

2026



INDEX 10

Special Moderator's Committee on Kinism and Race Realism

The Special Moderator's Committee on Kinism and Race Realism met via Zoom on August 28, 2025, at 2 pm, via Zoom on November 6, 2025, at 2 pm, via Zoom on January 16, 2026, at 2 pm, and via Zoom on April 15, 2026, at 2 pm. The members of the committee are: Rev. Benjamin Glaser (Catawba Presbytery), chairman, Rev. Harrison Holbrook (Grace Presbytery), Rev. Phillip Mayberry (First Presbytery), Rev. Andy Webb (Grace Presbytery), Elder Victor Johnston (First Presbytery), and Elder Scott Joyner (Florida Presbytery). The purpose of the Special Moderator's Committee on Kinism and Race Realism is to present to the Synod a theological and pastoral answer to the recent teachings of a now deposed ARP minister and other online entities that are causing trouble in the pews. In order to do that, the committee put together an executive summary and a more robust paper of our findings. The former and the latter are attached as Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

Simply put, any idea that posits racial superiority as a basis for church or civil social order is to be seen as out of bounds with Christianity as a religion and as a source of truth, and is sin. The Synod is asked to reaffirm the Bible and our Confession of Faith's witness to this matter and to remind all of our churches and their members of the fidelity to which all believers are called in loving the Triune God, and our neighbor, in all holiness and righteousness. This includes reaffirming the dignity of all human beings, regardless of their national origin, and their equality in calling and purpose in the eyes of their Creator for His kingdom and for the blessing of all in His grace.

Recommendations:

1. That the Synod encourage Central Services to make the two-page summary available to all churches in the ARP Church.
2. That the Synod adopt the paper as a position statement and encourage Central Services to place the attached paper on the ARP website under the "Other Resources" tab.
3. That Synod pause for prayer for the men who are leading the Kinism and Race Realism movements, for their repentance, and for the protection of those being led astray by their teaching.
4. That Synod dismiss the Special Committee with Synod's thanks.
5. That Synod receive this report as information and print it in the minutes.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rev. Benjamin Glaser, Chairman

Appendix A

Kinism Executive Summary

Definitions: What is “Kinism,” and what is “Race Realism?”

Kinism (from The Kinist Institute): “The belief that God has ordained the existence of distinct ethnic and racial groups and that these groups should be preserved and protected . . . It is the conviction that the love of one's own kind is a natural and biblical duty, and that the modern drive for 'multiculturalism' and 'universalism' is a rebellion against the created order.”¹

Race Realism The doctrine that differences in human races extend beyond simply geography, appearance, and ancestry. Racial differences also include differences in virtues and vices, intelligence, a tendency to rule or be ruled, and a propensity towards different gods and religions. These racial distinctions are not just real, but immutably set and maintained by God. This means certain boundaries ought not to be crossed, including mixed-race marriages, mixed-race schools, and mixed-race churches. It also means racial slavery, racial segregation, and intentionally exclusive white leadership can be biblical and good.²

History: Where did Kinism (and its close counterpart of Race Realism) come from?

While Kinism is partly a synthesis of a certain line of 19th-century southern protestant thought and 20th-century racial separatism, it arises today from an internet subculture of Dutch South Africans, former U.S. based reconstructionists, and loosely connected bloggers. The main web organs have been *Faith and Heritage* (now preserved on *Antelope Hill*), *Tribal Theocrat*, and *Iron Ink*. Race Realism is best exemplified by the magazine *American Renaissance* and its parent institution, *New Century Foundation*. It recently arrived in NAPARC circles mostly from the writings of Bret McAtee, Michael Spangler, and the *Pactum Institute*. Its presence in the ARP was first noticed through an ecclesiastical investigation of two former ministers in Grace Presbytery, Michael Hunter and Eric Hancox. Other members and former members of the ARP were engaged in the support of Kinism and Race Realism on X and other internet platforms. The statement made at the 2025 ARP General Synod was in response to the growing influence of these men. Our paper under consideration at the 2026 General Synod will help the ARP's response to such teaching.

Scripture: Does Kinism align with God's word?

No. Kinism is backwards theology; it is man trying to justify his own prejudices with the Bible, rather than letting his prejudices be transformed by it.

There are a number of New Testament passages that speak directly to the ethnic unity and fellowship commanded in the church. The clearest is Eph 2:11-14, which depicts the boundary in the temple between the court of the Gentiles and Israel's inner temple having been knocked down, thus restoring Jews and Gentiles (who are, notably, two separate ethnic groups) to real fellowship before the Lord. The effects of this barrier falling are shown in Acts 10, where Jewish Peter is taught by God to keep company with and share a table with the gentile Cornelius. It is also reflected in early local churches having

¹ <http://web.archive.org/web/20050206130240/http://www.kinism.net/index.php/weblog/mission/>.

² <https://www.pactuminstitute.com/the-pactum-blog/christian-race-realism-part-1-introduction>.

mixed-ethnicity members (Romans 16:1-15) that shared communion together, which is the highest act of fellowship. These churches even had mixed-ethnicity leadership who ministered together across ethnic lines (Acts 13:1-2). This fellowship was so serious that for the apostles, rebuke was warranted when this fellowship was cut off from Gentiles, as it was considered a denial of the gospel itself (Galatians 2:11-14).

What the New Testament expresses regarding race relations and covenantal inclusion, the Old Testament demonstrates as well. In the institution of the Passover, God made provision for the full inclusion of the Gentiles into Israel via the rite of circumcision, which was (for an adult) a profession of faith. Strangers sojourning in the land could become “as a native of the land” and partake of the Passover as an Israelite (Exodus 12:48-49), demonstrating the reality that those who were children of Abraham were always children by faith (Romans 4:11).

We see this racially-inclusive reality of God’s covenant people also demonstrated in the many lawful interracial marriages affirmed and blessed in the Old Testament, including Joseph’s marriage with Potiphara the Egyptian (and notable bi-racial children of Manasseh and Ephriam), Moses’s marriage with a Cushite woman, Salmon’s marriage to Rahab (a Canaanite), Boaz’s marriage to Ruth (a Moabitess), and Solomon’s marriage to the daughter of Pharaoh. The latter two being in the bloodline of Jesus Christ, who Himself did not have the pure racial blood demanded by Kinism. It is vital to note that interreligious marriage was (and is still now) prohibited, but interracial marriage between two professing believers was never prohibited. To conflate interreligious marriage with interracial marriage is to violate basic logic.

Westminster: Does Kinism align with the Westminster Standards?

No: It is first and primarily a violation of the communion of the saints (WCF Chapter 26). For Christians to intentionally segregate from other Christians based on ethnicity—in Sunday worship, marriage, schools, etc.—would be to not extend the kind of communion described below to those in Christ to whom that communion rightfully belongs:

“All saints, that are united to Jesus Christ their Head, by his Spirit, and by faith, have fellowship with him in his graces, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glory: and, being united to one another in love, they have communion in each other’s gifts and graces, and are obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as do conduce to their mutual good, both in the inward and outward man.

Saints by profession are bound to maintain and holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification; as also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities. Which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.” (WCF 26.1)

It is also a violation of Westminster’s allowances of marriage. Westminster allows for inter-racial marriages as shown in WCF 24.3:

It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry who are able with judgment to give their consent. Yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord. And therefore, such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, Papists, or other idolaters: neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies.

These violations mean that those who hold to Kinism or Race Realism violate their ministerial oaths, officer oaths, and membership vows.

Is Kinism sin?

Yes, it is plainly the sin of partiality (James 2:1-13). It is also a violation of the second greatest

commandment by the limiting of true love of neighbor only to certain ethnic neighbors (Luke 10:25-37). It is even a denial of the gospel itself, in which Christ reconciled us to himself and one another in real gospel fellowship (Galatians 2:11-14).

Conclusion

It is important to recognize that much of the writing from the pro-Kinist and Race Realism movements is an answer seeking a solution. Their position is that the white race is immutably superior to other races, by the design and purpose of God in His providence. In order to support their principles, they selectively quote our shared ancestors in the faith in service of their wicked ideas. Even if they accurately portray the writings of the past the ARP Church is bound by WCF 1.10, *“The supreme Judge, by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.”* It is good and right to disagree with faithful men of the past when what they posit violates the teaching of God’s word. In the spirit of Paul in Acts 17 at Berea, these men would welcome and would be encouraged by correction according to the Bible. It is why we hold that the Kinist reductionistic view of race and the Race Realist confusion of race with culture only leads to the abuse and destruction of the good news of our Lord. Paul did not believe Cretans would or should remain liars, but, like himself, through the transformation of the gospel, became conformed to the image of the Son. Wherein we see all Christians united together in our common faith. It is the position of the ARP Synod that racial partiality is sin, and always has been, in accordance with God’s law and the teaching of the Bible.

Appendix B

Defining Race Realism and a Brief History of the Idea

The first part of the paper will provide a history and a timeline for how it came to pass that the 2025 ARP General Synod was moved to condemn Race Realism, and its related, but not coordinate, relation known as Kinism is not as clear and relatable as many may consider. Some will attempt to tie in Martin Luther's *On the Jews and Their Lies* or go all the way back to John Chrysostom's *Eight Homilies Against the Jews* as precursors, for example, to the antisemitism that is native to both Race Realism and Kinism. Care needs to be taken so that two things are prevented from overwhelming our Synod's criticism of these movements. First is guilt-by-association, the second is giving the contemporary writers and leaders any unearned cache by witnessing any comparative place in speaking about them in the same breath as heroes of the faith. They have not gained that honor.

Likewise, let us not confuse freedom in Christ with a twisting of the scriptures that would include a requirement of separation and a desire to see one ethnicity dominate over others. The Lord has redeemed for Himself people from every tribe, tongue, people, and language. His desire is that none should perish. The Lord has redeemed not only the people, but also their ethnicities and languages. The promotion of churches where people are able to come together to worship in a language and expression that speaks to their soul is in keeping with the Lord loving and redeeming for Himself some from all people. It is not a promotion of separation. To suggest otherwise pushes brothers and sisters away from the freedoms they have in Christ. The church allows for different expressions of worship to the Lord while promoting the oneness of believers in Christ. The Kinist denies the unity in Christ and the equality of believers in Christ. The kind of thinking in Kinism/Race Realism does not just lead one to believe that one must have more compassion and responsibility towards one's own ethnicity, it also leads one to believe the opposite, that one has permission from God (or even, a command from Him) to have less responsibility and compassion towards those of other ethnicities.

