

"Race," Science and Essential Christian Precepts

An essay by Lawrence Johnson

Part One: "Race" and Science

Since the campaign and ultimate election of President Obama in 2008, there has been a great deal of commentary expressing a profound need and desire for a national discussion on "race." Yet despite this commentary, such a discussion has never truly taken place. Why? Maybe it is because the problem with "race" is that it actually doesn't exist as most people define it. Therefore how can one rationally discuss something that apparently doesn't exist? By this I mean that the overwhelming view of "race" as the genetic geographic divisions of humanity into three or more "races" has absolutely no scientific truth today and almost certainly never had any such truth in antiquity. To prove this point, let me start by quoting the relevant definitions of "race" from two recent dictionaries of American English.

World Book Dictionary

race *n.* 1. any one of the major *divisions* of mankind, each having distinctive physical characteristics and a *common ancestry*.
2. a group of persons connected by *common descent* or *origin*.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary

race *n.* the descendants of a *common ancestor*; a family, tribe, people or nation belonging to the *same stock*.

The reader will notice that I have italicized certain key words and phrases "*divisions*," "*common ancestry*," "*common descent*," "*origin*," and "*same stock*."

What I believe these definitions point to is the belief that, sometime in the past, mankind was neatly divided into 3 or more groups which had been geographically (and therefore biologically and genetically) isolated from each other over very long periods of time. Thus (according to this belief), these groups were well on the evolutionary march toward becoming entirely different species. ("Race" and "subspecies," as applied to both mankind and other species, are largely synonymous terms.) Of course one of the results of this belief is the secondary belief that these genetically isolated groups have separately evolved into "races" of different levels of intelligence, sexual prowess, and other positive and negative attributes. This logically leads to the concept that the only way to keep the "superior" race at its supposed high level of intellect etc., is to keep the "race" *pure* by not allowing any intermarriage or "miscegenation" with the "lesser" races. This resulted in the various anti-miscegenation laws that were common in America until 1967! And this also led to the so-called "science" of eugenics whose "racist" followers promoted the sterilization of over 50,000 African-American and other supposedly genetically "unfit" American women in the United States from 1900 - 1999. And even more sinister, eugenics was the excuse used for the senseless and diabolical extermination of over 6 million Jews, Gypsies and other supposed non-Aryan "racial misfits" in Nazi Germany.

I wrote earlier that the problem with "race" is that it does not exist. It not only *doesn't exist*, but almost certainly *never existed!* This may come as a great surprise to many. Most who

believe in "race" describe at least three great "*divisions*" of mankind, Caucasoid, Mongoloid and Negroid. The key word is "divisions." Now, there is no doubt that it is strikingly easy to visually recognize the differences between people of northern European ancestry, from those of east Asiatic or central-west African ancestry. But, in order to have different "races" or subspecies, evolutionary science would dictate that there would have to be complete biological isolation over a vast period of time. The problem with this is that Europe, Asia and Africa have evidently been one connected land mass *far* longer than modern humans have been in existence. Thus there would *be no significant barriers* for such divisions, and by nature such isolated "races" or subspecies could not even begin to form. Picture it like this, at one point in the distant past there *was* an original pair or small community of people. Scientific DNA evidence points to somewhere in west Africa as this Eden or cradle of modern mankind. While the Judeo-Christian religious tradition is very non-specific but seems to point to somewhere in the middle east. Where? It doesn't really matter because it is now evident that early pre-historic mankind survived by a stone-age hunting and gathering existence. By necessity, this was almost always a nomadic migratory way of life. Therefore as mankind procreated and gained population he *gradually* moved further and further away from this cradle until he occupied practically all of Africa, Europe and Asia. Furthermore, it is now believed, that there were, at one time, perhaps 40-60,000 years ago, land-bridges from Asia to Australia, Indonesia and the Americas. Thus, since earlier prehistoric times, the only humanly unoccupied continent was and largely remains Antarctica! This stone-age hunting and gathering manner of survival probably began about 200,000 years ago and still exists among certain human groups today. (This gradually gave way to agriculture probably starting about 8,000-10,000 years ago.) One of the consequences of this very slow stone-age migration away from our cradle, is that very gradual and small geographic changes - perhaps most noticeably in skin tone took place.

Visualize it like this. Let us imagine ourselves as innocent and unprejudiced travelers in the year 1400AD - well before Europeans began sailing all over the world and transplanting themselves and others from continent to continent. This imaginary journey starts in the temperate zone at the tip of South Africa. The people we meet are light brown skinned, somewhat slant-eyed, "peppercorn" haired, small people. Now we travel northward. As the climate becomes warmer, we notice that among other changes, people gradually take on a darker hue. Next, we arrive in Central Africa - one of the hottest climates on earth. The people we meet here are very dark-skinned, wide-nosed, and woolly-haired. We now travel northeast, through Ethiopia, Sudan, Egypt, Israel, Syria, and Turkey. The further we go away from tropical Central Africa, as the climate becomes more temperate, the more we gradually notice such features as lighter skin, wavy or straight hair and aquiline nose. In Turkey we meet perhaps 5% of the people with lighter skin and/or blond hair and blue eyes, features that we began to notice as far south as Egypt. From Turkey we might travel north northwest through Europe. While traveling we will progressively notice more people with light creamy complexions, blond hair and blue eyes. When we arrive in Scandinavia we will notice that perhaps 90% of the population has a very light complexion with blond hair and blue eyes! On the other hand, if we leave Turkey and travel directly *east* toward China we will see a gradual progressive change to people with straight black hair and "slanted" eyes. Yet instead, if we travel *southeast* from Turkey toward the Indian sub-continent we will see a gradual darkening complexion until many people in hot southern India are as dark as many in central west Africa!

What we saw in these travels was that human features make gradual and almost *imperceptible* changes as their native climate and environment changed. What we *did not* see in these travels are "racial" *divisions* - that is, no sharp geographic divisions between different

"kinds" or "races" of humans! Thus we may justifiably conclude that such separate breeding "stocks" or "racial" groups almost certainly *never existed* since the cradle of modern man.

Of course, I suspect that there will still be many who insist that the concept of different "races" or subspecies of humans is a central reality of our existence! But their days are numbered. Recent DNA evidence essentially **proves** this lack of "racial" divisions *far* beyond any reasonable doubt! Indeed mitochondrial DNA confirms, for all practical purposes, that *all* people are equally interrelated. For example, let us compare the DNA between, say, two unrelated Englishmen and one of these Englishmen and say, an unrelated central-west African man. The truth is that the **chances are EQUAL that this Englishman would be genetically as similar to the west African as he is to the other Englishman!** Obviously the genetics would be somewhat different as to skin tone and other geographic ancestral features. Yet these geographical differences are so genetically microscopic and infinitesimal as to be statistically insignificant on the total human genetic make-up! Therefore the central question is: *how and why* did this evidently garbled and erroneous idea of "race" become such a seemingly essential and predominate part of contemporary life and thinking? To comprehend this we must be cognizant to the following:

On the Concept of "Race" and History

Human geographical variation has been recognized since the beginning of human history.

1. Egypt: Ancient Egyptian art from over 5000 years ago to the Christian era depicts variation of human skin tone from the darkest to the lightest. Thus there are many current opinions about the "racial" origin of this earliest of historic civilizations. The two extremes are: 1. that this civilization was originally derived entirely from "Caucasians" from North Africa, Europe and Asia; and 2. that it was originally derived entirely from "Negroids" from Nubia (Sudan) or the land of Punt (Ethiopia and/or Somalia)! However all of this is not relevant since there is **no** evidence that the *ancient Egyptians themselves* attached any credence or importance to skin tone or such "racial" thinking. For the record, the ancient Greek historian Herodotus described Egyptians as having dark skin and woolly hair. Also the ancient Greek writer Lucien described an Egyptian as dark-skinned and thick-lipped. Yet, by the time of Moses (approximately 1200 BC) Egypt had imported and/or captured many slaves from all over the Mediterranean region. Thus by today's standards we would probably say that ancient Egypt was a multi-racial society. However, this would evidently be completely immaterial to an ancient Egyptian who would consider such a view as odd or just plain unimportant!

2. The Bible: The Bible has no mention of different geographical subdivisions, "races" or subspecies of humans. Yet from the opening book of Genesis forward, it mentions Ethiopia and Ethiopians 26 times. Only once, around the year 700 BC, is the Ethiopian's dark skin or physical appearance even mentioned - and this in a matter of fact, "non-racial, " non-judgmental manner; [Jeremiah 13:23] *Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?* Indeed, I believe that the inspired writers of the Bible, from Genesis through Revelation, were led to believe that we are *all* the children of God through Adam and Eve and are therefore *unified* as a biological species.

[Acts 17:26] *And (God) hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.*

Furthermore, the Bible from beginning to end, stresses the love of God and the brotherhood of all people! Thus "the greatest commandment."

[Luke 10:27] *You shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength, and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself.*

Indeed the concepts of separate "stocks" or natural "divisions" or "races" of man are in *direct* opposition to this universal "love" theme of Judeo-Christian scripture!

