

# Why a Philosophy of Christian School Education Must Have “Creation” as Its Cornerstone

Sid Galloway (2006)

## I. Introductory Background:

### A. *Personal*

1. Before regeneration
2. After regeneration

### B. *Philosophical, Historical*

1. Conservative to Compromise – A Historical Cycle
2. Compromise to Corruption by the Culture

### C. *Biblical* (Logos / logikos / hypo-theses)

1. Biblically Based = Derived from Contextual Exegesis
2. Faith is Rational not Blind Belief
3. Science and Scripture are Complementary Not Contradictory

## II. Creation Cornerstone for all Christian Educational Philosophy

### A. Significance of Origin Beliefs (Creation vs. Evolution)

1. God (The trustworthiness of His Character)
2. Graphe (The trustworthiness of His Written Word)
3. Gospel (The validity of His Good News Promise)
4. Glorify (God’s goal toward which all education should strive)

### B. Evidence for Origin Beliefs (Creation vs. Evolution)

1. Scholars (Least trustworthy, since this is merely an “argument from authority”)
2. Science (Second most trustworthy, since theories cannot be proven, only supported)
3. Scripture (Most trustworthy due to prophecy transcending space & time)

## III. Facts vs. Fads

- A. *Distinctions* (Why knowing the difference is vital to a school’s philosophy)
- B. *Facts* (Supported by empirical studies with high internal validity)
- B. *Fads* (Low internal validity that inherently inflates treatment outcomes.)

## IV. Appendices:

- A. *Full Outline* - “Creation: Cornerstone of Christianity”
- B. *Sources/ Resources* for further study (Annotated with extended quotes for context)

## I. Introduction

James 3:1 (NKJV)

“My brethren, let not many of you become teachers,  
knowing that we shall receive a stricter judgment.”

Hanging upside down on the Jungle Gym, four year old Johnny challenged Sam’s bold proclamations with, “*Oh yeah, how do you know that’s true?*” To which Sam replied, “*My TEACHER said so, that’s how I know!*” Without realizing it, preschool children like Sam and Johnny struggle with philosophical and epistemological issues. Sadly, most children - even the majority of adults - believe and behave as the proverbial, simple-minded man. Proverbs 14:15 says, “The simple believes every word, but the prudent considers well his steps.” Beliefs

produce steps (actions and methodologies). Most people fail to exercise wise prudence, which is now being replaced with the modern mantra of “critical thinking”. The phrase “critical thinking” sounds good on the surface, but in progressive practice it too often means learning not to question prevailing *assumptions*. Dr. John Mattick, professor of molecular biology at the University of Queensland and director of the Institute for Molecular Bioscience, illustrates this problem existing even among the realm of science:

“*Assumptions* can be dangerous, especially in science. They usually start as the most plausible or comfortable interpretation of the available facts. But when their truth cannot be immediately tested and their flaws are not obvious, assumptions often *graduate to articles of faith*, and new observations are *forced* to fit them. Eventually, if the volume of *troublesome* information becomes unsustainable, the *orthodoxy must collapse*.”  
[*Emphasis added in bold italics*]

The Hidden Genetic Program of Complex Organisms”, *Scientific American*, October 2004, p. 61.

People, especially young people, need to learn how to *discern*, and teachers are often the most powerful influence determining how well they will learn this vital skill. As a biology teacher, it has become increasingly clear that science teachers have perhaps the greatest opportunity to train students in the practical processes of analytical thinking. Thus, serving as a teacher is not only a wonderful privilege, but an awesome responsibility before God.

I’ve chosen to expand this paper beyond its minimum requirements for my own personal edification as well as to more comprehensively convey a conviction that “Creation” must be the cornerstone of a genuinely “Christian” educational philosophy. The *reputation* of our Creator’s character and the *development* of our students’ character qualities directly depend upon this foundation. I realize that my meager efforts and limited knowledge may not add anything significant, so I write this merely with the hope to encourage all of us toward God’s best. Too often, what seems “good” displaces the best. Therefore, my prayer is that the NCS administrative staff, Board of Directors, as well as relevant representatives from ACSI will consider the content prayerfully.

Teachers need to have a sound philosophical foundation and matrix on which to build their educational principles, proclamations, and practices. Beliefs are the roots that produce the fruit of behaviors. Therefore a teacher’s presuppositional worldview (or as my philosophy professors in the ivory tower of academia insisted we call it, *weltanschauung*) is not just an academic exercise. It is the heart from which daily teaching methodologies will naturally flow (Matt 15:19). The same holds true regarding a teacher’s understanding of and beliefs about the “why” of history: His/story (*heilsgeschichte* – for those in the white tower).

Since any school (secular or Christian) consists of different people with contrasting worldviews, its ability to function as a cohesive body is dependent on how well its members are able to accept one another’s individual differences, establish a coherent philosophy, develop related policies and practices, and then work together as a team toward those common goals.

For a *school* to be “Christian”, it must have a “biblical” philosophy of education from which its policies and practices are derived. Likewise, a Christian *teacher* should develop a personal philosophy of education that is derived from the Bible, not personal opinion, feelings, or the prevailing culture. In fact, I am convinced that a biblically based philosophy of education is the only conceptual framework that has the potential to help lead students and staff into the image and character of Christ – our Creator’s goal (Romans 8:28-29). My personal philosophy condensed into a firm conviction only after a thorough examination of, often wrestling with, the evidence God has made available through both general revelation (*empirical* study of His *World*) and special revelation (*exegetical* study of His *Word*) – Romans 1:20; John 17:17.

## **A. Personal Background 1. Before Regeneration**

Everyone has a current philosophy of life and learning that is always influenced by and therefore inseparably linked to personal background. The following is an attempt to summarize the most significant factors shaping my current worldview. Growing up, my life was a typical American, southern, white childhood, in a “good”, though nominally, “Christian” home. It consisted of church on Sunday and the strong teaching of moral rules. The Bible, however, was not taught in depth either at church or at home. So, questions about the ultimate issues of life began to arise and could not be adequately answered merely by religiously liberal clichés. Assuming this was all there was to Christianity; I rejected Christ and the Bible and began a personal search for answers through a study of world religions, philosophy, and psychology, culminating in a new age philosophical perspective.

This coincided with a pursuit toward a career in evolutionary animal behavior (ethology). Following graduation from LSU, I was hired to work in my “dream” job as a carnivore zookeeper at the Audubon Zoological Gardens in New Orleans – literally lions and tigers and bears, etc. However, my spiritual emptiness, growing bitterness, and broken relationships led to a personal crisis. I became suicidal and for the first time eager to know the real God, beyond my own imagination.

As I prayed for God to help me find objective evidence for the truth, I remembered an old African American, Christian man, Will, with whom I had worked during summer breaks throughout my teen years. He was tall and powerful physically, yet his greatest strength was psycho-spiritual. He had strength of character that not only withstood constant racism, but he actually cared about the racists who ridiculed him. When I looked at Will, I saw something that was not natural to this world. The origin of his character was clearly supernatural. I realized that the “Jesus” he followed must be real. So, I began to read Scripture and examine the support for its claim of Divine authorship. Evidence (*archaeological, historical, MSS, and especially fulfilled prophetic proofs - Isaiah 41 to 45*) convinced me that the Bible’s human authors were led by our Creator who transcends time – able to foretell the future with 100% accuracy. The Holy Spirit, using these many “convincing proofs”, led to my decision of rational faith (not blind belief - Proverbs 14:15; Hebrews 11:1) in Christ Jesus, submitting to His authority as my own Savior and LORD.

## 2. After Regeneration

A hunger for Scripture continued to grow. Starting at the beginning, Genesis, while comparing the underlying hypotheses of evolutionary theory with the Bible, I realized that evolution could not explain death theologically or life scientifically. It became clear that God's Word and vertical (macro) evolution were in diametric opposition to one another. So, eventually I turned from evolution and embraced biblical creationism as the worldview most consistent with the facts of both general and special revelation. In subsequent years, the Lord helped me find scientific and theological resources from organizations such as The Master's Seminary, ICR, AiG, CRS, CMI, NANC, IABC and others that provided further support for a biblical philosophy of life.

Wanting to help others who were struggling, I returned to school seeking to serve the Lord as a Christian family counselor, completing 12 hours of graduate study in Social Work at LSU and then transferring to and completing a Master of Divinity at the New Orleans Theological Seminary. After completing the M.Div., I entered the NOBTS doctoral program in psychology and counseling, but soon withdrew due to its secular nature *at that time*. For two decades I served as a biblical family counselor, director of a counselor training center, regional certification supervisor for three counseling organizations, developed a web-based counseling resource center ([www.soulcare.org](http://www.soulcare.org)), traveled presenting marriage and family seminars, and planted and pastored a small fellowship that later merged with another church. During this time, I became increasingly aware that not only is the Bible the *basis* for true Christianity, but that creation is the crucial *cornerstone* for truly Christian education.

While, pursuing a second master's degree and preparing for state teacher certification through SELU (part of the LSU system), I became grieved over the anti-biblical philosophy of many professors and the unsupported, ineffective, *progressive* methodologies promoted. Then in 2003, I accepted a position to teach biology at Northlake Christian School, where my six children have attended. Prepping creation-centered, internet-based curriculums for my Life Science, On-Level Biology, and Honors Biology classes eventually led to the development of an additional seminar for churches and schools entitled, "*Creation: Cornerstone of Christianity*".

Summers provided the opportunity to attend "*Science and Scripture*" conferences, where I had numerous discussions and subsequent email/phone dialogues with various Christian leaders regarding the significance of origins (*creation*), seeking to improve and better articulate my own philosophy of Christian education. Some of those who have helped me the most in this continuing education effort have been theologians such as Dr. John MacArthur, Dr. Paige Patterson, Dr. Jay Adams, and Dr. Terry Mortenson, educators like Ken Ham, Dr. David Menton, and Dr. Carl Wieland, as well as world renowned scientists including Dr. Richard Lumsden, Dr. Russell Humphreys, Dr. John Baumgardner, and Dr. Werner Gitt. I am grateful to the LORD and to each of these men for their help. Their collective advice encouraged me to ensure that my philosophy of education was exegetically derived from God's Word. Books and videos later required by ACSI for certification, along with many other resources, provided

further confirmation that a comprehensive, contextual examination of Scripture is the only sure foundation for a philosophy of Christian school education.

## **B. Philosophical & Historical Background**

### **Are the World's philosophical theories necessary?**

“Philosophy”, literally in koine Greek, “the love of wisdom” is a godly motive, provided that it is Christ-centered (Col 2:8). However, having spent many years studying philosophy prior to salvation, I do not believe that knowledge of formal philosophical terms and concepts is a *necessary* part of teacher education. Formal philosophical conceptualizations and theories now dominate many teacher education programs. There is nothing inherently wrong with studying the formal field of philosophy. Through phone and email discussions, Dr. David Hunt, professor of philosophy at Whittier College and past president of the Society of Christian Philosophers, helped me to see the effective role Christians can play in this field. Nevertheless, I believe that formal philosophy is not essential to teacher education and *can* at times lead to both confusion and arrogance (1 Corinthians 8:1). Impressive sounding verbiage filled with ruminations about metaphysics, ontology, axiology, and epistemology are often devoid of *useful* substance. Hopefully, my discussions in the latter sections of this paper will contain at least some useful fruit.

#### **1. Conservative to Compromise – A Historical Cycle**

Sadly, the history of “Christian Education” reveals a downward spiral from a conservative commitment to the canon of Scripture as inerrant authority, to compromise and corruption all the way down to the foundational creation message. I will try and summarize this in the “*Creation Cornerstone*” section. From a *human* perspective, the long history of Christian education is like the book of Judges. It presents a repetitive story of how biblical beliefs and practices about salvation, progressive sanctification, and Logos-centered education toward the goal of Christ’s character were replaced by the world’s alternative philosophies regarding the soul (psyche), the mind, and social relationships.

In contrast, God trained the people of Israel to effectively teach new generations, without using the terms and principles of the World’s philosophical system(s). Jesus trained the disciples without including philosophies of the world. Likewise, the apostles in turn trained the early church without integrating philosophical content from the surrounding culture. In fact, some of the most significant problems in the early church arose as a result of Greek cultural and philosophical influences upon some of the church fathers. Scripture is sufficient for philosophical issues.

Historically, questions about the nature of reality, one’s source of knowledge, the verification of truth in any particular field, discernment of what is morally right from wrong, and how to make decisions based on rational rather than blind faith have always been recognized as fundamentally *religious* questions. Thus, man’s knowledge about reality, the immaterial dimension of mankind, and moral values is dependent upon special revelation, the Bible, from our Creator.

In relatively recent times, educational and psychological philosophies have insidiously and often intentionally (Dewey, Freire, Freud, Jung, Maslow, Rogers, et. al.) morphed into pseudo-scientific professions and powerful institutions, culminating in the failed efforts of Goals 2000. The good news is that, from God's perspective (Rom 8:28-29), He has and always will preserve a remnant of believers committed to His Word as their inerrant authority. While never a majority in the world, such humble and sensitive communities of believers (churches and Christian schools) can serve as salt and light to preserve God's truths and His practical principles within an increasingly corrupted (decaying) world.

Secularization, a major theme in the development of an "American" system of education, began with the desire to form schools that did not force religious content particular to any denomination. Yet, general references to God and even to the Bible were commonplace. It was only during the 1960's that these references were nearly removed from the public arena. When the removal of biblical character values had come to fruition, the downward devolution led to deception, doubt, disloyalty, disrespect, disobedience, disorder, dysfunction (survival of the coolest / cruelest) destruction, death, and the dishonor of God in the Western educational system.

Inevitably, the need became obvious for a re-introduction of the fourth R, "Religious Values", in addition to "Reading", "wRiting", and "aRithmetic" - but this time it was done in a *generic* form to disguise its spiritual nature. So, philosophical theories, counseling concepts, and character development were once again added. These all deal with beliefs directly related to mature interpersonal relationships and individual happiness. Such goals are the heart and core of *progressive* education and psychology. To make people feel good, over and above actually helping them become good. In contrast, Jesus taught a paradoxical principle that holiness must be the goal in order to experience true happiness: joy (Luke 9:23-26).

Secular and humanistic educators are attempting to arrive at a consensus regarding which "generic" values are needed, trying to be tolerant to all religions represented in our pluralistic society, *except* of course biblical Christianity. Why are they intolerant of biblical Christianity? The written Word of God, the Bible, and the living Word, Jesus, claim to be the exclusively trustworthy source for religious, philosophical answers. This offends the prideful aspirations of sin nature in all of us, and which *dominates* the hearts of new agers, humanists, and secularists.

Scripture is not simply a supplementary resource for Christian educational philosophy. In a very real and practical sense, the entire Bible could be described as God's record and statement of His personal philosophy for the education and schooling of His own children. Whether it is the *teleos* goal of education, the nature and role of both learner and teacher, or the processes for learning and teaching, God's people did not have to wait 2,000 years for Dewey, et al. to complete His Word for educating believers. However, the issue of scope, sequence, and selection of subject/content matter does not fall within the realm of educational *philosophy*. Content is more an issue of educational *practice* that flows from a particular philosophical foundation, coupled with an effort to equip students with knowledge and skills applicable to projected college requirements and job markets.

## Are the World's philosophical theories "scientific"?

Not only are the World's philosophical theories *unnecessary*, but sadly much of modern educational philosophy is both unbiblical and scientifically unsubstantiated. Too often educational *psychology* with its questionable psychometric and testing tools (just as with social psychology and psychotherapy) are not and cannot become coherent, "hard", physical sciences like physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, etc. They are philosophical systems that deal with the non-physical "psyche", the soul, including its intellectual and moral development. In contrast to physical substances and external behavior, the psyche (mind, will, and emotions) involves *intangible* variables that cannot be controlled experimentally or studied empirically. For this reason, many studies regarding educational methodologies are internally *invalid* and thus inherently lead to *inflated* outcomes regarding effectiveness. Typical with many "soft" sciences, their theories and models quickly become promised panaceas, trusted as proven fact. Yet, too few practitioners ever check the evidence to see if claims are worthy of rational trust.