Most of the loudest voices and vociferous Race Realist/Kinist authors are men with small followings on the internet and no authoritative positions within the visible church. The ARP Synod cannot be seen as granting a place at the table to those whose only role in the Christian faith is to be an agent of division and whose sins are clearly evident. The wise counsel of Paul to Timothy from 1 Timothy 6:3-5 is heeded by this Synod:

If anyone teaches otherwise and does not consent to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which accords with godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but is obsessed with disputes and arguments over words, from which come envy, strife, reviling, evil suspicions, useless wranglings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, who suppose that godliness is a means of gain. From such withdraw yourself.³

Let the following retelling of the history serve as a warning to those who uncritically take up the past happenings within and without the church in order to bring disrepute to the good news of our precious Savior. May the Holy Spirit guide His people in truth and peace for the Kingdom of Heaven and for the

³ Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are from the New King James Version.

growth of the gospel among the nations to the glory of God. Since man is Imago Dei, made in the image of God, we must be watchful for attempts to separate mankind and create two different realities of what the Image of God is through separation of ethnicities, peoples, or nationalities, or that point to one race, ethnicity, language, color, or nationality as being immutably superior and above others. The preaching of the Word and administration of the Sacraments are to be done for all nations under one Christ, who is our Lord and God, and we are to enjoy the communion of the saints from all nations. It is not someone's "race" that predisposes them away from the Lord, but their sinfulness as humans.

DEFINING TERMS

The word Kinism comes from the Old English *cyn*, meaning "family, race, kind, or nature." It shares Proto-Indo-European roots with the Latin *genus* and the Greek *genos*. The suffix *-ism* is from (*-ismos*), which is used to form nouns of action, state, or doctrine. Linguistically, "kinism" literally translates to "the doctrine of one's own kind" or "familialism". From the now shuttered *The Kinist Institute*, the following definition provides a place to start:

*Kinism is the belief that God has ordained the existence of distinct ethnic and racial groups and that these groups should be preserved and protected . . . It is the conviction that the love of one's own kind is a natural and biblical duty, and that the modern drive for 'multiculturalism' and 'universalism' is a rebellion against the created order.*⁴

While in some sense, Kinism is a synthesis of a certain line of 19th-century southern protestant thought and 20th-century racial separatism, it largely arose around an internet subculture that brought together apartheid affirming Dutch South Africans, United States-based Reconstructionists, and a myriad of loosely connected bloggers from Europe and elsewhere. The main web organ of Kinism, *Faith and Heritage*, was joined by the indirectly associated websites *Tribal Theocrat* and *Iron Ink*, the latter authored by Michigan-based defrocked Christian Reformed Churches minister Bret McAtee. These served as the intellectual heart of Kinism online. Though *Faith and Heritage* is no longer operational, the publisher *Antelope Hill* has preserved the writings of *F&H* in an anthology available on their website.⁵ Most of the conversation has moved away from traditional forms of communication to the now mostly unmoderated world of Twitter (now X), Instagram, Facebook, and Reddit. The Kinist movement has decentralized and fractured as many of the protagonists have folded themselves into the wider Christian Nationalism conversation despite many within that dialogue seeking to distance themselves from some of the more outlandish racial claims.

The term "Race Realism" is a contemporary euphemism, but its etymological and conceptual roots are deeply embedded in the development of 19th-century scientific Marxism and 20th-century sociobiology. Understanding its history requires looking into how the word "realism", traditionally a philosophical or artistic term, was co-opted to lend an air of objective detachment to theories of biological determinism. Race Realists argue that race is a fundamental, biological reality that exists whether we want it to or not. Michael Spangler defines Race Realism in this way: *Race realism is the recognition that mankind is divided into distinct races, that the differences between the races are large and relatively permanent, and that this racial diversity ought to be acknowledged, celebrated, and defended.*⁶ There is a subtle overlap with how the label is used in the political philosophy expression Realpolitik, which seeks to activate political objectives using power dynamics and practical associations to arrive at a bigger goal. Race Realism applies it to domestic

⁴ <http://web.archive.org/web/20050206130240/http://www.kinism.net/index.php/weblog/mission/>.

⁵ <https://antelopehillpublishing.com/product/faith-and-heritage-a-christian-nationalist-anthology/>.

⁶ See here: <https://www.pactuminstitute.com/the-pactum-blog/christian-race-realism-part-1-introduction>.

politics, theology, and human relations, suggesting that different biological races are in a competition against one another, a competition where the white race, through God's electing grace, was given by God to rule over the other races, through providence.

From a secular standpoint, the race realism definition is best exemplified by the magazine *American Renaissance* and its parent institution, the *New Century Foundation*. Jared Taylor denies that he is a white supremacist; he instead supports the idea that he is merely a truth-teller. He understands himself to be just stating the facts about the differences between races that are marked in science. Taylor's mindset is an important thing to note when it comes to the advocates of Race Realism within the Reformed and confessional milieu. Supporters see themselves as merely noticing things that should be evident to anyone paying attention. Race Realism within NAPARC circles has arisen mostly from the writings of Michael Spangler, though others like Michael Hunter and the Pactum Institute and its founder Adi Schlebusch have also contributed. Pactum provides a more contemporary intellectual home to the movement in order to presumably give a more scholarly hue, moving away from what many consider to be cruder online talk.

CLEARING AWAY THE DEBRIS

In his own retelling of the history, Michael Spangler, in his book *Christian Race Realism*, makes much of the Southern theologians James Henley Thornwell and Robert Louis Dabney.⁷ Others within the movement have cited writers such as Rousas John Rushdoony and Episcopal priest T. Robert Ingram.⁸ Part of the problem in ascertaining the real history around Kinism and Race Realism is trusting sources and those who cite them. For example, Mark Rushdoony, son of R.J. Rushdoony, has written extensively against the use of his father as a proto-Kinist.⁹ Similarly, some have tried to clarify what Thornwell and Dabney argued in order to separate them from the modern attempt to co-opt Southern Presbyterianism for contemporary racial politics.¹⁰

Because of the confusion, the second part of this section will try to make sense of what history actually says and provide help in sorting out all of the data. Being fair and honest means properly adjudicating the record so that men are able to speak for themselves. A general mistake many make in recovering history is the *Argumentum ad Antiquitatem* fallacy, which will be addressed below.

⁷ Michael Spangler, *Christian Race Realism* (n.p.: Sacra Press, 2025), 67ff.

⁸ Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law* (n.p.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1973), 256, quoted in "Statement of Kinist Principles," *Faith and Heritage*, last modified May 12, 2011, <http://faithandheritage.com/about/statement-of-kinist-principles/>. T. Robert Ingram, *The World Under God's Law* (Houston: St. Thomas Press, 1959), 84, quoted in "The Biblical Duty of Segregation," *Faith and Heritage*; <http://faithandheritage.com/2011/08/the-biblical-duty-of-segregation/>.

⁹ Mark R. Rushdoony, "The Reality of Kinship," *Chalcedon Foundation*, August 26, 2013, <https://chalcedon.edu/magazine/the-reality-of-kinship>. Mark R. Rushdoony, "The Myth of Race," *Chalcedon Foundation*, March 27, 2017, <https://chalcedon.edu/magazine/the-myth-of-race>. Mark R. Rushdoony, "The Theology of Race," *Chalcedon Foundation*, October 21, 2013, <https://chalcedon.edu/magazine/the-theology-of-race>.

¹⁰ James Henley Thornwell, "The Rights and Duties of Masters," in *The Collected Writings of James Henley Thornwell*, vol. 4 (Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1873), 402-405. Guy Prentiss Waters, "The Spirituality of the Church," *The Gospel Coalition*, accessed March 17, 2026, <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/essay/the-spirituality-of-the-church/>. D. G. Hart, "The Spirituality of the Church: A Defense," *Ordained Servant* 15 (2006): 74-79.,,

It is common in Kinist/Race Realism circles to hear someone say something like “everyone prior to 1970 agreed with [insert Kinist/Race Realist idea here]”. Generally speaking, the historical timeline of Kinism and Race Realism can be summarized in this way. Prior to the *Reconquista* in the 15th and 16th centuries, the concept of an immutability of race was foreign to philosophy, science, and theology.¹¹ The Greeks believed a Scythian could move to Athens and lose his Scythianess.¹² Arguments in favor of a Kinist/Race Realism view begin to appear in response to the scientific “discoveries” of men like Carl Linnaeus. Linnaeus originated the division of humanity into four races: Asian (Yellow), European (White), African (Black), and American Indian (Red).¹³ His inclusion of various psychological traits was quoted later in I.Q. studies.¹⁴ As an example Linnaeus is positively cited by the Kinist *Pactum Institute* where Michael Hunter, Bret McAtee, and Michael Spangler are fellows.¹⁵

Using the new “science” of men like Linnaeus and others, Southern Presbyterians used these naturalistic findings to root their arguments in the division of the races.¹⁶ Or did they?¹⁷ Miles Smith cogently shows that there was no unanimity among the Southern divines, especially after the war.¹⁸ Not every Southern Presbyterian agreed with Dabney. The uncle of future U.S. president Woodrow Wilson, James Woodrow, explicitly denies the Baconian foundation of Dabney’s scientific arguments.¹⁹ Dabney fully understood he was a target of Woodrow’s pamphlet.²⁰ We do not need to be on a side in the unrelated theological debates of the late Nineteenth century to see the point being made; that every Presbyterian, in fact, did not agree on racial issues before 1950, or even 1900. Similarly, John Girardeau dealt critically with Dabney’s view of black men and women in the South.²¹ For further reading on this rift, one could not do

¹¹ Max S. Hering Torres, “Purity of Blood: Exclusion, Demarcation, and Gradation,” in *The Origins of Racism in the West*, ed. Miriam Eliav-Feldon, Benjamin Isaac, and Joseph Ziegler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 212.

¹²

Hippocrates, *Airs, Waters, Places*, trans. W. H. S. Jones, Loeb Classical Library 147 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1923), 20.

¹³

Carl Linnaeus, “The System of Nature,” in *The Idea of Race*, ed. Robert Bernasconi and Tommy L. Lott (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2000), 10–12.

¹⁴ J. Philippe Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995), 40–42.

¹⁵ Adi Schlebusch, “Linnaeus and the Reality of Kind,” *The Pactum Institute*, accessed March 17, 2026, <https://pactuminstitute.com/articles/linnaeus-and-the-reality-of-kind/>.

¹⁶ Robert L. Dabney, “Review of ‘Address on African Colonization’ by Rev. William H. Ruffner,” *Southern Presbyterian Review* 5, no. 4 (April 1852): 485.

