

EVOLUTION

Fact or Fancy?

Examining the Evidence

Has evolution been proven?

Is it scientifically possible?

Is chance evolution mathematically possible?

What about the great finds in the evolution of man:

Heidelberg man; Piltdown man; Peking man; Steinheim man;

Neanderthal man; Cro-Magnon man; "Lucy"; etc.?

How reliable are modern dating methods?

Finally, if we are created by God, what should you do about it?

Acknowledgments

Credit is given to the scientists whose efforts have uncovered many interesting facts about the earth and its history. World Book and Grolier's encyclopedias have yielded much valuable scientific information, for which we are indebted to them.

We would also like to express appreciation for the help supplied by the editorial committee and the hours of effort they gave to improve this booklet.

Preface:

Our purpose in printing this book is threefold:

First, for the atheist, unbeliever or agnostic, who has been under the influence of the teachers of evolution, we would like to expose some of the errors in the reasoning used to support evolution. We would like to encourage a sincere unbiased study of the “evidence” available for evolution, and to draw an honest conclusion based on the facts, rather than the theories and assumptions developed by evolutionists.

Secondly, for the Christian who has through the public school system or other means come in contact with evolutionary teachings, and has become somewhat confused or shaken in faith by their claims, we hope this little book will expose the errors of evolution, and encourage a study of the facts when confronted by ungodly theories and fictions.

Thirdly, for the Christian who has never doubted the creation account, we hope this book will show the harmony of the Christian faith and scientific fact. The godlessness taught in Science classes in modern schools and other media has had the sad effect of turning some Christians against scientific fact. The unfortunate result is a faith separated from reality and fact. The faith that God desires in us is a faith in His word and His creation; a faith that recognizes that His Word is true and His creation will only testify to its truth. Untruths can not be proven! We should reject ungodly theories, but never scientific facts. We need the discernment to recognize the difference.

"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, *being understood by the things that are made*, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse"
(Rom. 1:20).

For all we would like to point to God who created the heavens and the earth, and His Son Jesus Christ who came into the world to save us from our sins.

“Oppositions of Science”

Human nature hasn't changed since the apostle Paul wrote to Timothy exhorting him to “... **keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and *oppositions of science falsely so called*:**” (1 Tim. 6:20) Since early times there have been those who have attempted to “scientifically” explain the existence of the universe, the existence of life in general and man in particular, without having been called into being by God.

Why should there be such resistance to the idea of the existence of God? Because if we were created by God, it is obvious that we were created for a reason (if we came into being without the existence of God, there is no reason for our existence). If we were created by God, there is also something required of us by God. If there is a Higher Authority, there is a responsibility to this Authority - a moral right and wrong.

Modern “science” (“science falsely so called” as the apostle puts it) is largely occupied with the task of proving that it would have been possible for the world as we know it to come into existence without the intervention of God. The most popular theory is that all life evolved by chance from a lower form of life (which originally came into being by chance) and man is simply the most intelligent of the animals, not that he has any other responsibility to any higher power. This effectively does away with any sense of sin or moral right and wrong. The notions of right and wrong, order and headship, etc. are claimed to all be based strictly on culture.

The result of these teachings gradually being ingrained into the modern mind through the indoctrination of the public school, television and all other media, does have an impact in modern thought and action. We can see the result today simply by picking up a newspaper and reading the column headings. The widespread corruption that exists is the natural result of what is being taught. If there is no God, there is no right and wrong. If we have no higher power to give account to, there is no sin. If there is no soul and no eternity after this life, life is meaningless beyond the pleasures that we can obtain in this life. But are these logical conclusions from a scientific viewpoint?

To begin with, let's look at why the apostle Paul said, “**Oppositions of science, falsely so called.**” We notice that Paul did not reject science, but he rejected “*so called*” science. The Christian faith is called “the truth” in the Bible, and science is a quest for truth or knowledge. So we see that true science and the Christian faith are not opponents. Where science begins to be “falsely so called” is when too much confidence is put in the *conclusions that man reaches* by putting isolated facts together. The scientific community admits that it is not the facts and proofs, but “the power of the grand explanation” that gives strength to today's scientific theories. The problem is, not all man's conclusions are correct, and when the facts all come in, it is frequently discovered that the “grand explanation” was in error. We find that although the facts never change, what was considered scientifically correct twenty years ago, is now known to be error. This will also be true of the next twenty years. In other words we cannot always accept as truth the “grand explanations” given for observed facts.

