

### 33. Race Wars (Race Relations and Multiculturalism)

Tormented by band member Johnny Ramone stealing his girlfriend, fellow rock star Joey Ramone sang *The KKK Took my Baby Away*. Likewise, I must vent about a volatile issue.

As a child I was oblivious to race amidst a racial society. Since I was ostracized I strongly opposed racism, since I identified with outsiders. To me racialism solely consisted of expressing disgust towards other races. I tired of the ignorance around me, especially adults habitually using the N word, who had nothing intelligent to say on race. I felt empowered by identifying with others who also faced discrimination. Later, the progressive school system affirmed my position; teachers explained that underneath the epidermis everyone looked identical, besides having the exact same shade of red blood. I thought racialism was stupid and annoying, but still felt they might have a point, since my family continued their pronounced racial bias.

Society's attitude towards race began changing rapidly; rich sports heroes became predominantly black. I likewise became increasingly progressive. As an adult I had a black Protestant minister with black congregants, later, a Nigerian Catholic priest. I read a book on race relations, which denounced manifest destiny and taught manifold destiny; it noted that Adam and Eve were black, Africa being the "cradle of civilization."

#### Problems Arise

I welcomed having black friends. However, I never could secure their personal friendship, while fellow blacks were "brothers" and "sisters." Several times the friendliness of black salespeople charmed me, so I bought unwanted products and donated to dubious causes. I showed an interest in black dating partners, but they showed absolutely no interest in me. A white acquaintance showed interest in a black woman, and a man responded "Leave our women alone." I also learned that black women often condemned interracial relations. And although I was merely politically incorrect, people loudly condemned me. Yet racists escaped scrutiny by simply avoiding certain comments in mixed company.

February became black history month, while nobody else had their own month. With "affirmative action" blacks with inferior job performance, test scores, and less education than others began to take their jobs. My father, a competent hard worker with seniority, got fired and replaced by a black woman. Later, I noticed that white women disproportionately pursued black men, including unemployed abusive men, and learned that black men dominating white women was the most popular form of pornography. Then America saw its first black president, yet blacks still got preferential treatment so they could crush evil whitey.

On numerous occasions I visited a city's distinct areas; its Hispanic section, white section, black section, gay section, and Chinatown. I peacefully walked alone through Chinatown and the Hispanic, predominantly white; and gay sections. However, walking alone in black areas down streets adorned with broken glass and burglar bars, I couldn't go ten minutes without being bothered by an aggressive panhandler; several times violence erupted. Ultimately I was cornered in an alley with bullets flying about; a final turning point. My views on race changed forever.

#### Different Races or One Human Race?

Some claim that there's only one race, the human race. Some assertions are "The concept of race makes no biological sense; none."<sup>(1)</sup> In response, forensic scientists can determine a person's race based on human bone fragments and hair samples alone with almost 100% accuracy. Besides, a linkage tree was created that shows the genetic distance between the races based on 120 different blood polymorphisms.

Also, “The notion that there are black, Hispanic, or Native American genomes is ludicrous.” In response, nobody ever claimed that there are different racial genomes; a genome being the entirety of an organism’s hereditary nature. This deceptively misrepresents the position, which is that race is determined by \*small sections\* of the genome.

And “Think about it----what is the biological basis for the Asian category?” In response, race is determined by haplotypes, instead of a single gene. Haplotypes are combinations of DNA sequences at adjacent locations on chromosomes that are transmitted together. Haplotypes are categorized into haplo-groups which have specific letter designations; one of several biological determinants for race.

Others, while acknowledging race determinants, attempt to minimize them by pointing out that they are a tiny fraction of the human genome; we have more similarities than differences. But it’s also true that only one mutation on a single gene causes a radical difference, such as the mutation that causes Down’s syndrome. Others try to reduce race to skin color alone. One white activist even injected himself with dye, darkening his skin. He noted that he was treated hospitably before the dye job and inhospitably afterward, supposedly confirming the stupidity of society’s racism. However, skin dye cannot give someone African features. Being inhospitable would be natural, since people have disguised their appearance to commit crimes.

Race in America was never about skin color alone. We don’t suppose that a white person who visits a tanning salon enough times is eligible for affirmative action. On the other hand, discrimination in Africa has been about skin color; black Africans have killed and mutilated children of fellow tribe members because of the children’s albinism: white skin due to pigment deficiency.

