
FORUM NOTES

A Louisiana Family Forum Fact Sheet

Volume 2, Number 22

Fallacy of Racism

Periodical Publication

By [Paula Weston](#)

Answers in Genesis

The evolutionary view that life can evolve to ‘higher’ levels provides fuel for racist attitudes. The Bible, on the other hand, clearly shows the fallacy of racism.

THE increasing spread of evolutionist doctrine has much to answer for in relation to the way people often treat each other.

Sadly, people rarely recognize that the prejudices which have slowly become ingrained in their psyche have often been a result — directly or indirectly — of evolutionary thinking.

One of the prevalent evidences of man’s inhumanity to man is racism. Put simply, racism is prejudice against people of other ‘races’¹ for that reason alone. Stereotypical rules are applied to demean individuals based on their cultural background, skin colour, appearance or accent.

More often than not, these rules allow an unfounded assumption of superiority over that individual, which in turn justifies any feelings of disdain or indifference towards them. In truth, this attitude is usually based on nothing more than fear, ignorance, and misunderstanding. The manifestations of racism can be blatant, such as in hatred from the Ku Klux Klan or the oppressiveness of apartheid; it can also be as simple as telling degrading anecdotes or possessing a cold attitude of indifference.

As a result of evolutionary thinking, many in Western society are unable to experience heartfelt sympathy for starving children in poverty-stricken Third World countries. For reasons they could never justify, they believe ‘life’ somehow means less to these strangers with different skin colour and features. Incredibly, I have heard this type of comment from ‘educated’ people!

This misinformed attitude is understandable if people accept the idea of ‘survival of the fittest’, that the rules of the animal kingdom must apply to humans ‘because we’ve all evolved from animals’!

Neither racism — nor the idea of evolution — started with Darwin. Both are manifestations of basing one’s thinking on a non-Biblical foundation. However, Darwin's writings greatly fuelled racism, providing a ‘scientific’ justification for it. His book’s subtitle referred to the ‘preservation of favoured races’.

The Bible, of course, teaches in the first chapter of Genesis that God created the heavens and the Earth, and all life upon it. There is no evidence to show that man’s existence came about in any other way. The theory of evolution is based on assumption and misinformation.



If we believe the Bible, *all* of the Bible, then it is clear that *all* people were created by God. ‘And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul’(Genesis 2:7).

Acts 17:26 says: ‘And [God] hath made of one blood [i.e. from one original ancestor, Adam and his wife, Eve] all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth ...’ That means we're all related!

The origin of the earth’s different ‘races’ (the Bible doesn’t use this term, but calls them tribes and nations) has long caused unnecessary confusion among both Christians and non-Christians. The truth is surprisingly simple.

Most evolutionists today wouldn’t dispute the Biblical creationist understanding that all ‘races’ came from the same original population (they would not agree that it was only two individuals), although that wasn’t always the case. Evolutionists teach that these groups ‘evolved’ independently from each other, separated for many tens of thousands of years. Evolutionists feel this length of time is necessary to explain the development of physical differences between the ‘races’.

This misleading concept gives rise to the idea that some ‘races’ have developed and become more ‘sophisticated’ faster than others, leading to the ultimate conclusion (often subconsciously) that certain ‘races’ are superior to others.

The Answers Book, by [Ken Ham](#), [Andrew Snelling](#), and [Carl Wieland](#), offers a clear and concise explanation of how the different ‘races’ developed after the confounding of the language and population dispersion at Babel (recorded in Genesis 11:1–9). The book provides logical, scientific evidence that mankind has descended from Noah and his family (and Adam and Eve before that). See the online extract [How could all human races come from Noah, his three sons and their wives?](#)

It explains how the dispersion, involving the breaking up of a large group into many small groups (comprising members who spoke the same language) who only breed within the group, ensured the resultant populations would have different mixes of genes for various physical features.

Adam and Eve, created perfect, would have had the genetic information enabling their offspring to have the many combinations of skin, hair, and eye colour existent in the world today.²

Today’s population descended from Noah and his family after the Flood, so the amount of genes available would probably have been slightly reduced from those of Adam and Eve.

Thus, the dispersion ensured that within a short time certain fixed differences³ would become apparent in some of the small groups, which we would call separate ‘races’.⁴

In Romans, we are told that all men are bornequal:

‘For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God’ (Romans 3:23),

but the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ has brought the possibility of redemption and salvation:



‘For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that **whosoever** [regardless of which tribe or ‘race’ they belong to] believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life’ (John 3:16). Among believers:

‘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’ (Gal. 3:28)

In the light of God’s Word, there can be no justification for promoting or condoning racism.

MADONNA AND EVOLUTIONARY RACISM

So-called rock ‘star’ Madonna was quoted as saying she would be unlikely to choose a black partner again. Claiming to have been mistreated when she dated black men, she allegedly said: ‘Maybe a lot of it has to do with the fact that they haven’t had the same chances as we white people have had to be educated or exposed to things that make you more evolved.’⁵

Sadly, millions of young people follow all the antics and comments of Madonna, whose activities scarcely merit a claim of cultural superiority. The statement quoted confuses biology and social opportunity, but highlights the all-too-common belief that some ‘races’ are less ‘evolved’ than others.

In fact, modern molecular biology confirms the Biblical view that all the peoples of the world are astonishingly close genetically. For example, it is common knowledge in the medical profession that, when looking for someone as an organ donor for a transplant, the person whose tissue type is most suitable for you (whether you are black or white, for example) may very well be someone of the ‘opposite colour’. In reality, all of us have the same brown-black pigment, melanin, in our skin, simply making more or less of that pigment.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. The term ‘race’ used to mean such things as the English race, the Irish race, etc. but since Darwin we tend to think of the word differently, so most today think in evolutionary terms about that word. We should use ‘tribes and nations’ or ‘ethnic groups’ because of this wrong understanding of the word ‘race’..
2. Some features may arise from a loss of information due to mutation since the Fall. Red hair, for instance, appears to be due to an inherited mutation such that the brown-black fraction of the pigment melanin cannot be produced, leaving only the reddish component. Since the other fraction affords more protection against the sun, redheads are more susceptible to sunburn. .
3. Such differences do not arise out of nowhere; the information was already present, just that a new combination of genes can appear different. These differences are not only trivial, (e.g. more or less of the same skin pigment) they are only ‘fixed’ if that group only intermarries within its own group. As individuals from different groups intermarry, genes are again allowed to combine in ways which will lead to a greater potential for variation, and a lessening of apparent differences between the groups. In theory, such intermarriage should be a genetic benefit, increasing the overall information within offspring, and diluting harmful genes which have arisen through mutations since the Fall.
4. See [The Answers Book](#) for a fuller discussion.
5. *The Daily Telegraph*, Sydney, October 15, 1996.

First published in: [Creation Ex Nihilo](#) 20(1):52–53, December 1997–February 1998

