The Creation Verdict

Making Sense of Today's Critical Issues From a Biblical Perspective
During a hot July in 1925, a showdown took place in Dayton, Tennessee. High school biology teacher John Scopes had been charged with the then-illegal teaching of evolution. This battle between traditionalists and up-and-coming modernists came on the heels of the social upheaval of the 1920s. Pitting proponents of Victorian values against the flappers and mobsters of the Jazz Age had already led to battles over prohibition and women’s rights. The Scopes trial would test and, in many ways, determine which direction America would go.

Attorney Clarence Darrow, who defended Scopes, claimed the prosecution opened doors for a reign of bigotry. On the other side stood William Jennings Bryan, the head prosecutor and a passionate anti-evolutionist, who believed if evolution won it would be the end of Christianity.

At the end of the trial, after lambasting Bryan’s biblical beliefs, Darrow stunned the courtroom by instructing the jury to find his client guilty. Not only did this bring the matter to a swift conclusion, but it also prevented Bryan from presenting his own closing argument and questioning Darrow on his espoused atheism. Nevertheless, Bryan offered the following statement after the trial: “Christianity welcomes truth from whatever source it comes and is not afraid that any real truth from any source can interfere with the divine truth that comes by inspiration from God Himself.”

What happened in Tennessee almost 85 years ago is but a small indication of the great divide that still exists between those who stand by Darwin’s theory of origins and those who don’t. From the success of Ken Ham’s Creation Museum to the efforts of school board members to halt the teaching of intelligent design, the question of where we come from will continue to be a subject of debate.

In this issue of TORCH, we look back at the 150 years since the publication of Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species*. Ironically, those who posit evolution often point to creationists as believing wholly on faith rather than science, even though many of Darwin’s theories continue to fall apart under scientific scrutiny.

As you’ll see in the next 30 pages, evolution is just a theory … and definitely a matter of faith. Likewise, creationists believe by faith but use science to back it up. In fact, you will discover that scientific evidence of God’s hand in creation can be found in abundance. That’s why we’ve asked faculty members from Cedarville University to weigh in on the issues connected to the origins debate. These writers offer insightful perspectives, with answers, knowledge, and encouragement along the way.

As we seek to make sense of the evolution debate in this issue of TORCH, you will not only learn how to defend Scripture and the Genesis Creation account, but you will also find your faith strengthened.
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Replacing his faith in Creator God with misplaced certainty in the power of science, Darwin subjected himself to a disquieted life and a hopeless death.

In Greek mythology, Procrustes, the villainous son of Poseidon, kept an iron bed he claimed would magically adjust to the proper size of anyone who slept in it. He then enticed passersby to spend the night on this bed … only to discover to their horror that Procrustes made the visitors fit his bed by either cutting off their legs or stretching them on the rack. Today, we call the practice of making evidence fit a predetermined conclusion or worldview a “Procrustean solution.”

Charles Darwin never intended to be a modern-day Procrustes, but his theory of evolution has become the intellectual bed on which all views of human thinking, feeling, and living are made to fit.

Born the same day as Abraham Lincoln in 1809, many consider Darwin to be the “great emancipator of the human mind.”
In Darwin’s theory, the power behind the design and complexity of the world — long held as evidence of God as Creator and Sustainer of all things — is reduced to unintelligent and unguided forces. We no longer needed God to explain the order of the natural world. As William Provine of Cornell University said, “Evolution is the greatest engine for atheism that has ever been invented.”

In his early years, Darwin seemed an unlikely person to cause a revolution in every field of science, not to mention theology and philosophy. He studied medicine at the University of Edinburgh for two years before leaving to take up theology at Christ’s College in Cambridge. Captivated by William Paley’s scientific approach to the proofs for Christianity, he practically memorized Paley’s book Natural Theology. Darwin also considered the Bible to be authoritative and frequently went to it for comfort and guidance. His interest in science grew through a number of friendships at Cambridge, but the exploits of naturalist and explorer Alexander von Humboldt were the spark that ignited Darwin’s imagination.

In 1831, Darwin accepted an offer to serve as an unpaid naturalist on a journey to chart the coast of South America. During his five-year voyage on the HMS Beagle, he made notes on the geology of the coastlines and collected specimens of everything from plankton to beetles to fossils of large mammals. Reading Charles Lyell’s three volumes of Principles of Geology introduced him to the idea that geological changes occurred uniformly over long periods of time. This not only challenged the accepted religious view of Creation but also provided a framework for Darwin’s ideas about the developmental changes in plant and animal life.

By the time he returned to England in 1836, publication of his journal had made Darwin somewhat of a science celebrity. Over the next decade, he began to slowly turn away from his faith and look to the new assumptions of science as the means to understand life and the world. As he explained, “I gradually came to disbelieve in Christianity as a divine revelation.” By his 40th birthday, he had given up Christianity completely.

Ten years later, in 1859, he wrote the work that has altered the thinking of the Western world for the past 150 years: On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life.

In the decades following, Darwin continued his study and writing but found little solace in life or hope in death. “I must look forward to Down Graveyard as the sweetest place on earth,” he wrote to a friend. He died in 1882 at the age of 73.

In the realm of science, evolutionary theory is now the indispensable explanation for everything. The study of geology assumes it; current life sciences are worthless without it. Debate of any kind is not allowed. Darwin made his bed, and modern culture sleeps restlessly in it.

Dr. Bill Brown became president of Cedarville University in June 2003. A graduate of the University of South Florida, Brown holds a Th.M. and Ph.D. from Dallas Theological Seminary. As a nationally recognized worldview expert, he has authored three worldview-related books and is the executive producer of the worldview study re:View (www.re-films.com).
The fossil record proves to be a “voice” of truth when determining the validity of Creation.

Despite his misplaced conclusions, Charles Darwin was an excellent scientist. He made thorough and extensive observations, tested his ideas with experiments and real-world data, cited problems with his propositions, and provided ways in which his theory might be falsified. But one thing he didn’t do was come up with the theory of evolution. Rather, Darwin developed a theory about how evolution works and called it “natural selection.”