¹⁷

John B. Adger, “The Unity of the Human Race,” *Southern Presbyterian Review* 4, no. 1 (July 1850): 110–112.

¹⁸ Miles Smith, “Darwinism and Race in Gilded Age Southern Presbyterianism,” *Ad Fontes*, April 25, 2025, <https://adfontesjournal.com/miles-smith/race-and-darwinism-in-gilded-age-southern-presbyterianism/>.

¹⁹ James Woodrow, *Evolution: An Address Delivered May 7th, 1884, Before the Alumni Association of the Columbia Theological Seminary* (Columbia, SC: Presbyterian Publishing House, 1884), 12–15.

²⁰ Robert L. Dabney, “The Strategy of the Evolutionist,” *The Southern Presbyterian Review* 36, no. 1 (January 1885): 38–42.

²¹

better than take in David Calhoun's telling of the events.²² It is also worth noting that the post-war PCUS sided with Girardeau over and against Dabney.²³

While contemporary defenders and proponents of Kinism/Race Realism like to use the Southern Presbyterians and others to give supposed historical credentials to their views it is simply not the case that the tradition bears this out. Take their oft-made citation of J. Gresham Machen for example. Michael Hunter likes to point to a letter Machen wrote to his mother while a student at Princeton and claims, "J. Gresham Machen, [was] opposed to interracial marriage"²⁴ and provides no support for such other than associating him with others who did. Yet Robert Mackenzie takes apart the sloppy use of this letter to form an opinion on Machen's conceptions of race and supposed support for Kinism/Race Realism.²⁵ For instance, Mackenzie notes that in later years, "Machen was active in political organizations that worked to repeal [segregation] laws" and "Machen had come to believe the gospel was the only protection against such racism."

In an attempt to bring the American Dutch tradition into their Kinist/Race Realist vision, there are citations given from men like Geerhardus Vos, which supposedly confirm their theological case.²⁶ However, Vos himself was no supporter of the segregation found in the American South.²⁷

One other avenue of the discussion has to do with the related matter of chattel slavery. The Kinist/Race Realist attempts to show that the Westminster Assembly was in favor, if not at least quiet about the matter.²⁸ Yet there were those present who saw slavery as sinful.²⁹ Take this from Samuel Rutherford as proof, "A man being created according to God's image, he is *res sacra*, a sacred thing, and can no more by

John L. Girardeau, "Address on the Relation of the Church to the Colored Population," in *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States* (Huntsville, AL: Presbyterian Publishing House, 1871), 28–32.

²² David B. Calhoun, *Our Southern Zion: Old Columbia Seminary (1828-1927)* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 2012), 245–250.

²³

"Report on the Ecclesiastical Relations to the Colored People," in *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States* (Huntsville, AL: Presbyterian Publishing House, 1871), 28–31.

²⁴ Michael Hunter, "Answering Ecclesiastical Critics," *The Daily Genevan*, January 19, 2025, <https://www.thedailygenevan.com/blog/2025/1/19/answering-ecclesiastical-critics>.

²⁵ Robert Tracy McKenzie, "Fundamentalism in Black and White," *Ad Fontes*, April 25, 2023, <https://adfontesjournal.com/church-history/fundamentalism-in-black-and-white/>.

²⁶ Davis Carlton, "A Biblical Defense of Ethno-Nationalism, Part 1: The Table of Nations," *Faith and Heritage*, published May 28, 2012, <https://faithandheritage.com/2012/05/a-biblical-defense-of-ethno-nationalism-part-1/>. See also: Thomas Achord and Darrell Dow, comps., *Who Is My Neighbor? An Anthology in Natural Relations*, 2nd ed. (Lake Buchanan: Western Front Books, 2022), 429–430.

²⁷ Geerhardus Vos to Johannes Vos, April 24, 1893, in *The Letters of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. James T. Dennison Jr. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2005), 138–140.

²⁸ Hunter, "Answering Ecclesiastical Critics".

²⁹ Chad Van Dixhoorn, "The Westminster Assembly and the Eighth Commandment." In *The Westminster Confession into the 21st Century*, edited by J. Ligon Duncan III, 3:143–160. Jackson, MS: Reformed Academic Press, 2009.

nature's law be sold and bought, than a religious and sacred thing dedicated to God."³⁰ There are, of course, other contemporaries to Rutherford who would agree with his understanding of the lack of biblical warrant for chattel slavery, particularly from a racial point of view.³¹

For our purposes in the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, the matter was also made clear as these two quotes from Robert Lathan's history note:

*"At the time of the separation [1822], the Associate Reformed people of the South were by no means advocates of the institution of slavery. In fact, a very large number of them were decidedly opposed to it . . . Mr. Hemphill, the mover of the resolution [to form the ARP Synod of the South], and nearly all the people of his charge, were in 1822, far from being advocates of slavery. Mr. Hemphill lived and died opposed to slavery, and not a single one of the fathers of the ARP Synod of the South were advocates of the institution."*³²

And here:

*About the year 1828, some politicians in South Carolina came to the conclusion that slavery could be perpetuated only by keeping the slaves in ignorance. To effect this, it was purposed to petition the Legislature of the State to pass a law prohibiting the instruction of slaves. To prevent the enactment of such a law, the following, submitted Rev. John T. Pressley and Rev. John Hemphill was unanimously adopted by the Synod in 1828: WHEREAS, It is understood that petitions will be presented to the honorable Legislature of South Carolina, at its approaching meeting, praying the enactment of a law to prohibit the instruction of slaves to read; therefore, Resolved 1. That in the judgment of this Synod, such a law would be a serious infringement of their rights of conscience. 2. That the members of this Synod use active exertions to forward memorials to the honorable Legislature, remonstrating respectfully, yet firmly, against the passage of any such law."*³³

To return to the timeline for a moment as the 19th century progressed to the 20th century, the two European wars changed the nature of the theological and social conditions throughout the Western World. The situation in the United States and elsewhere only exacerbated the continued influence of scientific determinism, of which Kinism/Race Realism is a part.

As the questions around segregation riled the American consciousness, it moved the conversation within the Church, and the ARP and other Presbyterian denominations were not immune to these questions. Scientific Determinism grew in respectability and was used by many to support public policy throughout the United States.³⁴ For example Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger concurred with this division of races into those who are more fit, and those less so, "The mass of ignorant Negroes still breed carelessly and disastrously, so that the increase among Negroes, even more than the increase among

³⁰ Samuel Rutherford, *Lex, Rex: The Law and the Prince. A Dispute for the Just Prerogative of King and People* (London: John Field, 1644), 91.

³¹ George Gillespie, *A Treatise of Miscellany Questions* (Edinburgh: Gedeon Lithgow, 1649), 155–158.

³² Robert Lathan, *History of the ARP Synod of the South* (n/d, 1882), 326.

³³ Lathan, *History of the ARP Synod of the South*, 326.

³⁴ Carleton S. Coon, *The Origin of Races* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), 655–660.

whites, is from that portion of the population least intelligent and fit . . ."35 It was a common trope to be found among those supporting racial segregation more broadly.³⁶

It is unsurprising to find the same type of arguments being made among the Kinist movement.³⁷ Some in the mid-century PCUS made similar points in their defense of segregation and are often cited by Kinists/Race Realists as being fellow travelers.³⁸ Though some demur from the idea that Morton Smith, for example, actually agreed with how the Kinists seek to use his writings for their purpose.³⁹ While a 2018 report from the Presbyterian Church in America does not seek to minimize the way racial categories to support segregation were used in the past, "... our predecessors often justified the racial status quo by appealing to what they believed were providential and natural distinctions between the races."⁴⁰

Bringing the timeline to the present-day returns matters back to the online blogs, podcasts, and other forms of communications where conversations happen in 2026. While the timeline was by virtue of its length, somewhat restricted from touching on all the other sources that may be cited to show where these pernicious errors come from, it is hopeful that it fulfilled its mandate to give witness to how the historical arguments made for Kinism and Race Realism cannot handle the most surface-level historical critique. The Church is best served to recognize the complexity of the question and dismiss the facile supposed unity of the past as determinative of the future of the relations of men and women together within the body of Christ.

Old Testament Evidence For the Legitimacy of Interracial Marriage

Introduction:

As Reformed Christians, one of our primary convictions is that God's view of morality does not change. While He may (and did) impose certain civil and ceremonial restrictions under the Mosaic institution which were taken away through the work of Christ (Gal. 3:19), this reality does not touch upon particulars having to do with race. That is, our contention in this portion of the larger project is simply that *God has always approved of interracial marriage, even during the period of history wherein the Kingdom of God was confined to one nation.*

Because this is provable by many evidences, we find our antagonists to be utterly blind concerning race relations, and we have no hesitance whatsoever in stating that any theologian of any age who

³⁵ Margaret Sanger to Dr. Clarence Gamble, December 10, 1939, Margaret Sanger Papers, Library of Congress, Washington, DC, Microfilm reel 33, frame 128.

³⁶ Ernest Sevier Cox, *White America* (Richmond, VA: White America Society, 1923), 204-207.

³⁷ Davis Carlton, "Aesthetics: Kinism vs. Alienism," *Faith and Heritage*, October 21, 2014, <https://faithandheritage.com/2014/10/aesthetics-kinism-vs-alienism/>.

³⁸ G. Aiken Taylor, "The Church and the Social Order," *The Presbyterian Journal* 23, no. 14 (August 5, 1964): 7-9 and Morton H. Smith, "The Biblical Case for Segregation," in *The Southern Presbyterian Journal* 16, no. 1 (May 15, 1957): 7-10.

³⁹ Sean Michael Lucas, *For a Continuing Church: The Roots of the Presbyterian Church in America* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2015), 185-190 and Joseph A. Pipa Jr., "The PCA at 40: A Personal Reflection," *The Confessional Presbyterian* 9 (2013): 15-22.

⁴⁰ Presbyterian Church in America, "Report of the Ad Interim Committee on Racial and Ethnic Reconciliation to the Forty-Sixth General Assembly," in *Minutes of the Forty-Sixth General Assembly* (Lawrenceville, GA: PCA Administrative Committee, 2018), 614-687.

misconstrued Old Testament passages to support segregation in marriage or church life sinned greatly against Christ and His Church, notwithstanding any positive contributions to the Kingdom of God which they may have offered.

Although the Kinists seek to universalize the prohibition of intermarriage in Deuteronomy 7:1-5, this portion of our paper will demonstrate that this universalizing is based on at least two instances of grievous, categorical perversions of the text. The first involves the imaginative misconstruing of the so-called “Curse of Ham.” The second is a failure to heed the clear and voluminous amount of Old Testament case studies that disprove the Kinist heresy itself in no uncertain terms.

