

IT IS BIBLICAL TO BE CAUCASIAN, Song. chs. 4-7, (#3):

Clifton A. Emahiser's Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Website: emahiser.christogenea.org

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

With the first two installments of this theme we covered many of the benefits of being a pure Caucasian. We find ourselves in a delicate balance with our solar system and environment in many ways, especially our light spectrum, which works with our translucent skin to absorb vitamin D. We should therefore avoid over-covering ourselves with clothing, or applying excessive sun block to frustrate this natural benefit of which nonwhites are greatly deficient.

We now turn to a discussion on Acts 17:26, and how it is misused and abused by nominal churchianity! Unless one has an astonishingly low IQ, or lack the proverbial "eye to see", then one should comprehend that the entire Bible concerns one man and his family in the person of Abraham, from whom sprang Isaac, Jacob and the twelve tribes of Israel. From cover to cover, they are the dominant theme that one should not confuse. Yet, in spite of this fact, some make the spurious claim that all races have an equal standing with the people whom Yahweh chose and made exclusive Covenants with. These Scripture-twisting clowns will teach Acts 17:26 completely out-of-context in order to accomplish their evil, cunning subterfuge thusly:

"And [Yahweh] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation ..."

This begs the question, if all men are equal: Why in hell have boundaries! However, when these spurious teachers write books and advocate "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man" concept, one can identify them as promoting Satan's agenda, and an exceedingly damnable doctrine at that! One such writer commented thusly:

"The Bible does not even use the word 'race' in reference to people, but does describe all human beings as being of 'one blood' (Acts 17:26). This, of course, emphasizes that we are all related." (Ham, Wieland Batten, *One Blood*, Master Books, 1999, p. 53.)

When Paul addressed the men of Athens, he left no such impression! Are we to believe that Paul meant Mexicans, Chinese, Negroes, Arabs, Pygmies, and Tasmanians along with Israelites & Greeks as having "one blood", and all being blood relatives?

To write a book entitled *One Blood*, using Acts 17:26 as its biblical support. is risky to say the least, for one must twist Luke's Greek entirely out-of-context! William Finck in his *Christogenea New Testament* has this on Acts 17:26:

“And He made from one every nation of men to dwell upon all the face of the earth, appointing the times ordained and boundaries of their settlements.” (Paul cited Deut. 32:8.) It is clear, in the Greek, “one *blood*” isn't there! We will now analyze why this premise is highly flawed, and it is grossly ignorant to believe all races are of the same blood:

From the *World Book Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, pp. 327-328 we read under the subtitle:

“Blood Groups: Human blood can be divided into groups based on the presence or absence of certain substances, called *agglutinogens*, in the red blood cells. When the blood of one group is mixed with blood of another group, the red cells may *agglutinate* (clump together). Proteins in blood plasma, called *agglutinins*, cause the cells to clump. An agglutinin acts only on a specific agglutinogen. Naturally, no person's plasma contains the agglutinins for agglutinogens in his own red blood cells.

“Blood groups play an important part in blood transfusions. If a person of one blood type gives blood to a person of another type, the donor's blood cells may clump in the patient's blood stream. This clumping could cause death or severe illness, because the small blood vessels become blocked. There are several kinds of agglutinogens. The most important are the A-B factors and the Rh factor.

“The A-B Factors. In 1900, Karl Landsteiner, an Austrian-American physiologist, discovered the first known blood types. They were based on the presence or absence of two factors in the red cells. These factors, which are agglutinogens, were called **A** and **B**. Later scientists found four different kinds of red blood cells. They are: **(1)** those that contain only factor **A**, called *type A*; **(2)** those that contain only factor **B**, called *type B*; **(3)** those that contain both factor **A** and factor **B**, called *type AB*; and **(4)** those that contain neither factor **A** nor factor **B**, called *type O*.

“The agglutinin that causes blood containing factor **A** to clump is called *anti-A*. It is present in blood that does not contain factor **A**. The agglutinin of factor **B**, called *anti-B*, is present in blood that does not contain factor **B**. Type **O** blood, which contains neither factor, has both agglutinins. Type **AB** blood, which has both factors, contains no agglutinins.

