

An Open Letter to John Reasnor; or, A Need for Radical Unity

The following is my open letter to John Reasnor, abolitionist blogger at Kingdom and Abolition and contributor to The American Vision blog, in response to his September 27th, 2018, post entitled “Ignoring Ethnic Hatred, Disregarding Church Authority, and the Future of Christendom,” which was one of several posts on the topic of kinism, Peter Hammond, and the Future of Christendom Conference in October hosted by the Mid-Atlantic Reformation Society. Within this blog post there were comments made in an attempt to paint my father, pastor Paul Michael Raymond, as a defender or associate of Peter Hammond. Several comments were made about others who hosted or attended this conference. The letter is a belated reply, sectioned into five parts, to some of these comments while focusing on the basic arguments which Reasnor made for his boycott of the conference. The letter concludes with a request to meet in-person with Reasnor and a challenge to do ever-better things all for the advancement of Christ’s kingdom.

Dear John, and whomever this may concern,

First off I’d like to apologize for the extreme delay on this very anticlimactic letter. My initial Facebook post to your September 27, 2018, blog post ‘Ignoring Ethnic Hatred, Disregarding Church Authority, and the Future of Christendom,’ was on October 6. Also I must apologize to both you and Jordan Wilson for not replying to your private messages dated October 7 after our respective brief back-and-forth conversations. I’ll answer those questions here too. In order to understand this blog post, I have gone back and reviewed several Facebook threads and other posts including several of your own, but since beginning this letter there have been two new posts (one on your blog and one on McDurmon’s) which I will not have time to address here at length though I did read them. Note that I am currently no longer a member of the Level-Headed Christian Reconstructionist or Reconstructionist Radio Discussion Facebook groups by my own choice to leave for a season, so I’m not aware of any discussions on this topic from those groups since the conference. Now the outline of this letter:

- I. Disclaimers
- II. Definitions
- III. Response to Comments and Questions from You and Jordan Wilson
- IV. Outline of Key Points of Concern in Blog Post
- V. Response to Key Points
- VI. Conclusion

I. Disclaimers:

A) What this letter is not

1. This letter was NOT written by anyone other than myself and, therefore, everything that follows are my own words, arguments, and representative of myself alone. It’s unfortunate that I even need to state this disclaimer, but there have been too many situations where persons are lumped together merely because of some loose association with other people’s writings. Please read my words at face value and associate them with me alone.

2. This is NOT a defense or apologetic of Peter Hammond. I personally have never talked to the man, even when I attended the first 24-hours or so of the 2018 Future of Christendom Conference. I am currently not Facebook 'friends' with him and I do not plan to add him if he were to send me a friend request, though we have many mutual acquaintances. Anything I say for or against him is my impersonal interpretation of his words and actions.
3. This is NOT a dismissal of any legitimate problems addressed. In parts of this letter I'll actually agree with you on points using my definitions or understanding of words and I'll attempt to give a proper concluding solution which I believe you have not provided.
4. Lastly, this is definitely NOT a defense or apologetic of kinism. Though we have slightly different definitions of kinism (which will be addressed in Part II), we can agree on this much: kinism is heresy. Furthermore, both my dad and I have had to deal with kinists and "Christian Identity-ism" proselytizers for years – with a recent episode resulting in the excommunication of a proselytizer of "Christian Identity-ism" from the Reformed Bible Church here in Appomattox which, as you know, my dad pastors along with another elder and two deacons. We've also removed a handful of books from our book store which were written by well-known Israel Identity proponents. Those of their books in our library have been moved to our special 'heresy' section for research purposes. I take these issues seriously since I personally have invested months of one-on-one dialogue with people like that individual in order to bring understanding and reconciliation to biblical truth.

B) What this letter is

1. This letter IS a rebuttal to some of the backhanded innuendos against both my father (pastor Paul Raymond), and pastor Joel Saint, as well as clearing up some misconceptions in your article related to the Alliance of Reformed and Theonomic Churches (ARTC), my dad's relation to the Mid-Atlantic Reformation Society (MARS), and some details about the Future of Christendom Conference which I think are vitally important for context.
2. This letter IS fulfilling my promise to reply to your and Jordan Wilson's questions via messenger which I promised to answer, and it is not an attempt to stir up more controversy or endless back-and-forth debates. Some of them I'll respond too, others I frankly can't and won't since I have little to no knowledge of the details.
3. This letter IS an attempt to reply to some of the napalming of relationships that have happened this past year. I don't expect much to come from this letter. Most likely people will read it, nod their heads, then continue their Facebook debates or whatever else suits their fancy. But, as Jordan stated, I've been silent publicly, so this is me breaking some silence knowing that I have no power to change the situation.

II. Definitions

A) Racism

1. Your definition: While you do not explicitly define racism in this blog post, you do explicitly define kinism and linked to various articles which did the same. You do say the following HERE which I agree with 100%: “Some may believe that kinism is the same as racism. This is understandable, though not accurate. Kinism, though rightly associated with racism and racists, is not the same as racism. Kinism is a racist doctrine, but it is not synonymous with racism.” You accurately label racism as a doctrine or worldview.
2. My definition:

Morecraft: “Whenever we have any kind of belittling attitude toward people made in the image of God we are blaspheming God Himself.”

