

Katherine A. Faulkenberry

Advisor: Mr. J. Hughes

Senior Thesis

11 May 2007

### Impact of Evolutionary Thought on Western Civilization

Evolution. The word that makes most Christians cringe. After all, the theory completely denies God's involvement in the origin of the world. Most Christians therefore choose to completely ignore the teaching of Evolution. They change the channel when anything to do with Evolution comes up in news discussions. They do not speak of it at church. They may even send their children to Christian schools so they will not be exposed to it. But is this the reaction Christians should be having to the doctrine of Evolution? Should Christians just ignore it? Pretend it does not exist? No. Many Christians are scared of the idea of Evolution or hope they can escape it. Christians, however, must assert a Christian worldview that answers Darwinists' questions and counters its false claims. If Christians allow Evolution to continue unchecked, they will involuntarily assume presuppositions that are contrary to the teaching of the Bible and which lead to error in every area of human thought – humanities, economics, mathematics, etc. As Nancy Pearcey states, “the danger is that if Christians do not develop a biblical approach to the subject, then [they] will unconsciously absorb some other philosophical approach” (44). Evolution is much more than a theory of origin; it is a worldview-shattering, world culture-altering concept that has impacted society more than most realize, and Christians should take action to disarm Evolutionary thought.

An understanding of the teaching of Evolution, its historical origins, and the impacts it has on other areas of thought are essential for Christians before they can comprehend what a

serious threat Evolution is. Oxford's Concise Scientific Dictionary gives the scientific definition of evolution as, "the gradual process by which the present diversity of plant and animal life arose from the earliest and most primitive organisms, which is believed to have been continuing for the past 3000 million years". In other words, all life descended from a simpler organism that descended from a simpler organism and so on. The theory also includes the idea of Natural Selection, an idea more commonly known as Survival of the Fittest. This idea can be best stated the way Darwin himself put it: "if variations useful to any organic being do occur, assuredly individuals thus characterized will have the best chance of being preserved in the struggle for life; and from the strong principle of inheritance they will tend to produce offspring similarly characterized" (Darwin, 171). Simply put, if any variation occurs in reproduction that will help the species thrive, it will continue to occur in reproduction.

The best way for a Christian to understand how Evolutionary thought has altered culture and affected worldviews is to look at its impact throughout history. For the purposes of this paper, it is sufficient to focus primarily on America's history. The American colonies were founded by pilgrims who crossed the Atlantic to escape the religious persecution they experienced in England and Holland. They founded America, therefore, with a hope for religious tolerance. In fact, years later, when the Constitution was being formulated, that purpose was highlighted. It is, after all, part of the First Amendment of our Constitution:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Congress cannot make any law establishing a religion. The application of the Amendment is an important point of the debate. How far can Congress go with religious issues before breaking the First Amendment? This question proves controversial. For example, Darwinists are opposed by Creationists who submit Creationism as an alternative explanation of origins to Evolution.

Staff writers for the *Christian Science Monitor* describe Intelligent Design: “Intelligent design holds that nature is so complex that random natural selection, as argued by Charles Darwin in his 1859 theory of evolution, is an inadequate explanation for [complex nature’s] evolution. Instead, the natural world must be the work of an unnamed creator” (Grier 1). Earth, Intelligent Design proponents declare, is an exceedingly complex planet. The theory of Evolution is not sufficient to explain the intricacies of the world. In fact, the only way to explain the world is by believing that God or some creator created the world.

Proponents of Evolution believe that if Congress permits the teaching of Intelligent Design, Congress would be establishing a religion for the schools funded by Congress to teach. Therefore, Congress could not allow the teaching of Intelligent Design, as doing so would violate the “establishment of religion” clause of the First Amendment. However, proponents of Intelligent Design respond by claiming that Evolution is itself a religion. For example, Nancy Pearcey mentions a Columbus, Ohio newspaper claiming that Intelligent Design proponents want to bring religion into classrooms where it does not belong. She responds with the claim that religion is already there, and so they are discriminating (172). Belief in Evolution requires a measure of faith as described by Wysong:

