

The Kinist Heresy: A Biblical Critique of Racism¹

Chapter 1: Kinist Misuse of Scripture

[Brian Schwertley](#)

Today, we are going to examine a rapidly growing movement among professing Christians called kinism. Kinist or kinism comes from the word *kin*, such as “kith and kin.” The movement seems to be particularly popular among conservatives and ex-theonomists (I say ex-theonomists because kinism is essentially racist and antinomian). Its appeal lies in the idea that dark-skinned immigrants to the United States, be they African, Mexican or Caribbean, (generally speaking) tended to be socialistic in their outlook, more involved in crimes and a drag on the United States culturally, politically and socially.

Although the kinist literature on the web is almost completely devoid of biblical exegesis of appropriate passages (in fact, their use of passages tells us more about their racist presuppositions than it does about the teaching of Scripture), we will prove that they come to the Bible with a certain worldview or idea and then twist Scripture to make it fit with their concept of reality. We will examine each passage in turn.

Genesis 1:25

The first passage that is found sprinkled throughout their writings as support for their idea that intermarriage between different racial groups or “people groups” is immoral and forbidden by Scripture is from the creation narrative. It says, “And God made the beast of the earth according to its kind, cattle according to its kind, and everything that creeps on the earth according to its kind. And God saw that it was good.” The kinist does not quote the whole verse, but simply seizes on the phrase “according to its kind.” For example, the *Kinist Institute Manifesto* says, “We denounce the sin of miscegenation as a violation of God’s created order which has permanent consequences for every heritable trait. We appeal to God’s creation mandate of ‘kind after kind.’ It is the obligation of both church and state to forbid mixed unions according to biblical laws prohibiting unequal yoking.” (Miscegenation means intermarriage or inbreeding of whites and other races.) The basic idea behind their use of this phrase is that “Africans should mate according to their kind or within their kind”—“whites or Europeans should mate or breed only within their kind” and so on. This raises the question. Is this a legitimate interpretation of this passage or even a legitimate application of this passage? The answer is most certainly *no*.

In Genesis 1:25, Moses is noting that God created each “kind” according to a specific limited sphere of birth, function and existence. A modern way of saying this is that God created distinct species in the animal world. Biologically there is a genus or broad class of animals: mammals, reptiles, etc.. Then within a genus or subgenus are species. These are groups of

¹ This monograph is a slightly edited transcript of three Sabbath school lectures that, at the time they were given, were not intended to be published in written form. We have made it available to people in written form due to a number of requests to do so. Please keep that in mind as you read this paper.

animals which possess in common certain characteristics and, thus, they may interbreed and reproduce those characteristics. Dogs can have different varieties (breeds), but dogs are dogs and they only produce dogs. If mankind disappeared, dogs would eventually go back to their wild, common prototype. This is true of horses, species of fish, birds and so on. Things do not evolve into new species and each species is fixed by God and cannot interbreed with other species. Paul says the same thing in a different way in 1 Corinthians 15:39, “All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of animals, another of fish, and another of birds.” The flesh—the physical make-up—of different species differs considerably and each species is in a different unique category. Thus, for a man to mate with an animal is unnatural. It is an abomination (Lev. 18:23).

With the meaning of this passage in mind we ask, does it have anything to say regarding interracial marriage between human beings. Note the following comments that apply to this debate. (1) First, the different people groups or “races” (so to speak) of humankind can successfully interbreed. They can give each other blood transfusions, organ donations and so on. In other words, Asians, Africans, Europeans, etc. are all of the same kind or species. This point is rather obvious since we all came from Adam and Eve. Therefore, this passage does not support the kinist or racist position, but rather disproves it. As we will see, the great issue in the true biblical religion is not race or ethnicity, but faith and the ethics/worldview that come with the true religion.

In fact, it is noteworthy that modern fascist movements come not from the biblical worldview, but from Darwinism and macro-evolutionary theory. Blacks were thought to be less evolved than whites. Jews and Italians were lower on the evolutionary scale than northern Europeans. The Nazi movement, the eugenics movement, Planned Parenthood and the like, all flow from macro-evolutionary theory.