He wrote about it in his book *On the Origin of Species*. The idea of evolution — or the transmutation of species, as it was called in his day — had been around for centuries. Darwin became famous merely because he was the first to publish the most widely accepted theory of how one species changes into another.

But let’s examine some of the problems Darwin recognized about his own views, especially in regard to the fossil record. And then let’s consider: If an excellent scientist like Charles Darwin had known these problems would persist 150 years later, would he still have proposed evolution?
The Uncertainties of Theory

When Darwin published Origin, the science of geology and paleontology was still in its infancy. So, he drew upon contemporary examples of “evolution” to support his theory. For example, he cited his domestic pigeon breeding experiments as evidence that generational change occurs within a particular group of species. He reasoned that in natural settings some offspring have physical traits that are better suited for survival than their siblings. The better-suited offspring survive, while the inferior offspring die and, therefore, fail to reproduce.

In the 1859 edition of Origin, Darwin included a figure of an evolutionary tree (Figure 1). It shows that, over time, similar offspring diverge and become more and more dissimilar from one another. Eventually, what began as members of the same species become different species. Darwin then reasoned that all the species in the world today might have arisen from just a few primordial organisms. He realized the fossil record didn’t quite bear out this evolutionary story. In fact, he acknowledged the fossil record was fairly incomplete but believed future discoveries would help support his theory. As he explained in his book, Darwin recognized the following major problems with the fossil record:

Problem #1: Vast numbers of missing intermediate species

“If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking most closely all the species of the same group together, must assuredly have existed. … evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains, which are preserved … , in an extremely imperfect and intermittent record. … Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory” (pp. 179, 280).

Darwin recognized that his theory demanded vast numbers of intermediate species, from lower to higher groups. Those species were missing in his day and are still missing. A few purported intermediates have been found, but the numbers are far from what they should be if his theory is true.

Problem #2: Sudden appearance of multiple species within the same layers

“There is another and allied difficulty, which is much graver. I allude to the manner in which numbers of species of the same group suddenly appear in the lowest known fossiliferous rocks. Most of the arguments which have convinced me that all the existing species of the same group have descended from one
progenitor apply with nearly equal force to the earliest known species. For instance, I cannot doubt that all the Silurian [now called “Cambrian”] trilobites have descended from some one crustacean, which must have lived long before the Silurian age, and which probably differed greatly from any known animal” (p. 306).

Darwin is describing multiple species of trilobites appearing suddenly in the lowest Cambrian rock layers. Today, about 160 species of trilobites are known from the earliest Cambrian layers, many more than in Darwin’s day (Figure 2). None of the fossils in the rock layers below these shelled arthropods show their evolutionary origin. Darwin believed that, with time, these fossils would be found. They have not.

Problem #3: Sudden appearance of multiple phyla within the same layers
“If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have really started into life all at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of descent with slow modification through natural selection. For the development of a group of forms, all of which have descended from one progenitor, must have been an extremely slow process; and the progenitors must have lived long ages before their modified descendants (p. 302). … To the question why we do not find records of these vast primordial periods, I can give no satisfactory answer. … the difficulty of understanding the absence of vast piles of fossiliferous strata … is very great” (p. 307). [emphasis added]

Not only do multiple types of similar species appear in the earliest fossil-bearing rock layers, but multiple groups of dissimilar organisms also appear there. We can find approximately 40 different types of animal phyla alive today. These groups include the mollusks (clams, snails), echinoderms (starfish, crinoids), chordates (vertebrates), sponges, and corals. All of these have also been found within the earliest fossil-bearing Cambrian strata.

A few years ago, fish (vertebrates) were found in the Cambrian strata of China. The problem of these groups suddenly
appearing was present in Darwin’s day, but again he assumed fossil ancestors would be found in deeper strata. He didn’t think all currently living groups would be found in the Cambrian. Instead of the problem going away, it became worse. Darwin recognized these sudden appearances would be fatal to his theory, a fact many scientists have overlooked.

The Undeniability of Truth

Darwin’s theory of natural selection does a very good job of explaining how we might get varieties of certain types of animals. For example, a dog “kind” probably got off Noah’s ark and then diversified into the many types of dogs we see today. This kind of “evolution” is very acceptable within modern creationism. Darwin’s idea of natural selection works well in explaining these kinds of changes within groups.

But he took his theory too far. He argued that all life forms came from a few common ancestors and that the fossil record would eventually support his grand theory. After 150 years of further discovery, it’s time to recognize that what Darwin himself said would “falsify” his theory has indeed falsified it. The fossil record emphatically does not support the idea that life arose from a few common ancestors. Instead, it supports the idea that life arose from many and varied created groups as described in the first chapter of Genesis.

Dr. John Whitmore earned a B.S. from Kent State University in 1985, an M.S. from the Institute of Creation Research in 1991, and a Ph.D. from Loma Linda University in 2003. As associate professor of geology, he has taught at Cedarville since 1991 and is responsible for developing the University’s new geology program. He is also heavily involved in creation research.
Consistent with the Genesis account, the rock record provides a multitude of evidence for the Flood.
When Charles Darwin stepped on board the *HMS Beagle* for an around-the-world voyage in 1831, he carried a copy of Charles Lyell’s *Principles of Geology* with him. Probably the most significant geology book ever published, it would have a tremendous influence on the young scientist’s thinking … and on an origins theory that would change the world.

Lyell wrote his three-volume text to explain geology in a completely naturalistic way, devoid of biblical references. Although he did not make earth-age estimates in his text, the general consensus soon became that the earth must be millions of years old. Lyell argued that slow and gradual geological processes had shaped much of the earth’s surface and had formed many of its rocks. This way of thinking became known as “uniformitarianism.”