The Kinists’ Misunderstanding, Universalizing, and Extrapolating of the “Curse of Ham”

According to Genesis 9:19, Noah’s three sons, Ham, Shem, and Japheth are the progenitors of every living person on the earth today. The Biblical record immediately follows this statement by narrating the sin of Ham, who “saw his father’s nakedness and told his brothers outside” (Gen. 9:22). Noah then awoke and “knew what his son had done to him” (either by remembering or by being informed by his two other sons). His response was to utter a severe curse in 9:25, stating, “Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be to his brothers.”

The Kinists insist that the curse laid upon Canaan should be universalized to Ham and all his descendants (and therefore to all black people). For instance, Samuel Ketcham explicitly rejects the historic interpretation limiting Noah’s curse to Canaan alone, arguing instead that “Noah’s curse fell upon Ham and all his descendants,” while simultaneously identifying Africans as Hamites and Europeans as Japhethites, thereby reviving the old racialized “Curse of Ham” framework historically used to justify black inferiority and subjugation.⁴¹ From this bastardization of the text, the Kinist imagination runs wild, arguing for racial superiority for the assumed sons of Japheth, the white race. The same explicitly states, “God has not made us equal, and we ought to submit to His providence.”⁴²

However, it is notable even in the immediate context, that Canaan, the *youngest* son of Ham, alone is cursed. Ham was the “youngest son” of Noah (9:24), and now his own youngest son would be cursed... although *nothing* is said of Ham’s older sons: Cush, Egypt, and Put (Genesis 10:6). To go beyond the text is never safe, as this was, and is, a primary tactic of Satan Himself when he added “*any* tree of the garden” to the original commandment of God (Genesis 3:1).

The Kinists’ Dissatisfaction with the Scriptures Themselves

Like Satan in the garden, the Kinists go *way* beyond the text, as will be demonstrated presently. They do so in order to justify their own sense of importance and superiority, conveniently espousing a false doctrine that elevates their own ethnicity above others, likely due to deep insecurities and a failure to receive their valuation from Christ instead of from their outward appearance. Although they claim to believe the Scriptures, when faced with a portion of Scripture that clearly condemns their position, they do not heed it. Yet, we pray that the Holy Spirit will use this work to convince many of their error, such that they repent and humble themselves, that the Lord may exalt them (James 4:10).

⁴¹ Ketcham, Samuel. “Race and Noah (6).” Substack, 2025, samuelketcham.substack.com/p/race-and-noah-6. “Charges of Sin against Rev. Samuel Ketcham.” The Roys Report, Jan. 2026, roysreport.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/RPCNA-Charging-Documents-Sin-Racism-Sam-Ketcham.pdf.

⁴² Ketcham, Samuel. “Race and Noah (6).” Substack, 2025, samuelketcham.substack.com/p/race-and-noah-6.

A primary text, which is often cited by the Kinist as prohibiting all interracial marriage under the Old Covenant, is Deuteronomy 7:1-5. *We will attend to what it says, what it does not say, and how it was understood and applied in Old Testament times via several case studies.*

"When the LORD your God brings you into the land that you are entering to take possession of it, and clears away many nations before you, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations more numerous and mightier than you, 2 and when the LORD your God gives them over to you, and you defeat them, then you must devote them to complete destruction. You shall make no covenant with them and show no mercy to them. 3 You shall not intermarry with them, giving your daughters to their sons or taking their daughters for your sons, 4 for they would turn away your sons from following me, to serve other gods. Then the anger of the LORD would be kindled against you, and he would destroy you quickly. 5 But thus shall you deal with them: you shall break down their altars and dash in pieces their pillars and chop down their Asherim and burn their carved images with fire."

Consider with an open Bible the nations which are here named, and the relationship between them and the (rightly called) "Curse of Canaan" will become evident. The Girgashites, and Amorites, Hivites, and Jebusites, and of course the Canaanites are explicitly stated as being descendants of Canaan in Genesis 10:16-17. The Hittites (literally "descendants of Heth") also descended from Canaan's son, Heth (Genesis 10:15). This leaves the Perizzites, who almost certainly descended from the same, likely through Canaan's firstborn, Sidon.⁴³

Thus, this text *does* condemn interracial/intertribal marriage with seven distinct nations, all descendants of Canaan, at a particular point in history, to a particular group (the Israelites who came out of Egypt and warred with these nations). Thus, we should confess at the beginning that it is not interracial marriage *per se* which is prohibited in this passage, but rather, *interreligious marriage with these particular seven tribes (vs. 1), which would be given over to Israel to be defeated and completely destroyed (vs. 2), which was itself a fulfillment of the curse of Canaan.* Some of those who were not destroyed were *enslaved*, in contrast to the people of Israel, from whom Israelites were not to take slaves (Leviticus 25:45-46; cf. Joshua 9 and the enslavement of the Canaanite men of Gibeon). Likewise, Solomon later enslaved the remnants of these specific tribal descendants of Canaan in 1 Kings 9:20-21. This is the true fulfillment of the Curse of Canaan. Nowhere in Scripture can we honestly glean the idea that the curse was extended to all the descendants of Ham.

Moreover, from at least one of these groups (the Canaanites), we have an approved marriage within the line of Christ: for Rahab the *Canaanite* married Salmon, the father of Boaz and ancestor of David. In the seven case studies which follow, we will demonstrate that Deuteronomy 7:1-5 was always understood by God's people along these lines: interreligious marriage was (and is) prohibited; interracial marriage was never prohibited.

1) Joseph and Asenath, Daughter of Potiphora (Genesis 41:45-52)

In this text, we read not only that Joseph married an Egyptian... but even that two entire Israelite tribes could trace their lineage directly to Ephraim and Manasseh, *both half-Egyptians themselves!* Joseph explicitly attributes the blessing of these children to God in the naming of Ephraim: "The name of the second he called Ephraim, saying, 'For God has made me fruitful in the land of my affliction'" (Gen.

⁴³ Criss, Mark Stephen. "A BIBLICAL & HISTORICAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE LOST TRIBE OF THE PERIZZITES DURING THE LATE BRONZE AND EARLY IRON AGE." Doctoral Dissertation, 2022. "The Perizzites are most probable descendants of the Phoenicians and therefore the offspring of Sidon, the "first son" of Canaan, son of Ham, and son of Noah."

41:52). This rejoicing from the patriarch is diametrically opposed to the wicked Kinist sentiment that biracial children are “unfortunate.”

Indeed, when we come to Jacob’s covenantal blessings, we read the opposite of what the Kinists might hope to see. Instead of expressing hesitance due to the interracial marriage of Joseph, *Jacob gives a double blessing to him through the biracial children*. We should state at this point that the category “biracial” would likely not have even entered into the minds of the ancient peoples... yet the point remains, contrary the ideas of the Kinists.

Jacob blessed these half-Egyptian children heartily and without hesitance, such that Israel ended up with 13 tribes instead of 12. In fact, he elevated these biracial grandchildren to the status of “Reuben and Simeon” (Jacob’s own first-born and second-born children)!⁴⁴ These half-Egyptian children, celebrated by Yahweh, would surely have been frowned upon by the god of the Kinists.

We would also point out that Egypt was himself a “son of Ham” (Genesis 10:6). Thus, this is not simply interracial marriage, but interracial marriage with a Hamite, whom the Kinists confidently assert were dark skinned. How are we to seriously entertain the universalizing of the Curse of Canaan to all of Ham’s children, when *two entire Israelite tribes* resulted from intermarriage with one of Ham’s descendants?

2) Moses and the Cushite Woman (Numbers 12:1-16)

During the wilderness wanderings, Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses, “Because he had married a Cushite woman” (Num. 12:1). Leaving aside a full exegesis of this text, we note for now the bare facts that Cush refers to Ethiopia, and thus, to dark-skinned peoples. Moses, one of the greatest leaders in history, married this woman, who was herself not native to Israel and almost certainly had a different skin color than he had.

Because Miriam (like the Kinists today) *grumbled about this marriage*, God cursed her with leprosy: “Miriam was leprous, like snow” (Num. 12:10). This may have been an ironic judgment, such as we find throughout Scripture: that is, Miriam grumbled about the dark complexion of the Cushite’s skin, and was consequently cursed with a much lighter complexion through the leprosy! Whether or not this was the case, we see in Miriam’s curse a *clear approval by God of this interracial marriage*.

We should also note that marriage in Scripture was for the express purpose of having children (although companionship and sexual enjoyment were also assumed as attending purposes). No Israelite would *dream* of getting married without attempting to have children. Therefore, whether or not Moses actually had children with the Cushite woman is not the point: the marriage itself is a commentary on the subject, demonstrating God’s approval of interracial marriage and biracial children.

Again, we must point out that Cush was a son of Ham (Genesis 10:6), which yet again disproves the Kinists’ presumption regarding the expansion of the Curse of Canaan to all of Ham’s children.

3) Circumcision and Confession: THE Criteria for National, Religious, and Interracial Union (Exodus 12:48-49)

⁴⁴

“And now your two sons, who were born to you in the land of Egypt before I came to you in Egypt, are mine; Ephraim and Manasseh shall be mine, as Reuben and Simeon are” (Genesis 48:5).

[Exo 12:48-49 ESV] 48 If a stranger shall sojourn with you and would keep the Passover to the LORD, let all his males be circumcised. Then he may come near and keep it; he shall be as a native of the land. But no uncircumcised person shall eat of it. 49 There shall be one law for the native and for the stranger who sojourns among you."

In the institution of the Passover, before the Exodus proper had even occurred, God made provision for the *full inclusion* of the gentiles into Israel. The text is abundantly clear: those who would worship God by keeping the Passover were not prohibited due to race. Nor were they kept in some far-off section of the camp due to skin color or any other feature: as soon as they were circumcised they were "as a native of the land." They worshipped together: there were not separate camps for fair-skinned and dark-skinned members of the community.

It should go without saying that circumcision was *not merely ritualistic, but was itself a profession of faith*. Although we do not have space to go into the full meaning of circumcision here, we hope the reader will understand that circumcision was sacramentally "the covenant"... for this is how God Himself describes it: "This is my covenant, which you shall keep, between me and you and your offspring after you: Every male among you shall be circumcised" (Genesis 17:10).

This means, similar to baptism today, that circumcision was a sign and seal of God's Covenantal grace, and as such, visibly displayed the covenantal promises of God in the body of the circumcised.