(2) Second, although the text does not support kinist or racist views, it does teach by implication and application that bestiality and the attempt to blur species through cloning and so forth is immoral. If the kinist used this text properly, he would argue that whites should not intermarry with chimpanzees, orangutans or gorillas. Whites should not adopt the culture or the practices of the baboon or the gibbon. But to use this against interracial marriage between solid Christians or to argue that I must eat sauerkraut and sausage instead of burritos and kung pao chicken is complete nonsense. It is unscholarly rubbish.

Genesis 9:20-27

The curse on Ham (or more accurately the curse on Ham’s son Canaan) reads: “And Noah began *to be* a farmer, and he planted a vineyard. Then he drank of the wine and was drunk, and became uncovered in his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brothers outside. But Shem and Japheth took a garment, laid *it* on both their shoulders, and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father. Their faces *were* turned away, and they did not see their father’s nakedness. So Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done to him. Then he said: ‘Cursed *be* Canaan; a servant of servants he shall be to his brethren.’ And he said: ‘Blessed *be* the LORD, the God of Shem, and may Canaan be his servant. May God enlarge Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Shem; and may Canaan be his servant.’”

Racists have appealed to this passage for more than one hundred and fifty years. The general idea behind this passage is that dark-skinned people descended from Ham and dark-

skinned people, especially Negroes or black Africans, have a special curse throughout history. Here are some interesting quotes based on this text. In 1958 the Mormon church wrote, "We know circumstances under which the posterity of Cain (and later of Ham) were cursed with what we call Negroid racial characteristics." In 1929 the Jehovah's Witnesses took this position: "The curse which Noah pronounced upon Canaan was the origin of the black race." Although not appealing directly to Ham, a kinist web site has approvingly posted the following racist nonsense,

The Negroes were "political idiots," and the North by trying to put them into political authority had "sinned against all knowledge."

On the topic of the Negro's natural endowment one finds the beginning of a division of opinion; for though some held that he could never compete with the white man in the arts and sciences, others believed that he had the potential ability to succeed in all of them save that of political management. It is a further commentary on the traditional Southern view of the arts that no embarrassment was felt over conceding the Negro even superiority in music, poetry, and oratory so long as politics remained the white man's preserve. The Southern Bivouac declared that it would not be surprised to see Negroes "in another generation" producing artists, poets, and orators surpassing those of the white race. But it regarded talent for self-government as the peculiar gift of the Aryan. The Negro betrayed his unfitness for rule through "absolute, unqualified veneration for power in its every form and symbol." He could understand only external control. "Nature formed him for obedience, and even when he is riotous and apparently insubordinate it is most generally his expression of contempt for what he deems weakness, and indirect tribute to that which he esteems the real representative of superior controlling force."

More than one writer took the view that it was impossible for the two races to dwell together unless the blacks remained in a condition approximating slavery, and sometimes traditional religion was invoked to sanction such an arrangement. Thus *The Land We Love* could say of the Negro that "From his history we infer that God has given him a tendency to thrive and multiply in a condition of servitude," and that therefore "the servile condition of the negroes in the South was not contrary to the will of God." If they lived free of white supervision and control, they would assert their natural bent, revert to a primitive status, and so create a county in which no white man would care to remain. *De Bow's Review* suggested that within the foreseeable future the Negro would drive the white man from his domain and so achieve an all-Negro South. This was accompanied by the realistic observation that no inferior race is ever practically and actually free when in contact with a superior, for the latter is certain to find means of exploiting the labor of the former.

Does the curse on Canaan or the statement of judgment toward Ham justify the position that black Africans would always be an inferior, subject peoples? The answer is definitely not!

This curse which is really a kind of prophecy does not describe the inescapable fate of a whole race of peoples, but rather applies specifically to only one of Ham's four sons—Canaan—which peopled Palestine and what became Carthage. The idea that it applies to all of Ham's sons and, thus, all of Africa is not in the text and therefore must be read into the passage. This view became popular because of the justifications of slavery and the rather common idea in the nineteenth century that blacks were inferior intellectually to whites. The best Hebrew scholars and commentators also condemn the racist interpretation of this passage. H. C. Leupold writes,

Much serious misunderstanding has grown out of a refusal to take this word at its actual face value, especially the word "Canaan." *Ham* is not cursed, no matter how freely proslavery men may have employed this text. Canaan is the fourth son of Ham (10:6) and so may roughly be said to represent one fourth of the Hamitic race. He alone is under consideration here. The rest of the Hamitic stock, apparently, does not come under consideration because it is neither directly blessed nor cursed. Its influence on the development of the rest of the human race is practically nil and, therefore, need not be mentioned here.

