

THE IMPACT OF EVOLUTION ON AMERICAN EDUCATION

See us very briefly review

First, ~~what is~~ the Theory of Evolution as outlined by Charles Darwin in his famous book, The Origin of Species, published in 1859? *is hypothesis is*
Darwin ~~claims~~ that the thousands of different species of animals, insects and flowers that exist on earth were not the works of a Divine Creator who made each specie in its present immutable form, as described in Genesis, but are the products of a very long natural process of development from simpler organic forms to more complex organic forms.

Thus, *according* to Darwin, ~~the different species were mutable, that is,~~ *continue to change* ~~changeable~~ through a process of natural selection in which nature's harsh conditions permitted ~~ed~~ only the fittest to survive in more adaptable forms.

These views, of course, had *+ still have* ~~considerable~~ *moral + religious* ~~theological~~ implications. Ronald Clark, in his biography of Darwin, writes (p. 123):

There were two separate parts to the theory that, while offensive to the religious establishment in themselves, acquired their real danger--like the two halves of a nuclear weapon--when they were brought together. One was that species had not been created by God but had evolved over the years; the other was that evolution had not been directed by God but had been governed by the apparently fortuitous facts of natural selection. While Darwin was proud of his theory of natural selection, his most important single contribution to the evolutionary argument, he saw as one of its main virtues the fact that it provided a counterblow to the idea of creation.

Darwin also believed that all life originated from a single source -- a kind of primeval slime in which ~~the first living~~ the first living organisms formed spontaneously out of non-living matter through a random process. These organisms are supposed to have branched off into different forms -- plants and animals.

Evolutionists have worked out all sorts of fascinating genealogical diagrams purporting to show the descent and relationship of one species to another. But what they don't tell the public is that all of the connections in these family trees are based on pure speculation and conjecture. ^{the British scientist,} Sir Fred Hoyle, writes (p. 87): "It has been through the device of presenting such diagrams with the presumed connections drawn in firm solid lines that the general scientific world has been bamboozled into believing that evolution has been proved. Nothing could be further from the truth. . . . The absence from the fossil record of the intermediate forms required by the usual evolutionary theory shows that if terrestrial life-forms have evolved from a common stock, the major branchings in the evolutionary tree must have developed very quickly. And the major branchings, if they occurred, were accompanied by genetic changes that were not small."

aspect

Probably the most controversial/aspect of Darwin's theory was that concerning man's place in the evolutionary scheme. In his book, The Descent of Man, published in 1870, Darwin contended that man and ape were evolutionary cousins with a common ancestor. When it came to the mind, to intelligence, the gap between man and the other animals, Darwin believed, was one of degree. (A)

But the fossil record, ~~which was supposed to reveal~~ ^{ing} the different stages of man's evolution from apelike creature to homosapiens, has not been found. Paleoanthropologists have hunted high and low for the missing

link ^{or links,} But not only have they not found ^{them} ~~it~~, they are now prett~~y~~ sure that such links do not exist. So instead of admitting defeat, they've proclaimed victory! According to David Pilbeam, a paleoanthropologist at Harvard: "We should no longer say that we are descended from apes. We are apes."

In other words, since there is no missing link, one must conclude that men and apes are actually one and the same species. If that is the case, then why call men apes? Why not call apes men? Well if we did that we would not be able to experiment on apes in the laboratory. We would have to extend to them our notion of human rights, which, incidentally, we do not extend to unborn human beings.

All of which means that some scientists are willing to accept a bigger lie if the smaller lie cannot be proven true. Apparently, to some scientists, any lie is preferable to accepting the possibility that a Creator had something to do with everything that exists.

① In his notebook he had written: "Man in his arrogance thinks himself a great work worthy the interposition of a deity. more humble & I think truer to consider him created from animals."

~~Which means that some scientists will accept a bigger lie if the smaller lie cannot be proven true. Apparently, to some scientists, any lie is preferable to accepting the possibility that a Creator exists.~~

The simple fact is that no proof whatever has been found indicating that one species evolves into another. The fossil record is simply a series of still pictures of species that existed at one time. They do not show how one species evolves into another. Transitional fossils have not been found. The fossil record shows new species appearing suddenly without any ancestors. What scientific investigation indicates is that the species are immutable and that when mutations occur they do not become new species. For example, evolutionists have been experimenting with fruit flies for years in the hope of demonstrating evolution at work. But the fruit flies have stubbornly refused to develop into anything but more fruit flies, despite all kinds of stimuli, ^{including radiation.} Some mutations have occurred, but nothing to suggest the beginnings of a new species.

