



Christian Perspectives in Education

Send out your light and your truth! Let them guide me. Psalm 43:3

Volume 8 | Issue 1

2015

The Inclusion of False, Falsified, and Falsifiable Data that Favor an Evolutionary Worldview in the High School Science Curriculum of Public and Private Schools in the Philippines

Jerry F. Smith

De La Salle University, Dasmariñas, Cavite, Philippines, jfrsmith@gmail.com

Recommended Citation

Smith, Jerry F. (2015) "The Inclusion of False, Falsified, and Falsifiable Data that Favor an Evolutionary Worldview in the High School Science Curriculum of Public and Private Schools in the Philippines," *Christian Perspectives in Education*, 8(1).

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cpe/vol8/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at DigitalCommons@Liberty University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Christian Perspectives in Education by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Liberty University. For more information, please contact scholarlycommunication@liberty.edu.



1. INTRODUCTION

The author has directly examined high school biology textbooks from various high schools, public and private, over the past fifteen years, and has also had interactions with teachers, education majors, and science-education majors and faculty with a combined estimated total of approximately six-hundred-fifty teachers, future teachers from various schools, as well as university science professors, who were in agreement on the information in high school science textbooks presented in this paper.

1.1. Worldviews

Before proceeding, we must first clarify what a worldview is. A worldview is the belief that shapes how one looks at the world and at life. It is how one perceives meaning from the natural phenomena existing within the universe; their philosophy of life if you will. For example, regarding origins, Christians believe that God created the universe. Muslims believe that Allah created the universe. Hindus, Buddhists, and Taoists also have their own beliefs. Religions promote origins based on belief, though unobserved, how the universe came to be; out of the reach of scientific inquiry and natural evidence to prove or disprove their beliefs. As such, they are unscientific claims. In other words, these beliefs cannot be proven through testing, observation, or duplication. They are accepted as truth by the people of these religions but lacking naturally occurring scientific evidence to prove them conclusively. Therefore, these beliefs by definition of science cannot be included in any curriculum which purports to be scientific. That is, unscientific data, i.e. religious beliefs must naturally be excluded from a curriculum, textbook, and a class that deals with objective science.

Local high school science textbooks in the Philippines present a religious belief of something that has not been seen or observed, or duplicated through experimentation. These textbooks present that billions of years ago, from nothing we got everything (Kazan, 2009). The evolutionary (religious) belief or worldview is that the universe and life is the result of purely natural processes, apart from a Supreme Being or other intelligence. It sounds “natural” enough, but it is a belief nonetheless. It is still a belief in the sense that it is without conclusive scientific evidence to conclusively verify it, just as the religions mentioned above. As therefore a belief about origins, inaccurate data used to promote it should be left out of a science curriculum that would presumably focus on objective science. Yet, the data used in high school science textbooks tends to support and promote such a purely naturalistic belief or worldview even though it does not correspond with the scientific evidence, as will be demonstrated in the following paragraphs. Again a fundamental point must be reiterated before proceeding; that once one leaves the field of science, the natural realm, knowledge of origins becomes a matter to be taken up as a belief just as any other religion. Thus, the evolutionary worldview becomes a religious worldview based on a belief.

This paper will present in generalized format, an apparent one-sided belief or worldview that has been included into the science curriculum of public and private high schools in the Philippines to the exclusion of all others. Science deals with testable facts without interpretation allowing observers, or in this case, learners, the opportunity to draw their own conclusions about worldviews. Science in its purest form is simply objective knowledge without bias. As such, objective science cannot be presented in a curriculum where fallacy is presented as evidence from science, and which has a tendency to convince the students of a particular religious worldview, i.e. evolutionism. It should also be noted, that any attempt by an agency to influence

the thinking and worldview of a student by presenting only one side of an issue as is commonly the case in local high school biology textbooks, whether wittingly or unwittingly, is influencing the thinking of a particular group to that bias, and has then crossed over from (science) education, the presentation of objective data, into indoctrination, the presentation of select information.

1.2. Philosophies of education

Before embarking on a discussion of curriculum, it is important to note that there are many philosophies and or worldviews of education. Some key ideologies of curriculum include the essentialist view where students are to learn the basic academic skills; the pragmatist view which believes that the student should be able to apply knowledge gained from school in practical situations; the social reconstructionist perspective of producing learners who will facilitate social improvements; the disciplines view where mastery of the sciences is the goal; and the list could continue on. The point however, is that with each curriculum, there is a worldview behind it (Schiro, 2013; Kridel, 2010 pp.474-475).

That being the case, there is naturally an ideology or even worldview behind the curriculum developers that influences the current science curriculum among schools around the city, province, and the country (the Philippines). This paper will shed light on this observed perspective of education behind the science curriculum of these schools. As one author writes about this particular situation, “textbooks in general tend to be one-sided, with a bent toward evolution as the dominant theory, even announcing them as ‘facts’ of science” (Richard Lewontin, 1981, cited in *Evolution versus Creationism*, 1983, cited in "Richard Lewontin").