“Type **O** blood cells do not clump with any plasma, so type **O** blood is sometimes called the *universal donor*. **AB** plasma does not cause any kind of blood cell to clot, and this type of blood is sometimes called the *universal recipient*. But serious reactions may occur even if the donor belongs to group **O** or if the patient is in group **AB**. The donor should have the same blood type as the patient

“The Rh Factor was discovered in 1940 by Landsteiner and Alexander S. Wiener, an American scientist. This factor is a substance found in the red blood cells of most people. These people are *Rh positive*. However, about 15 per cent of all white people are *Rh negative* (do not have the **Rh** factor). Among Orientals and people of African origin, less than 15 per cent are **Rh** negative. The **Rh** factor may cause serious reactions or even death during blood transfusions and births”

From the 1980 *Collier's Encyclopedia*, vol. 3, pp. 268-269, under the subtitle "The ABO System we read:

"... **Rh.**: Another important and complex blood group system is the **Rh** system. This system derives its name from the rhesus monkey, *Macacus rhesus*, used in a series of experiments described by Landsteiner and A.S. Wiener in 1940. It was found that a rabbit injected with the red cells of the monkey produced antibodies that would agglutinate certain human blood, regardless of **ABO** type. This blood group came to be called **Rh-positive**.

"The genes determining **Rh** occur on three closely associated chromosomal loci, designated **C** or **c**, **D** or **d**, and **E** or **e**. Thus there is potentially a wide range of genotypes involving combinations of these (**CCDDEE**, **CcDDee**, **ccDDEe**, etc.). In practice, however, as a consequence of the blood typing methods in common use, the term Rhesus positive is applied to individuals who are **D** (genetically **DD** or **Dd**), and Rhesus negative to those who are **d** (genetically **dd**). Most non-Europeans are **Rh-positive**, the percentage of **Rh-negative** dropping to zero in Oceania and among the Australian aborigines. Asians and American Indians are mainly **cDE** and **Cde**, African and American Negroes **cDe**. Among Europeans and white Americans **CDe** is the dominant type, and about 15 percent are **Rh-negative**. The Basques of northern Spain show an unusually high incidence of 29 percent. The Rhesus system is of some importance, because in certain situations **Rh-negative** individuals may develop antibodies against transfused **Rh-positive** red cells. Thus, another **Rh-positive** transfusion at a later time may result in dangerous hemolysis (destruction) of the transfused red cells.

"**Erythroblastosis Fetalis.** Of great significance is the fact that an **Rh-negative** mother carrying an **Rh-positive** child may develop **Rh** antibodies against the blood of the fetus. This is possible since fetal red blood cells frequently enter the mother's blood, so that, in effect, the mother is transfused with her infant's blood. In about 10 percent of such pregnancies, the mother becomes 'immunized' and produces anti-**Rh** antibodies through the placenta. In these cases the maternal antibodies cross back through the placenta into the fetus and cause erythroblastosis fetalis, or hemolytic disease of the newborn.

"The specific action of the antibodies in this condition is to coat the fetal red cells, rendering them more susceptible to breakdown by the spleen. The resulting hemolysis may vary from mild to very severe, the most severe cases occurring when the concentration of antibody is highest. Thus, one feature of erythroblastosis is anemia, which jeopardizes the newborn, or may even cause intrauterine death of the fetus. Another characteristic of the condition is jaundice, resulting from the large amounts of the pigment bilirubin that develop when excessive quantities of hemoglobin are freed by the hemolysis. Bilirubin may cause irreversible damage in the central nervous system.

"Until recently, the only treatment for babies born with **Rh** blood disease was an exchange transfusion in which most of the baby's blood was replaced with **Rh-positive** blood. In 1967, however, scientists succeeded in developing a vaccine, called **RhoGAM**. The vaccine, when given to an **Rh-negative** woman within 72 hours after delivery, prevents the mother from producing antibodies to **Rh-positive** blood. Thus, in

the next pregnancy the antibodies will not be present in the mother's blood and the disease will not occur in the infant.

