

# GLASS HOUSE

---

Shattering the ~~Theory~~ *Myth*  
of Evolution



KEN HAM &  
BODIE HODGE  
General Editors

# GLASS HOUSE

---

*Myth*  
Shattering the ~~Theory~~  
of Evolution



KEN HAM &  
BODIE HODGE  
General Editors

First printing: February 2019

Copyright © 2018 by Answers in Genesis. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission from the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations in articles and reviews. For information write:

Master Books®, P.O. Box 726, Green Forest, AR 72638  
Master Books® is a division of the New Leaf Publishing Group, Inc.

ISBN: 978-1-68344-156-4

Digital ISBN: 978-1-61458-702-6

Library of Congress Number: 2018968229

Cover by Left Coast Design, Portland, OR

Scripture identified ESV is from the English Standard Version®, copyright © 2001 by Crossway, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture identified NASB is from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE®, Copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Scripture identified NKJV is from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Please consider requesting that a copy of this volume be purchased by your local library system.

**Printed in the United States of America**

Please visit our website for other great titles:  
[www.masterbooks.com](http://www.masterbooks.com)

For information regarding author interviews,  
please contact the publicity department at (870) 438-5288.



# Contents

Preface *Bodie Hodge and Ken Ham*.....6  
Introduction: Has Evolution Infiltrated the Church? *Ken Ham* .....12

## The Basics: Evolution, Science, and Religion

1. What Is Evolution: The Three Types to Recognize  
*Roger Patterson*.....22  
2. What Is and Isn't Science? *Dr. Jennifer Hall Rivera* .....36  
3. Is Science Secular? *Bodie Hodge* .....48  
4. Science Fields and Methodology Came from a Christian  
Worldview *Troy Lacey with Bodie Hodge* .....58  
5. Creation vs. Evolution — Is It an Authority Issue?  
*Bodie Hodge* .....68  
6. Millions of Years: Where Did the Idea Come From?  
*Dr. Terry Mortenson* .....82

## The History and Assumptions of an Evolutionary Worldview

7. Secular, Evolutionary, and Atheistic Religions *Bodie Hodge  
and Roger Patterson* .....96  
8. Are There Different Models of Evolution? *Roger Patterson  
and Dr. Terry Mortenson* .....110  
9. Living Fossils *Bodie Hodge and Troy Lacey*.....122  
10. Are Similarities in Life Forms Evidence of Common Design  
or Common Ancestry? *Dr. Tommy Mitchell*.....130

## The Big Four: Origin of Life, Natural Selection, Mutations, and Missing Links

11. The Origin of Life *Dr. Alan White*.....138
12. What about Natural Selection? *Dr. Nathaniel Jeanson and Dr. Georgia Purdom*.....154
13. Are Peppered Moths Evidence for Evolution? *Dr. Tommy Mitchell*.....162
14. Is a Species the Same Thing as a Biblical Kind? *Dr. Georgia Purdom and Bodie Hodge* .....170
15. Are Mutations the Magical Key That Makes Evolution Possible? *Dr. Elizabeth Mitchell* .....182
16. A Horse Will Always Be a Horse, of Course! *Dr. Jennifer Hall Rivera* .....190
17. Isn't the Whale Transitional Series a Perfect Example of Evolution? *Troy Lacey*.....204
18. What about Bird Evolution — Aren't They Dinosaurs? *Dr. David Menton* .....212
19. What about the Missing Links Like Lucy, Neanderthals, and *Homo erectus* That Prove Human Evolution? *Dr. David A. DeWitt* .....230
20. What about Human Evolution? *Dr. David Menton* .....242
21. Digging for “Missing Links” in the Wrong Place *Bodie Hodge* .....254

### More Science Arguments: Genetics and Anatomy

22. Do Humans and Chimps Share a Common Ancestor? *Dr. Georgia Purdom*.....260

- 23. Is Human Chromosome 2 the Result of a Fusion That Supports Shared Ancestry with Apes? *Dr. Georgia Purdom* .....272
- 24. Are Vestigial Organs Evidence of an Evolutionary Past? *Dr. Tommy Mitchell*.....280

**Implications of an Evolutionary Worldview?**

- 25. What About Haeckel’s Faked Embryos? How Do They Relate to Abortion? *Dr. Elizabeth Mitchell*.....288
- 26. What Are the Moral Implications of the Religion of Evolution? *Bodie Hodge*.....296
- 27. Did Darwin Renounce Evolution and Get Saved on His Deathbed? *Dr. Tommy Mitchell*.....312

**Christians and the Big Picture**

- 28. Conclusion *Ken Ham and Avery Foley*.....316

“

---

*Evolution is a model, hypothesis, idea, belief, or a worldview — it is not a theory, a law, a fact, or the truth (God’s Word is truth).*

---

”

## PREFACE

---

The CEO and founder of Answers in Genesis-US (AiG), the highly acclaimed Creation Museum, and the world-renowned Ark Encounter, **KEN HAM**, is one of the most in-demand Christian speakers in North America. He has appeared on Fox’s *The O’Reilly Factor* and *Fox and Friends*, CNN’s *The Situation Room* with Wolf Blitzer, ABC’s *Good Morning America*, the BBC, and more. His 2014 creation/evolution debate with Bill Nye “the Science Guy” was watched by an estimated 25 million people.

Author and speaker **BODIE HODGE** attended Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIUC) and received a BS and MS (in 1996 and 1998, respectively) in mechanical engineering. Currently, Hodge is a writer and researcher at Answers in Genesis and a consultant of the Editorial Review Board. He has been involved in several books and DVDs and is a regular speaker in the Creation Museum Speaker Series.

**E**volution (molecules-to-man) is a glass house. When you analyze it honestly, you can see right through the facade. A glass house, as its name implies, is not a sturdy structure, and is ripe for shattering at a moment's notice.

In our culture, many have been deceived into believing that evolution is a solid foundation and is well-attested — after all, it's integrated into nearly all subject material in most schools. The evolutionary worldview consists of more than just biological evolution. There is:

- Cosmological evolution or big bang where all things supposedly came from nothing.
- Geological evolution or millions of years of supposed earth history.
- Chemical evolution or an abiogenesis event to supposedly cause life to arise from non-living matter. Chemical evolution is sometimes denoted as a subset of biological evolution.
- Biological evolution or Darwinian evolution, where that initial life supposedly evolves into all the different kinds we have today.