The term African-American is erroneous. Following the term to its logical conclusion, blacks would not be African-American if they lived in Africa. They’d simply be African. White people born in Africa would then be African too. And if they came to America, you’d have a Caucasian being an African-American. So this is nonsense; a ploy to eliminate racial distinctions. Before the time of political correctness, anthropologists divided people into three principal subspecies: Caucasoid, Negroid, and Mongoloid. These classifications were never proven inaccurate.(2,3) And people throughout history recognized multiple races. I use the terms Black and White not for skin color, but for simplicity and clarity. Besides, scientific, peer reviewed documentation backs up the claim about differing races, differing brains, and their significance.4-7

### Importance of this Subject

Human distinctions greatly affect attitudes and behavior. Chief human distinctions are: age, experiences, job, health, marital status, place of residence, political allegiance, religion, and wealth. But all these are subject to change; each characteristic could change every year. And none of these distinctions are genetically predetermined.

On the contrary, any difference in physical appearance in any living organism (outside of weight fluctuation or purposeful alteration) always denotes a genetic difference. Likewise, identical twins are genetically identical, and genetics always affects behavior in any organism. That’s how it works. And nobody ever changes race. Furthermore, culture is usually the byproduct of one’s race. The other distinctions are sometimes affected by one’s race as well. Therefore, race is often life’s ultimate question. So we must find the right answer.

### Political Correctness

Unknown to history, a quixotic ideology of political correctness jousts with American society. In the radical 1960s, parallel movements of feminists, gays, and black militants began expressing anger and outrage over allegedly intolerable oppression. Demonstrations, shouting, intimidation, violence, and angry letters were used,

quickly causing radical change for these groups. Atheists joined ranks, also incorporating insults and ridicule. Today these groups remain intertwined; all four groups organize marches, and often, a member of one group supports the other three.

But if a white Christian straight male complains about life's injustices, he's offensive, a pessimistic turd, a dangerous militia type, or an unbalanced psychotic. Today, merely saying an outdated word, such as oriental, colored, retarded, or mulatto (used in Louisa May Alcott's book *Little Women*, along with quadroon) elicits ferocious denunciation. People should avoid words that they know will offend, but with so many demonized words, it's hard to remember them all. Since marginalized groups such as mentally challenged people and seniors are more susceptible to using despised words, ironically this rigid political correctness of expecting people to jump through hoops is a form of social persecution. If the term African-American is necessary, European-American is necessary for whites. Perhaps U.S. Hispanics are the Imperial Latin Nation within a nation. Even criminals should be recognized as "the morally challenged." A war of words without actions and actions without value, such as removing images of Native Americans from advertising and spouting deleterious drivel, is counterfeit caring.

American racial quotas sometimes make racial diversity into a caricature. You'll have an American-born Gentile white, a Black person, a European immigrant with limited English, a Mexican, an Indian, an Asian, and an Arab all working menial jobs in the exact same department. Yet the bosses are all one race, often Jewish. Being garbled up at the bottom, with the difficulty of understanding each other's accents and cultures, makes it harder to advance and helps prevent workers from uniting against unscrupulous bosses.

Worse, political correctness makes people afraid or hesitant to address the misbehavior and punish the criminal behavior of other races. Now, American movies only show whites as the bad guys, often with black heroes, and television has stereotyped whites as either "hillbilly" stupid or snobbishly rich, besides other propaganda which is shoved down people's throats. Although race no longer hinders anyone from success, people still throw tantrums about white-on-black racism.

### Nazism

Non-Jewish whites are demonized on the pretext that German leaders happened to be of that race. However, the German's brutality and attempt to conquer hinged upon superior weaponry; Germany being the steel capital of the world created this advantage. Africans hacked apart a million of their fellows with machetes and still enslave them; imagine what they would do with the same weaponry the Germans had. In fairness, check out a video channel which gives the German side of the story.<sup>8</sup>

Although the World War II era holocaust certainly happened, numerous people deny it. Reactively, governments retaliate like rabid dogs, incarcerating people merely for exercising free speech. Yet there are a dozen historical holocausts that the average person never heard of and therefore denies; I don't become enraged over it. People deny all or parts of it because Jews misuse this as political propaganda to demonize white non-Jews. Fictitious scenarios abounded to create added outrage, which were later discredited. Jews also ignore the millions of non-Jews who perished. Besides, the average Nazi soldier probably wasn't aware of Hitler's brutal plot; his imperative was doing his job and supporting his family.