Evolution requires plenty of faith; a faith in L-proteins that defy chance formation; a faith in the formation of DNA codes which, if generated spontaneously, would spell only pandemonium; a faith in a primitive

environment that, in reality, would fiendishly devour any chemical precursors to life; a faith in experiments that prove nothing but the need for intelligence in the beginning; a faith in a primitive ocean that would not thicken, but would only haplessly dilute chemicals; a faith in natural laws of thermodynamics and biogenesis that actually deny the possibility for the spontaneous generation of life; a faith in future scientific revelations that, when realized, always seem to present more dilemmas to the evolutionists; faith in improbabilities that treasonously tell two stories—one denying evolution, the other confirming the Creator; faith in transformations that remain fixed; faith in mutations and natural selection that add to a double negative for evolution; faith in fossils that embarrassingly show fixity through time, regular absence of transitional forms and striking testimony to a worldwide water deluge; a faith in time which proves to only promote degradation in the absence of mind; and faith in reductionism that ends up reducing the materialist's arguments to zero and forcing the need to invoke a supernatural Creator (455).

Evolution requires plenty of faith. Evolutionary thought requires belief in things that science has proved are extremely unlikely to occur. They must believe that proteins and DNA are not going to act like they are supposed to act as defined by science. They must believe that someday scientists will find the missing link between the different kingdoms of science, even though up to this point in science, fossils have been consistent in structure. And Margorie Grene, a leading historian of science and philosophy, states, “Today the tables are turned. The modified, but still characteristically Darwinian theory has itself become an orthodoxy, preached by its adherents with religious fervor, and doubted, they feel, only by a few muddlers imperfect in scientific

faith" (49). (The modified Darwinian theory mentioned in this quote refers to the extension of Darwinian thought as scientists have learned more about things like DNA.) Evolution is indeed preached with religious fervor.

Evolution is seen by many scientists to be the answer to the problem of origin. The claim a scientific basis that one day they may be able to touch and see for themselves. Though it has no heritage in religion, Evolution requires faith in a scientific process that is yet to provide answers to the tough questions of these critics of Evolution. However, they still hold fast to their claims. Therefore, Evolution should be considered a religion as it requires a belief in things not seen – things without real evidence. Yet scientists and common men alike refuse to let go of what they believe is true.

One major battle ground for the debate between Evolution and Creationism is the public school boardroom. What is to be taught in science classes funded by taxpayers? If the question of origin is a religious question, can public schools establish a religion by teaching students any theory of origins, whether that is Creationism or Evolution? So, in dispute then is the application of one of America's great founding principles: freedom of religion. The debate regarding freedom of religion is very important for the Christian to understand. America was founded with a focus on freedom of religion. That is part of what defines America. But legislators are now debating even that very issue. All because of Evolutionary thought's impact on American citizens.

But to understand how Evolution has impacted other areas of the Western worldview, one must continue to look throughout history. Not long after the ratification of the Constitution came the birth of Charles Darwin. Charles Darwin is credited as the "Father of Evolution." Darwin studied medicine at Edinburgh and theology at Christ's College and it was while at Christ's

College that he became interested in natural history. One of his professors helped Darwin get a place on the HMS Beagle. The Beagle's trip, from 1831 to 1836, was a five year voyage to chart the coastline of South America. About two thirds of the voyage, however, Darwin spent on land collecting samples. While collecting samples, Darwin noticed that the finches of the different regions and islands had different beaks that were suited to their particular needs for feeding and climate. Darwin then made conclusions from these observations and formulated his idea of adaptation. He stated in his book *Origin of Species* that if these finches could adapt, then other things could have adapted as well (Chandler 1-6). The idea of adaptation eventually led Darwin to his theory of Evolution. In Europe, the public was very interested in Darwin's new ideas and pressured him to publish more articles on the subject. The Church of England, however, formally rejected Darwin's theories, but overall, Darwin's ideas were accepted in Europe. By 1921, evolutionary ideas had spread to America, but they were widely rejected. During this year, William Jennings Bryan became a leader in the anti-evolution movement in America. In 1925, Representative John Butler from the Tennessee House of Representatives introduced legislation "calling for a ban on the teaching of Evolution in that state" (McCarroll 1). That bill was signed by Governor Peay in March of 1925. This bill was met with great acceptance among the general populace of Tennessee and similar bills were passed in Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi ("Timeline" 1).

