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We are studying worship in the throne room. This is segment number 22 of this series in Revelation 4:6-11. In this heavenly scene, John observes 24 elders who represent the church in heaven, joining the four living creatures in praising and worshiping God the Father. John sees the elders bow down before the Father's throne. He sees the elders casting their golden crowns of rewards before the Father's throne in an expression of subjection. The elders proclaim that the Father is worthy of praise. Therefore, they ascribe glory to Him because of His perfect essence, which deserves exaltation – His character; they ascribe honor to the Father because of His infinite value to mankind – the Creator and Sustainer; and, they ascribe power to Him because of His inherent ability to do all things – His omnipotence. The reason that the Father is uniquely worthy of worship is that He has created all things.

So verse 11 says, "You are worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power, for You have created all things, and for Your pleasure they are, and were created." The Father brought the material universe and its life forms into being out of nothing by His spoken word. The Father created this universe and its life for His own pleasure and satisfaction. As the Creator, He knows how all the creation must function, and He has explained those principles of functioning to us in the Bible.

**Evolution**

However, the rebellious nature of mankind does not want to subject itself to the Creator's authority, so it invents the myth of evolution to explain origins. With the myth of evolution, man is also free from the rules of the Creator, and can make his own rules and live his own life patterns. So, the question of origins actually determines your view of the world; and, your view of the world, in turn, determines your lifestyle. So, this is an enormously important issue: evolution or creation? The Bible makes an explicit declaration that God is the Creator. Is that true, or is it not true?

**Biblical Cosmogony**

Most of the human beings that you associate with in your daily life say, "Creation is wrong." They would look at Revelation 4:11, and if they would not outright say that it's a lie: "God did not create," they would at least say, "Well, maybe He did, and maybe He didn't." They're neutral. Of course, neutrality is equivalent to rejecting this statement. So, it's important that we pause to take a look at these explanations of origins – the attacks on what we call biblical cosmogony. That means your view of origins – how it all came into being. This is a very important matter, because what you think about this will determine your world view, and that determines everything else that you think and do.

**Western Civilization Cosmogony**

Up to about 100 years ago, Western civilization based its cosmogony (its view of origins) on the revelation of God as given in the book of Genesis. Up to about the year 1900, nobody in Western civilization, by and large, questioned the fact that what Genesis told us was the explanation of where everything came from; that is, that God had created out of nothing, by His omnipotence, through His spoken word. Today, however, Western culture is based on a cosmogony which entirely eliminates God from the picture as the cause of the universe, and of its life forms. In place of the biblical view, we have a self-evolving universe from eternally existing inanimate matter, and that has become the substitute for God. The principle is the concept of upward movement. Everything is getting better, and it's guided, in getting better, by blind chance, and this takes place over billions of years. The result of this force within the universe of everything moving upward over billions of years, by mere chance, has produced the universe. So, you have two distinct cosmogonies: one that the Bible presents, and one of the evolutionists, which is held by most people today.

This substitution of evolution for the creative work of a supernatural, omnipotent personal God lies at the base of the decline of Western culture today. I am strongly inclined to think that Western civilization (Western culture) is over the hill. I don't really believe, honestly, that there is ever going to be any return. I don't believe there will be a nuclear war before the rapture. I think that will take place after the rapture. There may be some substantial wars before, but I think the picture now is on the downside, and Western civilization will never again return to its peak of the wonder, amazement, productivity, and power that it had when it had the cosmogony of the book of Genesis. Its view of origins has destroyed the marvels of Western civilization that ultimately developed from the Reformation.

So, this is an important thing within an individual society. Perhaps within the circles that you live, there may be an orientation to a world view that may yet preserve freedom and blessing. Perhaps in this whole nation, it may be possible. But for the world as a whole, and for Western civilization (for Western culture), the best days are forever gone and forever passed. It is directly because of the rejection of what the Bible explained relative to where it all came from. Once he rejected the Bible's view, man became a totally different functioning creature within society. Man has lost his orientation to the rules of reality which actually govern the universe, and to the rules which govern social relationships. Therefore, man now acts like an animal instead of a creature which has been made in the image of God, and who has the capacity, in contrast to animals, for logical thinking. It all came about because of the abandonment of biblical cosmogony. How did this happen?