On the other side were the “catastrophists” of the day, who argued that rocks and fossils had formed quickly, many of them during Noah’s Flood. Using biblical arguments, these scientists believed the earth was only thousands of years old and the Flood account in Genesis had a large role in shaping the earth’s geology.

However, Darwin used Lyell’s book — as well as biological observations from his own voyage — to propose natural selection and write *On the Origin of Species*. Together, Lyell and Darwin convinced most scientists that the biblical record was wrong about the age of the earth, the origin of life, and Noah’s Flood. But in 1961, the tables turned again when Henry Morris and John Whitcomb published *The Genesis Flood*, which revitalized the modern creation movement. Since that time, creation scientists have identified evidence in the geologic record that validates the Flood as a worldwide catastrophic event.

**The Great Unconformity**

Deep in the rock record, just below where fossiliferous strata begin in earnest, a buried erosional surface, or “unconformity,” can be found. Under that boundary are rock types devoid of animal fossils. The unconformity occurs in many places around the world and is especially well exposed in the Grand Canyon (Figure 1). At the beginning of the Flood, “all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened” (Gen. 7:11). Imagine the tremendous amount of erosion this catastrophic event would have caused on the earth’s surface! And this is exactly what we find, worldwide in scope, buried deep in the rock record — large boulders overlying this eroded surface testify to the tectonic catastrophe that produced them. In the Grand Canyon, a few of the boulders are hundreds of feet in size, while others in California measure almost a mile in length!
Marine Strata on Land

The Flood account says that “all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered” and the “mountains were covered” (Gen. 7:19–20), so we should expect to find evidence of marine strata on top of the Great Unconformity. And we do. In fact, 75 percent of the continents are covered with thousands of feet of marine strata (Figure 2). Marine strata and fossils can be found in abundance in places like Ohio and Kansas. The rocks at the rim of the Grand Canyon, 7,000 feet above sea level, contain fossil corals and sponges. Obviously, the continents were covered with oceans at some point in history.

Thin, Widespread Deposits

Sedimentary rocks have a flat, layered appearance, making them easy to spot along highway cuts and canyon exposures. The Grand Canyon is an excellent example of marine sedimentary rocks exposed high on the continents. Many of these rock layers are relatively thin, with measured thicknesses of only hundreds of feet. For example, the Redwall Limestone (Figure 3), exposed as a thick, red cliff about halfway down into the canyon, shows up as a similar layer in Wyoming, South Dakota, the Canadian Rockies, Alaska, Asia, and Europe. Similar processes happening in a global ocean during the Flood can easily explain these deposits.

Evidence of Catastrophe

Consider Hurricane Katrina, the Indian Ocean tsunami of 2004, massive earthquakes, and volcanic catastrophes. The Flood had components of all these events and happened worldwide. Fossils are evidence of these catastrophic processes. Unless buried and protected, animals and plants decay rapidly and have no chance of being fossilized.
and preserved. The rock record is full of evidence of rapid burial, including dinosaurs (Figure 4), fossil trees (Figure 5), coal deposits, fish, and trilobites. The fossil record, then, is consistent with the biblical account of the Flood and proves that much of the rock record formed in a short period of time, not millions of years.

Continental Rearrangement
Conventional evolutionary geology teaches that continents slowly drift and rearrange themselves over millions of years. Many modern geologists believe the continents were rearranged catastrophically during the Flood. First suggested in 1858 by Antonio Snider (Figure 6), this idea is now known as catastrophic plate tectonics (CPT). Many modern creation geologists accept CPT as a mechanism for what happened during the Flood. In this model, cold, heavy rock of the ocean floor suddenly sank deep into the earth at the beginning of the Flood, causing circulation to develop within the deep mantle layers of the earth. The continents moved apart, then crashed into one another at velocities of tens of feet per second. Hot volcanic material on the ocean floor made the sea floor swell, displacing water onto the continents. Though still in development, this idea has gained favor within the creation geology community.

The Final Word
The apostle Peter said that in the last days men will willfully ignore God’s Creation and the Flood (2 Peter 3:5–6). Lyell and Darwin paved the way to make it scientifically acceptable to be an atheist. During Lyell’s time, many scientists believed in the literal truth of Genesis. Today, most scientists refuse to examine the evidences for Creation and the Flood, just as Peter predicted would happen.

We do not have all the answers. Our creation geology community is small, and there are not enough workers to tackle some major issues that still need to be addressed. We started the geology major at Cedarville University to help address some of this need. But a multitude of evidence gives us reason to believe the Flood account described in Genesis was real and worldwide — and that’s certainly something on which to build our faith.
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In the Beginning

How did we get here and how can we know for sure? Amid conflicting voices, the answers affect our lives now … and for eternity.

by Dr. Steve Gollmer
The man certainly had a way of communicating. Whether encouraging his young apprentice Timothy or preaching to godless Athenians, the apostle Paul reached his audience by first figuring out where they were coming from.

In Acts 17, for instance, he tells the people of Athens that the unknown god they worshipped was, in fact, the Creator who “gives to all people life and breath and all things” and that “in Him we live and move and exist.” He then says, “In the past, God overlooked such ignorance, but now He commands all people everywhere to repent.” Interestingly, Paul frames his discussion of theology around the theory of origins. In order to support the theology of a single God, he states that God created all things.

If only it were that easy today. We continue to struggle over origins as the evolution-creation debate rages on. What theory is correct? The answer to this question either strengthens or destroys Paul’s theological stance. But as it was in the days of Paul, so it is today. The names may change, but the essence of the arguments remains the same. Paul addressed the Epicureans and the Stoics in Athens, and in today’s culture creationism faces off against naturalism and transcendentalism.

**Proper Prejudices**

As frameworks from which to explain the world, origin theories are not testable in the sense of laboratory experiments. Rather, they stand or fall based on their ability to provide a consistent explanation of all observed phenomena. One must then evaluate whether inconsistencies are due to limited data and understanding or to a fatal flaw that demands rejection of the model. In either case, origin theories arise from a set of prejudices. But as cosmologist Steven Weinberg explained, “The great thing is not to be free of theoretical prejudices, but to have the right theoretical prejudices.”

