

Should Science be taught in Schools?

by Nishaun Smith

What is love but a child of parenting. Love is a word that has been long misunderstood. For a while now things like math or science have been preached in schools. Constantly the wise men of society have taught of the importance of theologies like evolution and sex education, etc. It is incredibly strange that no one has ever thought of the importance of teaching parenting in schools, except to young girls who are already mothers. Is the scientific community scared of offending feminists by speaking about the unique relationship between a child and mother? Why do psychologists tell mothers not to follow their emotions or feel guilty when leaving their children, at a young age, to go back to work? Why is it then okay for gays to listen to their twisted emotions? (Why are positive motherhood emotions ignored and negative gay emotions considered normal?) When will scientist decode the secrets of fatherhood, or are they intentionally hiding the rosetta stone of masculinity to protect gays? It is strange that there would be no scientific uproar if a scientist heard an African-American father being blamed for the destruction of the black community. Is it only poverty that is destroying the black community or is it also the lack of the unique relationship between father and son? There are many circumstances that culminate toward the lack of black fatherhood but, does the lack of having or being a father create weakness in the black community? No one would claim it was inaccurate to blame the black father specifically. But when it comes to gays all of a sudden fathers have no consequence. Is parenting a myth invented by creationists, that goes back to the Adam and Eve story? I have never heard a scientist make such a claim. Is a child's unique response to masculinity worthless? I have never heard a scientist claim that parenting is an evolutionary fluke or say humans are better off gay. This is a simple question, what will be taught in a school system that is legally obligated to be scientific? Will the child "of a" gay come to school everyday and learn that their parents are lying to them, in health class, or will the school system hide the truth that children need fathers; to protect these children from having to question their parents? Did the *logos* police protect the children of creationists or were they happy to offend the children of God? Why the contradiction? If society is going to do everything to prevent children from abstaining don't you think they should teach them parenting skills? No one has ever preached, fathers are unnecessary as long as you have a babysitter; to protect black people. It is weird that no one wants to offend gays or feminists.

If you want to list the positive attributes of science, high on your list may be medical care. God's main response to medical care is don't get sick, stay away from uncleanness and disease and bodily fluids, read Leviticus. Is the scientific community curing disease or causing them? That is to say did God create or invent pollution? Are scientists intentionally putting carcinogens and health hazards in our foods and deodorants, soaps and medicines; or are they just not very smart? One of those has to be true, maybe even both. If scientists will pollute the world for money then it is not hard to think they would over exaggerate natural selection. In a world filled with so many political, historical and religious lies, should we assume without any vigorous study that the scientific community is honest? Contrary to their own beliefs, God created them upright but they have decayed and devolved far from this, as have we all.

Should science be taught in schools, at first glance this seems like a joke but the question is far more important than a Christian may realize. Are scientists politicians, are they any different from the soothsayers, Chaldeans, magicians that interpret bones to their own progress. Are they any different from the astrologers or the Sadducees of the Bible. (Remember, magic is usually science as used for mischief.) Are the scientists like lawyers who twist facts for the highest bidders? Are they like scribes who twist words and documents for their own ambitions and stature? These things should be brought to debate, are the scientists evildoers? Are the natural scientists a magisterium for twisting theology to retain power over the laymen, that is to say have you ever tested a fossil? It is a little known fact that science in itself is not naturally scientific, the inability of science to lead to the truth has been proven. There are two systems that prove that facts are not as factual as you may think. One is the legal system the other all computer systems. They are all based on a theology pioneered by logician George Boole. The basic idea is by asking a question and demanding a yes or no answer the truth will be revealed. This is why lawyers cross examine witnesses by saying "yes or no please." The ones and zeros in computer language also reference true and false. Not many smart people would claim that the courtroom is a place where honesty abounds. There are many tricks of the licit trade that can also be functioned into the scientific community. Such as ignoring the evidence when it is limited, faking irritation and anger, building on prejudices like racism, and there is always the abuse, terrorist, fear card. (Is creationism really child abuse?) An example would be the complete ignoring of the actual evidence of evolution and the focus on the motive of evolution by natural scientists. The theory of evolution is far more complex than the evidence of evolution, and not one piece of evidence is contrary to anything said in the Bible, to keep this short and to digress, no one would ever accuse a computer of telling the truth, we wouldn't need that much online security. Mention creationism to a scientist and look how angry they get, I have never seen an airplane engineer act that way. Come to think of it I have never heard an engineer say that the shape of an airplane's wing causes lift, **randomly**. If any other scientist defined their trade with the basic argument of *random positive equations* they would be laughed out of their industry. There is no such thing as an equation that causes a random positive change but this is a base argument of evolution. That is to say if random positive equations are impossible then evolution is impossible. An equation can't be random or create a positive result by definition. An equation can only have equal predictable results, conceptual evolution is clearly false. To be a little clearer, $1+1$ is not equal to a random number, nor is it equal to a number greater than 2. All equations must be equal therefore no event or object can evolve into a more complex being having greater energy. (It takes more energy to create the human brain than it does to create a one-celled organism.) I think this should be the main

counter argument to evolution.

People have to understand that the early evolutionists were hell bent on disproving the Bible, so slowly as evolution became a religion the modern evolutionists, instead of looking at their parents' beliefs critically, choose to defend them. The problem with evolution is it is not repeatable and or observable therefore the theory is mostly assumption built on assumption. No evolutionists has ever even noticed that nothing else in the observable universe has ever evolved. That is to say there are mathematical reasons that prevent a pencil from evolving into a pen. Or lead into gold, or water into oil. So if you want to preach evolution into a more complex object, you have to prove **evolution into a more complex object**, instead of trying to prove that rocks are very old and the fossils inside these rocks are assumptively similar ages. I don't think mathematics allows evolution, because mathematics only allows equal change. You would think you would have heard this argument before, or at least a response to it. In the last hundred years someone should have asked such a basic question about the very concept of evolving. Things don't evolve so if something evolves you would think it would be priority to explain why, currently the main explanation of how evolution happened is, *random change leads to more complexity*. (Even though it doesn't, it only leads to equal change or creates a weaker object.) I think early evolutionists accidentally mixed up thinking they disproved the Bible's claim with thinking they proved evolution. Proving that rocks are old is far from proving that one fossil has any connection to another fossil. All honest evolutionists will admit that it may be impossible to prove evolution; so now they focus on building a circumstantial evidence case.

www.nishaun.com

www.about-god.org

Copyright © 2008 by Nishaun Smith
Feel free to copy **do not alter or sell**.