In other words, lions have remained lions, monkeys have remained monkeys, and cats have remained cats. Different breeds and varieties may exist within a species, but nature places built-in genetic obstacles to ^{evolutionary change.} ~~mutability~~. And when you consider that our museums are now filled with over 100 million fossils of 250,000 different species and not a single series of transitional forms has been found among them, one begins to suspect that a gigantic hoax is being perpetrated by the scientists. In fact, gaps between major groups of organisms have been growing even wider and more undeniable. And so it is hard to understand how scientists can assert that evolution is fact and still call themselves scientists. Even Dr. Stephen Jay Gould, a passionate defender of evolution, has written: "The fossil record with its abrupt transitions offers no support

for gradual change."

Even Darwin wrote in The Origin of the Species:

The geological record is extremely imperfect and this fact will to a large extent explain why we do not find intermediate varieties, connecting together all the extinct and existing forms of life by the finest graduated steps. He who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my whole theory.

Apparently, today's proponents of evolution are unwilling to take Darwin's own advice. *after 120 years of investigation.*

As for the origin of life, there is no fossil evidence whatever to support the supposition that all life came from a common ancestor. In fact, not only the fossil evidence but the genetic evidence as well points toward creation as the source of life. The evidence for creation is now so palpable that some scientists, convinced that life could not have originated as Darwin~~was~~ believe^d, are now theorizing that life, in a variety of forms, was sent to earth from outer space by some form of intelligence.

As for the theory that life originated by accident in ^{some} sort of chemical soup, it was Louis Pasteur who proved that spontaneous generation ~~was~~ ^{is} impossible. He contended that every generation of every living creature had to be derived from a preceding generation. Life could not have started spontaneously from inorganic matter.

But evolutionists have kept on hoping that they could produce life from non-life. In the 1950s Stanley Miller performed a famous experiment that synthesized amino acids from hypothetical components of the earth's original atmosphere. The experiment did not produce life from non-life,

for the distance from amino acid to life is immense.

In other words, the spontaneous-generation-of-life-idea is just wishful thinking on the part of evolutionists. Dr. Fred Hoyle has calculated that such an accident had one chance in $10^{40,000}$ of occurring, making it beyond possibility. Now that we know of the enormous complexity of the DNA genetic code and that the information content of a simple cell has been estimated as around 10^{12} bits we know that random development of living matter is an impossibility. Consider these facts: there are 2,000 complex enzymes required for a living organism, but not a single one of them could have formed accidentally. The genes of the simplest single-celled organism contain more data than there are letters in all of the volumes of the world's largest library. As Fred Hoyle has put it:

The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in
[accidental]
this way is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping
through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials
therein.

Yet one irresponsible evolutionist has gone so far as to say that given enough time, monkeys typing on typewriters could eventually type out the complete works of Shakespeare. To this Hoyle has replied:

If there were monkeys typing on typewriters covering every square foot of the Earth's surface and each one typed at random at the fantastic rate of ten characters a second for thirty billion years, there wouldn't be the slightest reasonable chance that a single one would type out a single specific five-word sentence of 31 letters, spaces and punctuation. The actual probability is less than one chance in a trillion.

To sum it all up: the fossil record does not support the idea of gradual evolution; it supports creation. The evolutionists call it punctuated equilibrium; Hoyle calls it cosmic creationism. Nor does the fossil record support the idea of a common accidental source of all life. Evidences of common ancestry have not been found. In addition, Louis Pasteur debunked the idea of the spontaneous generation of living organic matter from non-living, inanimate matter.

So why is evolution taught as fact and creationism kept out of the schools? Because all of modern secular education is based on the assumption that evolution is fact.

Progressive, or humanist, education is evolutionary theory put into practice in the classroom. Progressive education grew out of the new experimental psychology based on the belief that man is an animal, a product of evolution with common ancestry with the ape, and could therefore be studied like any other animal. In Germany, where the new psychology originated, Darwin's main support came from Ernst Haeckel, who maintained that psychology was a branch of physiology and that mind could therefore be fitted into the scheme of evolution. Haeckel was also responsible for the idea that during embryological development higher organisms like man relived their evolutionary history -- that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny. That hypothesis has since been proven false, but the look-say method of teaching reading was promoted by the progressives on the ground that children should go through the different stages that the human race went through in learning to read: pictography, hieroglyphics, and finally the alphabet. The application of the dictum that "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" in reading instruction has led to a literacy disaster.

All of educational psychology today is based on evolutionary thinking. The stimulus-response techniques of teaching developed by Edward L. Thorndike, John B. Watson, Ivan Pavlov and B.F. Skinner are all derived from Darwin. John B. Watson, in Behaviorism (p. 141) writes:

Darwin and also Lange emphasized the stimulus arousing the emotional response and the reaction to it. Their objective descriptions of fear reactions are classical and thoroughly objective and behavioristic.