(sermon clip – Kinism: The New Racism;

<https://theonomyresources.blogspot.com/search/label/Kinism%20Heresy>)

Morecraft’s words in this audio clip provide a guideline for defining racism. Racism is not merely limited to an active hatred of a people or culture’s skin color, lest that definition be too narrow. Nor is racism just a passive belief in the existence of multiple races, lest that definition be too broad. Racism is somewhere in the middle – while encompassing aspects of both ends – and ought to be defined in both an ideological/religious and cultural/societal sense. My personal definition of racism focuses on defining racism as limited to being a worldview but with applications as vast as the depraved heart of man. Here is a working definition:

Racism is the worldview which actively belittles fellow image bearers of God as being something less than human or less than equal to one’s own self or culture based on things such as national origin, language, or physical features. A racist worldview can be expressed in various forms, including but not limited to belief in kinism, belief in white supremacy or some other skin tone supremacy, belief that other “races” can not or ought not be saved, and an active fear, hatred, and or oppression of one or more people groups due to cultural origin, language, or physical features – examples include the antisemitism of Nazi Germany, the anti-Japanese sentiment in America leading up to the WW2 internment camps, or the growing modern black Hebrew Israelism movement. Racism is not synonymous with its applications, though they often stem directly from that worldview. If I use the term racist, I will be referring to a person who adheres to the worldview of racism in at least one sense of the above definition.

B. Kinism:

1. Your definition:

In your article HERE you provide this definition: “*kinism is the belief that God specially ordained ‘races’ and that He intends for us to preserve that division to one degree or another. Kinism believes that God ethically and specially ordained the nations and ‘races’. In short, kinism is a doctrinal conviction of anti-miscegenation. All positions commonly held by kinists flow from this key kinist doctrine.*” You then link to three

articles on the topic, including Brian Schwertley's article [HERE](#) which is the most comprehensive of the three. I agree with Schwertley's usage of the word more than your slightly too broad usage based on how he often distinguishes racism and kinism as being two separate ideas with overlapping applications. You also define kinism as being an injustice. You said it's "an injustice to many people, especially those in interethnic marriages, it is primarily an affront to God. Though less radical 'weak kinists' may have fewer human victims, the foundational heresy sins directly against God." The wording here ("human victims") equates kinism to something as serious to murder or physical abuse. I don't think that that is an accurate comparison if that is the comparison you were making because it makes kinism equal to racism in the more extreme forms. I do agree that "the foundational heresy sins directly against God," and that is frankly all that matters. All heresy is an injustice against God alone. This topic leads to the much larger discussion of what is the biblical definition of justice versus injustice and is holding an unjust worldview the same as performing an act of injustice on others.

2. My definition:

Like the definition of racism, the definition of kinism should not be too broad or too narrow and should not be used synonymous with its applications; e.g. I don't think kinism and anti-miscegenation should be used as interchangeable phrases. Further, the word kinist should not be used loosely or too narrow. Possibly the best theonomic blog series against kinism has been written by Stephen Halbrook of Theonomy Resources [here](#) in which he references Brian Schwertley's sermons a number of times.

I view kinism as nationalism's cousin where – similar to political nationalism's idolatry of the Nation State pitting the security of the nation over the freedoms of the individual – kinism idolizes the family bloodline and pits the security of the bloodline against the providential dominion of Christ over different cultural people groups. Hence kinism is often related to anti-miscegenation, but (slightly different from your definition) I see kinism's anti-miscegenation as a means to an end and not an end for itself. Another application of kinism would be the belief in the geographical separation of different people groups. Using a political term, kinism is essentially bloodline protectionism – with 'bloodline' defined in either a familial or racial context.

To keep things simple, if I use the word kinism I will be referring to the first part of your definition where you say, "kinism is the belief that God specially ordained 'races' and that He intends for us to preserve that division to one degree or another." If I use the term kinist, I will be referring to a person who adheres to the worldview of kinism in at least one sense of the above definition. I will not be referring to those who, whether by family tradition or the right of conscience, are merely uncomfortable with 'interracial' marriages, unless those persons take it upon themselves to act against those legitimate marriages either through written/verbal word or deed.

C. Nonsense

1. My definition:

Even though I clarified this via private message, I want to reiterate something here. Noah Webster defines the word nonsense as the following:

NON'SENSE, noun

1. No sense; words or language which have no meaning, or which convey no just ideas; absurdity. 2. Trifles; things of no importance.

As clarified via private message, I used the word as synonymous to “debacle” or “upheaval” or “crazy situation.” Using Webster’s first definition, I used the term in the “such-n-such makes no sense” or “that thing is an absurd idea or thing to say or do” sense of the term and not in the “this discussion is not important and therefore dismissed” sort of way. I probably should have used a clearer word to express my meaning and will shy away from this term from here on to avoid confusion. Take this as a lesson in how a simple word can be interpreted various ways. Multiply that by several thousand and that is what Facebook has become: the sport of misinterpreting other people’s words. But I digress...

