

Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America

Edited by

CAROL M. SWAIN

Vanderbilt University

RUSS NIELI

Princeton University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Dan Gayman

Dan Gayman is one of the leading figures in what is variously called the Anglo-Israelite, Christian Identity, or Christian Israelite movement. At the time he was interviewed for this volume, he was pastor of the Church of Israel, a fundamentalist-oriented evangelical group based in Schell City, Missouri. Gayman has developed a reputation among scholars and other knowledgeable observers of white separatist Christian sects for his theological sophistication and his ability to explain the often arcane doctrines of Anglo-Israelitism in a manner comprehensible to outsiders. Originally a high school principal and a member of a schismatic Mormon group, Gayman eventually abandoned the teachings of *The Book of Mormon* to become a full-time advocate for a more fundamentalist style of evangelical Christianity. As he explains in the following interview, his evangelical theology differs from liberal Protestantism in its fundamentalist assertion of Biblical inerrancy, but it differs from most contemporary fundamentalism in the theological importance it places upon ethnicity and in its identification of the ten lost tribes of Israel with the Anglo-Saxons and certain other white European ethnic groups. God, he believes, has singled out the modern Anglo-Saxons and kindred races as a Chosen People who have a special mission to live a life in greater harmony with Biblical teaching. The Anglo-Saxons and other white European ethnic groups, he believes, have displayed historically a superiority over other races in science, technology, philanthropy, and economic organization, but this superiority, he contends, is not the product of their natural endowments, but the result of their greater adherence to Biblical morality and the special graciousness by virtue of which God allows them to meet the demands of Biblical faith. In this interview and elsewhere, Gayman goes out of his way to distance himself from those Christian Identity groups who espouse violence as a means of

The interview of Dan Gayman on May 24, 2000, by Russell K. Niel is printed with kind permission of the interviewee.

ushering in the Divine Kingdom (this may be one reason he disdains the Christian Identity label), and while asserting the special chosenness of the Anglo-Saxon people and other white ethnic groups, he says his group harbors no enmity or ill-will toward members of any nonwhite or non-European groups. Gayman believes strongly, however, that different racial and ethnic groups should maintain separate worship services and should not socialize with each other or intermarry. He thus rejects the human-universalist interpretation of the Gospel and Pauline message, which almost all other evangelical churches espouse. Although he is aware that most evangelical theologians consider his beliefs about Israel's lost ten tribes to be fanciful, if not bizarre, Gayman insists that his reading of scriptural promises and prophecies is textually grounded and sound.

Interview with Dan Gayman

INTERVIEWER: You are pastor of the Church of Israel in Schell City, Missouri, and a leader of what is sometimes called the Christian Israelite movement. Could you explain what the Christian Israelite movement is, and how it differs from more mainline evangelical Christianity?

GAYMAN: Well, first of all, I am not sure just exactly what is meant by the Christian Israelite movement. We do not perceive the Church of Israel as being a movement *per se*. It certainly is not a political movement. It is not really even a religious movement. It is simply a means by which some people are seeking to express their Biblical and spiritual feelings, and I don't know that it really qualifies to be a movement.

INTERVIEWER: Then how would you describe the basic tenets of the Church of Israel?

GAYMAN: The basic tenets of the Church of Israel are pretty much mainstream in many areas, so I'm not sure if you want me to focus on those points of theological agreement with what we'll call the establishment Christian churches of this country, or whether you would want me to focus on those areas that make us different.

INTERVIEWER: Why don't you give us a little of both, some of the similarities and the differences.

GAYMAN: Okay, I think where we overlap . . . we are Trinitarian, historically we embrace all of the historic Christian creeds, all of the creedal statements of Christianity. In addition to the creeds of a Trinitarian position on the Godhead, we are also, I think, very orthodox in our treatment of what we would call the basic, fundamental doctrines of the church. And I believe that it is only in the area of identifying the lost ten tribes of Israel that we would have a major divergence from the establishment religious belief system that is presently in place in most of the Christian churches of our country. Only in respect to the

identification of the lost ten tribes of Israel and perhaps related issues do we have significant differences.

Now there is one other major difference that I think probably should be underscored. That difference would be the manner in which the standard of what we would call Bible morality is looked upon by many of the establishment churches of our generation. The Church of Israel holds to a more historic, Biblical definition of morality, and that would be interpreted by us as refusing to change our moral standards with the passing of time. One of the tenets of our belief holds that God is unchanging, that He speaks the infallible, unchanging word of truth. Therefore, we believe that the same moral standards that were, say, given to the Israelites of the Old Testament are as valid in our generation as they were at the time they were first given. So we would differ not only in terms of identifying the lost ten tribes of Israel, but also we would certainly differ with the establishment churches in terms of our upholding a moral standard of belief for the Bible.

INTERVIEWER: On the morality issue, then, you basically would take the view of the more fundamentalist or conservative evangelical churches, as opposed to some of the liberal Protestant mainline? Is that what you are saying?

GAYMAN: That is correct. We would certainly tend, without reservations, to be far more conservative than is currently the unfolding pattern in the moral belief system of establishment Christianity.

INTERVIEWER: Okay. Let's take up the issue of the identification of the lost ten tribes, since that's clearly what distinguishes you from the more typical fundamentalist church. Could you explain your views on that?

GAYMAN: Yes, we believe that the identification of the lost ten tribes of Israel is singularly a very important theological belief for the Church of Israel. Now, obviously the very name of the church, Church of Israel, would indicate that the word "Israel" holds a position of great prominence in our belief system, which is true. Eighty-five percent of the total Bible consists of the Old Testament scripture, which is a book written exclusively to, for, and about Israel. It only talks about other nations and/or peoples in the context of their relation to the Israelites of the Old Testament. We also believe that the other 15 percent of the Bible, the New Testament, is a book that simply confirms the pledges, covenants, and promises made to the Israelites of the Old Testament. Therefore, we look at the Bible as being an Israelitish book, believing that every author of all of the sixty-six books of the Bible descended from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the father of the twelve tribes of Israel. In this sense, then, we very much believe that the Bible is a book that points out the covenants, both conditional and unconditional, that were made with the Israelites in the Old Testament.

What happened to ten of those tribes at the time of the Assyrian captivity seven hundred years before the birth of Christ becomes of paramount importance to us because we believe that God has not forgotten the unconditional covenants and pledges made to these people at a time when they were still residing in their separate kingdoms, that is, the kingdom of Judah, with its capital in Jerusalem, and the kingdom of Israel, with its capital in Samaria. So those covenants and promises to the Israelites, many of them made unconditionally to the whole house of Israel, to all twelve tribes – all of those prophecies hold a very prominent place in the total spectrum of the theology of the Church of Israel. It is very, very important for us to know what happened to ten of the twelve tribes after they were carried into captivity by the Assyrian armies. We know what happened to the southern kingdom, made up of Judah and Benjamin and portions of Levi. A remnant from those tribes returned at the end of the seventy-year Babylonian captivity. However, that does not satisfy the need to know what happened to the greater body of the Israelites, that is, the ten tribes of Israelites. We believe that those people can be identified in history and that their movement across the geographic locations on a map can be fairly well and accurately pinpointed.

