

## Response Essay

“. . . Honor Christ the Lord as holy, always being prepared to make a defense to anyone who asks you a reason of the hope that is in you. . .” (1 Peter 3:15b)

My quest to answer Darwin began during a casual conversation with a friend. Annabelle was praising her biology teacher’s coverage of evolution. When I explained my doubts about the theory, she replied with textbook authority. The diagrams of evolving plant and animal life looked so realistic, and the explanations seemed so logical. While I tried to persuade her that evolution did not fit in a Christian worldview, I would first need to disarm her Darwinian arguments. Unfortunately, I didn’t have the tools.

Soon after that frustrating encounter, Answers in Genesis published *Evolution Exposed*. The book not only offered answers for my friend but it also taught me that the origins debate is not solved through facts alone. The evidence is the same. The interpretation of that evidence depends on one’s worldview: naturalism or theism. The outcomes of those worldviews on morality starkly differ.

Hence, my chosen topic attests that particles-to-person evolution is not a mere scientific theory; it is a philosophy leading to amorality. Without God, I learned that ethics falls prey to the tyranny of majority rule or the whims of personal opinion. Morality depends on a law-giving Creator.

After sharing my paper with Annabelle, she stepped away from her now crumbling belief in evolution. She realized that no dichotomy exists between religion and science. Agreeing that naturalism undermines morality, she doubted the practical worth of Darwinism. I responded, “In the end, we shouldn’t base our beliefs on the most pragmatic worldview. Which is true?”

Because Annabelle is now searching for the truth, the hours of research proved worthwhile. The Lord is working inside her heart and mind. Moreover, God is teaching me how to defend the hope that is in me. May our renewed faith in the Creator strengthen our faith in the Redeemer!

# **Evolution of Ethics**

How the biology class undermines Morality 101

Karin A. Hutson  
AIG Research Paper Challenge 2007  
March 1, 2007

# **Evolution of Ethics**

## How the biology class undermines Morality 101

Karin A. Hutson  
AIG Research Paper Challenge 2007  
Word Count: 2, 913  
March 1, 2007

The two young men sauntered through the school halls. One wore a t-shirt with the inscription, "Natural Selection."<sup>1</sup> Approaching a blonde-haired junior, Eric asked her, "Do you believe in God?" Cassie Bernall's simple yet courageous reply, "Yes," was her last. Her killers continued their rampage of Columbine High.

After the Columbine massacre, more calloused teenagers have continued the violence. Our grandparents remember when school began with a prayer and Bible reading. They don't remember, however, their old-fashioned schools troubled by school shootings, disrespect to teachers, or ethical debates. Ever since the Scopes Trial, one of the strongest arguments against Darwin's theory has been evolution's failure to uphold morality.

Darwin in *Descent of Man* claimed that if evolution were true, it has altered us not merely physically but also morally (Horgan 149). Can Darwinian evolution adequately account for and uphold human morality? This paper concludes it cannot. Within a naturalistic worldview that denies absolute truth, morality has no standards. Ethics then disintegrates into fickle opinions and conflicting preferences. Hence, evolution supports amorality, not morality!

Evolution replaces God, purpose, and morality with nature, chance, and relativism. No wonder violence and vileness wreak havoc in schools and society today! When the science class indoctrinates its students in naturalistic philosophy, morality is undermined.

---

<sup>1</sup> Catchpoole, Get Answers.

## When evolution is taught. . .

The average student blindly accepts evolution as fact. To public education's shame, textbooks often mislead students. "Textbooks present evolution in two different ways—small, observable changes (natural selection, speciation, adaptation) and large, unobservable changes (molecules-to-man evolution). They show evidence for the former and then conclude that this proves that the latter took place as well" (Patterson 52). While creationists don't argue that small-scale evolution occurs within a species, particle-to-person evolution remains unsubstantiated (Patterson 211-212).