3. The Journeys of Marco Polo: This Venetian merchant traveled widely from Italy through central Asia to China, Japan, India, Turkey, Greece and Scandinavia during the 24 year period of 1271-1295AD. He wrote extensively about his travels including physical descriptions of the various people he encountered. Nowhere in his writings, however, is there any inclination toward the later concept of dividing mankind into "races," that is, separate species or subspecies of humanity, to explain these geographic differences!

4. The European High Renaissance and Enlightenment (1492-1810): There were three European developments that would have far-reaching consequences and radically change the way the natural geographic variations of humankind were viewed. The first is the superior shipbuilding and development of the ocean-going vessel (the Carrack) during the 1400s which initiated the European exploration of the world in the latter 15th Century. The second is the invention of firearms which allowed the above exploration to result in the European colonization, enslavement and general forced domination of the rest of the world. The third is the remarkable and historically unprecedented European flowering of the arts and sciences. Indeed the painters and sculptors Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Rembrandt etc.; musicians Palestrina, Bach, Mozart etc.; Authors Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Shakespeare etc.; Scientists Galileo, Newton, Bacon etc. were supreme evidence of this flowering. But this flowering also helped create the massive European ego of natural supremacy. That is, this led to the false notion that Europeans were by *nature* intellectually, artistically, scientifically and even religiously superior to the non-European people of the rest of the world. This false notion of natural European supremacy led to the idea that Europeans came from better "stock" than other humans. Thus the concept that they were a separate, superior "race" was therefore born by 1580 when the word itself was coined into the English Language. This concept was in full swing by the mid 1700s when the great naturalist and biologist (famous for his groundbreaking classification of species), Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778) described four "races" or divisions of mankind.

Before we move on we must understand that there are two fundamentally different concepts of what constitutes "race." 1. Monogenism - which means simply that all human beings, although geographically different as to skin tone etc., are the lineal descendants of *one original* pair or group (for example Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden) and 2. Polygenism - which means that there are multiple original pairs or groups and thus *separate* lineal descendants originating from different stocks from various continents or sections of the Earth and these *separate* origins explain the above geographical variations.

Monogenism was the overwhelming view of "race" during the Renaissance and the ensuing Enlightenment. The thinking behind this view was, that in Europe during these eras, the general purpose for the study of science was to verify Biblical truth. Therefore, the study of science and Christian theology were viewed as compatible and complimentary disciplines. Since the Christian view of human origins is obviously monogenistic through the Genesis narrative of Adam and Eve, the polygenistic theory of race was largely viewed as false and heretical during these periods. This does not mean that the idea of "racial" superiority was entirely unknown in monogenistic thought. However, it was not until the wide development and acceptance of polygenism during the 19th century that the floodgates of supposed European "racial" supremacy and bigotry were fully opened.

5. The "Romantic" and Modern eras (1810-Present): Beginning around 1800 we

begin to see the separation, and often antagonistic attitudes, between scientific thought and Christian theology. We also concurrently see the rise of polygenism as the dominant "scientific" theory of "race." And this rise of polygenism was, for the most part, coupled with the rise of the academic field of study known as physical anthropology (recently re-named biological anthropology). We further begin to see the United States as the dominant nation in the development of these trends and theories. Indeed 19th century "white" America was extremely guilt-ridden and therefore very susceptible to what many of us now can see as the "pseudo-scientific" fallacy or myth of "race" (especially the polygenistic version of this myth). Thus we see this collective guilt of these controlling "white" Americans, who were almost unilaterally avowed Christian believers, swell up in relation to their inhumane slaughter and land-grabbing from native Americans and even more toward the horrendous and brutal institution of the slavery of African-Americans. In other words these "white" American Christians had a choice - either they could **erase** their guilt by reforming their ways and stop stealing land from the native "Indians" and abolish the slavery and the suppression of blacks - or, on the other hand, this guilt could be mollified by some kind of "reasonable" rationalization for their behavior. Therefore, the "scientific" proof that "Indians" and "Blacks" were lesser species, subspecies or "races" of men from inferior and separate ancestry seemingly was the perfect foil. Consequently we see the rise of various "experts" on "race." These men who claimed to be "scientists" were astonishingly often supported by, and/or were the faculty members of some of our most highly respected academic institutions.

Let us individually investigate some of these men to learn what sort of "scientific" method they employed.

Franz Joseph Gall (1758 –1828) was a German physician who specialized in the study of the localization of mental functions in the brain. He invented a system of "therapy" which became known as phrenology that involved feeling the bumps in one's skull to determine the patient's psychological and mental profile. Phrenology became very popular in England where it was used to rationalize discrimination against England's colonial subjects of other "races." It also became very popular in America from 1820 to 1850 to justify discrimination against native Americans and African-American slaves. By the late 1800's however, Gall's phrenology was largely and correctly determined to be so much pseudo-scientific malarkey.

Samuel George Morton (1799–1851) was an American physician and natural scientist. He has often been considered the founder of the field of American Physical Anthropology. From 1839-1843 he taught at Pennsylvania College. He was also an outstanding zoologist and geologist. But his massive collection of over 700 human skulls from all over the world and his measurements of cranial capacity (that is brain size) thereof account for his greatest fame. These measurements have recently been the subject of considerable controversy as to their accuracy. But most recent anthropologists who have re-examined them (This collection still exists at the University of Pennsylvania) attest to the accuracy of Morton's measurements. He published some of these results in his book "Crania Americana" (1839). His measurements concluded that "Caucasians" had the largest brains and "Negroes" the smallest with other "races" falling somewhere between these two groups. He made the outrageous claim that he could define the intellectual ability of a "race" by the cranial capacity. A large volume meant a large brain and high intellectual capacity, and a small volume indicated a small brain and decreased or low intellectual capacity.

Now, I am a 75 year old man and I did **not** just fall off the turnip truck. In my fairly long lifetime I have known a great many human beings with ancestry from many different parts of this earth and have yet to observe that any ethnic group or "race" has non-proportionally large or small heads in relation to the rest of their bodies. Thus a small person would have a proportionally smaller cranial capacity, that is, a smaller brain than a larger person. This appears to be true of **all**

ethnic groups or "races." ***THE TRUTH IS THAT THE HUMAN BEING - LIKE OTHER CREATURES IN NATURE - IS A PROPORTIONAL BEING. THAT IS, A PERSON OF ANY AND ALL ETHNIC GROUPS OF SMALL BODY AND STATURE WOULD HAVE A PROPORTIONALLY SMALLER SKULL AND THEREFORE SMALLER CRANIAL CAPACITY AND BRAIN SIZE.***

Did Morton claim that individual "Caucasians" of small body and stature and therefore smaller skulls with lesser cranial capacity and brain size were mentally inferior to larger "Caucasians?" *Evidently not.* Or did he claim that women are mentally deficient to men because women are on average much smaller, with corresponding smaller brain size than men? *Evidently not.* Or, consider the people of Guatemala, who are largely descended from native American Mayan "stock" and are on average about 4'10" in height and have, on average perhaps, only 3/4 the brain size of the people of the Netherlands who are on average about 5'10" in height and are descended from "Caucasian" "stock." Would Morton therefore claim that Guatemalans have only 3/4 the intellect of these Dutch "Caucasian" people? Or would he believe that Mayan "stock" is only 3/4 as "good" or "smart" as "Caucasian" "stock?" I believe HE OBVIOUSLY WOULD BECAUSE HE WAS AN A PRIORI BELIEVER IN THE MYTH OF "RACE!"

While this conclusion may seem overly harsh, it must be understood that the "white" controlling society of his time had a *desperate* desire to believe in a "science" that rationalized their dominance and reckless treatment of the other so-called lesser "races." Thus, scientific minds such as Morton and some of his followers, in order to get traction and achieve fame and acceptance were overly tempted to promote this totally *unscientific* concept of "racial" superiority. Yes, before he even decided to scientifically investigate "race," Morton obviously had the overwhelming predisposed (a priori) desire to believe that different "races," derived from separate and unequal "stock" or ancestry were inferior. Today it is flagrantly apparent that Morton's "brain-size" rationale is *obviously* absurd. To me it is far more absurd than Gall's now totally discredited "science" of phrenology. Yet Morton's rationale that brain size equals corresponding intelligence is the sort of pseudo-scientific gobbledygook that has been used to rationalize the entire polygenistic "race" issue from at least his era to the present.

Let us now briefly discuss the followers of Morton who have kept this evident junk "science" in the forefront of the entire "race" issue to the present day:

Josiah Clark Nott (1804–1873) was an American physician and surgeon. He and **George Robins Gliddon** (1809–1857) who was an English-born, American student of Egypt, produced two volumes; *Types of Mankind* (1854), and *Indigenous Races of the Earth* (1857). Both of these volumes attempted to verify the "truth" of Morton's errant thesis that brain size equals intelligence. Therefore (in their view) the darker-skinned "other" people of the world - are by *nature* mentally deficient.

Louis Agassiz 1807-73 was born in Switzerland and he had an extensive and valuable scientific legacy in many areas. But as far as "race" was concerned he was an un-scientific polygenist, strongly influenced by Morton and his "cranial capacity" theories of "racial" inferiority. He moved to the United States in 1846 and eventually became an American citizen. He was a popular lecturer on "race" in many American academic institutions from 1846-1850. He joined the faculty at Harvard in 1850 where he remained until his retirement in 1869.