Naturalism holds that the sum of all existence can be observed or measured and therefore any theory of origins depends solely on natural causes. Consequently, the universe is either eternal or the result of natural processes. Complex phenomena such as the cosmos, life, and the human mind must come from simpler origins.

Transcendentalism maintains that metaphysical principles extend beyond sensate knowledge. Origin theories based on this worldview do not regard the physical world as permanent, but as temporary and in the process of change. Complex phenomena are not the result of blind chance but the expected outcomes of a universal essence or consciousness.

Creationism proposes that everything results from the purposeful act of a transcendent Creator. The cosmos, life, and the human mind, as well as spirit beings, were created in functionally complete forms. Complex phenomena were inherent in creation from the beginning and reflect the omnipotence, omniscience, and creativity of a personal intelligence.

**New Beginnings**

The word “cosmos” refers to the systematic order of the universe. From before Aristotle to as recently as the 1960s, many scientists maintained that matter and the universe were eternal. But based on validated scientific theories and recent observations, it becomes necessary to concede that the universe has a definite starting point.

As a result of this discovery, naturalism is forced to go beyond
observable or measurable data to propose rational mechanisms for creating universes. In addition, life as we know it could not exist if physical parameters such as gravity, electricity, and nuclear forces differed slightly. Our fine-tuned universe is a statistical improbability as viewed from naturalism.

On the other hand, a temporary universe uniquely suited for the existence of life aligns with transcendentalism. Yet, to achieve this comfort, many transcendentalists allude to a universal consciousness that guides the development of the universe from its very beginning. Although at first this may sound like a creationist proposition, the Creation account found in Genesis differs in that the universe was created functionally complete. This implies a complexity in the relationship between space, time, and matter that is yet to be understood, contrary to naturalistic theories that start with relatively simple conditions. Although the creationist position is often denigrated as being a statement of faith, the current Big Bang cosmology proposes a universe composed of four percent ordinary matter and 96 percent “otherness,” which is also a statement of faith.

Life Issues
Although centuries of scientific scrutiny have validated the assertion “life comes from life,” Darwin proposed that the first life came from “some warm little pond.” To him, cells were little more than simple bags of protoplasm. But five years after the publication of On the Origin of Species, Louis Pasteur stated that his experiments related to germ theory dealt a “mortal blow” to the doctrine of spontaneous generation (life spawning from non-life).

Since then, the study of cells has not made Darwin’s proposal more plausible but has enhanced appreciation for the complex structures and regulatory mechanisms inherent in even the simplest cells. It may seem that “life comes from life” supports transcendentalism, but this worldview appeals to a life principle inherent to the universe. Therefore, transcendentalism is even more accommodating to spontaneous
generation than naturalism is. And it strengthens the creationist position that functionally complete life forms were created in the beginning by the One who is “the life.”

**Mind Matters**
The human mind — the essence of our identity — results from the special creation of mankind as described in the Genesis account. Being made in the image of God distinguishes mankind from animals, and the mind is a primary aspect of that distinction. Although animals respond to their environment, demonstrate learning, and exhibit personality, their use of language and ability to conceptualize abstract concepts pale in comparison to that of human beings.

Science has made great strides in correlating physical structures and chemical processes to animal and human intelligence, yet naturalistic models explain the difference as merely the number and quality of neural connections. The perception of “you” is considered an illusion brought about by complex biochemical reactions. Responding to such a cold view of existence, transcendentalists resort to concepts like atman — the self — which is a part of the universal essence of mind.

**In the End**
The real question when comparing origin theories is, “To whom are we responsible?” In naturalism, physical law and chance drive humankind. Although people may appear autonomous, they are ultimately destined to follow their genes and environment and, therefore, not accountable. In transcendentalism, people are not constrained solely by the physical world but directed by karma or other metaphysical principles. These principles are a law unto themselves and determine the trajectory of one’s life and afterlife.

The biblical account declares there is a God and He sent a Redeemer to whom we are accountable. Many of the Athenians responded to Paul’s remarks with sneers, but some wanted to know more. Others believed and followed. We, too, must decide what we believe about our origins, as it will determine what we believe about God.

---

Dr. Steve Gollmer serves as professor of physics at Cedarville University. He earned an M.S. in physics from the University of Illinois and a Ph.D. in atmospheric science from Purdue University. His research interests include climate modeling and systems biology. He has taught at Cedarville since 1994.
Debunking Those Pesky Creation Myths

by Dr. Aaron Hutchison

The popular debate over the origin of life is filled with misconceptions. Many supposed “facts” about both creationism and Darwinism are not actually true. Unfortunately, these myths can be repeated so often they become accepted as truth.

Christians should be prepared to respond to such myths. The next time someone challenges your faith in Creator God with one of these arguments, be ready to answer the myth with the truth.

Darwinism deals with objective science, religion with subjective faith. Science cannot be defined on the assumption that an anti-supernatural worldview competes with a theistic one. As a method for studying nature, science is neutral on the issue of the supernatural. To think otherwise improperly defines science as a worldview, a term that should not be applied to that which is merely a technique.

Of course, one does not have to subscribe to naturalism to practice science. Historically, many of the greatest scientists, Isaac Newton among them, were theists. Furthermore, naturalism is not the pure rationalism it purports to be. It takes as much faith to believe all things developed by random chance as it does to believe a mighty God created the universe.

Real scientists are not creationists.
While this is a favorite charge of those who seek to discredit the creationist movement, it simply has no basis in fact. As this issue of TORCH exemplifies, creationists can be active, published members of the scientific community. To further demonstrate this fact, Answers in Genesis has compiled an impressive list of scientists conducting cutting-edge creation research. This information is available at www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/bios/.