If Darwinism is speculative, why is it brandished as science? Colson answers, "Darwinism is dominant today not because of the strength of the scientific evidence but because Darwinism bolsters a worldview—one that rejects God and depicts humans as morally autonomous" (Colson, "How Now Shall We Live," 426).

What is this self-sufficient worldview? Naturalism is the worldview that evolution supports. Unlike theism which asserts that a Creator<sup>2</sup> must exist behind our universal order, naturalism counters that nature can produce itself without a self-existent Cause.

Because of those conflicting presuppositions, creationists and evolutionists interpret their observations differently. Creationists examine fossils and point back thousands of years to the worldwide flood explained in the Bible, while evolutionists look at the same fossils and point back millions of years. Their interpretations vary as extremely as their opposing worldviews.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> "The God who made the world and everything in it, being Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in temples made by man, nor is he served by human hands, as though he needed anything, since he himself gives to all mankind life and breath and everything. And he made from one man every nation of mankind to live on all the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their dwelling place, that they should seek God, in the hope that they might feel their way toward him and find him. Yet he is actually not far from each one of us, for 'In him we live and move and have our being. . .'" (Acts 17:24-28).

<sup>3</sup> "The argument is not over the evidence—the evidence is the same—it is over the way the evidence should be interpreted" (Patterson 25).

"Starting with different assumptions leads to different conclusions in almost every case. Ultimately, it takes just as much faith—if not more—to believe that only matter and natural laws can explain the universe" (Patterson 10).

Hence, both creation and evolution are belief systems about the past.<sup>4</sup> Both differ from empirical science as they attempt to explain how life began. Evolutionists deduce life's origins from the assumption of godless chance, whereas creationists establish interpretations on their confidence in the Book of the Creator.

If creation offers just as valid answers for life's origin as Darwin, which *Evolution Exposed* reveals, why is it banned from public schools? Authorities with a naturalistic worldview have monopolized the education department. Dr. Scott Todd boasted, "Even if all the data point to an intelligent designer, such an hypothesis is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic."<sup>5</sup>

While discussing the origin of life is proper in a science class, giving the Darwinian theory official credence and censoring the opposing view is indoctrination (Patterson 7). Although our founding scientists—Galileo, Kepler, Newton—experimented from a creationist perspective (Patterson 20), twenty-first century school officials unfairly regulate evolution to the classroom as science and creation to the church as religion. Both, however, are belief systems! The outcomes of these belief systems on morality contrast with each other sharply.

### **. . . morality is undermined**

First, this paper examines the way Darwinian evolution shapes, or rather misshapes, morality. Ken Ham asserts that "Evolution is a religious position that makes human opinion supreme," yielding the fruit of immorality (*The Lie: Evolution*, 29).

Evolutionists are still seeking to justify that morality could have evolved—let alone keep the peace. Darwin's missing link is adequately explaining how atoms evolved an ethical consciousness. The perplexing and oft-contradicting theories range from Dawkin's selfish gene theory ("My only goal is to progress myself"), to reciprocal altruism ("What will you give me if I do this for you?"), to kin selection theory ("I'll cooperate with my relatives. Death to all else!").

---

<sup>4</sup> Ham, *The Relevance of Creation*, Get Answers.

<sup>5</sup> *Nature*401(6752):423, Sept. 30, 1999.

Some evolutionists such as Nigel Barber<sup>6</sup> suggest that morality is more than a distinctly human phenomenon. They claim to find altruism in our evolutionary ancestors, citing examples such as chimpanzees hugging, bees working together in the hive, or penguins “adopting” a chick. Professor Daniel Dennett, a notable evolutionist, calls such a theory unlikely if not absurd. Mammals are just as likely to engage in cannibalism or homicide as participate in symbiotic relationships (Dennett 478-481).<sup>7</sup>

Since evolutionists cannot validate ethical behavior in animal ancestors, most explain morality as the *Homo sapiens*’ evolved method of cooperation in society. As evolutionists Ruse and Wilson admit, “Morality, or more strictly, our belief in morality, is merely an adaptation put in place to further our reproductive ends. Hence the basis of ethics does not lie in God’s will.” Irrational unless furthering one’s own interests, ethics “is an illusion fobbed off on us by our genes to get us to cooperate” (51-52). Society constructs morality, a social contract as Thomas Hobbes theorized, to keep the peace.

