

Jonathan G Koehn

English 2010

Professor E. Faatz

April 24, 2002

Biblical Creationism a Possibility That Teaches

Thesis: Creationism from the Bible perspective needs to be taught in public schools.

I. Origins of the human race.

A. The theory of evolution is taught as a fact.

B. Biblical origins of life should also be taught.

II. The Bible was once taught, but now it is restricted.

A. The theory of evolution was found illegal to teach.

B. Now the Bible is illegal to teach.

C. The theory of evolution is taught now, because it is supposedly scientific.

D. Restriction of creationism still continues.

III. Our countries fairness, where is it?

A. Evolution is also faith based.

B. The Bible might be right.

C. A college is teach creationism right along side evolution.

IV. Is the theory of evolution even a factual science, or is it even science?

A. The chance of evolution starting is virtually zero.

B. The fossil record of the theory of evolution.

C. The process of dating fossils is not that accurate at all.

D. The moon's surface dust.

V. The creationism should be brought back into the public schools.

A. Does the Bible violate the constitution?

B. The Bible fact or fiction?

C. Children need to learn to think about science from a Biblical viewpoint.

VI. The sides are on level ground.

VII. What educated society do people want?

A. Evolution teaches that domination is a must.

B. The Bible teaches peace.

C. A world conference brings up understanding.

VIII. Diversity strengthens, and helps children to grow.

A. Children are the losers when they can't make educated choices.

B. The future should teach diversity.

IX. Public schools, bring back parent input!

X. The Bible expresses the situation.

XI. Children leaders of tomorrow.

Jonathan G. Koehn

English 2010

Professor E. Faatz

April 24, 2002

Biblical Creationism a Possibility That Teaches

Do you know what is currently being taught in the public, school, science class?

Almost certainly, in most public school science classes here in America the children will be taught the "theory of evolution." No, let's back up the children are being taught the theory of evolution as a fact. Yes, the theory as a fact this is not a good teaching principal. A theory is a possibility, a thoughtful assumption it is not a fact. The theory of evolution as defined by Charles Robert Darwin, the founder of the theory of evolution, is the "process of natural selection". He theorizes that this is the origins of life on earth.

Another evolutionist Herbert Spencer describes that natural selection is "survival of the fittest" (*Can a Darwinian?*, 22). *Evolutionist*: one who believes in the "theory of evolution".

Children should also be learning, as a possibility, what is written in the very old, historical Greek and Hebrew text. Biblical origins on life from this text has been translated into our very own English language, into a part of the Bible, namely the book of Genesis. This is referred to as creationism. Charles C. Ryrie, a retired professor of Dallas College, but still holds a honorary professor title there. He is also a theology professor at Philadelphia College. He writes that this historical account was recorded by Moses, through God's guidance, and his skills as a scholar of Pharaoh's court.

Moses recorded through God's guidance the Biblical, historical, account of how

Adam and Eve were created by God. This was taught with such power, earlier in our nations history, as the theory of evolution is currently taught today. This fact was shown in "Scope's Monkey Trial" of 1925, where and when evolution was proven to violate the Butler Act of Tennessee. At that time the Bible was taught. Michael Ruse a professor of philosophy at Florida State University writes that in 1980 the state of Arkansas and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) grew agitated at Bill Clinton. Who was at the time governor of Arkansas, who passed a bill that legalized creationism in public schools. Ruse points out that Arkansas was particularly agitated, because they wanted to land a particular "[. . .] electronics engineer, graduate of MIT" to come live in Arkansas, but they wanted his children to be taught scientifically, so that he would decide to come to their state (6). Then in Arkansas, creationism was made illegal, greatly because of the ACLU and the state of Arkansas. The same has occurred throughout the rest of the United States of America, gradually the Bible has been thrown out in favor of the theory of evolution.

Now the theory of evolution is taught, because it is supposedly scientific, and if someone teaches creationism. They will get into a legal situation perhaps somewhat similar to Scope's Monkey Trial.

An example of creationism being severely restricted is brought up by Majorie Coeyman. She points out that in a biology class incident in the state of Minnesota, year 1999, that the teacher Rodney LeVake questioned evolution. Then going a step further he brought in the "intelligent design theory," that is based on a designer, very similar to creationism. Because of the school board this teacher was no longer teaching biology the following year. What has happened to the common ground, and the fairness that this great country was founded on? The Bible should be taught in the science class just as

much or more so than the theory of evolution because evolutionism is also faith based. Also because of the possibility that the Bible may be right, and also the Bible provides great moral value.