INTERVIEWER: What happened to these ten tribes? Who are their current descendants?

GAYMAN: The ten tribes today are to be identified among the great mass or millions of people who are generally referred to as the Anglo-Saxon and kindred peoples of the earth. These nations comprise the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States of America, the Dominion of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, all of Europe, portions and places in Africa, and other scattered places of the earth.

INTERVIEWER: So the descendants of these lost tribes today are not the present Jewish people, they are the white, northern European, Anglo-Saxon and Nordic people, is that correct?

GAYMAN: That is true with this exception. We believe that there are people in the world today who are called Jews who are descended from the southern kingdom of Judah. They are people mostly from the tribe of Judah, of the remnant that returned at the end of the seventy-year Babylonian captivity, together with maybe a small percentage of the tribe of Benjamin and the tribe of Levi. But we could not be persuaded that that small number of people constitutes the whole House of Israel. We believe the whole House – the main body of twelve-tribed Israel – that went into dispersion at the time of the Assyrian captivities, those tribes remain in dispersion today, and they comprise the greater body of the total Israelite population. The Jews make up a very small percentage of that total population.

INTERVIEWER: What evidence is there for believing that the white, Anglo-Saxon peoples around the globe are the descendants of these ten lost tribes? Is there any DNA evidence? What sort of facts do you base your conclusions upon?

GAYMAN: Our conclusions are based on a number of confirming points of evidence, the first of which might be a careful reading of the Bible to ascertain what it says about the potential future of the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. What were these people to be famous for? What were they to do in history? How were they to multiply? What would be their spiritual influence upon the nations of the world? As you carefully chronicle all that the Bible has to say about the millions of people that were to descend from Abraham and the prophetic promises made to him, you find only one people on the face of the earth that are made up of a nation and a company of nations, as in Genesis 35:11 – a group of nations that are called a multitude of nations that were to rise up in the midst of the earth, as in Genesis 48. We believe that through a careful examination of all that the Bible states about the twelve tribes of Israel, we could certainly say that these people are really able to be identified only among the Anglo-Saxon nations of the world.

Now, may I hasten to say also that our conclusions are not just based entirely upon what we will say are applied interpretations of the Bible. We believe that in the field of heraldry – much of the same heraldry that was assigned to the twelve tribes of Israel in the book of Numbers in the Old Testament has found its way into the heraldry of the Anglo-Saxon nations of the world. We also believe that much of the kind of activity that the Israelites were famous for in the Old Testament can also be found present among the Anglo-Saxon peoples of the earth.

INTERVIEWER: Do you believe that the members of these ten tribes, or the descendants of these ten tribes, have some special religious mission today?

GAYMAN: Yes, we believe that historically the Israelites of the Old Testament were to be a light to the world. They were to be the people through whom God would bless all of the nations of the earth. And we believe that if, for example, you look at the last, say, five hundred years of history, or at least since the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, it has been the nations of the Anglo-Saxon world that have brought advances in medicine. They have brought advances in scientific creativity and knowledge. They have opened up their storehouses of agricultural productivity to the world. They have endeavored to rescue and rush to the aid of victims of every kind of cataclysmic event on earth. If there is an earthquake somewhere or a major tidal wave, you can be sure that somewhere from the Anglo-Saxon world, help will be on its way to whatever other portion of the world is suffering from

some major calamity. So we feel that the Anglo-Saxon population of the world has historically been very ready and willing to allocate their resources and their knowledge to the assistance of these various and sundry people that were in trouble in any given location on earth.

INTERVIEWER: Do you believe that Anglo-Saxons are in some sense morally, spiritually, or intellectually superior to other ethnic groups?

GAYMAN: We do not believe that the Anglo-Saxon people are necessarily superior to any other ethnic group, but do believe that their success, their greater prosperity, their higher standard of living are no mere accidents or products of chance. The fact that the Anglo-Saxon people have historically generated the highest standards of living on the planet, we believe, derives entirely from their willingness to apply the principles of the Bible. Perhaps any other nation that wanted to likewise apply biblical principles might find themselves being blessed also. But we believe it of central importance that the Anglo-Saxon people have embraced Christianity and the Bible as the standard for their spiritual and moral value system in this present world, in contrast to, say, the Muslims, who run with a different theological program, and in contrast to the Jews and Judaism, in contrast to the Oriental world or to just about any other segment of the world. We feel that if there is a tendency for the Anglo-Saxon world to be blessed, it is because they have followed the Bible far more closely than others and have endeavored to apply the Bible and Christianity to their national life.

INTERVIEWER: So basically you are saying that the Anglo-Saxons, while they have displayed superior achievements in many areas, their superior achievement is not due to genes, or to climate, or to geography, or to the accidents of history. It's due primarily to their biblical faith – they have been more faithful to the Bible and any possible superiority is due to this.

GAYMAN: Yes, and may I add to that the fact that the Anglo-Saxon people, being the descendants of the twelve tribes of Israel, have a special calling and election to become a blessing to all the other peoples of the earth. In other words, every people that God has created may have their unique calling, but the Israelites have a unique calling and blessing in the election of God to bring the blessings of God to the rest of the world. We believe that a cursory examination of history would confirm very quickly that most of the technological blessings and advances of the last 150 years have basically come from the Anglo-Saxon nations of the world, and we want to emphasize that when we say Anglo-Saxon, we use the word Anglo-Saxon *and* kindred peoples of the earth. Sometimes it may not be possible to be inclusive enough if you just say Anglo-Saxon because we believe that there's a family of people that can be brought together through the word "kindred," all of which are part of the Anglo-Saxon world.

INTERVIEWER: Who would be these kindred peoples? Would they include Germans? Swedes?

GAYMAN: Yes, they would include people like the Germans and the Swedes and the Danes and people that sometimes might not always be thought of as being part of the Anglo-Saxon world.

INTERVIEWER: What about southern and eastern Europeans – Italians, Turks, Poles, Romanians, etc.?

GAYMAN: I would say that there may be pockets of those people that would fit into the category of the Anglo-Saxon kindred peoples, but just to say that they all broadly fit there, I don't believe that that would be a true statement.

INTERVIEWER: You believe, though, that the Anglo-Saxons and kindred peoples have a special, God-ordained mission to be a light unto the nations . . .

GAYMAN: Yes, sir.

INTERVIEWER: . . . both in terms of morals and religiosity, but also in terms of scientific progress and technology?

GAYMAN: Yes, scientific progress and technology, I think that they would certainly be leaders and forerunners and trailblazers in all of those areas.

INTERVIEWER: What are your views of non-Anglo Saxon, nonwhite Christians? Where, for instance, do black Christians or Hispanic Christians or Korean Christians fit in? Do you believe that they are created in the image of God and that they can find salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?