Well, it all began with an attack on the book of Genesis as being an authoritative divine revelation. That's where it all started. Naturally, that's where Satan would hit it – to take the book of Genesis, and to attack it for what it was saying relative to a world view, and an origin that was contradicted by the viewpoints of human viewpoint thinking.

**The Attack of the Scientific Community**

First was the attack of the scientific community. There was a challenge of the scientific world in the wake of Darwin's theory of evolution as the explanation of the origin of species. This was not a new idea with Darwin. It had been promoted even from ancient times. Ancient Greek philosophers proposed this idea, but Darwin crystallized it into a practical form. It burst upon the Victorian world at a time when that world wanted to break loose from the natural restraints which were imposed upon it by the Word of God. That's why Darwin's book no sooner hit the book stands than it was gone. It amazed everybody how quickly it was sold out, and then it amazed everybody how quickly the scientific world said, "Yes, this is it." Almost literally overnight, they swung from a biblical cosmogony to an evolutionary cosmogony. It changed just that fast.

The reason for this was that Darwin had raised the hopes and the confidence in the scientific community that they could prove evolution from available evidence. They said, "We'll start digging into the strata of rock, and we are going to find the connecting links. We are going to prove that one kind of animal developed into a different kind of animal. So, while the two kinds could not reproduce each other, they could reproduce within their own kind, but they developed one from the other. All we have to do is dig far enough and deep enough, and we're going to find the connecting links.

**No Proof for Evolution**

Well, the years went by, and today it is clear, that no such empirical proof exists in nature. There is no such proof of connecting links to the physical senses that man can observe. And science, if it is science, with what is observable and testable – that which can be placed in a laboratory and put under an examination, can be demonstrated to be true. So, evolution received, literally, a serious blow, if not a deathblow. But people still believe in evolution. Why? Because the only alternative is the supernatural Creator of Genesis. The only alternative is to accept what John hears these elders saying in Revelation 4:11 concerning the eternal one who is described as the Creator. That's the only alternative. It is not uncommon for evolutionary scientists to say, "Your arguments are such against evolution that I can't answer them. They are telling blows, but I cannot accept creationism because that requires me to believe in a supernatural act of a supernatural being." So, understand, first of all, that evolution is not accepted on scientific grounds. It is accepted as the lesser of what they consider two evils.

**The Attack of Comparative Religion Studies**

The second blow to the book of Genesis came from comparative religion studies. Comparative religion studies attacked the Genesis account by showing similarities of what Genesis said about origins with myths that came from ancient cultures and ancient civilizations. Comparative religion said, "Look at this. The Babylonians have a story about creation that is very similar to what you find in Genesis. The same is true of other cultures. The Canaanite civilizations had stories about where everything came from, and they all had a basic similar thread to what was in the book of Genesis." So, comparative religion student scholars said that this showed that the Hebrew people simply picked up the creation myths which were in existence among the Canaanite civilizations surrounding them, and that these creation myths of pagan religions were refined by the Jews because of the Jews' superior philosophical views. The Jews made them less gross. They got away from some of the images that the pagans had about the world resting on the back of a turtle, and all kinds of odd explanations of how it all exists, and where it all came from. They said that the Jews had a superior philosophical capacity. They refined the myths that they picked up from their neighbors. So, the Genesis record was actually based upon an original imaginary story that had no historical truth.

Well, students of religion grabbed that; the scientific world grabbed the attack of Darwin against the Genesis account; and, the book of Genesis received a serious blow. The comparative religion students (the religious students and the preachers) grabbed the argument of the comparative religions and said, "Yes, other people have stories about creation. The Jews merely refined theirs from those stories that they heard, but it does not have a base in history. There never was an Adam and Eve. There never was a Garden of Eden. There never was a God who was standing out there saying things, and bringing things into existence. That's just a story, and it's based on ancient myths." That was a serious blow to the book of Genesis.

**The Attack of Literary Criticism**

Then there was a third attack, and that was the attack of literary criticism. The literary critics said that they could analyze, by the language of the Bible, who wrote various sections. The literary critics said that they could read the book of Genesis, and they could discover several different authors: by the words they used; the style in which they wrote; and, so on. So, of course, this is an enormous arrogance on the part of a human being to say that he can analyze the style of writing (words which are used) of writings by people that he has never met; never seen; and, doesn't know anything about.