A type of erroneous reasoning called *Reductio ad Hitlerum*: playing the Nazi card, is a fallacy of irrelevance that consists of trying to refute one's opponent by comparing his view to that held by Hitler or Nazis.<sup>(9)</sup> For example, the Flat Earth society noted that Adolf Hitler believed that Earth was round while early Popes thought it flat, to support their belief.

In a reverse form of *Reductio ad Hitlerum*, contradictory groups use their having been forcibly codified with inverted triangles as propaganda for their causes. Gays trumpeted that they wore pink triangles and Jehovah's Witnesses trumpeted that they wore purple triangles, while each ignored the other. Nazis also

codified alcoholics, drug addicts, vagrants, and prostitutes with black triangles and criminals with green triangles. Moreover, everyone who opposed Nazism was codified and segregated, proving nothing.(10) Besides, Asians, Blacks, and Arabs served as Nazi soldiers; some were awarded the Iron Cross.(11) Furthermore, the true Holocaust was instigated by the Jews against Germany, documented in the book *Hellstorm*. Also see *The Zionist Jewish Role in Causing World War 2*.-12,13

### Standard Talking Points

Whites endlessly claim to get along with those of a different race better than their own. But how well do they actually know these “friends”? Logically, anyone who is outnumbered better behave themselves; so that proves nothing. And if whites get along better with other races, why don’t they consider moving to Africa, China, or India? Why don’t they at least vacation there?

Some people exclaim that “serial killers” are almost always white. But the media lies. Black men are more likely, percentagewise, to be serial killers.(14) “Progressives” cry: “Everyone has the same shade of red blood under their skin.” But every animal also has the same shade of red blood that we do; so this means nothing. Another cliché is: “Many ignoramuses hold racial views.” But many ignoramuses also believe that two and two make four. Since this doesn’t make two plus two equal five, this also proves nothing.

To dismiss White culture, many insist that “American Indians” (Native Americans or Red people) were the original inhabitants of the United States. That’s false; the Mound-builders were there long before the “Native Americans.” And since “Native Americans” were generally very warlike, they likely stole the land from the Mound-builders. In turn the earliest humans were responsible for the extinction of numerous animal species, who were here first.(15-17) And though many Whites claim to have one or more Red ancestors, it’s almost always hearsay, without any documented record whatsoever. Besides, it’s extremely unlikely that many Whites would have Red ancestors, since interracial marriage was illegal in the United States until the 1950s and 1960s.

### Contradictions

Individuals themselves shouldn’t be stereotyped, but overall differences in groups exist. Certain groups have a disproportionate amount of individuals with certain characteristics. Women recognize a difference between the sexes, not walking alone at night or being alone with a man they don’t know; a universally accepted distinction. Curfews and high insurance rates for teen drivers is another. Yet many recoil when racial differences are mentioned. Why? The apostle Paul clearly made a racial generalization: “One of themselves, their own prophet, said ‘The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, and slow bellies.’ This witness is true” (Titus 1:12-13).

Strangely, the politically correct often advocate and embrace both the gay community (feminist oriented, generally irreligious, sexually liberal) and Islamic culture (chauvinistic, generally devoutly religious, and sexually rigid including advocating the death penalty for gays). Another contradiction occurs when ultra-liberals grouse about racism while being a member of a group where everyone is white. Illogically embracing extreme contradictions betrays juvenile antagonism to traditional values and not standing for anything.

Identity theft is rampant: modern schools teach that we are generic people, not distinct males and females. They especially teach that different races are nonexistent. However, those who claim that there aren’t any differences in groups don’t actually believe that. Note: If women cannot achieve equality with men in a given situation, it’s claimed that men and women aren’t any different, we’re all people. But if a situation allows women to gain the upper hand, then there’s a big difference between men and women. If black people cannot achieve equality with whites in a given situation, there’s only one race, the human race. However, if a black person makes an outstanding achievement, it’s a victory for blacks. Sometimes “It’s hard to determine

someone's racial ethnicity" but it's easy to determine when affirmative action or set-asides are involved. Beware of these deceptions.