Now the descendants of Canaan, according to 10:15-20, are the peoples that afterward dwelt in Phoenicia and in the so-called land of Canaan, Palestine. That they became races accursed in their moral impurity is apparent from passages such as 15:16; 19:5; Lev. 18 and 20; Deut. 12:31. In Abraham's day the measure of their iniquity was already almost full. By the time of the entrance of Israel into Canaan under Joshua the Canaanites, collectively also called Amorites, were ripe for divine judgment through Israel, His scourge. Sodom left its name for the unnatural vice its inhabitants practiced. The Phoenicians and the colony of Carthage surprised the Romans by the depth of their depravity. Verily cursed was Canaan!²

Derek Kidner writes,

That the curse fell on Canaan, youngest son of the offender (10:6), who was himself a youngest son, emphasizes its reference to Ham's succession rather than his person. For his breach of the family, his own family would falter. Since it confines the curse to this one branch within the Hamites, those who reckon the Hamitic peoples in general to be doomed to inferiority have therefore misread the Old Testament as well as the New. It is likely, too, that the subjugation of the Canaanites to Israel fulfilled the oracle sufficiently (*cf.* Jos. 9:23; 1 Ki. 9:21).³

Victor P. Hamilton writes,

Canaan is to be a servant, a slave, to Japheth. Rather than seeing this oracle as an etiology of Israel's rise to power (the conclusion most often reached when form-critical questions are raised), we prefer to read it as a prophetic, futuristic view of relationships between Israel (and the Sea Peoples) and the Canaanites. In effect it outlines future history, when Israel conquered Canaan and the Sea Peoples were carving out their own niche in Canaanite-held lands.⁴

G. Ch. Aalders writes,

Meanwhile, the actual curse that is pronounced can hardly be applied to Canaan as a person. To be sure, one individual could be relegated to a position of total subjection to his brothers, but the sentence can more fittingly be applied to a wider group of people or a tribe or nation. Thus we could apply the curse to Canaan's descendants. That this is the case is confirmed by comparing this curse with the blessings pronounced on Shem and Japheth (vv. 26-27). There we note a reference to dwelling "in the tents (plural) of Shem." This would be descriptive of the tribal group that descended from Shem. Thus, also in the case of the curse of Canaan, we should think of the tribe that descended from him.

How are we then to think of the fulfillment of this curse? Let it be emphatically stated that this does not refer to the slavery of the black person. There was a time when the practice of

² H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1942), 349.

³ Derek Kidner, *Genesis: An Introduction & Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1967), 103-104.

⁴ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1-17* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 327.

slavery was readily defended by an appeal to the curse of Ham, but there is not one shred of biblical evidence to support this theory...

When we put all this data together, our interpretation of “the lowest of slaves” as a designation of a position of subjection under the control of other larger and more powerful nations becomes plausible. The Canaanitish tribes always were in a place of subjection and inferiority to the great powers such as Egypt and the Mesopotamian Empires. We know, in fact, that before Israel occupied the land of Canaan, the area was in complete subjection to Egypt. This, to our minds, would suffice as a fulfillment of Noah’s curse on the descendants of Canaan.⁵

Gordon J. Wenham writes,

“The lowest of slaves,” literally, “slave of slaves”: cf. the expressions “leader of the leaders” (Num. 3:32), “King of kings and Lord of lords” (Rev. 19:16). “To his brothers,” i.e., Shem and Japhet, as vv 26, 27 made clear, “Let Canaan be a slave to them.” How and when this prediction of Canaan’s subjection to Shem and Japhet was fulfilled is another subject of disagreement. Skinner sums up the problem neatly: “Three points may be regarded as settled: that Shem is that family to which the Hebrews reckoned themselves; that Canaan stands for the pre-Israelitish inhabitants of Palestine; and that the servitude of Canaan to Shem at least *includes* the subjugation of the Canaanites in the early days of the monarchy. Beyond this everything is uncertain” (186). Though many fulfillments of Shem’s dominance over Canaan can be seen, it is more difficult to know when Canaan was subject to Japhet.⁶

