

RELIGION
and the
RACIAL
CONTROVERSY

by

H.B. ISHERWOOD



RELIGION AND THE RACIAL CONTROVERSY

THE FALSE PROPAGANDA OF THE CHURCH

by H.B. Isherwood

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| The False Propaganda of the Church | 3 |
| The Myth of Racial Equality | 4 |
| Races Not All of One Blood | 5 |
| Racial Integrity and National Unity | 7 |
| Marriages between Races Forbidden by God | 8 |
| God Approves Repatriation | 9 |
| The Old Testament and Apartheid | 9 |
| Separate Racial Development and Progress | 10 |
| The United Kingdom and Multiracialism | 12 |

First Impression 1970

Printed and Published by The Racial Preservation Society,
Chapel Ascote, Ladbroke, Southam, Warwickshire

“ In the world and according to the flesh,
there is a great difference and inequality of
persons; and the same must be diligently
observed. ”

**A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the
Galatians. Martin Luther (1520)**

“ After this I beheld, and, lo, a great mul-
titude, which no man could number, of all
nations, and kindreds, and people, and
tongues, stood before the Lamb, clothed
with white robes, and palms in their hands. ”
Revelation 7:9

RELIGION and the RACIAL CONTROVERSY

THE FALSE PROPAGANDA OF THE CHURCH

It must be distressing to many of those brought up as heirs to the Christian tradition, whether Catholic or Protestant, to see the disturbing influence of the partisanship displayed by the hierarchy of the national Church of England and other Christian denominations in connexion with racial problems arising when fundamentally different kinds of people migrate indiscriminately from one nation to another, and the question is now being asked whether institutional religion can usefully make any constructive contribution to a matter more essentially secular than spiritual in character.

Broadly it may be said that the Church bases its teaching on the premise that all members of the human family, irrespective of the race or nation to which they belong, are born equal or could be made equal under a common culture, and that mixing the races and dissolving the nations have Scriptural approval.

Whether humanity as a whole would benefit from the application of such an egalitarian belief is open to doubt, as will be appreciated by the earnest student who reflects with an open and unprejudiced mind on what is outlined in this essay.

THE MYTH OF RACIAL EQUALITY

In the world of reality men are not born equal, nor is each mind at birth an undifferentiated *tabula rasa*, uniform with every other mind, as was once supposed. All human beings are distinguishable by innate diversity. Some are born more sensitive and with brighter minds than others; some are extroverts, others introverts; some by nature are generous, others mean, all such inner qualities predetermining the tone of behaviour in the individual and the character of his race. As a condition imposed by natural law one man differs from another in inherited constitution, disposition and temperament, in reasoning powers, imagination, genius and aptitudes. And all such fundamental differences can be viewed and compared on a racial basis.

Moral equality there could be, but for its validity such a concept does not require any assumption of natural equality. Nor does uniformity of treatment under law confer equality of being.

The human and racial equality as professed by the Church is no more than a device of political expediency invented to enable men of all races to be treated and ruled as pawns of equal value. In the Church this socially disruptive doctrine of egalitarianism, which in its modern Marxist form springs from the insurrectionary impulses that gave rise to the French Revolution and later the Bolshevik Revolution, has now assumed the character of dogma.

The concept of equal opportunity, useful as a formula for freedom implying the moral right to discriminate, has the effect in practice of proving that one man is superior to another. This also has racial significance.

Under the natural order of Creation human qualities and potentialities vary considerably from man to man and from race to race, and there is no way of eliminating or altering such intrinsic variety by upbringing or education. It will thus be realized that the teaching of equality between persons and between races unrelated to reality inevitably tends to inculcate envy, discontent and rebelliousness. Frustration results in loss of respect for traditional values, tried conventions and authority. Were the emphasis placed on quality rather than equality how much more civilised humanity would become.

The Church rarely if ever preaches the need for racial or national self-respect or the patriotism that stands on loyalty to one's own family and kinsmen under natural and divine law. On the contrary, the Church, as only too plainly revealed by the utterances of bishops of the Church of England acting in their temporal capacity in the House of Lords, has shown a pronounced bias towards communal licence and latitude.