Karl Popper, Ph.D., considered by many to be the greatest 20th century philosopher of science speaks to this question in "SCIENTIFIC THEORY AND FALSIFIABILITY", PERSPECTIVES IN PHILOSOPHY, Beck ed. 1975, p. 343. After examining various theories of psychology, Dr. Popper says: "though **posing** as sciences, (*they*) had in fact more in **common with primitive myths** than with science...."

[Emphasis added in bold]

The AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION appointed Dr. Sigmund Koch to direct a study focusing on the non-scientific nature of psychology. It was subsidized by the NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, and involved 80 eminent scholars. Dr. Koch concluded, "I think it by this time utterly and finally clear that **psychology cannot be a coherent science**" (Koch. Psychology Today, Sept. 1969, p.66). Dr. Koch further illustrates in THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR (Vol. 42, No 4, Autumn 1973, p. 636): "The *hope* of a psychological science became indistinguishable from the *fact* of psychological science. The entire subsequent **history of psychology** can be seen as the ritualistic endeavor to emulate the forms of science in order to sustain the **delusion that it already is a science.**"

[Emphasis added in bold]

Dr. Robyn Dawes, Acting Department Head, Dept. of Social and Decision Sciences, Carnegie Mellon University, winner of the APA William James Award in 1990, in his book *House of Cards: Psychology and Psychotherapy Built on Myth*, 1994, published by The Free Press also revealed the less than scientific nature of social and educational psychologies:

"We also know that the credentials and experience of the psychotherapists are unrelated to patient outcomes, based on well over five hundred scientific studies of psychotherapy outcome." (p. 38)

"Psychotherapy, has often been categorized a medical procedure, but as we have seen, it lacks the scientific grounding that characterizes modern medicine." (p. 133)

[Emphasis added in bold]

## 2. Compromise to Corruption by the Culture

### Are the World's philosophical theories compatible with Scripture?

In light of the above, it seems clear that psychological theories, including many within the realm of educational psychology, are not scientifically based and would be better described as *politicized* philosophies. E. D. Hirsch Jr., distinguished visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution and a member of the Koret Task Force on K-12 Education, expressed these concerns

in practical terms with his article, “Why Traditional Education is More Progressive” in *The American Enterprise Online* ([http://www.tackmag.com/issues/articleid.16209/article\\_detail.asp](http://www.tackmag.com/issues/articleid.16209/article_detail.asp)):

“. . . progressive educational ideas . . . have led to practical failure and greater social inequity.”

“. . . Like other . . . progressives, [“theorist of the political Left”] Freire rejected traditional subject matter and derided the ‘banking theory of schooling’, whereby the teacher provides the child with a lot of ‘rote-learned’ information.”

In addition to encouraging a return to the traditional banking theory with its emphasis on a lot of rote-learned information, Hirsch recommends that “. . . Children . . . should not be encouraged to follow ‘natural’ inclinations, which would only keep them ignorant and make them slaves of emotion.” He then explains how modern changes have been both subtly deceptive and seriously destructive.

“. . . Unfortunately, many of today’s American educators paint traditional education as the arch-enemy of ‘humane’ modern education.”

“. . . This argument ignores the fact that traditional knowledge-based schooling is currently employed with great success in most other advanced nations. It fails to note that challenging subject matter – the core of traditional education – can be taught in a lively, demanding way. If parents were told straightforwardly that the so-called “untraditional” or “modern” mode of education now dominant in our schools has coincided with the decline of academic competencies among our students, they might be less enthusiastic about the experiment.”

Most disturbing is that many modern *educational* psychologists have promoted philosophies that are *anti-biblical*, yet blindly followed by Christian schools, educators, and teacher education programs in universities. Humanistic and New Age principles now dominate modern education. If we want our students to be critical thinkers, then we should set the example.

Dr. William Kilpatrick, professor of educational psychology at Boston College, with degrees from Harvard and Purdue provides a fascinating insight into this insidious problem:

"It is true that popular psychology shares much in common with **Eastern religion**: in fact, a merger is well under way. But if you're talking about Christianity, it is much truer to say that **psychology** and **religion** are **competing faiths**. If you seriously hold to one set of values, you will logically have to **reject the other**." (*Psychological Seduction: The Failure of Modern Psychology*, 1983, p. 14) [**Emphasis added in bold**]

Finally, Paul Vitz, Ph.D., associate professor of psychology at NY University and author of *PSYCHOLOGY AS RELIGION: THE CULT OF SELF-WORSHIP*, says:

"In university psychology departments, hundreds of thousands of students every year still take courses in which the books and **critical analyses** cited above are almost **never, if ever mentioned**."

". . . More specifically, contemporary psychology is a form of secular humanism based on the rejection of god and the **worship of the self**." (p. xii) [**Emphasis added in bold**]

Dr. Robin Dawes weighs in on the influence of self-centered, new age philosophy on social sciences: "Professionals in psychology and psychotherapy clearly benefit from a **New Age psychology** - it brings them clients. Unfortunately, they in turn contribute to and reinforce that psychology. . . . the professionals' 'view' has become **highly compatible with the new Age view**. In particular, that very **egoism** . . . has come to be viewed as a necessary component of 'mental health.' . . . they are highly influenced by **cultural beliefs and fads**: currently, the obsession with 'me.' . . . in particular, a view that **feelings and self-esteem** 'cause' certain problems, in the **absence of evidence.**" (p. 250) [Emphasis added in bold]

Current Christianity is infected with a mystical, subjective, feeling-based faith that is not *biblical* faith based on objective, logical evidence. More dangerously, the root of Dewey's humanistic philosophical tenets, have "evolved" with the help of new age gurus like Abraham Maslow and his Esalen Institute into an open effort toward self-deification.

The Holy Spirit certainly convicts our hearts of righteousness, temptation, and sin, but He does not give new revelation to people today that would add to the completed canon of the Bible. Yet the phrase, "I feel that God told me \_\_\_\_\_", has become the justification for almost everything in modern Christianity. This mirrors the mystical way of Eastern religions, not God's Way. Dr. Paul Spears in the introduction to, *Foundations of Christian School Education*, says:

"Broadly speaking, modern education no longer has a unified vision, for education is pulled in many directions by competing allegiances. Training students how to get at truth **through reason** has been abandoned because the idea that one can actually have access to absolute truth is seen as foolish." (p. 6) [Emphasis added in bold]

In fact, an erroneous and unbiblical distinction between the "head" as reason and the "heart" as feelings has been manufactured by modern psycho-philosophy and absorbed into Christian culture. Even the brilliant, C. S. Lewis, thinking from within the literary culture in which he was immersed, perpetuated this myth of a head vs. heart dichotomy. The Bible does not divide these two. They are presented as inseparable sides of a single coin. The term *heart* is used over 800 times in Scripture (Hebrew – *lev*, Greek – *kardia*) and refers to reason with an emphasis on the will, motive, or attitude of the heart, not feelings or subjective experiences. Thus, God's rational Word focuses on our responsibility for willful reason with the right motives or goals as the *heart* of education (pun intended).

## C. Biblical Background

### 1. Biblically-Based Must Mean Derived From Contextual Exegesis of Scripture

Numerous biblical terms, passages, and principles directly impact human efforts to formulate an educational philosophy for implementation in a Christian school. More significantly, each of these is inseparably linked to the foundational doctrinal teachings set forth in Genesis chapters 1-11. The cornerstone of this foundation must be a natural, literal

understanding of the *creation* record. The following terms are just a small list of those that have been the most influential in the shaping of my own Christian school, educational philosophy. Some are the actual Hebrew or Greek terms used in OT and NT MSS, others are *transliterations*, while many are *translations* into English that carry significance etymologically, contextually, and in current usage.

Term	Relevant Passage (s)	Principle (s)
<i>Logos</i>	John 1:1; 14; 18	Word, reason
<i>Logikos</i>	Romans 12:1-3	Logical, of the Word
<i>Pistis</i>	Hebrews 11:1	Faith, rational trust
Hypothesis (compound term) - hypo - thesis	Proverbs 14:15, Hebrews 11:1; 1 John 4:1	Literally “underlying belief” or underlying presupposition Formally – testable prediction
Philosophy ( <i>phileo &amp; Sophia</i> )	Colossians 2:8	Love of wisdom
Biology, Psychology, Anthropology, Geology, etc	Gen 1:24-31	Study of life, soul, earth, etc, according to the Logos (Word)
<i>Parakletos / parakaleo</i>	John 14:26; 1 Thess 4:18; 5:11	Teacher, coach, called along side
Teach / Teacher / Rabbi Hebrew - <i>yara</i> = to point out - <i>lamad</i> = to goad Greek - <i>didaskalos</i> = to teach - <i>katecheo</i> = systematically - <i>matheteuo</i> = to disciple - <i>paideuo</i> = to train - <i>noutheteo</i> = to counsel - <i>paradido</i> = pass traditions	OT - Gen 1:26-31; 2; 18:19; 20  NT - Matthew 23:7-10; John 3:2	Teacher, master, authority, trainer, counselor, corrector, etc.
Soul, mind ( <i>nephesh, psuke, nous</i> )	Luke 9:23-26	Soul, life, mind
Heart / Will ( <i>lev, kardia, thelema</i> )		Reason, will, motive, attitude
<i>Paideia</i> / Pedagogy	Ephesians 6:1-4; Hebrews 12	Child training, “in loco parentis”
<i>Hypotasso</i>	Ephesians 5-6	Submission, subject to, literally “under rank”
Exegesis	1 Corinthians 4:6 “... learn not to think beyond what is written”	Interpretation by drawing out the author’s original intent
Eisegesis	1 Corinthians 4:6 “... learn not to think beyond what is written”	Interpretation by forcing in the reader’s preconceived biases
<i>Gnosis</i>	1 Timothy 6:20	Knowledge

Below are a few sample verses emphasizing teaching toward truly *critical* thinking.

- Proverbs 18:11 “He who answers a matter before he listens, it becomes shame and folly for him.”  
 Proverbs 18:17 “The first to bring his case seems right, until his neighbor comes and cross examines him.”  
 Act 1:3 “To these [*Jesus*] also presented Himself alive . . . **by many convincing proofs**, . . .”  
 1 Corinthians 4:6 “. . . learn not to think beyond what is written.”  
 Proverbs 14:15 “The simple believes every word, but the prudent considers well his steps.”  
 Isaiah 1:18 “Come, let us reason together.”  
 John 17:17 “Thy Word is Truth”

Hebrews 11:1-3 “Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

I Peter 3:15 “Be ready always to give a defense . . . to everyone who asks you . . . .”

Pslam 34:8 “Taste and see that the Lord is good”

1 John 4:1 “Test the spirits”

Romans 12:1-3

“I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, *which is* your reasonable [*logikos*] service. 2 And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what *is* that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.”

## 2. Faith is Rational Not Blind Belief

In order to keep the length of this paper reasonable, I’ll simply try and summarize what I believe are a few of the terms and principles most relevant to our modern times. The New Testament term *logikos* means logical and its root is the term, *logos*, meaning “word” or “information”. Jesus is called, “The” Word, - the physical embodiment of our logical God. This is why the scientific method was born in the womb of Christian culture, because biblical Christians knew they could examine the “Word’s” world through rational, logical, sequential thinking. Our God revealed Himself in the Bible as a logical God (Isaiah 1 – “come let us reason together”).

The Bible teaches an *empirical* method of acquiring knowledge and discerning truth about reality (general as well as special revelation). Hebrews 11:1 says that a person should only believe something is true, if it is based on sufficient *evidence* to support it. Once again, blind, irrational faith is not biblical.

For example, not long ago, I smelled smoke in my classroom. When there's smoke, the logical inference (Greek "hypo-thesis" = underlying belief) is that there's a fire somewhere, even though you can't directly *see* any flames. Since my room is filled with over 25 aquariums and terrariums (40+ live animals) with scores of electrical wires, I looked everywhere for the source of the smoke. Finally, I found it. It was coming from the chemistry teacher's room next door, where the students were using candles for an experiment.

My belief in a fire that I could not see was not blind faith. It was rational faith, based upon the overwhelming evidence of a room full of smoke. Genuinely biblical thinking, critical thinking, and sound scientific analysis all seek to examine evidence before choosing to believe that something is true.

In the same way, my faith in God’s promise of a Heaven that I can’t see and the salvation Jesus has purchased fully for me as a gift by his finished work on the cross is not blind. It is founded upon the visible, substantial evidences of Scripture, history, and the hundreds of fulfilled messianic prophecies that demonstrate the Bible to be spiritually authored by our Creator who transcends time – able to predict the future with 100 % accuracy.

### 3. Science and Scripture are Complementary Not Contradictory

Richard Bliss of the Institute for Creation Research graduate school wrote about the National Academy of Sciences April 1976 statement on academic freedom and scientific inquiry. He embraced the NAS standards for science education as compatible with biblical thinking:

“The student must learn that science implies ‘freedom of inquiry and dissemination of ideas’ and not censorship. Science education should teach: ‘a respect for logic, a desire to search for data, a longing for knowledge and understanding, a consideration of consequences, a consideration of premises, a demand for verification, and to questions all things.’” (Dr. Bliss quoted a few excerpts from an article, *The Spirit of Science*, published in the National Association for Research in Science Teaching journal, Vol. 53, No. 4, by Thomas M. Weiss.) [ <http://www.icr.org/article/389/>, see also, <http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=244> ]

Scriptural thinking and scientific thinking are complementary not contradictory, since both demand logical reasoning. It is important for any educational philosophy, especially science education, to establish the often *censored* fact that analytical, truly logical (*logikos*) and scientific thinking is based upon and grew out of a *biblical* understanding of God’s world. Tom Bethell, author of *The Politically Incorrect Guide to SCIENCE* (2005 p. 181), summarizes this historical reality well, “Christianity elevated the faculty of reason and fostered a spirit of inquiry. Without it, there would never have been a scientific revolution.” Similarly, Augustine wrote:

50. “And yet the validity of logical sequences is **not a thing devised by men**, but is **observed** and noted by them that they may be able to learn and teach it; for it exists eternally in the reason of things, and **has its origin with God**. [Emphasis added in bold]

Book II of *Christian Doctrine*: Ch 32 - *Valid Logical Sequence is not Devised but only Observed by Man*

Dr. Gordon Clark was one of the most respected and prolific Christian thinkers / writers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. While I don’t agree with every detail of his theology, his comments on the relationship between education and creation highlight crucial biblical truths. Not only was he a philosopher and theologian, but also chairman of the Philosophy Department at Butler University for 28 years. He was an expert in pre-Socratic and ancient philosophy as well as the application of the laws of logic.

“We note for one thing that Christ is the image of God (Hebrews 1:3), and that he is the **Logos** and **Wisdom** of God. We note too that **Adam** was given dominion over nature. These two points, seemingly unrelated, suggest that the **image** of God is **logic** or **rationality**. Adam was superior to the animals because he was a rational and not merely a sensory creation. The image of God is reason.” (p. 93)

“. . . Even **if** in God’s providence **animals survive death** and adorn the future world, they **cannot** have what Scripture calls eternal life because eternal life is to **know** the only true **God**, and knowledge is an exercise of the mind or reason. Without reason there can be no **morality** or righteousness: These too **require thought**. Lacking these, animals are neither righteous nor sinful.” (93)

“. . . Since moral **judgments** are a species of judgment, **subsumed** under general **intellectual** activity, one result of the Fall is the occurrence of incorrect evaluation by means of erroneous thinking.” (93)

“. . . The Bible **stresses** the malfunctioning of the **mind** in obviously **moral** affairs because of their importance. But sin **extends** its depraving **influence** in affairs not usually regarded as matters of morality. . . . we now make mistakes in simple addition. Such mistakes are pedantically called the ‘**noetic**’ effects of sin. But **moral** errors are **equally noetic**.” (93-94)

[Note, “noetic” comes from the Greek term for mind, *nous*.]