Matthew Henry writes,

He pronounces a curse on Canaan the son of Ham (v. 25), in whom Ham is himself cursed, either because this son of his was now more guilty than the rest, or because the posterity of this son was afterwards to be rooted out of their land, to make room for Israel. And Moses here records it for the animating of Israel in the wars of Canaan; though the Canaanites were a formidable people, yet they were of old an accursed people, and doomed to ruin. The particular curse is, *A servant of servants* (that is, the meanest and most despicable servant) *shall he be, even to his brethren*. Those who by birth were his equals shall by conquest be his lords. This certainly points at the victories obtained by Israel over the Canaanites, by which they were all either put to the sword or put under tribute (Josh. ix. 23; Judg. i. 28, 30, 33, 35), which happened not till about 800 years after this.⁷

John Gill writes,

...but as both were guilty, as appears from what has been observed on the former verses, and Canaan particularly was first in the transgression; it seems most wise and just that he should be expressly named, since hereby Ham is not excluded a share in the punishment of the crime had a concern in, being punished in his son, his youngest son, who perhaps was his darling and favourite, and which must be very afflicting to him to hear of; and since Canaan only, and not any of the other sons of Ham were guilty, he, and not Ham by name, is cursed, lest it should be thought that the curse would fall upon Ham and all his posterity; whereas the curse descends on him, and very justly proceeds in the line of Canaan; and who is the rather mentioned, because

⁵ G. Ch. Alders, *Genesis* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 206-207.

⁶ Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 202.

⁷ Matthew Henry, *Commentary on the Whole Bible* (McLean, VA: MacDonald, 1706), 1:74.

he was the father of the accursed race of the Canaanites, whom God abhorred, and, for their wickedness, was about to drive out of their land, and give it to his people for an inheritance; and in order to which the Israelites were now upon the expedition, when Moses wrote this account, and which must animate them to it; for by this prediction they would see that they were an accursed people, and that they were to be their servants: *a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren*; the posterities of Shem and Japheth, who stood in the relation of brethren to Canaan and his posterity; and to those he and his offspring were to become the most mean abject servants, as the phrase implies: this character agrees with the name of Canaan, which may be derived from [the Hebrew]...to depress, humble and make mean and abject...*and Canaan shall be his servant*; the posterity of Canaan servants to the posterity of Japheth; as they were when Tyre, which was built by the Sidonians, and Sidon, which had its name from the eldest son of Canaan, fell into the hands of Alexander the Grecian, who sprung from Japheth; and when Carthage, a colony of the Phoenicians of Canaan's race, was taken and demolished by the Romans of the line of Japheth, which made Hannibal, a child of Canaan, say, *agnoscere se fortunam Carthaginis*, that he owned the fate of Carthage; and in which some have thought that he refers to this prophecy.⁸

The common interpretation, which contradicts the racist understanding of a general curse on Ham and all Africans, is supported by looking at Canaan's descendants. They are the accursed tribes set apart by God for destruction and subjugation by Israel. Exodus 33:2 says, "And I will send My Angel before you and I will drive out the Canaanite, and the Amorite and the Hittite and the Perizzite, and the Hivite and Jebusite." The descendants of Canaan were rank idolaters and were known for their disgusting sexual practices: ritual prostitution, homosexuality, bestiality. Canaan's sin and his descendants' sins reflect the perverse behavior of Ham. The curse on Canaan has nothing to do with race or skin color, but *has everything to do with God's law and ethics*. That is the issue. Racists take the focus off of God's moral law and place it on something physical or biological. By doing this they get people away from God's law onto stupid human traditions that are complete nonsense.

