

The Bible as a Textbook

Supplement Three

Offered by Utmost Ministries

Table of Contents

Using the Bible as a Textbook	1
Textbook on Everything	1
Textbooks a Case of Morality.....	1
The Limitations of Any Textbook	2
How We Missed Teaching Subjects from Scripture.....	5
Where did we ever get the idea that specific subjects must be taught?	7
Classical vs. Modern Education.....	7
Where We Must Differ on Subject Study	8
An Interesting Study on Teaching and Learning	8
Facts, Subjects, and Domains	9
Types of Knowledge	10
Changing Schools for Better Education.....	10
Teaching to Individuals.....	11
Open Curricula.....	12
Succeeding in School Today.....	12
Why Math Doesn't Exist (Just for Fun).....	12
Scientific Allusions in Scripture	13
Why it is Important to Teach from the Bible.....	16

Using the Bible as a Textbook

Bible reading and use of the Bible as a textbook in public schools were accepted practices in the District of Columbia when Jefferson was president. Thomas Jefferson's mention of a wall of separation of church and state has been obstinately misconstrued (he stated that the wall should be erected to prevent government from interfering with the free exercise of religion, not to keep religion out of government schools).

Textbook on Everything

(From Vine & Fig Tree: The Bible is a Textbook on Everything)

'When I talk with secular Christians (those who claim to be Christians but believe in evolution, Keynesianism, Marxism, or "liberalism"), I'm always told that I cannot trust the Bible to give authoritative answers in whatever field we are discussing. The evolutionist says, "The Bible is not a textbook on geology" or biology or whatever. The Keynesian says, "The Bible is not a textbook on economics." The liberal says, "The Bible is not a textbook on political science." Whatever the discipline, the Bible is "not a textbook" in that field.

The implication is clear: the Bible is only a textbook on "*religion*." This is no threat to the secular Christian, because he has relegated "religion" to the "upper-story" of his life, which *at best* takes only one hour on Sunday morning. Religion is hermetically sealed off from every other area of life.

In fact, for these people, the Bible is not even a textbook on religion. Name one secular university religion class that uses the Bible as a textbook, that is, teaches religion as *the Bible* says religion should be taught. Sure, the Bible is an "exhibit" in most religion classes, along with Greek and Roman mythology, the Bhagvad Gita, and the Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh. But it has no more authority in the religion class than these pagan religion texts.

**If the Bible is not a textbook of science and economics,
it is not a textbook of *anything*.**

**"If I have told you earthly things and you do not believe, how will you believe
if I tell you heavenly things?"**

John 3:12

Textbooks a Case of Morality

When the Bible is said to not be a textbook in any area of life, then the true authority in every field is the religion of Secular Humanism.

The issue here is not facts: not science, not history, not economics, not politics. The issue is *morality*. The secularist is saying, "Keep your morality out of my life." What is right and what is wrong for these secularists is determined by the scientists, or the economists, or the politicians -- any "expert" but Moses and the Prophets; any authority but God. Even worse than saying the Bible is a textbook on geology is saying that the Bible is an *infallible* textbook on geology. This means that when the Bible speaks of a world-wide

flood at the time of Noah, there is no option but to accept it and make it the foundation of all geological theories and explanations. What makes this so offensive is not the facts that would remain unexplained by bringing the Bible into the classroom (for more facts are explained by the Bible than by uniformitarianism), but by the actions in our lives that would be scrutinized *and judged* by the Bible. This is what motivated the rise of evolutionism.

If the Bible is a textbook for the geologist, it means he faces God's Judgment for his political life.

Darwin wrote of his victory over Noah, and his joy that the Bible was no longer a textbook on geology:

As all forms of life are the lineal descendants of those which lived long before the Cambrian epoch, we feel certain that the ordinary succession by generation has never been broken, and that no cataclysm has desolated the world. Hence we may look with some confidence to a secure future of great length.

No doubt his belief produced great relief.

Sir Julian Huxley articulates the secular equivalent of "whew!":

The past of life has been steadily increased by science until it now (1958) exceeds the staggering figure of two and one-half billion years. And in place of an imminent Last Judgment, Life on this planet can now envisage at least an equal span of evolutionary time in the future.

If the Bible is a textbook for the politician, it means he faces God's Judgment for his sexual exploitation and his perjury.