1.3. Science

When we discuss science, we must agree that science is a bona fide organized body of knowledge which obtains facts from observable and testable phenomena. In other words, science deals with facts from the physical world that can be observed and tested. Hence, when one speaks of science, the reference is to concrete evidence of an observable state or process. Science therefore involves information attained through physical sources and excludes by very nature that which is supernatural, i.e., outside of the realm of what can be observed. It is "the intellectual and practical activity encompassing the systematic study of the structure and behavior of the physical and natural world through observation and experiment" ("Science"). The methodology of science includes:

(A) Objective observation: This includes measurement and data in the form of quantitative studies that deal with results which provide unbiased results. In other words, science deals with objective facts that can be replicated any time based on the data provided, as opposed to subjective issues like individual feelings, ideas, opinions, suspicions, or even instincts which are relative to an individual, and cannot be objectively verified;

(B) Evidence: This refers to the ability to experiment and or observe specific phenomena as benchmarks for testing hypotheses. In other words, there must be something that we can see, hear, touch, smell, or taste that can be examined. If we have something that we wish to 'prove' through scientific means, then we must have the ability to test it; and

(C) Induction: A reference to reasoning to establish general rules or conclusions drawn from facts or examples; repetition of said phenomenon; and critical analysis, which is through verification and testing, i.e. critical exposure to scrutiny, peer review and assessment ("What is Science?"). In other words, we must be able to reason general conclusions based on the facts,

based on the ability to replicate a phenomenon, based on the ability to re-check the means of testing, and based on close examination by peers in the same fields or by others who can assess using the same means.

To simplify the methodology of science further, if a hypothesis is falsified after experimentation, than it must be rejected as being inaccurate, and thus ‘unscientific.’ In terms of the current discussion, any information presented in high school biology textbooks that is found false, falsified, or falsifiable is no longer science, i.e. unscientific, and by nature must be excluded from a curriculum that is designed to examine scientific evidence of the natural world i.e., science.

1.4. Education or indoctrination?

Education refers to the knowledge and or skills one receives (“Education”). As was presented briefly in the previous paragraphs, curriculum flows from an educational philosophy that is inherently biased to the curriculum developers worldviews, e.g. “essential” elements of curriculum, or “social” constructs of curriculum, or “learning experiences” over academic knowledge, or “disciplines” over “non-essentials and the like; but who determines what is essential or non-essential in these cases? Curriculum designers themselves are influenced in one way or another by a particular worldview or philosophy of education. The potential therefore is for biased information to be injected into a curriculum while contradictory information is excluded. However, this practice borders on if not enters into indoctrination, since curricula from biased sources are intentionally or unintentionally aimed at presenting only certain elements of education, in order to guide the learner into the desired worldview or educational philosophy outcome (Kridel, 2010, pp.474-475).

Craig Kridel (2010) in his *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies* raises the issue that "indoctrination represents a classic dilemma in the field of curriculum studies." He goes on to say make the point of "whether all acts of teaching impose content, perspective, or values." According to Kridel (2010):

“[T]he term [indoctrination], however, took on specific historical significance as an ideological stance for educators from the early-to-mid 20th century who maintained that schools should serve as a tool for the reconstruction of society and should engage in the indoctrination of students... Viewed at the most fundamental level, the selection of content for any program of study may be seen implicitly or explicitly as a gesture of indoctrination in either a benevolent sense or as an act of oppression”(Kridel, 2010, pp. 474-475).

This was the case with Joseph Stalin of Russia, who knew the value of public education in accomplishing such goals. It was the same with Adolf Hitler of Germany and was also utilized by Mao Zedong of China. Stalin, Hitler, and Mao Zedong were known to use indoctrination to persuade people to their political (world)views (Boubacar, 2014; "Totalitarianism").

Indoctrination is a reference to specific training of the mind in order to accomplish certain institutional goals, or for the purpose of pursuing an ideological end (Boubacar, 2014) where "control of education is absolutely essential," and "citizens are surrounded with false information that appears to be true" ("Totalitarianism"). When false, falsified, and falsifiable data is included in a science curriculum and presented as science in a science textbook, it 'appears to be true' to curriculum developers, teachers, students, and even parents. As such, it becomes a subtle favoring of and tends toward a bias to an evolutionary worldview, unbeknownst to the curriculum users who present it and the curriculum receivers, particularly the

students, will in a collateral-curricular sense be conditioned to and inclined to believe, and behave in such a manner as will reflect this (religious) evolutionary worldview, but that particular behavior must be a separate discussion. The question comes to mind however, whether it is acceptable to the curriculum developers of local schools and is it acceptable to parents that students be biased toward a particular worldview in a high school science class? Do parents and curriculum developers want students to be indoctrinated into an evolutionary worldview?