GAYMAN: We believe that all of the nations, all of the separate and distinct races of the earth, are the creation of God. God has uniquely designed and placed His mark of ownership on all of those races. Each of those races has the ability and the proclivity to worship God in the manner and means by which He ordained that they would worship Him. We believe that each of those distinctive races can relate to God. They can all connect to God. How that happens we do not pretend to know. We do not speculate on that. We simply believe that all races bear the image that God created them to bear. They have their own unique, distinctive design and mark of ownership that God has placed upon them, and we believe that in every distinct race there is a difference in calling, there's a difference in their uniqueness. Some are gifted in some areas. Others are gifted in other areas, so we would say that there is a tendency for all of the created races to relate to God in a unique and different way. The Arab world, for example, does not relate to the God of Christianity in the same way that the Anglo-Saxon world would relate. The Moslem world would not relate to the Bible. They relate better to the Koran. They do not relate to Jesus Christ. They relate better to Allah and to Mohammed. The same would be true for Judaism. Modern Jewry

would not relate to the Lord Jesus Christ. They relate to their understanding of the God of the Old Testament, Jehovah or Yahweh, so they would certainly not relate to God or connect to God in the same way that the Anglo-Saxon world would.

By and large, the Oriental world has always connected to God through philosophers, various and sundry religious leaders, and people that have risen up in their history, such as Buddha and others of well-known fame in the Oriental world. So the Orientals have not related to God in the same fashion that the Anglo-Saxon world has. The Oriental world has not historically embraced Christianity; only individual Orientals have embraced Christianity. There has never been a national embracing of Christianity among Oriental peoples, in contrast to the Anglo-Saxons, where entire nations have proclaimed Christianity as being their predominant faith. In certain stages of European history, there was almost a conversion of entire nations as Christianity moved across Europe. There is a stark contrast between the way that the Anglo-Saxon world has related historically to Jesus Christ and the way of these other nations. We might summarize all of this by simply saying that all of the distinctive races have their unique way of connecting to God, and we believe that it is an erroneous assumption to believe that *all* of the distinctive created races are going to be able to connect to God in the very same way. We do not believe that the people of the Anglo-Saxon world are going to be able to historically link up with Buddhism and with other Oriental religions simply because it's not in the nature of the Anglo-Saxon to embrace Oriental gods and Oriental ideas about God. And the same is true with regard to the Orientals in relation to Christianity. Only individuals from the Oriental world have embraced Christianity, and only very sporadic individuals from the Anglo-Saxon world have moved into Buddhism or some other Oriental religion. It seems very evident that the Anglo-Saxons have historically embraced one religious faith – Christianity – that the Bible has been pretty much the exclusive book that they have followed, in contrast to the rest of the distinctive races of the earth, all of whom have a different way of approaching and knowing God.

INTERVIEWER: What about, though, nonwhite Christians? You mentioned examples of people who are non-Christian. What about the non-Anglo Saxon, nonwhites who see Christianity as their religion? I'm thinking particularly of African Americans and Hispanics.

GAYMAN: Would you mind clarifying that? I'm not sure that I know exactly what you are saying.

INTERVIEWER: My question is, can nonwhites be Christians in the same way that Anglo-Saxons can be Christians? And if there is a difference, what is the difference?

GAYMAN: Well, we believe that in order to be a qualifying believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, there is a covenantal standing. In Jeremiah, chapter 31, verse 31, the prophecy is given that, "behold, I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers when they were in the land of Egypt." Now in Jeremiah 31: 32–33, it goes on to elaborate that this new covenant, of which the New Testament is the sum and substance, was to be made with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah. We do not believe that the God of the Bible entered into all these special, unconditional covenants with the Israelites, and then all at once universalized these covenants. Nowhere in the Bible do we find where God universalized the unconditional covenants and made them suddenly universally applicable to all the peoples of the earth. So we believe that if there are individuals from the other races that seek to embrace Christianity, they will most assuredly be blessed to the degree and to the measure that they embrace the moral principles and values of Christianity, but insofar as to say that these individuals share in the same covenantal standing or blessing as the Anglo-Saxons and kindred races, we would not be able to say that.

INTERVIEWER: So you see Christianity as in some sense an ethnically exclusive religion, and not a universalist religion as most Christian evangelicals have in the past?

GAYMAN: Yes, I would say that we would view Christianity and its connection to the Anglo-Saxon world very much in the same sense that there's an ethnic link between the Arabs and the Muslim religion. There's an ethnic link between the Orientals and the various Oriental spiritual leaders that have risen up in history, Confucius, Buddha, etc. For these people and the religious philosophies that they embrace and espouse, there seems to be an ethnic tie that makes the Oriental have a proclivity to move in the direction of these Oriental philosophers. We believe that, by the same token, the Anglo-Saxon world has historically embraced the tenets of the Christian faith because they are the principal subjects of the Bible.

INTERVIEWER: Let me just ask you how you would interpret some of the Biblical passages critics of your view would obviously cite as incompatible with your biblical interpretation. Take the central text of Paul's Letter to the Galatians, the third chapter, the twenty-second to twenty-ninth verse. Let me read part of this passage. "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. . . . For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all

one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then ye are of Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Now this would seem to imply very clearly that if people have faith in Jesus Christ, they become one Christian people, and they are then all made members of Abraham's seed. In other words, they all become Israelites not by virtue of their genealogy or common biological descent, but by virtue of their common faith and common religious belief. How would you respond to that sort of criticism?

GAYMAN: Well, we would respond to that by first of all confirming the fact that every book in the Bible and every chapter and text used in the Bible must be placed in the context of the whole Bible itself. We would respond to the Pauline epistle in Galatians by saying, let's first look at the Gospels and what Jesus says on these matters. Jesus said in Matthew 15:24, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel." Now, since Jesus Christ is the founder of Christianity, we'll begin with Him. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel." This is a very important passage and it says that Jesus has come specifically to save the Israelites. In the conversion of Zacchaeus in St. Luke's Gospel, chapter 19, Jesus makes the statement that, for as much as Zacchaeus was a son of Abraham, that he had found salvation. So Zacchaeus found salvation because he was the seed of Abraham, that is, because he was an Israelite. Jesus said in John's Gospel, chapter 10, verse 26: "My sheep hear my voice and know me." The sheep that heard His voice and believed did not believe in order to become his sheep; rather, they believed because they were His sheep. His sheep, of course, are the Israelites. In Matthew 10:5-6 Jesus commissioned and instructed His disciples, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles. Into any city of the Samaritans, enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel." This means that the message of Jesus is directed specifically to the House of Israel. Again, the emphasis that we place on the lost ten tribes of Israel is there because we believe that the Bible places great emphasis there. The founder of Christianity, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, instructed His disciples to go out and find the lost sheep of the House of Israel.

Similarly, when James wrote his epistle, he begins, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad" (James 1:1). We are somewhere in the middle of the first century of the Christian era, with James addressing his epistles to all twelve tribes. When the apostle Peter, one of the original twelve apostles, wrote his epistle, he goes on to say to the dispersed across Asia, Bythnia, Cappadocia, and so forth, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father" (1 Peter 1:1). He is here talking to all of the Israelites in the great dispersion - 1 and 2 Peter are written to the Israelites. Similarly, when we come to the Gospel of Matthew,

Matthew was written originally in Hebrew. It was addressed to Hebrews, ethnic Hebrews who spoke Hebrew. This, we believe, is all very important.

