

Races, Racism and Evolution

by Rev. Tom Aicken

The fact that we all came from our first parents, Adam and Eve, means that we belong, every one of us, to the human race. It also means that it's wrong to speak of a plurality of races as if different tribes originated from different sets of parents who bear no relation to one another.

If this is so, that we all came from the same parents, from where did this notion of distinct races spring into being in the first place, and how did it come to be passed down to us over time? Let's be honest. The whole idea of a plurality of races is born, not of scientific data but of ignorance. The notion that some 'races' are superior to others has descended from pride, and the propagation of such folly is the work of prejudice. The existence of races (plural) is a figment of one's imagination and is no more real than aliens or the legendary sasquatch.

Again, if this is so, that a plurality of races is born of ignorance and has no basis in reality, how is it that so many people are convinced that such races are real and must be acknowledged? There are at least four factors which, to varying degrees, keep the illusion alive: (1) skin colour, lighter to darker, the result of natural selection; (2) foreign languages, a consequence of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11); (3) diverse cultures, the effect of people growing up in different places all around the world in isolation from other communities, which is something that produces people groups who gravitate to their own ways and cultivate their own traditions; and (4) the entrenched and very profound influence of vocabulary, the fact that we've been told about different races, have accepted that concept as true and can no longer imagine anything else.

There are evolutionists who now accept that all the world's population might have come from a common source after all. Nevertheless, they still insist that it must have taken millions (or even billions) of years to introduce all the changes that have occurred and the broad ranges of difference from one ethnic grouping to another. In the natural realm, however, what we consider to be radical changes often appear much faster than any of us would ever imagine to be possible. After severe storms, for example, and even massive volcanoes, how often we see that what was once left seemingly in a state of utter devastation is brought back even better than before and very quickly.

Consider this speedy process in regard to something very basic, such as the skin colour of human beings. The question may be asked, "How, even over multiple generations, could any two people, one male and one female, reproduce such a wide variation of skin colour as we see throughout the world today?" The fact is that skin colour is the result of the amount of melanin produced, the more of it there is the darker the skin will be, and that a vast number of people (especially those who are golden brown) have the genetic capacity to pass on a wide spectrum of colour variations to future generations. What is interesting is that, while identical twins share the same DNA, fraternal twins have a different DNA, and can even have a different skin colour! We rarely see different coloured twins, that's true, but the fact that it happens at all answers the question before us.

It's believed by many that natural selection is a component of evolution. In point of fact, however, natural selection (building on present information, not introducing new) runs counter to evolution and is an observable fact which supports creation. Hence, the diversity of skin colour from one region to another as noted above. The theory of evolution rests, not on natural selection but on the inexplicable introduction of totally new entities and their taking off in unexpected directions through a process of time and chance. This is where the 'survival of the fittest' notion originates.

It's also believed by many that mutations are a result and confirming evidence of evolution. That, too, is untrue. Mutations are, for the most part, harmful rather than beneficial. There is compelling scientific evidence that the genomes of all living creatures are degenerating due to the accumulation of harmful mutations, and this phenomenon is known as genetic entropy, or what some have called "devolution."

What's more, it's believed by many that the several 'races' of humans (note the assumption that this is true without providing any evidence) testify to the evolutionary account of our origins, and, at the same time, prove the biblical account of creation to be false. Oh, but this also is wrong. The races (plural) don't exist, as we've seen, and that is further demonstrated by the fact that there is greater genetic diversity within each of the so-called 'races' than there are differences between them.

While, though, the 'races' of common parlance are not real, racism, sadly, is very real. Indeed, our continuing to speak of different races as if they were real is itself racist and a stimulant to further racist conversation. Racism, like any false religion (including the theory of evolution itself), is based on a mountain of fabricated stories, which, if embraced by enough people over a long enough period of time, is eventually considered by all the unsuspecting to be a self-evident truth. With all other baseless mythology, however, let's repudiate every trace of it!

What does the Bible teach and science affirm? Both declare that God "has made from one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26). Notice, it says "from one blood." This is something to be celebrated, along with the fact that we are made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26,27), that we therefore have value, and that we are equal, all of us, one with another. Men and women are given different roles from one another, are to function in a distinguishable and complementary manner (1 Cor. 11:3), but our value and equality with people all around the world is indisputable.

Why would anybody want to believe in evolution? It's a simple fact that nothing comes of nothing, and nothing ever could. This principle is universally understood and we see it commonly applied to everything in life except, as a means to deny the existence of God, to our own beginnings (Rom. 1:18f). There men draw back and defy the rule. Take, for example, a beautifully painted picture from ancient times, a genuine work of art for which no one now living can identify the artist or knows much of its provenance. Is anyone really going to believe that nobody ever painted it, that it just came into existence by time and chance? That is absurd.

There are those who tell us that our present existence is the result of a 'big bang' which happened many millions of years ago. Oh, but that cannot explain how we got here or the beginning of anything. For one thing, explosions *destroy* life, not *create* it. For another, there would have to be something already in existence, such as reacting chemicals, to produce such an explosion. Think about it. How would those chemicals come into being if it was not by a Creator? Nothing comes of nothing, and nothing ever could!

Not all evolutionists are atheists. There are those who tell us that God created everything alright, but that He did so by some evolutionary means, a process known as theistic evolution. There are even many professing Christians who hold

this view. But what sense does it make to believe what God tells us of the new creation (that sinners are saved by the grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ) if they are not prepared to believe what He has told us of the old creation (how He made us in the first place)? Why would anyone accept what they are told of Christ – and commit to Him, the last Adam – if they don't accept what they are told of the first Adam?

I referred earlier to evolutionists who accept that the world's population might have come from a common source, and some of them, in turn, because they profess faith in Christ, want to retain the biblical account of Adam and Eve. They understand, and rightly so, that getting rid of our first parents is to undercut everything else in the Bible. What they fail to see, however, is that, not only theistic evolution, but every 'old earth' theory (including Day Age, Progressive Creation, Gap Theory and Framework Hypothesis) stumbles over the same geological rock. What is it? Thinking that science has now proved the earth to be millions of years old – which it hasn't – they mistakenly assume that the plain language of God's Word must be reinterpreted to align itself with these newly discovered "facts". That is a foolish turn to take, one which can end only in error.

God is eternal, self-existent, and He does not belong to the natural order of things; He is, rather, the Creator of the natural order, the Designer who brought it into being, the very One of whom, through whom and to whom are all things (Rom. 11:36). The very fact that this world exists at all is living proof of the One who is distinguished from it and brought it into being, and He is to be believed.

Genesis 1 gives us a brief overview of what God made on each of the six days of creation. Chapter 2 gives us an expanded view of Day 6. Chapter 3 is about the first man, Adam, plunging himself into sin and bringing a curse on all the earth about him as a result of his doing so.

With Adam, mind you, we have all fallen into sin, come short of the glory of God, and the Lord Himself has told us that He will by no means clear the guilty (Ex. 34:7). But what is most amazing in all this – and this was God's plan from the beginning – is that whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved (Rom. 10:11-13), that, if one belongs to Christ (evidenced by his laying hold of Him by faith), whether such a one is Jew or Gentile, he is Abraham's seed and an heir according to the promise (Gal. 3:26-29). This is the Israel of God (Gal. 6:16).

