

DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Faculty

March 10, 1982

Editor, Arkansas Times Magazine
500 East Markham
Little Rock, AR 72201

Dear Editor:

As an eyewitness of the entire Arkansas creation-evolution trial I was amazed at Greenberg's March article, "Praising the Obvious." First of all, is it obvious that all references to a Creator in public school science classes are unconstitutional? If so, then it must be obvious that Darwin's Origin of Species must be excluded too, since it refers to "the Creator" on the last page. So too must it be obvious that the Declaration of Independence is unconstitutional for its reference to the "unalienable rights of the Creator!"

Second, is it really obvious that a judicial decision to permit only one side of the origins issue is constitutional. The famous ACLU Scopes lawyer, Clarence Darrow, said it "is bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins." If this was an obvious truth in 1925, when only creation was being taught, is it not still obviously true when only evolution is being taught?

Finally, surely it is obvious to all who know the United States constitution that it opposes the establishment of any religion in the public schools. But is it not also obvious that when a federal judge rules that only the tenets of religious humanism can be taught--such as non-theism, naturalism and evolutionism--that he has in effect established the religion of humanism in the public schools. Again, a lesson from history. John Scopes said, "if you limit a teacher to only one side of anything the whole country will eventually have only one thought, be one individual." No, the Arkansas decision was far from obvious, but it was ironic. For the very court which dishonorably dismissed God began each day with the United States Marshal saying (praying?) "...God save the United States and this honorable court." Amen!

Sincerely,



Norman L. Geisler, Ph.D.

[for SCIENCE '82]

April 20, 1982

Dear Editor:

In a science magazine one expects objectivity, detachment and a fair presentation of relevant facts. Eldredge's review of the Arkansas trial offered none of these. First of all, emotive terms such as "farce," "soap opera," "showmanship," and "buffoonery" are not exactly detached scientific terms.

Secondly, the review is factually distorted and even false.

1) The Bill was drafted and promoted by a Roman Catholic (Mr. Ellwanger), not protestant "fundamentalists." 2) No witness for the Bill described himself as a "fundamentalist;" 3) Some witnesses for the Bill were buddhist or agnostic. 4) All witnesses for the Bill were recognized "experts" by both the ACLU and the court. (One witness had written some 300 scientific articles. Another had authored over 15 books.)

Thirdly, Eldredge impugns the sincerity and integrity of these honest, educated and highly reputable scientists when he claims that none of them really believed what they testified to in court--that scientific creationism is science and not religion.

Finally, Eldredge's "review" is not only scientifically unobjective and factually distorted but it is prophetically wrong. The Arkansas decision has not discouraged creationists. In fact, when one sees how non-factual, distorted and emotive evolutionists are approaching the issues it is only a matter of time before fair and factually minded people will see through the unscientific rhetoric that surrounds evolution. More and more will be saying what Eldredge heard (but didn't report) the famous British paleontologist, Colin Patterson, say (Nov.5 , 1981): "I myself took that view until about eighteen months ago. Then I woke up and realized that all my life I had been duped into taking evolution as revealed truth in some way...." Others too are defecting from the Darwinian ranks (Fred Hoyle, Wickramasinghe, Dean Kenyon). As the factual basis for evolution diminishes we can expect the emotional language to intensify. Eldredge's "review" is not an isolated example.

Sincerely,

Norman L. Geisler
Norman L. Geisler

witness at the Arkansas trial

DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Faculty

January 22, 1982

Editor, Discover Magazine
Rockefeller Center
New York, NY 10020

Dear Editor:

Your article on the Arkansas Creation-Evolution trial gave me new insights into how evolution has maintained itself in the absence of substantial evidence for over a century.

First, you emphasized the irrelevant. The judge said "the court would never criticize or discredit any person's testimony based on his or her religious beliefs." Yet you made sure that the irrelevant personal religious beliefs of the creationist witnesses were clearly noted. There was, on the other hand, a conspicuous absence of the radical liberal, agnostic, atheistic and even Marxistic beliefs of the evolution witnesses.