The fossil record proves Darwinism.
Despite the discovery of so-called “missing links,” the fossil record does not actually support gradual evolution. If everything living today had evolved slowly over millions of years, there should be fossils of thousands of transitional forms, creatures that are intermediates between types.

In reality, most of the fossils claimed as transitions do not stand up to close scrutiny. For example, the alleged transitional fossils linking apes to men have been conclusively shown to contain both ape fossils and human fossils, rather than indicating separate species.
intermediate between the two. Marvin Lubenow explains more about this in his book *Bones of Contention*.

**Antibiotic-resistant bacteria demonstrate Darwinism in action.**

In this classic example, evolutionists confuse adaptation, or microevolution, with macroevolution. It is essentially the same myth as a former one claiming that changes in finches’ beaks due to habitat demonstrate macroevolution. However, in both examples, we merely see life forms adapting to their conditions due to natural selection. The genetic codes for antibiotic resistance and different beak shapes were present from the beginning, created by God. And the environment allows the organisms with these particular traits to thrive and multiply. Therefore, natural selection, in a nutshell, remains entirely consistent with a creationist view of origins.

Still, that doesn’t mean new genetic information has been created. Creationists do not believe God directly created every species that exists today. Rather, they believe God created living things after their kind. The term “species” is a human classification distinct from the “kinds” of Genesis. Rather than proving evolution, bacteria give us a picture of what natural selection can and cannot accomplish. Theses organisms are some of the fastest reproducing creatures on earth, but in all of the many generations we have observed, natural selection has only led to different varieties of bacteria. We have yet to observe a bacterium evolve into an amoeba.

**Radioactive dating proves the earth is billions of years old.**

The series of techniques known as radioactive decay certain elements within the rock have undergone. But some of these techniques are based on questionable assumptions. Still others seem theoretically sound but give wildly inconsistent results. Even the best procedures have indicated dates of hundreds of millions of years for rocks known with certainty to be less than a century old. Furthermore, all radioactive dating methods are based on the assumption that nuclear decay rates have been constant throughout history. Recent creationist research has raised questions about the accuracy of that assumption, thereby calling into question the methods at large. For more information on this topic, consider Dr. Don DeYoung’s book *Thousands, Not Billions*.

As believers, we should not be surprised at the spread of untruths regarding the doctrine of Creation. Like 2 Peter 3 predicts, scoffers will come — men who “deliberately forget that long ago by God’s word the heavens existed and the earth was formed.” But we need not be shaken by these scoffers. When examined thoroughly, their claims inevitably prove to be incorrect. Man’s words may fail, but the Word of God will abide forever.

Dr. Aaron Hutchison serves as professor of chemistry at Cedarville University. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Kentucky and has taught at Cedarville since 2003.
Exposing Evolution’s Influence

Freud admired him. Hitler used his science as the basis for the Holocaust. And we still talk about him today. Clearly, Charles Darwin has influenced more than just the scientific community.

It would have been enough for evolution to remain in the hard sciences, but that didn’t happen. While classical fields such as history, literature, and philosophy advanced into the 20th century by “purging” themselves of their theistic roots, later disciplines like sociology and anthropology were founded on the assumption that humans evolved from animals over millions of years. And so, over the last century and a half, Darwin’s persuasion has touched our country, our communities, our homes, and our families on several fronts.

The Family
According to Genesis, God first established marriage through the creation of Adam and Eve, who then produced children. The evolutionary worldview reverses this order, positing that after millions of years of siring offspring, something akin to marriage develops.

If marriage is indeed an afterthought, then there’s nothing special about it. Why preserve the union of one man with one woman? Why not experiment with other arrangements such as multiple partners, serial marriages, same-sex relationships, incest, or even bestiality? The point is not how absurd or offensive these
groupings might appear to contemporary sensitivities, but how their justification proceeds logically from an evolutionary starting point.

In Genesis, God places marriage first, as the foundation upon which the family is established. As children mature into adulthood, they leave their parents and join their partners in lifelong unions that continue the propagation of the race. From a biblical perspective, marriage is permanent and parenting is temporary.

On the other hand, the evolutionary sequence of “family first, marriage second” facilitates the permanence of family relationships, while marriages become increasingly temporary. Today in the United States, 39 percent of children are born to an unmarried mother. Many of these women believe it is unnecessary to marry the child’s father. As a result, the mother-child relationship begins before marriage — if marriage occurs at all — and is often the most permanent relationship in the household.

Additionally, men often marry women who are already mothers, meaning the new husband becomes an instant father with a steep learning curve. He must acquaint himself with family operations in order to determine what his role might be. When that role is relegated to bringing home the paycheck, the cultivation of the marriage receives lower priority.

Such is the current state of family evolution. We have “progressed” beyond the traditional intact family into what frequently becomes temporary, fragile arrangements.

**Private Property**

In the evolutionary mind-set, the concept of private property is also outdated. Property ownership ushers inequality into the evolution of the race, and this unequal distribution of society’s resources lies at the heart of societal injustice. Evolutionists then conclude that the accumulation of wealth and power leads to wars, oppression, and the exploitation of millions of people. Ultimately, this kind of thinking ignores the depravity of the human heart and removes all responsibility from individuals.

Although social Darwinists believe societies will progress and improve over time, they take an interesting turn at this point and reverse their own theory. They argue that peaceful, unified relationships between people who respected the environment and bonded with nature characterized the pre-agricultural phase of human development.
But evidence suggests that some of these groups also practiced human sacrifice, cannibalism, slavery, and genocide, which contradicts this “noble savage” myth.

The biblical account, in contrast, reveals a highly developed system of technology early in history. Tubal-Cain produced useful instruments through insights drawn from metallurgy. In addition to following God’s instructions for building the ark, Noah utilized the construction and engineering expertise of his day to assemble a seaworthy vessel capable of withstanding a worldwide flood. Both violence and a high degree of technological development characterized the pre-Flood world of Genesis. Clearly, society and human nature remains unchanged since the Fall, and “setbacks” like private property are far from the problem.