Thorndike, the father of behavior^{ist}~~ism~~ ~~and~~ educational psychology, wrote in 1911 in his book Animal Intelligence:

Nowhere more truly than in his mental capacities is man a part of nature. His instincts, that is, his inborn tendencies to feel and act in certain ways, show throughout marks of kinship with the lower animals, especially with our nearest relatives physically, the monkeys. His sense-powers show no new creation. His intellect we have seen to be a simple though extended variation from the general animal sort. This again is presaged by the similar variation in the case of the monkeys. Amongst the minds of animals that of man leads, not as a demigod from another planet, but as a king from the same race.

Thorndike summed up progressive teaching techniques in the following unforgettable sentence:

The best way with children may often be, in the pompous words of an animal trainer, 'to arrange everything in connection with the

trick so that the animal will be compelled by the laws of his own nature to perform it.'"

In addition, the moral philosophy of the progressives ^{is} ~~was secular~~ humanism, which is now the general moral philosophy of public education. The first tenets of humanism, as explained in the Humanist Manifesto published in 1933, are:

Tenet 1: Religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created.

Tenet 2: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as the result of a continuous process.

Thus, both the psychology and philosophy of public education are based on ^{the} ~~false~~ ^{Darwinian} doctrine of ~~evolution or Darwinism~~.

Dr. Fred Hoyle writes: "There are so many flaws in Darwinism that one can wonder why it swept so completely through the scientific world, and why it is still endemic today."

Of course, we know the reason why. The entire liberal-humanist scientific establishment espouses a world view that emphatically denies the existence of God. Modern morality is based on the notion that man is an animal, there is no sin, and that sexual repression is unhealthy and creates neuroses.

But liberated ~~modern~~ morality has ^{not} ~~produced~~ ^{mental health, but} ~~social anarchy, rampant~~ ^{On the contrary, It has produced} venereal disease, mental breakdowns, suicide, drug addiction, increased crime, etc. ^{The sedative} ~~Valium~~ ^{now} is ^{the} largest selling drug in America. Modern morality has produced unprecedented stress, depression, and emotional confusion, and the only answer the humanists have for all of this is drugs.

Since both the theory and practice of contemporary public education are for the most part based on the theories and teachings of the progressives, all of whom believed that the theory of evolution applied to the development of mind as well as physical attributes, one can say without fear of contradiction, that the public school is a perfect reflection of the evolutionary humanist world view. As French biologist Jacques Monad put it: "Man has to understand that he is a mere accident. Not only is man not the center of creation; he is not even the heir to a sort of predetermined evolution that would have produced either man or something very like him in any case."

Note, incidentally, how similar Monad's view of man/^{is}to Darwin's that man should be brought down to the animal level where he belonged.

In other words, what the public school tells the child is that *man is no better than an animal; that ~~there is~~* there is no God, no CREATOR; life originated by accident; there is no meaning or purpose to life other than the satisfaction of animal needs and desires. And what the behavioral psychologists ^{teach} ~~the~~ the teachers is that children can be taught like animals by techniques developed in laboratories in which animals were the subjects of experimentation.

This is particularly true in the teaching of reading in the primary schools by way of the look-say method. In 1940, Prof. Walter Dearborn, head of educational psychology at Harvard, described the methodology as follows:

The principle which we have used to explain the acquisition of a sight vocabulary is, of course, the one suggested by Pavlov's well known experiments on the conditioned response. This is as it should be. The basic process involved in conditioning and in learning to read is the same.

Thus, animal training techniques are being used to teach children to read. The result, of course, has been massive reading failure for the simple reason that children are not animals and cannot be taught as animals.

When men accepted evolution as truth, they then had to devise a ~~Humanism is the~~ philosophy that tries to create meaning and values for human beings living in a godless, accidental universe. ^{That philosophy is humanism.} According to the humanists the purpose of life is self-realization or self-actualization, and according to humanist educator Arthur W. Combs, the primary goal of education is self-actualization. In other words the primary goal of education is not to teach the basic academic skills or to pass on to the future generation the values and knowledge ~~it the primary goal of education is~~ of the previous generation; ~~but~~ to inculcate the philosophy of humanism.

Dr. Combs tells us that the self-actualizing person is (1) well informed; (2) possessed of positive self-concepts; (3) open to their experience, and (4) possessed of deep feelings of identification with others. Self-actualization is a philosophy of life of this world, for this world. Its point of departure is atheistic, for it does not acknowledge the existence of God, or of God's Word, or of 5,000 years of human experience with God. It looks at life as if that experience ^{or was simply superstitious nonsense.} had never taken place. It brings man back to the time before God revealed Himself to Noah or Abraham ^{to}. It considers 5,000 years of religious experience as ~~totally~~ invalid, ~~totally without value,~~ ~~totally~~ irrelevant, and ~~not only~~ ^{current} without ~~modern~~ value but downright harmful.