D. Cultural Marxism

1. My definition: I do not and will not use this term, except to acknowledge its use by others. This term is confusing and unhelpful because of its ambiguity. I strongly urge others not to use this term and to seek other words to describe your meanings, but I still won’t denounce those who use this term.

III. Response to Comments and Questions from You and Jordan Wilson

A) Your comments in audio messages

1. I’m not sure how to download and re-upload the relevant audio clips, and I don’t think a full transcription is needed but here is what you said towards the end of the nigh-7 minute audio message, *“You’re upset and you’re alarmed, and making posts and sending messages because of your earthly father while your heavenly father is being drug through the mud by this kind of display of a lack of leadership and a lack of care for the flock. We open our doors to a wolf [Hammond]. He is going to raise money from the coffers of people that go to your church, from Joel Saint’s church, and God knows what he will do with those funds ... even if you end up disagreeing with me, you need to take this seriously.”*
2. Starting at the beginning:
 - (a) You imply that I have a greater desire to respect or defend my earthly father (who you imply to be in sin for speaking at the conference) instead of honoring my heavenly father. Firstly, “A good name is to be chosen rather than great riches, Loving favor rather than silver and gold” (Proverbs 22:1). I believe defending my dad’s good name against backhanded comments both in your comments and elsewhere on Facebook is proper and follows the commandment to honor my father and mother. Second, I fully expected you or someone to bring up his name in a post. He was the keynote speaker at the conference so naturally he’d be challenged as being a kinist-sympathizer at some point. Your post was not a surprise, and my reaction shouldn’t have been a surprise to you. Third, both in your message (*“You’re upset and alarmed...”*) and in Liz Sack’s comment on my post (*“I know how hard this hits home...”*) imply that I’ve been having an emotional struggle

or spiritual conflict while dealing with the fact that my dad spoke at a conference where Hammond did. Mark this and feel free to quote it: I am fully at peace that my dad did not back out of speaking at the conference, that he did not join in public denouncement of MARS's decision to keep Hammond as a speaker, and I have been fully in control of the level of emotion in my comments both here and on Facebook.

- (b) I only posted one thing to your wall and sent three private messages to you, Jordan, and pastor Garwood all saying essentially the same thing. I don't have a blog and I'm not one to randomly post these kinds of threads in Facebook groups or even my wall.
- (c) I did not catch this before, but your comment about funds going to Hammond directly from these two congregations is extremely disturbing and presumptuous and you did not even deal with that accusation in your blog post. Please clarify this.
- (d) If I did not take this whole situation seriously I would not have bothered to complete this letter. I would have just unfriended you on Facebook immediately after seeing your blog post, maybe in a similar fashion that you did to my sister, Rebekah, after I said in my initial message that my sister sent me screenshots of parts of your blog post. Or maybe that was after she live-streamed Hammond's breakout session? Either way, don't worry: no hurt feelings. For me this just displayed a little pettiness.

B) Answering Jordan's questions

1. Question/comment listed with replies:

(a) *"The Hammond issue is not nonsense."*; See section II. C. of this letter.

(b) *"Did Saint and PMR not claim Hammond was being bullied?"*;

I don't have those screenshots but I remember hearing my dad use that word once or twice in conversation. Have you contacted him for clarification or examples of what they meant?

(c) *"Is the ARTC not a pseudo denomination?"*;

For future reference the website is www.thereformationalliance.org, but you knew that because you were an Admin at one point. Its an alliance or federation of churches using a model inspired by John Owen and the Savoy Declaration instead of using the modern, often abused denomination model. But you kinda already knew this because, if I remember correctly, you were at one of the ARTC meetings and had at least one phone conference call with my dad, pastor Saint, and pastor Garwood on this matter. Maybe I'm mistaken. Feel free to continue calling it a pseudo-denomination if you wish, but please just stay honest about its structure when talking publicly.

(d) *"You should ask John what he means by upstarts with regard to Hoyle."*;

I never mentioned Hoyle, so either you assumed or you knew that that is who he was referring. See clarification point #2.

- (e) *“Where were you condemning Trewhella when we was calling recon radio heretics? Where was your concern regarding treatment of the brethren there?”*;

I do not think I ever saw this thread. Do you have screen shots for context? Feel free to message those to me privately. But I have no idea how that is related to this conversation unless you are implying an inconsistency on my part.

- (f) *“Where were you when people were calling Joel McDurmon a snake? in abolition group?”*; Same answer as above.

- (g) *“Is public disagreement always attack?”*;

Nope, never said it was. Public disagreements do require civility, context, and honestly representing your opponents’ arguments in order to be effective though. Ideally they would be prefaced with personal contact (phone, email, etc) if only to notify the subject matter of one’s intention or publication of the public disagreement. In a situation where a sin is committed, this step would be vital for calling the person(s) to repentance.