Cultural Anthropology
In a Darwinian world, everything is in a state of flux, with the slowness of change necessitating a timeline of millions of years. This rules out an unchanging God and calls into question any concept of moral absolutes. The Ten Commandments, for instance, are denied the status of a universal moral code that applies to all human societies.

Evolutionists claim human society has progressed beyond the need for the arbitrary, authoritarian codes of behavior that characterized superstitious religious societies of the past. But the problem with this perspective is that an absolute standard of fairness will always accompany attempts to correct the inequities of society and the oppression of powerless victims. This standard of human rights applies to all people groups. The conflict seems obvious, but a Darwinian perspective can tolerate logical inconsistencies in moral codes. It allows a person to hold others to ethical obligations without him or her being personally accountable.

Sociology and Religion
Sociology assumes all human experience and knowledge is socially produced, including religion. For instance, religion is explained in terms of cultural influences — beliefs and practices passed from one generation to the next by way of oral tradition.

In a Darwinian world, where “time plus chance” is preeminent, concepts of reality and truth are socially constructed. Each person’s religious “realities” are subjectively generated and may prove to be personally beneficial. With that in mind, it is acceptable if one’s spiritual experience provides peace of mind and release from fear. But it is unacceptable if one promotes his or her religion as obligatory for others. In a world where all truth claims are culturally relative, no religious “truth” can exist beyond human experience. The typical
sociological approach to religion precludes the possibility of a God who exists outside the human experience.

**Sola Scriptura**

Aside from God’s revelation of Himself in Scripture, all other religions are products of human imagination. As a result, we should not approach God like those who practice false religions. Nor should we try to control and manipulate God for our own purposes. We should be more concerned about violating the objective law of God than about securing social acceptance. And spiritual experiences should never trump the will of God as revealed in the Bible.

Darwinian assumptions about the family, private property, culture, society, and religion saturate our world. They are absorbed as readily and as unconsciously as the air we breathe. Only by weaving a commitment to the sole sufficiency of Scripture into the fabric of our thinking will we be equipped to deconstruct the “speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God” (2 Cor. 10:5). The Bible alone distinguishes the true Christian faith from all the other religions and ideologies of our culture.

Dr. Robert Parr serves as professor of sociology at Cedarville University. He holds a B.R.E. from Grand Rapids Baptist College, an M.R.E. from Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, an M.A. from Michigan State University, and an M.S.W. and Ph.D. from The Ohio State University. He has taught at Cedarville since 1980.

---
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Although the body’s cells may go tragically awry, they tell the story of Creation, the Fall, and future redemption.

Cancer. Few of us have not been touched by its horror. It strikes without mercy, prematurely separating us from loved ones and leaving a swath of pain and grief behind. We fight back as best we can, but our arsenal of toxins and radiation are often vain attempts that leave us wondering if the cure is worse than the disease.

As a cell biologist, I am inundated with information about cancer. Discoveries of cellular pathways impact our understanding of the disease, and every new finding expands our knowledge of how cells should behave. Cancer offers an excellent example of what happens when a created system ceases to function in accordance with its good design. As a Christian who believes the literal Genesis account, I am overwhelmed with the themes of Creation and the Fall as I learn more about cancer. In it I see a living parable.

**The Perfection of God’s Design**

Scripture tells us God’s original creation was very good and He was pleased with it. And despite the effects of the curse on the world, created things continue to bring pleasure to their Creator. Psalmists and poets have long extolled the manifold splendors of the universe. However, few have mentioned the inherent beauty and order God put into each cell. Undoubtedly, entire books could be written about the artistry and design evident there, but let’s take a closer look at the specific cellular mechanisms that impact cancer.

Designed with many constraints upon it, the cell is told when to grow, divide, rest, or die. A normal cell, as part of a healthy tissue, adheres only to other cells of its own tissue type. The cells communicate with each other so the organ or tissue functions as a whole.

In a healthy cell, division is controlled by a whole set of checkpoints. When signaled to divide, the cell will check to determine whether it has adequate nutritional resources. It examines genetic information (DNA) for errors, which are repaired if possible. If not, the cell will program its own death so it won’t be a threat to the organism. Otherwise, the cell grows to an appropriate size. Also, during the process of nuclear division, chromosomal segregation is checked for integrity.

As you can see, our wise Creator put many good systems in place in order for
Man receiving electron radiation therapy for skin cancer. Although treatments like this remind us of our need for redemption, God uses them to temporarily reduce the effects of the Fall.
organisms to function properly. Cells that behave according to their design work in harmony with one another, communicate with one another, and benefit the organism. The creation is, indeed, very good! Now, let’s contrast this good design with what we see in a cancer cell.

The Destruction of Sin

In studying the story of the curse God placed on mankind after the Fall, we read of thorns and thistles, pain in childbirth, and ultimately death. If a cell biologist had been God’s instrument for transcribing Genesis, the account would have undoubtedly included cellular mutations. These mistakes in the cell’s DNA result in all kinds of problems:

- Destruction of cellular communication,
- Division of cells without a signal to do so,
- Cell division when nutritional or size requirements have not been met, and
- Disabling of the programmed cell death pathway, which allows threatening cells to live.

If you examine mutations, you find they are almost universally harmful to an organism. But neo-Darwinism relies on mutations — combined with the force of natural selection acting on these mutations — to produce all of the species we see today from a single common ancestor. In this theory, these combined forces produce organisms of increasing complexity. Contrast this with what we see in cancer, where mutations lead to the loss of normal, good pathways and ultimately harm the organism.

Cancer cells divide in defiance of normal constraints. They no longer respond to growth signals or obey cellular checkpoints and are often characterized by DNA abnormalities, small size, and unusual morphology. They do not undergo programmed cell death, nor do they communicate well with the cells around them. When they break off from their tissue of origin, they adhere to other tissue types they normally would not associate with, allowing the cells to metastasize.