Immediately after the Civil War, the "race" issue reached a temporary American hiatus and it remained for certain European "racial" theorists to re-ignite this issue in the United States. The chief among them was **Joseph Arthur Comte de Gobineau** (1816-1882) who was a French aristocrat, novelist and man of letters who became famous for developing the theory of the Aryan master race in his *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1853-1855). De Gobineau is

often credited as being the father of modern "racial" thinking. Even though he never came to America, he exhibited a strong influence over American "racial" theory. Also, his follower **Houston Stewart Chamberlain**, (born 1855 in England, died 1927 in Germany.), was a British-born student of Germany and political philosopher, who turned to Gobineau for inspiration and whose advocacy of the "racial" and cultural superiority of the so-called Aryan element in European culture influenced German nationalist thought, particularly Adolf Hitler's National Socialist movement and the ensuing massive annihilation of over 6 million Jews, Gypsies and other "racial undesirables."

Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911) The concept of "race" rapidly became extremely virulent because of the new junk "science" of "Eugenics." Galton was largely the creator and Godfather of this field. Eugenics is basically controlled human "breeding" with the idea of "improving" the human species on a national or world scale. At first this breeding was to be achieved by three methods:

1. Immigration laws that prohibited lower "types" and lower "races" into one's nation.
2. Segregation of lower types and "races" into various ghettos and isolated areas.
- And 3. The legal sterilization of lower types, misfits etc. to *prevent* them from breeding.

A fourth method, that of extermination, was initiated later in Germany as previously discussed. Ironically, in his native England, Galton was knighted in 1909 for his "great contributions to humanity!"

The post-eugenics authors: **Nathaniel Shaler** (1841-1906) was a student of Agassiz and eventually succeeded Agassiz as professor at Harvard from 1869-1906. His 1884 article, "The Negro Problem," which was originally published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, stated that African-Americans freed from slavery were "like children lost in the woods, needing the old protection of the strong mastering hand," that they became more and more dominated by their "animal nature," that they lacked development when they grew from children into maturity, and the American slavery system was "infinitely the mildest and most decent system of slavery that ever existed." I find it almost incomprehensible that Harvard, surely one of the premier American academic and intellectual institutions, would allow a person with this level of obvious pseudo-intellectual hokum and bigotry to be retained on their faculty for 37 years! Evidently this bigotry was typical for the vast majority of post civil war 19th century "white" Americans. Hence, there would essentially be almost no one of "substance" (that is "whites") to protest against Shaler's obvious "racism." Indeed he was a very popular and influential professor who was rewarded by Harvard with an honorary doctorate in 1903 for his "broad human instincts." Among his students and followers were many American politicians (including future president Theodore Roosevelt). These politicians' influence on "racist" immigration, sterilization and anti-miscegenation laws was felt throughout the first half of the 20th century.

Next is **William Z. Ripley** (1867-1941) who in 1899 proposed the theory of three *separate* European "races" - Nordic, Alpine and Mediterranean. He basically provided **NO** scientific evidence to support his theory. Again by 1899, the belief in "race" by the "white" American academic community was so universal that scientific "proof" was no longer required as long as the author wrote with seeming "scientific" or "intellectual" authority. Ripley's theories were largely made famous and propagandized by **Madison Grant** and **Lothrop Stoddard**. Grant (1865-1937) in his treatise ***The Passing of the Great Race*** (1916) proposed that the "Nordic" race was superior and responsible for the highest level of human development, while lower European (Alpine and Mediterranean) and other "races" should be kept separate and often even sterilized to preserve this "high level" of "nordic" human development. Stoddard (1883-1950) was the author of easily the most inflammatory treatise of these three men, ***The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy*** (1920). President Herbert Hoover gave this treatise the highest praise.

Both Grant and Stoddard achieved large followings which included Adolf Hitler who praised Grant's book as his "Bible." Around 1939 Stoddard even traveled to Germany as a journalist where he actually met and evidently interviewed the Fuehrer and other Nazi leaders about the Jewish "problem!"

The Good Guys. (Finally, some light at the end of a **very dark** tunnel.)

The good guys would have to include those many people throughout our history who have heroically stood up for the rights of those people who were oppressed because of their "race." Among groups, The Society of Friends (Quakers) and other religious groups (especially including Jewish groups) are perhaps the most notable. Since the 1680s to the present time they have acted - often with great bravery - for "racial" justice. Their activities in the abolitionist movement and the underground railroad are legendary. A second group would have to be the civil rights workers of the 1950s-1960s, many of whom sacrificed their lives for this courageous cause. Among those whose bravery resulted in their lost lives were the following: Rev. George Wesley Lee, murdered on 5-7-1955, Emmett Till, murdered on 8-28-1955, Herbert Lee, murdered on 9-25-1961, Medgar Evers, murdered on 6-12-1963, James Chaney, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, all murdered on 6-21-1964, Viola Liuzzo, murdered on 3-25-1965, and Vernon Dahmer, murdered on 1-10-1966. And lastly Dr. Martin Luther King Jr, the Baptist minister who was certainly one of the elite amongst great American leaders. And he was the chief leader of the non-violent civil rights movement, perhaps the most noble, ethical and **Christian** movement in American History. (It never ceases to amaze me how so many avowed evangelical, flag-waving **Christians** seem to express their desire to return to the "good old days" of pre-civil rights "Jim Crow" America!)

*Dr. King was murdered on April 4, 1968 in Memphis, Tennessee. This is a day of **intense** shame in American history.*

The civil rights movement sought to bring equality to basically two different "races" of Americans. As such it only achieved partial success. There is still much obvious injustice (remember Trayvon Martin) in "racially" divided America and as long as *we are* so divided, a civil rights agenda is necessary.

But to me the central problem is not the equality of the "races," but more, the unity of mankind - especially the unity of all Americans. Thus, the *very idea of "race"* or separate (and unequal) supposedly ancestral divisions of Americans *is the delusion* that drives these schizophrenic "racial" divisions of our beloved nation in the first place. And it is, more than anything else, this corrupt fallacy of "race" that has led us, and continues to lead us, so far astray from our initial ideals of justice and equality as enunciated in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

This brings me to a new breed of biological anthropologists who have had the courage to revolutionize the "racial" tradition of their field by speaking out against the whole concept of "race." **Ashley Montagu** (1905-1999) was among the first. He wrote *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*, published in 1942 which questioned the very validity of race as a biological concept. From 1949-1955 Dr. Montagu chaired the department of Anthropology at Rutgers University. He also was the appointed chief investigator for the UNESCO Statement on Race of 1950. Fallout from this led to his dismissal from Rutgers and evidently made it impossible for him to seek other employment in the academic community. However, he continued his controversial writing on "race" and also on the equality of women. He became a famous author and public speaker on these subjects, including many guest appearances on The Tonight Show with Johnny Carson. His work has been invaluable in fighting "racial" prejudice and sexism. **C. Loring Brace**

(1930-) Longtime Professor of Anthropology at the University of Michigan, collaborated with Ashley Montagu on *Human Evolution: An Introduction to Biological Anthropology* in 1977. His treatise *Race is a Four-letter Word (2005)* is a work that I have repeatedly consulted in research for this essay. These two scientists along with others are definitely "good guys" in the struggle for American "racial" justice. I believe that this justice will only fully be achieved when the very concept of "race" is fully eliminated from the American psyche. That is, when we are fully transformed from a separate and unequal America, divided by schizophrenic "racial" lines, to an America that only sees our common unity as Americans in the same American boat. This is a boat that may very well sink if we are so *ignorant* and *evil* as to allow ourselves to see our beloved nation otherwise.

On Human "Intelligence" and IQ Tests

I must admit that I have essentially *no credentials* to discuss the above. Although volumes have been written about these issues by very learned, highly educated people in the field of psychology; unfortunately, it seems that very little common sense is apparent in many of these writings! For example, it has unequivocally been proven by numerous authors that the Stanford-Binet IQ tests and their more recent derivatives do not even *begin* to accurately measure static "natural" or "born with" general human intelligence as many claim. Yet other writers persist in promoting the theory that the white "race" has higher native intelligence than other "races" based on the results of these very same IQ tests! It is therefore my "common sense" opinion that in 2018 we simply don't yet know how to measure "born with" or static human intelligence! It is also my "common sense" opinion that in this year of 2018 we still also really don't know how to even *adequately define* such intelligence! And therefore how can something be accurately measured when it cannot even be accurately defined? With these factors in mind, I wrote the following:

"Mollie is an exceptionally smart reporter, She must have an IQ of over 130." "What a 'moron' Phil is. His survey indicates that he can't even do basic arithmetic!" We often hear talk similar to this and indeed the above alleged conversations are fairly typical today. Yet these conversations both make two basic assumptions; 1. That we know what general smartness, brainpower or "intelligence" is and 2. That brainpower or "intelligence" is accurately measured by IQ testing. Or to put it another way; Can general "intelligence" be defined? If it can be, can it be accurately measured?