### Prominent Blacks

Numerous black Christians would make fine public figures. However, black public figures usually reflect non-Christian or compromise positions. Instead of upholding traditional values, they dismiss them. America made Oprah Winfrey the richest woman on Earth from her spouting non-Christian and radical diatribe. Maulana Kar-enza, founder of US, known by the FBI as a dangerous militant group, created Kwanzaa in 1966. Kwanzaa was originally an alternative to the Christian holidays, as if they were antiblack. Besides, Kwanzaa had nothing to do with African culture, tradition, or religion.

A wide majority elected Barack Obama, a mulatto, President of the United States. Yet Barack's racist minister publicly stated "G\*\* d\*\*\* America." Although Barack conveniently disassociated with and denounced his minister right before his election, he supported the Syrian war on behalf of black militants and consistently initiated policies that opposed white British colonialists and which benefited non-whites worldwide. He was known as "The first gay President" for promoting same-sex marriage. Integrationist champions Michael "Martin Luther" King and Jesse Jackson were adulterers. Moreover, "Martin Luther" King plagiarized his doctoral thesis, and was an adulterer until the day he died, using church money to pay prostitutes.<sup>18,19</sup>

### Are Black Men Damsels in Distress?

Conspiracy theories exist among liberals, besting the conspiracy theories of conservatives. Racism allegedly went underground instead of vanishing, making it even more dangerous. Black men supposedly need to be rescued from this diabolical plot. Some complain that black people are disproportionately arrested, as if most are arrested for nothing, or that atrocious behavior by non-blacks is legal. Besides, the persecution and murder of Irish immigrants to America is almost forgotten. In Larry Elder's *Ten Things You Can't Say in America*(20), Chapter 1: Blacks are More Racist than Whites, Larry, who is black, explains that many complain about imaginary racism and glass ceilings, instead of working hard to advance. He also exposes white condescension. Also see David Horowitz's *Hating Whitey and Other Progressive Causes*.<sup>21</sup>

Only a fraction of whites are oppressive rich bosses or "The Man;" America has more poor whites than any other race. And Asians now surpass the per capita income of whites. So now Asians are part of the plot to oppress black people? Besides, Hispanics have the lowest per capita income, not blacks. Instead of complaining, Hispanic culture is very close-knit; Hispanics often save money since many live under the same roof and share vehicles. Since black Americans complain about the terrible condition of black neighborhoods and schools, should we suppose that Hispanics, Asians, Caucasians, and Indians are sneaking in and trashing black neighborhoods and schools? Should we envy races which are more productive than ours? Or should everyone take responsibility for themselves? Actually, Obama's election should have demolished the idea that racism prevents anyone in America from achieving anything they desire.

Besides, racial prejudice doesn't compare with what handicapped adults suffer. Sporadic pockets of racial hatred can be avoided while discrimination against the handicapped is universal. Yet crying racism continues while mentally handicapped adults still cannot find mates, maintain friendships, get good jobs or housing, and are mocked, misunderstood, and persecuted; this is deeply offensive. Our priorities are scrambled up; let's unscramble them.

## Full Integration?

Being integrated with people from every part of the globe would be most difficult, as you'd have diverse groups of people together speaking many different languages. For everybody to understand each other clearly, everyone would have to learn multiple languages. On the contrary, every group being separate would be the easiest way, as everyone would only need to learn one language.

Full integration would also integrate different religions. Yet each has different holy days, times of worship, and fervently preach opposing beliefs. To be faithful to their religion, some people won't work or get together on certain days or times while others won't work or get together on different days or times. Codes of behavior are sometimes radically different.

Different dishes served at mealtime overly burden the cook. Some cultures have even cooked and eaten dogs and cats; others consider them family members; yet others consider them vermin to be exterminated. Diverse groups disagree on what's proper etiquette or what's offensive, such as belching is rude for some and required manners for others to show appreciation for the meal.

Being of a different race often means a radically different culture. And it's natural to associate with others of your culture and be disconnected from other cultures, as one prefers the company of one who listens to the same music, not one whose music you cannot stand. Forced integration causes people to relinquish their cherished heritage and individuality. It is tyranny, not love.