"We are all children of God, all created after His image, and are therefore all alike and equal" is perhaps the most common of the fallacies now bedevilling the thinking of the Church when for purposes more political than religious the claim is made that men of all races are born equal and that inherited racial differences do not exist except in prejudiced minds. How successful the Church has been in propagating this Communist concept may be illustrated by quoting a letter from Malcom Muggeridge, published without rebuttal in *The Times* of July 19, 1970, in which this well-known publicist states in connexion with immigration and racial integration: "As children of God, one human family, there cannot be any intrinsic difference between man and man. To suppose otherwise is the vilest blasphemy."

Not all theologians, however, have been ready to endorse a theory which offends commonsense and which is at variance with the truths of nature as revealed by science. For instance, Ralph Inge, who was for a time professor of divinity at Cambridge and who later became famous as Dean of

St. Pauls, observed: "The ridiculous dogma that men are born equal is dead if not buried." And in explaining what is meant by Divine Judgement did not a former Archbishop of Canterbury assert: "In the sight of God all men are not equal"? And it may be interesting to recall that the orthodox Christian and devout scholar, Dr. Samuel Johnson, shrewdly remarked: "...mankind are happier in a state of inequality and subordination. Were they to be in this pretty state of equality, they would degenerate into brutes — their tails would grow." The learned Doctor was of course inveighing against the false revolutionary doctrine of human equality which was gaining currency in his day and which has now become an integral part of Church and Marxist teaching.

RACES NOT ALL OF ONE BLOOD

One "heavenly" father of all there may be, as written in *Malachi 11:10*, but not one "earthly" father. All interbreeding humanity could not have descended from one pair of parents — an incestuous notion. On this the Church still seems to attach too much literal credence to Biblical imagery.

Many of the Church hierarchy like to believe that the "solidarity of mankind" or the "essential unity of humanity" or the "universal brotherhood of man", not to mention "human dignity", "mutual esteem" and "brotherly love", must necessarily stand on the postulate of some kind of inborn equality or natural uniformity as imposed by the "blood relationship" of a common descent. In reality there is no such universal consanguinity. Nor can sanction for such an idea be found in the Bible.

The first part only of *Acts 17:26*, "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth", is quoted *ad nauseam* by oecumenical clerics, interpreting the metaphor "blood" too literally, as authority for their assumption of an indwelling equality between the races. What is clearly meant, of course, is that mankind as a whole could be regarded as belonging to a single distinctive species. The various races into which God has divergently divided mankind, however, can be identified and assessed separately on the basis of their respective genes, the organic units of heredity determining breed and brain, the seat of all the disparate subtleties of native intelligence. And a knowledge of differences in blood is indispensable in medical practice, as clerics should know who have had blood transfusions. Colour of skin is a genetic inheritance, but it is by no means the most important racial feature, although made to appear so by Churchmen and politicians. By far and away the most important racial traits are the inborn factors reflecting psychological differences, including intellectual capabilities. As reported in *The Times* of September 18, 1970, "our genes establish our character as well as our mental standards and our physical

characteristics". Such a conclusion, now accepted by most scientists of repute, is completely rejected by the Church, except Calvinism, since it is suspected that such "determinism" may invalidate concepts of free-will and moral responsibility. Such is not the case, however.

Degrees of intelligence depend more on genes than on environment. From the environment new knowledge may be gained with perhaps more understanding, and new habits may be formed out of instincts, but such acquisitions, though to a certain extent modifying character and personality during one lifetime, cannot permanently change the genetic structure in the way Lamarckian scientists once thought possible and which is still part of Church and Communist ideology. "Like father, like son", it is often said, but, contrary to Church (and Communist) belief, nothing acquired by education or exercise in one generation is ever passed down in the flesh to the next generation.