This book dives into answering evolutionary claims, putting them to the test, and watching how they shatter. Christians are commanded to test everything and hold fast what is good while abstaining from every form of evil (1 Thessalonians 5:21–22). We are also commanded to demolish arguments and false beliefs that are predicated on the opinions of man who oppose God's Word (2 Corinthians 10:5).

As we dive into the problems of an evolutionary worldview let us first examine a brief history of evolution thought:

- *Spontaneous Generation* or *Aristotelian Abiogenesis* (all sorts of life constantly arises from non-living matter almost daily) was believed by some ancient Greeks as the origin of living creatures in the mid-300s B.C.
- Epicureans, based on Epicurus' ideas, developed biological evolution in Ancient Greece about 300 B.C., arguing that all things are material and that everything evolves from tiny particles called atoms, hence their position of "atomists" or *Epicureanism*, one form of Greek mythology.
- Epicureanism took a hit after *Paul publicly refuted them* at Mars Hill in Acts 17 and Epicureanism essentially died until the A.D. 1500s.
- In the 1500s, a few people began *rethinking some atomistic positions*.



- In 1743, a French Historian, Benoît de Maillet, proposed *panspermia* — that life came from germs falling from outer space. This idea was rekindled several times.
- Frenchman Jean-Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet, Chevalier de Lamarck (Jean Lamarck) reinvented evolution in the late 1700s and early 1800s and it became known as *Lamarckian Evolution*, which proposed change through *use* or *disuse* (i.e., if a giraffe reaches up enough, its neck will get longer and pass that along to its offspring).
- *Erasmus Darwin* (Charles Darwin's grandfather) published a book called *Zoonomia* in 1794 that promoted Lamarckian Evolution in England.
- *Geological Evolution* began with precursor ideas by people like James Hutton in his book *Theory of the Earth* in 1795, that the past must be interpreted by what we can see in nature today (i.e., the *present is the key to understanding the past* as opposed to using the *past to understand the present*).
- Pierre-Simon Laplace proposed initial *Astronomical Evolution* in his book *Exposition of the Systems of the World* via nebular hypothesis in 1796.
- *Uniformitarianism in Geological Evolution* was solidified by Charles Lyell in his three-volume set *Principles of Geology* in the 1830s which argues that geological deposits were laid down slowly and gradually (uniformly) over long periods of time, presuming that catastrophes had NO major impact on geology in the past.
- Charles Darwin published his book *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection for the Preservation of Favored Races* and *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* in 1859 and 1871, respectively, promoting *Traditional Darwinism* where natural selection is popularized as a mechanism to supposedly lead to evolution.
- *Louis Pasteur* ultimately destroyed spontaneous generation with simple experiments in the 1850s–1860s, proving the Law of Biogenesis that life only comes from life, not non-life.
- Thomas Henry Huxley insisted on a specialized form of spontaneous generation called *Modern Abiogenesis or Chemical Evolution* to insist on a naturalistic chemical origin of life sometime in the past to give biological evolution a starting point so that biological evolution could finally proceed.

- *Neo Darwinism* developed in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century when people realized that natural selection doesn't develop the new information required for evolutionary changes — it only filters already-existing information. Thus, mutations (with natural selection) were proposed to generate new information for an organism (e.g., to go from an ameba to a dog, you need to add information for hair, lungs, circulatory system, nervous system, etc.). Observations show mutations are a detriment or nearly neutral, so those “in the know” are still looking for an actual mechanism for evolution.
- The *Scopes Trial* in 1925 unlocked a door to allow *human* evolution to be taught in classrooms (even though the evolutionists actually lost the case). This triggered a systematic removal of the Christian worldview in schools and the addition of the humanistic religion (i.e., atheism, naturalism, etc.) in state schools.
- In 1931, Georges Lemaître (with support from Edwin Hubble and Milton Humason, as well as George Gamow) developed what became known as the big bang or *Cosmological Evolution*.
- In their famous experiment regarding their primordial soup model, *Stanley Miller* and *Harold Urey* failed to make life in a test tube (a result we continue to see). It only produced some amino acids.
- In 1972, Niles Eldridge and Stephen Jay Gould proposed *Punctuated Equilibria* to explain why we don't observe gradual evolutionary changes in organisms in the fossil record (missing links). Essentially, the onward and upward changes in biological evolution must occur so quickly in spurts that we don't have a snapshot of them in the fossil record.
- Francis Crick (known for his co-discovery of DNA) with Leslie Orgel popularized *Directed Panspermia* in 1973 where it was proposed that aliens brought life to earth to seed it because the odds of naturalistic evolution are nearly impossible.
- Atheist and humanist John J. Dunphy insisted in 1983 that the *faith of humanism* must entirely replace the faith of Christianity in the classroom.

Much more could be stated, but this brief history leads us to the issues we find today permeating our culture surrounding evolution. This book dives into subjects like the origin of life (abiogenesis), natural selection, mutations, missing links, the religious nature of evolution, and many other topics that challenge the evolutionary worldview that has been imposed on most people.

Evolution is a model, hypothesis, idea, belief, or a worldview — it is *not* a theory, a law, a fact, or the truth (God’s Word is truth). A “theory” in science is one step below a “law” and, accordingly, has no evidence against it. Since evolution has mountains of evidence against it, it doesn’t even come close to being warranted a “theory.”

Some may argue that naturalistic religions that incorporate evolution, such as atheism, agnosticism, humanism, secularism, and the like, are not religious. However, this is false. An easy test of religiousness is to see if these views oppose religious tenets like biblical Christianity. And, of course, the answer is “yes” — humanistic religions do conflict with Christianity. As one example, God created in six days and rested on the seventh, where a naturalistic evolutionary view doesn’t have a God or a Creator but merely an accidental (naturalistic) beginning.

Another test is to see if these ideas are compatible with biblical Christianity’s young earth creation. How can a big bang, millions of years, and evolution be mixed perfectly with 6 normal-length-day creation thousands of years ago, a global Flood (which accounts for most of the rock layers that have fossils), and the existence of the God of the Bible? It is absurd to think these two can mix without conflict.

Of course, this doesn’t stop some Christians from trying to mix these beliefs, but they do so by giving up the Bible’s plain teachings (e.g., “a day doesn’t mean a day” in Genesis, the sun was created on day 1 as opposed to day 4, Adam and Eve didn’t exist, and so on). These syncretistic religions (mixing humanism and Christianity) have so many problems. We discuss this in the book as well.

We want to encourage you to relax and enjoy the book and its challenges. For Christians, our hope is that this book will help give you answers for your faith and a means to defend the biblical position when it is challenged.