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) simultaneously decided to support anyone willing to challenge the new Tennessee anti-evolution statute. Thus began what is commonly known as the Scopes Monkey Trial. The ACLU ran an ad in a Chattanooga newspaper with their offer of assistance. George Rappalyea saw this ad and convinced the town leaders of Dayton, Ohio, that such a court case would be a way to "put Dayton on the map" (Brinkley 266). The

town leaders agreed with Rappalyea and convinced John Scopes, a twenty-four year old general science teacher, to teach evolution in order to violate the law. Scopes was then charged, and friends of Scopes agreed to prosecute the case. When the news of the upcoming trial was released in Dayton, the whole nation got involved. William Jennings Bryan offered to head the prosecution team and Clarence Darrow, a prominent defense lawyer, offered to head the defense. The trial began in July with the whole city filled to capacity with eager onlookers and press. The trial ended ten days later when the jury issued a guilty verdict and Scopes was fined \$100, which both Bryan and the ACLU offered to pay (McCarroll 1-5).

The trial confirmed America's attitude of rejection towards evolution. More states passed anti-evolution laws, but the textbooks were still allowed to print information about evolution. Thus, children were still being exposed to evolution, although they were not actually being taught evolution. Up to this point in history, science had not been a focus in education. But a time was quickly coming and indeed was already starting, that would alter our nation's view of science and religion.

The world wars contributed to America's new focus on science in education. In 1917 America declared war on Germany and Austria-Hungary. By 1918 the world was suffering from "The Spanish Flu." Although World War I did not start the influenza pandemic, it did help to spread the disease. By the end of 1920 an estimated 50-100 million people worldwide had died from the disease. The massive outbreak led the world to begin to focus on disease prevention and hygiene, which led to more attention in Biology. World War II also affected how the nation viewed science. With the origin of the atomic bomb and the focus on accuracy in bomb targets and gun shots, the nation's scientists began to focus also in Chemistry and Physics. Both wars led to an unprecedented focus on science (Brinkley 256,302).

The Space Race also had its effects on America's approach to science. America realized, after the launch of the Sputnik, the artificial Russian satellite to be put into geocentric orbit, that the science education system of America was very poor relative to its Cold War enemies. Congress responded by passing the National Defense Education Act which allotted \$694 million from 1958-1975 to better the nation's science education.

By the 1960s, much of the general populace now was educated in the ideas of Evolution. In 1967 the law forbidding the teaching of evolution in Tennessee was repealed, much to the people's satisfaction. By 1968 the Supreme Court declared that all such laws were unconstitutional. All the children who had been exposed to evolution were now old enough to make their voices heard in the debate between the proponents of Evolution and Intelligent Design. They wanted Evolution to be taught alongside Creationism. Thus "Equal Time Laws" were created. Tennessee in 1973 became the first state to pass such a law. Several states followed suit. By 1975 these laws were also declared unconstitutional and Intelligent Design was quickly losing ground among the populous ("Timeline" 2). In fifty short years then between Butler's successful legislation in Tennessee and the Supreme Court decision in the 1970's, America had shifted from ardent opposition to free embrace of Evolution and Darwinian thought.

As American education has focused on science in the last three decades, the theory of Evolution has become more widely accepted. But how and where has this mass belief in evolution affected the ideas and values of the Western world? Evolution proposes that man is nothing more than a series of chemical reactions. If this is the case, then only the material things of the world can possibly exist. Laws, and Ethics are made up by man; they have no ground of absolute truth. Pearcey says, "If Darwinism is true, then both religion and philosophical absolutes (like Goodness, Truth, and Beauty) are strictly speaking false or fraudulent" (154).

Why? There is no transcendent God that governs the world. There is no strict set of laws that men must follow. Abstractions like Goodness, Truth, and Beauty are man-made products of evolution, not eternal objective reality based on the eternal godhead or an all-sovereign creator. Goodness, Truth and Beauty are indeed false because they are inventions of man. These cannot be supported by an evolutionary thinker as eternal transcendent truths, as a Christian would proclaim. They are merely inventions. When society loses a standard of good, true, and beautiful, it devolves to the level of the animals they have evolved from. That is, they begin to act like animals. They have no reason not to kill for whatever reason they want to. They can steal food without fear of the law. These and other possible scenarios show the distressing effects of an evolutionary worldview.