Genesis 11:1-9

Perhaps the most important passage used as a proof text by the kinist movement is the narrative dealing with the confusion of languages in Genesis 11:1-9. The kinist has a unique interpretation on this section of Scripture concerning the Tower of Babel. It is their central justification for racial or ethnic separation or segregation and it is their central proof text against interracial marriage. One of their websites says: "*Kinism is the belief that the ordained social order for man is tribal and ethnic rather than imperial and universal. Mankind was designed by God to live in extended family groups.... Blood ties are the only natural and workable basis for a healthy society not subject to the ideologies of fallen man. We believe this is the normative system for our people. We believe that our White people have a God-given right and duty to seek their own prosperity and existence as a distinct nation.*" The assumption of this quote is that one is either in favor of the kinist racist nonsense or else one is in favor of one-world government or some giant humanistic empire. This is the fallacy of *black or white*. The Bible rejects both.

Note also that the kinist assigns to blood ties something that can *only* be achieved by Jesus Christ and His law-word. Applied racism becomes a means of societal sanctification to the kinist. This is unbiblical and reveals a complete ignorance of history. Blood ties do not lower

⁸ John Gill, *Exposition of the Old Testament* (Streamwood, IL: Primitive Baptist Library, [1810] 1979), 1:68.

crime rates and stop wars. The high crime rate among non-white immigrants is due to their unbiblical worldview, not their skin color. Real Christian blacks, Mexicans and Vietnamese, etc. do not commit crimes and go on welfare. Real Christians do not use race to favor one group in the church or society over another. Real Christians of like-mind with John Calvin and John Knox, whether they are Chinese or Korean or African, would be a blessing to any society. To argue otherwise is to say that the gospel is less important or less powerful than race. The kinist form of racism ultimately is a denial of the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ.

Another kinist says, “When nations cease to be based on blood heritage rooted in common knowledge, culture and language, they will inherently lose their common faith.” He then refers to the Tower of Babel incident. Once again the kinist has it precisely backwards. The only way to have a common, lasting heritage and culture is to have a common faith. One’s faith determines culture, not the other way around. Culture to a large degree is an external manifestation of faith. If we took some real Christian families from Greece, Africa, Spain and China and put them on an island there would be no oppression, murder or suffering. Nazi Germany demonstrates what happens to a nation or culture that abandons the Christian faith. Soviet Russia is another good example. These nations (Russia and Germany) did not have a race problem, but a faith problem. Culture is an expression of faith; indifferent elements of a culture, like eating rice and fish instead of wheat and beef are adiafophora and irrelevant.

The Kinist Institute Manifesto says,

Extended blood ties are the only natural and workable basis for a healthy society -a society not subject to the horrifying ideologies of fallen man, be they socialist or capitalist, autocratic or democratic. We believe that an extended tribalism is the normative system for our people, the White races of Europe, the Americas, South Africa, Australia, Transcaucasia, or wherever our extended family finds itself in its modern diaspora...When Kinism.net publishes materials disparaging of other racial-ethnic groups, it is for the sole purpose of exposing the incompatibility and essential uniqueness of the cultures in question...Since the differences among men are in large part endogenous, it is meet that these differences will show themselves in the fruits of social organization, whether that is difference in wealth, position, or in abilities of all kinds. We honor and celebrate the shared history and distinctives of our people, its ancient heroes, its legends, its celebrations, and all of its variegated glories, while recognizing its failures, its latter day degeneracy, and its need to universally submit to the Law of God...Nevertheless, we stand or fall with no other but the White peoples of Europe, and their standards of beauty, their cultural achievements, the achievements of their civilization, established through the confluence of pagan and Christian traditions, are both irreplaceable and vital to our survival as a people.

Note just how unbiblical these assertions are—“extended blood ties are the only workable basis for a healthy society.” In other words, the gospel of Jesus Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit that flow from His perfect work are not enough to restrain sin, hatred and crime. No, according to the kinist, racial blood ties are what are needed. This once again is a denial of the gospel and the sufficiency of Scripture. Note, America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Europe are having significant problems because they have abandoned Jesus Christ and His law-word. Their insane immigration policies do not help. But if they were Christian and adopted biblical law, immigration would no longer be a problem—Roman Catholicism, Islam, Hinduism and the like would be against the law (that is, all outward, public expressions of idolatry and false religions are forbidden in a Christian [i.e. Bible-believing Protestant] commonwealth) and only Mexicans,

blacks and so forth who renounced idolatry would be allowed to immigrate. Race is not the problem; faith and ethics are the heart of the issue.