These theories purposefully discount universal truth and morality. For, if universal good existed, a universal God must have created the standard.<sup>8</sup> To naturalists, therefore, morality must be a construction of society, evolving with time and place.<sup>9</sup>

Such a worldview cannot uphold any ethical standard besides what an individual accepts as best for himself at any given time and circumstance. While ridding society of moral restrictions sounds liberating at first, imagine living in such a culture. Would you like to walk the streets at night if your next-door-neighbor’s moral code included armed

---

<sup>6</sup> *Kindness in a Cruel World*.

<sup>7</sup> “Where it is in his own interest, every organism may reasonably be expected to aid his fellows. Where he has no alternative, he submits to the yoke of communal servitude. Yet given a full chance to act in his own interest, nothing but expediency will restrain him from brutalizing, from maiming, from murdering his brother, his mate, his parent, or his child. Scratch an ‘altruist’ and watch a ‘hypocrite’ bleed” (Michael Ghiselin, 1974, *The Economy of Nature and the Evolution of Sex*, University of California Press, Berkeley).

<sup>8</sup> Dan Story writes, “We could not know what evil is, in any universal sense, unless a moral standard exists outside of us. Without a moral absolute—namely—dependent of human consciousness, there would be no criteria to determine what is right and wrong. . . . I could not justify telling you what you ought to do unless there was an absolute standard of moral behavior independent of individual persons and cultures” (*Dan Story, Defending Your Faith: How to Answer the tough Questions* [Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1992], 29).

<sup>9</sup> “In morality, naturalism results in relativism. If nature is all there is, then there is no transcendent source of moral truth, and we are left to construct morality on our own. Every principle is reduced to a personal preference” (Colson, *How Now Shall We Live*, 21).

robbery (survival of the fittest, he explains), deporting your race (natural selection, after all), and raping young women (a genetic predisposition<sup>10</sup>)?

The evolutionist retorts triumphantly, “But society constructs laws to restrict such bedlam!” True, society can group together to punish deviant behavior (Sober and Wilson 150), but first it must agree on a moral code. Even then, if it imposes its will on someone with a different system of ethics, its code becomes tyrannical.<sup>11</sup> For who wants his own ethical ideals repressed? Sadly, people call for protection from others, while demanding license for themselves. Such a society will require a massive police force to quell riots and crime where moral codes differ.<sup>12</sup>

Even if one society does consent to a particular moral code, it cannot claim its code for the world. In a relativistic world, that would be supreme arrogance. But what if another culture upholds a moral code of repressing women, slaughtering a certain, “unfit” race, or conquering the world by acts of terrorism?<sup>13</sup> One society may “believe that sending airplanes into skyscrapers is evil and wrong, and another may believe that it is pleasing to God and correct” (Ramsey, *Get Answers*). No country could command a stop if morality were relative.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Edward Wilson, author of *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, believes “that warfare, xenophobia, the dominance of males, and even our occasional spurts of altruism could all be understood as adaptive behaviors stemming from our primordial compulsion to propagate our genes” (Horgan 145).

<sup>11</sup> “If our convictions about right and wrong are nothing but chemical reactions, then there is no way for us to test their validity. They are necessarily arbitrary and nonbinding” (Sproul, Jr. 46).

<sup>12</sup> “When morality is reduced to personal preferences and when no one can be held morally accountable, society quickly falls into disorder” (Colson, *How Now Shall We Live*, 199).