For the non-Christian, we trust this book challenges the religion of evolution that has been imposed upon you through state schools, secular media outlets, secular books, and secular museums. We do this book not to merely refute false arguments, but because we care about you. We want to see people understand the truth and not be misled into false religions.



“

---

*Sadly, our culture is deteriorating into a wasteland of evil. Even the youth of today are really “ticking time bombs” — repercussions of a secular worldview.*

---

”

## INTRODUCTION: HAS EVOLUTION INFILTRATED THE CHURCH?

---

**KEN HAM** is heard daily on the radio feature *Answers with Ken Ham* (broadcast on more than 950 stations). Since the Creation Museum opened, he has been interviewed on *CBS News Sunday Morning*, *The NBC Nightly News* with Brian Williams, *The PBS News Hour* with Jim Lehrer, and many other outlets. Ken is also the founder of *Answers* magazine and writes articles for AiG’s popular website. During his many speaking events, Ken’s emphasis is on the relevance and authority of the Book of Genesis to the life of the average Christian, and how compromise on Genesis has changed how the culture and church view biblical authority. Ken also reflects on “hot button” topics of our day (e.g., the breakdown of the society, the attack by secularists on religious liberty, school violence, creation/evolution in public schools, abortion, lawlessness, and more).

**A** bortion, homosexual “marriage,” transgender, school shootings, euthanasia, global warming, free-sex, illegal drug use, suicide, anti-Christian sentiment — what do these have to do with evolution? More than you may realize. They are the evil fruits of an evolutionary worldview that has been imposed on generations of people in the Western world.

Worse than that, many people sitting in the pews have adopted these anti-biblical positions. When the church gave up the absolute authority of the Bible, particularly in Genesis, we opened a door that let the world dictate their beliefs as superior, and the Bible was “tossed aside.”

We need to *right* the ship of Christianity. But there is another problem. The ship of Christianity isn’t just going in the wrong direction, it’s sinking in our Western world. How do we right the sinking ship of Christianity? The first thing we need to do is get the water out and plug the leak. Then we need to get the ship turned to the proper course.

These fruits of evolution have their foundation in millions of years and naturalism (i.e., nature is all that there is, no God). This is part of the religion of humanism (where man is seen as the ultimate authority, not God) with denominations like secularism (no spiritual), agnosticism (can’t know if God exists), and atheism (no God exists).

So why should Christians accept aspects of this other religion and mix it with their Christianity? They shouldn’t. So now you know where the leak is on the ship! Now it’s time to start fixing the leak.

### **A Good God and World of Suffering?**

How is it that the world is full of death and suffering, and yet, at the same time, was called “good.” Consider God’s initial creation:

And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day (Genesis 1:31; KJV).

Try to imagine putting yourself in the position of a person who has no background knowledge of Christianity — a person who did not grow up in a Christian home, never attended church, and has been indoctrinated in evolutionary concepts through the education system. Most likely, this person has also been taught against Christianity by his/her parents, and by teachers in school and college.

Imagine a Christian who meets this person and tells him there is a God of infinite love who made the world and cares for us. After this

non-Christian listens, it wouldn't be surprising to hear him respond with the following:

I don't see any God of love. All I see are children suffering and dying. I see people killing and stealing. Disease and death seem to be everywhere. Nature is "red in tooth and claw" as a poet once stated. It's a horrible world. I don't see your God of love. If your God does exist, He must be a sadistic ogre.

The problem is that this non-Christian is looking at a fallen world. As Romans 8:22 states: "For we know that the whole creation has been groaning together in the pains of childbirth until now."<sup>1</sup>

When this person considers what is being told to him about the God of creation, he then, in a sense, blames God for the horrible world we live in. Without an understanding of Genesis and the account of the Fall, he won't comprehend at all how there can be a God of love amidst the groaning.

Now for a Christian, when a loved one dies or some tragedy strikes, it's understandable to ask God why these things happen. However, there are many Christians who also blame God and become angry at Him because they don't understand the real reason for the existence of death and suffering. I believe a major cause of this is that many Christians have been indoctrinated to believe that God "created" over billions of years, and that death, disease, and suffering are a part of this creative process. But this is not really the God of the Bible.

If we can believe Genesis 1:31, then we realize that God created everything very good. Every work of God is perfect in Deuteronomy 32:4. So we expected a perfect world, from a perfect God. So what happened to bring about this groaning world?

It's vital that Christians understand what occurred in the universe as a result of Adam's fall into sin. You see, the groaning, horrible world we now see around us (even though there's still a remnant of beauty from the original creation) exists because this is what we as human beings, in essence, have asked for!

In Colossians 1:17 and Hebrews 1:3, we learn that Jesus Christ, the Creator of all things, upholds all things by the Word of His power. As John Gill states in his commentary:

The whole frame of nature would burst asunder and break in pieces, was it not held together by him; every created being has its

---

1. Unless otherwise noted, Scripture in this chapter is from the English Standard Version (ESV) of the Bible.

support from him, and its consistency in him; and all the affairs of Providence relating to all creatures are governed, directed, and managed by him, in conjunction with the Father and the blessed Spirit. . . . preserves every creature in its being, and supports it, and supplies it with the necessaries of life; rules and governs all, and providentially orders and disposes of all things in the world, and that by his all-powerful will.<sup>2</sup>

The reason for our very existence — even at this very moment — is because He holds us together by His power. What an awesome thought! No wonder the Psalmist in Psalm 139:6 exclaimed, “Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high; I cannot attain it.”

Personally, I believe what happened at the time of the Fall was this: God gave Adam a choice: choose God and His absolutes, or choose autonomy (i.e., man makes his own rules). Adam (and, as rebellious creatures, we in Adam) chose life without God. We didn’t want God’s rules; we wanted to determine truth for ourselves. As a result, God, as a righteous Judge, gave us, in a sense, what we wanted (and deserved). He has withdrawn some of His power so as to not uphold the world in a perfect state — and look what happened. Everything is running down and falling apart. We are now experiencing the judgment of a taste of what life would be like without God — this mess is really our fault.

In Deuteronomy 8:4, 29:5 and Nehemiah 9:21, we read how the Israelites, when they were in the wilderness for 40 years, didn’t see their clothes or shoes wear out (and their feet didn’t swell). This was obviously a miracle of preservation from the Lord. Imagine if God were to do this with everything in the entire universe — then nothing would wear out. There would be no disease or suffering. This, of course, is how it will be in the New Earth after the restoration.