Evolution shatters the worldview of past civilizations and changes the focus of the world. The presence of the world around us, as defined by evolution, is basically here out of sheer luck. So the economy that has been established is here through the “natural forces” of survival of the fittest, not out of the hands of men or God.

Some might argue that Evolutionists want progress, so that future generations will have a better world. The world is of utmost importance to them because it is all they have. Marilynne Robinson says,

The idea of progress implies a judgment of value...to [embrace the idea of progress] would be to discover special value in peculiarly human attributes, to suggest, for example, that the mind is something toward which evolution might have tended. That would be to legitimize the works of the mind, its most characteristic institutions, concerning, for example, ethics and religion (29).

The ideas of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty are false and fraudulent in the evolutionary worldview. Ethics and religion are founded upon absolute standards of Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. These ideas, in the evolutionary worldview, are false and fraudulent. Robinson says that an evolutionary worldview cannot legitimize ethics and religion. Evolutionary thinkers cannot support judgments of value and so their worldview cannot embrace the idea of progress. The idea of progress assumes one state to be better than another, an arbitrary value judgment if there is no fixed principle by which to identify the good. The evolutionary worldview is self-defeating in this area because the Evolutionary thinkers have to embrace the world, but they cannot embrace progress. Robinson uses progress to mean the development of a society toward a more mature, beneficial stage. What is left then for an evolutionary economic worldview? The Evolutionary thinker must admit that all reality is in the physical world. The Evolutionary thinker is a materialist, because the physical world is all he has. Reconsider Darwin's Natural Selection. Life is a constant struggle to survive. Therefore, the economy is one big struggle to survive, meaning that the inhabitants of the world will use whatever means necessary to survive (Robinson 29-34) This is a world culture altering view of economy. Past civilizations focused on ethical means of trade, capital, etc. (Hoff 8). They had an ethic of objective morality. They wanted to do what is right according to the Bible towards those with whom they were trading. But now, as the world embraces an evolutionary worldview, the traders of the world are implementing an ethic of survival. Their main goal is to survive according to the idea of "Survival of the Fittest." Now, the people are going to do whatever it takes to survive, without caring if it compromises their past standards of morality. The world is in the midst of a battle over economic theories. Christians must meet faulty Darwinian economic theories and practices with truth.

Economic theories were not the only thing that changed as a result of the theory of Evolution. Evolution has altered the Western world's view of Math. The Lord loves truth and hates falsehood. "You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor" (Exod. 20:16). A Christian view of Math recognizes that Mathematics is about truth and establishing the validity of that truth. However, today math students are taught that "mathematics is man-made, that it is arbitrary, and good solutions are arrived at by consensus among those who are considered expert" (Chapman 149). Thus, answers are arbitrary and as long as there is consensus among the group any solution is acceptable (Chapman 149).

Math is a representation of reality. Every line, curve, and shape in nature has a mathematical formula. Everything we see in the world is a set of formulas making lines to form shapes. However, if Math can be altered by a consensus of experts, then Math can go from truth to whatever the experts think is right. Math would then not represent reality because reality is unchanging. Math becomes a lie. Math then loses its purpose as a representation of reality. God loves Truth. Proverbs 13:5 states, "A righteous man hates lying." If the Evolutionary mindset continues, than Math is something that must be shunned because it is falsehood. Indeed, this worldview has drastic implications for math and the economy.

The greatest impact of evolutionary thought comes in the altered view of mankind. If one accepts Evolution, one of the core ideas that he must affirm is the idea of "Survival of the Fittest". As described above, this idea basically states that the strongest will thrive and in the long run, will rise above the weak. They will dominate until some group stronger rises above and dominates them. This pattern continues throughout history.