In the Beginning...

It has been the desire of the scientific community to come up with a credible theory as to how the universe may have begun without being called into being by God. Several theories have been developed, which share some common ground. One theory is the “Big Bang Theory” which teaches that at one point there was a huge mass of matter of infinite density which, because of its density and volume, exploded (with a big bang!), and the earth, planets, sun, and all the other stars are simply chunks from this explosion, which developed their patterns and orbits as they are flying through space.

The “Pulsation Theory” adds that eventually everything will slow down and stop, then the gravity of all the masses will slowly pull everything together until everything smashes into a dense mass in the center of the universe again, which will cause another big bang. In other words, it is a continuing cycle of big bangs.

Another opinion, the “Steady State Theory” proposes a sort of continuous creation in which new matter is constantly being created to keep the universe at a constant density despite its gradual recession. This was an important theory in its time, but because of problems it couldn’t account for, it has been discarded by nearly all scientists of today.

The problems with each of the theories above is that:

1. There is no *evidence to prove either of them*.
2. They are all contrary to the second law of thermodynamics, which states that all energy and matter of the universe is descending to less organized forms.
3. Even if we would accept any of them, none come any closer to answering the question as to the beginning of the universe. They only push the question back a few steps. The question is, where did it all originate? All of these theories start with the universe already existing, only in a different form, or smaller scale. Where did that come from? Where did our original huge mass come from? Is it any easier to imagine a huge mass coming into being than the universe?

The only account of the origin of the universe that actually answers these questions is the story of creation that we find in the Bible: God was able to start with nothing and produce the “the worlds” by *the power of His Word*:

“Through *faith* we understand that the worlds were framed *by the word of God*, so that *things which are seen were not made of things which do appear*.” [Hebrews 11:3]

“All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made”. [John 1:3]

An inspired account of creation can be found in the first chapter of Genesis.

Examining the “Evidence”

A major occupation of scientists is the study of how man could have come into existence without supernatural means. By far the main field of study along that line in the last 100 years is evolution. Although much of the credit for the development of the theory in its modern form generally goes to Charles Darwin (1809-1882), a version of the theory can be found already in the first centuries AD. We

can read the writings of early Christians refuting these beliefs. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (200 - 265 AD) wrote against the "School of Epicurus" who held that there is no God but rather men and all things were formed gradually by chance. Dionysius showed that the beauty of the universe could not have been designed in such perfection by mere chance.

"No object of any utility, and fitted to be serviceable, is made without design or by mere chance, but is wrought by skill of hand, and is contrived so as to meet its proper use. And when the object falls out of service and becomes useless, then it also begins to break up indeterminately, and to decompose and dissipate it's materials in every casual and unregulated way". He quoted, "God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good."ⁱ

Textbooks and encyclopedias today say that although no one knows how evolution occurs, that it does occur is a scientific fact. *However, there has yet to be found any actual **evidence** to prove evolution.* There is evidence of many specie of plants and animals that have become extinct, but no evidence that any evolved into something else. In fact, this is one problem that troubles scientists - that *there is no evidence of a chain of gradual evolution from one specie to another.* Only distinct species are found. Some scientists feel that this would indicate evolution only "happening" occasionally in spurts changing things drastically in short times. Others feel that this is just how fossils happened to be preserved. Those who use sound reasoning recognize that it *clearly disproves evolution.* If there was a gradual change from one specie to another, we would find evidence of creatures in every stage of development.