Note also the blatant racism in the kinist idea that the difference among men is *endogenous*. This word means they are intrinsic to different racial groups. They flow from internal causes and *thus cannot be overcome by the gospel*. This is totally contrary to the gospel message. The gospel brings Jew and Gentile, slave and free, together in Christ. All believing races are part of the same church and partake of the sacraments together. To have separate tables of fellowship, Paul says in Galatians, is an implicit denial of the gospel (cf. 2:11ff.). If different races can be brought together in the church, then they can in a Christian society also.

Talk of a wonderful confluence of *pagan* and Christian traditions being “irreplaceable and vital to our survival as a people” is unbiblical and has more in common with Nazism than the Bible. Paganism has nothing to offer us; it is idolatry. It is sin. It is offensive to God. All elements of paganism in our culture should be destroyed and replaced with godly counterparts. Once again, we see that the kinist blatantly denies *sola Scriptura* and the sufficiency of Scripture. The elements of culture that are *adiaphora* or indifferent (e.g., chopsticks, wooden shoes, unique foods, architecture, modest clothing styles, etc.) we can hang on to and use to God’s glory. For example, I like to make good use of German beer, fine crafted weapons, sausage and automobiles; but I leave behind Christmas, Romanism and the satanic modernism of recent centuries. Everything is to be used to glorify God. Paganism in any form is satanic excrement.

Now that we have seen some of the *remarkably unbiblical* statements of the kinist movement related to their concept of the Tower of Babel incident, let us look at the text and see if it supports a racist or segregationist agenda. Genesis 11:1-9 reads,

Now the whole earth had one language and one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, and they dwelt there. Then they said to one another, “Come, let us make bricks and bake *them* thoroughly.” They had brick for stone, and they had asphalt for mortar. And they said, “Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower whose top *is* in the heavens; let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be scattered abroad over the face of the whole earth.” But the LORD came down to see the city and the tower which the sons of men had built. And the LORD said, “Indeed the people *are* one and they all have one language, and this is what they begin to do; now nothing that they propose to do will be withheld from them. Come, let Us go down and there confuse their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.” So the LORD scattered them abroad from there over the face of all the earth, and they ceased building the city. Therefore its name is called Babel, because there the LORD confused the language of all the earth; and from there the LORD scattered them abroad over the face of all the earth.

Not long after the flood, an apparently very large group of people journeyed together from the east and decided to settle in a very fertile area in a plain in the land of Shinar, which would become Babylon. (Babylon is southeast of Mount Ararat.) They became proficient in making bricks and building dwellings. Their sin is described in verse 4: “Come, let us build ourselves a city, and a tower whose top *is* in the heavens.” This was mainly a decision of the political-religious leaders of which the people heartily approved. The phrase “a tower whose top is in the heavens” simply means a very tall tower. They wanted to build a large ziggurat, which was a symbol of religious and political power in the Middle East as well as with the Indians in the Americas. Every ziggurat ever discovered was significant to the religious and political structure of that society.

This large group of people was clearly pagan. There is no reason to believe that the godly remnant took part in this blatant rebellion against God. Their great sin and the reason why they wanted to build a large city and a giant ziggurat is mentioned in 4b: “Let us make a name for ourselves, lest we be scattered abroad over the face of the whole earth.”

What was their sin? First, it was pride. The city and the tower would be a permanent monument to their power and achievement. They were seeking the glory of man instead of the glory of God. Second, it was a direct contradiction of and thus a high handed rebellion against God’s command to disperse and cover the face of the whole earth. God tells them to disperse and they say, “We will not. We will build a localized unitary civilization. We will build a giant empire here and now. Dominion over the whole earth means nothing to us.” They placed themselves directly against God’s stated plan for mankind.