How does this idea shatter the Christian worldview? Implicit is the idea that the new man is meant to rise above the weaker old man. Evolution implies that Goodness, Truth, and Beauty

are products of evolution. Similarly, morality is an invention of men. Evolution does not allow for any objective standards of what is right and wrong. If there are no standards for morality, then man can do whatever he wants if he feels that what he is doing is good and leads to his desired end of survival. A couple of examples illustrate the point.

The most extreme example would be of murder. If a murderer believes or claims that he murdered because the victim was weaker than him, why then can murder be called wrong? After all, if the strong are meant to rise above the weak, then this murder should be seen as one of the highest goods in an evolutionary worldview because the murderer was fulfilling "Survival of the Fittest." This is an extremely alarming thought. If murder can be thought of in this way, what is to keep men from becoming serial killers? What is to prevent all men from becoming terrorists? Why is what the terrorists did on September 11th wrong? A Christian would respond with Exodus 20:13, "You shall not murder." The evolutionary thinker, because he has no standards of morality, has nothing to respond with other than that he thinks murder is wrong. But if he looks at what he affirms (Survival of the Fittest), he would have to say that murder is an acceptable means of Survival of the fittest.

A common example of survival of the fittest is a lion attacking a herd of antelope. The lion attacks and typically kills the old or sick. This is survival of the fittest in action. The lion kills for food and man may ethically justify his murder by saying it is a natural means for survival. Here survival becomes the standard for measuring good and an objective ethic based on the revelation of the eternal God is rejected. A Christian Ethic is based on God's commands. However, it has been shown that an evolutionary thinker has no objective truth to center an ethic on, other than the concept of survival of the fittest. Ethics, then, are also products of Survival of the Fittest. For them, there is no difference between murder and this example.

Neither can evolutionary thinker dismiss genocide as an abominable practice. For example, Hitler saw the Jews as a weaker race. Therefore, he was completely justified in disposing of them. After all in his view and for the survival of those he judged fittest, the world would be a better place without them. The strong would have an improved ability to dominate.

Abortion is another example of violence justifiable by Darwin's ethic of survival. Abortion is the killing of a fetus before it has come to full term in pregnancy. Most women who have an abortion, have them because they do not want a child. They feel they cannot support it because they are too young or immature. They do not want to have to adjust their life for a child. These abortions, termed "personal choice abortions", constitute 98% of the abortions nationally (the other two percent are for medical reasons) (Johnston 2). The number of abortions in the United States in 2003 was eight hundred forty-eight thousand, one hundred and sixty-three. If one does the math, he finds that, given the percentages above, eight hundred thirty-one thousand two hundred children were killed in 2003 voluntarily. This is a detestable figure regardless of one's worldview. What human being would not be moved to sorrow over nearly one million children never given the opportunity to experience the joys of life? But this tragedy is the outcome consistent with a worldview that values the survival of the strong over life.

The evolutionary worldview cannot uphold any standard for Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. Nancy Pearcey states, "If Darwinism is true, than both religion and philosophical absolutes (like Goodness, Truth, and Beauty) are strictly speaking false or fraudulent" (154). How can Pearcey make such a claim? Consider the philosophical implications of Evolution. If there is no God, then Man decides what is good, true, and beautiful. Because of Man's changing nature and desires, these so-called "philosophical absolutes" are not absolute at all. They are false and fraudulent because they are different for different people. One person's definition of

good might be different from another person. If Man is just the product of years of changes and is just descended from an ape, then we have no basis for what is good. What Man calls good is in reality just a made up idea. A society that fully embraces evolution will be lawless. Consider this anecdote. A man decides that women who kill their unborn children are evil. These children are defenseless and innocent, but they are killed by women who just do not care. This, he decides is evil and so he carries a gun into an abortion clinic and murders all the women in the building. He believes that he has done a good thing by helping society dispose of these horrendous women. A society that expects all the tenets of Evolution must realize that there is no absolute of Good. Therefore, they cannot prosecute this man because they have no right to tell him what is right and wrong. Therefore, an evolutionary society will be uncontrolled. They have nothing except their own desires and the ends that seem to them most suitable for survival to determine what is good and bad (Catchpoole). And given the fickleness of man, society will never agree on what is good and bad and so there can be no law based on consensus. Even if the majority of society decides something and makes a law, they cannot force another man to obey their law without an absolute of Goodness and Truth. Therefore, a society that embraces Evolution will embrace Survival of the Fittest by taking it to its logical ends. They may try to institute laws to guard against this potentially unmanageable society. But they would be borrowing from a Christian worldview. The evolutionary theory cannot sustain a standard of goodness because they have no objective truth. Therefore, ultimately, for an evolutionary society to stay true to evolution, they must accept the logical end of Survival of the Fittest.