## Slavery

Whites are demonized because of enslaved Africans in America. However, those slaves were purchased from other black people who had captured them; even some black Americans had slaves. Besides, Islamic traders incorporated around 18 million African slaves while America incorporated only 10 million. Moreover, slaves were owned in all Islamic countries. Slavery existed in China from the Shang dynasty (1800-1200 BC) till the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Slavery existed in Africa throughout recorded history and continues today in Sudan. India had approximately 9 million slaves in 1841.(22) All races have enslaved others, enslavers often enslaving their own race. The primary reasons for slavery were one group being vulnerable to another and a premium on physical labor before modern technology, not racial supremacy. The television miniseries *Roots*, based on Alex Haley's book, was fictitious. Besides, Haley plagiarized writer Harold Courlander's fictional novel *The African*, and was subsequently sued. Furthermore, the "whites" who instituted slavery were a different race from typical whites, some of whom did more to free slaves and create labor-saving inventions that render slavery obsolete than any other race. I'll explain this later.

Furthermore, on the World Slavery Index, the ten countries with the least amount of slavery are White nations; the ten countries with the most slavery are non-white nations. Non-whites enslave others many times more often than whites do.(23) Chiseled in granite on the Jefferson Memorial in our nation's capital are President Thomas Jefferson's words: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than these [black] people are to be free," followed with a quote about education. However, his comment about freeing Africans was taken out of context from his autobiography and his other remarks were deleted. His following sentence was: "Nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government."24

Great Emancipator President Abraham Lincoln epitomized compassion, yet opposed racial integration. Lincoln said "I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the black and white races . . . . ." Furthermore, Honest Abe's Emancipation Proclamation was linked with his plan to gather every freed slave and send them back to Africa. Politicians derailed his plan, using the freed Africans for political gain.(25,26) Regardless, this recolonization was already partially implemented; the

nation of Liberia was founded by freed slaves. Its capital Monrovia was named after President James Monroe. Black people actually petitioned the government to return to Africa in 1935.(27)

### Historical Christianity

Although most Christian believers today agree that segregation is morally wrong, and castigate those who disagree, the consensus of Christian believers living centuries ago was that segregation was correct and interracial relations (called miscegenation) were wrong. And historical Christianity taught that children needed their parent's approval in mate selection, which would eliminate many interracial relationships.

They say that Jesus came to bring people together, not pull them apart. However, He didn't come to \*force\* people together. Even with unrighteous racial prejudice, Jesus didn't act like this was "unforgivable" as ultraliberals contend. The Samaritans were shunned by other Israelites as half-breeds. After establishing Himself as the one to be emulated, Jesus tactfully set a good example by talking to a Samaritan woman, and teaching the parable of the Good Samaritan, which surprised his disciples and got them thinking.

They say that Sunday morning is the most racially segregated time of the week as if that's bad. In an Eastern Orthodox parish, the priest announced that a rock was thrown through their window. He blamed the parish for not being racially diverse. Seriously?; and especially from a church that claims to be the most historical? Sunday morning was always racially separate; even today some congregations have a thousand members who are not only of one race but one exclusive nationality. Those self-edifying groups are content, so don't tamper with them.

Furthermore, Christians must not conform to this world (Romans 12:2); the world is supposed to conform to the Church. Lest we think that traditional Christianity was biased, consider that before the time of political correctness, non-religious people, including Charles Darwin after becoming agnostic, taught that black people were a transitional form between apes and humans. Christianity actually improved race relations. I would consider forced integration quite embarrassing. Suppose I'm unhappy with only having my own house and coerce you into sharing houses. Now what is the likely motivation?; that my house is a dump. And who might be responsible for that?