"(Abraham) received the sign of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness that he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised." (Romans 4:11)

Thus, the circumcised foreigner who would eat the Passover *was just as much in covenant with God as the native born* who had been circumcised as an infant. As with Abraham, circumcision was to this foreigner "a seal of the righteousness he had by faith." To be in covenant of God makes one a member, a full member, of God's people. Skin color was never even a consideration: only faith and obedience. Obviously, the circumcised foreigner could propagate holy seed with any native born Israelite, since this is what circumcision itself pointed to *ex essential*.

3b) The Memorial Aspect of the Passover and the Inclusion of Gentiles

The essence of the Passover celebration was *remembrance concerning what God had done for HIS people*. The scenario wherein a foreigner, who was not in Israel at the time of the Passover event, nor descended from Israel could "remember" deserves explanation. How, in other words, could a foreigner who celebrates the Passover apply *memorial instructions* such as are found in Exodus 13:8 or Deuteronomy 6:20-21?

Exodus 13:8-9: "You shall tell your son on that day, 'It is because of what the LORD did for **me** when **I** came out of Egypt.' 9 And it shall be to you as a sign on your hand and as a memorial between your eyes, that the law of the LORD may be in your mouth. For with a strong hand the LORD has brought you out of Egypt."

Deuteronomy 6:20-21: "When your son asks you in time to come, 'What is the meaning of the testimonies and the statutes and the rules that the LORD our God has commanded you?' 21 then you shall say to your son, '**We** were Pharaoh's slaves in Egypt. And the LORD brought **us** out of Egypt with a mighty hand.'"

The answer is found in both testaments. To be "as a native of the land" means that the foreigner who is circumcised embraces wholesale his new Israelite identity *and history*, as do all other Israelites in the community. In fact, this law *binds every member of the community* to do this very thing. The history of the confessing foreigner IS the history of the native Israelite by faith.

The New Testament expresses it this way: “Those who are of faith are the children of Abraham... blessed along with Abraham” (Gal. 3:7, 9).

What the New Testament teaches will be taken up in more detail in another section of this present work... but for now we state clearly: *what the New Testament expresses regarding race relations and covenantal inclusion, the Old Testament demonstrates as well, both by doctrine and by personal examples.*

4) Rahab and Salmon

Although little is known about Salmon, since he is not named outside of Matthew’s genealogy (Matt. 1:5), we *do know* something about his lineage and who he married. Salmon was a Judahite in the lineage of King David; an ancestor of Jesus Christ. His pedigree could not be more esteemed, humanly speaking. He could trace his lineage directly to Abraham (Matthew 1:2-5). He was the great, great grandfather of King David. And yet, he married a *Canaanite prostitute* named Rahab.

What makes this so noteworthy, beyond the scandalous facts themselves, is that Rahab belonged to a group from which the faithful Israelite was explicitly prohibited from marrying in Deuteronomy 7:1-5: the Canaanites. The obvious answer to this apparent conundrum is found in Rahab’s faith (Hebrews 11:31). The Bible, in both testaments, takes for granted what the Kinists blind resist: *faith in the true God makes marriage between any man and any woman legitimate in the eyes of God.*

Rahab’s confession of faith is found in Joshua 2:11: “Yahweh your God, He is God in the heavens above and on the earth beneath.” The spies then promised to “deal faithfully” with Rahab (2:14). Likewise, we know that Rahab was welcomed into Israel, living at least until the time of the writing of the book of Joshua itself (cf. Joshua 6:25). Thus we see that “dealing faithfully” in 2:14 entailed taking Rahab and her family into national union with Israel, making her eligible for marriage, just as a native born (cf. Exodus 12:48-49).

How unlike God it would be to reject a foreigner who professes faith! If one could worship God by remembering the Passover, how much more could one marry into God’s people by faith! In fact, this is the case with every single gentile believer in Christ who has ever lived, regardless of their skin color: Ephesians 2:13-19.

5) Ruth and Boaz (Ruth)

Boaz, himself the offspring of an interracial Canaanite/Israelite marriage between Salmon and Rahab (Matthew 1:5), is depicted as *an ideal Israelite* throughout the book of Ruth. Indeed, Boaz is among the most righteous men in all of Scripture.

Yet, Boaz married Ruth, who was herself a Moabitess. While it is likely that Mahlon should *not* have married Ruth while sojourning in Moab, by the time Boaz married her she had clearly professed the true faith, even swearing in the name of Yahweh (cf. Ruth 1:16-17). Moreover, Naomi told Ruth, “The man (Boaz) is a close relative of ours” (Ruth 2:20). Note how Naomi uses the first person personal plural pronoun to indiscriminately refer to both herself *and* Ruth! Paul speaks in the same way of the Galatian/Ephesian Gentiles and himself (cf. Gal. 4:31; Eph. 2:3; etc.). Clearly, in Naomi’s eyes, Ruth is “as the native born” (Ex. 12:48-49)!

Ruth and Boaz gave birth to Obed, the grandfather of David (and ancestor of Jesus Christ). Thus, David had both *Canaanite* and *Moabite* blood in his veins, as did Christ Himself.

In fact, Christ had Ammonite blood as well, since Naamah, the mother of Rehoboam, was an Ammonite (1 Kings 14:21). Would the Kinists advocate for “racial purity” beyond that of David and Christ?

6) Solomon and Pharaoh’s Daughter

We freely admit that King Solomon erred greatly by marrying foreign women *who practiced false religions*. Yet, the distinction is important, being found in the condemnatory text itself:

“Now King Solomon loved many foreign women, along with the daughter of Pharaoh: Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian, and Hittite women, 2 from the nations concerning which the LORD had said to the people of Israel, “You shall not enter into marriage with them, neither shall they with you, for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods.” Solomon clung to these in love. 3 He had 700 wives, who were princesses, and 300 concubines. And his wives turned away his heart. 4 For when Solomon was old his wives turned away his heart after other gods, and his heart was not wholly true to the LORD his God, as was the heart of David his father.” (1 Kings 11:1-4)

However, early in Solomon’s reign he had married the daughter of Psusennes, the last king of the 21st Dynasty of Egypt.⁴⁵ There is *no condemnation* of this marriage to be found in Scripture, leading us to conclude that she, along with other foreign women like Ruth and Rahab, must have confessed true faith. In fact, the subject of the Song of Solomon may be this very princess. The subject of the *Song* is compared to “a mare among Pharaoh’s chariots” (1:9), has dark skin (1:5), and is Solomon’s “spouse” (4:8). Regardless of whether she was or wasn’t, we do know for certain that she was a descendent of Ham with brown skin.

However, Solomon’s heart was turned away by his other wives, whom he married “along with the daughter of Pharaoh” (1 Kings 11:1-4). In this valuable text as touching our subject, we see, side by side, *what IS condemned and what IS NOT condemned*. Marriage to a foreign woman (notably yet another descendant of Ham) who professes faith in the true God is not condemned. Marriage to foreign idolaters is condemned. Specifically, it was prohibited to intermarry with the nations which are named in 11:2 (cf. Deut. 7:1-5). Moreover, while the lists in these texts do not match perfectly, *the rationale in both texts is identical*: “for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods” (1 Kings 11:2); “for they would turn away your sons from following me, to serve other gods.” (Deut. 7:4).

This is, again, *identical* to the parameters set by God in the New Testament when it comes to marriage, as found in 1 Corinthians 7:39 and 2 Corinthians 6:14. Believers are under no circumstances to marry unbelievers, *but are free to marry whoever they want to marry, “only in the Lord.”* There is no mention of race to be found, if the texts are read in context rather than through a lens of preexisting racial bias.

Thus, one major error of the Kinist is that he seeks to impose a wall where God has *always* opened a door. The believer, in both testaments, even under the law, was free to marry anyone, of any skin color or nationality who professed faith in the true God. In fact, every time we pray in Jesus’ name, we are praying to a Being who, in His incarnation was and is multi-racial, as His own lineage proves.

7) Nehemiah 13:23-27

This passage is sometimes used by Kinists and others to say more than it says. In this passage, it’s *not* that interracial marriage is universally condemned, but rather, that intermarrying with unbelievers is condemned due to the corrupting effects it has on the believer. This is obvious from several considerations: 1) The children of these marriages were no longer able to speak the language of Judah (vs.

⁴⁵ Keil, C.F. “Commentary on the Old Testament” vol. 3, p. 29. 2006.

24), that is, they could not even understand the Law of God or the speech of the priests. 2) The reference to Solomon's corruption from foreign (pagan) women refers to *women of the same sort; women who were foreign and refused to convert to Judaism*. However, Nehemiah does not and would not denounce foreign women like Solomon's first wife, or Rahab, or Ruth, or any woman who confessed the true faith and would live as a converted Israelite (Exodus 12:48-49).

Conclusion of the Old Testament Evidences for Interracial Marriage

God has furnished us with repeated examples of what is and what is not condemned in the Old Testament. Interracial/intertribal marriages *with unbelievers* is universally condemned in the Old Testament (and the New). However, interracial/intertribal marriages with converts is universally approved and even celebrated, with some of the most famous and devout men and women in Scripture as examples of such unions. Thus, the Kinists do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures.

New Testament Examination of the Kinist and Race Realism Position

Theology is not the art of baptizing what we already believe. Theology is the disciplined submission of the mind and conscience to the Word of God. One of the most basic commitments of Reformed theology is the belief that doctrine must arise from Scripture rather than from instinct, sentiment, or cultural prejudice. When theology proceeds in the opposite direction—beginning with a desired conclusion and then selectively appealing to Scripture in its defense—the result is distortion rather than faithful dogmatics. Yet there has been a persistent temptation throughout church history to do theology backwards—to start with our own feelings, prejudices, or deeply held convictions and then force the Bible to conform to them.

John Owen warned that “every error in doctrine begins with a neglect of some truth”⁴⁶. Kinism illustrates this principle clearly. Rather than arising from the teaching of Scripture, it arises from ethnic prejudice and then attempts to conscript Scripture into its service. This backward method of theology is not unique to Kinism. It has appeared repeatedly wherever Scripture confronts something the natural man finds objectionable.

Backward Theology Illustrated: Arminianism

The resistance of Arminian theology to the sovereignty of God in salvation provides a familiar example. Several Reformed theologians have observed that we do not struggle with God's sovereignty because it is obscure; we struggle with it because it is so clear. Consider Romans 9:11–13: “(for the children not yet being born, nor having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works but of Him who calls), it was said to her, ‘The older shall serve the younger.’ As it is written, ‘Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated.’” Or Ephesians 1:4–5: “just as He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love, having predestined us to adoption as sons by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will.” These texts could scarcely be clearer, yet because they offend human notions of fairness, Arminians often respond by twisting passages like 2 Peter 3:9—“The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some count slackness, but is longsuffering toward us, not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance”—to teach a universal salvation will, ignoring the immediate context of God's patience toward the elect.