“ . . . **Evolution** views man as a natural development from atoms . . . to . . . human beings . . . ”  
“This non-theistic, naturalistic view is difficult to accept because it **implies** that the mind, too, as well as the body, is an **evolutionary product rather than a divine image**. Instead of using the **eternal principles of logic**, the mind operates with the practical results of **biological adaptation**.” “ . . . John **Dewey** insisted that **logic** has already **changed** and will continue to **change**. If now this be the case, our **traditional logic** is but a **passing evolutionary moment**, our theories, dependent on this logic, are temporary reactions . . . and therefore the evolutionary theory, produced by these biological urges, **cannot be true**.” (94-95)

“ . . . **Christian** evaluation of **subjects** in the **curriculum** and of pupils or students in school is **rational** and intellectualistic, in **opposition** to the **emotionalism** and **anti-intellectualism** of the present age.” (95)

“The **object of education** is **truth**; the **transmission** of truth to the younger pupils and the **discovery** of new truth by more advanced students.” (95)

[**Emphasis added in bold**]

The Works of Gordon Haddon Clark, Vol. 10, A Christian Philosophy of Education. The Trinity Foundation, 1946, revised third edition 2000.

---

## II. Creation: The Cornerstone of Christian School Education

“Science and politics have become inseparable because of **funding** and regulation policies. Moreover, politicians intervene in the practice of science, sometimes diverting science and the interpretation of scientific findings away from where the evidence leads to directions deemed politically desirable.”

[**Emphasis added by bold underline**]

*POLITICIZING SCIENCE*, 2003 edited by Michael Gough a biologist involved in science policy congressional Office of Technology Assessment, think tanks, etc.

“There is no known natural law through which matter can give rise to information, neither is there any physical process or material phenomenon known that can do this.” [Emphasis added by **bold underline**]  
Werner Gitt, In the Beginning Was Information, 1997, p. 79

It is worth repeating that my study of the scriptural and scientific evidence led to an increasing awareness that not only is the Bible the *basis* for true Christianity, but that creation is the crucial *cornerstone* for truly Christian education. Jesus made it clear that when building a home, that is a spiritually and relationally unified body of people (Mat 7:21-29), the cornerstone is the key. Whether or not the cornerstone of the foundation is firmly and accurately established (i.e., *square*) dramatically affects the final outcome of the structure. If the cornerstone is off just a few millimeters, then each additional stone magnifies that error until the final building can be off by many meters. The subsequently twisted and distorted structure would be inherently unstable and eventually lead to destruction.

To begin a discussion about “origins” it is often helpful to summarize the various categories in which different worldviews fit. Below is my effort to briefly delineate these four groups. They are listed in an order moving from a biblical view of origins through progressively less biblical worldviews.

<b><u>Biblical Creationists</u></b>	<b><u>Pseudo-Creationists</u></b>	<b><u>Theistic Evolutionists</u></b>	<b><u>Atheistic Evolutionists</u></b>
<p>Believe that the creation of the earth and universe occurred in six, natural 24-hour days, about 6,000 years ago. There was no death of <i>nephesh</i> creatures before Adam's sin. A catastrophic global flood including earthquakes and tectonic shifts destroyed all nephesh life not on Noah's Ark and formed most of the fossils, rock layers, etc. Science and Scripture are in harmony, i.e., complementary, not contradictory. (ICR, CRS, AIG)</p>	<p>Believe that biological evolution from microbes to man is impossible, yet they believe the six "days" of Genesis 1 mean long periods of millions or billions of years; that there was no global flood, and that death existed from the very beginning, desired and designed by God, which make Him a monster.</p> <p>- Example (Progressive Creation by Hugh Ross)  - Example (Gap Theory, claiming a time gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, but no solid evidence for it.)</p>	<p>Believe that God exists, desiring and designing evolution's process of death and survival of the fittest to create man from microbes, using <b><u>mutations</u></b> and natural selection over <b><u>millions</u></b> of years.</p> <p>As with pseudo-creation views, theistic evolution paints a portrait of God as monstrous, not a good shepherd.</p> <p>- Example (Framework Hypothesis)  - Example (Liberal Theology)</p>	<p>Believe that no God is necessary for atomic, chemical, and biological evolution to have created everything from nothing by random chance.</p> <p>This view is logically and mathematically absurd, claiming that nobody + nothing = everything.</p> <p>In addition, the Law of Biogenesis (life comes only from life) negates atheistic evolution. A living cell cannot arise from non-living chemicals.</p>

Below I will try and summarize why I believe biblical creation must be the cornerstone of any "Christian" educational philosophy. My *emphasis* will be on the first creation outline point, which is the "*Significance*" of biblical creation. That is, why the issue is so important and relevant for today. Then, regarding the subject of the "*Evidence*" for biblical creation, the focus of this paper and its length make it necessary to merely summarize the categories of evidence along with references and links for further study. Hopefully, my discussion on the *significance* of creation as the crucial cornerstone will be sufficiently clear that it will stimulate serious study of the amazing evidence God has preserved and provided in support of His Word about the why and *how* of origins.

## A. The *Significance of Creation*

### 1. GOD (The trustworthiness of His Character)

“... Charles Darwin himself turned away from religion as much or more because of the ‘senseless’ death of his 10-year-old daughter Annie than any logic.”

Thomson, Keith Stewart, “Natural Theology,” *American Scientist*, vol. 85 (May/June 1997), pp. 219-21. Dr. Thomson is University Distinguished Scientist in Residence at the new School for Social Research in New York. p. 221

Did God desire and design the system of violently selfish competition, pain, fear, suffering, & death that *seems* to dominate “nature” today? Please remember that an artist’s heart is revealed by His work of art (Matthew 15:19).

Imagine that you hired a brilliant artist-sculptor to create something special for your den. Finally, he brings you in to unveil his personal masterpiece. There, standing before you is a sculpted scene of a crocodile ripping a young antelope into pieces alive – blood dripping from the torn flesh as the baby cries out for its mother.

What would you think about the art? What about the artist? Now think further. What “kind” of God is our Creator? Is He a “Good Shepherd”, a trustworthy “Father”? Is the violence of the wild kingdom God’s Way, or evidence an infection? How can we know for sure?

*General* revelation (the empirical study of God’s World – Romans 1) merely proves that a powerful and intelligent designer must have created creation. In order to truly know if He is worthy of our trust and obedience (hypotasso, saving faith) requires *special* revelation (the exegetical study of God’s Word – John 17:17). His Word, from its beginning to its end, makes it clear that He is the kind of God who created an Eden ruled by His love, filled with perfect peace and harmony even among the *nephesh* animals. Our God is not the Creator of disease, suffering, & death. The Hebrew term “nephesh” is used of both animals and man, referring to the ability to feel and think. It is traditionally translated as *soul* for man and as *creature* for animals, but it is the exact same term. Actually, it is usually used as a phrase, *nephesh chayah*, meaning living soul or living creature. Man is distinct, not because he can think and feel, but because he is endowed with the ability and responsibility to think, feel, and choose about God.

Satan, sin, & separation from His full protection and provision are the source of suffering. Doubt of God and His Word (Gen 3, “did God say”) followed by disobedience infected God’s Eden, metastasizing into a malignant cancer of disorder, dysfunction, disease, death, ultimately the dishonor to God’s image and character. The wages of sin is escalating entropy – death.

Certainly, a person can be a genuinely born-again believer and at the same time believe in evolution. Personally, I did not become convinced of creationism until many months after my own conversion. I had not yet thought through what kind of “god” is portrayed by *theistic* evolution, which is a common belief among many Christians? Remember, survival of the fittest depends upon pain, fear, suffering, & death. Theistic evolution is a belief that unwittingly blasphemes God by portraying Him as a monster.

“[Natural] selection is the blindest, and most cruel way of evolving new species, and more and more complex and refined organisms. The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which our whole modern ethics revolts. An ideal society is a non-selective society, one where the weak is protected; which is exactly the reverse of the so-called natural law. I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea that this is the process which God more or less set up in order to have evolution.”  
[Emphasis added]

Monod, Jacques, “*The Secret of Life*,” Interview with Laurie John, Australian Broadcasting Co., June 10, 1976 (shortly before his death).

Above all other reasons, *biblical creation* is *significant* because it directly impacts the reputation of God, addressing the very character and trustworthiness of our Creator. It is not a side line, minor issue.

## 2. **Graphe (The trustworthiness of His Written Word)**

“Graphae” is the NT Greek term for the “written” Scripture (1 Cor 4:6). Is God’s Word trustworthy? Does it contain errors? If students doubt the historical accuracy of God’s Word about “Origins”, why should they trust what it says about spiritual things?

“**Theistic evolution** is a significant **threat** to the Christian church. It **undermines** the very **foundation** of the Christian faith and causes people to **doubt** the truth of Scripture. . . . In [theistic evolution], **death** is **not the enemy** but the very **means** by which **God created** everything. But the **Bible** is very clear about this: the **wages of sin is death**. **Death came** into the world **through** Adam's **sin**. Therefore there was **no death prior** to the **fall** of man and therefore there could be **no evolution** whatsoever **before** that time.”  
[Emphasis added in bold]

David DeWitt, PhD (Creationist) Biochemist and Neuroscientist  
<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs2004/0112rejected.asp>

“If I have told you [about] earthly things, (*Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Physics, Anthropology, Psychology, etc.*) and you do not believe, how shall you believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?”  
John 3:12

Jesus said in John 3:12 that if a person does not believe what He (the Word of God) said about earthly things, then that person's trust in His Word about spiritual things would be severely undermined. The unwarranted rejection of the historical and scientific accuracy of Genesis chapters 1-11 has been one of the most destructive forces affecting the spiritual health of Christians, families, schools, nations, and our world.

When students do not have a strongly supported belief that the Bible is God’s inerrant Word, then they will not fully embrace the moral teachings that their “flesh” naturally does not like. It is crucial for a Christian school to clearly establish its educational philosophy and practices on the orthodox, cornerstone of biblical creation.

### 3. Gospel (The validity of His Good News Promise)

Genesis 1:29-31

And God said, "See, I have given you every **herb** that yields seed which *is* on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose **fruit** yields seed; to you it shall be for **food**. Also, to **every** beast of the earth, to **every** bird of the air, and to **everything** that creeps on the earth, in which *there is* life, *I have given* every **green herb for food**"; and it was so. Then God saw **everything** that He had made, and indeed *it was very good*. So the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

Gen 9:1-4

"And God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth. "The **fear** of **you** and the **terror** of you will be on every **beast** of the earth and on every **bird** of the sky; with everything that creeps on the ground, and all the fish of the sea, **into your hand they are given.**"Every moving thing that is alive shall be food for you; I give all to you, **as {I gave} the green plant.** "Only you shall **not eat** flesh with its **life** [Hebrew = **nephesh**], [represented by] blood.

Romans 8:21-22

"the **creation** itself also will be **set free** from its **slavery** to **corruption** into the freedom of the glory of the children of God. For, we know that the **whole creation groans** and travails, in pain together until now." [Emphasis added in bold]

When an internationally recognized creationist speaker was giving a presentation in Edinburgh, Scotland, a number of university students came up and said, "When we're trying to witness to non-Christians at the university, they **always** bring up the same **two questions**." The speaker stopped them and said, "I can tell you what those two questions are about: **creation/evolution** and **death and suffering**." "Yes," they said, in surprise . . . . But we've been **told by** our **churches** to **ignore** those questions and **just** tell them about **Jesus** dying for their sins on the **Cross**." [Emphasis added in bold]

(This story was shared by a speaker at a conference hosted by [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org))

Some Christian leaders (*pastors as well as school administrators and teachers*) have mistakenly assumed that it is best to *minimize* the creation vs. evolution issue and *merely* focus on the Gospel. They fear that making the issue of creation central is *unnecessarily* divisive and therefore destructive. Sadly, they have failed to think issues through to their own logical conclusions. Remember, Proverbs 16:25 says there is a way that seems right to a man, but it (their human assumption) ends in death and destruction. God's gospel stands or falls on the historical reality of His first Adam. If there was no literal first Adam, then the second Adam, Jesus (Rom 5), died for nothing.

The true and *full* gospel says that Jesus died to pay the penalty for man's sin, and that God will one day restore the universe to its originally peaceful state. God told Adam in Genesis that if He rebelled, the result would be the beginning of death. God withdrew a measure of His protection and allowed the *escalation* of entropy (disorder), leading to death. At the end of this age of corruption (2 Pet 3), God will fully withdraw His holding hand and allow the universe to "pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up". Then He will restore a new Edenic universe.

To help my students understand the logical connection between Eden and God's promised new Heaven and new Earth, I walked in one day and announced some "good news". I said, "Students, I've decided to *restore* my grading system to the one I originally used in the beginning, back when I gave everyone a guaranteed "A" no matter what they did. I promise!"

A few of the students looked elated, some dumb-struck. But, a few of the really sharp ones quickly raised their hands and asked, "Mr. Galloway, did you ever really have that kind of grading system?" To which I admitted, "No, I've never had a system like that." The response of those *critically* thinking students' was exactly what I had hoped. Two of them nearly shouted out in unison, "Then, Mr. Galloway, your promise is based on a lie, so we don't believe you."

If Eden is mythical, then God's promise *restore* the Earth is based on a lie and should not be trusted (Gen 1:29-31; Isa 11:6-7; 65:25; Romans 8:21-23). The original Eden and the new Earth are inseparably linked. God promises to RESTORE the earth to the way it was in Eden where the lion, leopard, lamb, and calf lived in vegetarian peace. But if Eden is a myth that never really existed, then God's promise is based on a lie. The Good News – the Gospel – is that Eden was a garden of peace and the coming Kingdom for all who embrace His Lordship will be the same. This is the *full* Gospel that every Christian school should have and clearly communicate as the cornerstone of its philosophy and practice, for God's glory and the edification of its students.

#### 4. **Glorify (God's goal toward which all education should strive)**

"Modern **Darwinism** is built, most fundamentally, upon what I will be calling "**The Primary Axiom**". . . . [It states] that man is merely the product of *random mutations* plus *natural selection*. . . . It is for this reason that the overwhelming **majority of youth** who start out with a belief that there is more to life than mere chemistry – **will lose their faith while at college**. I believe this is also the **cause** of the widespread self-**destructive** and self-**denigrating** behaviors we see throughout our culture."

From the Prologue of, *Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome*, 2005. Dr. John Sanford has been a professor of genetics at Cornell University for more than 25 years, publisher of over 70 scientific publications, recipient of over 25 patents, and is now a **newly converted young earth creationist**. [Emphasis added in bold]

Yawning is an amazing thing. Picture in your mind someone's mouth slowly stretching open into a full yawn. When I travel and speak, one of the slides I like to show the audiences is of a person yawning. It never fails. Within seconds, most of the people are either yawning or trying to hold one back. Yawning is contagious, and so are all other social characteristics. Our Creator has made us socially contagious so that we will more easily absorb from our parents and churches His Way, His true beliefs and His good practices. It is a key to effective discipleship.

The dangerous thing, however, is that in this fallen world our socially contagious nature will also pick up the corruption of the culture that surrounds us. The Way of God is the way of the cross, the way of His Son, who sacrificed self for the true needs of others. The Way of evolution (survival of the fittest) is to sacrifice others for the desires of self, as with abortion.