Second, you omitted the essential. Creationism was judged wrong because of its religious source. Yet you omitted all of the crucial testimony that source has nothing to do with the scientific justifiability (as evolution witness Dr. Ruse said). You also failed to inform your readers of my testimony about the source of Kekulé's model for the Benzene molecule--a vision of a snake biting its tail! Or of Tesla (whom you heralded in the same issue) whose source for the alternating current motor was a vision while reading a pantheistic poet (Goethe)! What about Socrates, whose inspiration for philosophy came from a religious prophetess, the Oracle of Delphi. Has anyone ever rejected their scientific theories simply because of their odd religious-like source?

Finally, have you told your readers what the ACLU lawyer, Clarence Darrow, said at the Scopes trial (1925), that it "is bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins." Oh yes, my insight into evolution. When you emphasize the irrelevant, omit the essential, and forbid the opposing view a hearing, it is easy for a theory to long outlive its evidence. Myths die hard.

Sincerely,



Norman L. Geisler, Ph.D.

DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Faculty

September 1, 1982

New York Times
New York, NY

Dear Editor:

I was appaled by your narrow-minded article on "Updating Man's Ancestry" (8/29). The authors presented evolution as the only way to interpret origins and as undoubted fact. They are wrong on both counts. Even Charles Darwin referred to "the theory of creation" and admitted he would not prove the theory of evolution. Clarence Darrow said it well at the Scopes trial: it is "bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins." And what is true of presentations in the schools is also true of in the press. We need more than a free press in America; if our freedom is to long survive we also need a fair press.

Norman L. Geisler, Ph.D.

NLG:bew

April 12, 1982

[for PHA BETA KAPPA]

Dear Editor:

As a witness at the Arkansas creation trial I wish to respond to Dr. Young's "Review." It is not difficult to agree with many of his premises such as: 1) "The universe is not eternal but had a beginning." 2) "No view should be allowed to be the exclusive creationist position." 3) "The theory/of evolution/ does have its weaknesses and certain aspects may eventually prove untenable...." 4) "It is vital that we distinguish between evolution as biological change and evolution as a philosophy." 5) "Evolutionism is a strictly atheistic, materialistic philosophy that has no room for God." 6) We should "seek through proper legal channels the elimination of evolutionism on the grounds that a religious world-view is being promoted by government."

In view of these excellent premises one was astounded at Young's conclusions. For the Arkansas law he opposed actually supported these premises. The law mandated that all sides of every major point on origins be taught, if any were taught. Likewise, the law strongly opposed giving a religious advantage by teaching only one side of the origins question. One was further amazed to hear Young praise judge Overton's ruling, since it would forbid even Young's view being taught in schools! For the judge ruled that any implication of God or a supernatural cause (such as Young does in nos. 1, 5, 6 above) is unconstitutional. To clarify some of the confusion surrounding this case the reader may refer to our documentary account of the trial in The Creator in the Courtroom: "Scopes II," Milford, Mich.: Mott Media Pub.).

Surely Professor Young exceeds the limits of his own premise (No. 2) when he declares: "this view of creation/in the Arkansas law/ should not gain access to our schools...." Why should not the evidence for all points of view be presented? Further, Young dogmatizes way beyond the spirit of scientific openness when he proclaims: "this narrow 'scientific creationism' certainly cannot be defended on scientific grounds" (Emphasis added). One thing is certain, we will never know if creationism can be defended unless it is given a chance to be declared. Whatever other reservations one may have with Young's conclusions, we agree when he says: "I see no compelling reason for a Christian to combat the scientific theory of evolution provided that evolution is really taught as science...." If Young would accord the same privilege to creationism (which the Arkansas law would have done), then there would be no problem.

Sincerely,



Dr. Norman L. Geisler, Ph.D.

Dallas, Tx