Another thing that baffles evolutionary scientists is the existence of what we call instinct in animals. It is clear that animals "know" to do many things for their preservation that they were never taught and which would not be a natural response, or within the scope of their intelligence. Birds, when they are about to lay eggs build nests, some of which are engineering marvels - even if they have never even seen a nest being built before. Creatures travel thousands of miles to very specific places that they have never been before to lay eggs, etc. Spiders spin webs that could not possibly have been designed by their own intelligence. Every generation of honeybee builds up their combs with the same perfect geometry, and evaporates the honey (by fanning with their wings) to the same perfect consistency, so that the honey doesn't spoil, or run out of the cells. This obviously could never have evolved, but where did it come from and how is it given them? Psalms 104:24 tells us: **"O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches."**

The modern theory of evolution requires each of the evolutionary changes to have happened by chance (since it has been proven that genetic makeup is unaffected by the surroundings.) In other words, in a dead world with no living plants, animals, bacteria, etc., at some point some molecules united in such a way that a single celled living creature came into being. This cell was not only alive, but it had the ability to reproduce another like itself. These cells had slight differences, and of course, those most adaptable to the surroundings survived to reproduce. Gradually they became multi celled, and larger, and sometime along the line sprouted limbs: legs, arms, wings, fins, tails, etc. Is this a logical theory? Assuming it would be scientifically possible, let's examine the chances of this happening.

Is Evolution a Mathematical Possibility?

The odds of something happening by chance can be calculated mathematically. If the odds are too low, it is considered an impossibility. For instance, if a monkey would sit at a keyboard and randomly type in letters, what are the odds that he would perfectly type out the word “EVOLUTION”?

There are about one hundred keys on a typical keyboard. So, if we would ignore capitalization, there is one chance in one hundred that our monkey would hit the correct first letter. There is one chance in 10,000 (100×100) that he would hit the first two letters in correct order. There is one chance in 1,000,000 ($10,000 \times 100$) that the first three letters would be correct. Since “evolution” is nine letters long, there is one chance in 1009 ($1,000,000,000,000,000,000$) that he would spell it out correctly.

Most evolutionary scientists claim the earth is about 4.5 billion years old. There are some who claim the universe is up to one hundred billion years old. Let’s suppose our monkey typed constantly, day and night, at a fast rate of 3 keys per second, (94,608,000 per year) for one hundred billion years. He would have typed 9,460,800,000,000,000 keystrokes since the dawn of the universe. In 6000 years, the approximate realistic age of the earth, he would have typed 567,648,000,000 keystrokes. Comparing to our total odds of 1009, either of these would be considerably less than a drop in the proverbial bucket. When the odds are this small, it could be considered mathematically impossible for a monkey to type out the word “evolution” by chance even in one hundred billion years of constant typing.

What does this have to do with evolution? Early evolution theories were based on the idea that developments caused by the environment, such as tough skin on the feet from walking over rough ground, are passed on to the next generation. Some had even taught that changes were carried on for the needs of animals, for instance, giraffes got long necks from reaching for leaves on tall trees. These theories have been proven to be in error. Scientists know now that it is not possible for changes caused by the environment to be inherited. The modern theory of evolution is based strictly on chance mutations, simply because that is the only option left since evolution by any other means is proven to be scientifically impossible. In our monkey and keyboard example, we had a very simple example of chance - hit one correct key in one hundred each time. Its low odds were only caused by the fact that this needed to be done nine times. In the theory of evolution, each “chance mutation” is extremely complex. Each step is not one chance in one hundred, but one chance in trillions. There are not only nine steps involved, but billions. Nor are we going at a rate of three strokes per second - in fact *throughout all of known history there has not been one example* of a major chance mutation improvement that passed on to its offspring!ⁱⁱ

Let’s begin with the first step. “Spontaneous Generation”, or the first single celled creature able to reproduce, coming alive in a dead world. It is well known today that spontaneous generation is impossible. However, in this case they believe that the impossible did happen. Scientists working in a lab have never been able to produce any kind of life able to reproduce itself, even though they have painstakingly studied all forms of life. Even the simplest form of life is a complex and precise mixture of materials – and something else. Creation of life is proven to be beyond human abilities. If scientists in a

lab cannot produce life, or even give life to something that has all of its components, but has died, how would we expect life to just fall together and happen?