For example, Beethoven was possibly the greatest musical genius of all time. Later in life he became guardian of his nephew Karl. In dealing with Karl, one could reasonably say that Beethoven didn't have the sense that he was born with and because of this, his guardianship ended with disastrous and tragic results. Was Beethoven "intelligent?" Musical genius - YES Very high "intelligence." Dealing with children NO, "moron" or "imbecile!" Yet, even though Beethoven might have been an extreme case, it is not unusual for many of us to be very smart or gifted in one area and fail miserably in another. Therefore, it seems that this is part of being human and, at best, one could reasonably say that human "intelligence" is very specialized and certainly impossible to define. Indeed the myriad number and variety of human activities and talents and even cultures, religions etc. seems to make this very idea of static inborn general "intelligence" meaningless. One could therefore surmise that one is only "intelligent" in that in which one is "*intelligent*" in! Thus, how could anyone claim to measure *general, unknowable* "intelligence?" Indeed, at the very least, this seems to *INSULT* one's "intelligence."

Let us now examine I.Q. (intelligence quotient) testing. From approximately 1820-1900 high

"intelligence" or mental ability was thought to be the result of certain bumps in the skull (Phrenology - Franz Joseph Gall) or a physically large brain only (Samuel George Morton and his followers). French psychologist **Alfred Binet** (1857-1911), was among the first people to be justifiably horrified by these pseudo-sciences and motivated to do something about it. Thus, working with his research assistant **Théodore Simon** (1872-1961), he developed a test called the Binet-Simon scale, the purpose of which was to identify French Parisian children who needed extra help with their school work. This test was very successful at doing this. However Binet *did not* design this test to attempt to permanently measure static "intelligence" or label a child as a permanently brainless "slow learner" or "feeble minded" individual. His premise was that these children were not *born mentally inferior*, but mostly that their deficiencies were that they had not adequately *learned how to learn*, and that this extra help should be formulated in attacking *this* problem. Binet became justifiably recognized as a great scientific thinker and pioneer in his field. Unfortunately he died in 1911, five years before his name was surreptitiously used in the American created Stanford-Binet I.Q. tests of 1916. If there is such a thing as "turning over in his grave" I am sure that there is a veritable, continuous earthquake around the grave of Alfred Binet to this day!

Therefore let us now examine the American attitudes that led to the development of this American made Stanford-Binet I.Q. test. America was born with the initial ideals that "all men are created equal" and "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union..." The problem with these ideals is how do we define "all men" or "We the People?" This question has been at the center of the American psyche since our inception. My thoughts on this are that presumably these early writers *literally meant what they wrote*, that is, they believed in the visionary and eventual inclusion in governmental affairs of *all* American adult human beings. Yet in their era "all men" and "We the people" as indicated by those who had voting privileges, included only "white" males who were landowners - *only a very small part* of the adult population of that time! During the presidency of Andrew Jackson (1829-1837) voting rights were extended to most "white" men. Women finally achieved full voting rights in 1920. African-Americans technically had voting rights after the Civil War but throughout the Jim Crow era (1877-1965) these rights were effectively eliminated by poll taxes, literacy tests etc. - especially throughout the southern states. However the heroically fought for Voting Rights Act of 1965 seemingly *permanently* achieved this basic right for all Americans regardless of "race!" Unfortunately this seeming permanence was shattered in the 2012 elections, where we saw the voting rights of the poor whites, African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans again threatened by the newly enacted photo ID laws and early voting suppression in many states. Furthermore the June 26, 2013 Supreme Court ruling against Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 threatened to *entirely negate* this earlier 1965 legislation

So, while the dominant trend of America in its 240 year history has been great progress toward its goals of equality and a more perfect union. There has also been a strong and sometimes greater counter-force *against* these trends. We have already seen how the totally insignificant but *visible* geographic genetic variations of the ancestry of certain Americans has been immensely blown up to effectively create the illusion that different "races" are *by nature* vastly inferior and unequal to the other "white" north European "nordic race." Until 1900 this "inferiority" was largely "scientifically" rationalized with the brain size, cranial capacity argument. But it became apparent that this argument needed a supporting "science" to back it up. Thus we see the development of the Stanford-Binet I.Q. test which, among other things, purports to measure the static, unchangeable *natural* (inherited) "intelligence" or brainpower

of an individual. As I mentioned before, I'm 75 and I was not born yesterday. I have *learned* from acute observation that human beings are *learners*, not instinctual "born withs" or "already haves." From birth we learn almost everything, how to walk by trial and error, how to talk and understand speech by imitation and observation. As a matter of fact our vastly superior ability to learn and *the ultimate and accumulated result of this learning which is knowledge* is what makes us unique from all other creatures on earth! (I also believe that such concepts as reason, logic, rationality, deduction etc. can and *should be* described as further learning *derived* from previously gained knowledge.) Thus, how to measure the a priori, predisposed *ability to learn* as distinct from and opposed to that which is *already learned* (knowledge) is an extreme paradox and a practical impossibility. In other words, learning ability and knowledge are inextricably fused together, intertwined and inseparable.

To give an extreme example which should further clarify the above; consider an illiterate Australian aborigine with only stone-age tools, isolated in the dry inhospitable environment of the Australian outback. He would, *by necessity* concentrate his learning on the countless ways of finding food and especially water in his drought-infested, hostile environment. While likewise a Harvard law professor, who has never needed to survive in such a severe environment, would concentrate his learning on laws, their applications and legal challenges etc. Transplant either person, with their very individualized and culturally specialized knowledge, to the other's environment and they would be hopelessly lost - like attempting to swim in fog - and ultimately become seeming imbeciles! Who is more "intelligent?" Of course the Harvard professor would score infinitely higher on the culturally skewed, modern day I.Q. tests, but that fact would not help him survive in the outback with only stone-age tools. To me this illustrates that smartness, brainpower, or intelligence *only* seems to exist within a specific culture - and even within a *specialization* within that culture. And even then it is impossible to know how much of it a person was born with naturally or how much was acquired.

Let us again turn to Beethoven to shed a different light on this last aspect. Consider the following: Mozart and Mendelssohn seemingly were both *born* musical geniuses - that is, they could produce masterpieces as fast as they could write them. Since early childhood their music seemed to naturally and innately flow out of them. On the other hand, Beethoven seemingly did not display *anywhere near* the apparent amount of inborn natural talent or genius as these composers. He constantly struggled, painfully honing his material, doing seemingly endless revisions of themes, rhythms etc. to perfect his compositions,. Thus, to me, his *heroic* and *indomitable will* to create great music at all costs was his saving grace. This becomes even more evident later in life when he composed many of his greatest masterpieces after suffering the extreme handicap for a musician of total deafness! And I believe his work ultimately had a greater impact on classical music than *either* Mozart's or Mendelssohn's. Therefore, perhaps he was an even greater musical genius despite his seeming lower level of natural talent!

Perhaps this illustrates that such aspects as motivation and/or will power has infinitely more to do with great human achievements than high scores on culturally skewed Stanford-Binet I.Q. tests. Therefore for well over three centuries of American history, a whole group or "race" of Americans has largely been denied anything but chattel slavery, which was followed by corrupt sharecropping and menial servile employment (i.e. Jim Crow). All this was accompanied with intensely limited legal rights. I feel it should become apparent that for this group or "race" such psychological motivation and/or will power to achieve greatness would, at best, be severely dampened.

In any case, it now becomes *obvious* that there is overwhelming difficulty in measuring static genetic "intelligence" *even within a specific culture and even within a specific specialty and even within a specific field within that specialty*. Consequently, it seems that at this stage of the game, we simply do not have the ability to even *begin* to define natural "born with" general intelligence. ***And if it cannot be defined, it obviously cannot be measured!***

The Pioneer Fund - The Bad Guys return with a vengeance, this time with big money, I.Q. tests and even more pseudo-scientific hokum.

Wickliffe Draper (1891-1972) was a multi-millionaire who believed in the African repatriation movement (that is, send the "Negroes" back to Africa where they *belong*). He also believed that the original "nordic" northern European "pioneers" were the only true "native" and "racially" supreme Americans. And because of this alleged supremacy, these "pioneers" brought the only worthwhile civilization to America. In 1937 he used his vast wealth to help create the Pioneer Fund "to advance the 'scientific' study of heredity and human differences." (Technically this fund was created by Henry H. Laughlin who was a believer in eugenics *and* was a Nazi sympathizer.) Basically what this fund does is to supply generous grants to "scientists" who do "research" that is skewed to support the belief that Americans with African descent are by *nature* intellectually inferior to those "pioneers" with "pure" nordic (i.e. WASP - White Anglo-Saxon, Protestant) European descent.

Among the many recipients of these grants are: 1. American psychologist **Arthur R. Jensen** (1923-2012) who received 1.1 million dollars in grants for his "research." Through these grants and his ensuing "research," Jensen achieved such notoriety that an entirely new word was coined into American English: "*Jensenism*, n. the belief that blacks are mentally inferior to whites, based on results of intelligence tests that failed to account for such differences as test questions slanted in favor of whites, lack of cultural and educational opportunities among blacks, etc." I feel that this definition somehow says that Jensen was a great huckster of a massive amount of heinous pseudo-scientific "racist" malarkey!