<sup>13</sup> C.S. Lewis rightly said, “If no set of moral ideas were truer or better than any other, there would be no sense in preferring civilized morality to savage morality, or Christian morality to Nazi morality. In fact, of course, we all do believe that some moralities are better than others. . . . The moment you say that one set of moral ideas can be better than another, you are, in fact, measuring them both by a standard. . . comparing them both with some Real Morality, admitting that there is such a thing as a real Right, independent of what people think, and that some people’s ideas get nearer to the real Right than others” (Wayne Martindale and Jerry Root, eds., *The Quotable C.S. Lewis* [Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1989], 441).

<sup>14</sup> “The secular humanist somewhat naively wants us to deny the existence of God, presume our beginnings to be a result of chaotic chance (rendering both our origin and our destiny meaningless), and yet still calls us to fight for human rights and dignity. . . . Why does human dignity matter if we are all cosmic accidents? The very source of human dignity comes from the dignity of the Creator” (Sproul 156).

Thus, evolution cannot provide a firm foundation for morality. Because it provides nothing to grasp as truth, it must rely on the gusty, altering winds of public opinion. How can a Darwinian society promote good when good cannot be defined? Indeed, evolution offers no logical basis for kindness, humility, and truthfulness.

This moral purge causes increased violence and vileness in modern-day schools. In an evolutionary society, no one can condemn Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold for murdering fellow students at Columbine High.<sup>15</sup> If distinguishing between good and bad is wrong, how can a teacher encourage his student not to cheat or take drugs? If matter is all that matters, why not cheat on tests, why not use marijuana, why not shoplift? If no higher Law-Giver exists, why respect teachers, parents, or police?

Therefore, teaching particle-to-person evolution does undermine morality. It replaces God, purpose, and morality with nature, chance, and relativism. It leads to violence and vice.<sup>16</sup>

## Response of Evolutionists

While some evolutionists have labored to answer such ethical criticism, others, such as Richard Dawkins, an Oxford professor and evolutionist, boast in their death blow to

---

<sup>15</sup> "If indeed all that we are is reducible to chemicals, then how can we be held responsible for any of our thoughts, words, or deeds?" (Sproul Jr. 43).

<sup>16</sup> "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. For his invisible attributes, namely, his eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived, ever since the creation of the world, in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse. For although they knew God, they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles. Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, 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. For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error. 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 decree that those who practice such things deserve to die, they not only do them but give approval to those who practice them" (Romans 1:18-32).



morality. In an interview with Dawkins, Jaron Lanier commented, “There’s a large group of people who simply are uncomfortable with accepting evolution because it leads to what they perceive as a moral vacuum, in which their best impulses have no basis in nature.” Dawkins replied stoically, “All I can say is, That’s just tough. We have to face up to the truth.”<sup>17</sup>

Would all evolutionists agree with that frightening outlook? Not all. Professor Dennett confesses, “Ethical decision-making examined from the perspective of Darwin’s dangerous idea, holds out scant hope of our ever discovering a formula or an algorithm for doing right. But that is not an occasion for despair; we have the mind-tools we need to design and redesign ourselves, ever searching for better solutions to the problems we create for ourselves and others” (Dennett 510).

This is foolhardy optimism. If naturalism is true, how can one rationally try to improve himself? As R.C. Sproul Jr. counters, “But if their view is correct—if we think what we think and do what we do because of our genes or chemicals in our brain—then there is no point in trying to persuade us of that point of view. . . . those who hold this view invariably appeal to our mind, instead of our brain, all the while denying that there is such a thing as the mind” (Sproul Jr. 43). Claiming that natural forces empower everything is itself a truth claim prohibited by naturalism!<sup>18</sup>

No, evolution cannot create “better solutions” when “better” cannot be defined. “If we cannot answer moral questions on which people disagree, because truth is relative, how can we decide that it is better for mankind to survive than not to survive?” (Sproul Jr. 101).

Following Dennett or Dawkins, naturalists either unabashedly glory in their liberation from absolute morality, trusting innate human goodness, or they stoically accept the pointlessness of existence. The former choice is illogical. The latter fits more closely with evolutionary tenets. Such a realization of the emptiness of the Darwinian worldview is the nihilist conclusion.