The lines were vividly drawn by Aldous Huxley, grandson of "Darwin's Bulldog," Thomas H. Huxley:

I had motives for not wanting the world to have a meaning; consequently assumed that it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption. The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics, he is also concerned to prove that there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do, or why his friends should not seize political power and govern in the way that they find most advantageous to themselves. . . . For myself, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation, sexual and political."

The Limitations of Any Textbook

To say that the Bible is a textbook on geology is not to say that it contains every formula, every date, and every molecular structure. Consider Orlin Grabbe's textbook on International Financial Markets. While it may discuss digital cash, foreign currencies, "forwards," "swaps" and interest parity, there are many subjects it does not discuss. Does this mean it is no longer a textbook?

There are many subjects not discussed in the Bible, and many facts not mentioned. It is, nevertheless, the Word of God, and it governs us in every area of life, and whatever it states on any subject of life, it is our infallible authority. What makes this proposition so offensive is that the Bible addresses every area of our lives. God claims jurisdiction over every action every thought.

Consider the Table of Contents from Rushdoony's *Institutes of Biblical Law*. Under the pattern of the Decalogue, Rushdoony surveys all the case laws, prophetic utterances, and the commands of the Lord and His Apostles. Decades of study are evident in hundreds of footnotes to "secular" sources, to which Biblical Law is applied in detail (over 3000 Biblical citations). It can be seen that no area of life is not addressed by God's Law. Most evangelicals would never think to apply the Bible's authoritative and concrete direction to such problems as these:

III. The Third Commandment

2. Swearing and Revolution
3. The Oath and Society
5. The Oath and Authority

IV. The Fourth Commandment

3. The Sabbath and Work
 5. The Sabbath and Law
- Appendix: The Economics of Sabbath keeping -- by Gary North

V. The Fifth Commandment

1. The Authority of the Family
3. The Economics of the Family
4. Education and the Family
5. The Family and Delinquency

VI. The Sixth Commandment

2. The Death Penalty
5. Hybridization and Law
6. Abortion
8. Restitution or Restoration
9. Military Laws and Production
10. Taxation
13. Quarantine Laws
14. Dietary Rules
20. Social Inheritance: Landmarks

VII. The Seventh Commandment

1. Marriage
5. Family Law
6. Marriage and Monogamy
7. Incest

- 9. Sex and Crime
- 11. Adultery
- 12. Divorce
- 14. Homosexuality
- 17. The Transvestite
- 18. Bestiality

VIII. The Eighth Commandment

- 1. Dominion
- 2. Theft
- 3. Restitution and Forgiveness
- 4. Liability of the Bystander
- 5. Money and Measure
- 6. Usury
- 9. Landmarks and Land
- 10. The Virgin Birth and Property
- 11. Fraud
- 12. Eminent Domain
- 13. Labor Laws
- 15. Prison
- 18. The Rights of Strangers, Widows, and Orphans

IX. The Ninth Commandment

- 5. Corroboration
- 6. Perjury
- 8. False Witness
- 11. Slander Within Marriage
- 13. Slander as Theft
- 16. Judges
- 17. The Responsibility of Judges and Rulers
- 18. The Court
- 19. The Procedure of the Court
- 20. The Judgment of the Court

X. The Tenth Commandment

- 1. Covetousness
- 3. Special Privilege
- 5. The System

XV. Notes on Law in Western Society

It is obvious that *The Institutes of Biblical Law* is no gushy, "pious" devotional reader. It is a pathbreaking, foundational Reconstruction of Law, Politics, Jurisprudence, and Social Morality. Every Christian Lawyer should read the book from cover to cover (849 pages). Every political scientist should do the same. It is not the last word, but it is the first word in generations attempting to rigorously apply Biblical laws to the problems of

contemporary society from a Bible-believing perspective. The importance of Rushdoony's *Institutes* and of the "Theonomics" movement in general is not in the details of their applications, but the inescapable conclusion that the Bible provides all the Law we need to apply to the facts of our lives.

Rushdoony and the Reconstructionists have completely challenged the prevailing "piety" of the Protestant and Evangelical churches. Breaking asunder the previously impenetrable barrier between the "clergy" and the "real world," Rushdoony shows how every believer-priest must apply the Word of God to every area of his life. Since its publication (1973), the Reconstructionists have continued to apply God's Word to contemporary problems in new areas and in new ways.