The second part of *Acts 17:26*, "...and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation", is not so frequently mentioned by those who seek to dissolve the human racial divisions (as is being attempted in Communist Russia, and now also in America and Great Britain) since in this we have evidence of the divine will that the races should be kept apart in their own lands.

According to their natural inclinations and social needs "...every nation made gods of their own", as we read in *11 Kings 17:29*, or as put by the scientific historian, Professor C.D. Darlington of Oxford, "Each religion had its own racial origin. Nowhere better than in the divergent expressions of a common religion do we see the divergent expressions of different races." St. Paul was well aware of the intrinsic variations within the body of mankind as exhibited in diverse national cultures and religions, for in *1 Corinthians 12* reference is made to "diversities of gifts....differences of administration.... diversities of operations....for the body (of mankind) is not one, but many." And the inclusion of the two sexes in *Galatians 3:28* amply proves that St. Paul did not have in mind any physical (biological) equivalence in human relationships. In his commentary on St. Paul's *Epistle to the Galatians* Martin Luther had this to say: "In the world and according to the flesh, there is a great difference and inequality of persons; and the same must be diligently observed." As between persons, so between peoples, natural racial distinctions must be heeded if mutual understanding with tolerance is to be achieved.

As St. Paul pointed out in *1 Corinthians 15:44*, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." In racial matters we are largely concerned with the "natural body" and the human fitness to survive progressively on earth. St. Paul was a missionary divinely inspired, not a Socialist politician as are some bishops today, and the essence of his teaching

is that all mankind, without altering race or nationality, social status or sex, could merit spiritual salvation by following Christ's example and teaching.

That some nations and races are elected by God to be different from others seems obvious from *1 Peter 2:9*, "But ye are a chosen generation (race)...a peculiar people....that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."

RACIAL INTEGRITY AND NATIONAL UNITY

In ancient Biblical times nations and tribes of races of different kinds of people, racially conscious from the very beginning of their existence, struggled for supremacy in the same territories (as indeed they are doing today), and many passages in the Old Testament give warning of the dangers of communal discord and strife inherent in what is now called racial integration or race mixing in multiracial communities.

God, not man, fashioned the pattern of the races and placed them "in their lands; every one after his tongue, and after their families, in their own nations", as we read in *Genesis 10:5*. Further confirmation of the Almighty's intention to establish the nations on the natural foundation of their creation is to be found in *Genesis 10:32*, "...and by these were the nations divided in the earth....", again emphasized in *Deuteronomy 32:8*, "When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people...."

That God furthermore decreed that one race shall be placed before another is unequivocally confirmed in *Deuteronomy 7:6*, "...the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth." Again in *Numbers 14:12* it is written that God "...will make thee a greater and mightier nation than they." From this we are bound to accept that in their God-given natural endowments, their reasoning faculties, their instinctive aspirations and all that goes into the building of character, some races and subraces are more favoured than others, which inescapably brings us to the conclusion that some races must be superior to others, the truth of which is endorsed by science, however displeasing this may be to certain ecclesiastics and subversive politicians.

Under the Almighty's design and dispensation, purposive as those who believe in the Deity must suppose, each race was created with its own peculiar capacity for development, a fact of nature scientifically demonstrable and proven by racial histories, so it is unreasonable to expect all races to reach the same heights of civilisation or indeed to survive at all. Neither education, speaking the same language, nor living in a common environment with a common faith can ever bridge the "differential" gap so deeply engraved by

the hand of God.

Any synthetic levelling process of racial intermixing, whether this involves interbreeding or not, which breaks down a nation's natural cohesion cannot possibly succeed in lifting up the whole of humanity to a higher uniform level. Without the ties and restraints of family life and kinship with racial affinity national societies become unstable, as we know from Biblical history. Such societies are invariably disfigured by shoddy habits and moral laxity. Already racial promiscuousness is becoming as rife as sexual promiscuousness.

It should not be concluded from this, however, that the superior races have no moral obligation to help the more backward races if these races are in need of help.