God's Way and the way of evolution are diametrically opposed to one another. Theism and survival of the fittest (theistic evolution) are incompatible with belief in a God of love.

Glorifying God is the purpose of life, which means to reveal His true character through our lives and relationships. If a person, family, or nation *believes* that "survival of the fittest" was God's Way (*method*) of creation, then what kind attitudes and actions will such a belief produce? It is no wonder we that we have a world filled with increasing deceit and violence.

This is the fourth major reason why the beginning chapters of Genesis are so significant. They are the foundation for every major doctrine in Christianity, especially the *moral* principles that lead to personal and corporate character - "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control" (Galatians 5:16-25). The purpose and goal of Christian school education is to instill and enhance the character of Christ (Romans 8:28-29) into the hearts and lives of its students. When people see Christ's character in our lives, families, and churches, they see something *unnatural*, supernatural and are drawn to Him. "Survival of the Coolest", coined by my teenage son, Steven, many years ago, is not God's Way.

Creation, the biblical truths about *how* and *why* God designed His universe, under gird all of Christianity. What a person, family, church, counselor, ruler, or even nation believes about the origin of the universe, earth, life, and man is the central *root* producing its practical and moral *fruit*. The cultural *root* of evolution's "survival of the fittest" produced the Holocaust in Germany as well as the modern holocaust of abortion. This philosophical root is especially insidious in the realm of education – subtly affecting many subjects including history, language, literature, biology, chemistry, physics, astronomy, geology, anthropology, psychology, etc. It is taught in major textbooks, museums, zoos, popular magazines, and glamorously portrayed through educational TV (especially PBS - "Propaganda Broadcasting System"). So, what fruit is produced by this new root of our culture in the lives of "Christian" youth?

[Christian teens] asked to estimate the likelihood that they will continue to participate in church life once they are living on their own, ... levels dip to only about one of every three teens.

Barna Research Online, 'Teenagers Embrace Religion but Are Not Excited About Christianity,' January 10, 2000, [www.barna.org/cgibin/PagePressRelease.asp?PressReleaseID=45&Reference=D](http://www.barna.org/cgibin/PagePressRelease.asp?PressReleaseID=45&Reference=D)

What should we do to correct this serious problem? 1 Peter 3:15 tells us to "... sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer [*evidence*] to every man that ask you for a reason of the hope that is in you with humility and reverence". This means that every Christian teacher must know not only *what* he believes, but just as importantly *why* he believes it. He must be able to give logical, scriptural and scientific *evidence* for his beliefs, starting with the beginning – creation.

The root problem is a question of Lordship, which begins with a student's understanding of God as Creator. What or who is their source of authority for what they believe? Will it be God, His Word, based upon the strong evidence He has provided? Or will it be something or someone less than God and His trustworthy authority? If their view of God is a theistic

evolutionary one, where God desired and designed survival of the cruelest and whose Word is historically and scientifically wrong, why would they trust and follow His lead?

To shed some positive light on this gloomy picture, there are some exciting changes taking place as a result of parents, churches, Christian schools, and organizations who are obeying the command of 1 Peter 3:15 and applying it to the cornerstone issue of creation. For example, a front page article of *The Los Angeles Times* (March 31, 2006) revealed that “Sometimes disruptive, but often **sophisticated** questioning of evolution by **students** has educators increasingly on the defensive.” [Emphasis added in bold] In fact, the UK’s, *Guardian* (May 2, 2006), also reported that an increasing number of students are challenging their instructors when evolution is taught as fact. The *Guardian* article, typical to the liberal media bias, grossly misrepresents creationism and creationists.

Our desire as Christian teachers is that our students will not be “disruptive” when they interact with their college professors, but model the humility of Christ (Luke 2), who showed impeccable honor toward authority as a youth. He “sat” under their authority and respectfully asked intelligent questions that eventually led the teachers to ask Him to share more.

## **B. The *Evidence* for Creation**

### **1. Scholars (Least trustworthy, since this is merely an “argument from authority”)**

This category of evidence is important, but it is the weakest of the three that I will list, since God’s authority always overrules the majority. Even apart from God’s authority, majority opinion among mankind’s intelligentsia has often been overruled by new evidence. Hypotheses, theories, and even scientific laws have been overturned as more accurate data accumulated.

PBS regularly claims that there are no respected PhD scientists who have rejected macroevolutionary theory. One of the reasons PBS deserves a new title, *Propaganda Broadcasting System*, is that they know this claim is false. There are 1,000's of PhD scientists who have rejected macroevolution because the scientific evidence convinced them it is now no more than a set of *unsubstantiated* hypotheses.

They include, for example, the inventor of the MRI, Dr. Raymond Damadian, Dr. John Baumgardner of Los Alamos Laboratories (described by U.S. News & World Report magazine as "the world's pre-eminent expert in the design of computer models for geophysical convection."), and Dr. A. E. Wilder-Smith (<http://www.wildersmith.org/>, one of very few scientists who earned three doctorates in physical sciences from prestigious universities - Oxford, then Geneva, and finally Zurich). The following links provide a list of further examples, along with detailed biographies:

- [AiG \(http://www.answersingenesis.org/Home/Area/bios/default.asp\)](http://www.answersingenesis.org/Home/Area/bios/default.asp)
- [ICR \(http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=185\)](http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=185)
- [CMI \(http://www.creationontheweb.com/content/view/2084/\)](http://www.creationontheweb.com/content/view/2084/)
- [CRS \(http://www.creationresearch.org/speakers.htm\)](http://www.creationresearch.org/speakers.htm)

## 2. Science (Second most trustworthy, since theories cannot be proven; only supported)

This second category of evidence is stronger than a mere argument from majority authority, but still not as strong as the evidence of Scripture. A hypothesis (Greek "hypo-thesis") is literally an underlying proposition (belief). A proper scientific hypothesis must be formulated (stated) as a testable prediction, usually as an "if . . . then" statement, that can be falsified (nullified). The term "*falsified*" in science does not mean "fabricated", but simply "proven to be incorrect". Remember that useful hypotheses can never be "proven", according to, Dr. Karl Popper, probably the most respected expert and philosopher on the scientific method, (<http://www.univie.ac.at/science-archives/popper/>). Hypotheses can only be "supported" or falsified. Also, it only takes one false test to disprove.

If a hypothesis is tested many times by many scientists and not *yet* proven false, then it might graduate to the level of being called a strongly supported "theory". If a theory is further tested for a long time and still not *yet* falsified, then the scientific community may choose to call it a scientific "law". Once again, it only takes one false test to disprove a hypothesis, theory, or even a law. Keep in mind that the history of modern science is filled with disproved theories and laws that were dogmatically defended by the majority of scientists of that day.

It is also important to understand that not all "sciences" are the same. Operational or observational sciences, such as chemistry, physics, and biology, involve observation and repeatable experimentation (testing) of *present* events. There is another category of science that is *qualitatively* different. It is called "origins" science or "historical" science. This realm of study involves the examination of things left over from the *past* (fossils, rock layers, genetic coding passed on to new generations, etc). The *past* cannot be seen directly, nor repeated through experimentation. So, these leftovers from the past are the evidences that must be *interpreted* by researchers. This is more akin to historical or forensic investigations of the past. All scientists (whether creationists or evolutionists) have the same evidence. The question that is significant is whose model is the most consistent with all the evidence.

Macroevolutionary theory makes claims about all three dimensions of science: physical, biological, and social. Due to the limited purpose of this paper, I will simply list a number of the major questions for which a biblical creation model best fits the evidence. Links to supporting resources will be provided in the appendices for further study.

### **Origin and Age of "Stuff" – His/story**

- From what and where did space, time, matter, and energy come into existence?
- Is the universe thousands or billions of years old?
- There are hundreds of ways to estimate the age of the earth and universe. Over 90% of them show it cannot be billions of years old, yet easily fit the thousands of years time frame of Scripture.

\* Example for further study - C14 recently discovered in diamonds

\* Example for further study - Helium diffusion in zircon crystals

### **Origin of Geologic Structures** (Did a global, catastrophic flood and tectonic upheaval create them?)

### **Origin of Life** (Does the Law of Biogenesis apply for the first cell?)

### **Origin of Death** (Why is there disease and death throughout the creation of a loving God?)

**Origin of the Different Kinds of Life** (Are mutations a possible mechanism for macroevolution?)  
**Origin of Human Races** (Are there different races or merely varied cultures of one race?)

One area of scientific evidence does need to be addressed directly, due to the mischaracterization (“straw-man” argument) often made *about* creationists. Evolutionists, especially in the media, love to claim that creationists do not believe that organisms have changed over time. Please note that all scientists who are also biblical creationists recognize that *natural* selection (adaptation) is a real process, yet resulting only in *horizontal* change within a particular species/genus (a “kind”), such as frogs of different size, color and shape. *Artificial* selection (like the breeding of dogs), can also produce horizontal change within a particular kind (white Poodles vs. black Great Danes). However, this is merely “microevolution” involving the sorting and/or loss of previously existing genetic information (alleles), not the creation of new information in the genome. Breeding or selecting *frogs* for thousands or even for millions of years can only produce breeds of *frogs*.

The Darwinian belief (macroevolution) that natural selection plus *mutations* have produced *vertical* change from a microbe into all of the orders, classes, phyla and even kingdoms now known is contradicted by a massive amount of evidence. The belief that microbes became amphibian kinds that eventually became reptile kinds that eventually became bird kinds is impossible because this would require the addition of incomprehensible amounts of new genetic information. Research demonstrates that the genetic information in each “kinds” gene pool (a “kind” representing a species or genus) is fixed / limited and never increases by *mutations*. All *mutations* are a loss of genetic information, not an addition.

"The failure to observe even one mutation that adds information is more than just a failure to find support for the theory. It is evidence against the theory. We have here a serious challenge to neo-Darwinian theory." [Emphasis added in bold]

Dr. Lee Spetner, (Non-Christian) world famous Prof. of Biophysics at Johns Hopkins, and author of, *Not By Chance: Shattering the Modern Theory of Evolution*

### 3. Scripture (The most trustworthy due to prophetic proofs that transcend time)

“The evidence from Scripture is by far the best evidence for creation. No better evidence can be imagined than that provided from Him who is not only the only eyewitness observer, but who also is the embodiment of all truth. All Christians should be content in His claims for creation. There are those, however, who reject the authority of the Scriptures. I believe that the best extra-biblical evidence for creation would come from the design of organisms past and present. ”

Dr. Kurt Wise, Associate Professor of Science and Director of the Center for Origins Research at Bryan College. PhD Invertebrate Paleontology, Harvard University, M.A. Geology, Harvard University. <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/313.asp>

Isaiah 11:6-7

"The wolf also shall  **dwell** with the lamb,  
The leopard shall  **lie down** with the young goat,  
The calf and the young lion and the fatling together;  
And a little child shall lead them.  
7 The cow and the bear shall  **graze** ;  
Their young ones shall lie down together;  
And the  **lion shall eat straw**  like the ox.

Hebrews 11:1-3

“Now **faith** is the substance of things hoped for, the **evidence** of things not seen. For by it the elders obtained a good report. Through **faith** we understand that the **worlds were framed by the word of God**, so that **things** which are **seen** were **not made of things which do appear**.”  
[Emphasis added in bold]

The Bible is the only book containing 100's of prophecies that have accurately predicted the future of nations, kings, & most important of all Messiah Jesus. The Bible transcends time and demonstrates its Divine authorship.

*Science Speaks: Scientific Proof of the Accuracy of Prophecy and the Bible*

[http://www.geocities.com/stonerdon/science\\_speaks.html](http://www.geocities.com/stonerdon/science_speaks.html)

By PETER W. STONER, M.S., and ROBERT C. NEWMAN, S.T.M., Ph.D., Moody Press Chicago

Peter Stoner, M.S.

Chairman of the Departments of Mathematics and Astronomy at Pasadena City College until 1953; Chairman of the science division, Westmont College, 1953-57; Professor Emeritus of Science, Westmont College; Professor Emeritus of Mathematics and Astronomy, Pasadena City College.

Robert C. Newman, S.T.M., Ph.D.

Ph.D. in Astrophysics, Cornell University, 1967; S.T.M., Biblical School of Theology, 1972; Associate Professor of Physics and Mathematics, Shelton College, 19689-71; Associate professor of New Testament, Biblical School of Theology.

(See also, <http://www.familybible.org/Articles/BibleProphecy/Probability.htm>)

H. Harold Hartzler, of the American Scientific Affiliation, in the foreword of Peter Stoner's book, *Science Speaks*, writes: “The manuscript for [the book], *Science Speaks*, has been carefully reviewed by a committee of the American Scientific Affiliation members and by the Executive Council of the same group and has been found, in general, to be dependable and accurate in regard to the scientific material presented. The mathematical analysis included is based upon principles of probability which are thoroughly sound and Professor Stoner has applied these principles in a proper and convincing way.”

Once again, space will not allow a comprehensive exegetical discussion of the Bible's claim that the universe was created out of nothing (Hebrew “bara”) about six thousand years ago, in six natural, literal 24 hour days, with no death of nephesh creatures prior to the sin of Adam. I will only be able to mention a few of the most central biblical evidences and then list scholarly resources for further study in the appendices. The orthodox, biblical teachings below stand in diametric opposition to the claims of even *theistic* evolution, making it intellectually impossible to integrate the two worldviews. Only one of the two can be true. Proper exegetical interpretation cannot justifiably merge the two into a theistic evolutionary philosophy without twisting Scripture through extreme eisegesis.

**1. Gospel – Sin, Penalty, Atonement:** As discussed previously, the *gospel* of the “second Adam” (Jesus) depends on the historical reality of the first Adam? Only a literal interpretation of Genesis 1-11 can theologically explain the origin of degeneration, disease, and *death* (survival of the cruelest) and the necessity of Christ's sacrifice on the cross.

**2. Order / Age of Creation:** The Hebrew term “yom” can mean a general period or a literal 24 hour day. However, when it is used in Genesis 1 for the six days of *creation* it is *qualified* by a *number* (day 1, day 2), as well as the terms “*evening*” and “*morning*”. These qualifiers always mean a literal 24 hour day, and this interpretive fact is consistent in the over 2,000 uses of the term “yom” in the Old Testament. The only place that some *modern* theologians ignore this

interpretive rule is in Genesis 1, not by exegesis, but by eisegetically forcing the hypothetical idea of long geological ages into the God's Word.

Also, the *chronology* carefully preserved in God's Word, using the "boring", yet vital genealogies, clearly claims creation of the universe and Adam to have occurred approximately 4,000 years before Jesus of Nazareth. (See Dr. Nolan's new book referenced in the appendix)

**3. Geology Shaped by Global Catastrophe:** Noah's Ark and the global flood (about 1,500 years after creation) are often misrepresented, unwittingly, even in the most conservative churches. The cartoons of boats with giraffes and elephants hanging out the sides are cute, but confusing to children and adults. Noah was only told to take nostril breathing animals and birds, thus a limited scope of creatures. The ark was approximately *1.5 million cu. ft.* in size and thus easily able to hold all the *parent* creatures necessary to produce all of the *breeds* of nostril breathers (species and genera) we have today. Many aquatic creatures survived in the water below the Ark, and many insects, spiders, amphibians, etc, survived floating on the massive amounts of vegetation. Note that amphibians absorb significant oxygen through their moist skin.

This same catastrophic scenario was amazingly mirrored in the Mt. St. Helen's explosion (1980) that scraped an entire forest into a huge local lake, on which the trees floated for about a year. Massive, multi-layered sheets of sediment were deposited, through which deep canyons were subsequently cut, producing a scale model of the Grand Canyon. Even many evolutionary geologists are now becoming convinced by new evidence indicating that most of the geological structures we see today (sedimentary rock layers, canyons, etc) were formed by catastrophic hydrodynamic (water) forces.