### Interracial Marriage and the Bible

First, we have the "Old Testament," although Christians of all stripes believe it was superseded by the "New Testament." However, many consider it extremely important, so I shall explain it from an impartial, detached perspective. And I certainly see women from every race and ethnicity as beautiful and special in her own way. Now supposedly, Old Testament religious leader's wives were of a different major race than their husbands. The most common claim is that Moses' wife Zipporah was black, since she was called an Ethiopian. Besides Ethiopia having different people back then, who might not have been black, *Apostolic Constitutions Book VI* (words of the apostles recorded by Saint Clement AD 90) says that calling Moses' wife an Ethiopian was slander. Solomon's lover in Song of Solomon 1:5-6 seems to be black racially. However, Wycliffe's 1380 translation refutes this: .....Y am black, \*but fair\*, as tabernacles of Cedar (a naturally light wood).....Y am black, for \*the sun hath discoloured me\*.....(28) Modern reinterpretations contradict how these and many other passages were understood for three thousand five hundred years.

And if segregation was inherently immoral or unethical, then most people throughout history would be wrongheaded, including God, if the Hebrew Scriptures lauded by Christians and Jews are valid. This is because a prominent feature throughout this "Old Testament" (or Jewish Tanakh) was racial segregation. It was even said to be commanded by God (every passage that says to keep separate and/or not intermarry with other peoples). Per the book of Jonah, with Jonah preaching to Assyrians, it is undoubtedly fiction.<sup>29</sup>

If this segregation was religion-based, there are only two possible ways God could have revealed Himself to the degree that the Jewish religion provided: 1) Direct and miraculous; 2) Indirectly, by Abrahamic people proselytizing others.

Consider option 1: God revealing Himself to humanity, each individual choosing to accept or reject “the faith”. Now we know that ethnic Jews followed Judaism, while all Mayans/Incans, Greeks/ Romans, people from India, Blacks, and Chinese did not. With Earth’s then population (twenty million?) what are the odds of that if proposition #1 was true? Now an ethnic Israelite accepts the Jewish religion. The odds of the second person being an ethnic Israelite accepting that religion is 1 in 6. The odds of the third person being an ethnic Israelite: 1 in 36. The fourth: 216, the fifth: 1,296. The odds against all ten people being only one ethnicity are more than 1 in ten million. Before we get to ten thousand, the odds against that is a number greater than the number of atoms in the entire physical universe. \*Option 1 Refuted\*

Consider option 2: Abrahamic people proselytizing others. First, nowhere in their bible did God tell Israelites to spread Judaism, unlike Christianity’s Great Commission. God commissioned Jonah to the Ninevites, but only to stop extreme injustice, not spread Judaism. Secondly, the Israelites NEVER spread the Jewish religion; they still haven’t to this day. Thirdly, in their bible the Israelites regularly lacked faith, and today, half of Jewish people are atheists, yet are considered fully Jewish, while often, those outside their traditional bloodline, though converts to their religion, are rejected as false Jews. Fourthly, it was already understood that the “Old Testament” (Jewish Tanakh) commanded \*racial\* segregation. Although those texts were dramatically reinterpreted in the radical 1960s, most Jews today still understand the original interpretation.

And consider Matthew 10:5-6, where Jesus commanded the apostles to preach the coming of Christianity. For the time being He instructed them to avoid Gentiles and concentrate on the house of Israel. The distinction cannot be from their having a saving religion since they are identified as lost. And the distinction cannot be from being easier to convert due to their partial revelation, unless Jesus lacked the sense to realize that most Jews would reject Christianity, while many Gentiles would receive it. Rather, Jesus certainly delineated people based on race. \*Option 2 Refuted.\* So the Hebrew bible clearly teaches segregation.

However, New Testament Christian scriptures never mention interracial relations. Since I’ve read and studied these scriptures thoroughly many times, please don’t try to persuade me one way or the other by pointing out passages. The passages are open to interpretation. I’ve also searched the writings of the early Church fathers diligently with the express purpose of finding their position on this issue. I must conclude that they were silent about it. In summary, Christian texts do not answer this question. We must look elsewhere.

### Interracial Coupling and Nature

There are two vital and distinct considerations regarding this issue. So before making an assumption on where I stand, you must read this entire section. Now every type of animal on Earth always prefers to mate with its own kind. This rule of Nature is so stringent that even particular subspecies of birds, monkeys, mice, felines, and so on prefer their own peculiar type, even if they can reproduce with other subspecies. Human races are undoubtedly subspecies of *Homo sapiens*. Therefore, purposely choosing a mate from a different race is a gross trespass against Nature’s ironclad rule. And if God created Nature, does this not sin against God?