MARRIAGES BETWEEN RACES FORBIDDEN BY GOD

In *Deuteronomy 7:3*, under the heading of "Communion with the nations forbidden", appears the stern injunction against marriages between members of different races: "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter shalt thou not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son." This divine command is made doubly clear in *Ezra 9:12*: "Now therefore give not your daughters unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons, nor seek their peace or their wealth for ever: that ye may be strong, and eat the good of the land, and leave it for an inheritance to your children for ever." Such an insistence on racial purity and integrity is again stressed in *Ezra 10:11*, "Now therefore make confession unto the Lord God of your fathers, and do his pleasure and separate yourselves from the people of the land and from the strange wives." And no one can misunderstand what is meant by the Almighty's order in *Leviticus 19:19*, "Ye shall keep my statutes. Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind; thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seed; neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee."

We know from *Numbers 12* what acute distress Moses caused his own people when he married a black woman not of his race.

The Hittites were not of the Jewish race or faith and great grief was brought to Isaac and Rebekah when their son, Esau, married two foreign Hittite women, as described in *Genesis 26:34:35*.

Similar anguish is being suffered today by parents when their children, against wise advice, marry into another race, a procedure the Church specifically blesses even though it is contrary to Biblical law and can be seen to be disruptive of family life and social harmony — and national unity.

Authorities have suggested that the offspring of Esau and his alien Hittite wives were the ancestors of the racially mixed Edomite people, later

identified as Idumeans, who were such a thorn in the side of the Jews for hundreds of years, indeed, right down to the coming of the Christ when they disappeared from the pages of history. The lesson to be learnt from this needs no elaborating: It is not meet for the races as evolved by God to interbreed.

Let us pray while there is yet time that America and Great Britain, both now standing in imminent peril, take heed of this clear Scriptural warning of the dangers ever present to a nation in multiracialism in which germinate the seeds of dissension, degeneracy and decay.

REPATRIATION APPROVED BY GOD

Although cultural contributions may have come in from outside all civilizations practically without exception have been built on the social stability afforded by racial homogeneity. This is how the nations, as cognate gregarious entities, have emerged under the beneficent care of the Almighty. Cultures reflecting the quality of the people vary between nations thus racially formed, and varying correspondingly are religions reflecting spiritual sensibility.

It is clearly not in accordance with Scriptural advice for national populations, sharing a common evolution and with the same ancestral history from which has come their corporate sense of nationhood, to destroy their organic unity by bringing within their fold incompatible racial elements and trying to absorb them.

With divine blessing we are expected as patriots to value our own birth-right and heritage and be loyal to our own families, our kinsmen, our race and nation.

In *Isaiah 13:14* we read: "And it shall be as the chased roe, and the sheep that no man taketh up; they shall every man turn to his own people, and flee everyone into his own land." In this the nations have divine sanction for the repatriation of unassimilable people of alien races to the more racially congenial society of their national homelands.

THE BIBLE OF THE JEWS APPROVES APARTHEID

The Old Testament is the Bible of the Jews, the backbone of whose nationalist faith in Jehovah is essentially apartheid. One can only marvel at the way the Jews, ever intensely racially conscious, have untiringly persisted at the cost of much suffering in preserving themselves as a "nation within a nation" down through the ages as a racial and religious entity. So should it be with other nations if they value God's Providence and have pride in themselves and their forbears and are dutifully concerned to see that their children

have a worthwhile future on earth amongst their own kind.

It is often said that a Jew is only a Jew by virtue of his religion and that Jews are no more than a socio-religious group. This is entirely erroneous. Benjamin Disraeli, for example, was a Jew by race, of the Sephardim, a fact of which he was supremely proud, but he was a Christian by faith and an Imperialist. Karl Marx was a Jew by race, of the Ashkenazim, but he was baptised a Christian, though later in life he became an Atheist.

Obedying the Lord and resolutely refusing to be assimilated and absorbed by another race of people, which they were inspired to see would lead to their extinction as a special race, the Hebrews under Moses took their people out of Egypt. For precisely the same reason a similar Exodus is now being attempted from Socialist Soviet Russia and the adjoining Communist lands.