We may disagree with his applications and interpretations, but we must begin where Rushdoony begins: with the recognition that the Lord claims sovereignty over all the earth, and has given us His Law in written form in the Bible. Every Christian, in whatever capacity he exercises his gifts, must bring every thought captive to the lordship of Christ. Lawyers are not excepted. Nor are judges, politicians, educators, scientists, and all others involved in "secular" matters. The Bible is not an out-dated document for the "religious," for "church-workers," and for the "ordained clergy" and other ecclesiastics. God's Law governs all men.

The Bible is a textbook on every subject.'

How We Missed Teaching Subjects from Scripture

The typical objection to teaching subjects from Scripture has been that this subject or that subject is not covered in the Bible. One result of sin in human beings is the tendency to think backwards on most issues in comparison to Scriptural truth. Once again, God said, "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways...For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts" (Isaiah 55:8-9). In fact, we are not likely to think the right way unless we are steeped in His Word. Many times, when a clock has gone "hay wire," it will begin to run backwards. The reason we cannot understand the subject that all subjects to be taught are in Scripture is that our understanding is "hay wire."

The term "hay wire" is defined technically as the effects of arbitrary orders, that appear contrary to a group's or an individual's ideals and ethics. The something arbitrary to the way we have been trained to look at things is then "hay wire" in our view. Now go back and look at the parables of Jesus and tell me if any of them were different, in the same way, to what you always thought or believed. The answer will probably be, "Yes," if you are in the mainstream. Folks, I tell you that it is not God's way to be in the mainstream with your thoughts, your beliefs, your ideologies, or your ethics. We need God to guide us and we are to think spiritually. God gave us His Spirit to help us to do this – to renew our minds (Romans 12:2). We are not to keep thinking about what is important the way we did before we were His.

Most parents of home schooling children today were raised up in a public society, trained up in a public school system, taught a public work ethic, and attended churches that were run like businesses modeled on the same societal values and methods. In having this happen to us, certain security factors were built into our brains that are real good for living a worldly life, but not for living an abundant life in Christ. No matter how hard we try to fit this way of life into the life for which God designed us, we can never do it. Therefore, we just glue it on to the Christian life and hope it sticks. The problem with this is that it is never strong enough to be sure about and never improves on the life God gave us. When new objectives enter our life, we have to stick those on two. Because this life does not fit together perfectly with God's plan, all those so-called Christian add-ons eventually make our life a mess or somewhat incomplete.

The best way to assure that our life does not become a mess is to make sure we add objectives that fit well with God's plan for us and our children, never compromising, and then our lives will be strong and secure in the real sense. We might not recognize the model, but then we do not have to recognize it for it to be what God has planned. We must learn to find security in Him and give up the securities with which we are most comfortable – they are no more than false securities and temporary at best. This reasoning is where the “narrow path” spoken of by Christ in Matthew 7:14 comes into focus. “Few will find it” is what He says, because they do not want to part from the ways they find to be secure, even though they are actually not real security.

Thinking “hay wire” or backward is to look at all the subjects that are in secular schools and textbooks and classrooms and coming to the firm conclusion that these subjects are all necessary to learn for a good fruitful life. Many people today truly have set their minds on the idea that school cannot be taught outside the public school system. Yet, with great success, over two million families across the U.S.A. are doing this very thing. Someone has to be wrong, and it happens, in this case, to be the majority of the world. How does something like this happen? The fact is, “Few will find it” – that is, the truth. Some of the reason is due to ignorance. Not many people actually know all that has been achieved in the home school community today. All they know is public or private, when it comes to the subject of education for children.

The very same thing has happened within the home education arena. No one, except for those strange Star Trek followers, can see that there are still frontiers at large. These frontiers have pioneers. These pioneers are to be commended, but will not be for some years to come, because it takes us that long, with many hard falls and bumps in the road, to wake up to these ideas. You often find that these pioneers do not want to be commended, because they do what they do because they see it as something vital that must be done.

When it comes to the question about which subjects can be taught with the Bible, the question should not be, “Can you teach science or math from the Bible?” but rather “Should you teach science or math?” Where, that is, did we ever get the idea that every subjects taught in the public schools “must” be taught to our children? Did you ever think about the fact that these subjects are not questioned? Did you ever think about why

you never questioned them? I believe these are some questions upon which it is worth spending some time here.