When you come to the Pauline epistles, we have no problem there. We embrace all of the Pauline epistles. If you will notice in the last chapter of the book of Galatians, Paul makes it clear that peace is to be upon all the Israel of God. So when he is saying that there is neither male nor female, there's neither Jew nor Greek, the word "Jew" as you previously quoted from the book of Galatians 3, is an appellation that identifies an Israelite of the kingdom of Judah, perhaps of the tribe of Judah, so we would have no problem with the word "Jew" there. That would be a member of the House of Judah, or of the southern kingdom of Judah. The word "Greek" would have an application to the Israelites who were in dispersion that were Greek speaking. Seven hundred years after the Assyrian deportations of millions of these Israelite people into the very regions where mass conversions of Christians were taking place in the New Testament era of history, we would say that these people were indeed Greek speaking but they were also Israelites in dispersion. These were the Greeks Paul was referring to.

And I might say if I could, just to digress for a moment, if we go into the Bible, let's look at Ephesians 2. In Ephesians 2:11-12, where St. Paul talks about the Gentiles, he's talking to a group of people called Gentiles: "Wherefore, remember that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." All right, now who were these Gentiles that at that time were estranged from the Commonwealth of Israel, were strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world? Well, they were this great multitude of Israelites from the northern kingdom that some seven hundred years earlier had been divorced and sent into dispersion. But notice what the great apostle Paul says in Ephesians 2:13, he says that "now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far-off or made nigh by the blood of Christ," so he's now talking to that great body of divorced Israelites in dispersion. Now I hope that I am not overextending this discussion, but I'm trying to show that the chapter that you quoted from the book of Galatians has a very definite order and certainly needs to be addressed, but it has to be looked at in the greater context of the entire New Testament itself, and even beyond that, of the entire Bible. So now we are in verse 14 of Ephesians 2: "For he is our peace who hath made both one." Who does the word "both" refer to? Both Israel of the northern kingdom and Judah of the southern kingdom. But establishment Christianity makes no distinction

between the houses of Israel, as carefully chronicled throughout the narrative of the Old Testament. They simply fail to distinguish between the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of Judah, and in so doing, they miss the major thrust of the direction that God is taking in the words of the Old Testament Scripture.

So now we come to Ephesians 2, verse 16: "And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." Now who did God reconcile into one body by the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, having slain the enmity thereby? Both Israel and Judah are the two separate divisions of people that are being joined together and brought into unity in one. Then he goes on to verse 17 and says: "And came and preached peace to you, which were a far-off, and to them that were nigh." Now who were the people that were a far-off? Well, these are those barbarian-speaking people that were called heathen by the Jews or Judeans – Israelites of the southern Kingdom of Judah, who are now being brought into the bond of the covenant of the Lord Jesus Christ and then to them that were nigh. The people that were nigh were the Israelites that were living right in the southern Kingdom of Judah, that were then known in New Testament times as simply Jews. Now where the establishment church has really erred, we believe, is that they have simply discounted the lost ten tribes of Israel. They have written them off as being irrelevant. All of the unconditional covenants and promises of the Old Testament have been essentially transferred by establishment clergy to simply the church. Well, we believe that Israel is the church, and the church is Israel.

INTERVIEWER: And this church has a definite ethnic base?

GAYMAN: Yes, we believe the church has an ethnic base. We believe that Israel is the church, and the church is Israel. May I digress for just a moment? If we turn to the epistle of 1 Peter, when Peter said: "Peter, an apostle to Jesus Christ and to strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bythnia, *elect* according to the foreknowledge of God the Father." Who are the people in New Testament Scripture, 1 Peter 2, that are the elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father? We don't need to look very far and deep into the Bible to find out that there's only one people that were ever given the status of being in the election of God the Father from before the foundation of the world, as in Ephesians 1, 4 and 5, and as found also in 2 Timothy 1:9. The elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father are the Israelites. Notice carefully now, Peter comes along in chapter 2, same epistle, in verse 9, and says: "But ye are a *chosen* generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who have called ye out of darkness into his marvelous light." When Peter here is writing his epistles to the Israelites

in dispersion, he is paraphrasing in 1 Peter 2:9 a verse found in Exodus 19:6, which declared the Israelites to be the peculiar people, the treasure unto God that He had placed on the earth.

Now consider 1 Peter 2:10. This is *very* important because now I am going to show you how there is a direct *ethnic* correlation between the people that Peter is writing his epistle to and the promises made to the ethnic, physical, racial Israel of the Old Testament. 1 Peter 2:10 is a direct quote taken from the Old Testament prophet Hosea, chapter 1, verse 10. The prophet Hosea is talking about Israel of the northern kingdom, those people that are going to be divorced, going to be sent into dispersion. They will be the unpitied people, the people that are cut off, sent into dispersion, but at the very time that Hosea prophesies of their dispersion and being cut off, he also prophesies that "in the place where it was said unto them that ye are not a people, there will it be said, in that very place, that ye are the people of God" (Hosea 1:10). So Peter now, in 1 Peter 2:10, is going to give a direct quote from Hosea 1:10, reminding these people that he's writing to those who are ethnically the people to whom God has promised that even though they were not a people, sent into dispersion, cut off, and called Gentiles – meaning a nonpeople or a heathen people – that they would nevertheless become the children of the living God. Now these kinds of examples are laced throughout the New Testament Scripture.

I've been in Ephesians and I've been in 1 Peter, but let's turn to the book of Romans. This is important, I think, because I feel that when we look at the book of Galatians and those oft-quoted verses that you cited, which are probably the classic verses recited by most clergymen to universalize Christianity and take it from its ethnic Biblical setting and explode it into a universalist religion, Paul's remarks in Romans help to explain what Paul really meant. In Romans 2:14–15, Paul says: "For when the Gentiles which have not the law do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." Now here is something very interesting. Here we have Paul speaking of "Gentiles which have not the law." These are heathen peoples outside the Commonwealth of Israel; they are estranged from the covenants God made to Israel. They are a nonpeople – that is, Gentiles. Now we believe that these so-called Gentiles, heathens, barbarians, Greek-speaking Hellenes, are indeed Israel of the lost ten tribes, who were then in the first century in dispersion in the very areas where New Testament evangelization was going on. By nature they were doing the things contained in the law (verse 15), which show the work of the law written in their hearts. Now here is something really unusual. Here are Gentiles, who though separate from the law, were by the very nature of the way they lived their lives living somewhat by the moral standards of the law, and Paul says they have the work of the law written

in their hearts. One does not have to be a rocket scientist to go back into the Old Testament and find out who God said would have the law written into their hearts. The promise made to Israel and Judah, Jeremiah 31:31-34, was that God would write the law into the hearts of these people.

INTERVIEWER: So these Gentiles Paul speaks of were not just any non-Jews, but only those whose forbears had been part of the original tribal confederation of Israel described in the Old Testament?