When you think about it, God is so merciful to us. Even though we have a predisposition to want life without God because of our rebellion in Adam, our Creator has given us only a taste of what this is like. He still upholds things so we can live in this world. If God were to withdraw even more of the Word of His power, then things would become much worse. And the more God removes His restraining influence from the nations (remember it is God who raises up kings and destroys kingdoms), the more we would see the horrible sinful nature of man expressed in evil deeds.

---

2. <https://biblehub.com/commentaries/gill/colossians/1.htm> and <https://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/gills-exposition-of-the-bible/hebrews-1-3.html>.



I believe we can see a practical example of this before our very eyes in America, the UK, Australia, and other countries. What happened? These nations were once more Christianized. God's laws were respected and, by and large, obeyed. But now we observe a nation full of fornication, wickedness, murder, deceit, haters of God, inventors of evil things, children disobedient to parents — and even a Church that, for the most part, has compromised the Word of God with the teachings of sinful, finite, and imperfect people.

More and more people are rejecting the God of the Bible. Evolutionary teaching is rampant. We see Western nations that seem to have lost a sense of right and wrong — there doesn't seem to be an understanding of God's absolutes. America appears to have lost its moral basis. Other once-Christianized countries (e.g., England) are even further along than America.

God has a warning for all nations. In Romans 1, we read that when people rejected God's Word, God gave them up and gave them over. Romans 1:25 states: "because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever! Amen."

This, of course, is a very apt description of a naturalistic evolutionary worldview. And it is also an apt description of those Christians who compromise with evolution and/or millions of years teachings. They are in essence placing the word of sinful fallible people above God's Word — thus worshipping the creature more than the Creator.

I believe Romans 1 is describing what happens when God removes more of His restraining influence and Word of His power. Things will degenerate even more. And what will be the result? Paul describes it for us in Romans 1:28–32:

And since they did not see fit to acknowledge God, God gave them up to a debased mind to do what ought not to be done. They were filled with all manner of unrighteousness, evil, covetousness, malice. They are full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, maliciousness. They are gossips, slanderers, haters of God, insolent, haughty, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, foolish, faithless, heartless, ruthless. Though they know God's righteous decree that those who practice such things deserve to die, they not only do them but give approval to those who practice them.

Oh, America, and other once-great Christianized nations! "Return, O faithless sons; I will heal your faithlessness" (Jeremiah 3:22). "Let the wicked

forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let him return to the LORD, that he may have compassion on him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon” (Isaiah 55:7).

Sadly, our culture is deteriorating into a wasteland of evil. Even the youth of today are really “ticking time bombs” — repercussions of a secular worldview.

### **Defusing Bombs in Public Schools**

People are asking: “why?” Why do some teenagers have such a low view of human life that would lead them to shoot and kill their fellow students and attempt to kill and destroy them with bombs in a suicide attack? What’s behind all this? Could it happen again?

The sad thing is that potential “bombs” are being built in public schools every day. The mayhem created by school shooters from the USA to Finland to Germany over the past few years is nothing compared to the “bombs” still waiting to explode in this culture. This nation needs to brace itself as these begin to explode across the nation.

Today, generations of young people appear to have an utter sense of purposelessness and hopelessness. Many have an obsession with death, with little or no sense of right and wrong. These are the “time bombs” in our culture, and many of them already have their “fuses” lit.

There will be more senseless killing, more violence, more bloodshed, and more sorrow and suffering. And for all the talk, and all the opinions, this nation and many others haven’t learned the lesson. The real “disease” has not been dealt with.

### **Evolutionary Bombs**

Just a couple of weeks after the horrible killings at Columbine High School in Colorado (one of the first major school shootings), students (including those who saw friends shot in front of their eyes) went back to school and sadly were given the ingredients to make more “bombs.” You see, when millions of students have been told in their classes that there is no God, that man is just an animal, and that death, bloodshed, and violence (similar to what we observe in today’s world) are a natural part of the evolutionary mechanisms that produced man, then let’s be honest about the logical consequences!

In that worldview, who determines what are (or are not) “right” and “wrong” actions? If violence is a part of the evolutionary process, then why should we try to combat it? If man is just an animal, then who decides what

“value” is placed upon human life? If death is nothingness, then what is the point of suffering in this present world?

### **Whose Values?**

People are crying out asking why these students don't have the “values” of past generations. But what they mean by “values” in reality is Christian morality. It is only on the basis of an absolute authority (the God of the Bible) that one could insist on the morality of the Ten Commandments (e.g., Thou shalt not murder); otherwise, it's just an opinion. And who determines whose opinions are the right ones?

School students once went through the public education system learning Christian morality, understanding its foundation in an absolute authority — the Word of the Creator God to whom they were all accountable. Then there followed students who went through the education system learning Christian morality (but without its foundation), a time when the Bible, prayer, and God's Law were taken out of the system. Thus, they had a moral structure but with no foundation.

At the same time, students were being taught with ever-increasing fervor that man was an evolved animal. Shortly after, a new group of students went through this same education system, but not only were they taught evolution as fact, they also increasingly saw Christianity attacked and ridiculed. The more the foundation for Christian morality was attacked and removed, and the more students were taught there were no absolutes, the more their worldview reflected this change.

These are ingredients for powerful “bombs” to explode, resulting in hatred of Christians and the devaluing of human life, leading to killing one's fellow man and suicide. Now it's not that a student wakes up one morning and says, “There's no God, and I'm just an evolved animal, so there's nothing wrong with killing students and teachers.” The longer that generations of young people grow up in a culture whose education system is devoid of Christianity and pervaded by evolutionary philosophy, the more possible that an increasingly large subset of these students will eventually act out in accord with the foundation they've been given for their understanding of life. It is not just the schools that are giving the ingredients for “bombs” to the students. Much of the Church has also contributed in this regard.

### **The Church's Compromise**

The 1999 Templeton Prize for Progress in Religion (\$1.24 million award) was given to scientist Ian Barbour who stated in an interview concerning his

work for which he received this accolade, “You simply can’t any longer say as traditional Christians that death was God’s punishment for sin. Death was around long before human beings. Death is a necessary aspect of an evolutionary world.”<sup>3</sup>

Sadly, much of the Church has accepted the view that millions of years of death (in the fossil record) preceded the arrival of man on this planet. Thus death, bloodshed, disease (there is evidence of much disease like cancer, arthritis, etc. in the fossil bones), and violence existed for millions of years leading up to man. After God finished creating man and the animals, the Bible states that “everything he had made . . . was very good.” Thus, with this compromise with Scripture, death, bloodshed, disease, and violence would actually be seen as “very good” per Genesis 1:31.