**4. Babel:** The Bible says the Tower was the spark for all of the different cultures and languages, present on Earth today. According to the Bible, there is only one, physical human race (Acts 17). In fact, scientifically, there is only one people "color": melanin, the pigment that makes us all shades of tan. There are no black and white people. Only God's Word has the foundational answer to racism.

**5. JESUS:** The writers of Scripture & Jesus all taught about Genesis 1-11 as literal history. They all based the foundational principles for family, marriage, parenting, and truth upon a literal Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden.

**6. New Earth Promise:** Most importantly, God's biblical, *full* good news promise of a *restored* new Earth without nephesh death is inseparably linked to a literal Eden. If the former was a myth, then the promise of the later is based upon a *lie*.

**7. Active Application:** Christian schools and their staff have a responsibility to base their teaching models and methods upon the principles of literal biblical creation. Schools, especially those seeking to promote genuinely "biblical" education, have a responsibility to *promote* the foundational truths of biblical creation.

### III. Facts vs. Fads

#### A. Distinctions - Why knowing the difference is vital to a school's philosophy

Though *biblical* faith should be founded upon facts and only those theories that are supported by sufficient evidence, far too many Christian schools have absorbed, like cultural osmosis, various unsubstantiated fads as well as a few principles and practices whose underlying hypotheses have been proven false either scripturally, statistically, or scientifically. I appreciate the critically thoughtful caution Northlake Christian School staff exercise in their evaluation of new theories and methodologies. Time and space will not allow for a full discussion of facts vs. fads, but I believe the subject requires at least an extensive representation of relevant quotations and references for future study. The following quote advertises a government guide made produced by the department of education to help staff evaluate the modern flood of educational fads flowing into our school systems.

**“Identifying and Implementing Educational Practices Supported By Rigorous Evidence”**

“The field of K-12 education contains a vast array of educational interventions - such as reading and math curricula, schoolwide reform programs, after-school programs, and new educational technologies - that **claim** to be able to **improve** educational **outcomes** and, in many cases, to be supported by evidence. This **evidence** often **consists** of **poorly-designed** and/or **advocacy-driven** studies. State and local education officials and educators must **sort through a myriad** of such **claims** to decide which interventions **merit consideration** for their schools and classrooms. **Many** of these practitioners have seen **interventions, introduced** with great **fanfare** as being able to produce dramatic gains, come and go over the years, **yielding little** in the way of positive and lasting change - a perception **confirmed** by the flat **achievement results** over the past **30 years** in the National Assessment of Educational Progress **long-term trend.**”

[Emphasis added in bold]

<http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/rigorousavid/index.html>

True facts, from a scriptural and scientific perspective, are limited to mathematical and logical truths ( $2 + 2 = 4$ ; logic's P's and Q's) as well as biblical teachings that are clear (Exodus 20 - “Thou shall not commit adultery”; “Remember the Sabbath . . . For [in] six days the LORD made heaven and earth . . . and rested the seventh day”). From the realm of educational philosophy and psychology, the closest things to facts are conclusions that come from rigorous, empirical studies with high internal validity. These are *hypotheses* that are currently *supported* and have not *yet* been nullified. Therefore, only the above should be trusted as worthy to instill into students' minds and lives. Embracing ideas that have not been supported by sound empirical studies would not be the instilling of *facts*, but rather the inflicting of *fads* on experimental guinea pigs.

My hope and prayer is that we all will investigate more carefully the studies behind various fads, before embracing and implementing them. Likely, we will discover that many have already been shown to be fallacious assumptions promoted in spite of mountains of contradictory evidence. Below, I'll merely list a few examples. Rather than attempting to justify each one, I'll simply provide relevant quotes and cite resources.

## B. “Facts”

### 1. Direct Teacher-centered Instruction (A proven, time-tested traditional methodology):

#### **A Direct Challenge, by Debra Viadero, Education Week, March 17, 1999**

"When an independent research group **evaluated** the **research** backing up 24 popular school reform models this year, it found **two surprises**. The **first** surprise was that **only three programs** could point to strong evidence that they were **effective** in improving student achievement. The **second surprise** was that **Direct Instruction**, a program **long scorned** by many educators and academics for its lock-step structure, **was one of them.**"

[Emphasis added in bold]

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1999/03/17/27direct.h18.html>

#### **Teacher-Centered Instruction and Rodney Dangerfield, by Mark C. Schug.** (Also available as a [PDF](#).)

"Teacher-centered instruction has again and again **proven** its value in studies that show it to be an **especially effective** instructional method. Yet, when **self-appointed** education leaders meet to share best practices or write about effective teaching, teacher-centered instruction, as the comedian Rodney Dangerfield used to say, gets no respect. ... Teacher-centered instruction is **supported** by a **strong** set of **empirical results** conducted over several **decades**. And yet, these approaches are ignored by the leaders of the profession, as evidenced by the content in **textbooks used to train teachers** and in authoritative reviews of research. **To discuss** teacher-centered instruction is **not even considered polite conversation.**"

[Emphasis added in bold]

<http://www.edexcellence.net/institute/publication/publication.cfm?id=317&pubsubid=909>

#### **Direct Instruction: Its Contributions to High School Achievement, by Martin A. Kozloff and Louis LaNunziata of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, James Cowardin, Director, Millennium Community School and Frances B. Bessellieu New Hanover County Schools, July, 2000**

"This paper describes the design principles, instructional practices, and specific curricula of Direct Instruction--one example of **focused, systematic, explicit** instruction. . . . **Direct Instruction** provides **highly effective** programs whose implementation fosters **beneficial change** in students' engagement and achievement, in teachers' skill at instruction and evaluation, and in the social organization of schools (e.g., strong shared mission and teacher teaming)." [Emphasis added in bold]

<http://people.uncw.edu/kozloffm/dihighschool.html>

#### **Research Regarding Direct Instruction, by Dave Ziffer.**

This is a short summary of research supporting the use of Direct Instruction, along with links to other sources.

<http://www.projectpro.com/ICR/Research/DI/Summary.htm>

#### **Teachers' Perceptions of Direct Instruction, by Bessellieu and Kozloff.**

"**Thirty** years of research shows that Direct Instruction--one type of **focused** instruction--fosters **rapid** and **reliable achievement** in students **regardless** of **ethnicity**, "race," family **background**, or **socioeconomic** status. ". . . both **large** scale and **smaller** scale **experimental research** comparing the outcomes of different forms of instruction . . ."

[Emphasis added in bold]

<http://people.uncw.edu/kozloffm/teacherperceptdi.html>

#### **Direct Instruction: What Is It?** by Rory Donaldson.

*Break down tasks into component parts and teach the component parts to mastery*

<http://www.brainsarefun.com/di2.html>

## 2. Authoritative Management of Schools and Classes (Biblical *Hypotasso* Structure):

Modern classes, and even school staff, are often characterized by chaotic confusion rather than ordered structure, cooperative focus, and effective activity. The primary reason for this is the culture's rejection of God's created structure for authoritative form and function in human systems.

The modern model and methodology of "*mutual* submission" in families and schools is a well intentioned, yet unbiblical myth even found in fine works like, *Guiding Faculty to Excellence: Instructional Supervision in the Christian School*, by Gordon B. Brown, p. 5. The apparent origin of the myth is a desire to emphasize that leaders (authorities) should be kind, loving, humble, etc. These are important qualities. Yet none of these vital characteristics is synonymous with or even implies *submission*.

A definitive explanation of the unbiblical nature of this assumed principle is available by Dr. Wayne Grudem:

“. . . **Here is the point:** None of these relationships are ever reversed. Husbands are never told to be subject (*hypotasso*) to wives, nor the government to citizens, nor masters to servants, nor the disciples to demons. Clearly parents are never told to be subject to their children! In fact, the term *hypotasso* is used outside the NT to describe the submission and obedience of soldiers in an army to those of superior rank (see, for example, Josephus, *War* 2.566, 578; 5.309; compare the adverb in 1 Clement 37:2). The *Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon* even defines *hypotasso* [passive] to mean "be obedient" (p. 1897). Of course, the exact form submission takes, the way it works out in practice, will vary greatly. But in spite of all these different forms of submission, one thing remains constant in every use of the word: it is never "mutual" in its force; it is always one-directional in its reference to submission to an authority."

[**Emphasis added in bold**]

<http://www.cbmw.org.uk/articles/MythMutualS.htm>

Like many unbiblical concepts absorbed by believers and put into practice, this myth undermines and destroys the design of God for harmonious relationships. It has contributed to the breakdown of authority between parents and children, principals and teachers, and especially between teachers and students. Parents are afraid to command their children to follow their lead, and even more afraid to apply sufficient consequences to enforce order. Similarly, school administrators often assume it is "bad" or unChrist-like to exercise the authority (even kindly and humbly) that they have been delegated as leaders. Subsequently, disorder, conflict, and chaos often characterize the Body of staff that is supposed to be under an administrator's command.

## 3. Homework (Quantity vs. Quality):

**In defense of homework, by Marianne M. Jennings**

“. . . Not all homework is **beneficial**. Real homework hones. But **busy work** assigned as homework is, well, just busy work. There is a certain breed of teacher unaware of Bill Gates' PowerPoint and who insists on **posters, presentations and panoramas** as homework based on the **odd belief** that children learn from such inane tasks." [Emphasis added in bold]

<http://www.jewishworldreview.com/cols/jennings022301.asp>

"**The Right Kind of Homework**", editorial in the New York Post, Jan. 21, 1999.

"The problem is not the amount of homework. What's **wrong** is the **amount** of quasi-educational **busywork masquerading** as homework." [Emphasis added in bold]

New York Post - New York, N.Y. Date: Jan 21, 1999 Start Page: 26 Section: Editorial

**J. E. Stone, Ph.D., founder of the "Education Consumers Clearinghouse", says,**

"Instead of responding to the public call for better results and greater accountability with better use of the existing school day, the schools with which I am familiar are **retaining the often ineffectual and inefficient practices to which they are accustomed and dumping the result-oriented exercises on students (and parents) as homework.** ... The growing concerns about homework need to be redirected. **Where parents see too much homework they need to ask what the schools are doing with the available school day.** Is time being wasted on non-academic matters? Do the teaching methods used seem to be chosen on the grounds that they are entertaining for the students rather than effective in bringing about learning?" [Emphasis added in bold]

<http://education-consumers.com/>

**Do Students Have Too Much Homework?** The Brown Center Report on American Education

"A **wealth of data** exists on the topic of homework."

". . . Why is it important to get the homework story right? Mainly because it is **positively associated** with student **learning.** **Research** shows that the relationship of homework with student **achievement** is **positive** for both middle and high school students and neutral for elementary school students. The research does **not prove causality**, an ever-present **difficulty with research on many educational practices.**"

". . . . How does it **compare** with students in **other countries?** It is an extraordinarily **light load.** The Third International Mathematics and Science Survey in 1995 asked students in their final year of secondary school how many hours per day they spent studying or doing homework. Of **twenty nations**, the **U.S.** ranked **near the bottom**, tied for the next-to-last position."

". . . . **If a homework problem exists, solutions should come from parents and teachers, not policy interventions.** . . . . Homework **loads vary by student.** Even in the same family, children experience homework differently. If parents believe their child has too much homework, they should **talk** to the **teacher**, or **teachers** in the case of high school. It is a **conceptual mistake** to try to **standardize** school assignments in **units of time.** If the page you are currently reading were assigned to thirty high school students to read, they would take varying amounts of time to complete the task. **Teachers should try to standardize the content of schoolwork, not the time to complete it.** Only teachers and parents working together can assess the individual circumstances regarding homework and determine whether children's homework loads are appropriate. **Making such decisions away from classrooms is inappropriate.**"

[Emphasis added in bold]

<http://www.brook.edu/gs/brown/20031001.pdf>

Obviously, there are many other "facts" associated with "education" as well as Scripture that could be discussed relative to a Christian philosophy. Instead of trying to cover more of these, most of which should be readily apparent, I'll move on to the less obvious: "*fads*".

## C. Fads

### Examples for further examination:

1. Self-Esteem vs. Christ-Esteem
2. "Critical Thinking" Phrase without Substance
3. Developmentally Appropriate Practices (DAP)
4. Multiple Intelligences / Learning Styles
5. Projects, Posters, & Portfolios
6. Brain Based Learning Pseudo-Science
7. Hands-On Experiments/Activities vs. Reading Comprehension & Thinking

First, a few quotes illustrating the pervasive scope and destructive potential of educational fads. Many "innovations" are not just temporary, but long lasting in their negative effects.

**Fad, Fraud, and Folly in Education**, by Martin A. Kozloff

(Watson School of Education, University of North Carolina at Wilmington, November, 2002)

"The **common view** [of fads] does **not adequately capture** the **history of innovations in education** (ranging from **questionable to destructive**), such as additive-free diets, "gentle teaching," "sensory integration," "full inclusion," and "facilitated communication" for persons with autism and other developmental disabilities; whole language, invented spelling, inquiry learning, discovery learning, learning styles, multiple intelligences, "brain-based teaching," constructivist math, portfolio assessment, authentic assessment, "journaling," self-esteem raising, "learning centers," "sustained silent reading," "developmentally appropriate practices," and "student centered" education for more typical students.

" . . . **pernicious** innovations in education **waste time, money, energy, hope, learning opportunities,** and the chances for beneficent outcomes."

" . . . Second, the list of wasteful and pernicious ideas (**pedagogies**), materials (**curricula**), and activities ("**practices**") in education is **not limited to passing fads**. **Some** destructive innovations **exist for decades** under the same name (whole language) and when **finally mauled by sufficient data** and popular magazine articles **revealing their damaging effects, merely change their name** (to "balanced literacy") and keep working at the same old stand.

Third, fads are isolated events in the culture. A pet rock inhabits an end table only. **A chronic, destructive education innovation infects a large circle**. For example, constructivism influences how education students are trained (they discover how to teach); how learning is understood (knowledge can't be transmitted, it must be created anew by each learner); what the ends of education will be (appreciation—not necessarily mastery—of literature; celebration of—not necessarily knowing much about—different cultures); how schools will be governed and organized (as "democratic communities of life-long learners"); and how teachers and schools will be evaluated and certified—according to portfolio "rubrics" of airy psychological dispositions ("Displays sensitivity," "Open to new ideas") and educationally correct shibboleths; e.g., If a multiple choice question on a certification exam says "developmentally appropriate," that's the right answer.

Fourth, the **history** of education is **blotched both by faddish ideas and methods that don't work** and by **persistent failure to institutionalize ideas and methods that do work** (Finn & Ravitch, 1996; Ravitch, 2000). . . . However, **Direct Instruction** and Applied Behavior Analysis were immediately and relentlessly attacked by sellers of the predominant, progressive and largely useless curricula tested in Project Through (Watkins, 1997), and until recently Direct Instruction and Applied Behavior Analysis were tolerated and marginalized as at best useful only for disadvantaged children and children with special needs." [Emphasis added in bold]

<http://people.uncw.edu/kozloffm/fads.html>

Please note that while a few of these new theories and practices may have *some* limited truth and *value*, in many cases they have been taken to *extremes* and/or may contain some *destructive* elements. The following warning and suggestions to *parents* regarding educational fads applies to teachers and administrators who are told by “progressive” university faculty that traditional teaching methods are out dated and less effective. So, when the following quote says, “parents”, it might help us all to read it as “*parents and school staff*”. I am grateful that NCS staff actively follows these guidelines for the sake of God’s glory and the benefit of our students.