GAYMAN: Yes, let me explain. When the Old Testament canon ends, the twelve tribes of Israel – except for a remnant of Judah and Benjamin and scattered individuals from the other tribes – had been carried away into the vast Assyrian wilderness. This event is chronicled in II Kings 17:5-6 and took place around the year 721 B.C. Conservative estimates place the number of Israelites that were carried into the Assyrian captivity to be about ten million people. None of them returned with the remnant that rebuilt the Temple. Only a small remnant numbering less than 50,000 people from the tribes of Judah and Benjamin returned from the land of Babylon where they had earlier been taken by the Chaldean armies under the leadership of Nebuchadnezzar.

The estimate of ten million people being captured and moved in mass is calculated upon the basis of I Chronicles 21:5 and related Scriptures. During the reign of King David, he commissioned Job to number Israel. I Chronicles 21:5 records an army of 1,100,000 men in arms among the tribes making up the Kingdom of Israel. Adding all the women, children, and older men and remembering that Israel was not carried away captive for almost three hundred years after the reign of David ended, the figure 10,000,000 would be a modest one. Later Jewish sources also confirm this. One of the most well-known historians and frequently quoted by subsequent historians was Flavius Josephus. Writing in the first century, this Jewish historian and contemporary of the Apostles confirms that the ten tribes of Israel were then in existence and that their numbers were immense: “there are but two tribes [of Israel] in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude, and not to be estimated by numbers.”

A more modern Jewish account appearing in the *Jewish Chronicle* for May 2, 1879, confirms the words of Josephus and further documents the existence of the ten lost tribes of Israel. I’ll quote from that account: “There has always been, however, an unwillingness to admit that a fate which has befallen so many nations has overtaken the Ten Tribes. Why should they have been less tenacious of life than their brethren of Judah? Nay, the Scriptures speak of a future restoration of Israel, which is clearly to include both [the house of] Judah and

Ephraim [the house of Israel]. The problem, then, is reduced to the simplest form. The ten tribes are certainly still in existence. All that has to be done is to discover which people represents them.”

The lost ten tribes ceased to be called Israelites in their captivity and appeared under a number of different names. These millions of “lost Israelites” occupied the geographical landscape of much of the Greek and Roman world in the first century of the Christian era. The early Christian churches at Rome, Corinth, the churches of Galatia, the churches at Ephesus, Philippi, and Colosse, were populated by the lost ten tribes of Israel, referred to as Gentiles in the New Testament. These Gentiles are one and the same with the lost ten tribes of Israel now settled by the millions into the regions where the Apostle Peter directed his epistle (1 Peter 1:1-2). When Peter was chosen of God to open the door into the Gentile world by bringing the Gospel to Cornelius, who was a Gentile from the lost ten tribes of Israel, he opened the Gospel up to divorced Israel, then in dispersion, and it was St. Paul who then spent the remainder of his life preaching to the Gentiles.

One of the principal names historically assigned to the lost ten tribes of Israel has been the name “Caucasian,” derived from the Caucasus Mountains and always pertaining to the white race. It was in this very region that millions of Israelites belonging to the lost ten tribes of Israel dwelt as they made their way through and around the 750-mile-long range of the Caucasus Mountains from which the name “Caucasian” comes. Now establishment Christianity in our view has made two mistakes here. Number one, the Bible has been suddenly lifted from its ethnic perimeters and boundaries, and, secondly, all of the unconditional covenants, pledges, and promises made to the Israelites have been essentially transferred to the church. This church, by today’s definition – modern Christianity’s definition – is an international, multiracial body that is made up of whoever professes a belief in Jesus Christ. Whoever professes such a belief becomes the spiritual seed of Abraham. We believe this view of the church is inconsistent with the teachings of the Bible, which identifies the church with the ethnic, racial Israel.

INTERVIEWER: So the true church in your view is not any multiethnic, international organization, but the true body of the church is composed of the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel who you identify with the Anglo-Saxon and closely related races?

GAYMAN: Yes. But let me extend that definition to also include emphatically – now this is very important – that the church also incorporates the Israelites who historically were part of the southern kingdom of Judah, meaning that the portion of Judah, the portion of Benjamin, and Levi, that returned at the end of the seventy-year Babylonian captivity and returned to rebuild the Temple. All of those people certainly are

incorporated into the ethnic body of what we call the twelve tribes of Israel, so we want to emphasize twelve tribes, and not ten.

INTERVIEWER: So besides the Anglo-Saxons, today's Jews would also be a part of that Israelite race, and hence part of the ethnic basis of the church?

GAYMAN: Yes. However, there is a discussion that would have to be held on what constitutes an ethnic Hebrew Jew versus those who say they are Jews and are not, as in Revelation 2:9 and 3:9.

INTERVIEWER: Who are the true Jews today?

GAYMAN: The true Jews today would be that body of people who are bringing forth the fruits of the children of Abraham, and we would conclude that there are many traditional historic Orthodox Jews who embrace the Old Testament Torah, and who, even if they deny the existence of the Messiah in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, we believe that they are living in strict adherence and compliance with the Old Testament moral standards. These people, we believe, would constitute a part of the original tribe of Judah, portions of Benjamin or Levi that are ethnic Israelites, and all qualify in the ethnic setting of Scripture to be a part of the total plan of God for his people.

INTERVIEWER: Do these Jews have some special religious mission today, like the Anglo-Saxons?

GAYMAN: So far as having a mission, we believe that those who are true ethnic Jews, their primary mission in time and history has been to preserve the oracles of God. They have been the custodians and caretakers of the essential Old Testament Scripture. They have been the grand caretakers and keepers of the oracles of God that have been handed down through the centuries of time, and the Masoretic Old Testament canon probably would not be available today were it not for these people. At this point, I need to digress, however, and emphasize that there is a great part of what is called modern Jewry that is not ethnically related to that portion of the modern Jewish people that we believe are ethnic Israelites. For example, I am looking at a book entitled *The Thirteenth Tribe*, written by Arthur Koestler, one of the most well-known Jewish authors in the twentieth century. In *The Thirteenth Tribe*, which was a best-seller published, I believe, by Random House . . . what Mr. Koestler does in this book, that I think is rather remarkable, is that he traces an element of modern Jews who make up a rather significant portion of the total population of modern Jewry, and he very convincingly proves historically, archaeologically, and by other means that they have no relationship, no ethnic connection to Abraham, to Isaac, to Jacob, or to any of the Hebrew characters of the Old Testament. These Jews could be lumped – now this is not Mr. Koestler, this is Dan Gayman speaking – these Jews could be lumped with those

spoken of in Revelation 2:9 and 3:9. We believe that all of those people who *claim* to be the true descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and call themselves Jews but are not, fit into the category of Revelation 2:9 and 3:9, where Jesus Christ Himself said "I know the blasphemy of them which say they *are* Jews and are not." And then He goes on to say what He believes they should be rather known as.

INTERVIEWER: How can one tell the difference between the real Jews and the false claimants?