⁴⁶ John Owen, *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (Grand Rapids: Christian Classics Ethereal Library)

Arminian systems routinely minimize or reinterpret the explicit passages while elevating less clear texts to neutralize their force. The order is reversed: human autonomy is assumed, and Scripture is made to conform.

Kinism as the Same Methodological Error

Kinism follows the same methodological pattern. It begins with a commitment to ethnic separation and then seeks to make Scripture support that commitment. In order to do so, it must ignore or radically reinterpret the New Testament's teaching on the unity of the church and the abolition of ethnic barriers in Christ.

Prominent Kinists are remarkably candid about the prejudices that drive their system. R. J. Rushdoony, frequently cited as a foundational influence, wrote in *The Institutes of Biblical Law*: "The white man has behind him centuries of Christian culture, and the discipline and selective breeding this faith requires"⁴⁷. He further argued that integration leads to violence because of supposed moral inferiority: "If the white man feels guilty towards the Negro, he is less capable of defending himself against the Negroes who turn into a revolutionary rabble, bent on theft and murder"⁴⁸.

Corey Mahler is even more explicit: "The African is inferior in virtually every way when compared to the European. The African is less intellectually capable, less attractive, less self-controlled; the African is more violent, more destructive, more gullible; and the African is more prone to demon worship, to syncretism, to heresy"⁴⁹. He even denied that the Holy Spirit can make black people as godly as white people and appeals to crime statistics to imply inherent criminality⁵⁰. Bret McAtee equates racial integration with communism and fears the erasure of racial differences⁵¹. Thomas Achord, writing under a pseudonym, exalts "White skin and genes" as conferring unique accomplishments and rights⁵². Michael Spangler frequently asserts that Whites are the supreme race, "Race is Real, Jews are evil, and Whites are Supreme"⁵³. These statements reveal a worldview rooted in stereotypes of White Supremacy and the inferiority and undesirability of all other races in shared communities—prejudices that Kinists then read back into Scripture in order to create a framework for how church and society should be ordered. For instance, Michael Spangler has written:

"Yet whatever other reasons may recommend segregation today, the most compelling reason for it is precisely that given by God in Deuteronomy, that of morality and religion. Historic Southern

⁴⁷ R. J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1973), 251.

⁴⁸ Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law*, 251.

⁴⁹ Corey J. Mahler (@CoreyJMahler), "The African is inferior in virtually every way when compared to the European," X, November 2024, <https://x.com/CoreyJMahler/status/1857880159417753733>.

⁵⁰ Corey Mahler, "James White Vs. Corey Mahler Debate Black Sanctification," YouTube video, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=taMoR7aAz2Q>.

⁵¹ Bret McAtee, "Kinism & Its Fight Against the Gnostic Empire That Is the Reformed Church; McAtee Contra Leon," *Iron Ink*, September 12, 2024, <https://ironink.org/2024/09/kinism-mcatee-contra-leon/>.

⁵² Thomas Achord, posting under the pseudonym @TuliusBorland, cited in Alastair Roberts, "On Thomas Achord," *Alastair's Adversaria* (blog), November 27, 2022, <https://alastairadversaria.com/2022/11/27/the-case-against-thomas-achord/>

⁵³ Michael Spangler @spanglermt, X, Nov 6, 2024 <https://x.com/spanglermt/status/1854140047026446599?s=20>

segregation protected a more virtuous, civilized, and Christianized white population from harmful association with blacks who were significantly less virtuous, civilized, and Christianized.”⁵⁴

The critical question, however, is not the motivation for the framework the Kinists promote; it is whether the New Testament actually teaches that framework and, as we hope you will see, it does not.

The Clear Biblical Witness to Ethnic Unity in Christ

The New Testament does not encourage segregation in church or society but repeatedly presents the gospel as breaking down ethnic barriers and creating one new people from Jew and Gentile alike.

Acts 10 – God Declares No Man Common or Unclean

Peter’s vision and the conversion of Cornelius forever shattered Jewish-Gentile separation: “And a voice spoke to him again the second time, ‘What God has cleansed you must not call common’... Then he said to them, ‘You know how unlawful it is for a Jewish man to keep company with or go to one of another nation. But God has shown me that I should not call any man common or unclean’” (Acts 10:15, 28). Gordon Fee notes that this narrative is “pivotal... It demonstrates that the Spirit’s work transcends ethnic boundaries, making the church universal”⁵⁵.

A common Kinist response to Acts 10 (and Galatians 2) is the claim that the passage authorizes Gentile salvation while leaving intact ethnic separation in fellowship. On this reading, Peter is permitted to recognize Gentiles as saved, but not required to treat them as full and equal table companions in the ordinary life of the church. They affirm that the church can remain segregated in its worship. This distinction is artificial and cannot be sustained either from the text of Acts or from the concrete realities of early Christian worship.

Acts 10 Explicitly Addresses Fellowship, Not Abstract Soteriology

The presenting problem in Acts 10 is not whether Gentiles can be saved in principle, but whether Jewish believers may associate with them. Peter himself frames the issue this way when he enters Cornelius’s house:

“You know how unlawful it is for a Jewish man to keep company with or go to one of another nation. But God has shown me that I should not call any man common or unclean.” (Acts 10:28)

The objection Peter anticipates is social and relational (keeping company with, going to, eating with) not theoretical. God’s correction therefore addresses the very matter Kinists attempt to exempt: ethnic separation in fellowship. John Calvin is explicit on this point. Commenting on Acts 10:28, he writes that the vision must not be confined to food laws, because its intended referent is people and common fellowship:

“Moreover, he mitigateth very well by these words the offence which did stick in their minds, by reason of an old grudge which was between the Jews and the Gentiles, so that he could by no means have entered his speech better. For he pronounceth that those are now clean who were before unclean, so that they have mutual fellowship now with the saints. Furthermore, whereas he said that it was

⁵⁴

Michael Spangler, “Christian Race Realism, Part 5: Objections,” *Pactum Institute*, August 6, 2024, <https://www.pactuminstitute.com/the-pactum-blog/christian-race-realism-part-5-objections>.

⁵⁵

Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 345.

wickedness for the Jews to go in unto the Gentiles, we must know that this came not so much from the law, as from the observation of the fathers. God had forbidden, indeed, that they should (not) entangle themselves with marriages or covenants, (Deut. 7:3;) they were never forbidden to eat with them, or to use the common businesses of life. But lest that familiarity might entice them into that which was forbidden, they observed the custom delivered by the fathers, so that they did not company together. It is to no end to dispute here whether that tradition did bind men's consciences; for Peter doth not teach what is lawful according to God, but what was commonly used. No man. He maketh the sum and end of the vision more plain, when he referreth that unto men which was spoken of meats. And whereas he saith, that no man is unclean, it may not be understood of (all) particular persons; for it is certain that all unbelievers are polluted with uncleanness of conscience, so that they pollute those things which are otherwise pure, when as they do but touch them. Paul also saith that their children remain unclean until they be cleansed by faith. Finally, if faith alone do purge and purify the hearts of men, unbelief doth make the same profane. But Peter compareth the Jews and the Gentiles together in this place; and because the wall of separation was pulled down, and the covenant of life is now common to them both alike, he saith that those are not to be counted aliens who are made partakers of God's adoption."⁵⁶

Calvin's point here is clear: the Spirit did not merely revise a dietary code while leaving ethnic distance intact. The vision teaches Peter how to regard men. To continue to treat Gentile converts as unfit for table fellowship is to refuse the lesson of the vision itself. This is confirmed by Acts 11, where Peter is criticized not for preaching to Gentiles, but for eating with them: "You went in to uncircumcised men and ate with them" (Acts 11:3). Peter does not correct the charge by distinguishing salvation from fellowship. Instead, he recounts the vision and concludes that resisting full Gentile inclusion and fellowship would be resisting God.

Apostolic Churches Were Necessarily Mixed at the Table

The Kinist attempt to sever salvation from fellowship also collapses when one considers the actual form of apostolic congregational life. The earliest churches were not abstract gatherings of believers who merely affirmed one another's salvation from a distance. They were table communities.

From the beginning, Christian worship involved shared meals. Jude refers to the love feasts (ἀγάπαι) that accompanied the church's gatherings (Jude 12). Paul rebukes the Corinthians, not for eating together across social lines, but for doing so sinfully and divisively (1 Cor. 11). The problem in Corinth was not mixed fellowship, but selfishness within it.

It is historically and liturgically inescapable that the Lord's Supper, instituted as a table ordinance, was celebrated in mixed Jewish-Gentile congregations. There is no evidence in Acts or the epistles of ethnically segregated tables, services, or sacraments. To posit such a practice is to posit something the New Testament never even hints at. The Westminster Larger Catechism makes explicit what the New Testament assumes about the Supper:

*"The Lord's supper is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein, by giving and receiving bread and wine... they that worthily communicate feed upon his body and blood... and have their union and communion with him confirmed, and are mutually strengthened in love."*⁵⁷

⁵⁶ John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Henry Beveridge, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844–45), comment on Acts 10:28.

⁵⁷ *The Westminster Larger Catechism*, Q. 168.

The Supper is not merely vertical communion with Christ, it is horizontal communion with one another. To deny table fellowship is therefore to deny the sacramental expression of the church's unity.

The Lord's Supper Is the Highest Act of Fellowship

Reformed theology has consistently understood the Lord's Supper as the most concrete and sincere expression of ecclesial fellowship. Calvin is again unambiguous on this point in the *Institutes*, where he describes the Supper as binding believers together in love:

"We are all partakers of the same bread, and hence are all one body... there cannot be a nearer bond of love than that which the Lord here commends."⁵⁸

This theology makes the Kinist position untenable. If Jewish and Gentile believers may partake of the same Christ, but must not partake at the same table, then the Supper is emptied of its ecclesial meaning. The "one body" becomes a fiction, affirmed verbally but denied sacramentally. This is precisely why Paul treats Peter's withdrawal from Gentile tables in Galatians 2 as a gospel issue rather than a cultural preference. Table fellowship is not adiaphora; it is the lived confession of justification by faith alone.

Galatians 2 – Paul Rebukes Ethnic Separation

Paul confronts Peter publicly in Antioch: "Now when Peter had come to Antioch, I withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed; for before certain men came from James, he would eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews also played the hypocrite with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter before them all, 'If you, being a Jew, live in the manner of Gentiles and not as the Jews, why do you compel Gentiles to live as Jews?'" (Gal. 2:11–14).

