a "celibate mentality" where piety is neither 'spoiled' by priestly mediation nor public ceremonial. Kinists might rekindle the memory of ordered community by exciting Kingly practices within common fellowship and worship. The author has several suggestions:

- Bringing the presbytery to accept a superintendent or an arch-presbyter to function as titular head. Calvin and Luther's writings on superintendency could be re-considered.
- An aggressive diaconate assisted by vestrymen might slowly channel the services of the welfare state away from an anonymous bureaucracy to the person of the superintendent. This 'arm' of the church would be like early Roman dioceses, where bishops participated in princely secular powers. If the secular throne is abandoned, the bishop may temporarily assume it.
- Revive the Reformed catholic calendar as found in the original KJV-- not only the daily offices but feast days for historical saints-- especially those that memorialize the life of the *ethnos*, demonstrating God's providential graciousness.
- Renewing the place of the offertory in worship, reconnecting the profane with sacred through the consecration and tendering of vows, alms, and other articles.
- Restore confessionalism so that old Protestant, ethnic churches, e.g., German-Lutheran, Scottish-Presbyterian, and Anglican might cross and interrelate into a Nordic catholicism, thereby reproaching Eastern counterparts.

The author hopes to expand on these themes later.

Footnotes:

(1) The *Protestio* is the document from which 'Protestant' is derived. Hereafter, the German Lutheran Princes were known as 'protestants'. The *Protestio* stipulated four things: the sovereignty of the princes in matters of faith and ceremony, suppression and persecution of Anabaptists, the reform of the Mass (especially providing the laity with communion in both kinds), and an appeal to Charles V for a free general council to resolve Roman error.

(2) The national principle would later carry over to Ireland and Scotland, Elizabeth and James I forming national churches there, making England the first Empire organized around the principle of nationality or commonwealth. This expanded with George I to include Bohemia as well as growing colonies overseas. We might even imagine New England belonging to that commonwealth in a sort.

(3) Appointed Bibles were those allowed in church readings and sermons. The most famous of which is the 1611 King James. Prior versions were printed in large text, known as 'voluminous'. The KJV was printed in small letters, intended for home and travel. Early versions contained a declaration by His Majesty announces the purposes

of True Religion as well as the Christian kalendar with tables for daily prayer. Voluminous versions often bound catechisms and articles together inside.

(4) The 1552 42-Articles also rejected celibacy. These were rescinded under Mary I but restored in 1563. Article 32 says, "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness".

(5) Erastian refers to Thomas Erastus's 1568 manuscript, republished in 1682, as *A Treatise of Excommunication*. The treatise dealt with the question of discipline, leaving the civil magistrate to deal penalties and laity a greater role in discipline. Erastianism commonly describes the state's supremacy over church. Erastus said, 'the church is a mother not a magistrate'. In the context of England this was the Crown combined with a hereditary, divine right to the throne. Daresay royal Erastianism worked until Jacobin forces turned upside-down the relation between monarch and parliament.

dies).

(6) In 1534 all clergy, professors, school masters, clerks, vestrymen, military, judges, and officers in parliament had to profess the King's Supremacy. The oath of allegiance determined churchmanship as well as property and civil rights. It was not lifted until the 1830's along with most test acts. It's failure was due to insurgent, democratic forces.

(7) The 39 Articles assume the national church with kingly supremacy normative. See articles 34 (the national church having the right change ceremony) and 37 (Rome having no jurisdiction). Article 37 gives the King sovereignty over both temporal and ecclesiastical bodies but not sacraments or 'spirituals'.

(8) The Presbyterian equivalent of vestries were "consistories". Early vestries assumed various services the monastery had provided, namely care for the elderly, feeding the poor, financial loans, innkeeping, hiring tenant farmers on the glebe, rudimentary Christian education, and even genealogy records/research. Vestrymen or 'swornmen' also were the secular arm of the bishop's power to regularly visit and discipline churchgoers, and from this relation we get the idea of the 'county posse' as well as militia.

Charles is the author of Anglican Rose, a weblog where Episcopal worship and polity are explored. He lives and works in northern California.



Coming in the Fall 2010 issue of The Kinist Review:

***Protestant Radicalism and History*, by John Marshall**

Fall Number available November 30, 2010 at www.kinism.net