However, that being said, with no corresponding partner available, animals consistently mate with differing types of animals if possible. Also, since divergent animals and differing human races have the biological ability to reproduce or at least inter-mate, this shows it is natural under extenuating circumstances. With no compatible same-race partner available for someone with an intense desire for marriage who has a different race prospect available, expecting lifetime singleness and celibacy would be irrational. In those cases, interracial marriage would be natural. “Ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; and the fowls of the air, and they



shall tell thee: Or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee: and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee” (Job 12:7-8).

However, most such unusual situations could have been eliminated if interracial relationships were disallowed to begin with. Consider that the only women who were ever attracted to me were white women with blue eyes like me. So it’s highly offensive for other ethnicities to rob men like me of our mating prospects. Besides, a common motivation for interracial marriage is cultural Marxism.<sup>(30)</sup> This movement seeks to obliterate racial, cultural, sexual, and religious differences, creating a generic society. For example, 100% of people who opposed interracial marriage opposed same-sex marriage, and 100% of the early supporters of same-sex marriage supported interracial marriage.

For those who believe that God created distinctive races, supposing that you have a better idea in obliterating His races and creating one composite race would be the epitome of arrogance. And for those that believe that the distinctive races naturally evolved their particular characteristics over millions of years, seeking to undo the natural order would be stupid. Besides, those who take the lead in promoting cultural Marxism are Jewish racial supremacists. They only seek a classless society for the masses, not themselves. Notably, throughout the aforementioned Jewish bible, the Israelites generally kept their distinctive bloodline and all other particulars intact, while crushing everyone else. Even today, Hebrew nationalism, with the separatist view that various races and characteristics are very unequal, gives Jewish supremacists, despite their tiny population, the cohesion to dominate others. Those who succumb to cultural Marxism lose their ability to fight for their own people.

Then there are the common motivations of seeking a status symbol, and choosing a mate from a different race because that race generally has lower standards. Besides, many people are not physically attracted to different races. Others desire that their children reflect their own ethnicity. Considering these facts, there must be millions of people for whom a member of their own race is their only option for a mate. Therefore, mass interracial marriage robs many people of potential mates; it is uncharitable. Many find it deeply offensive. And white woman/non-white man couples have higher divorce rates than same race couples.<sup>(31)</sup> In summary, interracial marriage alone is not sinful; it can be expedient (though cases of expediency would be eliminated if men from other races stopped taking our women). Rare cases would not undo the natural order to any significant degree. However, improper motivations for interracial marriage are very sinful. They make this phenomenon common, along with other aspects of cultural Marxism, which dismantles the natural order and creates a herd-like rabble.

### Somebody Else’s Unbearable Baggage

Innumerable people are treated unfairly by fellow Americans; I’ve been treated unfairly hundreds of times. But only one group has recourse to “the race card”: a weapon designed to punish perceived unfairness. And in thousands of cases pulling the race card masks the wrongdoing and incompetence of its wielders. For example, the Jackie Robinson West Little League baseball team was awarded the championship. However, Chris Janes, a Little League official, was convinced there was fraud, which robbed other Little League teams of their chance to win. He informed Little League International, who then stripped Jackie Robinson of their championship title.<sup>32</sup>

Instead of taking responsibility for their recruiting and other violations, player’s parents became irate. The Rev. Jesse Jackson and Catholic priest Michael Pflieger began protesting. At a news conference Chris Janes was denounced for “hateful racism.” He also received death threats, and people slowly drove past his house to intimidate him, which scared his wife and children. What truly exposes this as insanity is that Chris’s wife is black. So no amount of attempted racial harmony can fix this junk.

Another weapon is rioting. The 1965 Watts riots supposedly facilitated positive social change.(33) And bigotry, persecution, and crime was certainly committed towards black people in America, while there is positive social change today. However, an equal degree of bigotry, persecution, and crime was committed toward numerous groups, including Asians, Hispanics, Irish, Jews, and Native Americans, while there is positive social change today. Yet they all did without any civil rights riot. On rare occasion grave injustices still occur, but occur equally toward people of every group.