2. Canadian psychologist **J. Philippe Rushton** (1943-2012) was a modern day exponent of Morton's 160 year old cranial capacity-brain size theory for measuring intellect! Indeed, some pseudo-scientific racist hokum *never* seems to die! And of course he also was an exponent of the above-mentioned "Jensenism" brand of I.Q. test malarkey. *And* he also came up with his own brand of "racist" hokum - the application of r/K selection theory to humans which he elucidated in his 1995 book, *Race, Evolution and Behavior*. Part of this theory is the amazingly outlandish belief that in humans, the *stronger* the sexual drive that one has somehow *diminishes* the amount of intelligence one has! In other words high intelligence equals low sex drive and low intelligence equals high sex drive. He "verifies" this with "statistics" that supposedly prove that African men and their descendants, have larger penises with harder and longer lasting erections, and therefore have higher sex drive than East Asians and Europeans and their descendants. Therefore since high sex drive equals low intelligence, these men of the "Negroid" "race" *by nature* must have lower intelligence than corresponding men of the "Mongoloid" or "Caucasoid" "races!" To me, it is very difficult to understand how Rushton or anyone else could accurately gather these "statistics." I mean, how could *anyone* accurately measure the penises and especially the longer harder erections of various men of any of these "races," who were complete strangers. Especially, how could they be so measured in the heat of passionate love-making and be lucky enough to get out alive? At the very least they would

almost certainly get beat to a pulp and *very* seriously injured by those *and* their sexual partners while being so measured! But perhaps, I just don't get it because - maybe I *DID* JUST FALL OFF THE TURNIP TRUCK YESTERDAY!

In the year 2000, J. Philippe Rushton's *Charles Darwin Research Institute's* tax records indicate that a grant of almost \$500,000 was awarded from the Pioneer fund for the above sort of "research." Over the years he almost certainly was given other generous grants plus Rushton probably was well compensated for serving as the president of the Pioneer Fund from 2002 until his death in Oct. 2012.

3. British psychologist **Richard Lynn's** (born 1930) views are very similar to Rushton's and Jensen's; in both continuing to believe the 160 year old (Morton) cranial capacity-brain size theory of measuring intelligence and Jensen's more recent low I.Q. theories of black "racial" inferiority. Richard Lynn's *Ulster Institute for Social Research* received over \$600,000 in grants from the Pioneer Fund between 1971 and 1996. Lynn also served on the fund's board of directors from 2002.

4. *The Bell Curve*, (1994) by psychologist and behaviorist **Richard Herrnstein** (1930-1994) and right-wing political scientist **Charles Murray** (born 1943) is a massive 858 page volume with a great many statistics, charts etc. which deal with intelligence, wealth, class structure and "race." Among its central tenets is that since blacks score lower on I.Q. tests, they *naturally* have inherited less intelligence than other "races." And to "help" them is futile because their achievements will *by nature* always be static and on a lower level. Therefore society as a whole will not benefit sufficiently from this "help." Thus, welfare should be reduced or eliminated. Affirmative action in the workplace and schools sharply curtailed and/or completely ended. And funding for the Head Start program diminished or eliminated. Although there is no record of Pioneer directly funding the authors of *The Bell Curve*, these authors drew heavily from Pioneer-funded "research" and "statistics" - especially from Jensen, Rushton and Lynn. Thus this book is very much a part of the *venomous* legacy of the Pioneer Fund.

The Southern Poverty Law Center, a major civil rights organization, has consistently listed the Pioneer Fund as a hate group. To me this is obviously true. At this point we should emphasize that from inception to this day this fund has received government approved 501(c)(3) non-profit status as a "scientific" or "educational" institution! In America we do have freedom of speech and press, yet this is essentially governmental support of a hate group and is, among other things, a *severe* violation of our citizen's rights as law abiding tax payers.

Conclusion

At this point we should be able to see that the concept of "race" in America *is* the result of complicity and collusion between the dominant and controlling "white" European-Americans and so-called "scientists." These "whites," who mostly claimed to be "Christians," desperately needed an excuse to justify their brutal oppression of African-Americans and other minorities. And these "scientists," who were often vastly rewarded with academic honors, professorships etc., were willing and able to *betray true science* to supply this excuse and give so-called "scientific" credence as *justification* for this vicious oppression. In other words, "race" is a **monumental pseudo-scientific myth (or hoax)** - created *only* for the purpose of rationalizing and keeping the control of land, power and money in the hands of the "white" majority.

Part 2: "Race" and Essential Christian Precepts

The American founding fathers all claimed to be Christians (of various levels and denominations). Therefore, despite the fact that our Constitution guarantees religious freedom, America was founded by Christians and largely continues to claim Christianity and Biblical principles. Therefore, what does the Bible teach about "Race?" And what does it say about the unity and brotherhood of all people? AND what does this authoritative Christian holy book say about the possible reason that the myth of "race" has had such general acceptance amongst the American Christian community? (And why is Sunday morning the most "racially" segregated time of the week in current American life?) I will attempt to answer the above by discussing pertinent and important scriptures as they relate to these questions.

[Acts 17:26] And (God) hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;

As stated previously the above new testament scripture testifies to the biological unity of mankind and completely negates any possibility of separate human creations or "races." Indeed it affirms what is apparent throughout the old testament - that we *all* are one unified biological species because we are *all* lineal descendants of Adam and Eve. We also know that Adam and Eve lost their innocence by committing the "original sin" of consuming the fruit of the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." And likewise we are *all* descendants of Adam and Eve whom God created in his own image! Thus, it seems to me that both of these seemingly opposing forces are absolutely essential to understanding any and all Christian theology and moral teaching. Yes, we ARE wonderfully and perfectly made in God's image. But we also miss the mark (i.e. sin) and simultaneously fall far short of His image and perfection! Now, at this point we must discuss how mankind learns of God and then discovers his relationship with Him. ***We Christians learn of God and His image from two sources, 1. nature and 2. holy Scripture.***

1. Nature: In nature, both universal and earth-bound, the image we see is the infinite, unbelievably awe-inspiring, magnificent and wondrous creative genius of God.

[Psalms 8:3] When I consider Your heavens, the work of Your fingers, The moon and the stars, which You have ordained

Today, with our modern telescopes, we can see millions of galaxies (such as our "Milky Way") each containing literally billions of stars. Indeed many astronomers now believe that the number of stars in the universe are basically uncountable and infinite! Now let us contemplate the thought that God has "ordained" the stars and moon. The stars have been "ordained" by God (seemingly from the beginning of time) to keep their orderly appointed places in the galaxies and the universe. Our moon has been "ordained" by God (again seemingly from the beginning of time) to circle the earth in its orderly monthly patterns. And the earth has been "ordained" by God (and again seemingly from the beginning of time) to circle our sun in yearly seasonal patterns. And lastly the earth has been "ordained" by God (and yet again seemingly from the beginning of time) to spin on its axis in 24 hour daily cycles.

Thus we can see from the natural universe (the work of God's fingers!) not only the wondrous creative genius of God but also the essentially peaceful, orderly and supremely logical qualities of His universal creation!

Now let us meditate on the life that He created on earth. To get an infinitely small microcosm of this, let us contemplate the lowly example of the maple tree. Every maple tree has great individual differences yet they are *all* maple trees! On closer inspection, each leaf has great individual differences yet they are *all* maple leaves! On even closer and microscopic inspection each *individual living cell* of a leaf has great individual differences yet they are *all* cells of maple leaves! God is *unquestionably* not a boring cookie-cutter, mass-production God. Indeed He is a miraculous wonder worker with endless and infinite creativity and one could say that He creates endless variety within structural unity. And how might we apply the above to humans? First we must acknowledge that all people, like all of earthly life are biological creatures of nature! Thus, while we are all instantly biologically and visibly different, unique individuals (endless variety) we are one species (structural unity). And what does this have to do with "race?" All people (except albino mutants) have varying amounts of the pigment, melanin in their skin. God, in His infinite wisdom gave people native to very hot sunny climates high levels of melanin *as protection* against sunburn and ultra violet radiation damage (which causes cancer) . Likewise God (again in His infinite wisdom) gave people native to colder, cloudier climates much lower levels of melanin to *compensate for* vitamin D deficiency caused by the *lack* of exposure to sunshine. Thus, what God created was the single species of mankind, all with great individual differences and *among these differences* are the extraordinarily *minor* gradual geographic variations such as skin and hair pigmentation. Yet what God in His infinite wisdom created, humans recklessly and intentionally *falsely diagnosed* as separate and unequal "racial" divisions of mankind!" Therefore now we must ask, just *how* did this multi-generational belief in this monstrosity of "race" come about? To answer this we must now consider the second source for understanding God's image and nature and what our human response to it should be.

2. Holy Scripture: What we see in the Bible, especially through the love, teachings and actions of Jesus, is a God of grace, mercy, love and forgiveness. Thus we are exhorted to love and worship God and *equally* to show grace, mercy, love and forgiveness toward God's wondrous and unique creation which is our fellow humans of all the earth! Let us now delve further into the concept of mankind being made in God's image.