F. F. Bruce comments that Paul's stand "preserved the truth that in Christ, Jew and Gentile are one"⁵⁹. Peter's withdrawal was driven by fear of the circumcision party, but Paul declares it contrary to the gospel itself.

Acts 10, Galatians 2, and the Supper Belong Together

Acts 10 authorizes Gentile salvation by authorizing Gentile fellowship. Galatians 2 condemns ethnic separation because it denies the gospel. The Lord's Supper embodies both truths by placing redeemed sinners, Jews and all sorts of Gentiles, at one table. The Kinist claim that Acts 10 permits salvation but not full and equal fellowship therefore requires the invention of an ecclesiology foreign to the New Testament: churches without shared tables, sacraments without shared communion, unity without contact. Such a church never existed in Apostolic Christianity. The burden of proof lies with those who would reintroduce ethnic barriers where Christ and his apostles destroyed them.

Acts 13:1 – Diversity in Church Leadership

Acts 13:1 moves the argument beyond fellowship alone and into the realm of church office and authority, a point at which Kinist ecclesiology fails even more decisively. Luke writes:

⁵⁸

John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 4.17.

⁵⁹

F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 130.

“Now in the church that was at Antioch there were certain prophets and teachers: Barnabas, Simeon who was called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.”

This leadership team was strikingly diverse. Barnabas was a Levite from Cyprus. Simeon, called Niger, that is, “black,” was likely a black African. Lucius was from Cyrene in North Africa. Manaen was connected to the Herodian court. Saul was a Pharisee from Tarsus, trained under Gamaliel. Luke identifies these men deliberately, and he records their diversity without embarrassment, apology, or qualification. Luke does not describe parallel congregations, racially stratified offices, or segregated leadership structures. There is one church at Antioch, and within that one church there is a single body of prophets and teachers exercising spiritual authority together. The New Testament offers no hint that Simeon or Lucius occupied a subordinate role, or that Saul’s Jewishness conferred superior authority, or that ethnic difference required separation in office.

Antioch itself reinforces the point. It was a cosmopolitan city populated by Greeks, Syrians, Jews, Romans, and Africans. Classical sources describe it as populous and diverse, a place where cultures mixed naturally. Luke’s narrative assumes this social reality and treats it as the ordinary context of Christian ministry, not as a problem to be solved. James Montgomery Boice rightly observes that “the Antioch church was a model of diversity... Here we see men from different backgrounds united in mission”⁶⁰. Far from condemning this diversity as sinful or disordered, God uses it to commission the first missionary journey to the Gentiles (Acts 13:2–3). The Holy Spirit speaks not to a racially homogeneous leadership body, but to a visibly mixed one.

This directly contradicts Kinist claims that churches should be racially segregated or that certain races should not exercise authority over others in the church. If such principles were binding, Antioch would represent ecclesial confusion. Instead, the New Testament presents it as exemplary. Nor can it be plausibly argued that these men ministered together without fellowshiping together. Acts 13:2 states that “as they ministered to the Lord and fasted,” the Spirit spoke. These are shared acts of worship and devotion. In the first-century church, such shared ministry necessarily entailed shared fellowship. Prophets and teachers who prayed, fasted, and governed together would also have eaten together, including participation in the love feast and the Lord’s Supper.

Finally, nothing in apostolic teaching would have prevented intermarriage among the Jewish, African, and Gentile members of the Antiochene church. The New Testament forbids marriage outside the faith, not across ethnic lines. Paul’s instruction is explicit: believers are to marry “only in the Lord” (1 Cor. 7:39). If ethnic separation were a binding moral principle, apostolic warnings would be expected but none are given. Acts 13:1 therefore stands as a concrete refutation of Kinist ecclesiology. It presents a church in which ethnic difference neither establishes hierarchy nor justifies segregation, either in leadership, fellowship, or the ordinary life of the body.

Ephesians 2:11–16 and the Abolition of the Middle Wall

Paul’s teaching in Ephesians 2:11–16 provides the most direct and theologically developed refutation of Kinist ecclesiology in the New Testament. Here Paul does not merely narrate events, as in Acts, but explains what Christ has accomplished and what that accomplishment means for the structure of the church.

Paul writes:

⁶⁰ James Montgomery Boice, *Acts: An Expositional Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), 228.

“Therefore remember that you, once Gentiles in the flesh – who are called Uncircumcision by what is called the Circumcision made in the flesh by hands – that at that time you were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of separation,”

The “Middle Wall” Had Concrete Historical Meaning

Paul’s imagery here is drawn from the ancient temple’s architecture. The “middle wall of separation” refers to the low stone lattice wall or *soreg*, between the Court of the Gentiles and the inner courts of Israel’s temple. In the Second Temple period, inscriptions on these stones warned that non-Jews who crossed the threshold would risk death. The wall was not a vague spiritual metaphor, it was a legally binding, physically enforced boundary marking restricted access to God’s presence under the Mosaic economy.

In this symbolic use, Paul evokes the lived reality of estrangement between Jews and Gentiles. Gentiles could see God’s Temple, could offer prayers from afar, could hope for blessing, but they could not draw near, they could not share in the covenantal privileges of Israel. That is precisely the condition Paul describes when he says Gentiles were “far off.”

Christ Has Abolished the Wall, Bringing Gentiles Near

But Paul insists that all this has decisively changed forever because of the saving and unifying work of Christ:

“But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For He Himself is our peace, who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of separation, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, that is, the law of commandments contained in ordinances, so as to create in Himself one new man from the two, thus making peace, and that He might reconcile them both to God in one body through the cross, thereby putting to death the enmity.” (Eph. 2:14–16)

This is not the mere permission of salvation for Gentiles while maintaining social or ecclesial distance. It is the actual abolition of the very barrier that stood between Jew and Gentile before God. Paul draws a line under old divisions, declaring them terminated by Christ’s atoning work. When Paul declares that Christ has “broken down” this wall, he is not speaking metaphorically of a vague sentiment of unity, he is declaring that the structures that once enforced racial separation before God have been abolished. The wall is not lowered, relocated, or repurposed; it is torn down.

John Calvin comments plainly:

“The Jews were separated, for a certain time, from the Gentiles, by the appointment of God; and ceremonial observances were the open and avowed symbols of that separation. Passing by the Gentiles, God had chosen the Jews to be a peculiar people to himself. A wide distinction was thus made, when the one class were ‘fellow-citizens and of the household’ (Eph. 2:19) of the Church, and the other were foreigners. This is stated in the Song of Moses: ‘When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel: for the Lord’s portion is his people, Jacob is the lot of his inheritance’ (Deut. 32:8, 9). Bounds were thus fixed by God to separate one people from the rest; and hence arose the enmity which is here mentioned. ... Ceremonial observances were afterwards added, which, like walls, enclosed the inheritance of God, prevented it from being open to all or mixed with other possessions, and thus excluded the Gentiles from

the kingdom of God. But now, the apostle says, the enmity is removed, and the wall is broken down. By extending the privilege of adoption beyond the limits of Judea, Christ has now made us all to be brethren. And so is fulfilled the prophecy, 'God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem' (Gen. 9:27)... Paul declares not only that the Gentiles are equally with the Jews admitted to the fellowship of grace, so that they no longer differ from each other, but that the mark of difference has been taken away; for ceremonies have been abolished."⁶¹

Calvin's point is not merely that Gentiles may be saved. It is that they are admitted to the same fellowship, the same access, the same standing, the same nearness. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones powerfully illustrates the completeness of this change using an analogy that highlights the nature of the one new humanity Paul speaks of. He contrasts two political models:

*"What is this 'one new man'? Let me give you an illustration. Think of the difference between the British Commonwealth of nations and the United States of America. In the British Commonwealth, you have a number of different nations—Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and others. They are all separate nations, and they remain separate nations. They have their own governments, their own laws, and their own specific identities. But they are bound together in a commonwealth; they are a coalition of separate identities. But when you look at the United States of America, you see something entirely different. There, people have come from all the different nations of the world. They have left their old countries and their old national identities behind. They have entered into a new country and have become something entirely new—they have become Americans. They do not retain their old separate national identities as they do in a commonwealth; they are fused together into one new entity."*⁶²

This analogy is precisely what Paul intends by "one new man." Christ does not create a league of separate ethnic churches that coordinate from a distance. He creates a new entity in which former barriers have been dismantled and their functional power exercised away.

Brought Near Together — Not Merely in Principle

The decisive language of Ephesians 2 underscores that what Christ accomplishes is not merely formal or abstract. Gentiles have been brought near, not simply saved but integrated into the people of God on the same footing as Jewish believers. The subsequent verses make this explicit:

"For through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father." (Eph. 2:18)

This is temple language. Paul is describing shared access to God's presence together, something that the law previously did not permit. Kinist attempts to segregate "soteriological inclusion" from "practical fellowship" here collapse under the grammar of the passage. Access is not merely theoretical, it is relational and communal.

Ephesus: A Multi-Ethnic Context Requiring a Realized Unity

This teaching was not abstract for Paul's original Ephesian audience. Ephesus was a thriving, multicultural city in the Roman world. Luke already portrays the Ephesian church as consisting of Jews

⁶¹ John Calvin, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians*, trans. William Pringle (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1854), comment on Ephesians 2:14.

⁶² D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, "Christ's Way of Making Peace," sermon on Ephesians 2:15, *MLJ Trust*, <https://www.mljtrust.org/sermons/book-of-ephesians/christs-way-of-making-peace/>

and Gentiles (Acts 19). Their fellowship in worship, teaching, and table life was already a lived reality that Paul had seen, experienced, and encouraged long before he wrote this letter to them. To insist that the wall is still operative in church life would render Paul's declaration not only redundant but incoherent in its own historical context.

Why the Kinist Reading Fails

Kinist interpreters frequently offer readings such as:

*"Grace restores nature, including race and ethnicity"*⁶³

or that the wall refers only to ceremonial law and not a reference to ongoing ecclesial practice.

Such formulations hinge on preserving ethnic distinctions as morally binding categories even after Christ's work, but as we have seen Ephesians 2 makes that interpretation impossible. The wall is gone and the new unity Paul describes is not a patched-up old identity but a new creation, something that did not exist before and that uproots the old categories that once defined alienation.