Where did we ever get the idea that specific subjects must be taught?

In order to get a rounded understanding of this subject, I have to take you to where we started on the subject route. The following except also gives us a glimpse at where we got “hay wire” about the directive for what to teach our children, in following the methods we have gotten attuned to, like the proverbial “frog in a slow boiling pot.”

(From Classical Homeschooling: The Graves Academy; Richard Mitchell)

Classical vs. Modern Education

‘Modern public education does not look like the trivium. But in order to understand why, we have to understand from whence modern education has come. For, if one takes a cursory glance through Classical America, we find that even 200 years ago things were very different in American education than they are today. How did we get so far away from the classical tradition in education?’

In order to approach an answer, we must understand the rise of government- sponsored education, and with it, the public school nightmare. Richard Mitchell, professor of classics at Glassboro State College, deftly details the not-so-subtle shift in educational philosophy that accompanied that change from classical education to modern education in *The Graves of Academe*. You must read the whole work; it is a thoughtful and considered piece of scholarship, elegantly written with humor and insight. In it, he follows the rise of the pseudo-science of “educationism,” and its rejection of academia in favor of the unmeasurable and untestable nebulous principles of behavior modification and “humanism:”

Over and against the overweening demands of scholarly intellectualism, the teacher-trainers have set the presumably unquestionable virtues of what they call “humanism.” They use this term in so many different contexts and to characterize so many different kinds of acts and ideologies that I will not attempt to discuss it fully here. It will just have to grow on you. It does not, as you might think, denote as usual a particular school of thought or slant of philosophical or religious speculation connected especially but not exclusively with the Renaissance, although many who use the term *have* heard of the Renaissance. This is something closer to “humaneness,” as that word is used by what used to be called the “Humane Society,” an organization that publically deplored the cruel treatment of horses. One of the aims of “humanistic” educationism is to deplore the cruel treatment of children subjected to the overbearing demands of knowledge, scholarship, and logic by the traditional powers of authoritarian intellectualism.

And so here we are today, as far away from traditional scholarship and training in the rigorous demands of the trivium that underpins it, as one can get. It is a far cry from the tested and proven methods of nurturing the intellect, drawn from the classical tradition, required by historic American education:

[The] NEA task force that had been made up largely of scholars, the Committee of Ten, [was] called together in 1892 and chaired by Charles W. Eliot, then president of Harvard University. That committee had come out in favor of traditional academic study in the public schools, which they fancied should be devoted to the pursuit of knowledge and the training of the intellect. But what can you expect from a bunch of intellectuals? The Eliot Report of 1893 was given to things like this:

“As studies in language and in the natural sciences are best adapted to cultivate the habits of observation; as mathematics is the traditional training of the reasoning faculties; so history and its allied branches are better adapted than any other studies to promote the invaluable mental power, which we call judgment.”

Obviously, the Eliot committee did its work in the lost, dark days before the world of education had discovered the power of the bold innovative thrust. All they asked of the high schools was the pursuit of knowledge and the exercise of the mind in the cause of judgment.’

Where We Must Differ on Subject Study

We must, as Christian home educating parents, differ with the humanistic reasoning of the Harvard Committee of Ten mentioned above, beyond the reason that they, being humanists do not believe in God, by following a program of God through His Word. The parallel to that Harvard effort, for the Christian student might be a goal to “cultivate the habits of observation” through the wisest direction of the Proverbs and Parables in the Word of God, rather than through language and the natural sciences. We might then accomplish “training their reasoning faculties” through the Scriptures, perhaps reading the Epistles and the Gospels, rather than through the traditional use of mathematics for the same. And finally, we might “promote the individual mental power” of our students, which we contribute to the wisdom and judgment of God, as opposed to that of man, through memorization of Bible verses, chapters, or books, rather than through the study of “history and its allied branches,” which are in no way “better adapted than” the study of Scripture for this purpose.

An Interesting Study on Teaching and Learning

I was particularly impressed with Dr. Roger Schank. The founder of Engines for Education, he “has devoted his career to understanding how people think and learn. He began his career as a professor of Computer Science and Psychology at Stanford and Yale where his research focused on Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science, investigating how the human mind worked and building computers that emulated the cognitive capabilities of humans.