[Gen 1:26-27] And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. 27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

It is curious that the plural "us" and "our" and "them" is used in verse 26 while in verse 27 the singular "God" and "his" and "him" (and then the plural "them" is used after "male and female created he them") There are several names (and/or concepts) of the singular "God" in the old testament writings: the silent and un-pronounceable YHWH, along with El Shaddai, Adonay, Elohim and Yahweh (or Jehovah). The question therefore arises, is God several (possibly many) plural, perhaps male and female "personalities" who separately communicated with one another over the creation of mankind? And therefore is there a singular ultimate "decision making" God who gives "permission" to these lesser "personalities" to create mankind? And lastly, since God made man in his image and He (She) created mankind male and female might God (or gods), by reverse logic, conceivably also be one male and one female God? Or might He (She) be a unified "male *and* female" God of a *singular* image? Thus, while the above could possibly be making a statement on gender equality, it seemingly has little to do with "race."

To me, the ultimate meaning of the above scripture remains a mystery. Therefore I find myself searching elsewhere for understanding of first, what God's image *is* and second, how mankind is *made* in His image. Indeed our God - the awesome and magnificent creator of the heavens, earth and life, the God who transcends the beginning and end of time. This God *cannot* be compartmentalized by *personalities* or *gender*. Any attempt to do so irreparably diminishes Him to far inferior and minuscule *human* levels of perception! So the question remains. What is meant by the "image of God." Or who or what is the core substance and/or essential quality of God. We must examine other scriptures for this enlightenment. But before we do this, perhaps we should rule out the possibility that there is a scriptural physical or *visual* image that represents God.

Therefore let us consider this. The vast majority of contemporary Christians believe in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit or the plural Holy Trinity. Yet concurrently they also believe in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit *fused into* the singular "Godhead." Indeed this is undeniably *also* a great mystery. But what does *this* have to do with "race" and/or the image of God? The only physical or *visible* image we ever had of God *is* the Son. Yet what is remarkable is that Jesus, the Son of God, spent 33 years on earth in a physical human body. Several biblical writers walked and talked with Jesus for at least three years and knew *exactly* what his appearance was. Yet not *one* of these writers, *including his own evident half-brothers James and Jude*, were led to *describe* this appearance in their inspired writings! Why is this important? For well over 700 years practically the only images we have had of Jesus are "Caucasian" which were originally derived and later copied from European artists of the Renaissance such as Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Rembrandt etc. And now we have the intensely popular commercial distillation of these (and other later European art works) in Warner Sallman's "*Head of Christ*" of 1941! This alleged portrait features Jesus as a northern European "Caucasian" man with brown wavy hair of shoulder length and it has been reproduced more than *500 million times* according to its publishers. And in 2018 it is *still* the overwhelmingly popular contemporary image of Jesus in churches, both Protestant and Catholic, YMCA's, Salvation Army stores, and other Christian oriented enterprises throughout America and much of the rest of the world! The huge *problem* with this is that the vast majority of the world's people *don't appear to be northern European "Caucasians"* with light skin and brown wavy hair. Thus, since Jesus came to save the *entire world of humanity* how can one expect the vast majority of "non-Caucasians" to identify with this *subliminal "racist" imagery* of the Son of God? Therefore, I believe this speaks to the wisdom of the today *largely ignored* first commandment which exhorts us *against* the worship of idol gods and/or creating "graven" or carved (including painted or drawn) images of God. [*Exodus 20:1-2*]

Now, let us examine the essential quality or the core substance of God.

God is Love (Agape - i.e. altruistic, benevolent, sacrificial love)

The above exact phrase is only found twice in all of scripture yet on both occasions perfectly expresses why Christianity *must once and for all* reject the myth of "race."

[*1 John 4:8*] *He who does not love does not know God, for God is love.*

"Race" is a concept that segregates, divides, creates excessive suspicion and hatred, and is all about the supremacy of one "race" over another and is therefore the very antithesis of love and knowing God!

[*1 John 4:16*] *And we have known and believed the love that God has for us. God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God in him.*

God is love, thus He must have created us in love. Therefore, if we wish to "abide in God" we are propelled to love Him *and* what He created. Indeed I believe this is exactly what is meant by mankind being "made in the image of God." Amongst all of God's vast number of creatures, we alone are the *only one* which is capable of universal agape love, not only for each other, but also for God and his entire creation! To understand this further, let us now consider the following scripture:

[John 4:24] "God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth."

Yes God *is* spirit. And God *is* love. Therefore, since God is spirit, and love *is* a spiritual quality and apparently the ultimate quality that God possesses, Love and God are essentially and entirely one and the same - i.e. synonymous concepts! This, I believe, *is the spirit and truth we must worship Him in*. Thus one can again comprehend why the concept of "race" (especially the scientifically untenable notion that one so-called "race" is somehow *by nature* genetically different and intellectually superior to another so-called "race") - is completely antithetical to abiding or being one with God or *being made in the image of God*. In other words the concept of "race" is a total and complete heresy against these most treasured and fundamental Christian teachings! This can be even clarified further by the "great" commandment and the parable of "The Good Samaritan."

Matt. 22:35-40] 35 Then one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question, testing Him, and saying, 36 "Teacher, which is the great commandment in the law?" 37 Jesus said to him, "'You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.' 38 This is the first and great commandment. 39 And the second is like it: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' 40 On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets."

We can see that following the above *commandments* have essentially the same meaning and result as the previous "God is Love" discussion. But what *is* unique is that these are the all-inclusive two commandments that all other commandments, prophesies and laws can be weighed and evaluated by *[Matt. 22:40]*. In Luke's gospel these "great" commandments are followed by the parable of "The Good Samaritan."

[Luke 29-37] But he (the lawyer), wanting to justify himself, said to Jesus, "And who is my neighbor?" 30 Then Jesus answered and said: "A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, who stripped him of his clothing, wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead. 31 Now by chance a certain priest came down that road. And when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. 32 Likewise a Levite, when he arrived at the place, came and looked, and passed by on the other side. 33 But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was. And when he saw him, he had compassion. 34 So he went to him and bandaged his wounds, pouring on oil and wine; and he set him on his own animal, brought him to an inn, and took care of him. 35 On the next day, when he departed, he took out two denarii, gave them to the innkeeper, and said to him, 'Take care of him; and whatever more you spend, when I come again, I will repay you.' 36 So which of these three do you think was neighbor to him who fell among the thieves?" 37 And he said, "He who showed mercy on him." Then Jesus said to him, "Go and do likewise."

We have already discussed that the concept of separate biological "races" of humans is of recent origin. But what is *not* recent, but is evidently as old as mankind, is intense ethnic hatred and scorn. It was especially alive and well during the time of Jesus in the Jewish attitudes toward their neighbors, the Samaritans. Thus, a "good Jew" would not speak to a Samaritan, touch a Samaritan or even travel through the land of Samaria! Yes their hatred was *so* intense that when traveling from Jerusalem to Galilee and vice/versa they would completely bypass Samaria by crossing to the east side of the Jordan river thus increasing the length of a normal six day trip to an eight or nine day trip!

Indeed the Jewish attitude toward Samaritans was very similar to the treatment of "untouchables" in the old Hindu caste-system of the Indian subcontinent or the "Jim Crow" mind-set of many historic *and even* contemporary American so-called "whites" toward "blacks!" Thus when Jesus tells the lawyer to "Go and do likewise" he is directly exhorting us today to stop thinking of other "races," ethnic groups, religions etc. with hatred and start truly loving "thy neighbor as thyself!" Therefore the parable of the good Samaritan infers a direct condemnation of contemporary "racism" while simultaneously defining God's characterization of a neighbor as one who supremely demonstrates agape love toward *all*.

[Matt 6:24 NKJV] "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and Mammon."

Yes folks, "Race" is all originally about loving and serving Mammon (The demonic god of wealth, power, excessive materialism, and greed)! Let us begin by looking at one of the myths that the vast majority of Americans are taught and many still believe today. **"Columbus discovered America in 1492."** This is obviously not true! What Columbus actually "discovered" is that other people *already had* discovered America and were happily occupying this "new world" when he arrived in 1492. Thus the most important "discovery" was *not* made by Columbus but by these "Indians." It was that Columbus and especially the subsequent Spanish conquistadors, were largely a greedy, brutal bunch of selfish hypocritical "Christians" who *actually* served the god **"Mammon."** Many of us know of the conquistadors' legendary looting of Mexican and Peruvian gold treasures. But what is less well known is the sheer murderous brutality of many conquistadors such as Hernan Cortez in Mexico and Francisco Pizarro in Peru. No, Columbus *did not* discover America and/or the "New World!" But what he actually did was to begin the "white" serving of the god Mammon through the process of the European conquering and *bringing to submission* these two American continents.