- (h) *“I’m willing to assist in talking to John Reasnor and I have in the past. Have you talked to Hoyle? I have directly addressed Hoyle about his public online conduct already on multiple occasions and he continues on.”*;

Yes, I’ve talked to Hoyle since this message but I’m not sure what me talking to Hoyle has to do with you talking to John. John is his own man, Robert is his own man. Me being in the middle both geographically and even somewhat politically and theologically between John and Robert does not mean I should be middle man of communication between them or you and Hoyle. Y’all ultimately have to be the ones to reach out to each other to open lines of communication and rebuild bridges. If you want to set up a conference call or get coffee sometime, I’m willing to help with that. Also see clarification point #2.

IV. Outline of Key Points of Concern in Blog Post

Throughout the blog post you have two primary focuses: Peter Hammond, and the Future of Christendom Conference. As said earlier, this letter will not be a defense of Hammond. Unlike others, and mainly for sake of time, I will concede a limited amount of your arguments when I do agree while focusing on my main concerns. I will also not deal with certain points that are beyond the purpose of this letter. This ought not be interpreted as me 100% agreeing with those undealt with points. I’ll merely state the reason I will not deal with those when they arrive. Here’s an outline:

A. Key Points of Concern

1. Your description of Hammond

- (a) point #1 – Hammond as a kinist
- (b) point #2 – Hammond as a racist
- (c) point #3 – Hammond’s excommunication and subsequent accusations

2. Your use of Hammond against the conference
 - (a) point #4 – Hammond should not have been invited as a speaker
 - (b) point #5 – giving Hammond a stage as a sin
 - (c) point #6 – Hammond as a litmus test for eldership and attendees
 - (d) point #7 – Joel Saint and MARS as minimizing kinism
3. Your misrepresentation of my father and ARTC
 - (a) clarification point #1 – my dad is not a member of the MARS Board of Directors
 - (b) clarification point #2 – use of the terms pseudo-denomination and upstarts
4. Your comments against pastor Joel Saint and MARS
 - (a) point #8 – comments related to paedobaptism and excommunication documents
 - (b) clarification point #3 – trip to Holocaust Museum in D.C.
5. Other lesser points
 - (a) clarification point #5 – the right to boycott and publicly say so

V. Response to Key Points

1. Your description of Hammond

- (a) point #1 – Hammond is a kinist; AGREED, in part;

Using your definition at the beginning (“...to preserve that division to one degree or another”), I would concede that Hammond is a kinist because of his clear view stated in the first quote from him in the blog post (“...to marry across the color line would be to me to betray my parents and all of our ancestors...[and] Almighty God...”). I view the subsequent quotes from him as various aspects or degrees of this type of ‘bloodline protectionism.’ Whether he claims to be a kinist or not is irrelevant at this point using that definition.

That said, using my definition (or even your’s), it is not 100% clear how a kinist worldview is compatible with an evangelism ministry such as Hammond’s. More on this later.

You mentioned nationalism in your blog post so I will mention it here:

In a recent Facebook comment I saw, Hammond denies being an economic nationalist (National Socialist) and claims to be an opponent of “International Socialism” (aka Communism). Whether you believe him or not, I like those terms he used since they are also used by one of my favorite political philosophers, John T. Flynn, in his 1940s book *As We Go Marching*. Taking Hammond’s words at face value, and viewing his kinism through my overused political lens, I’d still



Matthew McRay Believe Peter Hammond, I ask this honestly, do you agree with the Neo-Nazi view of Hitler? It seems like you defended Hitler when you were on the talk show. Was that the case?

Like · Reply · 11h



Peter Hammond No, my Father was a British soldier in the Royal Artillery who fought in the 8th Army all 6 years of the Second World War, mostly in North Africa& Italy, under Field Marshall Montgomery.

I have ministered throughout Eastern Europe, from Poland in the North through to Romania, Bulgaria and Albania in the South. The betrayal of over 100 Million Christians into the hands of the brutal communist regime of Josef Stalin's Soviet Union by the Allies at Yalta and the incinerating of whole cities, such as Dresden, were war crimes that every Christian should be outraged about.

We are against every form of socialism and secularisation. To fight Hitler's National Socialism did not require supporting Stalin's International Socialism. I have written and spoken against the National Socialism of Adolf Hitler and its secular humanism. I have condemned their euthanasia, abortion, gun control and other oppressive and murderous policies. As I have and continue to condemn the secular humanism of Marxism and the perverse wickedness of our secular humanist western world. That includes the secular humanistic policies of the United States of America.

Like · Reply · 10h

classify Hammond as a cultural-nationalist or national-kinist (cultural-bloodline protectionism) but obviously not as an economic-nationalist since I know nothing of his personal political philosophy.