Then, a tragic event occurred: his kids went to school. When Roger looked at what they were doing in school, he was appalled. The school was overlooking most of what he knew to be true about learning. He decided to build new kinds of educational devices, ones that would excite students and teach them things that would be useful to them in the real world. Andersen Consulting offered to finance a new research institute under Roger's direction at Northwestern University. The Institute for Learning Sciences (ILS) was born.

Roger served as Director of ILS for ten years, spearheading the development of new learning methodologies using the computer as a simulation device. Using his new methodologies, he built computer-based curricula for major companies and government agencies, including GE, IBM, Walgreen's, Wal-Mart, Deloitte and Touche, the US Army, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Veterans Administration, and a host of others.

Roger then became interested in using his new methodologies in our schools. Carnegie Mellon University agreed to adopt his curricula at their new Silicon Valley campus, where he currently serves as Chief Educational Officer. Soon after, he founded Engines for Education, a non-profit organization dedicated to designing and building new curricula for primary and secondary schools.”

The following are pertinent excerpts from what he has developed informationally, in regard to the schooling and the use of “subjects” to teach children.

Facts, Subjects, and Domains

‘Schools typically organize courses around subjects like art or mathematics. Why is this? It turns out that it's not because that's what is best for students. It is just what is best for the scholars who sit at the peak of the academic pyramid.

A subject is a collection of similar skills, cases, and facts that have been grouped together as an object of study. Subjects are defined by two things: a criteria for selecting which cases and facts serve as "subject matter," and a set of skills used to understand that subject matter. For example, physics is a subject that deals with interactions between matter and energy. "Doing physics" involves a set of skills, which range from timing the swing of a pendulum to constructing particle accelerators. Academic researchers usually investigate a single specific class of subject matter. That's why subjects are a convenient mode of organization for them.

When teaching subjects, schools often make the mistake of separating the cases and facts (which are taught in lecture) from the skills (which are taught in labs). But teaching skills in labs apart from facts and cases tends to confuse students, and kills off their motivation for learning the skill. Likewise, teaching subject matter apart from the relevant skills is a bad idea because students find it difficult to use the subject matter in a context different than that in which they learned it. Many view history, for example, as a set of cases and facts, but this view ignores the skills that history packages, and drains the life and most of the value from it.

The problems with subjects, however, go far beyond the artificial distinction between lecture and lab. Subjects keep schools from effectively tying education into students' lives. Students do not experience their everyday world as a set of subjects; they experience it as a set of domains. Some examples are politics, trucks, and animals. A domain is, like a subject, a collection of skills, cases, and facts. Domains, however, have a much more eclectic mode of organization. Domains organize things according to how they cluster in everyday human experience. Domains have three interesting properties. First, domains tend to cut across subjects. Any of the above domains can be

used as a vehicle to teach the subjects of physics, biology, or history. Second, peoples' goals and interests tend to flow along the lines of domains, not subjects. Third, apart from superficial differences, many domains tend to be quite similar to each other. This means they can serve as convenient mechanisms to negotiate between the interests students naturally have and the subjects educators want to teach. If schools want to tap their students' interests, it means they must forego the traditional lines of subjects and reorganize around domains.'

Types of Knowledge

'Here are three types of knowledge we would like adults to possess, and therefore children to learn:

Skills (scriptlets). People who are very skilled at something often employ complex strategies, which are, in essence, combinations of scriptlets, packaged so that the understanding of how they fit together gives their user the reputed skill.

Cases: A case is a story about one or more events that comprise a whole. Cases typically serve to illustrate points about how to behave or how the world works. Each point illustrated by a case is usually of some larger significance; that is, it can be generalized to other situations. Sometimes, however, cases are simply used as reference points that are part of the common culture. The Battle of Gettysburg is a case. It might be used to illustrate one or more particular military points, or to tell us something about history, or it might simply be used as an example of something all Americans know about. Cases can typically be described from many points of view.

Processes: A process is a high-level skill we feel is especially important; they tend to have a very abstract nature. The decision to call X a process and Y a skill is inherently political since it is based on what one feels the school system should proactively support in the curriculum. The school system can successfully pursue only a few skills proactively; those we believe the school system should select are processes. Given that one can effectively pursue only a few processes, it makes sense to pick very high-level ones. The three processes we concentrate on are communications, human relations, and reasoning.'