Now let us concentrate on the treatment of native Americans in the early colonies and later in the United States. I shall begin with a quote from the famous Harvard educated poet and Puritan minister Michael Wigglesworth (1631–1705) who, in 1662 described our land as "a waste and howling wilderness, where none inhabited but hellish fiends, and brutish men that devils worshiped." This attitude by European settlers, as exemplified by Wigglesworth, has become the overwhelming sentiment toward native Americans from the early colonial era to at least the early 20th century. (Sadly, in certain instances, this attitude still exists today!) Unfortunately the false idea that native Americans are *by nature* brutal savage devils and hellish fiends has been used as a monstrous excuse for European settlers and/or their descendants to forcibly grab (i.e. steal) enormous tracts of land (i.e. the "waste and howling wilderness") for

their own use. This continuous land-theft has several unspeakably scandalous highlights, such as the Indian Removal Act of 1830 which culminated in the "trail of tears" of 1838 in which practically all the native Americans of the southeastern United States were forced to leave their native land and migrate to "Indian" Territory in Oklahoma! The obscene suffering encountered and countless lives lost in this forced migration make this more like a massive blood-bath or massacre than a forced migration! Of course the "white" greed for land and power did not stop there, Europeans and their "white" descendants pushed west and continued to forcibly grab the best land for themselves and push the "Indians" into progressively smaller and less fertile reservations. The western land wars of the late 1800s and early 1900s, which included several bloodthirsty massacres, continued to decimate and impoverish the "Indian" population. Although the land wars are over, this impoverishment has continued to the present. Native Americans are among the poorest ethnicities in America today! Such is the heartbreaking result of this long-time "white" love and worship of the god "Mammon!"

Thus, while the natives were being decimated and almost totally removed from the southeast, African slaves were being purchased in droves by the planters who now used this slave labor to build, farm and work their plantations on this fertile "waste and howling wilderness" that was forcibly stolen from these "Indians!" Therefore these antebellum plantation owners, through the exportation of cotton, tobacco, sugar, rice, peanuts, etc. became *easily* the wealthiest class of Americans during this period. Indeed, among the first five "founding father" presidents, four (Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe) were wealthy plantation owners who *owned* an average of approximately 165 slaves each!

There is no question that the treatment of native Americans by so-called "Christian" European immigrants was the result of greed for land, i.e. the love of Mammon. But the entire slave trade and the resultant institution of antebellum slavery was even a far more insidious example of this love of money, power, materialism and greed which I believe defines the *absolute worship* of "Mammon." Let us begin with the "middle passage" on the west African (Atlantic) coast. A ship lands in a certain port in central west Africa. Near this port one can see several large fort-like structures (slave factories) with dungeons packed full of people. These people were generally prisoners of war captured by various African tribes or kingdoms. They were brought to Africa's west coast to be sold to slave traders in exchange for guns, ammunition, (used to fight further wars) rum and other goods. As many as 600 of these slaves are now "branded" with hot irons and packed and chained into the bowels of this ship. These "living quarters" often had less than five feet of headroom -- and throughout a large portion of the deck, sleeping shelves cut this limited amount of headroom in half. There was extremely poor ventilation and little room - often not even enough space for buckets for human waste disposal. On top of this it was *extremely* hot with an estimated average daily temperature of well over 110 degrees Fahrenheit - It is no wonder that an average of 15% of these slaves died in this typical six week/two month voyage of crossing the Atlantic ocean. Many of these captured slaves were so tormented that they tried to commit suicide by starving themselves to death! For this they were further punished by extreme whipping and torture until they submitted and ate. If this did not work, the ship's slave masters even had a special tool (a speculum orum) which forcibly and painfully held their mouths open until they swallowed the non-masticated food. Of course this forced feeding, whipping, torture etc. was done to keep as many slaves alive as possible to make ever greater financial profit from their sale!

It is remarkable that this hideous, evil slave trade was one of *the most financially profitable "businesses" of that entire era (1526-1853)*. But what is even more remarkable is that

the vast majority of these slave ship captains, slave-masters and sailors who committed this monstrous, inconceivable sadism and murder *claimed Christianity as their faith!* How could these "slave-traders" justify these horrendously evil deeds especially in light of the second part of the greatest commandment ("Love thy neighbor as thyself")? Would not their consciences condemn them? As true Christians would they not be *consumed with unrepentant guilt?*

One such slave ship captain, John Newton (1725–1807) was one of the *very few* who, throughout this 327 year era, *did repent* and speak out about the horrors of slavery and especially of the middle passage. He soon became a fiery Christian preacher and abolitionist. He even led a campaign which resulted in Britain's elimination of the African slave trade in 1807. He also wrote many hymns, his most famous being "*Amazing Grace!*" As for the vast majority of these many slave masters, however, they evidently were *apostate* Christians, i.e. hypocritical Christian *pretenders* who secretly became Mammon worshipers. Yes, when at home, many were model citizens, even pillars of their communities, who attended church regularly, perhaps even were deacons in their churches!

But when they returned to their very lucrative lives as Slave-masters at Sea, they became sadistic, murderous monsters *ruled* by their greed for money and power (i.e. the god "Mammon")! Yet, to keep their own sanity they needed some theory or rationale to justify their diabolical behavior. Therefore, in their minds they relegated and compartmentalized these slaves as only equal to lower animals or beasts of burden such as oxen or horses. Thus they referred to the slaves as "cargo" to be transported by the cheapest, least expensive means possible. Consequently it was but one small step to creating the monumental myth (and heresy) that by "nature" God created different biological levels or "races" of humanity and so the heathen blasphemy of "race" was ultimately born. Allow me to further explain how this might have worked. These slave-masters lead double lives. Thus, when they returned home they had to explain to their wives, children and friends their "other" life i.e. what, and more importantly, *why they did what they did* when they were away at "work." Therefore after brainwashing themselves that these dark-skinned Africans were lower animals and "cargo" they now found it necessary to also brainwash their families and friends in order to justify their careers and their own alleged high level of morality. We must remember that at home they were largely wealthy and dignified members of their communities. Thus it evidently did not take that much persuasion or brainwashing to convince most that they were truly highly moral and Christian citizens. Indeed the rationalization that Africans were by nature "inferior" spread throughout all "high class" whites who had any connections with slavery, whether they were slave-masters at sea, slave merchants, and even plantation owners etc. But this alleged "African inferiority" did not filter down to middle and lower class whites until Bacon's Rebellion of 1676. Nathaniel Bacon was a property owner in Jamestown, Virginia who organized an armed rebellion against the elite Planters (Plantation owners) and William Berkeley, the governor of Virginia. There is much confusion as to the true reasons for this rebellion. Bacon's militia of 500 men consisted of lower class whites including indentured servants *and* many African slaves. This alliance between lower class whites and slaves so horrified Berkeley and the elite planters that they enlisted the help of the British crown and "redcoats" to put down this rebellion. This eventually resulted in the passing of the Virginia Slave Codes of 1705. These codes effectively permanently fixed the idea of segregation and white supremacy between lower class, impoverished whites and slaves. Among other things, one of these new laws generously rewarded lower class whites for turning in suspected runaway slaves. These slave codes were the first of later similar slave codes throughout America. Thus these Virginia Slave Codes of 1705 were the start of a divide and

conquer strategy by elite planters and other wealthy "whites" throughout the colonies to create *two mutually hostile separate and unequal castes - poor "whites" pitted against blacks*. Consequently the concept of black "racial" inferiority and segregation became a permanent and fundamental fixture amongst *all* classes of "white" Americans from 1705 to the present time.

Indeed this myth (and heresy) of "race" has so permeated the American culture and history that we have had over 200 years of slavery, 4 years of the brutal civil war (1861-1865) to free the slaves, followed by a failed reconstruction which by 1877 degraded into 85 years of "Jim Crow laws" which again largely reduced the African-American population to servile status and second or third class citizenship with no voting or other significant citizenship rights. Enter the civil rights movement of 1954-1968 largely led by Dr. Martin Luther King. This remarkable non-violent movement seemingly desegregated public transportation, schools, restaurants, and housing along with establishing and guarantying voting and "interracial" marriage rights ***all within a period of less than 15 years!***

Indeed, for the next 40 years (1968-2008) it seemed to many "whites" that "racial" prejudice and discrimination had effectively ended and America had become a color-blind society! At first the election of President Barack Obama in 2008 seemed to affirm this position! But shortly after his inauguration it became apparent that there is still a powerful, robust, but subliminal undercurrent of white "racism" present in American society. Indeed "race" and "racial" oppression now seems to be so deeply entrenched in the American culture and subconscious that neither the civil rights movement *nor* the presidency of Barack Obama has even made a slight dent in this diabolical heresy of "race!" Let us consider the "birther" conspiracy theory in which a high percentage of "white" Americans are ***so*** "racially" brainwashed as to believe that President Obama was somehow an alien, foreign-born, *un-American usurper* to the presidency! They believe and offer up *hype* that he was foreign born in Kenya and later a secretive, covert Muslim citizen of Indonesia - all this *despite authentic birth certificates and other indisputable proof to the contrary*. Indeed this blasphemous "racial" brainwashing harkens back to and is similar to Wickliffe Draper (1891-1972) and his "Pioneer Fund" - i.e. that the ancestral "nordic" (i.e. WASP - "White," Anglo-Saxon, Protestant) northern European "pioneers" and their descendants are the only *true* "native" Americans with their supposedly superior culture and intelligence. (Thus, the true native Americans are therefore designated as apparently "foreign" alien "Indians") (See pp. 10-12). And let us not forget that birther in chief, President Donald Trump! Just how did this obviously absurd "birtherism" ever gain such unheard-of traction? And even more preposterous, how and why did such an obvious "birther" as Donald Trump end up being elected to the U. S. presidency? At this point I will reserve an opinion on this for a later time when we have a better understanding of the outcome of the Trump presidency! But it seems that surely, as far as American "racial" bigotry goes, the more things seem to change, the more they actually stay the same.