Yet, scientists believe that somewhere, sometime, it happened that the right materials came together the right way *totally by chance* - and a single celled creature came to life! But much more than that happened. It chanced to be at a place where there was nourishment for it. It happened to be the very kind of nourishment that it could use. It happened to have the ability to absorb that nourishment, change it to a usable state, dispose of the waste, and grow. By chance, it also had the ability to reproduce. Any single cell from which something could descent would need to be able to do all this. If we could imagine all the millions of things that had to be right, and all the billions of things that could have gone wrong at each stage to get to this point, and recognize that we still don't understand how the life could have started, (if everything could have by chance happened to come together perfectly, we still only have a dead cell), we can see that it would be a whole lot easier for a monkey to type the word "evolution" by chance, than for life to begin by chance.

But we have only begun our game of chance. This cell that came into being by chance, also needed to reproduce with billions of chance improvements on its descendants throughout generations, until it chanced to become a plant, or an insect – like creature that could move, etc. By this time there were many other forms of life, possibly bacteria, virus, etc., so it needed to develop an immune system to protect it from its relatives. Since it's legs, wings, etc. developed entirely by chance, there had to be billions of useless mutations before anything useful showed up. Remember in this game of chance, birds would be as likely to have fins instead of wings, tails like monkeys and ears like rabbits. Anything would have grown out any place before something useful happened. Each stage into each useful living creature needed to go through billions of chance mutations.ⁱⁱⁱ Even if chance mutation improvements were possible, mathematically, there is not a shadow of a chance that even the most simple forms of life we know of today could have evolved in a mere hundred billion years. This is without even considering whether life itself is possible without being given by God.

On What are Scientist's Calculations of the Age of the World based?

"Accurate dating methods" played a big part in the progression of the theory of evolution, because they gave the tremendous time periods that would be so necessary to imagine the changes. (Man can imagine almost anything happening in millions of years, regardless whether or not it is scientifically or mathematically possible.) The most accurate dating method known is "Carbon-14". Carbon 14 or radiocarbon is a radioactive form of carbon with an atomic weight of 14 instead of 12 like regular carbon. There is one atom of radiocarbon for every trillion atoms of ordinary carbon in the air we breath, so plants and animals are constantly absorbing it. Like all radioactive materials, radiocarbon constantly decays by giving off particles. This is called radioactivity. The atoms decay at a uniform rate. At this rate, half of the radiocarbon is gone in 5,750 years. This is called the "half life" of radiocarbon. Every 5,750 years, half of the rest remains. So to test plant or animal material for age, scientists test how much radiocarbon it is still giving off, and compare that to what a live plant or animal contains today. To

consider this accurate over any length of time is not being realistic however. Let's look at one point that is being overlooked.

Radiocarbon is formed by cosmic rays. When these rays hit the atmosphere, they smash various kinds of atoms in the air. Some of the neutrons that are knocked out of their atoms hit nitrogen atoms. This causes the nitrogen atom to give off a proton. The atom then becomes a radiocarbon.

Scientists assume they know how much radiation their subjects originally gave off, by how much a living specimen gives off today. For that to hold out, we would need to assume that the earth's atmosphere hardly changed, especially the amount of nitrogen in it (which is what radiocarbon is formed from), and that there were always as many cosmic rays striking it as there is now. If we study the Bible account of the flood, it appears that there were great differences in the atmosphere compared to now. It didn't rain, but rather the earth was watered sufficiently by a heavy dew. (Gen. 2:5,6) It appears that there was a layer of water vapor in the upper atmosphere (Gen 1:6-8), which would have blocked much of the cosmic radiation. Scientists studying preserved remains of ancient extinct reptiles have observed that their lung capacity would not have been large enough to support their bodies in today's atmosphere. They must have lived at a time when the air was richer in oxygen (air today is 78% nitrogen and 21% oxygen).

If much of the cosmic radiation was blocked by the atmosphere, and there was more oxygen (leaving less nitrogen) in the air, there could not have been as much carbon 14 produced, therefore not as much absorbed by life before the flood, therefore not as much left in the remains today. These facts would naturally produce test results millions of years in error on remains only several thousand years old.