How then can the Church give an answer to those asking “why?” in regard to these terrible school killings? Imagine a pastor who believes in millions of years sitting down with a student who says that he would like to commit violence to his classmates. The following could be the conversation:

“Billy, you can’t hurt your fellow classmates like that. You must love your fellow man as God loves. There is a God of love, Billy.”

“Pastor?”

“Yes, Billy.”

“Pastor, do you believe in millions of years before man? Do you believe the fossil record is millions of years old?”

“Yes, why, Billy?”

“Well it’s a record of death, disease, bloodshed, and violence, right?”

“Yes, Billy — that’s true.”

“Well, according to the Bible then, God described this as very good?”

“Well — yes.”

“Well, pastor, I am loving as God loves. Death, bloodshed, violence, and suffering have always been a part of how God loves.”

The point is, those in the Church who have added millions of years to the Bible have to admit that Billy — and not the pastor — is being the consistent one. It’s only the Christian who believes in a literal Genesis and understands that death, bloodshed, violence, suffering, and disease are a consequence of sin (our sin because we are descendants of the first man Adam)

---

3. *Dayton Daily News*, Religion section, March 13, 1999.

who can talk about a real God of love (who provided His Son as a sacrifice for our sin to suffer death for us). He gives the answer as to why this is a groaning and violence-filled world.

As a ministry, we want to help defuse these “bombs” and provide these students (and teachers) in the public school system, secular media, secular museums, and so on with the truth about their origins so that they will understand that they are made in the image of God, are sinners separated from their Creator, but that they can be saved for eternity, and know purpose and meaning in life through Jesus Christ.

### **The Evolutionary Story Changes and Is Rewritten Over and Over Again**

Where would you rather put your faith and trust: in the words of fallible, sinful men who don't know everything, who weren't there, and whose ideas and models change all the time — or the Word of the infallible God, who knows everything, has always been there, and whose Word changes not?

The Bible certainly makes it clear that God's Holy Word is forever “fixed in the heavens” (Psalm 119:89). Because the infallible Creator God is omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent, this of course is what we would expect of God's Word to us.

However, because human beings are fallible, sinful, and very limited in what they can know (e.g., “If anyone imagines that he knows something, he does not yet know as he ought to know” — 1 Corinthians 8:2), we should always keep this in perspective when listening to the claims of secular humanistic scientists concerning life and its origins.

Therefore, we shouldn't be surprised when it seems that evolutionists find new evidence almost daily that causes them to rewrite some aspect of evolution. But when is the public going to wake up? If one kept a file of what is happening in evolutionary thought, it would be an almost endless stream of articles where evolution changes daily!

It is incredible to see people putting their faith and trust in the ever-shifting sands of evolutionary ideas rather than in the changeless Word of God. The Word of God, however, declares many times, “It is written.”

Where do you put your faith and trust? In “It is written” (God's Word — beginning with Genesis) or “It is rewritten” (man's word/humanism — evolutionary ideas)?

The church needs to get back to the authority of the Bible in the church — plug the hole in the ship. Training the next generation to stand on the

authority of Scripture in Genesis in our culture is the next step at “righting the ship.” So long as the church continues to give their children to the world for their training instead of training them up in righteousness of the Lord and teaching them to defend their faith with apologetics, then this spiral down into humanism will only worsen, as the ship will continue to sink.

“

---

*To be certain, there is no straightforward way to read Genesis 1–2 and arrive at a history of the universe that approaches the evolutionary view held by so many Christians today.*

---

”

# 1

## WHAT IS EVOLUTION: THE THREE TYPES TO RECOGNIZE

---

**ROGER PATTERSON** earned his BS Ed degree in biology from Montana State University. Before coming to work at Answers in Genesis, he taught for eight years in Wyoming’s public school system and assisted the Wyoming Department of Education in developing assessments and standards for children in public schools. He is a contributing author to *Answers Magazine*, and has served as general editor and contributing author in numerous books, including the multi-volume works *World Religions and Cults* and *How Do We Know the Bible Is True?* He helps to answer many difficult questions of faith, theology, and science, as well as serving as part of Answers in Genesis’ editorial review board.

If we want to have a meaningful interaction with someone, it would be really helpful if we spoke the same language. But within the language, we must have a common understanding of the words that we are using. If you were from Wisconsin and flew to Florida and asked where the bubbler is in the airport, you would probably get a confused look.

In the discussions around origins, defining our terms is extremely important. If we don't start with common definitions for words like science, evolution, religion, faith, and theory, we will be talking past one another. When most people use the word *evolution*, they have the idea of biological evolution in mind — molecules turned into minnows which turned into mice and men. But there are several forms and senses of evolution that could create confusion.

Evolution comes from a Latin word that means “to unroll.” With that in mind, we can use the sense of “change over time” as the broadest meaning of the word. Someone's taste in music or ability to paint can evolve. But in the origins debate, we can't just use the word in a loose sense. It must be clearly defined.

## Two Main Senses

From a biblical worldview, the idea that all life on earth shares a common ancestor must be rejected. God has revealed in the opening chapter of Genesis how he created living things according to their kinds — one kind did not come from another. A Christian should not agree with the naturalist that life gradually evolved from a common universal ancestor billions of years ago.

But Christians can agree that there is change among dogs over time. Some people use the term *microevolution* to talk about the small changes that we can observe in living things (e.g., new dog breeds, antibiotic resistance in bacteria, etc.). The same people may refer to the supposed change from amphibians into reptiles — a much larger change — as *macroevolution*. They would argue that the same type of processes that produce the small changes in dogs can eventually produce the extreme changes needed to go from fish to amphibian. Thus, microevolution eventually leads to macroevolution . . . or so they believe.

But to argue for both ideas with the same definition of “evolution” introduces the logical fallacy called *equivocation* (or bait-and-switch fallacy). The types of changes that result in a new breed of dog are not the same types of changes needed to turn fins into legs or gills into lungs. The first is selecting from traits and information already present; the second requires the addition of traits and the new genetic information that codes for those



traits. Thus, the terms *microevolution* and *macroevolution* should be avoided — they are misleading terms.

### Three Main Types

The idea of evolutionary changes in both living and nonliving things is not a new idea. We know from the writings of ancient Greek thinkers that evolutionary views were common. The Epicureans promoted a form of spontaneous evolution that rejected the need of gods to bring about forms of life from basic elements they called atoms.<sup>1</sup> Earlier, Anaximander of Miletus promoted a view of the first life emerging in an ancient wet period of earth and amphibious forms coming later, with humans eventually arriving. While these and other thinkers proposed various views of evolution, these ideas are not what we think of as evolution today.