Witness how it has recently become evident, often through private cell phone videos, of irrefutable proof of police brutality and murder toward unarmed African Americans. Think of Michael Brown Jr., Eric Garner, Tamir Rice (a 12 year old boy!), Walter Scott, Sandra Bland, Freddie Gray and Laquan McDonald. Rarely are these police ever prosecuted for these crimes, effectively allowing the police to be the new *legal* lynch mobs of the 21st century! Also Michelle Alexander, in her extremely well written and researched book *"The New Jim Crow,"* documents how the "war on drugs" which was initiated in 1971 by President Nixon, but was accelerated and increased tenfold by the Reagan administration in the 1980s (and rampantly continues to this day) has willfully and cruelly been used as an excuse for the mass incarceration of African-American men. Beside being an intense injustice against these men, after their release it also

classifies them as felons thus making it extremely difficult to find employment and effectively eradicating their right to vote in most states. Add to this the 2013 Supreme Court ruling against Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which essentially negates this heroically fought for act of 1965! And further add to this how we also see other attacks on African-American suffrage such as special and stringent voter ID laws, the elimination of early voting, severely reducing voting hours, redistricting, gerrymandering along "racial" lines, and the unwarranted removal and/or moving of polling locations in African-American neighborhoods etc. Yes, we still have the same obsolete, heretical (and now useless and destructive) "racial" caste system that was begun when the first slave ships left west Africa over 400 years ago bound for the new world.

On a different track, there are many today who seem to understand that "race" *is* a scientific and biological fallacy. But then these same people attempt to re-define "race" as a "social construct." The problem with this is that since "race" *is* a myth and non-existent, how can one suddenly decide to re-define "race" as a "social construct" when there is no such thing as "race" to begin with?

Now, what we *do have* are two mostly separate and unequal "social constructs" - or more properly defined as "ethnic groups" - that are *divided* along lines **maliciously defined** by the myth and heresy of "race." The first is the allegedly "superior" and therefore privileged "white" European-American group - supposedly a group derived *only* from "pure" European ancestry. The second is the allegedly "inferior" and therefore *underprivileged* or oppressed "black" African-American group - a supposedly "impure" or somehow genetically "corrupted" *mixed* group consisting of those who have varying amounts of *visible* African ancestry. Thus what it has all come down to are two ethnic groups based on the blasphemy and heresy of "race" which began about 400 years ago and **wrongly** endures to divide us in these contemporary times.

Therefore, for several times over the past 400 years we Americans have attempted to lift up "blacks" in order to bring equality to the two "races." First we abolished slavery in 1865 after 4 years of fighting the brutal Civil War. This attempt at "racial" equality, at best, lasted 12 years when it was replaced in 1877 by the oppression and "racial" inequality of "Jim Crow." Secondly we had the civil rights movement of 1954-1968 which attempted to bring "racial" equality by integrating schools, lunch counters, public transportation etc. It also achieved passage of the voting rights act of 1965. This attempt at "racial" equality, at best, lasted 15 years when it was replaced in approximately 1983 by the "new Jim Crow" "racial" inequality and oppression of the war on drugs and the beginning of mass incarceration and police brutality along with renewed efforts to suppress African-American voting rights. Unfortunately this "racial" inequality has not only lasted to today, but seems to be growing daily. Now there *does* seem to be a new civil rights movement on the horizon in response to this "new Jim Crow" (for example the "Black Lives Matter" movement). Let us suppose that this new movement is successful and that equality of the "races" is once again seemingly achieved. Who can say that this cycle of "racial" inequality followed by civil rights "racial" equality will not be repeated again and again into the future. And who can say that at some point in this process a dangerous and diabolical "Hitler like" politician will not fan the hateful flames of "racism" to gain power and essentially destroy our American democracy? As a "white" American Christian I believe the only answer is an understanding that GOD DID NOT CREATE THE HERESY OF "RACE." WE HUMANS, IN CORRUPT DISOBEDIENCE TO GOD DID! Therefore we must recognize that God created ALL people in his glorious image of love and have a MONUMENTAL CHANGE OF HEART to create new unified religious institutions to this effect. Thus we must have a complete acceptance of Jesus, and all that He stands for through His inspired actions and teachings as documented in the New Testament. I say this

especially to the "white" American church. Historically the "white" church was largely responsible for the creation of the "black" church by "whites" not allowing "blacks" to worship in and/or join their churches during slavery and the Jim Crow eras. Thus, now Sunday mornings are easily and conspicuously the most segregated time of the week in modern America! Indeed *God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God in him.*" [1 John 4:16] therefore it should now be obvious that we **have unjustifiably and completely failed to confront and repudiate this heresy of "race" for well over 400 years.** Consequently I believe that our God (who is love) is becoming very upset and impatient with this reprobate, "racially" divisive schizophrenia in His institutions (churches, meeting houses, synagogues etc.)

Therefore, the question remains WHAT CAN "WHITE" CHRISTIANS TODAY DO TO CHANGE THIS? First, we must recognize that the only way to take a stand against "racism" is to stand *against the vile heresy and myth (or hoax) of "race" itself.* Indeed, at this stage of the game, to fight for African American civil rights is commendable, but this, as we have already learned, only brings a temporary solution to the problem of "racism." Therefore, instead of being ***silent conspirators in the whole "race" heresy,*** we can sponsor various teaching sessions, seminars and discussion groups etc. within our local churches, meeting houses, synagogues etc. with the goal of converting and ***changing the hearts and minds of entire congregations to the biblical truth of human and Christian unity.***

This includes converting the church to the "good Samaritan" ideal and mind-set of loving thy neighbor as thyself - or as Martin Luther King put it *"to a day when people will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character."* This does *not* mean that it's mandatory to become what some might describe as a color-blind church. Skin tone is a very visible part of everyone's physical identity similar to one's relative height. But unlike height, skin-tone is *loaded with prejudice, character assassination and association.* Indeed we Americans are *all molded* by which side of the color line we were born into. If we, who are born so-called "white," are going to grow in God's grace to truly love and understand our neighbors on the *other side* of the color line, we must challenge our own (*often subconscious, offensive and even abusive*) attitudes and behavior and learn to understand and sympathize with the views, attitudes and even behavior of those on the other side. (Again a quote from Dr. King *"The Negro needs the white man to free him from his fears. The white man needs the Negro to free him from his guilt."*)

This may seem like an exceedingly tall order, therefore it can only be successful if we *constantly keep in the foremost part of our hearts, minds and souls* that the whole concept of "race" is a Satanic myth, hoax and heresy. Thus the above "color line" is also a derivative and divisive heresy of equally heretical proportions. Therefore we must *constantly* pray to our God (who is love) to once and for all ***monumentally clean our individual hearts, minds and souls of this divisive "racial" fear and hatred.*** Somehow we should realize that "race," in referring to human beings is one of the most loaded, onerous and filthy four letter words in the English language. Its implications are venomous in that it creates the blasphemous illusion of a fundamental biological or natural inequality between ourselves and others. Thus as we pray for ourselves and our institutions, we must keep the egalitarian ideals of the following scriptures in mind.

[Col. 3:11] where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcised nor uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave nor free, but Christ is all and in all.

[Gal. 3:28] There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

Yes, ***we are all one in Jesus***, therefore as we progressively become filled with true human love, unity and equality, others will witness our change, see the light, and jump on the bandwagon and desire an identical change. And as our religious institutions throughout America see the light, the following scripture will become a reality:

[Matthew 5:14-16] 14 You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden. 15 Nor do they light a lamp and put it under a basket, but on a lampstand, and it gives light to all who are in the house. 16 Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven.

And all of America will witness the light in its religious institutions and ultimately become a nation where we *finally* live up to the truth of our founding ideals: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

Postscript

This essay was not meant to be a "scholarly" document, hence there are no footnotes. However if the reader wishes to verify the theories presented here, or to simply gain further knowledge on the subject of "race," I recommend the following books, articles and three-part video series:

"RACE" IS A FOUR-LETTER WORD (2005)

by C. Loring Brace

Published by Oxford University Press

The Myth of Race - Robert Wald Sussman

The Troubling Persistence of an Unscientific Idea

Harvard University Press.

Cambridge, Massachusetts London, England (2014)

Race - The Power of an Illusion (2003)

Produced by California Newsreel , <http://newsreel.org/video/>

RACE-THE-POWER-OF-AN-ILLUSION (also available on YouTube)

"Skin Deep" an article by Elizabeth Kolbert *National Geographic* (April 2018) pp. 29-41

Recent DNA evidence on tracing the migrations of early prehistoric

humans throughout Africa - and later out of Africa.

The Cross and the Lynching Tree - James H. Cone, Published by Orbis Books (2011)

Compelling theological evidence linking the lynching of African-Americans with the crucifixion of Jesus.