Another thing that scientists feel proves that the earth is millions of years old is the oil and coal deposits. Oil and coal are considered to be "fossil fuels" - that is, the remains of plants that lived millions of years ago. The reasoning is that it would have taken millions of years^{iv} to transform it into oil and coal. However, pressure greatly accelerates the process. In fact, scientists in a lab have produced a barrel of oil from one ton of garbage in *twenty minutes*! Now, let's think about a time that tremendous pressure was exerted on the earth. In Gen. 7 we read that there was a flood in which the waters covered the highest mountain in the world by 15 cubits, (about 20 feet). The highest mountain today is Mount Everest (29,028 ft) if that was covered with water, the pressure at sea level would be *12,598 lb. per square inch, or nine hundred seven tons per square foot*! This pressure was not only applied for 20 minutes, verse 24 says "**And the waters prevailed upon the earth an hundred and fifty days.**" Even if it were not for this fact, however, we know that God who created the world by the power of His Word, would not have had any problems creating the coal and oil fields as they are today!

Scientists will admit that there is no historical evidence beyond about 3000 BC. The ideas of the time span since creation that we get from reading the genealogies in the *Bible have never been scientifically proven wrong*. Rather, the facts support the Bible. We do have real evidence going back about 5000 years (3000 B.C.). Also most scientific data points to a universe only several thousand years old. For instance, scientists had expected to find deep dust on the moon, however there was only about 3

inches, which would imply several thousand years accumulation rather than millions. Is it coincidence that this holds out with the time span that the Bible teaches?

A Brief Look at the Evolutionary Stages of Man and the “Evidence” of Their Existence

If we study the supposed evolutionary progress of man from an ape-like ancestor, we can see what the theory of evolution is built on, which should give us an indication as to how creditable and “scientific” it is.

Below are the most famous and well-known stages of what scientists consider “Early Humanoids”, and a brief description of the “evidence” that “proves” they existed. To avoid getting too lengthy, we are only using the common name for each stage, some are also known by several scientific names. “Humanoids” are generally further classified as “Homo Erectus” or erect man, (the first four listed below are in this group), and “Homo Sapiens” or wise man, (the last four are in this group). Modern man is sometimes called “Homo Sapiens Sapiens” (wise wise man) ***“Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools... changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator.”*** (Romans 1:22-25 partial)

1. **Heidelberg Man** - He was “scientifically” built up from a jawbone found in 1907 that many believed to be a human jawbone.
2. **Nebraska Man** - He was “scientifically” built up from a single tooth that was later found to be the tooth of an extinct pig.
3. **Pitldown Man** - Parts of a human skull with an ape-like jawbone were discovered in 1912 at Pitldown (England). Scientists believed it belonged to a prehistoric man who lived up to a million years ago. The combination of a large, apparently modern brain, and the jaws and teeth of an ape was accepted by scientists of the time as the long-sought “missing link” between the apes and humans in the chain of evolution. This made it a most important find for evolution, because it seemed to “prove” a link between man and apes. In 1953, British scientists tested the jawbone and found it to be that of a modern orangutan which was deliberately added to a 600 yr. old human skull. *This had fooled scientists for nearly forty years!*
4. **Peking Man** - The first “evidence” was a single tooth found in China in 1927. Part of the top of a skull was found in 1929. Scientists later found “more bones of the same kind”. All this “evidence” disappeared in 1941.
5. **Steinheim or Swanscombe Man** - The only evidence of his existence is three pieces of skull (no facial bones). The first piece was found in 1935 in the gravel of the Thames River.
6. **Neanderthal Man** - The earliest complete skeletons known. First Scientists thought Neanderthal was a squat, stooping, apelike creature. But later research showed them to be completely human, fully erect, very muscular, with brains as large as (actually slightly larger than) modern man. These skeletons show a common bone deformity caused by rickets. Lack of sunshine caused a vitamin D deficiency characterized by bowed legs and receding foreheads and jaws. There is no evidence that these skeletons were anything other than modern man.

7. **New Guinea Man** - The skeleton differs slightly from many races today (which all vary even within races and even families), but is very like those of the modern natives in that area today.
8. **Cro-Magnon Man** - From complete skeletons found in the Cro-Magnon caves. These were equal both in brain capacity and physically to modern man. The main differences are that the Cro-Magnon Man seems to in general have been more heavily muscled than modern man, and their jaws, faces, and teeth, like those of the Eskimos, were enlarged by heavy chewing. This has to do with lifestyle - not evolution.