In passing it may be said that the Jews, mostly of the Ashkenazim, now invading the Holy Land and the lands of the Arabs in the Middle East are heavily charged with the genes of non-Semitic Mongoloid (Khazar) ancestry. Many of them are not Judaists at all, a fact deplored by the rabbinate, but atheists or rationalists who belong to the same racial group that did so much to bring about the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.

APARTHEID OR SEPARATE RACIAL DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRESS

The independent Negro (Bantu and other) nations in Africa, now under "one man, one vote, one party" despotic regimes, are determined by a process of what is called Africanization to retain their racial identities, but for some reason the Church has raised no objection to such apartheid practices, even though these highly race-conscious nations are now tending to renounce Christianity, which they feel is a cult more suited to European than African races. Many Negro politicians, indeed, are coming to believe that Christianity is little more than an instrument of imperial colonialism.

We have seen how certain God-fearing Christian elements in the Congo, in Nigeria and in Zambia have been murderously suppressed, how the Moslem Arabs in Zanzibar were massacred, how Indians (Hindus and Sikhs) and Pakistanis (Moslems) were being thrown out of Kenya (a nation now famous in history as the scene of the Mau Mau terrorist atrocities) and Uganda. But such racial political operations have evoked little criticism by Churchmen, who seem to be purblind to their real significance.

Recognising the need to protect for posterity the qualities and traditional cultures of the different races and subraces in their domains,

which include South West Africa, the Republic of South Africa are setting aside vast territories for the exclusive habitation and the use of the Bantu and other distinct peoples to enable them to realize their true natures.

An enlightened procedure of a somewhat similar kind is also being applied in the Republic of Rhodesia. Because of this these great independent nations, the only remaining trustworthy Christian bulwarks in the whole of Africa against the pressures and demoralizing tactics of Communism and Paganism, are being mercilessly attacked by the Church. Even Portugal, a nation under Roman Catholic dispensation, has not escaped the odium of the Church, despite the fact that in her African provinces racial distinctions are not officially recognised and miscegenation (racial interbreeding) is not discouraged – as it ought to be according to the Bible.

As long ago as 1964 the British Council of Churches declared its readiness to support, with the Communists, a warlike blockade of South Africa to force the government there to change its constitution. Later this body saw fit to inform all Christians who contemplated migrating to South Africa that if they accepted the social conditions prevailing there they would be committing a “blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.”

In spite of the awful spectacle of the Congo before their eyes, the World Conference on Church and Society recommended (in Geneva, 1966) that the constitutional issue of Rhodesia be handed over to the United Nations who would be required to use mercenary troops to compel the Rhodesians to submit to pagan alien rule. And what is one to think of the political prejudices of the Most Reverend Archbishop Lord Fisher of Lambeth who in December 1965 expressed the theocratic view that the “only responsible bodies able to speak for all Rhodesians” on political issues were the Churches, not the legally-elected representatives of the people? This former Archbishop of Canterbury later suggested that “Smith, the Prime Minister (of Rhodesia), could have done one of two honourable things – he could have resigned or he could have led Rhodesia to secede from the Commonwealth.” Because Ian Smith did neither of these things Lord Fisher, speaking for the Church, vilified him as “dishonourable” and “stupid”, saying that “Smith is not the first fanatic to let what he supposed was his honesty lead him into disastrous moral conflicts.”

Gratifying no doubt to the Church, as it was to Communism, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Harold Wilson, who is Vice President of the Socialist International, but not of course Prime Minister of Rhodesia, without consulting either the British people or their Queen, had Rhodesia, self-governing since 1923, handed over to the United Nations, an amoral and irreligious body hostile to British interests, to sanction a mandatory international blockade to force the Rhodesians to overthrow their government by unconstitutional means.

In the event, as history records, Ian Smith, by the grace of God and with the support of Rhodesians of all races, stood firm, and saved his nation from barbarism.