They argued, for example, that when you read the first two chapters of the book of Genesis, that it is obvious that there were two different writers. One author wrote chapter one; somebody else wrote chapter two; and, they pasted them together and said, "God wrote them both." That's what literary criticism was all about. The argument was that when you read those two accounts of creation (and there are two accounts), that they contradict one another, and therefore, there are evidences that these are not by a single author. They claim that Genesis 1 contradicts Genesis 2. But in fact, the truth of the matter is that Genesis 1 tells of divine creation of the whole universe, including man and woman. Then, as is Hebrew style (this is really Hebrew style of writing), they would back off, and they would backtrack, and they'd say the same thing in a little different way and with a little different emphasis in order to stress some particular point.

So, God the Holy Spirit led Moses to back off, and in typical Hebrew literary style, in chapter 2, he gives an explanation of creation specifically from the point of view of the creation of mankind – the creation of men and women. Therefore, you will find that in chapter 2, he doesn't repeat all the information that's in chapter 1. And there is no contradiction between them. It's simply a difference of emphasis.

You have this same kind of literary attack concerning the book of Isaiah. The literary critics say that the book of Isaiah was written by at least two different people, because the first part of Isaiah has one kind of atmosphere and sound to it; and, the second part (the last part of the book of Isaiah) has a totally different feel, and a totally different sound to it. And it does. But the reason is not that two different people wrote it. The reason is subject matter. The first part of Isaiah deals with the doom; the day of the Lord; and, the terrible, horrible things that are going to happen to the world and to the Jewish people. That has one kind of quality to it. But then in the last part of the book of Isaiah, he bursts forth into the glories of the millennium which is coming, and the golden age which the earth is going to have. So, the whole picture changes, and indeed it has a different feel to it. But it's because of the topic, not because of the writer. Well, literary criticism's attacks on the Genesis record is simply arrogant man's assumption that his reason is equipped to contradict the Bible.

So, during the whole 20th century, it was the attack of the scientific world against Genesis with the idea of evolution; the attack of comparative religions – that the Jews are just another religious group that evolved; and, the attack of literary criticism that the Bible is a pasted-together book written by many different writers. These have undermined the book of Genesis. Suddenly, people no longer believed in the biblical explanation of origins. They had a totally different viewpoint. Then during the 20th century, this opposing viewpoint (a human viewpoint cosmogony) was incorporated into public education, and it has been training people during this whole century to believe that the Bible record of origins is pure myth, and that it has been disproved.

The truth of the matter is that both evolution and creationism can only be accepted by faith. You have to understand that. There was nobody present when God was created. Therefore, we have no eyewitnesses. Whether you believe in evolution or whether you believe in creationism, it's an act of faith. Evolution, while claiming to have scientific proof, has no such thing. Scientific proof is what you can put into a laboratory and demonstrate that it actually produces what you claim it produces. So, we're dealing, first of all, with what people must accept by faith. Many evolutionists are quite ready to admit that what they believe is indeed an act of faith. They'll agree: "Yes, it is an act of faith."

However, the question that they propose is: "Why should I assume that the Bible is a more worthy subject of my belief? Why should I look upon the Bible as a more worthy object of my faith than I do upon the scientific mind and the scientific thinking of our day?" They admit it's of faith. The question is: "Which faith are you going to believe?"

Of course, that does put it in stark contrast. This is one of the reasons that the opponents of teaching creationism in public school are so adamant. They realize that you can take a group of ordinary American school kids, and you can say, "Now, there are two explanations for where everything came from, and where all life came from." Then, on the one hand, you present what the Bible says (the biblical cosmogony); and, then on the other hand, you present the evolutionary cosmogony, the average American school kid is going to say, "Boy, that evolution is really dumb." The more you get into it, the more you realize that it indeed is a myth. Then when you begin to look at certain basic scientific laws that make it absolutely impossible for evolution ever to have occurred, if a kid knows those two laws, he'll laugh in your face. Immediately, the people who are trying to keep creationism out of public schools realize that if young people are exposed to what the Bible says, most of them will go with the Bible, and they will reject the nonsense of the scientific elite.