The world's view of beauty is another area Evolution has impacted today's society. In the Bible, God has established a standard of beauty. All forms of beauty must conform to these objective standards. God called his Creation good. God called Israel, his people, beautiful. And

God is called beautiful. The Evolutionary worldview leaves no room for this standard of beauty. The worldview leads to an aesthetic subject to man's whims. Man in his sinful state sees whatever he desires is beautiful. Man is exceedingly sinful without God and will find beauty in the most evil things. Without a standard of beauty, the world pursues sin and debauchery (Pearcey 154-156). Men are drawn to these evils because they are consistent with his sinful nature. But without an objective standard, man becomes his own measure for beauty. What ever aligns with his nature is what he recognizes as beautiful (Burgess).

With the spread of this worldview and it being applied to these areas, every area of man's thoughts are assaulted with the violence of anti-Christian Darwinian thought. As more men are accepting this worldview, they are turning from Religion because Evolution denies the idea of a God. Some men try to blend the idea of God and Evolution. They claim a Deistic idea, meaning they believe in a God who lets the world run on its' own natural laws. However, this is also not acceptable for the Christian who believes in a God that is active in managing the world. Therefore, as support for Evolution grows, religion shrinks in power. This is, of course, bad for Christianity. The Christian church needs to realize how bad Evolution is for them. This is an assault against God and the Gospel. The Christian church needs to take action and fight against Evolution.

So then what can the Christian do to fight Evolution? Currently, some Christians are attacking the public school education system. They believe that if the children are exposed to Christian thought when they are young, they have a better likelihood of accepting Christian doctrine in the future. This is unobjectionable because children are easily influenced when they are young. However, the attempt to attack the public school system in America is essentially futile. The public school system, supported by the government will always appeal to

Amendment One:

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

The opponents of Intelligent Design claim that when Congress requires the teaching of Intelligent Design, they are in reality, requiring the teaching of the Bible. This would be of course, a violation of Amendment One.

Consequently, this approach, attacking the public school education system, is entirely futile. So, what is a better way for the Christian to combat Evolutionary thought? In order to be prepared to attack Evolution, the Christian must assert, teach, and live according to a Christian worldview. One of the ways the Church has failed in combating Evolution is in letting it grow without attacking it with their full force. Instead, the great majority of the church has let Evolution grow unchecked. The Christian must be educated in the societal implications of Evolution. When Evolution claims another concept, the Christian must fight it. What we allow to pass without a fight will become commonplace in tomorrow's society. The Christian can no longer sit back and watch Evolution grow. Evolution is spreading evil in the world by denying the absolutes of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness. The Christian must see Evolution as a direct attack from Satan and combat it whole-heartedly. The Christian must fight Evolution on many battlegrounds. He must not only fight against the spread of Evolution, but fight against what Evolution seems to have already claimed. The biggest thing Christians must be aware of is what Evolution has already claimed is its teachings on Man. This has done more damage to society than any other facet of evolutionary theory. The Christian must show the world how Man is not

descended from the ape, but is made in the image of God and is something to be cherished.

Also, the Christian must teach their children about the Genesis creation account and the authority of Scripture. The Christian must not only fight Evolution in the present time, but they must prepare their children to carry on the battle when they are gone. The Christian is called to teach their children the teachings of the Bible. Consider Proverbs 22:6: “Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it,” and Deuteronomy 11:18 & 19, “Therefore, you shall lay up these words of Mine in your heart and in your soul, and bind them as a sign on your hand, and they shall be as frontlets between your eyes. You shall teach them diligently to your children, speaking of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down and when you rise up.” Children brought up in a Christian home must be taught the Truth of the Bible as commanded by God. They cannot and will not get a Christian education in public schools. The child needs a Christian education to be fully prepared for his coming battle.