---

<sup>17</sup> “Evolution: The dissent of Darwin,” *Psychology Today*, January/February 1997, p. 62.

“But these speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves” (Jude 1:10).

<sup>18</sup> Colson, *How Now Shall We Live*, 421.

## The Nihilist Approach

So far, this paper has argued pragmatically that evolution undermines morality. But if evolution is true, why fool ourselves with moral restrictions? Rather we should live our evolutionary life to its full emptiness. That oxymoron is extolled by nihilism. Nihilism, futile existence, is living life according to evolutionary philosophy.

As Sproul assesses, “We either have God and meaningful morality and meaningful lives, or we have no God, and all of life is meaningless, without any trace of hope” (154). Nihilists live—not in denial of that despair as some evolutionists<sup>19</sup>—but with indifferent acceptance of life’s insignificance.

“The greatest contribution of the nihilists is their pointing out the clear-cut consequences of what life would be without the existence of God. They reject half-hearted, compromise positions that hesitate to embrace either full-orbed theism or total nihilism.” (Sproul 154).

True nihilists, however, are a rare find. Genuine nihilism requires utter apathy towards living or dying, helping or hurting, joy or sorrow. Such a person would not even have the impetus to persuade high school students of evolution! Evidently, most evolutionists are not nihilists. According to evolutionary tenets, however, all should be.

To be clear, this paper is not arguing that an evolutionist is inevitably another Dylan Klebold or Bartleby (Sproul Jr., 114). Rather, evolution offers them no standard to make ethical decisions. A hypocritical Christian is misrepresenting Christ, whereas an amoral evolutionist is acting consistently with his worldview (Carl Wieland, *Get Answers*).

---

<sup>19</sup> See Ridley 264.

Remember, the main cause of sin is the depraved sin nature that dominates even without the faulty worldview of evolution. While evolution doesn't directly cause sin, its naturalism presents a good excuse because it denies that morality is universal, that sin is sin, that a Judge will requite!<sup>20</sup> Hence, studies show moral decline among those who accept evolution.<sup>21</sup>

Do America's hurting schools have any alternative education to evolutionary nihilism?

## The Creation Answer

Teaching creation also influences morality but with the reverse effect of evolution. Creationist beliefs stem both from the universe's design and the Bible's divine revelation. The Scripture's first verse asserts, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth" (Genesis 1:1). Creationists examine the beauty and "irreducible complexity" of everything from galaxies to aardvarks to cells. Natural forces cannot be credited for such design. Creationists praise the Maker.<sup>22</sup>

Students of creation science construct a wholly different worldview than students of evolution. Rather than thinking she descends from chimpanzees, a creationist student knows she is fundamentally unlike animals. She was made in God's image with a rational mind, active will, and sensitive emotions. The spirit God gives her seeks to know the Lord and lives on after the body's death. Thus, people are neither animal's equals nor oppressors but good stewards of the earth God has entrusted to them (Genesis 1:28).

Contrary to Darwinian philosophy, a creationist student learns he has inherent worth. He is not a heap of atoms evolved from a crock-pot of amino acids but uniquely

---

<sup>20</sup> As apologist Ron Rhodes says, "I concede that atheists can hold to certain moral principles. I do not believe, however, that they can ultimately *justify* these principles. One can outwardly claim that hate, racism, and genocide are wrong, but if there is no ultimate standard of morality (God), how can these things *actually* be wrong?" (Rhodes 116).

<sup>21</sup> Overman <[http://www.icr.org/research/index/researchp\\_ro\\_r01](http://www.icr.org/research/index/researchp_ro_r01)>.

<sup>22</sup> "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the sky above proclaims his handiwork" (Psalm 19:1).