Thus, we can say that the impact of evolution on American education has been devastatingly broad and deep. The application of behavioral psychology on teaching techniques has destroyed academic standards to the point where we are now considered a nation at risk. To expect our students to achieve academic excellence while excluding the development of the intellect, which the behaviorists are doing, is like Pharoah's demanding the children of Israel to make bricks without straw.

Fortunately many of our young people are resilient and healthy enough to survive the public school's harm. But millions of others are not so fortunate and have become the functional illiterates and intellectual cripples that plague our society.

The blacks in America have become the chief victims of this crippling educational malpractice. Functional illiteracy is now estimated at 50 percent among blacks. Contrast this with an illiteracy rate of 9.2 percent among urban blacks in 1930 -- years before affirmative action, federal compensatory education programs, civil rights victories, integrated schools, equal educational opportunity, etc.

With the decline in academics has also come a decline in science studies in American schools. According to the Cincinnati Enquirer of November 23, 1985:

The level of science and mathematics taught in the Soviet Union is so much higher that comparisons with the average American students are meaningless. . . .

All Soviet students study calculus for two years, whereas only 105,000 U.S. high school students took a year of calculus in 1976. .

Compulsory science for Soviet students is demanding: they must take five years of physics, four years of chemistry, 5½ years of

biology -- whereas for U.S. students only 9.1% receive one year of physics; 16.1%, one year of chemistry; 45%, one year of biology, and 17.5%, one year of general science.

But, you might ask, don't the Soviets also believe in evolution? The answer is that they do, but they don't apply it to the teaching of the cognitive skills.

Equally devastating has been the humanist impact on teen-age morality. The humanist philosophy has so traumatized American youth that we now have the highest rates of teenage suicide, drug addiction, sexual promiscuity, venereal disease, abortion, unwed parenthood, and crime in the history of our nation. Among young male blacks, homicide is now the number one cause of death.

On the matter of teen-age pregnancy, Time magazine of Dece. 9, 1985, reported:

Nearly half of black females in the U.S. are pregnant by age 20. The pregnancy rate among those aged 15 to 19 is almost twice what it is among whites. Worse still, nearly 90% of the babies born to blacks in this age group are born out of wedlock; most are raised in fatherless homes with little economic opportunity. "When you look at the numbers, teenage pregnancies are of cosmic danger to the black community," declares Eleanor Holmes Norton, law professor at Georgetown University and a leading black scholar.

Thus, our education system is turning America's black population into a permanent underclass plagued by unwed teenage parenthood, abortion, functional illiteracy, drug addiction and crime.

Despite its falsehood, the theory of evolution has been integrated into our popular culture as truth. For example, this is what the 1977 edition of the Standard Family Reference Encyclopedia says about evolution:

Life probably first evolved from the primeval soup some 3000-4000 million years ago when the first organic chemicals were synthesized due to the effects of lightning. Primitive algae capable of synthesizing their own food material have been found in geological formations some 2000 million years old. Simple forms of animals and fungi then evolved. From that time there has been a slow evolution of multicellular organisms.

Someday, the average educated American will be able to read that paragraph and understand it for what it is: a fairy tale. In the first place, spontaneous generation is impossible even with such primitive Nor does lightning produce life. It seems to do just the opposite. forms as viruses. /Second, because of the enormous complexity of living matter, the random, accidental self-creation of life is mathematically impossible. Third, why would living matter randomly develop the need or desire to eat? To continue living? But why would it want to continue living? Would the algae's quality of life in the primeval soup be so wonderful that it would develop this remarkable urge to keep living? As for "slow evolution," not even the evolutionists believe in that anymore. They now believe in "punctuated equilibrium" in order to explain the sudden appearance of species without ancestors.

So much for the theory of evolution. But some of the most intelligent people in America take it to be true. For example, Secretary of Education William Bennett recently told John Lofton in an interview: ^{in The Washington Times} "I believe there is good scientific evidennce for evolution."

I believe that Secretary Bennett is not very well informed. As head teacher of our nation, he should know better. But the fact that he doesn't tells us something about our time and our culture.

This time and this culture are permeated with lies, and that is an indication to what extent men are dominated by Satan today. And when men are dominated by Satan, how do they act? Paul gives us a very graphic picture in Romans, Chapter 1:

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. . . .

Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:

Who changed the truth of God into a lie

For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:

And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; ~~men with men~~
~~working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that~~
~~recompense of their error which was meet.~~

And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;

Being **Y** filled with all **Y**unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers,

Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,