(b) point #1 – Hammond as a racist; DEBATABLE but highly possible;

While I'll admit that his quotes and interviews on the neo-nazi podcast are pretty damning and very much a broad-brush of Jewish culture, I will not go into this because – comparing the definition of racism at the beginning (“...*the worldview which actively belittles fellow image bearers of God...*”) with the definition of kinism – I think kinist is a more apt description since Hammond's ministry in Africa and elsewhere – which naturally requires his white skin tone to fellowship with (“mix” with) other believers who have black or brown skin tones – does not seem to be compatible with an outright racist worldview which idolizes skin color, claims certain people groups are sub-human, or belittles those with different skin tones. Secondly, his appearances on those neo-nazi podcasts could be explained as proof of his nationalist-kinist worldview instead of an inherent racist hatred for other “races” without Hammond himself being a neo-nazi himself. That may seem like a contradictory claim, but I've seen this in politics where a non-racist appears on a racist podcast in order to gain some name ID or influence with the podcast listeners to move them towards a certain viewpoint. Understand this: I'm not saying that Hammond is not a racist, I am saying that he does not seem to act like one according to my distant knowledge of his mission work. This all depends on the definition of racist or racism that you use. Again, I'm not defending his podcast appearances or his words, but merely the act of appearing on questionable podcasts in and of itself is not reason enough for denouncement.

(c) point #2 – Hammond's excommunication and subsequent accusations; DEBATABLE;

I list this as debatable because I have yet to gain access to the various documents you mention. I have read the summary, but I also noticed your paragraph here: “*There is also a contrary examination of the excommunication from Brian Abshire that sided with Hammond. I have asked for this document, and thus far no one has provided this document. I'd be happy to read it.*” If my understanding is correct, Phillip Kayser was involved in the arguments in Hammond's defense and he was one of the speakers at the conference. Yes, I do believe ecclesiastical courts matter but I also believe that hearing both sides is the minimum “due diligence” needed before stating a public opinion. I think the debatable aspect is not so much whether or not Hammond was excommunicated, but whether or not that was done so properly/biblically/theonomically. Accusations alone do not prove guilt – especially in the most serious of accusations. Hence, I will not state an opinion on the accusations since I've yet to receive both sides of the arguments, as it appears that you haven't either as of that blog post. If you can send me a copy of either side of the court debates or send me the contact info of where to get a copy, that would be helpful for a subsequent discussion on the matter. [As a side note, I do not have an opinion of Kenneth Talbot since I do not know him personally. Also as a side note, I know quite a few people who did not attend the first Future of Christendom Conference due to Bojidar Marinov's views on egalitarianism and the rumors of his excommunication from a church once-upon-a-time. Other friends who did attend that conference did so with the knowledge that MARS did not endorse each and every viewpoint that Mr. Marinov held to. I and my parents also attended.]

2. Your use of Hammond against the conference

- (a) point #3 – Hammond should not have been invited as a speaker; AGREED;

This is something that I told you back in March when I said that Kevin Novak would have been a more ideal pick as a speaker. You agreed and then said that Joel McDurmon would have been another option. The point being: at that point in time, you knew my basic stance about Hammond, my dad's opposition to kinism and relation to the conference with MARS (see point 3.b), and you even called ARTC an "alliance" instead of "pseudo-denomination."

- (b) point #4 – giving Hammond a stage as a sin; DISAGREE;

Inviting Hammond was unwise due to the controversy of the man, yet this same group of God-fearing conference organizers invited another controversial man the previous year (Bojidar Marinov) and were ridiculed for that pick then as well. Inviting controversial figures in and of itself is not a sin, though it is often unwise when better options exist. I also disagree that inviting Hammond was a sin because I have a different view of the nature of what a conference is. Noah Webster's dictionary defines conference as,

CON'FERENCE, noun [See Confer.] 1. The act of conversing on a serious subject; a discoursing between two or more, for the purpose of instruction, consultation, or deliberation; formal discourse; oral discussion. 2. A meeting for consultation, discussion or instruction. 3. Comparison; examination of things by comparison.

CONFER', verb intransitive [Latin , to bear, to bring forth, to show, to declare] To discourse; to converse; to consult together; implying conversation on some serious or important subject, in distinction from mere talk or light familiar conversation; followed by with. CONFER', verb transitive 1. To give, or bestow; followed by on. This word is particularly used to express the grant of favors, benefits and privileges to be enjoyed, or rights which are to be permanent; as, to confer on one the privileges of a citizen; to confer a title or an honor. 2. To compare; to examine by comparison; literally, to bring together. [See Compare.] 3. To contribute; to conduce to; that is, to bring to. The closeness of parts confers much to the strength of the union, or intransitively, confers to the strength of the union.

You seem to have a much higher view of conferences as a place of authority, whereas I view conferences as the modern equivalent of the ancient Forum where ideas, philosophies, or worldviews (especially the controversial ones) are presented, debated, and discussed. This is one way of how we can combat heresy head-on in our modern age in a similar fashion to how the early church did with their councils: through in-person meetings and lectures – which is why on Facebook a long time ago I fully endorsed a debate between McDurmon and Hammond to settle this situation in one of the many threads in the Level-Headed or ReconRadio groups. Our disagreement on this point and onward, perhaps, shows a disagreement on our views of the definitions or limitations of authority. Perhaps this is why you now call ARTC a pseudo-denomination because we have slightly different views of authority within the church and between churches. Either way, I don't view Hammond's invitation to or presentation at the conference as a sin based on the nature of what a conference is: conferred speaking time to present or debate ideas, worldviews, etc. The question is, did he teach heresy as truth while at the conference? I'll refer you to the recording of his lecture here.