Additionally, black people first started rioting in Washington in 1835, followed by Detroit's riot of 1863, the 1919 "Red Summer" where riots occurred in dozens of cities, Detroit's riot of 1943, Harlem's riot of 1943, Detroit again in 1967, the 1992 Los Angeles riots, and the 2014 Ferguson riots.(34-41) There were many others. Black people have been rioting from California to Chicago to New York for 179 years. In these riots entire cities are thrown into chaos, many stores are looted, many homes are burned to the ground, and many innocent people are attacked and killed. So what should be done?

First, since the media is already dominated with biased and hostile diatribe claiming that whites owe blacks reparations, read the Internet article *Apology to the Black Race*, so that you, in fairness, see another viewpoint.<sup>42</sup>

### Apartheid verses Natural Behavior

In Daniel chapter 2, Daniel prophesied that mixing with an undesirable people would cause the Roman Empire to collapse; hence the famous "feet of clay" expression. If incompatible religion was the chief cause, why was each previous world power supplanted by one just as pagan instead of "God's chosen people?" Furthermore, race mixing was the feet of clay of the antecedent Greek, Medo-Persian, Babylonian, and Egyptian empires. This prophecy is also paramount to Christianity.

Segregation based on physical appearance alone, which treats others as inferiors and is enforced with violence or denies medical treatment is morally wrong. So is segregation for the purpose of political and economic discrimination (apartheid). Unrighteous segregation offended people and engendered a harmful backlash.

However, all segregation is not apartheid or hateful. Some modern prisons had to enforce racial segregation to avoid excessive battling between rival racist gangs. If all political correctness and rebellion against traditional values vanished, people might naturally gravitate towards their own race, and separatism might predominate, as oil and water naturally separate. Instead of either apartheid or integration, the historical norm is the segregation more aptly termed separatism or racial separation. By examining detailed United States maps, you will notice various Native American reservations; this racial separation functions smoothly since Native Americans want to preserve the specialness of their own people. So did Madison Grant, a white separatist and the person most responsible for the preservation of California's giant sequoia trees. Besides wanting to preserve the red-woods, he also wanted to preserve the red-heads.

Since birds of identical type flock together, often with no other types of birds around, must we enforce bird integration and stop their evil racism? Rather, birds of a different type are in another bird's nest to destroy the eggs and take over. Besides, China has always been close to 100% Asian, yet has existed for 4,300 years and is 1.3 billion strong. As for mixed race countries .....? Interestingly, if we were living in any time from when Earth began until the 1950s, we wouldn't even be having this discussion. And many racials are not primarily concerned about what's natural or unnatural from a carnal standpoint, but are concerned about upholding boundaries that people throughout world history recognized.

## Egalitarians VS. Racialists

Everyone knows that some races had low life expectancies, primitive cultures, remained poor, had high crime rates, and became subservient, while other races had long life expectancies, highly advanced civilizations, became wealthy, had lower crime rates, and became dominant. What's in dispute is how they got that way. Many say this came about because some groups perpetuated enormous evils on others and had good luck, while other groups suffered enormous evils at the hands of others and had bad luck. Therefore the groups who were historically successful owe the historically unsuccessful groups a gargantuan debt. This is \*egalitarianism.\* Others say this disparity came about because some groups were relatively immoral, lazy, and genetically impaired, while other groups were relatively righteous, hard-working, and genetically predisposed to success. Therefore the more successful groups must keep separate from those who are not to avoid being harmed by them, and mustn't support them since they cannot properly use that support. This is \*racialism.\* (Egalitarianism and racialism are often improperly defined).<sup>43,44</sup>

There is a third group: racial supremacists; every race has some. Although all supremacists are racialists, it's unfair to characterize racialists as supremacists, as few are. Supremacists are those who consider their race superior to all other races in all respects, and that their race should completely dominate the planet. Besides, some supremacists, unlike other racialists, promote racial integration, not segregation, so they can exploit other races.

Some people denounce multiculturalism as unworkable, and that "the religions" cannot get along, but okay racial integration. Yet you cannot adequately separate people based on creed or culture since people change religions and adopt different cultures. They could possibly change them every week. Rather, religion and culture are born from one's race. So one must either be for multiculturalism and multiracialism or oppose both. Certainly egalitarianism and racialism cannot both be right; one position must be wrong. So we must find the truth on this matter by analyzing all available evidence. The following chapter is necessary to complete this subject.