If Kinist theology were true, that ethnic distinctions must be preserved in church structure, authority, or fellowship, then Paul's declaration at Ephesus would be not only puzzling but antithetical to his own practice. The wall would be strengthened and renewed rather than abolished, a conclusion Paul emphatically rejects. If the wall is torn down only "in principle," but must be rebuilt in practice, then Christ has accomplished nothing visible. If Gentiles are brought near, but must remain structurally distant, then "nearness" is emptied of meaning. Paul's declaration would have sounded absurd to a first-century audience if the implication were, "You are now equal in Christ—but must remain physically separate." Ephesians 2 therefore does not merely allow actual visible integration, it demands it. Any theology that seeks to strengthen the wall Christ has torn down, whether by racial hierarchy, segregated churches, or restricted fellowship, stands in direct contradiction to the apostolic gospel.

Colossians 3:11 – Christ Is All and in All

"Here there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcised nor uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave nor free, but Christ is all and in all" (Col. 3:11).

Paul brings the argument to its theological climax in Colossians 3:11, where he writes, "Here there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcised nor uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave nor free, but Christ is all and in all." If Ephesians 2 shows us the wall of separation being torn down, then Colossians 3 shows us what now stands in its place, not a segregated body of permanently separated peoples whose communion will forever be only spiritual, but a new humanity whose identity is so completely defined by Christ that the old distinctions no longer function as markers of standing, privilege, or separation within the people of God.

William Hendriksen states the point plainly: "All racial bigotry, chauvinism, and snobbery is condemned here. Here the truth that before God 'all men are equal' receives its best—because infallibly inspired—expression"⁶⁴. Paul is not offering a general call to kindness, nor appealing to a vague sense of equality, but declaring what is now true in Christ. The distinctions men have long used to elevate

⁶³ Bret McAtee, "Kinism & Its Fight Against the Gnostic Empire That Is the Reformed Church; McAtee Contra Leon," *Iron Ink*, September 12, 2024, <https://ironink.org/2024/09/kinism-mcatee-contra-leon/>.

⁶⁴ William Hendriksen and Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of Colossians and Philemon*, vol. 6, *New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953–2001), 151.

themselves over others no longer determine a person's standing in the church. He does not suggest that Greeks cease to be Greeks or Jews cease to be Jews, nor does he deny the realities of culture, language, or history. Rather, he teaches that none of these things has any bearing on a man's place before God or within the body of Christ.

Douglas Moo sharpens the same point when he writes that Paul "does not deny that such distinctions exist; rather, he denies that they have any relevance for one's standing in the new community created by Christ"⁶⁵. That distinction matters. The issue is not whether differences exist, but whether they are allowed to function as boundaries within the church or as grounds for separation and hierarchy. Paul takes those distinctions — racial, religious, cultural, and social — and removes their authority. They remain real, but they no longer govern the life of the people of God.

This becomes even clearer when one considers Paul's deliberate inclusion of the "Scythian," for here he reaches to the very bottom of the ancient world's hierarchy of peoples. The Scythian was not simply different, he was regarded as uncivilized, violent, and morally inferior, the sort of man against whom others measured their own refinement. Yet Paul includes Scythians without hesitation, precisely in order to make the point that there is no category of man so alien, so despised, or so far removed that he is excluded from the new humanity in Christ. This shows the principle at hand is timeless and reminds us that every people, whether Assyrian, Jew, Edomite, or modern nation, has been tempted to absolutize its own position and to construct a theology that justifies its superiority. The pattern is universal, and Kinism simply represents one more iteration of that same fallen instinct.

At this point the Kinist appeal to the familiar maxim that grace restores nature must be carefully considered, because while it is true in its proper sense, it is misapplied here. Grace does not obliterate creation, nor does it render human distinctions meaningless in every respect, but neither does it preserve the sinful uses to which those distinctions have been put, especially when they are employed as barriers to fellowship or as grounds of pride, hierarchy, or separation. The issue, again, is not whether ethnicity exists, but whether it may function as a governing principle in the life of the church, and Colossians 3:11 answers that question by removing it from that role entirely. As Moo rightly notes above, the point isn't merely that these distinctions are irrelevant to salvation, but that they are irrelevant to the identity and life of the church as the people of God, and that is precisely what Kinism denies when it seeks to reintroduce ethnicity as a foundational structuring principle.

Paul's conclusion leaves no room for qualification, for he says not merely that Christ is important, or even that Christ is central, but that "Christ is all and in all," meaning that Christ himself is now the defining reality of the church, the ground of identity, the bond of fellowship, and the measure of standing before God. Everything else has been relativized, not denied, but placed in its proper and subordinate position. The Christian religion breaks down every wall of partition and unites people "of every tribe and tongue and people and nation" in one fellowship.

When Colossians 3:11 is read alongside Acts 10, Acts 13, Galatians 2, and Ephesians 2, the conclusion becomes unavoidable, for the New Testament does not merely permit multi-ethnic fellowship as a kind of optional expression of unity, it requires it as a consequence of Christ's work, and it does not merely tolerate the breaking down of ethnic barriers, it grounds the very identity of the church in that reality. Kinism, by contrast, seeks to preserve those barriers, whether in fellowship, in the ordering of the church, or in the relations of believers, and in doing so it reintroduces precisely those distinctions which the apostle declares to be without relevance in Christ. Hendriksen's judgment therefore stands, not as an

⁶⁵ Douglas J. Moo, *The Letters to the Colossians and to Philemon*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 284.

isolated comment, but as a faithful reflection of the text itself, “All racial bigotry, chauvinism, and snobbery is condemned here”⁶⁶, and any attempt to retain them, however refined or theologically framed, must be understood not as fidelity to creation, but as resistance to redemption.

Matthew 12:46–50 — The Family of Christ

The teaching of Christ in Matthew 12:46–50, together with its parallels in Mark 3 and Luke 8, presses the argument beyond questions of Jew and Gentile fellowship and forces us to reckon with something even more basic, namely, the place of natural kinship itself within the Kingdom of God. Matthew records:

“While He was still talking to the multitudes, behold, His mother and brothers stood outside, seeking to speak with Him. Then one said to Him, ‘Look, Your mother and Your brothers are standing outside, seeking to speak with You.’

But He answered and said to the one who told Him, ‘Who is My mother and who are My brothers?’ And He stretched out His hand toward His disciples and said, ‘Here are My mother and My brothers! For whoever does the will of My Father in heaven is My brother and sister and mother.’” (Matt. 12:46–50)

Jesus isn’t rejecting his earthly family in this passage, and he certainly isn’t breaking the Fifth Commandment. Elsewhere, Christ frequently teaches the importance of loving one’s parents (see Matthew 15:3–9 for instance). However here He plainly teaches that there is a bond created by grace which surpasses even the nearest natural relation. Those gathered around Him in faith are not described merely as followers, disciples, or companions, but as His family.

That truth would probably have sounded shocking in the first century world, where loyalty to family, tribe, and ancestry shaped nearly every aspect of social life. Yet Christ gathers His disciples from different regions, classes, and backgrounds, and speaks of them as belonging to one household. The church therefore cannot be understood merely as an alliance of separate peoples who happen to share certain religious convictions while remaining fundamentally divided by blood and ancestry.

Calvin comments on this passage:

“The bond of faith is more sacred than every other bond, because it binds us to the Son of God. Hence it follows, that all believers are brethren among themselves in a more excellent degree than though they were sprung from the same womb.”⁶⁷

That observation reaches to the heart of the matter. The Christian who comes from a different people or nation from ours isn’t simply a distant ally in religion while our closest attachments are to people of the same ethnicity regardless of their religious beliefs. Union with Christ creates a real brotherhood, one that reaches farther and lasts longer than earthly descent. A man may share our ancestry and yet remain outside the household of faith; another may come from a people utterly unlike our own and nevertheless belong to us in Christ more closely than many members of our own extended family.

Matthew Henry writes in a similar spirit:

⁶⁶ William Hendriksen and Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of Colossians and Philemon*, vol. 6, *New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953–2001), 151.

⁶⁷ John Calvin, *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke*, trans. William Pringle (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1845), comment on Matthew 12:50.

*"All believers are near akin to Christ. Communion with God and with one another is to be valued above the nearest relations on earth."*⁶⁸

This helps explain why the early church was something of an enigma to the surrounding world. Christianity did not spread merely as a new philosophy or ethical system; it created communities in which old ethnic or national hostilities and divisions no longer governed fellowship. Jews and Gentiles, slaves and free men, rich and poor people gathered together under the authority of the same Lord, heard the same Scriptures, prayed the same prayers, and approached the same table. For all of them the ground truly was level at the foot of the cross. Pagan writers noticed this immediately because it cut against ordinary expectations about status, ethnicity, and social order. To quote Porphyry, "The Christians have abandoned the customs of their fathers, and have gone over to foreign laws."⁶⁹

Lloyd-Jones wrote about the new relations the Christian has:

*"The Christian is nearer to the Christian in another country than he is to his own kith and kin who are not Christians. That is the New Testament doctrine of the church."*⁷⁰

That statement by Lloyd-Jones is the clear implication of Christ's teaching. The line separating mankind most decisively is no longer Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, black and white, but believer and unbeliever. The regenerate man from another race is our brother in a way an unbelieving relative is not, because the same Holy Spirit that dwells in us dwells in them and forever unites us.

Lest the Christian position be caricatured as unnatural, we note that none of this abolishes natural affection or erases gratitude for one's heritage and people. Christianity doesn't teach contempt for nation, language, or family. What it does teach us is that these things no longer possess ultimate authority within the church. Kinship according to the flesh has been subordinated to kinship according to the Spirit. This is where Kinism collides with the teaching of Christ. However carefully framed, Kinist thought consistently treats ethnic solidarity as carrying greater practical weight than the spiritual brotherhood established by the gospel. The effect is to push believers back toward separation at precisely the point where the New Testament presses them together. Because of this black and white Christians coming to the Lord's Table in the same congregation are not participating in a temporary or superficial association, they belong to one another in Christ. They pray to the same Father, are indwelt by the same Spirit, confess the same gospel, and await the same inheritance. To retreat from that reality into racial separation, whether defended in the language of prudence, order, or "nature," is to move against the direction of the New Testament itself. Christ does not gather his people around "blood and soil," but around Himself.

Conclusion of the New Testament Examination of Kinist/Race Realism Position and Final Testimony

Kinism is a tragic example of doing theology backwards—starting with racial prejudice and then twisting Scripture to fit it. The Reformed faith, committed to Scripture alone, rejoices in the gospel's power to unite what sin and prejudice divide. May we let the Word speak plainly and submit our hearts fully to its teaching.

⁶⁸ Matthew Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*, comment on Matthew 12:46–50.

⁶⁹ Porphyry, fragment preserved in Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 1.9.

⁷⁰ D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *God's Way of Reconciliation: An Exposition of Ephesians 2* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1972)