So, the issue is a matter of faith. Only God was present at creation. He has reported what took place. He's the only eyewitness that we have who is qualified to speak on the subject. That's why, in speaking to Job, God pointed that out. God point blank asks poor Job, "Where were you when I was laying the foundations of the universe?" And of course, the answer is that Job wasn't around. He didn't have the slightest notion as to what was going on. God was pointing out to him that only God is qualified to speak on the subject.

So, science can only deal with currently observed processes and phenomena. Science knows nothing about how these processes worked in the distant past. Evolution is totally beyond the proof of the five senses. Your world view is going to be built on your view of origins (your cosmogony). Our world view governs every decision we make. So, the two are very important. It makes a great difference whether one views himself as coming from a glob of inanimate matter, or from the hand of a personal Creator God. The world view determines your self-view; it determines how you view others; and, it determines your values and behavior. It determines everything. Your view of the world determines how you treat people. If people are nothing but animals, then you can treat them like dogs, and it doesn't really make any difference. But if people are in the image of God, then it does make a difference how you treat people. Your world view is based upon your view of origins.

The Christian faith is based on the world view that God is the cause of everything. Christians have a rational mind with which to validate and to defend their beliefs. The true evidence of science always confirms what the Bible reveals. Ancient cosmogony myths actually died because they became undermined with so much evidence that contradicted what they were saying. The evidence undermined the myths as man came to know the world. But there is no scientific evidence that has ever undermined what the Bible has presented as the basis of origin. Many ancient myths simply were discarded by people because, with what people discovered, they realized that the myths were false. This has never been the case with the biblical view.

**Problems in Studying Origins**

So, when we're going to study origins, we have to face up to the fact that we have certain problems that we deal with. I know that you get tired of being treated like a nincompoop and an idiot because you believe what the Bible says about origins. But it's good to realize the problems of the arrogant people who reject the point of view of the Bible.

**Physical Problems**

There are, first of all, physical limitations in finding out where it all came from. You and I can exist only in a limited environment of oxygen, heat, and water. The astronauts that were just out in space could not make the spacewalk outside the capsule. Why? Because the space suits, which contained the environment that they must have to survive, were leaking. Because the space suits were not sound, they couldn't go out into space. Man has an extremely limited environment in which he can exist. If you get too much heat, or too much cold, you will die. If you have a lack of water, you will die. If you get a lack of oxygen, you will die. It is a very slim balance. The functioning of the planet earth in space must be exact for life to survive on this planet. That's why we're not finding physical life on other planets. The physical limitations of human existence are never under our power to change. The only way we can go into space is to take our environment with us. We can't change ourselves. That physical limitation is always upon us.

This limits the extent of man's physical senses – the limits to which man's physical senses can function effectively. You can only see so much with your eyes, and then you have to have a microscope or a telescope. You can only hear so much with your ears, and then you have to have electronic devices to go beyond that. You are extremely limited. It is fantastic how limited the capacities of a human being are. It's very important that you recognize that your physical limitations are enormous. Some of you know that about other people, but you should know that about yourself. The physical limitations are enormous. We have to live in a very strict confinement or we don't survive.

**Spiritual Limitations**

We also have spiritual limitations. Remember that we're going to find out where it all came from – origins. Immediately, we have physical problems to restrict us, but we also have spiritual problems. Our conscience indicates to us what we ought to do, but by nature, we don't do even what we know we should do. True moral values cannot be determined by man on his own. Man is evil by nature. Man is in rebellion against God. Man has no inherent knowledge of God's thinking, and therefore God's works. So, our spiritual limitations, by nature, limit our appreciation for what God can do. How do you know what God is like? Most of you can rattle off ten basic qualities (attributes) of the essence of God. But the only reason you can do that is because you learned them from the Bible. Somebody taught them to you. What do you know by nature about God? You know practically zero about Him. What you know about God, and how He can work, and how He really does work, you have to get from information from Scripture. So, that's a terrible limitation – the spiritual limitations.

**Mental Limitations**

Then you have mental limitations. Several of you say, "Now, that one I make can understand – mental limitations." Human beings are capable of only a very limited range of knowledge through their senses. The range of experience has to be extended through mechanical devices. We are limited in the expanse of time in which we can gain information. You're limited to your own lifespan. You can't extend your examination into the future. You can't handle what's coming in the future. How can you tell what's coming in the future? Unless you have information from outside yourself, either from God (He can tell us what's coming), or from the demonic world (they know some of the things that are coming in the future). Otherwise, you can't cope mentally with the future.