How can scientists with only a tooth or a fragment from the top of a skull figure out what the specimen looked like, what it ate, how it hunted, how it lived, etc.? The answer is simple; They obviously can't. *The first five in the list are not supported by any real evidence.* They are the products of imagination - famous, highly educated imaginations, but imaginations nevertheless. The last three are real skeletons, in fact, real *fully human* skeletons. *What we have examined above is the only type of "evidence" scientists have of man's evolution! There is no real evidence!*

Possibly the most famous "early humanoid" and in evolutionists eyes the most conclusive evidence of human evolution is "Lucy". The evidence of her existence? Two fragments of skull about the size of a half-dollar!

Some people feel that they can believe in evolution and still believe the Bible. This is impossible. The Bible teaches that the universe was called into existence by God. God called all life into being "after his kind" (Gen. 1), and **"God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."** (Gen.2:7) The fact that the Bible makes clear that every creature was created "after his kind" doesn't mean that there can be no variation within each "kind". For instance, because of selective breeding, the desirable traits of domesticated animals have been improved. These are not "chance mutations". Whatever variations there are *within a specie*, the animals are just as much "after their kind" as they were when God created them. They will never evolve out of "their kind" into another kind.

The earth and the rest of the universe was called into being by the power of God. Science, correctly applied has never disproved this. Unlike the animals, God created man with a soul that will never die. Man was also created with a freedom of will and given life on earth to exercise this choice of will, that he may choose or refuse to be a follower of God.

How does this affect me?

As we have seen above, it is not possible that you are a product of mere chance, with no meaning or purpose in life. You have not evolved into a mass of living flesh that has no mission to fulfill, no song to sing, no rhyme or reason for being. You are a distinct created being, made in the likeness of the Almighty God, (Gen. 1:27). Unlike the rest of creation, you have been given a soul that will never die, and you have been given "the knowledge of good and evil" to know right from wrong. You have a prescribed role to fill and a mission to accomplish here on earth. **"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."** (Rev. 4:11)

How can I please my Creator?

By accepting the salvation that He is offering you. It is God's will that all obtain salvation and experience the joys of heaven. God **"Will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth."** (1 Tim. 2:4) He is **"Not willing that any should perish."** (2 Peter 3:9) However, it was revealed to the apostle John in Rev. 21:27 that **"there shall in no wise enter into it [heaven] any thing that defileth."** Yet we realize that **"All have sinned and come short of the glory of God"** (Rom. 3:23) making it impossible for you (or anyone else) to be saved unless it were by divine intervention.

That is just what has been done. Divine intervention *has been* provided. God made provision for your redemption by sending His Son Jesus into the world to be crucified by those who rejected Him, as a sacrifice for the sins of those who receive Him as their Lord and Savior.

In other words, even though we are unrighteous and **"The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God"** (1 Cor. 6:9), Jesus was sacrificed for our sins - in our place, so that we could be cleansed from our sins. Does that mean that because of Jesus' sacrifice on the cross, we are now all purified? No, *only those who accept God's offer* of salvation are saved. Also, Jesus will not merely save us *in sin*, but He will save us *from sin*. Jesus promised that He will give the Holy Spirit to His followers, to empower us to live a life of victory over sin.

Who is Salvation for?

"All have sinned and come short of the Glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). *Every one of us* is in need of salvation through Jesus. Not one of us has the ability to save his own soul. **"Neither is there salvation in any other"** (Acts 4:12) Jesus is our only hope of salvation. **"Whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life."** (John 3:15) Just as without Christ every one of us is lost and without hope. So in Christ every one of us ("whosoever will") can be saved.

How can I Obtain this Salvation?

1. **Recognize** that God exists and that even though you may have been ignoring Him, He will someday require an account of your life: **"But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."** (Heb. 11:6) As we saw in the section above, without Christ we are all sinners and deserving of hell. The first step in accepting Christ's salvation is recognizing that we *need* it. We need to recognize our position before God. We need to realize that we can never earn our way to salvation, and our only hope is in accepting Jesus' sacrifice in our place for our sins.