Note: *I think it is interesting and important to point out that these three processes: "communication, human relations, and reasoning," that Roger points out here, are very close if not identical to those that God commands of parents with their children in Deuteronomy chapter 6.*

Changing Schools for Better Education

'The least we can ask of our schools is that they not destroy the natural love for learning that our children bring into the first grade. Unfortunately, it would be hard to find a more effective method of destruction than that used in today's schools: Children are placed in peer groups all too eager to ridicule differences that raise their fears about taking risks. They are drilled with facts and rules that indicate to them that there are experts in the world who know stuff, and that the student's job is to simply absorb what these experts

have to say. Their interests are disregarded so that they learn to believe their interests must not be very important. They are ranked frequently enough to be instilled with the idea that they are not very smart, or they embark on a mission to seek the official approval that comes from parroting back the official answers.'

Teaching to Individuals

'Communication, human relations, and reasoning capture what people would agree are basic skills our schools should impart to students. Of course, we must also help students learn skills above and beyond these three processes. But we do not need to mandate long lists of these skills. It is critical that we not fall into the "literacy list" trap of proclaiming that students learn everything we decide to support. People's interests and goals vary, and it is neither plausible nor desirable to teach the same set of skills to every student. Not every student can readily learn every skill.

Students are more likely to learn a skill if it is one they have chosen, and if they have an aptitude for it. One of the primary goals of the school system should be to get students excited about and confident in their ability to learn. Allowing students to choose which interests they will pursue is therefore crucial. As long as they are choosing in concert with a teacher who can judge that what they propose to do is worthwhile, we can be confident they are not wasting their time.

We would want most students to learn the skills that are normally packaged under traditional subject headings, for example:

- politics
- physics
- economics
- math
- reading
- history
- geography
- reading
- design
- biology

These are all worthy subjects, and someone who is designing part of the open curriculum should strive to include the skills these subjects package. But not everyone needs to learn any one of these particular subjects (or any one of the particular skills within them). To help the student learn anything useful without crushing his desire to learn in the process, we must be willing to sacrifice the impossible dream that the student learn everything we would like.

Although at the level of the curriculum we should not make anything other than the three basic processes mandatory, at the level of the course, we may insist students learn additional specific skills. Thus, a segment on trucking intended for a high school student might include the requirement that the student learn how to build a budget, develop a print advertisement, or design an air conditioning unit for a refrigerated trailer. Courses

may well have specific requirements for students to master. But students should not be forced to take those courses if they don't match some interest the student holds, or that the teacher can help the student develop.

These ideas pertain to business training as well as public education. It would be ludicrous to propose that every business training exercise focus solely on the three basic processes. Perhaps these processes should be part of every exercise, but clearly business training should also aim to impart specific skills. These skills must nevertheless be of intrinsic interest to employees. If they illustrate a way for employees to do their jobs more effectively, for example, they will be of interest as a matter of course. But if, as is the case in some companies, training is primarily a way of getting some time away from the day-to-day grind or fulfilling a mysterious training requirement, then it is quite likely that the training will be valueless, as is so much of the classroom teaching prevalent in the mainstream educational system.'

Open Curricula

'Paradoxically, less control can lead to more learning. An open curriculum is based on the idea that we should adopt a more focused way of managing students' learning. We can select a small core set of things we want students to master and not sweat decisions about exactly how and when they learn them.

This idea places students in charge of their own learning, helping them find something they want to accomplish, and assuming they will learn what they need to learn and get it done. The concept of an open curriculum goes against all notions of a conventional fixed curriculum. Why? Because fixed curricula are damaging.'

Succeeding in School Today

'Those who succeed in today's school often do so by learning what the rules are and slavishly following them. Occasionally, in the last few years, I taught an undergraduate course that attempted to get students to think for themselves. (I taught this course twice at Yale and twice at Northwestern. It was disguised as a computer science course at Yale and listed as a psychology course at Northwestern.) In this course, I attempt to get students to do some original thinking. The class focuses on discussing unanswered questions about human thought processes. The students may say what they want, they just have to do so in a rigorous manner. I say very little. Many students are uncomfortable with this situation. They want to know what I think and I refuse to tell them. They are reluctant to think for themselves, and are eager to tell me what they think I want to hear. My failure to encourage this kind of behavior leaves many of them confused about what it means to succeed at this game. Academic success is what drives them, and I take away the usual means.'