- (c) point #5 – Hammond as a litmus test for eldership and conference attendees; DISAGREE;
& point #7 – Saint and MARS as minimizing kinism; DISAGREE

If you lined up every speaker at any conference, you'd see that no two speakers are in identical agreement on all points of doctrine. Many of them might even have pet doctrines which they like to teach about. I remember hearing pastor Kevin Swanson once going on a tangent about tattoos with I did not agree with completely, or how pastor Joseph Morecraft once answered a question about reformed rap music in a manner which I completely disagreed with. Pet doctrines or usage of words (e.g. "cultural Marxism") should not diminish the lecture's overall value or message in the ears of the hearer.

In this case, its not a pet doctrine being preached but an inherent worldview of the lecturer which – as you argue – taints the entire lecture and conference as a whole. Should Hammond's mere presence at the conference be interpreted as an endorsement of or minimization of kinism by the MARS board and other speakers? I'd say absolutely not, even if other board members or speakers do not publicly state their opinions on the matter. You might even agree with that much. Should Hammond's position as a speaker be interpreted as an endorsement of or minimization of kinism by the MARS board and other speakers? Simply based on Webster's definition of what a conference is, I'd say absolutely not. The nature of a conference is different from the nature of a church, hence I'd argue that a conference speaker does not actually have 'authority' as you state ("...*authority in order to teach the Bride of Christ...*"). You equate teaching with authority of an almost ecclesiastical nature. Perhaps it would be helpful for you to expound on this.

I've helped organize enough events to know that the invited guest speakers, especially the keynotes, do not represent the host organization(s) or the individual organizers' viewpoints. To conflate the speakers' viewpoints with the conference organizers' viewpoints is to do a disservice to the organizers by assuming their 100% endorsement of the speaker's entire viewpoint. Unless they've stated otherwise, I highly doubt that the MARS Board endorsed every doctrinal stance of every speaker they've had this year (or last year for that matter). And I doubt that that will change any time soon.

On a side note, while you mention Martin Selbrede's article about the Cherem Principle, you failed to mention that Mr. Selbrede was the co-keynote speaker of the conference along with my dad. It wasn't until your comment on my post that you state your opinion of this. You said, "*I believe attending the same conference as a guest or as another speaker is righteous if you publicly rebuke Hammond, but questionable at best if you don't. But it is not clearly a sin on its own. I believe men like Martin Selbrede are in this category. If Martin or Philip or Trewhella greeted Peter as a brother and treated him as a brother, that would be sin and hatred towards Peter.*" I find it interesting that you do not seem to hold other speakers to the same standard as, say, my dad. Further, have you asked Mr. Selbrede of his perspective of the conference? Have you asked pastor Mark Rushdoony, who was also present as both a vendor and attendee, his viewpoint of the situation? More on this later.

3. Your misrepresentation of my father and ARTC

- (a) clarification point #1 – my dad is not a member of the MARS Board of Directors;

Yes, my dad was influential in helping launch the Independence Reformed Bible Church in Pennsylvania. Yes, my dad has spoken at several MARS events in the past – including a break out session at the 2017 Future of Christendom Conference. But no, my dad is not on the MARS Board of Directors so he did not have a say in any of the conference logistics. Furthermore, even though one of the ARTC churches was involved in the logistics does not mean that ARTC itself was involved in any capacity. No one explicitly said it was, but the inclusion of ARTC in the blog post was entirely unnecessary unless you were trying to imply it had a connection with the conference. I'm not even sure why my dad was included other than the fact that he was one of the keynotes or that McDurmon tagged him in his "line in the sand" post in the Level-Headed and ReconRadio groups shortly after my dad posted something unrelated to the conference.

(b) clarification point #2 – use of the term pseudo-denomination and upstarts;

(Also see my response to Jordan's question above.)

If you and Jordan had not previously been in touch with me about helping with the ARTC logo and website, I might have believed you when you said in the audio message that you "*didn't know what to call [ARTC]*" except a pseudo-denomination. You point out that pseudo means "para" or "new," and so brush off the remark as an innocent word. Yet you previously just called it an "alliance," which it is and not some conspiratorial para-church ministry that abolitionists are often accused of being a part of. So, I'll give you the benefit of the doubt but our brief chat a few months back make that difficult.

When Jordan said in his message "*You should ask John what he means by upstarts with regard to Hoyle,*" that means that (at least to Jordan) you were referring to Robert Hoyle specifically when you used the word upstarts. Based on other things Jordan has said to me I believe that he is willing to have civility, but your use of the word upstarts makes it hard to believe that you share that same sentiment. If an in-person meeting with lots of coffee were arranged to hash out our differences and come to a "unity of the faith" on where we do agree, would you honestly be willing to meet with me, Robert Hoyle, and Eli Jones and whoever else in Virginia you think should attend? Perhaps sometime in the Spring or early Summer? Given your comments about Hoyle's rebuttal to McDurmon's view of the Cherem Principle (which was endorsed by pastor Joseph Morecraft), I suspect that your answer will be no, that no unity can be found, or that you don't unify with Hammond-sympathizers. Prove me wrong and I would be pleasantly surprised.