GAYMAN: How can one tell the difference? Well, by their fruits ye shall know them. In other words, let's suppose, for example, that we examine the fruit borne by the two classifications or groups of Jews in the world today. One group will be the very careful custodians of the Old Testament Scripture. They will be very, very faithful adherents to the idea of Judaism. They will be the caretakers of the synagogues, and they will be very devout in their faith. They will be very moral. They will be following the moral standards of the Torah in contrast to those others, who we'll call the pseudo or false group of Jews, who bring forth just the opposite. For example, let's just suppose that we look at the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 inside of Russia. A great many of the leaders of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 in Russia were Jews, and they were not the kind of quiet, tranquil Jews that were carefully and meticulously following the Old Testament moral standards and attending to the needs of the synagogue and feeding the poor and doing all this sort of thing. The Jews operating in the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 were out fomenting revolution.

INTERVIEWER: So the true Jews are the pious Orthodox Jews – the Hassidic Jews, for instance – rather than the more secularized Jews or Reform Jews?

GAYMAN: Yes. I would say that that is true, yes.

INTERVIEWER: Your views are very similar to those of the Christian Identity movement, yet in recent years you have tried to disassociate yourself from the label of Christian Identity, while still acknowledging important similarities between the Church of Israel and the Christian Identity religion. Could you explain what distinguishes your group from Christian Identity?

GAYMAN: Yes. First of all, Christian Identity, to the best of my knowledge, has no structured means by which they identify with historical Christianity. I know of *no* Christian Identity church that embraces creedal Christianity, as we do. We embrace the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed. I do not find any known Christian Identity group in this country or abroad that embraces these historic creeds of Christianity. I would say also that there is an important difference in, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity. We have been long

adherents to the doctrine of the Trinity, while in contrast Christian Identity groups vary in their position on the Godhead. Some of them believe in the Trinity; some of them do not.

You see, Christian Identity has a very loosely structured system of theology, and it almost defies anyone's ability to find out what they really believe because every individual Christian Identity church sort of has a different theological mold. It's very difficult to find a universal standard of belief system in Christian Identity. Very seldom would you ever even find a printed statement of what they believe because, in truth, many Christian Identity adherents do not know what they believe. They may have definite ideas in some areas of their belief system, but when it comes to theological formulas, they really have no systematized theological belief systems. Now, I would like to contrast that with the fact that the Church of Israel has a published theological belief system. It is well established; it has been printed up and is available for anyone to read.

I would also like to emphasize the fact that in the more than fifty years of the existence of the Church of Israel, there has never been a single racial incident whereby hostility toward other races has ever drawn the attention of law enforcement officers or agencies. So there is a *decided* difference, we believe, in the attitude that the Church of Israel has toward other races and that of certain Christian Identity groups. We believe God is the author and creator of *all* the distinctive races, that He placed His mark of ownership upon them all, that He has a unique plan and purpose for every race that He created, and that God relates to every race, and they relate to Him in a manner unique to their own special existence. This contrasts with Christian Identity, which might try to imagine that God is not the author of all races. I have read some pretty far out explanatory notes on where they believe some of the races came from. We believe that is a major contrast between us and Christian Identity. We count God as the author of all races, and we do not believe that there is any room whatsoever in our theology for hatred of any race. God says in Genesis 1:31: "He looked at everything that he made, and behold, it was very good." Therefore, if God called everything that He created very good, we're very happy to call it very good also. We believe this is one of the distinguishing differences between what the Church of Israel stands for and what Christian Identity has been doing – at least in the historical context that the media has placed it in over the last twenty years.

INTERVIEWER: So you don't believe in hatred toward any race and you don't believe in violence directed toward any race, but you do believe in ethnic separatism. In terms of worship, many Christian organizations in the twentieth century – Billy Graham's crusades being perhaps

the most famous – have adopted interracial, interethnic worship services. Graham, I think, started multiracial crusades as early as the 1940s, and organizations like Promise Keepers in more recent times hold mass, mixed-race revivals. But you would strongly disapprove of this kind of multiracial worship service, is that correct?

GAYMAN: Yes. We have traditionally, throughout the entire history of the Church of Israel, held to a view of ethnic separatism in marriage, in worship, and in social settings. Like the Pilgrims who settled America in 1620 and the thousands of Puritans who followed them as Separatists from England, remnant Christians from the Church of Israel seek to live in marriage, worship, and social settings as *separatists*. We have no problem, however, with the diversity of races in the workplace. Our people have historically worked very well in racially diverse workplaces. In small businesses where there was racial diversity, our people have done very well, and they have also done well within larger corporate settings. Our people have done very well in the armed forces, and in college and university classroom settings, too.

But when it comes to the idea of marriage and worship and social settings, we practice ethnic separatism. It would be a violation of our religious conscience to bring the races together in a worship forum. Now there is a reason for this. We believe that there are a number of biblical injunctions that we would stress that are stated clearly in Scripture, and we would cite these as being the biblical grounds upon which we would want to practice ethnic separatism in respect to worship. This doctrine of ethnic separatism is as old as the Bible itself. The Book of Genesis calls Abraham and Sarah to separate themselves unto their God (Genesis 12) and move to a land where they had never lived before. Abraham and Sarah, followed by Isaac and Rebekah and then Jacob and his family, all practiced the basic law of ethnic separatism as they followed God's call. The twelve sons of Jacob blossomed into the twelve tribes of Israel, the very centerpiece of the entire Old Testament. God called for Israel to be a people separated unto Himself, saying, "I am the LORD your God, which have separated you from other people" (Leviticus 20:24).

Addressing Jehovah, the God of Israel, Moses made this core statement on the doctrine of ethnic separatism: "For wherein shall it be known here that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? So shall we be *separated*, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth" (Exodus 33:16). When Solomon was dedicating the Temple unto the God of Israel, he declared this regarding ethnic separatism and Israel: "For thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance" (I Kings 8:53). The doctrine of ethnic separatism is as central to the Bible as apple pie is to most European Americans. The command of ethnic

separatism continues throughout the Bible, right into the New Testament. Moreover, if, as stated in chapter 7 of the Book of Revelation, 144,000 Israelite households are to be sealed at the end of the age – 12,000 from each of the twelve tribes – the doctrine of ethnic separatism is imperative to the very end of history.

Aside from specific scriptural problems, the idea that people can come together and worship God in the same building, sitting in the same pews, and not have interracial dating and marriage would be inconceivable. If we bring them together in the church and we are all going to become one family inside the walls of the sanctuary, certainly there will be no question that we will have interracial dating and then marriage, and all that goes with that. So we would be opposed to any kind of multiracial worship. Absolutely.

INTERVIEWER: Why do you oppose interracial marriage so strongly?

