communique'

Registration trials vanishing

By Rick Obritschkewitsch
Of The Print

Less than 10 minutes! That's right, it took less than 10 minutes. It was unbelievable.

Last Wednesday morning, I made my way over to the Community Center prepared to spend at least an hour in the long lines getting registered for spring term.

But when I got into line there wasn't much of one. So I thought, well why not set the stop watch on my good ol' Mercury quartz just to see how long it takes.

The line, to may amazement, moved along very smoothly. After getting through step one there was a short stop, but that was filled up by filling out an insurance request card, determining whether or not I wanted school insurance.

They were also asking that if I was not a registered voter, to register, so that I could vote for the College levy in the next election. But I was already registered, so that took care of that.

From there it was on to step two, where my classes were checked to make sure that I wasn't taking two at the same time, and that none of the classes I wanted to take had been cancelled or were already full. It only took another few minutes there getting class selections checked, and taking a few comments on my last name.

But now came step three, the final step, the step that had taken the most time last term: payment of tuition and fees. And again, I was amazed at the short amount of time that this step took.

When I checked my stop watch it read 9:47. That's nine mintues and forty-seven seconds.

I thought maybe I was just lucky by getting through registration so quickly. Maybe it was because it was the first day of registration, but in checking with other people I had found that they had gotten registered just as quickly.

So I guess there's only one thing left to say: CONGRATULATIONS to all those involved in the rapidness of registration for spring term on a job well done, and thank you.

Ever had one of those days?

To The Editor:

Have you ever had one of those days? Have you? I don't mean just an average rotten day, but a truly pitiful day?

Where you get to bed at one o'clock the night before and you're really tired—but you only have a tape player and the only tape you have is Beethoven's Ninth Symphonie

You do finally get to sleep around two, and you're awakened at 6:30 the next morning by these two equally obnoxious alarm clocks, one sounding like someone trying to upchuck an empty stomach, and the other sounding like the Bell Telephone Company has taken your room hostage and is getting complaint calls every two seconds. Not bbbrrriiinnnggg..bbbrrriiinnnggg, but bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrriiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiigggggggggg-

After five minutes of arguing with yourself on the importance of existing on this day, you finally get out of our door/bed on to a freezing cold floor in a freezing cold room, then discover that you don't have any decent pants to wear, so you put on these stupid looking things reserved only for Mr. Greenjeans (no offense intended) and go out and drink a cold cup of coffee in an equally freezing room. Then you go out into the freezing cold to catch an overcrowded bus filled with these brats from a Christian school and big Italians who love to sing to themselves (but can't).

Just wanted to know
T. Augustine

EDGERTON

Scientific Creationism a Scopes Trial reversal

To the Editor:

The three science instructors quoted in the January 21 article, "Scientific Creationism?" were either very uninformed or very prejudiced. Unfortunately, neither position is acceptable for a college level instructor assuming the opportunity to speak out on an issue in his or her field.

For example, all three instructors claimed that creationism is not in the realm of science. Then why does the Creation Research Society have several hundred members with postgraduate degrees in natural science who believe that creationism is at least as credible scientifically as evolution? Is it reasonable to brush aside the viewpoint of many men and women of science without a hearing or is it perhaps probable that the instructors in question were not aware that so many of their colleagues disagree with such a claim?

Professor Snively said,"...from a scientific point of view you cannot teach a belief." Since that was in reference to creationism, then the evolutionary hypothesis had better be thrown out of the science classroom because it is also a belief. It is based on the assumption of uniformity in rates of change since the universe began. That belief can never be proven scientifically because it supposedly occurred prior to human observation. "Belief in evolution is thus exactly parallel to belief in special creation--both are concepts which believers know to be true but neither, up to the present, has been capable of proof." Matthews, "Foreward" to C. Darwin, *Origin of Species* at xi (1971).

All three instructors seem to place creationism in the realm of religion. Professor Lee said, "I don't feel there can be any such thing as scientific creationism...Science is based on facts. We have lots of courses about religion..." However, Dr. Henry Morris, one of the leading proponents of scientific creationism says that it involves "no reliance on Biblical revelation, utilizing only scientific data to support and expound the creation model." In debates across America such men ably present creationism scientifically while opponents repeatedly bring up the religious issue apparently in an attempt at guilt by association.

Professor Hampton said, "...evolution is happpening, we can see it..." He is invited to cite one conclusive example of evolution from one complexity of life to another. The concept of evolution requires too much time for such changes to be observed. In fact, Dean Kenyon of San Francisco State who taught evolution for 12 years sees a lack of evidence for the transmutation of species required for evolution. He is now teaching creationism in his classroom.

It is time for public schools and colleges to recognize some important aspects about the creation-evolution controversy. First, "evolution only" is not good science. It lacks evidence for key issues like the transmutation of species and the standard evolutionary geologic column. Are Clackamas Community College science students informed that such a geologic column exists nowhere in the world in its entirety? In fact, in several instances the geologic layers exist in the wrong order with no evidence of overthrusting. The creation model can integrate such scientific evidence at least as well as the evolutionary model.

Second, it must be recognized that "evolution only" is not good education. A recent study indicates that students learn science more effectively when taught a two-model approach to origins.

Third, "evolution only" is not good democracy. Various surveys indicate that the teaching of both the creation and evolution models would better represent the wishes of those who pay for public education. Even Clarence Darrow in his Scopes Trial defense for the teaching of evolution stated that it is "bigotry for public schools to teach only one theory of origins." It is now the Scopes Trial in reverse. Let's stop presenting evolution to students as if it were the only scientifically credible explanation for origins. Instead, let's give the creation and evolution models equal time and let the students be free to choose knowledgeably their own view. Fortunately, school districts are beginning to give students this choice, but until it becomes the standard practice academic freedom for creationism is apparently a farce in the science classroom.

I urge Professors Snively, Hampton, and Lee to exhibit an open mind and be willing to give a hearing before their students to the other view. Let them or a student group arrange for a debate with a qualified creationist like Professor Chittick of George Fox College or with one from the Institute for Creation Research in San Diego (addresses have been given to the editor of this paper). If it really is an open and shut case for evolution, there should be nothing much to fear. Unless, of course, the truth might be otherwise.

John Slivkoff
Cannon Beach, Oregon

Editor's note: We have received two letters recently that have not been signed. Before we can print any letters, they must be signed. Name may be withheld upon request, but we need the names.

staff

THE PRINT, a member of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, aims to be a fair and impartial journalistic medium covering the campus community as thoroughly as possible. Opinions expressed in THE PRINT do not necessarily reflect those of the College administration, faculty, Associated Student Government or other staff members of THE PRINT.

office: Trailer B; telephone: 657-8400, ext. 309 or 310
editor: Thomas A. Rhodes
assignment editor: Matt Johnson; news editor: J. Dana Haynes
arts editor: R.W. Greene; feature editor: Steve Lee
sports editor: Rick Obritschkewitsch
photo editor: Duffy Coffman
staff writers: Linda Cabrera, Amy DeVour, David Hayden, Tom Jeffries, Mike Rose, Susy Ryan
staff photographers: Brenda Feltman, Ramona Isackson, Sue Hanneman
typesetter: Kathy Walmsley; graphics: Lynn Griffith
cartoonist: J. Dana Haynes
advertising and business: Dan Champie
adviser: Suzie Boss