Why Math Doesn't Exist (Just for Fun)

'We have concluded that most of math doesn't exist. For example, there is no such thing as negative numbers. I can't hold in my hand negative-something, there is no thing that is below zero. Subtraction doesn't exist either. It is just adding negative numbers, which don't exist. Addition doesn't exist either because it is just subtracting negative numbers,

which don't exist. Multiplication doesn't exist because it is just repeated addition, which doesn't exist. Division? It doesn't exist either, because it's just multiplying decimals. Since multiplying doesn't exist, how can you multiply decimals? Square roots are just dividing, which doesn't exist. For this reason, we think there should be no math other than learning numbers. We should receive no math instruction after preschool.'

(From CreationEvidence.org: Dr. Carl Baugh, Ph.D.)

Scientific Allusions in Scripture

Dr. Henry Morris of the Institute for Creation Research has compiled an impressive list of allusions to scientific principles in Scripture. This list actually demonstrates that a matrix of scientific principles underlies the body of Scripture. These principles were not known to the leading minds of the day in which they were written; in fact, many of them contradicted what was being taught at the time. Such a list confirms that the Scriptures are scientifically credible. It further confirms that the Scriptures were supernaturally inspired.

(Compiled by Dr. Henry M. Morris, *Defender's Bible*)

Scientific Area of Study:	Phenomenon or Process:	Where mentioned in Scripture:
Hydrology	Hydrologic Cycle	Ecclesiastes 1:7; Isaiah 55:10
	Evaporation	Psalms 135:7; Jeremiah 10:13
	Condensation Nuclei	Proverbs 8:26
	Condensation	Job 26:8; 37:11, 16
	Precipitation	Job 36:26-28
	Run-off	Job 28:10
	Oceanic Reservoir	Psalms 33:7
	Snow	Job 38:22; Psalms 147:16
	Hydrologic Balance	Job 28:24-26
	Springs in the Sea	Job 38:16
Geology	Principle of Isostasy	Isaiah 40:12; Psalm 104:5-9
	Shape of Earth	Isaiah 40:22; Job 26:10; Psalm 103:12
	Rotation of Earth	Job 38:12,14
	Gravitation	Job 26:7; 38:6
	Rock Erosion	Job 14:18,19
	Glacial Period	Job 38:29,30
	Uniformitarianism	II Peter 3:4
	Dinosaurs	Job 40,41
Astronomy	Size of Universe	Job 11:7-9; 22:12; Isaiah 55:9; Jeremiah 31:37
	Number of Stars	Genesis 22:17; Jeremiah 33:22
	Uniqueness of Each Star	I Corinthians 15:41
	Precision of Orbits	Jeremiah 31:35,36
Meteorology	Circulation of Atmosphere	Ecclesiastes 1:6
	Protective Effect of Atmosphere	Isaiah 40:22
	Oceanic Origin of Rain	Ecclesiastes 1:7
	Relation of Electricity to Rain	Job 28:26; Jeremiah 10:13
	Fluid Dynamics	Job 28:25

Biology	Blood Circulation	Leviticus 17:11
	Psychotherapy	Proverbs 16:24; 17:22
	Biogenesis and Stability	Genesis 1:11,21,25
	Uniqueness of Man	Genesis 1:26
	Chemical Nature of Flesh	Genesis 1:11,24-2:7;3:19
	Cave-men	Job 12:23-25; 30:3-8
Physics	Mass-Energy Equivalence	Colossians 1:17; Hebrews 1:3
	Source of Energy for Earth	Psalms 19:6
	Atomic Disintegration	II Peter 3:10
	Electrical Transmission of Information	Job 38:35
	Television	Revelation 11:9-11
	Rapid Transportation	Daniel 12:4

I was fascinated to find Dr. Carl E. Baugh's "Creation in Symphony" orchestral model of creation incorporates "music of the spheres" concepts known to creationists since before the 17th Century. The German Christian astronomer, Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), who discovered the elliptical shape of planetary orbits, attempted to show the existence of a relationship between the distances of the stars and musical harmonies in his book 'De Harmonie Mundi.' The Voyager I and Voyager II planetary probes (1977-1989) also recorded the electromagnetic "voices" of the vibrating planets and moons in our Solar System. A full octave of notes is represented by the Sun (F#), Mercury (C#), Venus (E), Earth (G), Mars (C), the asteroid belt (A), Jupiter (B), Saturn (D), Uranus (C# - E), Neptune (E-Flat), and Pluto (C).