GAYMAN: We oppose interracial marriage so strongly because we believe that it is a violation of God's original design and the creation of every race. We believe that it basically undermines the whole concept of God's original design and creation. It erases God's mark of ownership upon the mixed children that come out of a union between two diverse race partners. So we feel that it is a direct threat to the very nature under which God originally separated and divided the races. In Deuteronomy 32, beginning at verse 7, in a well-known passage of Scripture, the Bible tells us very clearly: "Remember the former days. Consider the years of many generations. Ask thy Father, and He will show thee thine elders, and they will tell thee, when the most high divided to the nations their inheritance, He *separated* the sons of Adam according to the number of the children of Israel, for the Lord's portion is His people. Jacob is the lot of his inheritance." Now you see, we believe very clearly that the Bible teaches separatism in regards to certain areas of human conduct. One of those areas would be in worship because interracial marriage works against the very nature of all of the orderly design in the creation. Every form in the flora and fauna world that God has created follows the pattern of the law of kind after his kind, a law which is stated no less than ten times in the first chapter of Genesis. So interracial marriage is a violation of the law of kind after his kind. It breaks down the distinctive order of God's creation. And we believe that what interracial marriage really does is that it takes away from every race. We would want every race to retain the original creation design that God intended for that race, and we believe that interracial mixing or marriage tends to take away *from* every race what God intended.

Let me explain further what we mean by the law of kind after his kind and why we adhere to the principle of ethnic separatism in marriage, worship, and intimate social settings. All of nature surely does

witness to the truth of mixing with your own kind. All the birds that fly in the heavens associate with their own kind, and have done so from the day of their creation. Black birds mix only with their kind. All the animals of the forest were programmed by the Creator God to mate among their own kind. Every individual species in the creation, and there are countless numbers of them, have maintained their own identity because of the inherent law of kind after kind.

God, we believe, has written the basic law of separatism into the very genetic code of all of His creation. The law of kind after kind is basic to the very genetic code of all created life. This basic law of God and creation is inherent in all of life, including the diverse and distinct races on earth. Within each distinctive race is a strong propensity to stay within the perimeters of their own kind. The proclivity for every distinctly created race to stay within its genetic borders is the very reason that the divergent racial stocks have persisted throughout history. The Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid races were created separate and distinct from one another. The Creator programmed within each race an instinctive drive to cohabit within their kind. The survival of every pure race is dependent upon the practice of ethnic separatism. It is only when these divergent races are brought together in the same landscape, places of worship, and educational settings that the law of kind after his kind is broken down. We believe that every race has the responsibility to preserve the original design of ethnic distinctions which the Creator God placed there, and that is why we practice ethnic separatism.

INTERVIEWER: In terms of demographics, what sort of people join the Church of Israel and what are their reasons for joining? Do you have any specific strategies for recruiting new members?

GAYMAN: We have no particular strategy for recruiting new members. We have no television programs, we have no radio programs, so our basic evangelistic presupposition is John 6:44: "No man can come unto me except the father which has sent me draw him, and I will raise him up to the last day." So we are totally dependent – dependent upon the power of the Holy Spirit to draw people to our religious persuasion. We really employ very minimal technological advances to achieve evangelical goals, and so the people that are drawn to this church are basically drawn by word of mouth. It's each one, teach one. The evangelists of this church are the people that come into contact with the theological menu of this church. They like what they find, and then they tell others. And the people that they talk to are generally, and always, people with an ethnic likeness – we're talking about Anglo-Saxon and kindred peoples who talk with Anglo-Saxon kindred peoples. We make no effort to evangelize other races. We make every effort to preach tolerance to

the other races. We make every effort to advance a nonhostile position to the other races, to reemphasize that there has never been a single racial incident in the history of the church here. We have no problem getting along with the other races, and, in that sense, in the sense of our ethnic separatism, we're really no different than most of the synagogues that would be made up almost exclusively of Jews. They may have occasionally opened their doors to someone else, but it's kind of a rare thing. The Muslims are predominantly Arabs. So we don't think that there's anything really so extraordinarily different about our ethnic separatism. We feel that separatism is a part of nature. Nature itself segregates. The Amish have lived in segregation. The Mennonites live in segregation. A lot of the Jewish communities of the world live in segregation. There's segregation practiced all over the place. It's just unfortunate that if white people decide to do it, it suddenly becomes *extremely* bad.

INTERVIEWER: What is your opinion on the system of racial segregation that existed in the South under the Jim Crow era until the late 1960s?

GAYMAN: Well, first of all, I think if the Church of Israel had existed back in the earliest days of the formation of the southern United States, we would not have agreed to slavery in any form. We do not believe that slavery, as it existed in the South, has a Biblical foundation, so we would not have been in favor of any kind of slavery system. Indeed, we would have encouraged the southern plantation owners to have invited the multitudes of very needy and very poor people from Ireland and other places in the British Isles and Europe to have migrated to the United States to fill the role that had been placed upon the African people who were brought here as slaves. I think that we would, in general, have frowned upon the whole system that actually produced slavery and the Jim Crow laws that followed the basic Civil War-Reconstruction era of history.

But we do not feel that the post-Civil War, post-Reconstruction era history – from, let's say, 1865 to the present – has brought any great, significant blessings to the Negroid race. One merely has to drive through the ghettos of New York, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, Cleveland, any one of those places, and one would have to greatly sympathize with the millions and millions of black people who find themselves living in such terrible conditions. We simply do not see where the great majority of the black people have been blessed by recent developments – let's say, for example, the termination of the separate but equal public school facilities. There's a strong indication that the blacks may have been better off with the pre-1954 separate but equal public school facilities than they are under full integration today because the test scores of both blacks and whites are not as good at the end of the twentieth century as they were at the midpoint in the twentieth century.

There is a failure in our public school system that came in with the termination of the separate but equal public school policies that had existed before 1954. So separate education may not have been harmful. But we certainly would want to emphasize that all the races should have equal access to the job markets of this country. We do not support discrimination in job markets. But, by the same token, we do not believe that equal access to those jobs means that reverse discrimination should be in place against white people. We feel that what has happened now is that there has been a gradual evolution of the economic sector of this country such that it now practices reverse discrimination. In an effort to push affirmative action, Caucasians have been basically denied their fair stand in the workplace.

INTERVIEWER: So you would strongly oppose any government policy of affirmative action?

GAYMAN: Yes, we would oppose all forms of affirmative action as being discriminatory. In an effort to make things favorable for one race, we automatically discriminate against another one. We would be in favor of rescinding all affirmative action programs.

INTERVIEWER: How would you characterize the current state of race relations in the United States? What are the major problems dealing with race today?

GAYMAN: Well, it would seem that the major problem that we have in the racial programs of the twentieth century, moving into the twenty-first century, is that the whole concept of race in America has been one in which consistently the Caucasian – the majority race, the founding race – has been . . . gradually discriminated against as the government seeks to promote these minority races. The government has a pro-woman, pro-minority posturing in all of its economic philosophy, and we believe that that policy has become discriminatory against the Caucasian race in general.

Many of the institutions of American society, we believe, have come to share in this prejudice against whites. For instance, television and the movie industry simply are not neutral about white people. Instead, they use every opportunity to degrade and distort the culture, history, and self-worth of whites. The press and the camera are out to ridicule and intimidate any white American who would dare stand up in favor of his or her color, culture, or history. White people are finding that Hollywood and all major television networks are dedicated to elevating the stature of the nonwhite. The democratic one-person/one-vote formula for winning elections has endeared almost every American politician to favor Third World migration to America.