"But ask the beasts, and they will teach you; the birds of the heavens, and they will tell you; or the bushes of the earth, and they will teach you; and the fish of the sea will declare to you. Who among all these does not know that the hand of the LORD has done this? In his hand is the life of every living thing and the breath of all mankind" (Job 12:7-10).

designed by a Creator God. Rather than being a product of haphazard chance, he was purposefully made to glorify God by enjoying Him forever.<sup>23</sup>

Therefore, life is intrinsically valuable. Suicide, euthanasia, abortion, and embryonic stem cell research are no longer ethical dilemmas to debate in an ethics class but utter evils. Human dignity and rights are not mere ideals extolled in word by politicians but worth bestowed on every culture, race, gender, and individual.

Creationism also supports responsible authority. Instead of rebelling against “artificial” authority, the student realizes that parents, teachers, and government should be honored because they are invested with leadership from the Ultimate Authority. As these lesser authorities are accountable to God for how they apply that influence, the student is accountable to God for respecting them (Romans 13:1-7).

Furthermore, the student of creation learns he is not a victim of nature but responsible to the Creator for every deed. This accountability motivates him to work hard and live right. No longer can he plead in a courtroom that a primitive animal instinct caused him to prey on the weak or that his genes made him rape. He will be judged for his life on earth because God has placed His moral law within. That conscience intrinsically knows right from wrong.<sup>24</sup>

Not only is the knowledge of good and evil ingrained within, but it’s also spelled out in the Bible, God’s revealed will. The Ten Commandments were fitly summarized by Jesus: loving God and others (Matthew 22:37-40). Only by following Christ can true peace reign.

If our schools embrace creation education, will utopia prevail? A quandary remains. Even embracing the biblical view of morality cannot help us fulfill its call for virtue. The answer to Fyodor Dostoyevsky’s question is no, man cannot be good without God. The Bible explains our failure to perfect ourselves. Ever since the Fall of Adam and Eve, man has been in bondage to his own selfish desires, leading to sin: lying, coveting,

---

<sup>23</sup> John Piper.

<sup>24</sup> “For when Gentiles, who do not have the law, by nature do what the law requires, they are a law to themselves, even though they do not have the law. They show that the work of the law is written on their hearts, while their conscience also bears witness, and their conflicting thoughts accuse or even excuse them on that day when, according to my gospel, God judges the secrets of men by Christ Jesus” (Romans 2:14-16).

stealing, hating, killing. The punishment for such offenses against the holy and just God must be eternal separation from Him in hell.

Although our sin separates us from Him, God's love made one way of salvation. He sent the perfect Lord Jesus to fulfill the moral code. Christ died to pay for our failure, and rose from the dead to give His followers victory over sin. He sends His Spirit to believers so their virtuous lives may glorify and rejoice in God.<sup>25</sup>

### Concluding with the beginning

In conclusion, our beliefs about life's beginning radically affect our moral values. Ultimately, differing beliefs cannot destroy the truth. Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No man comes to the Father except through Me" (John 14:6). This is the ultimate truth claim given by the One who claimed union with God since before the beginning of time and to be the Agent of creation (John 1). Our response to Christ reveals our destiny! The choices consistent with evolution and creation are two: accepting evolution leads to an amoral end; turning to the Creator means trusting Jesus as the Savior and Lord who sanctifies to genuine morality.<sup>26</sup>

In order to share Christ with secular America, one must first confront the blinding worldview of evolution. This indoctrination begins in the classroom. Operational science

---

<sup>25</sup> While perfection only comes in heaven, a true believer is being sanctified by Christ.

"And you were dead in the trespasses and sins in which you once walked, following the course of this world, following the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience—among whom we all once lived in the passions of our flesh, carrying out the desires of the body and the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, like the rest of mankind. But God, being rich in mercy, because of the great love with which he loved us, even when we were dead in our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ—by grace you have been saved—and raised us up with him and seated us with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus, so that in the coming ages he might show the immeasurable riches of his grace in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus. For by grace you have been saved through faith. And this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God, not a result of works, so that no one may boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them" (Ephesians 2:1-10).