A pair of writers for The Times newspaper, John O'Leary and Russell Jenkins, bring forth a startling fact, that in the state of Ohio a school is teaching creationism right along side evolution, but still even there evolution must be taught as a fact. Guess what this school Emmanuel College in Gateshead, Ohio, was one of the "best schools inspected" in the year 2001. They point out that even after re-inspection the school was allowed to keep creationism as an "alternative" to evolution. Now if only the public schools would bring creationism back to the text-books.

Is the Theory of Evolution even a factual science?

First off let's start with the chance of evolution ever happening. What seems to be the most misunderstood about evolution is the first cell, and how very complex its chance of ever happening would have been.

Here is the complexity as explained by retired college professor Walter L. Bradley, who is an educated person in polymers, and thermodynamics, and also the author of *The Mystery of Life's Origins (The Case for Faith)*. He describes that the chance of a single cell forming, starts with the amino acids of which there are eighty kinds, but only twenty of these are in "living organisms" (98). He explains that these must be combined in the correct order to make a single protein molecule.

Furthermore, he tells us that there are an equal amount of "amino acids that are right and left handed," and only the left ones are found in "living matter" (99). He informs us that there are possibly one hundred amino acids, that must be used to form one protein molecule. From there, a cell would need possibly two hundred protein

Surely the fossils found in the various stratas would prove the theory of evolution correct? There are now, approximately one fourth of a million fossils in the fossil record. Even with this great amount of fossils, transition links are few, and far, between, but the punctuated theory seems to address the transition link issue. Remember this punctuated theory when we get into the natural selection process, and mutations. Mell Gabler and his wife were on the education text committee in 1995 for the state of Texas. He tells us that there should be a progression of fossils going backwards toward the beginning of origins according to the theory of evolution (*Creationist Controversy*). They simply don't exist the fossils just stop abruptly as a person travels backwards in the so called evolution history. Darwin figured that the fossil record would one day prove the theory of evolution right. He has been wrong all along. This sure makes a person wonder what else, Darwin has theorized wrong in the theory of evolution.

The evolutionist will still want more. Why? because to put it simply they still believe in evolution, grasping to it like a small boat trying to land on a grain of sand in the ocean of chance.

What about the dating of the fossil record, and the stratas that contain the fossils?

Radio-carbon dating is the process of dating the fossil record. Defined, it is a process through which carbon is absorbed throughout the life of a living organism. Then the carbon is dispelled through radiation, throughout time, according to Michael Ruse, and "Dating Methods." Evolutionist measure the remaining carbon to attain their dating.

How ever John Yaukey, a writer for the Salt Lake Tribune, writes that carbon dating's usefulness is gone when it comes to non-organics like "fossilized remains" and rocks" (n.p.). Kathy Wollard writes that how do the evolutionist know for sure the date of

carbon dating for carbon-14 has been increasing in the atmosphere over time. She writes that the evolutionist use tree rings to help make sure the dating is accurate, but is there really 40,000 year old trees? For that matter how about 20,000 year old trees. The evolutionist could be dating a fossil to be 3,000 years old. When it is actually only 100 years old, because the carbon from the surrounding rock affected the testing.

Constance Holden writes that carbon dating is useless beyond 40,000 years.

Evolutionist look to another dating method for older objects, known as potassium-argon dating.

Potassium-argon dating is the method of dating fossils through the age of the strata, in which the fossils are contained. Potassium-argon is extracted from the strata around the fossil, presupposing the fossil to be buried in the proper layer. Evolutionist use potassium-argon to date fossils that radio-carbon dating cannot date. Because radio-carbon dating accuracy decreases in supposedly older fossils ("Dating Methods").

However both radio-carbon and potassium-argon dating are affected by pressure, such as the great flood from the Bible (*Creationist Controversy*) would produce great amount of pressure upon fossils, and strata. Ryrie writes that a volcano was tested using the potassium-argon method, and this volcano was known to be only thousands of years old, but when it was tested through this method. It tested out to be between one hundred thousand and forty million years old. He writes that this is because the sea pressure, from around where they got the sample, affected the dating. Richard Esser, M. Heizler, et al. write that Mount Erebus lava was tested and the age indicated, was suspicious. This was because of excess potassium-argon, according to C. M. Merrihue and G. Turner's writings of 1966 ("Argon Dating"). They write that the lave was tested again with a better method, some of the tests performed overall had

access potassium-argon, and some were considered acceptable. How do they know for sure that the acceptable tests are right? This sounds like a great deal of guessing. The testing of the fossil records age is still in need of great work and may never be right. It seems that many evolutionist are jumping to conclusions. This is also happening with the Bible today. Its value is not being considered correctly.

Furthermore Mell Gabler tells us that we should look at the moon's surface. The dust on the surface is only three fourths of an inch deep, but according to the theory of evolution, it should have collected way more dust over the eons from various meteorites (*Creationist Controversy*).