Among these early Greek explanations, we see an emphasis on chemical elements turning into living things and those lifeforms changing over time. In Eastern thought, there are also forms of evolutionary thinking. Taoist, Buddhist, and Hindu traditions also extend to the formation of the physical elements of our universe. It is apparent that the idea of evolution has expanded through time and across both the physical and biological realms.

With that as background, naturalistic evolution encompasses these key points:

- The universe is approximately 14 billion years old.
- The big bang explains the origin of the universe.
- Stars and galaxies formed gradually over billions of years.
- Our solar system, including our planet, formed gradually about 4.5 billion years ago.
- Life evolved on the earth as chemicals interacted to form the first “living” organism.
- The landscape of the earth has been gradually shaped by natural forces through uniformitarian processes.
- Organisms increased in complexity over time with all life on earth sharing a common ancestor.

To simplify, we can break this into three categories that can be easily remembered.

---

1. Bodie Hodge, “If Paul Were Around Today, Would He Argue Against Evolutionists?” Answers in Genesis, <http://answersingenesis.org/apologetics/if-paul-were-around-today-would-he-argue-against-evolutionists>.

1. **Cosmological Evolution:** From the singularity of the big bang, all space, matter, and energy gradually formed the universe and all the galaxies, stars, and planets in it. (Cosmic Evolution is another term that could be used here.)
2. **Geological Evolution:** The earth formed from the debris spinning around our sun as it gathered into a ball. Over time, the earth cooled, the atmosphere formed, and the seas accumulated. The surface of the earth was shaped and reshaped over billions of years.
3. **Biological Evolution:** The first life formed as chemicals spontaneously formed every component needed for life. From this first organism, all life on earth has gradually developed into the variety we see today. (**Chemical Evolution** is another term included in this category, denoting specifically when nonliving matter supposedly gave rise to life.)

While we can divide these into three categories, those with an evolutionary worldview (whether they are Christian, atheist, deist, or any other religious group)<sup>2</sup> view this overall process as a continuum. These ongoing, natural processes overlap one another and flow into one another. For example, the formation of stars could be included in cosmological evolution, but the planets that supposedly formed from the spinning disks of stars is on the line between cosmological and geological. Likewise, the alleged assembling of chemicals to form the first life is a precursor to biological evolution, but must happen for the evolution of living things. So, some would separate chemical evolution as a fourth category.

### Cosmological Evolution

Cosmogony and cosmology are the fields of study that deal with the origin and formation of the universe, including the galaxies and the stars they are made of. The dominant view of the origin of the universe is known as the big bang model. While it has undergone many changes (and will surely undergo more), the basic idea is that the universe came into existence 13.7 billion years ago. The entire universe was contained in an infinitely small point known as a singularity. This singularity began to expand slowly, then extremely rapidly, and then slowly again, though there is no reason for such changes in rate.

---

2. Roger Patterson, "What About Theistic Evolution?" Answers in Genesis, <http://answersin-genesis.org/theistic-evolution/what-about-theistic-evolution>.

Cosmological models propose that over time stars and galaxies began to form through natural processes, as basic elements like hydrogen, helium, and lithium formed and collected into clouds called nebulae. These clouds of gas coalesced to form the first stars (specifically *astronomical evolution*). Stars grouped together as galaxies were born. These galaxies continued to move away from one another as the universe continued to expand.

Later, galaxies began to interact and collide. As stars were born, aged, and died, heavier elements like carbon, nitrogen, and iron were formed. As stars exploded at the end of their lives, they spread these elements into space, and they were collected in new stars. Eventually, all of the elements that we see were created through this gradual process over many generations of star formation.

While many people will reject that this is a form of evolution, the evolutionists themselves use the language. You can take classes taught from textbooks like *Introduction to the Theory of Stellar Structure and Evolution*, *Stellar Evolution*, *Cosmology: The Origin and Evolution of Cosmic Structure*. Terms like galactic evolution, stellar evolution, and cosmic evolution are common in scientific literature. Based on this, it is a significant part of the larger evolutionary worldview. People who believe the universe came about as described in the big bang model can rightly be called evolutionists, even if they reject Darwin's ideas regarding biological evolution.

But can any of these events be verified? Are there other ways to interpret the things we observe in the universe around us? Why has the model changed so much? Are there other models to consider?

### **Biblical and Scientific Concerns**

The many scientific problems with the big bang model and other aspects of cosmological evolution have been written about in great detail by both scientists who are biblical creationists and secular scientists who will honestly criticize their fellow scientists. How the first stars formed, where the singularity came from, how the laws of physics operated in the singularity, the relatively smooth nature of the cosmic background, and the horizon problem are just a few.<sup>3</sup>

To resolve the horizon problem, big bang supporters have suggested that there was a period of inflation, or a burst of expansion, in the first fractions of a second after the universe began to expand. The problem is that there is no evidence or reason to suggest there was an inflationary period other than

---

3. Danny Faulkner, "Problems with the Big Bang," Answers in Genesis, <http://answersingenesis.org/big-bang/problems-with-the-big-bang>.

to avoid the horizon problem. One textbook refers to this as a “correction . . . needed to allow for the fact that the expansion was more rapid at the beginning.”<sup>4</sup>

The inflation solution to the horizon problem is nothing more than a story to support a belief about the past. To add to the problem, there is no well-established reason for the inflationary period to have occurred and no explanation of how it slowed itself down in a smooth fashion. Despite these observational shortcomings, most big bang supporters adhere to the “fact” of the inflationary phase. The same type of flawed explanation is given to prop up other aspects of the story without any substantial evidence.

From a biblical perspective, the big bang and the description of creation given in Genesis 1 are absolutely incompatible — there is no way to marry the two. One major problem is the order of events. To be certain, there is no straightforward way to read Genesis 1–2 and arrive at a history of the universe that approaches the evolutionary view held by so many Christians today.

In fact, there are many blatant contradictions in the order of events described in Genesis and the evolutionary accounting of the events that formed the universe as known today. To reconcile these differences, it seems that much dismissal or twisting of the text must be performed to accommodate the various evolutionary processes.<sup>5</sup>

The table on the following page presents a few of the differences with biblical text that must be reconciled if an evolutionary view is embraced (including geological and biological elements that will be discussed later). Many people have not considered these contradictions, and this is a great point of discussion as biblical creationists dialog with believers who hold evolutionary views.

There are clear biblical and scientific refutations of the ideas within cosmological evolution. Examining these makes it clear that anyone who holds onto these ideas has a shaky foundation for their worldview.