2. **Count the cost** of surrendering your life to Christ. Salvation is free, but it isn't cheap. You can't "get saved" and keep living your old life of sin. In Luke 14:26-35 Jesus compares becoming a disciple or Christian to building a tower. He shows that just as it is necessary to first count the cost before starting material projects, so we should also count the cost of being a Christian. Ask yourself, "Am I ready to give up everything to be a Christian? Can I give up all my hopes, dreams and plans for the future and surrender it all to whatever He asks of me? If persecution would come because of my faith, could I even give my life for Him?" The answer to these questions are important because Jesus said that if we cannot give up *everything including our own lives we cannot be His disciple!* (Luke 14:26; Mt. 10:37)

3. **Repent** of the sin of your former life. Be truly sorry for the wrong you have done and leave your life of sin. (Acts 3:19)

4. **Confess** your sins and your sinful nature to God. (Rom. 10:9,10; 1 James 5:15, 16; 1 John 1:9)

5. **Forgive** anyone who has wronged you. It is sin to carry malice or to be unforgiving. We cannot expect God to forgive us if we will not forgive our fellow-man. (Matt. 6:14-15).

6. **Fully surrender** your life and everything in it to Jesus Christ. (Luke 14:33) Anything that you cannot surrender to Christ will block your peace with God. Your own will and carnal nature needs to surrender if it is to be replaced by the divine nature of Christ.

7. **Be Born Again** by the power of God. Read John 3 and Colossians 2:11-15. Your conversion itself is composed of two parts: #1 Death of the carnal sinful nature (referred to in #6 above); #2 The new birth by the Holy Spirit of God. The death of the sinner is followed by the new birth of the saint. (Rom. 6:4)

If the nature of Christ has taken the place of your old nature, the following evidences of the Holy Spirit will be present:

Spiritual growth will be the natural result of the Holy Spirit within. II Peter 3:18 says, “**Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ**”. Read the Bible and pray regularly each day. Be baptized and become a member of a Bible believing church. Fellowship regularly with a group of believers who both teach and live by the Scriptures. (Heb. 10:24,25) The fruit of the Spirit found in Galatians 5:22 will be a result of your spiritual growth.

Obedience to the commandments of Jesus and the leading of the Holy Spirit. If Christ is really Lord of your life, your life will be in subjection to His will. (Matt. 5:48; I Pet. 1:22; Heb. 5:8,9; John 14:23-27)

Witnessing to others of the faith in Christ. (Luke 12:8) A natural result of the presence of the Holy Spirit is the desire to see others saved.

“Rejoice in the Lord always; and again I say, rejoice.” (Phil. 4:4) As a child of God you will rejoice that you are not a mere accident of chance. You rejoice that He loved you and made provision for your salvation, and that He has gone **“to prepare a place for you.”** (John 14:1-6). **“Rejoice, because your names are written in heaven.”** (Luke 10:20)

Glenn M. Wenger / ©1999 / Weaverland Publications / 1438-H West Main Street Ephrata PA 17522

PH:717-738-3333

ⁱ The Ante-Nicene Fathers V.6 P.85

ⁱⁱ Selective breeding improvements, and the variety of breeds of animals, such as dogs and cats have nothing to do with evolution. These are all working with genes that are all already there since creation. Evolution requires new genetic information to create fins, for instance, then make fins into legs or wings, etc. Genetic mutation, however is always detrimental (it's caused by the loss of genetic information) and tends to be destructive. For instance, horses and donkeys are crossed to make a mule - but mules can't reproduce.

ⁱⁱⁱ According to the theory of evolution, the earth should gradually be filling with more variety of creatures and plant life. However, we know the opposite to be true. The variety of species is rapidly decreasing. Many creatures and plants have become extinct in the recent past and environmentalists are concerned about many more that are

in danger of extinction. An estimated 2/3 of the creatures that have existed are now extinct. Facts point to creation of all creatures and then gradual extinction, not a gradual buildup from nothing as evolution would dictate.

^{iv} In 1842 miners found a human skull in a seam of coal that was supposed to be 50 million years old. This was supposedly long before humans existed. Other human skeletons have been excavated from rock supposed to be 100 million years old. These findings are rarely published because they do not hold out with evolution theories.