White people, moreover, have lost all control of their educational institutions. Public schools now cater to the growing, nonwhite

majority on a colossal scale. Historical revisionism is removing every trace of white heroes from the pages of American textbooks. The culture and history of the whites is being stripped from the pages of history, while a new, fabricated history of America is being forced down our culturally impoverished school children. White people, too, face open discrimination in almost every college and university in America.

A generation of affirmative action programs have ushered in an era of white discrimination in the work place and elsewhere in American society. The disbursement of tax money, government entitlement, and a legion of other programs all favor the nonwhite majority in America. White people are becoming increasingly alienated from their government at every level. White people, it seems, are on their way to belonging nowhere! I might explain here, that we do not blame nonwhites for this situation. White people have no one to blame but themselves for their current plight. As I wrote in a recent article in our church magazine, "We have found the enemy, and he is us!"

INTERVIEWER: Evangelical Christians of a more mainstream cast would see your Biblical interpretation as highly strained, if not bizarre, and many would, I think, compare your ethnic claims about the ten lost tribes of Israel to Afro-centric writers who claim that Jesus and his disciples were all black. I think in both cases they would charge that you are motivated by some kind of ethnic self-congratulation or ethnic chauvinism. How would you respond to that kind of critique?

GAYMAN: I would respond to that critique by simply saying that until the turn of the twentieth century, until the year 1900, almost all of the philosophical and religious beliefs of the Church of Israel, as we practice them today, all the moral standards and the theology that the Church of Israel embraces today, were basically the moral standard of America. This was true, in fact, up to and including the year 1950. So our moral standards today are the moral standards that were in place throughout most of the history of America. Now with regard to our racial beliefs, we believe that the only difference between the way the Church of Israel understands and ministers to the racial issues of our day, the primary difference between the Church of Israel and mainstream Christianity, is that most of the white people – and certainly most of the white people in the rural sectors of the United States of America – believe in separation of the races in marriage and in worship, but they are reluctant to make that belief system public. The major difference that separates us from the vast majority of all Caucasians in America is that we do not hide our belief regarding racial separatism. Just look at America's white suburbs. White people have engaged in a white flight out of the inner cities and have congregated into the suburbs, and as the old suburbs fill up with a racial mix, we find a new

white flight out of those suburbs into new all-white or nearly all-white areas. All of those people believe in their hearts what the Church of Israel practices, that is, the separation of the races.

And if I were to travel and visit the vast majority of all Anglo-Saxon religious services on a given Sunday morning in the rural villages and hamlets of this country, I would find ethnic separatism from beginning to end. Very seldom will I find a person of another race worshipping in these churches. I have personally visited any number of Protestant and Catholic churches on a Sunday morning in the villages and towns of southwest Missouri, and seldom do I find any person of another race other than Caucasian in those places of worship. In fact, I can go even to places where there is a distinctive nonwhite population and still can't find that racial mix in the churches. Now, the Church of Israel is out on the cutting edge of not hiding anything. We're trying to say what we want for ourselves, we want for all other races. We ask nothing for ourselves that we do not want for everyone else. Now some people would frown upon what we call good. We believe that racial, ethnic separatism by Biblical standards is what God ordained from the beginning of the creation, so we practice it. We have no problem with those who choose not to, but at the same time we feel that we are being deprived of *our* civil rights. We're being deprived of our First Amendment rights when the news media and even those not part of the news media want to point a discriminating finger at us because we have a right to practice our religious conscience just as everyone else does. Even though some people may call our belief system radically different from theirs, that's what America is all about. We're a nation of great religious and racial diversity. But we find it increasingly more and more difficult to practice *our* definition of ethnic separatism because in the very country of great religious, racial, and ethnic diversity, in the very country that promises such a democratic and liberal belief system to be practiced within its borders, there seems to be a growing unwillingness to allow Caucasian people to practice their religious differences and uniqueness.

INTERVIEWER: Well, that's the end of our formal questions. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us that we haven't discussed?

GAYMAN: Yes, there is. There is one other area that has not been touched upon that I think is extremely important.

INTERVIEWER: Please explain.

GAYMAN: The Church of Israel is not now, nor has it ever been, antigovernment, meaning that one of the cardinal principles of our belief system is that we are bounded by Scripture to offer daily prayers and supplication for all civil leaders and rulers, regardless of their political affiliation, that we are scripturally bound to be peaceful, law-abiding

citizens. We endeavor to maintain close communion and relationships with all government levels of authority. We have open communion with all law-enforcement agencies in the county, state, and federal government. The church here makes no effort whatsoever to teach animosity or hostility toward civil government. We believe very strongly that good citizenship consists of obeying every ordinance of government at every level until government forbids us from doing something that God commands or commands us to do something that God forbids. So we are a very law-abiding church – and again, that, we believe, clearly separates us from what we'll call some of the radical behavior that has been exhibited in certain religious circles of this country in recent years. The people of the Church of Israel are hard-working, honest, law-abiding people, and they believe in complying with all ordinances of government. They have responded to the call of their country in every war of this century. They have paid their taxes. They comply with all state driving licensing requirements and registration. So we are not part of any so-called civil rebellion movement. The Church of Israel has never belonged to Operation Rescue. We have never picketed abortion clinics. We have never been part of any civil disobedience group in this country. In the entire history of the church, we have an impeccably clean record insofar as law enforcement is concerned.

There is also one final thing I would like to say by way of summary about the scriptural basis of our core beliefs. A mere cursory examination of the corpus of the Bible should quickly dispel any idea that the lost ten tribes of Israel are not a vital and imperative subject. From cover to cover, the Bible is a book about Israel and God's plan for them. At the end of the Bible, in the apocalyptic Book of Revelation, the people known as Israel remain its focus and grand theme of God's Kingdom on earth. From Genesis 12:1 through the remainder of the entire Old Testament Canon of Scripture, the Bible is written to, for, and about the twelve tribes of Israel. The New Testament itself is a confirmation of what God promised the twelve tribes of Israel in the pages of the Old Testament Scripture. The Bible is the family history of the Israelite people. Every author of the Divine Word of God, Genesis to Revelation, was an Israelite. The Law, Prophets, Psalms, History, Gospels, and Epistles are all about the twelve tribes of Israel.

The final eschatological view of Bible history targets the fulfillment of God's promise to Israel. The redemption of Israel was the first priority of Jesus Christ coming as the anointed Messiah. The return of Jesus Christ (the Greater David) to rule from the Throne of David, the future resurrection of the dead in Christ, the gathering of the twelve tribes onto the land of their fathers, and the subsequent restoration of the Kingdom of God are the central focus of eschatological history. Without a knowledge of who and where the lost ten tribes of Israel are,

the subject of Bible prophecy is without a solution. When the international, multiracial church replaces physical Israel as those central to God's plan, the very heart and soul for which the Bible is written is lost. We believe that when the Bible is interpreted apart from the unconditional covenants made with the House of Israel, it is a false theology crafted by the mind of man apart from God and Scripture.

INTERVIEWER: Thank you.