<sup>26</sup> "... scoffers will come in the last days with scoffing, following their own sinful desires. . . . The Lord is not slow to fulfill his promise as some count slowness, but is patient toward you, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should reach repentance. But the day of the Lord will come like a thief, and then the heavens will pass away with a roar, and the heavenly bodies will be burned up and dissolved, and the earth and the works that are done on it will be exposed. Since all these things are thus to be dissolved, what sort of people ought you to be in lives of holiness and godliness. . . . You therefore, beloved, knowing this beforehand, take care that you are not carried away with the error of lawless people and lose your own stability. But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. To him be the glory both now and to the day of eternity. Amen" (2 Peter 3:3-18).

must be separated from the naturalistic philosophy of evolution. When the science class upholds particles-to-person evolution, morality and Christ are undermined. Morality and Christianity depend on Genesis. Thus, the evolution versus creation dispute is worth answering!

While some time may pass before creation science is allowed back in the public school system, Christians must act now. Students can be prepared with creation answers to give to teachers and fellow students, offering hope of moral principles. Let's persuade America to teach the truth . . . then live it!

“Thus says the Lord: Maintain justice, and do what is right, for soon my salvation will come, and my deliverance be revealed” (Isaiah 56:1).

## **Bibliography**

- Catchpoole, David. How to Build a Bomb in the Public School System. Get Answers. 12 Feb. 2007. <<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v22/i1/bomb.asp>>.
- Colson, Charles. Burden of Truth and How Now Shall We Live. Prison Fellowship Ministries, 1997.
- Dennett, Daniel. Darwin's Dangerous Idea. New York, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Geisler, Norman and Brooks, Ron. When Skeptics Ask. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1990.
- Ham, Ken. The Lie: Evolution. Green Forest, Arizona: Master Books, Inc, 1987.  
The Relevance of Creation. Get Answers. 12 Feb. 2007.  
<<http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v6/i2/creation.asp>>.
- Horgan, John. The End of Science. U.S.A.: John Horgan, 1996.
- Morris, Henry. The Biblical Basis for Modern Science. U.S.A.: 1984.
- Nash, Ronald. The Closing of the American Heart. U.S.A.: Probe Ministries International, 1990.
- Overman, Richard L. Comparing Origins Beliefs and Moral Views. 1998. Institute for Creation Research. 12 Feb. 2007.  
<[http://www.icr.org/research/index/researchhp\\_ro\\_r01/](http://www.icr.org/research/index/researchhp_ro_r01/)>
- Patterson, Roger. Evolution Exposed. Answers in Genesis, 2006.
- Rhodes, Ron. Answering the Objections of Atheists, Agnostics, and Skeptics. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 2006.
- Ramsey, Janine M. What basis, morality? Get Answers. 11 May 2004. 14 Feb. 2007.  
<<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2004/0511basis.asp>>.
- Ridley, Matt. The Origins of Virtue. Penguin Group, 1996.
- Ruse, Michael, and Edward O. Wilson. 1985. The Evolution of Ethics. New Scientist 108, no. 1478 (17 October): 50-52.
- Sarfati, Jonathan. Refuting Evolution. Brisbane, Australia: Answers in Genesis, 1999.
- Skehan, James W., Nelson, Craig E., Skoog, Gerald. The Creation Controversy and the Science Classroom. Arlington, Virginia: NSTA Press, 2000.
- Sproul, R.C. Defending your Faith. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 2003.
- Sproul, R.C., Jr. Tearing Down Strongholds and Defending the Truth. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing Company, 2002.
- Veith, Gene Edward, Jr. Postmodern Times: A Christian Guide to Contemporary Thought and Culture. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1994.
- Wieland, Carl. Evolution and Social Evil. Get Answers. 27 April 2004. 12 Feb. 2007.  
<[http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2004/0427social\\_evil.asp](http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2004/0427social_evil.asp)>.
- Wilson, David Sloan and Sober, Elliott. Unto Others: The Evolution and Psychology of Unselfish Behavior. U.S.A.: 2000.