### **Education Terminology Every Parent Must Understand**

The following offers a condensation of the “Critical Guide to Terms and Phrases”, an appendix in the book: *The Schools We Need and Why We Don’t Have Them* by E. D. Hirsch. The summary was produced by the Texas Education Consumers Association for their web site, which is currently down for renovation.

“Teachers and administrators use **jargon** which is sometimes unfamiliar to parents. When faced with strange jargon, parents are **reluctant** to ask **questions** or **debate** educators for **fear of sounding ignorant**. When parents do gather the courage to argue, educators sometimes use their jargon against us. For example, if you were to express a **desire for traditional** teaching methods, the teacher may use **pejorative** terminology to thwart your complaints. You **may be told** that **traditional** education is “just” **drill and kill** or **rote-learning**. The implication is that **you** are misguided, **ignorant** of **developmental** processes, and perhaps even **mean-spirited**. Then the teacher tells you: “We are a **child-centered** school, so we do not use those **old-fashioned** methods anymore because **research has shown** that our child-friendly methods are better.”

“This use of jargon implies that the teacher cares more about your child’s education than you do. After all, the teacher has been trained to use the most **progressive** methods available, so his or her knowledge on this subject shouldn’t be questioned. What the teacher **neglects** to tell you is that the “**research**” she refers to is **not necessarily supported** by **mainstream scientific inquiry** (i.e., published in scientific journals within a specific discipline such as psychology).”

“By using terminology that has either negative- or positive-sounding connotations, educators can succeed in silencing your opposition, simply because you don’t understand the meaning of the words and phrases. Therefore, you should arrive at the teacher conference knowing the language teachers speak, just as you would have to do if you visited a foreign country.” [Emphasis added in bold]

<http://www.nychold.com/hirsch-termin.html>

### **Perils of the Pendulum Resisting Education's Fads**

By Gail Russell Chaddock, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor, August 25, 1998 edition.

“Teachers call it the “reform du jour,” and for many, it’s the biggest challenge at the start of any school year. That’s when the latest idea for how to improve student performance kicks in.

“. . . The 1990s brought down new mandates to teach to individual “learning styles - **despite a lack of consensus on how to measure learning styles, or whether it is better to teach to a learning style or to help students overcome it.**”

Even critics note these ideas have valid points. But they were often **adopted without data - without balancing the claims of competing teaching techniques** - and then taken to **extremes**. That resulting pendulum swings are prompting a reevaluation of how educators adopt new practices in the classroom.

“There’s a very substantial metamorphosis of the culture of education going on in this country - a new **demand for research-based educational practices,**” says Douglas Carnine, director of the National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators, which is based in Eugene, Ore.

“. . . The Washington-based Evaluation of Research on Educational Approaches, founded with the support of unions, principals and superintendents, aims to help educators make that call. It is about to issue its first report evaluating the results of programs for children in poverty in October.

“**Professional development for teachers** has been very **hit-and-miss**. Some **gurus** of the month do **some good**, some do **no good** at all, some do positive **harm**,” says the McDonnell Foundation's Bruer.

## HOW TO FAD-PROOF YOUR SCHOOL

The **key** to fad-proofing your school is to **look for things that work** and **avoid those that don't**. Here are suggestions from some top superintendents and teachers:

- \* Remember that the most **entertaining** consultant does **not always** have the **best** ideas.
- \* **Textbook** publishers or consultants **rarely provide** data or **evidence** that their materials or in-service programs are effective. Insist on it.
- \* Take a **hard look** at the **research** base **behind** a proposal: What's the evidence that students will learn more under the new program than under the program it is replacing? What is the **experimental design** of the study and how strong is the evidence? How similar are students in this study to those in your classroom?
- \* Is the **method of teaching described** in **sufficient detail** that it can be **replicated** in the classrooms. Extremely talented teachers can do wonders with about any program; you need to be sure that a program is effective even when not brilliantly executed.
- \* Move slowly and **include teachers** in researching, deciding, and implementing a new program.
- \* **Start new programs** on a **sample group** and test the results **before** expanding to the **whole** district.”

[**Emphasis added in bold**]

<http://www.csmonitor.com/1998/0825/082598.feat.feat.2.html>

Below, I'll try and provide a few quotes relative to some of the specific fads listed above. The danger of unsupported fads is so insidious that I believe the time and space for the following information is essential to a discussion of educational philosophy in this day and age. Please remember that I previously stated my recognition that some of these ideas, theories, and practices may contain some truth and value, yet real research needs to be carefully and *critically* evaluated before they are embraced in total and applied to the school or classroom.

## 1. Self-Esteem

### **Christ-Esteem not Self-Esteem: Removing the Seeds of Self-Deification**

1997 . . . by Sid Galloway Updated February 2002

<http://www.soulcare.org/Counseling/Self-deception.htm>

**ONE NATION UNDER THERAPY: How the Helping Culture Is Eroding Self-Reliance**, by Christina Hoff Sommers, and Salley Satel, MD. St. Martin's Press, 2003. Dr. Sommers is described above regarding the previous book, and Dr. Satel is a psychiatrist and a lecturer at Yale University School of Medicine.

“. . . what children need most is guidance on how to be civil and ethical – not how to be self-obsessed (something many children have no problem learning on their own).”

“These would-be healers of our purported woes dogmatically believe and promote the doctrine we call ‘therapism’”.

“. . . Because they tend to regard normal children as psychlogiselly at risk, many educators are taking extreme and unprcdedeneted measures to protect them from stress. . . . The NEA distributes a teacher's guide that suggests an anxiety-reducing version of tag, ‘where nobody is ever out.’”

“It is now the practice for ‘sensitivity and bias committees’ inside publishing houses to expunge from

standardized tests all mention of potentially distressing topics.” (p. 5)

“We suggest that children are not helped by being wrapped in cotton wool and deprived of the vigorous pastimes and intellectual challenges they need for healthy development. Nor are they improved by educators, obsessed with the mission of boosting children’s self-esteem, telling them how ‘wonderful they are. A growing body of research suggests there is, in fact, no connection between high self-esteem and achievement, kindness, or good personal relationships. On the other hand, unmerited self-esteem is known to be associated with antisocial behavior – even criminality.” (p. 6)

**Exploding the Self-Esteem Myth**, By Roy F. Baumeister, Jennifer D. Campbell, Joachim I. Krueger and Kathleen D. Vohs, January 2005 Scientific American

“Boosting people’s sense of self-worth has become a **national preoccupation**. Yet surprisingly, **research** shows that such efforts are of **little value** in fostering **academic progress** or preventing undesirable behavior. People intuitively recognize the importance of self-esteem to their psychological health, so it isn’t particularly remarkable that most of us try to protect and enhance it in ourselves whenever possible. What is remarkable is that attention to self-esteem has become a communal concern, at least for Americans, who see a favorable opinion of oneself as the central psychological source from which all manner of positive outcomes spring. The corollary, that low self-esteem lies at the root of individual and thus societal problems and dysfunctions, has sustained an ambitious social agenda for decades. Indeed, campaigns to raise people’s sense of self-worth abound. **Some findings** even suggest that artificially boosting self-esteem **may lower** subsequent **academic performance**.

“. . . . At the outset, we had every reason to **hope** that **boosting self-esteem** would be a potent **tool** for helping **students**. Logic suggests that having a good dollop of self-esteem would enhance striving and persistence in school, while making a student less likely to succumb to paralyzing feelings of incompetence or self-doubt. Early work showed positive correlations between self-esteem and academic performance, lending credence to this notion. **Modern efforts** have, however, **cast doubt** on the idea that higher self-esteem actually **induces students** to do **better**.

Such **inferences** about **causality** are possible when the subjects are **examined** at **two different times**, as was the case in 1986 when Sheila M. Pottebaum, Timothy Z. Keith and Stewart W. Ehly, all then at the University of Iowa, tested more than 23,000 high school students, first in the 10th and again in the 12th grade. They found that self-esteem in 10th grade is only weakly predictive of academic achievement in 12th grade. Academic achievement in 10th grade correlates with self-esteem in 12th grade only trivially better. Such **results**, which are **now available** from **multiple studies**, certainly do **not** indicate that raising self-esteem offers students much benefit. **Some findings** even **suggest** that artificially boosting self-esteem **may lower subsequent performance**.” [Emphasis added in bold]

<http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?articleID=000CB565-F330-11BE-AD0683414B7F0000&sc=1100322>

### **Benefits of Boosting Self-Esteem Questioned: Some Efforts May Be Counterproductive**

“Self-esteem has become a household word. Teachers, parents, therapists, and others have focused efforts on boosting self-esteem on the **assumption** that high self-esteem will cause many positive outcomes and benefits. A **new report challenges** the traditional self-esteem model and suggests that efforts to boost an individual’s self-esteem might in **some cases** have the **opposite effect**.”

“The report, “Does High Self-Esteem Cause Better Performance, Interpersonal Success, Happiness, or Healthier Lifestyles?” in the May 2003 issue of *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* (<http://www.psychologicalscience.org/journals/pspi/pdf/pspi411.pdf>) takes an objective scientific look at the effects of self-esteem on academic performance, success in the workplace, and other areas where it has been generally assumed that increased self-esteem leads to achievement.”

“We have **not found evidence** that boosting self-esteem causes benefits,” the authors wrote. “Our findings **do not support** continued widespread **efforts to boost self-esteem** in the hope that it will by itself foster improved outcomes.”

The authors, Roy F. Baumeister, Florida State University; Jennifer D. Campbell, University of British Columbia; Joachim I. Krueger, Brown University; and Kathleen D. Vohs, University of Utah, discovered

that "efforts to boost the self-esteem of pupils have **not** been shown to improve academic performance and may sometimes be counterproductive." April 8, 2003 [Emphasis added in bold]  
<http://www.psychologicalscience.org/media/releases/pr030408.html>

**Forget Self-Esteem; Set High Educational Standards**, By J. Martin Rochester and David Rose

"We make **our living in higher education, teaching** political science and economics.

". . . David Gelertner, the prominent Yale University computer scientist, captured the essence of the problem in an essay in *Time*: "Our schools are in crisis. Statistics prove what I see every day as a parent and a college educator ... students who can't write worth a damn, who lack basic math and language skills. Our schools are scared to tell students to sit down and shut up and learn; drill it, memorize it, because you must master it whether it's fun or not. Children pay the price for our educational cowardice."

". . . he is expressing the frustration many of us have with a K-12 reform movement that has gone from the **one extreme** of "drill and kill" to an **opposite extreme**, encouraging in students a "**do your own thing**," "**I'm OK, you're OK**" mentality uninhibited by any authoritative standards regarding grammar or other aspects of pedagogy.

In a study reported in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Brad Bushman of Iowa State University and Roy Baumeister of Case Western University found that **college students** have **unrealistically high opinions** of themselves and are often **unable to tolerate criticism**, sometimes becoming **violent when their exaggerated self-image**, cultivated by years of ego-stroking in grade school, **comes up against someone** who dares to say "you are wrong."

"Forget about self-esteem," Baumeister advises parents and teachers, "and **concentrate on self-control**."  
[Emphasis added in bold]  
<http://www.landiss.com/teaching/forget-self-esteem.htm>

## 2. Critical Thinking

"The **problem** with many youngsters today is **not** that they **don't have opinions but** that they **don't have the facts** on which to **base** their opinions."

Albert Shanker, respected president of the American Federation of Teachers, quoted in "Debating the Standards", New York Times, Jan. 29, 1995

"What seems to have disappeared in just a generation or so is **the willingness we used to have to defer judgment until we had enough experience and breadth of knowledge to make a judgment**. The students, more socially ambitious than intellectually curious, feel put upon and won't abide what they believe to be the absurd and arbitrary demands of their instructors. The instructors have devised a way to pander to this classroom anarchy by incorporating it into their peculiar hermeneutic theories of literature -- or else they have abandoned faith in the very idea of objective worth. They don't have the nerve to stand there at the front of the classroom and announce what is painfully obvious: 'You're young, you're dumb, and you're wrong.'"

David R. Slavitt, University of Pennsylvania, "Circling the Squires", essay in "Dumbing Down: Essays on the Strip Mining of American Culture"

"The **evidence** regarding **critical thinking** is **not reassuring**. ... Usually, it is **not the logical structure** of people's inferences that chiefly causes uncritical thinking but rather the **uninformed or misinformed faultiness** of their **premises**."

". . . **Critical-thinking skills**": A phrase that **implies an ability to analyze** ideas and solve problems while taking a sufficiently **independent**, "critical" stance toward authority to think things out for one's self. . . . But it is a **goal** that can **easily be oversimplified and sloganized**. In the **progressive** tradition that

currently **dominates** our schools, "critical thinking" has **come to imply a counterpoise to** the teaching of "**mere facts**," in which, according to the dominant caricature, sheep-like students passively absorb facts from textbooks or lecture-style classrooms. Critical thinking, by contrast, is associated with active, discovery learning and with the autonomous, independent cast of mind that is desirable for the citizens of a democracy. Conceived in this progressive tradition, critical thinking belongs to the formalistic tool conception of education, which assumes that a critical habit of thought, coupled with an ability to read for the main idea and an ability to look things up, is the chief component of critical-thinking skills. **This tool conception, however, is an incorrect model of real-world critical thinking. Independent-mindedness is always predicated on relevant knowledge: one cannot think critically unless one has a lot of relevant knowledge about the issue at hand. Critical thinking is not merely giving one's opinion.** To oppose "critical thinking" and "mere facts" is a profound empirical mistake. Common sense and cognitive psychology alike support the Jeffersonian view that **critical thinking always depends upon factual knowledge.**

Prof. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., founder of Core Knowledge, in "The Schools We Need and Why We Don't Have Them".

### 3. Developmentally Appropriate Practices (DAP)

#### **"Developmentalism: An Obscure but Pervasive Restriction on Educational Improvement"**

By J. E. Stone East Tennessee State University, in EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS - A peer-reviewed scholarly electronic journal.

#### **Abstract**

Despite continuing criticism of public education, **experimentally demonstrated and field tested teaching methods** have been **ignored, rejected, and abandoned. Instead of a stable consensus** regarding best teaching practices, there seems only an **unending succession of innovations.** A longstanding educational doctrine appears to underlie this anomalous state of affairs. Termed **developmentalism**, it presumes "natural" ontogenesis to be optimal and it requires experimentally demonstrated teaching practices to overcome a **presumption that they interfere** with an optimal **developmental trajectory.** It also discourages teachers and parents from asserting themselves with children. Instead of effective interventions, it **seeks the preservation of a postulated natural perfection.** Developmentalism's rich history is expressed in a literature extending over 400 years. Its notable exponents include Jean Jacques **Rousseau**, John **Dewey**, and Jean **Piaget**; and its most recent expressions include "**developmentally appropriate practice**" and "**constructivism.**" In the years during which it gained ascendancy, developmentalism served as a basis for rejecting harsh and inhumane teaching methods. **Today it impedes efforts to hold schools accountable for student academic achievement.**

<http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v4n8.html>

### 4. Multiple Intelligences (MI) and Learning Styles (LS) Popularized by Howard Gardner

"**Playing Verbal Tricks**", by John Leo, U.S. News & World Report, August 2, 1999. "Harvard's Howard Gardner, who **thought up the theory** of multiple intelligences, **was once asked why** [he named it that]. '**If I had called them talents,**' he said, '**no one would have paid any attention.**' "

#### **Do Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic Learners Need Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic Instruction?**

by Daniel T. Willingham, professor of cognitive psychology at the University of Virginia, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), American Educator, Summer 2005. Introduction: "The idea that people may differ in their ability to learn new material depending on its modality -- that is, whether the child hears it, sees it, or touches it -- has been tested for over 100 years. And the idea that these differences might prove useful in the classroom has been around for at least 40 years. What **cognitive science has taught us** is that

**children do differ** in their abilities with different modalities, **but teaching** the child **in** his best **modality doesn't affect** his educational **achievement**. **What does matter is whether** the child is **taught in** the **content's best modality**. All students **learn** more **when content drives the choice of modality**. In this column, I will describe some of the research on matching modality strength to the modality of instruction. I will also address **why the idea of tailoring instruction to a student's best modality is so enduring -- despite substantial evidence that it is wrong.**"

[http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american\\_educator/issues/summer2005/cogsci.htm](http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/issues/summer2005/cogsci.htm)

(see also, [http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american\\_educator/issues/summer2005/cogscisb.htm](http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/issues/summer2005/cogscisb.htm) )

**"Different Strokes for Different Folks? A Critique of 'Learning Styles'"** (PDF file) by Steven A. Stahl, *American Educator* (American Federation of Teachers), Fall 1999. "People are different. Certainly people might learn differently from each other, and we should structure our teaching accordingly. **This sounds so reasonable. But it isn't.**" [http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american\\_educator/fall99/DiffStrokes.pdf](http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/fall99/DiffStrokes.pdf)

#### **"Multiple Intelligences Theory Makes Educators Feel Good"**

National Center for Policy Analysis

"There are now hundreds of schools based on the idea of "multiple intelligences," says James Traub in the *New Republic*. Referred to as "M.I." by supporters, it is a **theory that few psychologists accept, and some view** as nothing more than a "**hunch and opinion.**" However, M.I. is **appealing to educators**, says Traub, because it **offers** "an **explanation for academic failure** in which the **problem lies in the system** of measurement **rather than the student or the teacher....**"

<http://www.ncpa.org/pi/edu/oct98w.html>

<http://www.igs.net/~cmorris/critiques.html>

This article summarizes seven other papers and sources critical of MI, and provides links and references.