All of these examples depict good creation corrupted by mutations. If we take a look at immune involvement, we see this even more clearly. Our immune systems were designed to tolerate our own cells, protect us from things that are not “self,” and fight against cells, proteins, and pathogens from outside sources. Immune hormones, produced and secreted into the bloodstream, tell the immune cells what to do and when to do it. Custom-designed responses for viruses, bacteria, and parasites are off-switches that keep our immune systems from overreacting. It is a beautifully integrated system of communication — a good creation.
Unfortunately, although our immune systems are constantly on the watch for invaders, they often fail to detect cancer. Why? Because cancer cells are a part of you — your own cells that have betrayed their normal function and become parasitic. They sap the resources of the organs, crowd out normal cells, and cause dysfunction, pain, and even death, if nothing stops their progress. But in many cases, your immune system will mount little to no response against these renegades because their protein tags still mark them as “self.” The immune system simply wasn’t designed to fight against itself. These corrupted cells are, for the most part, outside its surveillance.

The Promise of Redemption
So we have corrupted, traitorous cells and a lack of immune response to the threat. Is there any hope here?

The Genesis account does not simply describe Creation and the Fall. It also foretells redemption. As Paul told the church at Rome, creation groans as it waits for redemption. Certainly we feel the groaning as we deal with cancer, and we wait for death, the last enemy, to finally be defeated.

Yet we do not simply wring our hands and wait. As we exercise biblical stewardship over creation, we learn more about the workings of normal cells and the chaos wrought by mutations. We are able to design more effective treatments that eradicate cancer with fewer side effects. We devise improved tests for early detection, making a better prognosis possible. We correlate disease with lifestyle choices and encourage people to exercise wise stewardship of their bodies. In the not-too-distant future, we may even be able to design custom therapies based on the genetics of the individual tumor.

Cancer will likely be with us as long as the fallen creation endures. But don’t be discouraged! Our wise Creator has promised never to leave or forsake us. And in the new heaven and earth that the apostle Peter exhorts us to look forward to, cancer — like all of the corruption resulting from the Fall — will no longer have the power to harm or frighten us.

Dr. Heather Kuruvilla earned her bachelor’s degree from Houghton College in 1992 and her Ph.D. from The State University of New York at Buffalo in 1997. She has taught at Cedarville University since 1997, currently serving as professor of biology.

In recent days, the term “universal health care” has incited both fear and relief, conviction and confusion. Consequently, we’ve been forced to think broadly about how health care intersects government, economics, sociology, and more. Join us in the next issue of TORCH (spring–summer) as we tackle key concerns related to health care. As always, we’ll examine multiple perspectives, present accurate and timely information, and look to God’s Word as our source of truth and compass for living.
A tour of the Creation Museum in Petersburg, Kentucky, ends with the movie *The Last Adam*, a short film portraying how Jesus, the last Adam, rectifies the sin problem of the first Adam. The film communicates a message too often left out of the creation-evolution debate: it’s all about Jesus.

I’m not suggesting, of course, that every creationist argument should start with the story of the crucifixion. But if we do not begin with the presupposition that Jesus is the reason behind everything connected to creation science, then we’ve missed the point of Genesis 1–2.

The Gospel hinges on Creation, as the books of John and Matthew reveal in their opening chapters. John introduces Jesus by saying, “In the beginning was the Word.” Similarly, Matthew begins with a genealogy that ties the original Creation account to Jesus. These writers, as well as the other New Testament authors, want us to see that Christ is the goal of history, which includes Creation. The first Adam was made in the image of God, an image ultimately perfected in the last Adam, Who is the image of the Father. Jesus declared Himself to be the One in Whom we find the Sabbath rest of God, fulfilling the purpose of the original Sabbath.

The Creation story is ultimately a story about Jesus Christ, since one cannot read Genesis 1–2 without considering His life, death, and resurrection. He created the world, and creation finds its meaning and purpose in Him. The last Adam doesn’t simply restore the old creation: He brings us a new world, foreshadowed in the first Creation account.

And that’s why a Creation Museum tour ends with the story of Jesus. As Ken Ham, founder of Answers in Genesis, told Impact News, *The Last Adam* is “the most important” part of the museum because Jesus isn’t “only our Creator, as Colossians 1 teaches, but most importantly our Savior.” The creationist apologetic is inseparable from the One about Whom the Creation story was given in the first place.

This editorial is presented by CDR Radio Network, The Path. Chad Bresson serves as Impact News director and is the host for the Impact News Front Page program. A Cedarville University graduate, he is a self-proclaimed news junkie and has been at the network since 1992. Bresson and his Front Page program can be heard online at www.thepath.fm.

To hear the complete interview with Ken Ham, visit www.thepath.fm/news.
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**Did You Know?**

The Centennial Library has a library-career advancement program for students, including career orientations, on-campus library internships, and scholarships for graduate study in library science.
Engineering Success

Cedarville proves once again that even small universities can make big impressions. Over the past several months, students from the Elmer W. Engstrom Department of Engineering and Computer Science have seen success at several competitions.

At the Solar Splash Competition in Arkansas, Cedarville out-maneuvered 14 other schools and sailed away with its fifth world championship and this year’s Outstanding Drive Train Design Award. The goal of the competition is for student engineers to create the fastest, most maneuverable, and most energy-efficient solar boat. Fifteen schools from three countries competed, including Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Arkansas, and the University of Southampton (UK). The win positioned Cedarville as the record-holder for the most world championships.

Designed for fuel efficiency, the University’s one-man Supermileage cars competed in two international events. At the Shell Eco-Marathon in California, Cedarville achieved its best-ever performance of 1,257.5 mpg, earning fifth place among 34 teams and beating out schools like UCLA, California State, and the Rochester Institute of Technology.

