

The case against evolution



The Case Against Evolution This essay addresses whether evolution ought to be taught in public schools. In my view, the answer is that there is no valid basis for including evolution in public school curriculums. My arguments are not based on the Culture Wars commonly presented in the mass media. Rather, my arguments are based on the observation that evolution is an unproven concept, as it pertains to the origins of life on Earth, and that it is too often manipulated by people with a political agenda. To this end, this essay will discuss the nature of the evolution argument, why it should not be taught in public schools, and the implications if it were included in public school curriculums.

In order to understand the dangers of teaching evolution, it is first necessary to define the term. Evolution refers to the attempt to establish the origins of life on Earth. This approach is based upon the scientific and naturalistic theories of narrow-minded scientists. The approach is most often espoused by astrophysicists, geologists and biologists (Creation-Evolution Controversy). The scientific method is the sole method of analysis. Morals and the supernatural are irrelevant. Evolutionists argue that the universe was created instantaneously from nothing, that life forms developed slowly, and that life as we know it today is the result of mutations and adaptation to our environment. It is an extraordinarily insular analysis that excludes many other possibilities. It is an exclusionary philosophy. That is dangerous.

As an initial matter, it is well-established that evolution is an imperfect science. Although it can be established, through fossils, that mutations have occurred, it cannot be established with any certainty that we originated from a Big Bang. Nor can it be established with any certainty that the Big Bang actually occurred or that there was nothing of substantial existence prior to

the Big Bang. These theories are, at best, speculative. Chemistry and biology, on the other hand, have well-established principles and they are proven by years and years of tested applications. Evolution isn't really a science. It is a descriptive endeavor, a narrative in hindsight, that is devoid of any real proof. It is misleading to pretend that it is the equivalent of courses in biology, chemistry, or physics.

In addition, those that propose including evolution in public school curriculums often have ulterior motives. Their concern is not science. Their concern is not truth. Their concern is not the truthful discovery of the origins of the universe, but the replacement of God with science. You don't see scientists participating in lawsuits. You see politicians and people with an axe to grind as plaintiffs in legal proceedings. These people are not concerned with what is actually true or false; quite the contrary, these people are simply trying to impose their personal preferences on society. Public school curriculums, however imperfect they may be, are not the forums in which to engage in political debates. We have courts and political representatives for these types of conflicts. Subjecting primary school children to these kinds of difficult issues is almost immoral. We are using them as shields and swords in a moral and political debate that does not yet involve them. They are being used and manipulated.

Finally, the United States has firm philosophical principles designed to separate religion from the state. Evolution, while not a religion in the institutionalized sense, is nevertheless an explanation for the origins of the universe. In this way, evolution functions as the equivalent of teaching creationism in the public schools. Both subjects are inappropriate. Teaching absolutism, in either form, is wrong and should be prohibited.

Works Cited

" Creation-Evolution Controversy." Wikipedia Free Encyclopedia. Retrieved August 2, 2006. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creation-evolution_controversy#Overview_of_the_controversy