4. Your comments against pastor Joel Saint

I won't dwell on this section long because I think a better defense of the God-fearing men of MARS should be written more systematically by someone closer to each of them if they do chose to reply to your various accusations – especially given Liz and Allen's post on your blog which I think was entirely uncalled for from someone who claims to have left the IRBC through letter (probably via email) instead of a phone call or at the planned in-person meeting which they canceled. But I do want to briefly touch on something in defense of pastor Saint which you wrote.

(a) point #8 – comments related to paedobaptism and excommunication documents;

You provide a few screenshots without any greater context in order to point out a supposed contradiction in pastor Saint's Facebook comments. For all we know there could have been 100

comments prior that show the development of thought and how words are used to convey that thought. Regarding paedobaptism, you say “*Even worse than that, Joel Saint claims that being a paedobaptist is worse than being a kinist*” without providing any screenshot or audio clip with context. You merely state something is outlandish without presenting an argument for why or even proof for its existence. Also, I highly doubt that pastor Saint would even actually have made such a claim given that in ARTC there are both paedo and credo baptist viewpoints with paedobaptism being in the majority. If you can’t provide proof with context for this you should probably recant this portion.

As said before, since I haven't read the documents yet I will not discuss the content. I will say this though: perhaps pastor Saint did not have the complete set of documents but only some of them and was trying to make sense of the some. You said, “*Joel Saint has had access to the very same documents I have access to for several months...*” Again, as said earlier, given that you yourself admitted to not having one half of the excommunication documents (Hammond’s defense), an argument could be made that you yourself should not have written on the topic until you had the complete set of documents. I won’t pretend to know what pastor Saint read or did not read at the time of those comments, but I see no reason to question his integrity – which you do, especially in your update to the Sacks’ blog post here. As Liz once quoted Proverbs 18:17 in article she wrote in defense of two abolitionists, so will I quote here: “The first one to plead his cause seems right, until his neighbor comes and examines him.” Both your and McDurmon’s posts on these topics have questioned the integrity and motivations of pastor Saint and the MARS Board. While I do hope that they do respond in a formal and civil debate setting, you should not be surprised if they never respond to you in a manner similar to how David did not respond to Shimei.

(b) clarification point #3 – trip to Holocaust Museum in D.C.;

Ah! a quick trip down memory lane. The abolitionist project in D.C. is probably one of my fondest memories. It was an example of radical unity under Christ for the common cause of justice for the preborn. One somewhat insignificant memory I have was when all one hundred or so of us were sitting down for lunch in front of the Washington Monument ‘breaking bread’ together. In fact, I remember sitting next to Liz and Allen Sacks during lunch talking, in part, about how awesome it was for the unity between our two congregations (in PA and VA) in fighting against abortion. You sat down a few feet behind us and Jordan Wilson came by soon after to introduce himself to you. It was that day that I met you for the first time, and I remember chatting briefly about politics or something with you while in front of the Museum. Another great memory is when Alan Maricle, myself, and two other abolitionists got lost for an hour while looking for Alan’s car after my car got locked overnight in a parking garage. Great times. Amazing fellowship. Much success.

The reason I bring this up is because, other than using it to question pastor Saint’s motivations and somehow associate him with those neo-Nazi podcasts through Hammond, 1) I recall that you denounced T. Russell Hunter and many others who were at that event this very year due to the Kill The Lizard (KTL) debates in the Abolitionism group. It just seemed odd to me why you would bother using this abolitionist project in your blog post. 2) The radical unity of fellowship and willingness to debate fellow abolitionists face-to-face expressed back then is now totally abandoned and replaced with endless streams of blog posts, including the Sacks’ post on your blog, which rarely provide tangible long-term solutions and only add fuel to the already burned down bridge. That radical unity has decayed since a mere 2 years ago to be almost nonexistent.

5. Other lesser points

(a) clarification point #5 – the right to boycott and publicly say so;

I've personally never seen a long-term benefit to boycotts, though their short-term effects are hard to avoid. People are free to boycott as their conscience deems fit, but I like to point out how boycotts are only as effective as the consistency of the boycott. This is a moot point since the conference is now long past, but your four points for your boycott are inconsistent within the context of the conference definition given earlier.

- i. *"I refuse to willfully sit under the teaching of a wolf who has been lawfully given over to Satan by a legitimate ecclesiastical court."*;

Logistically Hammond was a breakout session not given in the main room of the conference. People either chose to go or not to go hear his lecture. This provided a freedom of Christian conscience to attendees, especially those keeping up with the controversy (which I posit that most of the attendees were). No one was forced to sit under Hammond's lecture.