If this was not fascinating enough, I also discovered that, as with everything else, this fact had been revealed by God in His Word, thousands of years earlier, in Job 38:7 where we read, "...**the morning stars sang together**, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?"

Some researches have found cause to believe that the firmament in its crystalline structure acted as a crystal radio receiver. Water makes a very good antenna. In the firmament you had a crystal antenna and energy field and the Bible does specifically state that it is the morning stars that sang, vocalized, through the firmament. What scientists are finding out is that all of the stars sing to us. All of the radiation in its vibratory cycle sings to us.

A physicist by the name of Fiorella Terenzi did her Ph.D. research on radio waves coming from Pulsars. She stated in a science journal that we are being hugged by this cosmic radio energy. She actually took the digitalized information that is there and transferred it and produced an audio tape of it and found it to actually be a soothing, healthful, hugging of cosmic radiation. One missionary from Alaska wrote that within the last few years that near the top of the globe where there are concentrated magnetic lines of force that are stronger in moment and energy, that some of the Eskimos and missionaries actually report audible notes being heard because of the ice crystals formed in the charged lines of energy.

Are you convinced that the Bible is the greatest textbook ever written yet? How about this? The Bible is scientifically accurate. While the Bible is not a book primarily concerned with science, where it does deal with science, it is completely accurate. Consider the following statements which are NOW known, but which were certainly not the opinion of such scientists as there might have been at the time they were written (more than 5000 years prior).

Job 26:7-Empty place in the North

Job 26:7-Earth hung upon nothing

Isaiah 40:22-The earth is round

Proverb 8:27-The waters are round

Jeremiah 10:12-Einstein's theory, $E=MC^2$

Joel 2:5-Describes airplanes and jets

Ezekiel 38:9 and Jeremiah 4:13-More about airplanes

Zechariah. 14:12-Effects of atomic radiation

Isaiah 50:3-The heavens are black

Job 28:25-Air has weight

Job 25:5-The moon doesn't have its own light

Jeremiah 33:22-The stars cannot be numbered

Ecclesiastes 1:6-The wind travels in circuits

Jeremiah 5:22-The Ocean doesn't overflow

Job 28:5-The earth has fire inside

Jeremiah 6:22-The earth has sides (not flat like a plate)

Job 38:31-Earth rotates around the axle star

Leviticus 17: 11-Life of the flesh is in the blood

I Corinthians 15:39-All flesh is not the same flesh (Parke Davis pharmaceutical house discovered the "antihuman precipitin" test which establishes the identity of different kinds of flesh- whether it be human, dog, cat, buzzard, etc.).

Why it is Important to Teach from the Bible

In the history of ancient times, many warriors came to the battle from each side. During the heat of the long battle, the intermingling of warriors caused confusion as to which warrior was on one side or the other. As a result, some of those in the battle would end up following the enemy and fighting against their own, or would simply have trouble recognizing which was which. To assure that this did not become a problem, the leader would sound a horn and raise a standard or a flag (symbol of allegiance). This would be repeated over and over during the battle. Then all the warriors faithful to that banner would go behind that standard and then they would rush into the battle once more. While they were behind that banner, they could reestablish who was on their side of the battle and see who was the real enemy.

In this life, we have an enemy that wants the minds of our children as their booty. 1 Peter 5:8 warns us to “Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour.” In this battle, our children will be sure to be mingled with the enemy, and since we know the enemy is subtle, they will have difficulty determining who they are from those who are righteous. It is a blessing that God has provided a standard from which they can go out into banner, knowing that they are on the right side. Isaiah 59:19 tells us about God’s provision for this where it says, “... the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the LORD shall lift up a standard against him.” The standard that is being spoken of here is the Bible. It is the only thing that can be relied upon to remain the same while everything in this world is, by its temporal nature, continually changing. It is also the only thing that the enemy cannot change or disguise for its own purpose, and for the same reason, it is the only thing that the enemy would like to see vanquished.

It is vital, then, that we parents be vigilant about not allowing the Bible (God’s standard) to be replaced with man’s teaching, based on models of education developed by the secular world for their purposes. We must not fall into, and especially must not help build, the fowler’s net for our children (Proverbs 6:5). We would not do this on purpose, but we must be certain we do not also do this unawares.