“Other Blood Group Systems. The **MN** system is inherited on two genes. There are three genetic types, **MM**, **MN**, and **NN**, which are expressed as the three blood types **M**, **MN**, and **N**. Closely associated with **MN** is the **Ss** system. There is also a **P** system. On rare occasions incompatibilities of these groups may cause difficulties in matching blood for transfusion, or result in transfusion reactions. Other blood group antigens, named after the subjects in whom they were found and first described, include Kell, Duffy, Kidd, Lewis, and Lutheran. The first three may, rarely, cause transfusion reactions and hemolytic disease, and the last two are relatively innocent group antigens. There are a number of other minor groups that are of genetic importance. One of these is Diego, which is virtually never found in Europeans or West Africans but occurs in small numbers of individuals of Mongolian origin with the exception of Eskimos.

“Among the most recently discovered blood group systems is the **Xg** system, which is of particular interest because the gene that determines its presence is found on the **X** chromosome. This is the first example of a sex-linked blood group, and its value in mapping the sex chromosome is presently under study.”

Special notice should be taken here: If somehow a mistake in matching blood-types from one person to another occurs when giving a blood transfusion, it can cause serious complications, even death! However, if all men have “one blood”, as some so loudly proclaim, anyone could donate blood to any other one, regardless of their genetic origin! *[pile it higher and higher]*

Those in the know are aware that blood is classified into four types: **A**, **B**, **AB**, and **O**. Each blood type is also sorted by an **Rh** factor - either positive (**+**) or negative (**-**), which result in eight variant blood types. Each blood type is created by a particular gene. The blood types are so particularly dissimilar that if one type of blood is transfused into a person with a diverse type, it can bring about death.

Also well known is the fact that blood contains different alleles, or surrogate genes at certain sites on the chromosomes which contain specific detailed inheritable properties. Here are some particulars about the genetic difference in blood among various races:

Blood Type Data From Several Sources:

“The percentage of the population of the several races having certain blood groups vary enough so that the race of a population, if not of a particular individual, can often be identified based on blood analysis. Further, a person's blood can often eliminate him as a member of a particular race.

“The Diego (**Di^a**) blood antigen is absent in Aryans and Negroes, but high in Turanians (Orientals). The Kell (**K**) antigen is common in Aryans, but is rare in Negroes and Turanians. The Sutter (**Js^a**) antigen occurs only in Negroes ... Blood group **A1,2** is found in Negroes, but is seldom found in Aryans or Turanians. Contrary to popular myths, the races do not share a common blood.” (Thomas C. Allen, *Species of Men*, TC Allen Co., 1999, p. 24-26.)

“The Lewis (*Le*) allele (i.e., either of a pair of genes located at the same position on both members of a pair of chromosomes and conveying characters that are inherited alternatively in accordance with Mendelian law) is found in most races but is absent from the blood of Australian aborigines. The **FY-0** allele is found in most Negroes, but is not in Asians or Australians. The *r* blood allele is common in Europeans, but does not exist in Australians, Polynesians, or American Indians. Almost 90% of Bushman have the **cDe** allele but it is near zero in other races (C. Weisman, *Anthology of Racial Issues*, 1997, pp. 84-85.) The Duffy null allele, which confers resistance to malaria, is found in 100% of African Negroes and 0% in other races (*Ethnic Variation as a Key to the Biology of Human Disease*, *Annals of Internal Medicine*, Sept. 1, 1997. 127:401-403.) This source also states that the **ALDH2*2** allele is frequent in Asians, but 0% in Africans and Europeans. The blood gene for sickle cell anemia is found mainly in Negroes.

“A study of an enzyme haplotype in the blood showed ‘Africans have predominately a different haplotype not found in other populations’ (*The Mankind Quarterly*, ‘Tracing the Genetic History of Modern Man,’ Vol. xxxv, No. 1, Fall/Winter, 1994, p. 80.) ‘On a genetic and biological level, blood varies considerably, and is a distinctive characteristic which can set the races apart.’

“A person’s blood group is one of his physical characteristics, just as dark skin may be, or blue eyes or a hooked nose. Like other physical characteristics, blood groups can be used to divide mankind into races’.” (William C. Boyd & Isaac Asimov, *Races and People*, Abelard-Schuman, New York, 1955, p. 145.)