- ii. *"I refuse to give any credibility to the position of authority that is implicitly handed over to this false teacher by the MARS board."*;

Great, good for you. No one asked you to give credibility and being an attendee would not automatically do this. Perhaps you can argue that being an attendee to that specific lecture would, but that is not what you said.

- iii. *"I refuse to have any sort of fellowship with a man we are commanded to not even eat with."*;

Understandable, and yet it is based on documents that could therefore also not be publicly available to all of the would-be attendees of the conference. What would have your solution to that have been?

- iv. *"I have serious questions about the discernment of any group of men (the MARS board) that would prop up such a man as Hammond, even after all of these details about his character have been made plain to them."*;

This is probably your best and only argument for your boycott, not because you are correct in your analysis, but because you exercised your Christian liberty of conscience by not going because of MARS inviting Hammond though you unfortunately did so while questioning the integrity or discernment of the MARS Board and have taken it on yourself to call them to repentance of something that you view as an act of injustice. Meanwhile, the same conference was attended and even endorsed by God-fearing men I know you do respect, namely pastor Mark Rushdoony and Martin Selbrede, and powerhouse organizations like the Chalcedon Foundation had book tables there. As a side note, a simple web search will show that Chalcedon has old interviews with and articles about and by Peter Hammond on their website. If your boycott were consistent, you'd be calling those men to repentance of their association with the conference, MARS, and Hammond and command those resources be taken down – just like McDurmon did with other organizations a few days ago. But you haven't, to my knowledge, which puts the consistency or seriousness of your boycott into question. I highly doubt that you were planning to attend the conference anyway since you did not attend the previous year's conference, and that decision to continue to not attend was merely confirmed once you realized Hammond was a speaker. If it wasn't Hammond, it might've just been the outcry about Trewhella's use

of John Knox quotes. You were and are free to boycott what you will, but in hindsight I don't think it was effective in the long-term for solving the problem you saw.

VI. Conclusion

While this is probably the longest letter I've ever written, I doubt that this letter will achieve anything and I apologize again for its lateness. I said that I'd write something so I wanted to keep my word. In it I conceded a few of your foundational points: that Hammond is a kinist and most likely a racist (according to my definitions and understand of those worldviews, not yours), and that MARS should have had a better pick for a breakout speaker. I still vehemently disagree with the application of your points, your view of conferences and authority of the speakers, and your methodology of handling this situation which has been primarily through Facebook and blog posts instead of through intentional personal off-line contact. I'm sure I bypassed many points – most notably the excommunication papers – but I hope my reasons are satisfactory for the time being.

When I private messaged you I also messaged pastor Jason Garwood the following:

“I removed John from his admin position on the Abolish Abortion Virginia page and demoted Jordan from admin to moderator. I still am willing to work with both of these gentlemen in spite of John's attacks on my father or his associations with Bojidar's attacks on my father. That said, I can't allow John to have access to the page while this situation plays out. I'm allowing Jordan access because I view him as a closer brother and one who has yet to attack my dad. I surely still want to continue working together and build any burnt bridges between the various churches across the reformed, post-millennial, theonomist camp. If we are truly post-millennials we will treat people with a higher sense of dignity and urgency for unification not as conspirator or para-church competitors. I pray for you all in Warrenton and I have a lot of hope moving forward in Virginia as we work together.”

If we are honestly postmillennials and brethren, then we need to act like it in our communication and attitude with each one instead of acting like deconstructionists. I still hold this position 100%, and – based on pastor Garwood's response to me – I trust this is the position of others as well. My offer to getting coffee and having a civil one-on-one or small group discussion is valid and I hope you accept it at some point. I'll be at the March for Life in January to hand out AAVA and Defy Tyrants literature, if that is a good time for you after the day's events. Maybe you can bring your copies of Hammond's excommunication papers then for me to read in your presence. If you shrug this letter off, then I can only challenge you, McDurmon, and whoever else to do better: do your own conferences and invite who you think are the best of the best, host your own events that will stir up the Bride of Christ to action in every area of life. Don't bother tearing down institutions like MARS, IRBC, or ARTC if you don't have an alternative to replace it with. Just be like Nehemiah and build something better.

God speed.

-Christian Raymond
christianpraymond@gmail.com

“Walk in wisdom toward those who are outside, redeeming the time. Let your speech always be with grace, seasoned with salt, that you may know how you ought to answer each one.” - Colossians 4:5-6

“Love suffers long and is kind; love does not envy; love does not parade itself, is not puffed up; does not behave rudely, does not seek its own, is not provoked, thinks no evil; does not rejoice in iniquity, but rejoices in the truth; bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.” - 1 Corinthians 13:4-7

“Brethren, if a man is overtaken in any trespass, you who are spiritual restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness, considering yourself lest you also be tempted. Bear one another’s burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ. For if anyone thinks himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceives himself. But let each one examine his own work, and then he will have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. For each one shall bear his own load.” - Galatians 6:1-5

“I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you to walk worthy of the calling with which you were called, with all lowliness and gentleness, with longsuffering, bearing with one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” - Ephesians 4:1-6