In conclusion, the theory of evolution has been circulating for a long time and will not be brought down easily. Many people have accepted it and it will be challenging to attack it. However, it is not an ancient theory. It is not something people have believed for centuries. However old it is, it has been shown that the Evolutionary worldview has serious implications for society and the world in general. The Evolutionary worldview also has serious consequences for the stability of the church. Evolution should therefore, be a major concern for the Christian and the Christian should be attacking Evolution in the areas it has already affected and in the ideas it is already hitting. As stated above, Evolution is much more than a theory of origin, it is a worldview shattering, world culture altering concept that has impacted society more than most realize and should be of utmost concern for the Christian.

## Works Cited

- Brinkley, Alan. Days of Destiny. London: DK, 2001
- Burgess, Stuart. "The beauty of the peacock tail and the problems with the theory of sexual selection." Answers in Genesis 08 May 2007 <<http://www.answersingenesis.org/tj/v15/i2/peacock.asp>>
- Catchpoole, David. "Morals decline linked to belief in evolution." Answers in Genesis 8 May 2007 <<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2/4340Relevance7-5-2000.asp>>
- Chandler, Sanford. "Charles Darwin." Coe College: Biology Department: Darwin - Short Bio 03 March 2006 <[http://www.public.coe.edu/departments/Biology/darwin\\_bio.html#top](http://www.public.coe.edu/departments/Biology/darwin_bio.html#top)>
- Chapman, Michael. "Worldview War in the Classroom." No Retreats, No Reserves, No Regrets. Ed. Brannon Howse. St. Paul: Stewart, 2000.
- "The Constitution of the United States," Amendment 1.
- Darwin, Charles. The Origin of Species. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: Random House P, 1995
- "Evolution." Def. 1. Oxford Concise Scientific Dictionary. 1st ed. 1985.
- Greene, M. "Faith of Darwinism." Encounter Nov 1959: 49
- Grier, Peter and Josh Burek. "Banned in Biology Class: Intelligent Design." Christian Science Monitor. 21 Dec. 2005 <<http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/1221/p01s01-ussc.html>>
- Hoff, Karla and Joseph E. Stiglitz. "Modern Economic Theory and Development." <<http://www.worldbank.org/research/bios/khoff/hoff-stiglitz-fronteirs%20of%20dev%20ec.pdf>>
- Johnston, Wm. Robert. "Reasons given for having abortions in the United States." 4 Dec. 2006. 18 Mar. 2007 <<http://www.johnstonarchive.net/policy/abortion/abreasons.html#6>>
- Koenig, Louis W. Bryan. New York: Putnam, 1971.

McCarroll, Daniel. "State v. John Scopes ('The Monkey Trial')." Dept. Of Law, U of MKC. 14

Mar. 2006 <<http://www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/scopes/evolut.html>>

Numbers, Ronald L. Darwinism Comes to America. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1998.

Pearcey, Nancy. Total Truth: Liberating Christianity from Its Cultural Captivity (Study Guide Edition). Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2005.

The Reformation Study Bible: New King James Version. R.C. Sproul, gen. ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1995.

Robinson, Marilynne. The Death of Adam. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Ruse, Michael. The Evolution-Creation Struggle. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2005.

"Scientific Law." Def. 1. Houghton Mifflin: College Division

<<http://college.hmco.com/geology/resources/geologylink/glossary/s.html>>

"Scientific Theory." Def. 1. Glossary of Atmospheric Terms: American Meteorological Society.

1999 <<http://www.ametsoc.org/amsedu/WES/glossary.html#L>>

Scott, Eugene C. Evolution vs. Creationism. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood P, 2004.

"Timeline: Evolution vs. Creationism." Green Bay Press Gazette 13 Nov. 2005. 12 Mar. 2006

<<http://www.greenbaypressgazette.com/apps/pbcs.d11/article?AID=/20051113/GPG0101/511130510/1207/GPGnews>>

Vine, Phyllis. One Man's Castle. New York: Harper Collins, 2004.

Wysong, R.L. The Creation-Evolution Controversy. Midland, Michigan: Inquiry P: 1981.