In fact, the singular city of man and the giant singular tower (a religious/political structure) were in essence to be visible symbols of their unity. Leupold says, “The tower was to provide the rallying point and to be at the same time a token of their union of purpose.”⁹ They sought unity and security in man’s ingenuity and effort instead of obedience to God’s Word. They believed they could attain salvation through human autonomy and works instead of faith in God and His Word. They desired an apostate, anti-God—religious, cultural, political and linguistic unity. Man wanted to make a name for himself autonomously apart from God’s law, revelation and plan. Although they were rank pagans, they were self-conscious humanists. By uniting mankind into a monolithic force in one giant city-state, they were seeking the unity of their god—humanity.

Thus, third, it was a form of idolatry—an early form of humanism. Gary North writes,

Again, citing Rushdoony: “The Tower of Babel was an attempt to force this apostate thesis of ultimate oneness and equality onto all mankind. There was to be no division among men, and no separation or discrimination, only an absolute unity. The religion and virtue or ethics of Babylon was to be the fact of humanity, and community was simply in the common fact of humanity. In the City of God, community is through the Redeemer in God; in the City of man, the Society of Satan, the ground of communion is a common humanity irrespective any religious or moral differences. All differences must be suppressed in favor of the anonymity of union. The good life and the full life are in and through the State. The theological requirements for the unity of the godhead require this faith in the unity of humanity, its one true god. Hence, ‘Let us build us a city,’ a one-world order, and usher in paradise apart from God.” He [Rushdoony] continues: “In terms of all this the meaning of the proclamation ‘Let us make us a *name*,’ becomes clear: let us be our own blessing, our own Messiah, savior and god. Let us be our own creator, our own ultimate source of meaning and definition. Let there be no value above and beyond us; let man be the source of the definition, not the subject of it. Let man be beyond good and evil, and beyond meaning, since he is himself the source of all definition.”¹⁰

What was God’s judgment or method of dealing with this rebellious situation? In verses 5 and 6a the Triune God observes the situation and notes this unity, “Indeed the people are one and they all have one language.” Then in verse 6b God addresses the situation “and this is what they begin to do; now nothing they propose to do will be withheld from them.” Yahweh states that nothing will be able to restrain this evil plan and its consequences unless this building project and this

⁹ H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1942), 387.

¹⁰ Rousas J. Rushdoony, “The Society of Satan,” *Christian Economics* (Aug. 4, 1964) as quoted in Gary North, *Genesis: The Dominion Covenant* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1982), 150-151.

quest for a humanistic unity are halted. God makes it clear that this humanistic, idolatrous, and godless one-world government civilization must be stopped in order for God's plan for mankind to go forth. (We must note the broad context. God had recently destroyed the human race for its supreme wickedness. God wants to restrain man's wicked plans without once again bringing total destruction.) This was in reality a very merciful judgment.

This was a judgment with permanent effect. The separate languages resulted in separate people groups or separate tribes, city states and eventually separate nations. Separate languages, tribes and nations will exist at the second coming of Christ.

It was a brilliant judgment. God could have destroyed the partially built tower and leveled their city. But that would have only solved the problem temporarily. Towers and cities are easily rebuilt. But if the leadership and workforce are divided into separate linguistic groups who cannot communicate with each other, the unity necessary to contribute to the work and finish it is destroyed. The confusion no doubt brought fear and great bewilderment and the different linguistic groups went their separate ways. God's purpose in thwarting a great pagan, godless empire and in spreading humanity over the whole earth was accomplished.

All of this raises the question: does this section of Scripture condemn interracial marriage as the kinists believe? And does it teach that each racial group must remain completely separate because that is God's plan for humanity? In answer to this racist nonsense, note the following.

First, the great sin of this passage was the pride of autonomous, godless men seeking security, safety, salvation and meaning through *a humanistic unity and humanistic religion and philosophy* instead of faith in God and obedience to His law-word. *The unity of human language was not intrinsically sinful or wrong.* God created the original human language; and man spoke this language for two thousand years before this time without one reference to it as a sin, and without one reference to God's displeasure with mankind having a single language. God was always concerned with violations to the His revealed will.