Next we will move into the area of natural selection, and mutations.

Mellisa Burdick Harmon, a writer, writes that Darwin describes natural selection as the process through which nature weeds out the creatures not fit to survive. As Spencer said the theory of evolution is "survival of the fittest". Natural selection works through the process of mutations. The stepping stones of fossils are based upon natural selection. Some say that natural selection is performed through a punctuated process.

However when mutations have been performed in experiments, they have been proven to be harmful, and with only a few mutations occurring overall (Ryrie). Belinski writes that a bird in one place eats the snails. While a bird, in another place, is surrounded by many snails, and it starves to death. If the theory of evolution was true then the second bird would have adapted through natural selection to eat the snails.

Remember the punctuated theory? It is a theory of illogic, for it would require a similar chance to what that theory of evolution had to undergo to even start. Because the mutations would have to fall in just the right way. A tongue made by chance before the mouth situation would occur more often than not, thus it is an illogical theory.

Furthermore a bad mutation, and a whole species could crumble. This is what should happen to the theory of evolution, its support should crumble.

On the other hand the Bible should be brought back as a teaching text in public schools.

Critics will call upon the ruling that the Bible violates the constitution, according to the supreme court of 1988. Overtime different states have made the Bible illegal based greatly upon the Supreme Courts ruling, for many judges don't wish to go against the Supreme Court.

Although as M. Staton Evans, "the director of the National Journalism Center in Washington, D.C." (128), writes that many states, even after the constitution was written still had state churches. Evans also informs us that the day right after the constitution was written, that congress had George Washington declare " a national day of prayer and thanksgiving " (134). Evans gets right to the core of the issue, the justices of today are using picked information to suit their point. He writes they are weighing, the establishment of religion in the constitution, against what James Madison and Thomas Jefferson said. Even though Thomas Jefferson wasn't a framer of the constitution!

Why was the Bible even thrown out of education in Arkansas? Because of the political agenda, and ACLU's agenda to raise themselves up (Ruse).

Krishtalka quips that the Bible is not a factual science, it's a book of myths, legends (*Creationist Controversy*).

Well for starters, teach the Bible more along the lines of a possibility. Krishtalka calls it a myth, but it has been proven that Jesus existed, and that Noah's flood happened. Here is what the *Zondervan's Bible Dictionary* has about Noah's flood.

One of the striking archeological discovering of the last century was that

of the Babylonian tablets giving the account of a great flood. The text of these tablets appears to date back to the early second millennium B.C.

And is paralleled by fragments even earlier. (59)

Furthermore they write that "according to Johannes Reihm, there are a total of 268 [' [. . .] records, traditions, and legends of a great flood.'] " (*Zondervan's Bible Dictionary*). The Bible is not a bunch of myths. The Bible is a great deal more factual than many people, or all people let on, or understand. Biblical creationism should be taught as a possibility, just as Norma Gabler tells us that the theory of evolution should be taught as a possibility, not a fact.

John Philip, a professor at Berkley College in California, tells us that Isaac Newton worked on science from a Biblical perspective. This is how children should be taught to view science again.

The theory of evolution and the creationism are now on level ground, no advantage to either side. Both are a belief, and a belief system. Now to tip the field a bit for the skeptic.

The theory of evolution teaches what Spencer writes as the description of the theory of evolution, "survival of the fittest" (22), in other words the strongest, most intelligent man will win. This sounds a great deal like an infamous dictator known as Hitler. He wanted to create a super human race. So he began to wipe out the Jews. Because he thought them a unfit blemish. There is a great possibility that Hitler learned this, concept from evolution (Ryrie).

On the other hand the Bible teaches that a person should love their neighbor, as their own person, treat the elderly with respect, and help the weak (Bible). The Bible teaches the values America was founded upon. The Bible also helps a person to look

beyond oneself, it helps a person to grow away from self-being self-centered. Which educated society will the people want to live in?

Edd Doerr writes about November 23-25 in 2001 when the " [. . .] United Nations Internal Consultive Conference on School Education in Relation of Freedom of Religion and Belief, Tolerance, and Nondiscrimination " was in session (42). He writes that the conference promoted, that education should fortify and "uphold religion, or belief" to help "peace and understanding" in people (42).

Education is strengthened, minds are expanded, through the discussion of possibilities of life. Education is strengthened, and minds are expanded when children are no longer repressed by strictly the evolutionary belief system. Because children may want, and they do need more. Here is what Roger DeHart, a biology teacher in Seattle, Washington, has to say on the matter, "I allowed students to write either a position paper on evolution or one on intelligent design [basically creationism], giving five best evidences." "Or they could choose to have a debate. Now they can't do either. The students are the losers here. Where is freedom of speech when they're censoring someone? Is that what they want to teach?" ("Whose 'Science'?", n.p.).