It should be starting to be very clear that all blood is not the same interracially, or among members within one’s own race. Therefore the expression “one blood” cannot possibly be defined to mean all blood biologically or genetically are the same. This is found to be particularly true in the realm of genetics, which was unknown in ancient Biblical times. When using the term “blood” in our day, we often use it to signify race, as well as heritage, lineage or family relationship. We sometimes speak of royal blood; Indian blood; or mixed blood, among others. However, the Bible never used the term “blood” in that manner! The following is typical of some Bible researchers on the meaning of “blood”:

“The blood contains the vital principal or the essence of animal and human life. (Gen. 9:4: **‘But flesh with life thereof which is the blood thereof, you shall not eat.’**) Because of the sacredness of life, the Israelites were enjoined from eating the blood.” (*The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*)

“Blood by itself serves to denote life passing away in bloodshed, and generally life taken away by force. It was anciently believed that the blood is the seat of the life.” (*Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon*)

The term “blood” in the Bible was generally used to refer to the essence of life. So when we happen on the term “blood” in Scripture, we can comprehend its significance. Up until, and including the crucifixion of Christ, it had reference to sacrifice or atonement. Never in the singular was it used to imply the biological relationship of people. There is no greater blatant error than to insinuate the mistranslated “one blood”

means all races of unrelated people! This should reveal how presumptuously wrong the authors of *One Blood* are!

“The use of the word ‘blood’ to indicate relationship is not even accurate. That usage has its origin in medieval times.” (John R. Baker, *Race*, Oxford University Press, 1974, p. 14.) During that period there was no knowledge of DNA nor genetics, so they applied the term “blood” to express “kind after kind” for relationship and lineage.

To errantly use Acts 17:26 to claim everyone is related or has the same genetic lineage, has been swallowed up by nominal churchianity big time! Faulty is the practice of employing current concepts and definitions to words spoken 2 or 3 thousand years ago, as over time their meanings have drastically changed. Even some of the KJV language is now out of date!

The term “blood” was seldom applied biologically to a family member. Rather the ancients used the phrase “bone and flesh”. This is very significant, as the marrow of the bone is the germinating area for generating new blood as the old red and white blood cells die off. The phrase “bone and flesh” doesn’t nullify the “blood” in the following verses:

Gen 2:23: **“And Adam said, This *is* now bone [+ marrow] of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.”**

Gen 29:14: **“And Laban said to him [*Jacob*], Surely thou art my bone [+ marrow] and my flesh ...”**

Judges 9:2: **“... remember also that I *am* your bone [+ marrow] and your flesh.” [*Abimelech speaking to his relatives.*]**

2 Sam. 5:1; 1 Chr. 11:1: **“Then came all the tribes of Israel to David unto Hebron, and spake, saying, Behold, we *are* thy bone [+ marrow] and thy flesh.”**

2 Sam. 19:12” **“Ye *are* my brethren, ye *are* my bones [+ marrow] and my flesh ...”**

Eph. 5:30: **“For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones [+ marrow].”**

Using modern-day language, these verses might read, “you are of my blood”. However, no such definition existed in ancient times, and using the expression “bone and flesh” really didn’t leave “blood” out of the equation! Had Paul said at Acts 17 that Yahweh *has made all men of one bone and flesh*, Luke, who was writing it all down in Greek would have had a lying pen! The Greek for “one blood” is not there!

We have proven that Acts 17:26 is not speaking about “one blood”. We could agree that all people need “blood” to survive. Rather, one must come Biblically to understand that blood is actually the very essence of life. This essence of life is essential to both man and animals, for blood accomplishes the same thing in both. This blood conveys essential oxygen, nourishment, vitamins, antibodies and electrolytes to cells and tissues and eliminates waste products along with carbon dioxide. All of this we have in common; all races and mammals. Other things we have in common are found in Ecclesiastes 3:18-20, where it reads:

“¹⁸ I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that Elohim might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are

beasts. ¹⁹ For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalls them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all *is* vanity. ²⁰ All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.”

What segregates Adam-man from beast are their separate DNA genetic codes, which controls the essential fatty acids! Otherwise, one could mate with a tree, animal, fish, or reptile of some sort. Throughout all nature, one gets ½ of his DNA from his father and ½ from his mother; “kind after kind”; if not, then a GMO bastard!

Notice especially “... **and the bounds of their habitation**” at Acts 17:26, for boundaries are established for segregation, not integration! Isn't it about time, then, that we “**come out from among them and be separate**”, while there is still time to do so?