Second, the changing of a solitary language to many languages was a means to an end. Once again, God did not have an ax to grind against one language but confounded the language to divide this evil, unified mass of humanity. To turn this passage into a lesson on interracial relations misses the whole point. God is against man seeking a unified, anti-God one world empire. The many languages stop evil men from achieving this end. This passage does not condemn a Christian in an English nation from learning French, or Dutch or German or even Swahili to God's glory.

Third, this passage does not speak to the issue of race at all. God changed the languages. There is nothing in the text about a changing of skin colors, hair types or facial features. God did not in an instant make up different races. Different racial features took several centuries of people groups living in isolation in radically different climates with breeding continuing within a specific geographical area. If the kinist wants to argue that different language groups should not intermarry they can try to make that case, but the Bible teaches there is only one race—the human race. By adopting the language of the macro-evolutionists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and then applying it to different nationalities (which treats the various people groups as intrinsically different with regard to their being), the kinist is in line with secular humanistic racist propaganda. Such thinking, obviously, has nothing to do with the Bible.

Keep in mind, the means God used to scatter people over the earth was to “confound their language.” Note there was no mention of marriage, different races or skin colors here. In fact, if anything was going to help bring nations together again, it would be a reversing of the confusion

of language. Thus, to be consistent, if kinists believe nothing should be done to advance a one-world government, then they should not study or teach foreign languages.

Interestingly, Paul and many of the apostles were bilingual and had no problem living according to the *non-sinful* aspects of Greek, Roman or Jewish culture. Paul worked with Barnabas, a Jew, and Timothy, a Gentile. He was not a segregationist either racially or culturally. The issue for Paul was sin or violations of God's moral law. When the Jews separated themselves from the Gentiles at the fellowship meal in Antioch, they were strongly rebuked by Paul for segregationism in the church. Such a practice was an implicit denial of the gospel and the oneness of the body of Christ.

In fact, linguistic analysis (which is a hard science) has both supported the Tower of Babel judgment and demonstrated the absurdity of racism—especially racism based on skin color. At Babel God apparently created the main branches of languages from the one trunk of the original created language. One of these language branches is called Indo-European. Out of this one language several languages evolved over time. We know this by comparing these languages and noting striking similarities. These similarities do not exist between Indo-European and African languages or the Semitic languages. In the Indo-European language group are the Germanic languages (this includes everything from West German, North German, Dutch, Friesian, Flemish, Swedish, Danish, Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon which became English), the Italic (Latin became Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan), the Balto-Slavic (Russian, Polish, Czech, Romanian, Bulgarian, Lithuanian, etc.), Iranian (old Persian, Persian, Avestan), Greek (Hellenic, there was classical Greek, Koine Greek, Byzantine Greek, then modern Greek), Armenian, Albanian, Celtic (Irish, Breton, Gaelic, Welsh) and the Indian (Sanskrit, Middle Indian, Bengali, Hindustani). What is particularly interesting is that the Aryan Indians are linguistically more closely related to Germans than Germans are to the Celtic peoples. Thus, the dark-skinned Indians are more closely related to Germans than are the Irish and the Welsh and the Scottish. Thus, the idea that dark skin is a sign of a curse is complete nonsense. Dark skin is simply better suited to hot, tropical, sunny climates. (The idea that dark skin is a sign of the curse comes from the view that the word Ham means black, or sunburned. This is nonsense. The meaning of the name Ham is not clear.)

Fourth, the whole kinist use of this passage is based on a logical fallacy. The assumption is that any interracial marriage or any cultural mixing (i.e. the non-sinful elements of a culture [e.g., wooden shoes, tacos, stir-fry, burritos, etc.]) is sinful and leads to a one-world government. This is sheer nonsense. It is one thing to work for an anti-Christian one-world secular humanistic super state. It is something different to use Chinese silk or play the sitar or African bongos or marry a Christian that is Korean. Instead of demonstrating that intermarriage between races is sinful or that all cultural mixing is sinful, the racist or the kinist simply assumes with no proof whatsoever that when two Christians of different races get married they contribute to the death of that culture or are furthering Satan's goal of a monolithic anti-Christian state.

Copyright 2011 © Brian Schwertley

[HOME PAGE](#)