What about the past? Here we come to the crux of the matter if we're talking about origins. What can your mind indeed do about the past? What can you really know about the past? If you're going to know anything about the past, you are restricted to historical records of somebody who is on the scene, who saw it and wrote it down for you, to preserve it so that you would know what happened; or, you have to make assumptions about the past which you can test. So, our mental limitations on the past pose a serious question as to how much we can know about where everything came from. That is simply because you can't go back there and confirm it.

Philosophers have struggled to arrive at assured conclusions with no success. They cannot, even with their capacities, come to assured conclusions concerning a lot of issues that concern us in our lives. So, any human attempt to arrive at the answer to the origin of the universe of life must cope with these three basic limitations in securing knowledge.

**World Views**

Let's take a look at origins and world views. Everybody lives and acts according to some kind of a view of the world, and some kind of a view of reality. The world view that one operates under determines his conduct and his goals in life. All expressions of the world view may be reduced to two basic types. So, everybody has a world view. I don't care what your age is. You have a world view. There are two basic types of world views, and all variations fall under these two basic types. One we call human viewpoint. The other we call divine viewpoint. Each of the two basic types of world views is determined by its view of the origins upon which it is based. Human viewpoint is based upon the concept of origins by means of evolution. Divine viewpoint is based on a world view of origins by means of creation.

This is an important connection. Your view of the world via evolution brings you to human view point. Your view of the world via creationism brings you to divine viewpoint. Each of these two basic types is the view that somebody in the world holds.

**The Human Viewpoint World View**

Let's look at the human viewpoint world view, because this is the one that most people hold. This is the natural response of the old sin nature. There are two characteristics to the human viewpoint world view.

**Autonomy**

One is autonomy. That means that man acts independently of God. Man is determined to erect a world view out of his limitations without any guidance from God through the Bible. So, here you have these terrible limitations: physical; spiritual; and, mental. With those limitations, you have a world view through the evolution route which ends in human viewpoint. Human viewpoint people are always autonomous. They're always the independent type. This attitude of independence stems from man's resentment and his hatred toward God; toward what God has said; and, toward what God has done in history.

A classic example of that is Cain. Cain, right there at the beginning, had no reason in the world to hate God or to resent God. He had all the reason in the world to appreciate what God had done for him. But it is the natural expression of the sin nature to want to be independent: "I don't want your so-and-so rules on my life. I want to be independent. I want to do my own thing," as the phrase in our time goes. Of course, you can see that this streak can run through Christians, and it does. There are all kinds of Christians who have the world view of autonomy. They have the spirit of autonomy in them. They are not subject to constituted authority.

This is why it is a bad thing for you to permit your children to associate with other children (particularly their peers), on an individual basis. Children have no frame of reference of a desirable view of the world and of life. Remember that children are not carriers of desirable qualities. They are carriers of undesirable qualities. When you permit your children (especially when they become teenagers) to socialize out there with one another (teenagers going out with teenagers), just expect a lot of grief in your life. Just expect a lot of grabbing of the reins and trying to jerk them back in line, because the most disastrous influence upon kids is other kids. They are carriers of terrible qualities. Parents who don't understand that do not realize that they have a God-given responsibility to keep their children preserved from the influence of other kids. The nicest kid in the world suddenly does something you're horrified by. Why did he do it? Because he got into contact with some of his peers, and they were carriers of a bad quality, and he picked it up.

Not only are children carriers of undesirable qualities, but they are highly infectious. They are prone to picking up the infection with a wink of an eyelash. One of the qualities that young people carry from their sin nature is autonomy. When they hit those teenage years, this evil shows up, and they don't want their parents telling them what to do; they don't want their teachers telling them what to do; and, they don't want authorities telling them what to do. Then they become sneaks. They go around; they become vandals; they destroy things; they damage things; they strike out; and, they try to demonstrate their independence by these destructive ways.

Autonomy is the result of the world view of evolution which comes to a human viewpoint of origins, and that human viewpoint of origins, since there's no God out there creating, says, "You are your own person. Do what you want, and don't let anybody stop you." As the title of the song goes, "Doing the Thing that Comes Naturally." God's rules are in conflict with the sin nature. The sin nature wants no restraints from higher authority. The pieces of God's revelation may sometimes be accepted into a human viewpoint world view, provided it is compatible with man's autonomy. Man incorporates religion, but man is autonomous within the religion he incorporates. He'll accept it as long as it doesn't crimp his style.