In June, the cars competed in Michigan, where Gold Lightning took fourth place with 1,077 mpg and Slipstream took seventh with 1,038 mpg.

In April, five female engineering students earned second place in the Games 4 Girls Competition in Champaign, Illinois. Teams designed computer games geared toward and judged by middle school and high school girls. Other participating schools included Cornell University, the University of Southern California, and the University of Virginia.

With tougher requirements, the 2009 Formula SAE competition in Michigan proved taxing, but Cedarville’s team faced the challenges with ingenuity and teamwork. For this competition, students design race cars that are evaluated for production potential and then tested in four events for acceleration, turning capability, handling, endurance, and fuel economy. Competing against schools like Purdue University, Cornell University, Universidad Simón Bolívar (Venezuela), and Graz University of Technology (Austria), Cedarville placed 45th out of 119 schools and was one of only 33 teams to finish all the events.

www.cedarville.edu/engineering
Dr. Dan Estes was recently appointed as dean of Cedarville’s newly formed school of biblical and theological studies. Estes has taught at the University since 1984 and holds the rank of distinguished professor of Bible.

Estes earned his B.A. in preseminary Bible and English from Cedarville in 1974, his Th.M. in Old Testament exegesis from Dallas Theological Seminary in 1978, and his Ph.D. in biblical exegesis from the University of Cambridge in 1988.

Dr. D.A. Carson, a faculty member at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and well-known author and biblical scholar, has been one of Estes’ mentors and believes he brings the necessary traits for this position. “Dan has displayed a remarkable combination of administrative sense and level-headed fidelity to Christ and His Word,” said Carson. “A post like this calls for both theological vision and organizational skill; only rarely do both strengths combine in one person as they do in Dan.”

This appointment represents a strategic step in launching the school of biblical and theological studies. The University’s Bible program previously fell under the department of biblical education. By repositioning the program as its own academic school, Cedarville once again affirms the integral role of biblical training to University curricula.

www.cedarville.edu/bible

Hewlett-Packard Highlights CU Technology

Establishing technological prowess isn’t an easy task. But Cedarville University certainly deserves that reputation, having been chosen by a technology powerhouse as a case study for computer integration in higher education.

When recently upgrading the University-provided PCs in residence hall rooms, Cedarville chose the Hewlett-Packard Compaq dc5800. This desktop PC was selected because, according to Dr. Dave Rotman, associate vice president for technology, “They’re quiet, well-built, and designed for business use. They’re not a consumer-grade product, so they stand up to more abuse than a lot of other PCs.”

As a result, Hewlett-Packard selected Cedarville for a case study, setting the University apart as a leader in higher education technology and showing the success of the partnership between Cedarville and the company. Some of Cedarville’s technology standards that Hewlett-Packard highlighted include the commitment to updating computers on a three-year cycle and providing students with more than 150 software programs at no extra charge.

Next, Cedarville will study mobile devices to see how they might be standardized, as well as examine the mini-notebook market. But whatever steps are taken in the future, the goal of being a technological leader will remain a priority.

www.cedarville.edu/compserv
## Cedarville Connection

### Upcoming Events
Here’s a sampling of what’s happening at Cedarville over the next few months. Visit www.cedarville.edu/events for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5–7 Missions Conference</td>
<td>4–6 Winter Play:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8–9 Ohio Worship Leaders Conference</td>
<td>Much Ado About Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22–23 High School Leadership Conference</td>
<td>Nursing Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28–30 Winter Play:</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Much Ado About Nothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 Business Day</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 Science and Math Day</td>
<td>Engineering and Computer Science Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13 Grandparents Day</td>
<td>18–20 Music Showcase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–14</td>
<td></td>
<td>8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>East to West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8 East to West</td>
<td>Dr. Bill Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Dr. Carl Ruby</td>
<td>Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15 HeartSong and OneVoice</td>
<td>Dr. Bill Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gospel Choir</td>
<td>South Charleston, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanon, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>20 The Master’s Puppets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carrollton, Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>East to West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East to West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 HeartSong</td>
<td>Dr. Bill Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temperance, Michigan</td>
<td>South Charleston, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 The Master’s Puppets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 OneVoice Gospel Choir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reynoldsburg, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CU on the Road
Consider attending the following Cedarville events in your area. Visit www.cedarville.edu/reps for other itineraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dr. Carl Ruby</td>
<td>East to West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jackson, Michigan</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HeartSong</td>
<td>HeartSong and OneVoice Gospel Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette, Indiana</td>
<td>Lebanon, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lifeline Players</td>
<td>The Master’s Puppets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saint Johns, Michigan</td>
<td>Carrollton, Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>East to West</td>
<td>8 East to West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>Columbus, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1 HeartSong</td>
<td>1 HeartSong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temperance, Michigan</td>
<td>Temperance, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Master’s Puppets</td>
<td>The Master’s Puppets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield, Ohio</td>
<td>Springfield, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OneVoice Gospel Choir</td>
<td>OneVoice Gospel Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reynoldsburg, Ohio</td>
<td>Reynoldsburg, Ohio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East to West is a new University ministry touring team that combines drama and music to form an exciting multimedia event designed specifically for upper-elementary and middle school students.
Get a head start and save on your college expenses! At just $150 per credit hour, Cedarville Academy courses are an amazing value and offer a biblical perspective, challenging academics, and the latest online learning technologies.

Apply now.

1-800-CEDARVILLE
www.CedarvilleAcademy.com
It’s a rare university that can offer you a world-class educational experience within a vibrant, Christ-centered learning community, but Cedarville is just such a place.

Step onto our campus, and join 3,000 students in a daily celebration of faith. Step up to the challenges of top-ranked academic programs, and enjoy unique learning experiences that can take you around the world. Step into the future as a Cedarville graduate, and you’ll be sought after by the best businesses and graduate schools.

Discover an educational experience that will equip you for a lifetime of leadership, service, and success. Find out for yourself what makes Cedarville so unique.

www.SoCedarville.com