A good philosophy in the future would be to treat all life origins, as a possibility. Many people will still say that these are religions, and many people will still not want religious possibilities at all.

Kristin E. Homles, a writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer, points out that teens do enjoy religion. She writes that a study released by the University of Pennsylvania shows that the main percentage of over two thousand youth in this study voiced, that God plays a main role throughout "their life" (n.p.). Not only do many want God's word, but they enjoy being in activities that are done in support of God. Children should be taught

to make educated choices on their beliefs and on the origins of life. Don't force feed them.

The parents deserve far more, than being pushed aside. Because the school system is being thought of as a political baby sitter by many people. The Public Schools should give the parents a choice, allow and encourage the parents to participate more in education. Whether it be what children learn on the origins of life, or what they learn in the history class.

When this happens, our nation's public schools will be once again be listening to the public through whom it is really supported.

This portion of the Hebrew text (Bible) expresses the whole situation far better than I could ever hope to.

Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them [people]; for God hath shewed it unto them.

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:

Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,

And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. (Romans 1:19-23)

Please don't let the public school system cripple children's learning. Because a

person continues learning through out life. The public school needs to instill that children will always need to learn lest they fall into the trap of "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Romans 1:22). The public schools system needs to strengthen, and expand the minds of our nation's children through various possibilities. So that they the leaders of our nation, for tomorrow, will be prepared.

Works Cited

- Berlinski, David. "The Deniable Darwin." *Commentary* 101:6 (June 1996): 19. Online EBSCO. 2 April 2002.
- Coeyman, Majorie. "Evolution Gets Dismissed From Some Classes." *Christian Science Monitor* (16 Aug. 1999): n. pag. Online SIRS. 17 April 2002.
- "Dating Methods." *Monkeyshines on America* (2000): 9. Online EBSCO. 2 April 2002.
- Doerr, Edd. "A Groundbreaking Declaration." *Humanist* 62:2 (March/April 2002): 42. Online EBSCO. 21 March 2002.
- Esser, Richard, M. Heizler, et al. "Argon-40/Argon-39 Dating of Mount Erebus, Ross Island, Antarctica." *Antarctic Journal of United States* 29:5 (1994): 14. Online EBSCO. 2 April 2002.
- Evans, M. Stanton. "The Constitution's Framers Did Not Intend Strict Separation of Church and State." *Civil Liberties: Opposing Viewpoints*. Ed. Tamara L. Roleff. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 1999. 128-137.
- Harmon, Mellisa Burdick. "Evolution's Reluctant Prophet: Charles Darwin." *Biography* 4:8 (August 2000): 96. Online EBSCO. 18 March 2002.
- Holden, Constance. "Humanity's Baby Steps." *Science* 282:5394 (27 Nov. 1998): 3/8. Online EBSCO. 11 April 2002.
- Holmes, Kristin E. "Religion Matters to U.S. Teens, Study Finds." *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. (27 February 2002): n. pag. Online EBSCO. 3 March 2002.
- In the Beginning the Creationist Controversy*. Randall Balmer. Prod. KUED. WTTW, Chicago. 5 June 1995.
- O'Leary, John and Russell Jenkins. "Academic Criticizes Creationist School." *The*

Times (15 March 2002): 7. Online. EBSCO. 20 March 2002

Koehn 13

Ruse, Michael. *Can A Darwinian be a Christian?* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Ryrie, Charles C. *Basic Theology*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1999.

Savoye, Craig. "Whose 'Science'?" *Christian Science Monitor* (8 Feb. 1999): n. pag. Online SIRS. 17 April 2002.

Scope's Trial. 1925. University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law. 2002 <www.law.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/scopes/day8.htm>.

Strobel, Lee. *The Case for Faith*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000.

Tenney, Merrill C. ed. *Zondervan's Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Colorado Springs, Colorado: Alive Communications, Inc., 1967.

Thompson Chain Reference Study Bible KJV (King James Version). Indianapolis, Indiana: B. B. Kirkbride Bible Company, Incorporated, November 2000

Wollard, Kathy. "Counting Age By a Carbon Clock." *Newsday* (7 July 1998): C2. Online SIRS. 17 April 2002.

Yaukey, John. "The Evolution of the Theory." 5 Sept. 1999. *Salt Lake Tribune*. 5 Sept. 1999.

<www.tribaccess.com/lpBin21/lpext.dll/TribAccess/1999/Sep/2dp?f=templates&fn=document-frame.htm&q=%22carbon%20dating%22&x=Simple&2.0#LPHit1>.