## **5. Projects, Posters, PowerPoint, and Portfolios**

**"Lost In Action: Are time-consuming, trivializing activities displacing the cultivation of active minds?"** By Gilbert T. Sewall, in *American Educator* – Summer 2000.

"Education is **not a game**. The **only valid architecture** for projects and activities is **core knowledge**. How to handle words, express yourself fluently, and listen are not educational electives. **No substitute exists** for the **foundations** of mathematics, history, and science. Individual deliberation, judgment, understanding, and the ability to take advantage of the present **depend on** an individual's **storehouse** of these **fundamental facts and skills**. They are the armature, skeleton, and the **building blocks** on which continuing **education depends**. Facts and academic mastery are what too many activities **artfully dodge**. What **civilizations** have **considered the keys to** and the **superstructure** of knowledge, **contemporary progressives label lower-order skills.**"

Sewall is director of the American Textbook Council.

[http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american\\_educator/summer2000/LostInAction.html](http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/summer2000/LostInAction.html)

## **6. Brain Based Learning**

**Buyer Beware: Too Early To Use Brain-Based Strategies**, by Kathleen Madigan, *Basic Education* (Council on Basic Education), April 2001. (Note: Kathleen Madigan, Ed.D., Executive Director of the National Council for Teacher Quality, is the former assistant dean for the College of Education at the University of Oregon, and has been a regular and special education teacher.)

"Why is this a symbol of what's wrong with education? What is not wrong is wanting to help all students learn and trying to find methods to do so that are supported by research. What is wrong is that, once again,

**educators have taken a leap of faith rather than use good science**, impeding the development of a professional knowledge base.

"The trouble is that some educators are extrapolating piecemeal from certain findings and creating curriculum specifications without actual research to back up their claims. They are hitting the streets with 'brain-based' learning kits and workshops. ... **Using the term 'brain-based' has become fashionable, but unfortunately, it is only that -- a fashionable fad that may actually undermine serious research in a very complex field.**

**"In fact, actual testing of brain-based theories in classrooms is almost non-existent."**

<http://www.c-b-e.org/be/iss0104/a2madigan.htm>

**Brain Research Oversold, Experts Say**, by Valerie Strauss, Washington Post, March 13, 2001. "D.C. School Superintendent Paul L. Vance often says he plans to revamp early childhood education with the 'latest brain research.' The only problem: Top brain researchers say it can't be done. **'You can't go from neuroscience to the classroom, because we don't know enough neuroscience,'** said Kurt W. Fischer, director of the Mind, Brain and Education program at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education. ... **'There really is no research that links learning strategies or classroom methods to changes in brain structure,'** said John T. Bruer, president of the McDonnell Foundation in St. Louis. ... **'Educators are making a very big mistake by wasting their time on 'brain-based' curricula.'** That hasn't stopped a growing number of educators from believing that the world of education can be reborn via neuroscience and by buying what Sam Wineburg, professor at the College of Education at the University of Washington in Seattle, calls **'snake oil.'** Companies sell learning kits 'based on the latest brain research,' and professional development consultants peddle the concept to teachers."

<http://teachers.net/gazette/APR01/strauss.html>

**Put Brain Science on the Back Burner** by Dr. John T. Bruer, James S. McDonnell Foundation. Excerpt:

"There has always been a simmering interest in brain research among educators. Recently, however, that interest has gone from simmer to full boil. In the past 18 months, for example, we have seen special issues of "The American School Board Journal" (February 1997), "Educational Leadership" (March 1997), "The School Administrator" (January 1998), and now "The NASSP Bulletin" (May 1998) address the implications of the new brain research for educators.

"These issues contain a variety of articles -- articles by advocates of brain-based curricula, articles by educational futurists, articles by cognitive (not brain) scientists. In fact, it is **rare to find an article** written by a **neuroscientist** in the **educational literature**. Of these articles, those citing cognitive research ... provide the most useful advice to educators. **Educators should be aware that cognitive science - the behavioral science of the mind - is not the same as neuroscience - the biological science of the brain.** ... Most other claims found in the emerging brain and education literatures are **vague, outdated, metaphorical, or based on misconceptions.**"

"...Despite all the interest and media attention, we **currently do not know enough about brain development and neural function to link** that understanding, in any meaningful way, **to educational practice.**"

"...We should be **wary of claims that neuroscience has much to tell us about educational practice.**"

"...**Neuroscience has discovered** a great deal about neurons and synapses, but **not nearly enough to guide educational practice** in any meaningful way.

[http://mysite.verizon.net/pulsar/Library\\_Ref/Biology/Brain%20Development/Put%20Brain%20Back%20Burner/brain%2520back%2520burner.htm](http://mysite.verizon.net/pulsar/Library_Ref/Biology/Brain%20Development/Put%20Brain%20Back%20Burner/brain%2520back%2520burner.htm)

(See also, [Education and the Brain: A Bridge Too Far](#) by Dr. John T. Bruer, James S. McDonnell Foundation. <http://www.ucalgary.ca/%7Emueller/P365/bruer.txt>)

## 7. “Hands-On” Experiments vs. Reading and Thinking

**Reading: The Most Important Science Process Skill**, by Dr. Stan Metzenberg.

”It has become **fashionable** in science education to **mold** K-12 students **around** an *idee fixe* [**obsession**] of a modern scientist; formulating hypotheses, observing measuring, and **discovering through hands-on investigations**. What has been **left unsaid** is that **real scientists don't** actually spend very much of their day "observing" and "measuring." **They read!** Reading **for understanding of content** is the **core process skill of science**, and there is **no substitute for practice** at an early age.”

“A student who has not developed the skill of learning through reading has no professional future in science. **Without a foundation in scientific vocabulary** and with **minimal knowledge of scientific fact**, their words bear an accent of **ignorance** that is impossible to conceal and nearly impossible to remediate.

While young people should be encouraged to enter science, they must also be given the education that will permit them to succeed.”

“**Hands-on investigative activities ought to be sprinkled** into a science program **like a 'spice'**; they **cannot substitute** for a **'main dish'**. The **best 'hands-on'** program would be one in which students can get their **'hands on' an informative textbook!**”

[Dr. Metzenberg was a consultant for the Academics Standards Commission, and is an Assistant Professor of Biology at California, State University Northridge.]

<http://youth.net/ysc/educnews/readscie.htm>

**Minds-On" Science Education**, Science News, April 27, 1996. A professor of biology writes, "... there comes a time, starting in middle school or high school, when students **must acquire a body of knowledge**. **How can they do this and still have the hands-on science** that everyone is calling for? **Hands-on science moves far too slowly** for them to **acquire a body of knowledge**." Another person writes, "Having students **formulate** and carry out **experiments** is an **important part** of their education. ... **However, making this the main curriculum is misguided**. In doing **research, students learn** facts at a **snail's pace**. If they are ever to become scientists, they **need to stand** on the **shoulders of those** who came **before them**. For a more thorough overview of this topic, read *Dumbing Down Our Kids* by Charles J. Sykes. Meanwhile, parents need to insist on proven techniques in the education of their children."

[http://www.sciencenews.org/pages/sn\\_arch/4\\_27\\_96/letters.htm](http://www.sciencenews.org/pages/sn_arch/4_27_96/letters.htm)

# APPENDICES

## Appendix A – Full Outline for “Creation: The Cornerstone of Christianity”

### I. **Significance** of Origin Hypotheses (*Why is this subject so important?*)

#### A. **God** (Good Shepherd or Monster – The trustworthiness of His character)

1. Theistic evolutionists cannot explain death theologically
2. Did God design survival of the cruelest?
3. Theistic evolutionism blasphemes the character of God the Good Shepherd

#### B. **Graphae** (Greek term = “written” / Scripture – The trustworthiness of His written Word)

1. Doubt of the Bible’s beginning leads to doubt of the rest of its claims
2. John 3:12 “If you don’t believe me on earthly things . . . why heavenly things?”
3. Earthly = astronomy, anthropology, biology, geology, etc
4. Heavenly = God’s nature, sin, salvation, Gospel, etc

#### C. **Gospel** (The validity of His promise is dependent on the first Adam)

1. Good or Bad News
2. Jesus, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Adam (Rom 5) died because of the 1<sup>st</sup> Adam
3. If Adam was merely a myth and death did not result from his rebellion, then Jesus died for nothing.

#### D. **Glorify** (To reveal His character - God’s goal toward which all education should strive))

1. Cornerstone of Christianity / Counseling into the Image of Christ
2. Practical fruit growing from root beliefs about God, self, etc
3. Are we to become like Christ or like Hitler / Saddam / etc

### II. **Evidence** for Origin Hypotheses

#### A. **Scholars** as Evidence (1000’s of scientists and theologians who reject evolutionary hypotheses)

\* Argument from “authority” is a weak argument, yet is a valid category for logical inference

##### 1. **Science** Scholars (Christian & Non-Christian)

\* A Few Christian Examples

- a) Dr. Raymond Damadian, MD (Inventor of the MRI)
- b) Dr. Don Menton, PhD (Anatomy Professor at Washington Medical School)
- c) Dr. Terry Mortenson, PhD (History of Geology)
- d) Dr. John Baumgardner, PhD (Los Alamos Laboratory – TERRA supercomputer mode)
- e) Dr. Russell Humphreys, PhD (Sandi Laboratory – Physics)
- f) Dr. Raymond Damadian (Inventor of the MRI)
- g) Dr. A. E. Wilder-Smith, (3 Doctorates from prestigious European universities)
- h) Dr. Werner Gitt, PhD (Director German Federal Institute of Physics & Technology)
- i) Dr. Jonathan Sarfati, PhD (Chemistry, Chess Champion – record beating 12 blindfolded)
- j) Dr. James Allan, PhD (Geneticist, Scotland)
- k) Dr. Jason Lisle, PhD (Astrophysics, graduated with honors)
- l) Dr. Gary Parker, EdD (Biology, author of 5 textbooks)

\* A Few Non-Christian Examples

- a) Dr. Lee Spetner, PhD (Biophysics, Johns Hopkins University)
- b) Dr. Michael Behe, PhD (Biology, Berkley University)
- c) Dr. Jonathan Wells, PhD

d) See [www.answersingenesis.com](http://www.answersingenesis.com), <http://www.creationontheweb.com>, [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org), [www.crs.org](http://www.crs.org), for 100’s more examples

\*\* Compare top atheistic evolutionist, Dr. Richard Dawkins of Oxford, who could not defend mutations as the mechanism.

##### 2. **Scripture** Scholars (1000’s of experts in Scripture and its original languages)

\* (Conservative experts who believe biblical creation to be true)

- a) Dr. Ting Wang (Expert in Hebrew & OT at Stanford University)
- b) Drs. Keil & Delitzsch (One of the most respected OT commentaries ever written)
- c) Dr. H. C. Leupold (Hebrew language expert, Capital University)
- d) Dr. Douglas Kelly (Professor of Systematic Theology – summary quote re: liberal Hebrew scholars)

\* Liberal experts who reject the Bible’s inerrancy, yet admit that the Hebrew language of Genesis teaches a literal six 24 hour day creation only thousands of years ago, with no death before sin)

##### a) Dr. James Barr (Oxford University – liberal expert in the Hebrew language and the OT)

\* Quotation from the liberal scholar, Dr. Barr:

- “... probably, so far as I know, there is no professor of Hebrew or Old Testament at any world-class university who does not believe that the writer (s) of Genesis 1–11 intended to convey to their readers the ideas that:
- creation took place in a series of six days which were the same as the days of 24 hours we now experience
  - the figures in the genealogies provided by simple addition a chronology from the beginning up to later stages in the biblical story
  - Noah’s flood was understood to be world-wide and extinguish all human and animal life except for those in the ark.”

## B. Scientific Evidence

- \* Not the strongest evidence, since hypotheses, theories, & laws can never be "proven" and are all subject to falsification.
- \* Science conclusions, different from mathematics, can only be supported, and it only takes one test to falsify.