In September, 1970, the World Council of Churches unanimously voted a grant of two hundred thousand dollars to Negro terrorists (called guerillas or freedom fighters) to enable them to buy arms to destroy by assassination the constitutional governments of South Africa, Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola and Guinea. This outrageous proposal apparently met with the approval of the British Council of Churches, one of whose spokesmen had the wicked effrontery to state (September 1970) that the "organisations practising terror are the white authorities."

A Socialist prelate, the Bishop of Southwark, has said "apartheid is inherently evil an affront to the basic dignity of man." Thus does a man of the cloth repudiate the decrees of the Almighty as set forth in Holy Writ. Even the pulpit of St. Pauls has been desecrated by Communist-aligned spokesmen, sponsored by the Church, who advocate the use of violence to bring about world racial assimilation contrary to God's revealed will. As a demonstration of their dislike of the way South Africa was being governed, Church dignitaries, including bishops, even went to the absurd lengths of placing themselves at the head of irresponsible street mobs to deter English people from watching South Africans play cricket.

In realistic opposition to this agitation the Bishop of Exeter declared in November 1969 that the African republics "must be allowed to develop along their own lines according to their own racial characteristics", which is the policy of the South African and Rhodesian Governments.

Perhaps the most notorious and relentless Church critic of the South African policy of establishing separate nations of different races to give them scope to evolve along civilized lines of ethnic self-determination on a natural footing (as approved by the League of Nations and the United Nations – and the Bible) is a Socialist, the Rev. Trevor Huddleston, now Bishop of Stepney, but according to an interview published in *The Times* of April 29, 1970, he may be changing his mind, for he was moved to say about Indian, Pakistani and Negro groups of settlers in England; "Immigrant communities do need the opportunities of finding their own culture and being able to discover themselves", which in principle accords with what the South African and Rhodesian authorities are trying in a practical way to make possible.

THE UNITED KINGDOM AND MULTIRACIALISM

With the tacit blessing of the Oecumenical Church there has been an unwelcome wave of immigration into Great Britain over the past twenty

years of the overspill and unwanted populations of independent nations of non-British coloured races. No similar influx of such completely alien people into the British Isles from lands outside Europe has occurred before. Nor has immigration on such a vast scale been necessary or justified, seeing that Great Britain is already dangerously overpopulated with hundreds of thousands of her own people unable to find regular employment, many even without homes.

“Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy”, as we read in *Isaiah 9:3*, and much distress has needlessly been caused to Britons, the English, Scots, Welsh and Irish, whose instincts and reason are telling them that their future as a nation united by a common ancestry and history has been compromised.

Innocently using the argument often advanced in defence of slavery in the Americas, the Socialist politicians of the Church, more prejudiced than informed, like to claim that the indigenous British people themselves have materially benefited by the use of immigrant labour. It can be shown, however, that on balance such an economic argument is without much foundation. Up to twenty years ago few, if any, coloured people were employed in hospitals or on transport. Nor would these services break down if coloured staff were not employed now. It is true, of course, that the immigrants themselves have profited by the social imbalance, but at the expense of the native British people.

In the spiritual field, it is doubtful whether in the long run British society, founded on Christian traditions with a Christian constitution (see the Book of Common Prayer), will derive any benefit from the massive intrusion into their midst of alien cults such as Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Sikhism, Judaism and Freethinkers, all antipathetic to Christianity.

Once upon a time there was a British Empire within which all races could perhaps in the end have been entitled to regard themselves as Imperial subjects and citizens with the constitutional right to move freely and settle down anywhere in Imperial territories. But mainly at the instance of the coloured non-British nations the Empire no longer exists. In its place is a hotchpotch commonwealth of independent nations all racially conscious, mostly without allegiance to the British Crown and often antagonistic to Great Britain. The United Kingdom, however, is still the focal point of this unstable and disintegrating multiracial structure, but in no way does this require Great Britain herself to become a nondescript multiracial community of people with irreconcilably divided natures, religions and loyalties.