So, the religious systems that encourage freedom and doing your own thing are the religious systems that are most attractive to people today. Autonomous man simply will not subject himself to the full authority of God's word, the Bible. You can't be subjected to the Bible until the domination of the sin nature within you has been removed by the new controlling authority of the Spirit of God as the result of regeneration. Sheer human reasoning power and subjective experience are substituted for God's revelation in a human viewpoint world view. But man's mind is defective, so his reasoning powers are limited. Therefore, his conclusions are defective. His experience is defective because he can't really interpret what's happening to him. So, when he substitutes his reason and his experience for God to maintain his autonomy, he has doomed himself.

**Idolatry**

There's another terrible quality that is always associated with human viewpoint. People sometimes miss this. That is idolatry. A world view via evolution not only ends up with a quality of autonomy, but it always ends up in idolatry. Man without God is always idolatrous. The human viewpoint world view always rejects the true God, and ends in idolatry. Man has to have some ultimate reference point for his decisions, and to explain his experience. Everybody has to have some anchor point in the universe. That's the quality of origins.

When you reject the Creator God, you have to go to something else. The only thing you can go to is God's creation. So, you deify some part of God's creation. You deify the sun. That was the favorite in ancient times, and that is seen everywhere today. If you go to Rome and visit the Vatican in the St. Peter's Basilica (the Pope's own church), you will see everywhere the symbols of the sun god, because Roman Catholicism is a descendant of the Babylonian ancient religious system which deified the sun. When you cut yourself off from the real God, you take part of creation, and you make that the god. Of course, the first chapter of the book of Romans tells us how men began making animals as their gods – not only four-footed animals, but even things that creep along the ground, like snakes and bugs and beetles. The dung beetle was one of the great gods of the Egyptians.

So, man always becomes idolatrous in his world view via evolution. He deifies some part of the creation. But no matter what he defies in nature, that thing is not sufficient to explain everything. The dung beetle can't explain everything that has come about. There are some things that you can't explain with that, and there are some things you can't really explain even that the sun produced. So, whatever the god is, there's always something left over that they really can't say, "This is the cause." So, they resort then to chance. They leave the unexplained to sheer chance, and sheer chance becomes another god in effect. At the heart of evolution is sheer chance as the God who makes it work.

**Microevolution**

Human viewpoint world view is based upon the foundation of evolution as the answer to origins. You have a variety of expressions of this evolution that we should mention. One is microevolution. Microevolution is small biological changes resulting in smaller classifications of subspecies. These changes are entirely within a certain kind of animal or plant, and those changes do not keep these animals from being able to reproduce with each other. They're still the same kind.

For example, one of the interesting things, if you ever visit the White Sands National Monument in New Mexico, that area where the first atom bomb was exploded, you'll see lizards. But one of the fascinating things about it is that they are not brown lizards. They're little white lizards – beautiful little white lizards. If you want to take a picture of them, you try to get them to run on something that's got some color, because you won't even see them in the sand. Why are there white lizards in White Sands, New Mexico, and brown lizards in the state of Texas? Evolution – microevolution. That's really why. It is because certain light-colored lizards, that lived in White Sands, New Mexico, were able to hide better from their predators, and they didn't get gobbled up. All of the darker colored ones got eaten. So, the lighter mother and father lizards kept producing lighter baby lizards. In every generation, the lighter ones survived, and the darker ones didn't. So, more and more lighter-colored lizards survived until only the very white lizards could hide on that sand, and not have some bird reach down and peck them for lunch.

That is microevolution – infinitesimal little changes within a subspecies. But if you bring a little white lizard from White Sands, New Mexico, and a brown lizard from Texas, they'll mate, and you get a sort of a little chocolate-colored child lizard out of it, but they'll mate. They will intermix with one another. They're still the same kind. Microevolution is a reality.

The Bible, obviously, is not in opposition to microevolution. That does take place, and we know it. For all we know, all the different kinds of dogs we have today may have been the result of microevolutionary changes down the line over a period of time. But the point is that this kind of evolution is too small. The changes are too small, and they are too limited to try to explain the idea of new kinds of species coming into existence. Microevolution is not in conflict with the Bible, but it certainly would not explain the concept of evolution into various kinds.