### 1. *Introduction* to Science

- a. Fascinating Photo Discoveries (Dino Tissue, Fossilized Hat, etc)
- b. Complementary nature of science and Scripture
  - 1) Logical / Critical Thinking
  - 2) Proverbs 14:15; Hebrews 11:1 Faith based on evidence, not blind faith
  - 3) NT Greek - *logos* = word / information, *logikos* = logical
  - 4) Jesus = THE Logos (Rational God who created an ordered world that can be studied logically)
  - 5) Scientific Method
    - i. "Born in the womb of Christian culture"
    - ii. Demands rational belief based upon sufficient supportive evidence
- b. Limitations of Science
  - 1) Hypothesis = (Greek, *hypo* – *thesis* = underlying belief)
  - 2) Hypotheses can only be supported, but never proven.
  - 3) Hypotheses are often falsified.
  - 4) Theory = hypothesis that has been tested, supported, and not yet falsified.
  - 5) Law = theory that has been further tested, supported, and not yet falsified.
- c. Types of Sciences (Qualitatively different)
  - 1) Observational or Operational Science (Experimental to Technological application)
  - 2) Origin or Historical Science

### 2. *Physical* Science (Atoms to Astronomy)

- a. Astronomy (Origin of the Universe, Bara, 1<sup>st</sup> Law Thermo, Starlight)
  - 1) Origin of Universe (Bara / Ex Nihilo (First Law of Thermodynamics)
  - 2) Big Bang (Beginning or End)
  - 3) Starlight, Time, and Relativity
  - 4) Origin of escalating entropy (Beyond the 2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Thermodynamics)
    - i. Deception, doubt, disobedience, disorder, dysfunction, disease, death
    - ii. Dishonor of God's Image
- b. Geology (Origin/Age of the Earth)
  - 1) RATE Team of Scientists
  - 2) Dating Assumptions (C14 in diamonds; Helium diffusion in zircon crystals)
  - 3) Catastrophism vs. Uniformitarianism
    - i. Global Flood
      - Baumgardner's Los Alamos Laboratory super computer model: TERRA
      - Rock layers (sedimentary deposition)
      - Ice Age
      - Architecture of the Ark
    - ii. Fossil formation

### 3. *Biological* Science (Atoms to Adam)

- 1) Atheistic evolutionists cannot explain LIFE scientifically. (DNA)
- 2) Origin of Life / DNA (Biogenesis vs. Spontaneous Generation)
- 3) Irreducible Complexity
- 4) No New DNA or New "Kinds"
  - \* No mechanism for new DNA or new "kinds" of animals
  - Natural Selection is real and was first described by Christians
  - Genetic change is limited to "kinds" at the genus or family level
  - Mutations are now known to never create new DNA, but rather cause a loss of genetic information.
  - So microbes to monkeys to men change is impossible

C. **Scripture** (Strongest evidence, since it has the unique support of 100's of prophecies, demonstrating Divine authorship)

\* See the overwhelmingly statistical significance of the probabilities calculated in Peter Stoner's book, [Science Speaks](http://www.geocities.com/stonerdon/science_speaks.html) (online copy [http://www.geocities.com/stonerdon/science\\_speaks.html](http://www.geocities.com/stonerdon/science_speaks.html)) H. Harold Hartzler, of the American Scientific Affiliation, Goshen College writes: "The manuscript for Science Speaks has been carefully reviewed by a committee of the American Scientific Affiliation members and by the Executive Council of the same group and has been found, in general, to be dependable and accurate in regard to the scientific material presented. The mathematical analysis included is based upon principles of probability which are thoroughly sound and Professor Stoner has applied these principles in a proper and convincing way." (see also <http://www.familybible.org/Articles/BibleProphecy/Probability.htm#science>)

\* The Bible stands alone as the only book which claims to prove its Divine authorship by predicting the future hundreds of times with 100% accuracy. God, through Isaiah in chapters 41-48, sets forth this prophetic challenge in opposition to all of man's idols. Every prophecy whose time has already past has been fulfilled in such a detailed and accurate manner that the only logical inference (faith is the evidence of things not seen) is that our Creator who transcends space and time (past and future) was the sovereign guiding source of its content.

1. Hermeneutics: This is the formal process of interpreting written documents, including the Bible.
2. Day: The Hebrew term "yom" mean a normal 24 hour day in Genesis (qualifiers = #, evening, morning).
3. Earth: The Bible says the heavens and the earth are thousands not millions of years old.
4. Life: The living God made plant "life" (DNA), created (bara) nephesh animals, and humans.
5. Death: The Bible says the origin of dysfunction, disease, and death is the sin of Adam.
6. Flood: The Bible says that Noah's flood was global, destroying all nostril breathing creatures.
7. Babel: The Bible says the Tower was the spark for different cultures and languages, not races.
8. JESUS: The writers of Scripture & Jesus all taught about Genesis 1-11 as literal history.
9. Salvation: Being saved in Noah's Ark was a physical, prophetic picture of being saved "in Christ".
10. Active Application: What should you and I do now?

### **Conclusion Regarding the Cornerstone of Creation:**

A. Christian schools and their staff have a responsibility to base their teaching models and methods upon the principles of literal biblical creation.

B. Schools, especially those seeking to promote genuinely "biblical" education, have a responsibility to *promote* the foundational truths of biblical creation.

## Appendix B

### Recommended Resources for Further Study (Annotated Comments for Some)

#### **Books:**

#### **Books Required by ACSI for the Philosophy of Christian School Education paper:**

*Foundations of Christian School Education*, Colorado Springs, CO: ACSI, 2003 (800) 367-0798.

*Love Your God With All Your Mind*, by J. P. Moreland. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress, 1997. Available through ACSI, Colorado Springs, CO: (800) 367-0798.

*Teaching Redemptively: Bringing Grace and Truth into Your Classroom*, Donovan Graham. Colorado Springs, CO: ACSI, 2004. (800) 367-0798

*Reclaiming the Future of Christian Education*, Albert E. Greene. Colorado Springs, CO: ACSI, 1998. (800) 367-0798.

#### **One Additional Book from the ACSI list required for the Philosophy of Christian School Education paper:**

*Guiding Faculty to Excellence: Instructional Supervision in the Christian School*, Gordon B. Brown. Colorado Springs, CO: ACSI, 2002. (800) 367-0798.

#### **Relevant Books Recommended for further Study:**

##### **Books Specific to Education, Philosophy, Psychology, etc -**

*Class Warfare: Besieged Schools, Bewildered Parents, Betrayed Kids and the Attack on Excellence*, by J. Martin Rochester, Encounter Books, San Francisco, CA, 2002.

Dr. Rochester is the Curator's Distinguished Teaching Professor of Political Science at the University of Missouri. He is a recipient of the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching at UM.

*The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism is Harming Our Young Men*, by Christina Hoff Sommers, PhD. Dr. Sommers is the W. H. Brady Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. Her PhD is in philosophy, and was a professor of philosophy at Clark University in Worcester. Simon & Schuster, 2000.

*ONE NATION UNDER THERAPY: How the Helping Culture Is Eroding Self-Reliance*, by Christina Hoff Sommers, and Salley Satel, MD. St. Martin's Press, 2003. Dr. Sommers is described above regarding the previous book, and Dr. Satel is a psychiatrist and a lecturer at Yale University School of Medicine.

*MANUFACTURING VICTIMS: What the Psychology Industry is Doing to People*, By Tana Dineen, PhD. In a personal conversation with Tana (who withdrew from a successful 30 year career as a psychologist), she shared with me that the accumulating evidence convinced her that far too much of psychology is not science, but rather assumptions and fads promoted by the field to convince people they need expensive counseling.

*PSYCHOBABBLE: The Failure of Modern Psychology and the Biblical Alternative*, by Richard Ganz, PhD. Crossway Books. Rich was raised in a Jewish family in which his mother hope her son would become a respected psychoanalyst. Rich succeeded in the eyes of his mother, but God had different plans.. Rich became a Christian while working in a psychiatric hospital and saw that the profoundly practical counseling from God in Scripture was sufficient for the needs of the soul (psyche) and relationships.

*THE DEVALUING OF AMERICAN: The Fight for Our Culture and Our Children*, by William Bennett. Summit Books. The first two chapters address education concerns with many insightful revelations and practical suggestions:

1. *Crisis in American Education*
2. *What Works in American Education and Why*

*Back to the Blackboard: Design for a Biblical Christian School*, by Jay E. Adams, PhD. Timeless Text, 1998.

*The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators: Facts and Figures on the State of American Society*. William J. Bennett. A Touchstone Book, 1994.

*The Devaluing of America: The Fight for Our Culture and Our Children*, William J. Bennett. Summit, 1992.

*NEA Grab for Power: A Chronology of the National Education Association*, by Dennis Cuddy. Hearststone, 2000.

*NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education*, By Samuel L. Blumenfeld. Paradigm, 1984.

*NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH: The Inspiration, Authority, and History of the Bible Explained*, Brian H. Edwards. Evangelical Press, 2006.

*Our Character, Our Future*, Alan Keyes and George Grant. Zondervan, 1996. Dr. Keyes chapter 16, "EDUCATION AND LIBERAL SHIBBOLETHS", is worth the purchase of this small book.

### **Books Specific to Scripture and Science -**

*ANSWERS ACADEMY: Biblical Apologetics for Real Life – A broad overview of the nature of science, with special emphasis on introductory geology and astronomy*, by Ken Ham (biology / education), Terry Mortenson (history / geology), PhD, and Jason Lisle (astrophysics), PhD. Answers In Genesis, 2005. This wonderful training package, including books, booklets, and DVD's is a professional production in both its video quality as well as its content.

*DISMANTLING THE BIG BANG: God's Universe Rediscovered*, by John Hartnett, PhD. Master Books 2005. Dr. Hartnett received his Ph.D. with distinction from the Department of Physics at the University of Western Australia (UWA). He works there with the Frequency Standards and Metrology research group. John's current work involves the European Space Agency's atomic clock ensemble in space.

*THE MYTHOLOGY OF MODERN DATING METHODS: Why million/billion year results are not credible*, by John Woodmorappe (Biology and Geology). ICR Press. John's book is written for the layman and succeeds in clearly explaining the censored assumptions that evolutionary scientists do not want you to understand.

*THE GREAT TURNING POINT: The Church's Catastrophic Mistake on Geology – Before Darwin*, by Terry Mortenson, PhD. Master Books, 2004. Terry's excellent and concise book reveals that the concept of millions and billions of years of earth history is a very recent hypothetical assumption that arose not from the evidence of science, but rather the anti-biblical compromises in previous centuries.

*CREATION EVANGELISM FOR THE NEW MILLENNIUM*, by Ken Ham (a high school biology teacher in Australia for 15 years, then for the past two decades a leading speaker on Scripture and Science issues, and president of Answer In Genesis. Master Books, 1999.

*BONES OF CONTENTION: A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils*, by Marvin Lubenow. Baker Books. Dr. Michael Charney, emeritus professor of anthropology and zoology at Colorado University, says about this book: "Like a true scholar he researches in depth the literature in the scientific journals, sifting the evidence, searching out the areas open to interpretation. . . ."

*NOAH'S ARK: A Feasibility Study*, by John Woodmorappe (Biology / Geology). ICR Press. This amazing and detailed book demonstrates from many different fields of science as well as Scripture that the flood of Noah was globally catastrophic and that Noah's Ark (1.5 million cubic feet) was more than capable of carrying all parent "kinds" of animals necessary to produce all of the nostril breathing breeds we see today.

*NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH: The inspiration, authority, and history of the Bible explained*, by Brian Edwards. Evangelical Press, 2006. This new revised edition presents definitive evidence for the historical reliability and accuracy of the Bible.

*WAR OF THE WORLDVIEWS: Powerful Answers for an "Evolutionized" Culture*, Master Books, 2005. Eight authors, ranging from PhD scientists to theologians to educators discuss the foundational significance of what a person or culture believes about creation.

*REFUTING EVOLUTION Volumes 1 & 2*, by Jonathan Sarfati. Master Books.  
*See also, REFUTING COMPROMISE*, by the same author. These three volumes refute the propaganda and censorship fostered by the mass media (PBS, National Geographic, etc.), as well as a few popular Christian leaders and speakers who promote evolutionary and progressive creation compromises.

*The Politically Incorrect Guide to SCIENCE*, by Tom Bethell. Regenery, 2005.  
*A Christian Philosophy of Education*, by Gordon H. Clark. The Trinity Foundation. 1946 (Revised Edition 2000) This excellent new revision demonstrates the political and profit driven reality behind much of what is called science, including evolutionary theory.

*Genesis of a Legacy: Raising Godly Children in an Ungodly World*, by Ken and Steve Ham. This excellent book and video series was produced by a pair of brothers about their father and his godly influence on their lives, emphasizing the role of biblical creation as the cornerstone. Master Books, Green Forest, AR, 2006.

*MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS: Evidences for the Christian Faith*, by Henry Morris, PhD. Dr. Morris was trained as a hydraulic scientist. This book and the many others he wrote regarding science and Scripture helped to revive the awareness of the wealth of wisdom provided by God in His Word.

*ICONS OF EVOLUTION: SCIENCE OR MYTH? Why much of what we teach about evolution is wrong*, by Jonathan Wells, PhD. Regnery Publishing, 2000. Dr. Wells is a biologist who holds PhDs from both Yale and UC Berkeley.

*THOUSANDS . . . NOT BILLIONS: Challenging an Icon of Evolution – Questioning the Age of the Earth*, by Don DeYoung, PhD. Master Books, 2005. Dr. DeYoung is a member of the RATE team of scientists. He is a physics professor at Grace College, Winona, IL, and has written 12 books on science. RATE stands for Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth. The team, including world renowned scientists such as Dr. John Baumgardner of Los Alamos National Labs, has revealed numerous new evidences that show it is impossible for the earth to be billions of years old.

*The Battle for the Beginning: The Bible on Creation and the Fall of Adam*, by Dr. John MacArthur, world renowned theological and biblical exegete, is also president of The Master's College and Seminary. Word Publishing Group, 2001.

*DARWIN ON TRIAL*, by Philip Johnson. Intervarsity Press, 1991. Professor Johnson is a graduate of Harvard and the Univ. of Chicago. He has taught law for over two decades at the UC Berkeley. His book, using the logical arguments central to legal evidence, demonstrates that evolution is not a theory, but rather a package of unsubstantiated hypotheses.

*DARWIN'S BLACK BOX: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, by Michael Behe, PhD. Dr. Behe is Assoc. Prof. of Biochemistry at Lehigh University. His book demonstrates the irreducibly complex structures and biochemical pathways that could never have arisen by an evolutionary process.

## **Videos (Annotated Comments)**

(Three VHS Tapes Required by ACSI for the Philosophy of Christian School Education paper)

By Dr. Ollie E. Gibbs, ACSI Vice President for Academic Affairs

- Session I - Understanding Educational Philosophy:  
A Contrast of the Christian and Secular Approach
- Session II - Humanism: Its Meaning and Influence
- Session III - The Necessary “Ingredients” for a Christian Philosophy of Education

**(DVD) Genesis of a Legacy: Raising Godly Children in an Ungodly World**, by Ken and Steve Ham. This excellent book and video series was produced by a pair of brothers about their father and his godly influence on their lives, emphasizing the role of biblical creation as the cornerstone.

### **(DVD) The Challenges of a Multi-ethnic Ministry**

Dr. Charles Ware

This powerful talk on the "race issue" explains how Genesis is the key to understanding human conflicts and breaking down multiethnic barriers to the gospel.

### **(DVD) It Doesn't Take a Ph.D.! ... The Cure for a Culture in Crisis**

Dr. A. Charles Ware

In this extremely timely message, Dr. Charles Ware reveals a strategy that will inspire and equip Christian families to confront (and win!) the exploding culture war in America.

**(DVD Training Series) ANSWERS ACADEMY: Biblical Apologetics for Real Life** – A broad overview of the nature of science, with special emphasis on introductory geology and astronomy, by Ken Ham (biology / education), Terry Mortenson (history / geology), PhD, and Jason Lisle (astrophysics), PhD. Answers In Genesis, 2005. This wonderful training package, including books, booklets, and DVD's is a professional production in both its video quality as well as its content.

**\*\* Hundreds of professionally produced DVD's are available through the organizations listed later.**

**\*\* Thousands of Articles are also available for download from the organizations' websites.**

## **Periodicals / Journals:**

Answers In Genesis Family Education

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/>

- "Answers Magazine: Building a Biblical Worldview"

Creation Ministry International

<http://www.creationontheweb.com/>

- "Creation Magazine"

- "Journal of Creation"

(A peer reviewed technical journal covering all realms of science from a scriptural worldview.)

Creation Research Society

<http://www.creationresearch.org/>

- Creation Research Journal

(A peer reviewed technical journal covering all realms of science from a scriptural worldview.)

Institute for Creation Research

<http://www.icr.org/>

- Many periodical are available from ICR

NANC (National Association of Nouthetic Counselors)

[www.nanc.org](http://www.nanc.org)

- The Biblical Counselor

ABC (Association of Biblical Counselors)

<http://www.christiancounseling.com/>

- Newsletter

IABC (International Association of Biblical Counselors)

[www.iabc.net](http://www.iabc.net)

- Newsletter

CCEF (Christian Counseling & Education Foundation)

<http://ccef.org/home.htm>

- Journal of Biblical Counseling

## **Educational Institutions:**

The Master's College

<http://www.masters.edu/>

The Master's Seminary

<http://www.tms.edu/>

Cedarville University

<http://www.cedarville.edu/>

ICR Graduate School

<http://www.icr.edu/index.html>

- ICR's faculty includes scientists associated with Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories, as well others with PhD's from prestigious universities.