## Geological Evolution

At some point during this cosmological evolution, the earth and our solar system had to form. The dominant model in the evolutionary view is called the nebular hypothesis. The basic idea proposes that a cloud of dust and gasses from previously exploded stars gathered together and began spinning.

- 
4. F.S. Hess et al., *Earth Science: Geology, the Environment, and the Universe* (Teacher Wraparound Edition), (New York: Glencoe/ McGraw Hill, 2005).
  5. Terry Mortenson, “Evolution vs. Creation: The Order of Events Matters!” Answers in Genesis, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2006/04/04/order-of-events-matters>.

Evolutionary History	Genesis Account
The sun forms before the earth	The earth is present before the sun
Earth forms at the same time as other planets	The earth is formed before the other planets
The earth begins as a molten mass of rock without any water	The earth begins with water
Reptiles evolve before birds	Birds are formed before reptiles
Thorns and thistles evolve before man	Thorns and thistles are a result of man's sin

A star formed in the center, and the remnants collected together based on their relative densities (the inner planets are rocky, and the outer planets are gaseous) to form planets and their satellites. The earth began as a molten ball that eventually cooled. The atmosphere eventually formed, and water was available to form the oceans. Once there was water, life could develop.

Along with this, the plates that make up the earth's crust were in constant motion. They shifted up and down as well as horizontally over the billions of years of earth's history. The plate tectonics model we know today was not developed and broadly accepted until the 1960s. Adopting the standards of uniformitarian thinking, evolutionists teach that the plates move at an incredibly slow rate today, so they must have done so in the past.

Likewise, the layers that we can see as part of the geologic column are supposed to be a record of slow and gradual deposition and erosion over billions of years. The formation and erosion of mountains that formed as plates collided and volcanoes erupted, as well as the rift valleys that formed and flooded to form seas, represent a slow and steady process in the evolutionary models.<sup>6</sup>

Since these models speak of "change over time" in the surface of the earth, the layers in the crust, the atmosphere, and other aspects, these models can rightly be called forms of geological evolution. While the term may not be common, textbooks like *Historical Geology: Evolution of Earth*

6. John Whitmore, "Aren't Millions of Years Required for Geological Processes?" Answers in Genesis, <http://answersingenesis.org/geology/arent-millions-of-years-required-for-geological-processes>.

*and Life Through Time* and thousands of journal articles include geological evolution in their titles.

### **Biblical and Scientific Concerns**

The nebular hypothesis is not something that has been observed, nor have the smaller theoretical ideas that make up the model. For example, gas clouds do not naturally collapse on themselves. As the density of the gas increases, it naturally wants to expand, not contract into a star. Likewise, the particles floating through space would not clump together to form planets, but bounce off one another.

The date of 4.5 billion years assigned to the earth does not actually come from measurements of earth rocks, but of meteorites. This only makes sense if you assume that the nebular hypothesis is true and that meteors in our solar system formed at the same time as the earth.

On top of that are many assumptions that must be accepted to calculate the age of a rock. While the evolutionary view proposes that the rock layers were laid down gradually, there is virtually no erosion between many layers where millions of years are supposed to have passed. There is also no convincing explanation for how an ice age would be sustained, let alone many of them, through history.

The Bible gives us a date for the age of the earth, and it is thousands, not billions, of years old. The Bible also gives us a simple explanation for explaining the rapid formation of layers of sediment without any erosion between them. Further, the Bible gives us a superior mechanism to explain the ice age as a result of the Flood of Noah's day. These explanations, based on both biblical data and scientific observations and models, are rejected without consideration by naturalistic evolutionists.

### **Biological Evolution (Including Chemical Evolution)**

In the naturalistic view, all life on earth today came from some unknown collection of nonliving substances. There have been many models proposed for how this happened, but the general term applied to all of them is chemical evolution. Another term is abiogenesis — the genesis of life (*bio*) from non-life.

Once life got started, the first cell must have had all of the parts that would allow it to be separate from its environment, gather and process food, eliminate waste, store information to replicate itself, repair damage to itself, have a process to duplicate itself, and many other functions. And all of this

happened through random interactions of chemicals acting under natural laws . . . or so they believe.

Once this first cell evolved, it would then need to continue to duplicate itself. Variations by mutations would be needed so that natural selection could work to bring about survival of the fittest in various environments. From there, the single-celled organisms supposedly developed into various forms (e.g., eukaryotes and prokaryotes), some of which remained as single cells while others began to develop into multiple cells working together.

It was these multicellular organisms that then developed into more and more complex organisms like worms. Worms became fish, fish became amphibians, which became reptiles. Other cells developed into algae and plants, which eventually moved onto the land.<sup>7</sup>

Once the plants and animals moved onto land, they continued diversifying through mutations, natural selection, and other natural processes. From the original single-celled organism that was the first living thing, all life supposedly diversified through a branching process that would resemble a giant bush with branches of varying lengths. This “tree of life” concept is the heart of biological evolution.

Most evolutionists today would hold to the neo-Darwinian evolutionary ideas. Based on the proposal of Charles Darwin, primarily in his book *Origin of Species* in 1859, all life evolved from a single organism, diversifying over time. Though Darwin had no notion of DNA and genetics as we understand them today, his basic idea of traits that were inherited and passed on with variations to offspring still stands as the foundation for evolutionary views today. While there is new data used to support the evolutionary explanation of life, the *grand theory of evolution* has become so flexible it seems that any idea can fit into it regardless of how it may contradict other aspects.

### **Biblical and Scientific Concerns**

If this all sounds like a lovely story, that is exactly what it is. While there are fossils and traces of life in the rock record, these pieces of scientific data must all be interpreted. While they can be used to attempt to support the ideas of evolution, they can also be used to support the biblical model of origins. No one has ever observed these processes happening. In fact, the type of transformation necessary to turn a fish’s gills into the lungs of an amphibian are only ideas in the minds of evolutionists, not facts that can be examined.

---

7. Elizabeth Mitchell, “‘600 Million-Year-Old’ Sponge Said To Show When Multicellular Animals Evolved,” Answers in Genesis, <http://answersingenesis.org/origin-of-life/600-million-year-old-sponge-said-show-when-multicellular-animals-evolved>.

The biggest hurdle to chemical evolution is the origin of information. The code found in DNA is very complex. There is no known natural mechanism that can create such a code from natural interactions of chemical substances. To accept that DNA formed spontaneously is to accept something that cannot be demonstrated scientifically — yet it must be true in the evolutionary worldview. And many who hold to evolution will actively deny that chemical evolution is part of biological evolution. While that is technically correct, how did biological evolution get started if chemical evolution didn't happen?