**Macroevolution**

Then there is another kind of evolution that comes from this line of world view via evolution, and that is what's called macroevolution. Macroevolution is major changes – biological changes that result in the production of a larger classification of animals and plants. This would be some animal that didn't exist before, or some plants that never existed before. That is macroevolution, and this results in transitions into a new species. However, this kind of transition into new kinds has never been observed. It's not observed taking place today, and there is not a single thread of evidence in the fossil records of macroevolution.

This is what is so disappointing to the evolution scientist today. In Darwin's day, they were riding high. They thought, "Boy, fellows, we have it made. We're going to start digging, and we're going to find the evidence for these major changes, because we're going to see how, gradually, a lizard became a bird; gradually, a bird lost its feathers and then became a monkey; and how, gradually, the monkey lost his hair and grew up, and started walking on two legs, and became more and more intelligent, and finally became Charlie Boozer. We're going to prove it. We're going to show how all of this progressed step-by-step. We're going to prove it." That is no longer the case. There is not a thread of evidence of macroevolution.

So, these major transitions, indeed, if they existed, they would prove sufficient to breed new species. But there is no evidence of any kind that they ever did exist. And the Bible clearly condemns this.

**Cosmic Evolution**

Then there's one other kind of evolution and that is cosmic evolution. These are the three types that people are going to hit you with, so you might as well know them. Cosmic evolution is the evolution that deals with all of the universe as a whole. It's evolution from simple forms of the whole universe as we have it today. But it goes beyond the biological evolution of macroevolution. Macroevolution is in cosmic evolution. Cosmic evolution says that not only does man biologically develop piece-by-piece and step-by-step; but, so does he in his cultural development; and, so does he in his religious development. It says that all of religion that we have today began as a very primitive superstition, and then cosmically evolved into what it is today, as well all of the human relationships.

For example, marriage was a very primitive relationship at one time. A guy with a club was living in a cave, and he came along and saw a young girl; knocked her in the head; grabbed her by her long hair; and, dragged her to his cave. That kind of primitive marriage situation evolved, gradually, into the more sophisticated realms. The family life was a very primitive thing. Gradually, where there was no restriction on sexual relationships, finally there was an evolving of the family relationships as to who was allowed to have sex with whom; under what conditions; and, what relationships. And it all gradually evolved. All of this is cosmic.

Where do you get all this? Out of these wonderful limitations that we have of our physical capacities; out of our spiritual capacities; and, out of our mental capacities. Out of all these limitations, we can come up with these marvelous conclusions concerning cosmic evolution. So, cosmic evolution says that life evolves from inorganic non-life, and then man evolves from organic life. And then, man's social relationships evolve from that. So, it's a total evolution. This is held by most people as affecting man's culture, as well as everything else that man does.

That brings us to the very fascinating question of: What kind of records and what kind of evidence do we really have to deal with when we are going to decide evolution or creation, which is going to determine our world view, and the consequences of a human viewpoint or a divine viewpoint order? The sources of information on which to base our world view are enormously important. Once you understand how limited human beings are to sources of information, then you will get a better perspective on the evolutionists.

The evolutionist is a professor in a big school. He has a lot of degrees. He's been to school for a long time. He's done a lot of experimenting. He's learned a lot of things. But he scares you. Who are you to stand up and talk to him? Who are you to stand up and oppose somebody that has degrees behind his name, and a person who is in such esteem within the community? He scares you. But you'll not be bowled over if you'll understand, first of all, the limitations relative to origins, and then, more specifically, the evidence from which all of these world views are brought.

Next time we're going to look at the evidence, and you're going to be shocked with actually how little there is to work with, such that the smallest child in the primary department will laugh in the face of the most intelligent, prestigious biological scientist when he talks about evolution. He will understand that the poor man has a world view which is human viewpoint, which is based on independence from God, and therefore casting himself into darkness, and is based on idolatry which worships man, and on down through man, to all kinds of animal life. It rejects the divine viewpoint revelation of the book of Genesis and the creation of God. We'll take a look at the sources of evidences of what man has to struggle with in order to come up with answers.

Dr. John E. Danish, 1982
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