As a result of the ill-conceived *British Nationality Act (1948)* Great Britain, in a “moment of national aberration”, has saddled herself with a problem which America is finding insoluble, even though legislation has been enacted outlawing freedom of social selection (the basic right to pick and

enjoy one's own company) and racial segregation. The *Civil Rights Acts* in America, under which the teaching of Christian morals in state-aided schools is forbidden, have already had the effect of engendering "permissiveness" and exacerbating racial tensions. Similar measures, the *Race Relations Acts*, outlawing the traditional right to discriminate, are doing little to promote racial harmony in the United Kingdom where the various racial groups cannot by their very God-given natures, diverse in breed and creed, ever be welded together or integrated to "combine into a single congruous whole."

Under these Acts "race relations" has developed into a monstrous parasitical industry and tax-wasting bureaucracies have proliferated. One of them, the Community Relations Commission, with a title presumably designed to mislead, had for its first chairman the Archbishop of Canterbury. Later his place was taken by a superannuated Socialist trade union agitator, assisted by numerous coloured aliens. Another racist organization is the Race Relations Board, equally multiracial, whose chairman, copying the sneak or police informer procedure of a Communist state, publicly invited immigrants, as a way of inciting racial feelings, to complain if they felt they were not being accorded the hospitality they were led to expect from their reluctant British hosts. This Board even went to the extreme lengths of trying to prevent the truth about the science of race being propagated, again imitating the Communist technique. Fortunately an impartial judgement on this at the Lewes Assizes of March, 1968, went decisively against the Board and their Socialist and cosmopolitan overlords.

In their effect the *Race Relations Acts*, which forbid any open recognition in practice of racial distinctions, gravely hampering criminal detection, even making it unlawful for an Englishman to show preference for Englishmen in England or patriotically to proclaim in public that he is proud of his great race, can be seen to be subversive of good social order. Yet this discriminatory legislation, in implementation often resulting in absurdities, which has brought so much discredit to English jurisprudence, meets with the unqualified approbation of the Church of England. In his support of it, the Bishop of Chichester, speaking in the House of Lords in June 1967, denounced any rational opposition to it as "this evil thing in our midst."

By denying there is any value in the morale associated with national integrity founded by God on the brotherhood of racial kinship, the leaders of the Church in Great Britain are placing themselves in the ranks of the renegades condemned in *Micah 7:6*, where it is written "a man's enemies are the men of his own house (nation or race)."

Apparently imagining that to be uniform in language and education is to be united in kind and that to be racially conscious is to be racially prejudiced, the Church reveals its failure to understand the true significance

of the racial ferment in the world.

Religion without realism is no more than superstition, but in pursuance of a narrow and outmoded ideology, sanctioned neither by the sciences nor by the Scriptures, the Church seems to be incapable of making itself aware of the reason for its loss of influence and the cause of its decline.

Their heritage and birthright now being thrown away, the people of British stock who made Britain a great nation and established a great empire are now being admonished by Church and State to resign themselves to becoming a nation no longer British but multiracial, a nation without a soul, a self-destructive cosmopolitan fraternity of mixed races and mixed religions, disunited and bereft of any disciplined sense of destiny, a people fully meriting the condemnation in *Deuteronomy 32:28*, "For they are a nation void of counsel, neither is there any understanding in them."

Race mixing against God's will is the surest way of destroying a nation.

“ Great empires may fall as victims to circumstances beyond their control – forced out of the arena of history by the superior might of external enemies or the inexorable pressures in the evolution of human civilization. Nations do not decay that way: they decline through inner corrosion – through a surrender of the energy or will to live. Empires, like families, may be disrupted by the intrusion of others: nations, like individuals, fade away because of enemies within. ”

Dr. Immanuel Jakobovits, the Chief Rabbi, in *The Times* of January 16, 1970

**Printed and Published by The Racial Preservation Society,
Chapel Ascote, Ladbroke, Southam, Warwickshire**