There are several chicken-and-egg problems with this theory of evolution. For example: DNA needs to be transcribed into RNA to make proteins; proteins are needed to duplicate DNA, but DNA provides the code to make the proteins; proteins spontaneously fall apart in water, but water was needed for the first life to form. The challenges to chemical evolution are so numerous that to accept that it happened by chance is to accept odds that can only be accepted by faith — faith in unobservable events and chance.

While the odds of chemical evolution bringing about the first cell are astronomically high, there is a bigger problem. To accept this idea is to contradict what God has revealed in the Bible. Genesis 1 clearly describes how God supernaturally created the world and all of the living things in it. Rather than natural processes over billions of years, God created the living things over the course of a few days. There is no way to reconcile these two views without doing great harm to one or the other. Either the Bible is true and God created the plants and animals according to their kinds, or life evolved gradually from the same kind of organism. These two worldviews are not compatible.

### **Chain of Assumptions**

If we were to draw a diagram of the naturalistic evolutionary view of the universe, it would have the big bang at the center and move out to the evolution of the organisms living today. In between would be the formation of stars, planetary formation, gradual deposition and erosion, chemical evolution, the first cells, multicellular life, and then the diversity of life we see today.

If we use the analogy of a chain, we can examine naturalism as it applies to evolution to see if it is a reliable foundation to build a worldview upon. If one truth claim is dependent upon another claim, if we can prove the first is faulty, then the second is faulty also. And if all of these ideas have flowed through time in a great chain, then the support for the entire model crashes to the ground if any of the links is shown to be flawed. Biological evolution



can't be true if chemical evolution (abiogenesis) didn't happen in the first place. And stars can't form if the big bang didn't create the matter needed for the first stars.

When we start from a biblical perspective, we can demonstrate on the authority of the Bible that these evolutionary ideas are false. But if we do an internal critique of the naturalistic evolutionary worldview by accepting (for the sake of argument) the assumptions of naturalism, we can examine whether the system can stand on its own merits.

The links in the chain could be arranged in different ways, but let's think about the "highest" lifeforms we see today as the top link, stretching down (backward through evolutionary time) to the formation of the earth, and eventually the big bang. For the moment, we will grant the billions of years and the laws of nature needed to allow evolutionary processes to happen. So all we have is the observed evidence, the laws of nature, time, and chance occurrences (since there is no "guide" or "intelligence" in the naturalistic worldview).

### **But First . . .**

- Before you tell me how humans and gorillas evolved from an ape-like creature (the top of the evolutionary chain), you have to be able to explain how a trait like sexual reproduction came to exist.
- And before you tell me how sexual reproduction happened, you have to tell me how the first organisms that were sexually different came to be without going extinct (a male and a female would have to accidentally evolve simultaneously).
- And how did the first multicellular organism have the genetic information to develop different cell types?
- And before you tell me that the first living thing diversified into many types, you have to prove to me that chemicals can assemble themselves into complex integrated systems (despite the fact that it is not happening today).
- And you will have to demonstrate how specific, coded information came to exist in the DNA from simple interactions of chemicals in an environment in the past.

These are just some of the assumptions in the links of biological evolution and abiogenesis. If any of these links fail to be proven, especially the earliest links, the chain cannot hold the weight of the worldview it is supposedly supporting.

The same types of issues come with geological evolution.

- Biological evolution requires billions of years for the random interactions to produce complex life.
- But to support the story of biological evolution, you have to assume that the layers of rock were deposited gradually over billions of years.
- You have to explain how there are many layers where millions of years are supposed to have passed, yet there is virtually no erosion.
- You have to assume that a tree trunk can be fossilized standing upright through layers that supposedly span millions of years without rotting away.
- You have to prove how fossilized crabs from “millions of years ago” look identical to crabs walking the beach today.
- You have to assume that the dates calculated from radiometric isotopes are not impacted by the assumptions involved in the calculations.
- You have to accept that the extrapolation of measured rates of radiometric decay can be extrapolated backward for millions or billions of years.
- You must prove that the current rate of movement of the continents has always been the same.
- You have to explain how those layers formed from a cooling molten earth as an atmosphere was forming to provide the water for life to begin.
- And you have to assume that the dust particles floating around the nebula would actually stick together to form clumps large enough to make a planet, not to mention what caused the nebula to spin in the first place.

And if you are still holding onto the chain after the assumptions of geological evolution, you have to assume that heavy elements were forged in the hearts of ancient stars billions of years ago, exploding to provide those elements to form our sun and earth.

- But how did those first stars form if gas clouds tend to spread out, not collapse into extremely dense spheres (of which our sun is a fairly small specimen).
- And you must also assume that the stars we see in the galaxy around us represent stars in their various stages of development, which

means you have to first assume stars develop over time, passing through stages.

- And this matter had to come from an exquisitely fine-tuned process responding to highly specific physical laws that just happen to be the way they are without a lawgiver to set them in place. This includes the apparently smooth period of rapid expansion and then slowing down of that expansion . . . for some reason.
- And what exactly was the singularity that initiated the big bang?
- And where did it come from?

There are many places along the naturalistic chain that the only answer to why you would accept these ideas is a blind faith (accepting a claim without scientific evidence) in naturalism — it must have happened that way, because here we are. Biblical creationists don't have every detail worked out as far as how things happened in the past, but the restraints of naturalism make the acceptance of immaterial things like the laws of nature, laws of logic, and information impossible to account for. Only the God of the Bible can explain how these laws came into existence, how the information in the first living things was programmed into the DNA, and how the universe we see around us was formed.

Are you really going to put your faith in this chain to hold up your worldview?

### **Who Do You Trust?**

When it comes to evaluating the evolutionary worldview, there is a lot to try to understand. But all of this ultimately comes down to a matter of authority. Are you going to trust man's word based on the assumption that everything we see came from an impersonal source that defies the laws of nature? Or are you going to trust the intelligent God who has revealed Himself to us in His creation, the pages of Scripture, and the person of Jesus Christ?

While I have argued in broad, general statements, the specifics of each point I have raised have been examined by qualified scientists from both a naturalistic evolutionary and a biblical creation worldview. Are you going to place your trust in the evolutionary view or the biblical view? One view paints you as an animal who is a consequence of random chance collisions of particles with no future beyond this life and no standard of right and wrong.

The other tells you that a loving God created you in His image with purpose and that there is hope of an eternity of joy with Him after you die.

So, were you once a worm who is just going to die and become worm food? Or are you a special creation of a God who cares for you? Those are the consequences of the worldview you trust in.