When the education system of a nation is held by a particular belief, this belief will likely find its way into the classroom through all subjects, not only science. However, in this paper, the author seeks to draw attention to the need for more detailed criticism among the curriculum developers when accepting science textbooks into a high school science curriculum, and the resulting consequence of this lack of detailed criticism, i.e. the potential for indoctrination, whether knowingly or unknowingly, of students into an evolutionary worldview using unscientific data.

Certainly, private schools that wish to teach their students particular religious beliefs will disagree with the injection of a different belief into their science curriculum. Often in Christian schools for example, 'Values' classes present God as the Creator of the universe and all life, however, science classes use textbooks which promote a purely naturalistic worldview that excludes a Supreme Being, i.e. God using inaccurate science to demonstrate it. This of course creates confusion for the students and objective of the private schools of promoting their religious belief becomes muddled in this confusion. This need not be the case if a science curriculum excludes unscientific data leaving only objective facts for the learners to draw their own conclusions.

2. PROBLEMS

The following six general problems within the science curricula of high school will be presented in order to demonstrate tendencies toward an evolutionary worldview present in the high school curriculum of Philippine schools. Detailed discussion is not practical in this paper but points are presented in order to show inaccuracies and stimulate the thinking of the reader toward a critical analysis of current high school science curricula.

2.1 Problem 1: The use of biology textbooks in high school science curricula that use a falsifiable hypothesis of the origin of the universe (e.g. ‘cosmic evolution’ or ‘the Big Bang’) that demonstrates purely natural means of the development of species, and which tends to promote an evolutionary worldview.

2.1.1. The first law of thermodynamics

The first law of thermodynamics states that matter cannot be created or destroyed. One author (Septjian, 2011) asks the questions:

“What exploded? Where did the space come from? Where did the matter come from? How did the matter get so perfectly organized? Where did the energy come from? How was the energy harnessed? Where did the laws come from? How did Time, Space & Matter enter existence at the same moment? How did all the elements evolve from Hydrogen and Helium? How did life begin?”

These are valid questions that cannot be answered by science. A law of science is just that, an unbreakable rule of the physical universe. The observation that something came from nothing cannot possibly be a scientific argument and must therefore be counted as a religious

worldview. An evolutionary worldview which states that everything we have in the universe came from a Big Bang violates this natural law and goes beyond the boundaries of science and should not be included in a high school science textbook where it would influence the students' beliefs of origins.

2.1.2. The law of conservation of angular momentum

The Law of Conservation of Angular Momentum states that, "when the net external torque acting on a system about a given axis is zero, the total angular momentum of the system about that axis remains constant" ("Law"). One key point of this law is that, "when an object is spinning in a closed system and no external torques are applied to it, it will have no change in angular momentum" ("Conservation"). The Law of Conservation of Angular Momentum simplified teaches that if something is spinning in one direction and a piece breaks off, it will also spin in the same direction.

According to this law of nature, if everything in the universe were swirling around, naturally, in a particular direction, as is proposed by the hypothesis of evolution (Septjian, 2011) then broke apart, everything should be spinning in the same direction. However, as science has discovered, Venus, Uranus and possibly Pluto rotate backwards from the other six planets in our solar system. Astrobiologist, David Grinspoon (1997 cited in: Freakes, 2013) admits, "We have some theories about how the spin of Venus may have been pulled into sync with Earth. Unfortunately, they don't really work, at least not yet." In its February 11th, 2002 edition, CNN reported that one galaxy spins backwards ("Goofy"). Again, David Grinspoon (1997 cited in: Freakes, 2013) states, "It seems we will never have a theory predicting in detail how a solar system arises from a disc." And finally, physicist Paul Davies (1981, cited in "Paul" 2011, also

cited in "Creation's") confesses the big bang as something supernatural, beyond the scope of observable science: “[The Big Bang] represents the instantaneous suspension of physical laws, the sudden abrupt flash of lawlessness that allowed something to come from nothing. It represents a true miracle.” This law of nature disproves the evolutionary worldview hypothesis of a swirling mass that broke apart and must therefore be rejected according to the scientific process.

2.1.3. Religious beliefs

By using the term “miracle” in the statement above, this evolutionist (Paul Davies) equates our origins to a ‘non-natural’ occurrence, which goes beyond the scientific body into a supernatural and unscientific area of logic. The first law of thermodynamics and the law of conservation of angular momentum falsify or at minimum bring questions to the inclusion of evidences from an evolutionary worldview into high school science textbooks. The question is raised, why would this falsifiable hypothesis be included in a high school science textbook meant to educate students about ‘natural’ science? Just as other religious worldviews believe that a supernatural force or intelligence created the universe, so too does the evolutionary worldview. No one was there to observe it, nor can we repeat this. Therefore, any belief of origins must be removed from ‘science’ textbooks. Should not the matter of origins be discussed outside of the boundaries of the school curriculum, as such discussions enter the supernatural realm? Does the responsibility to teach children about supernatural beliefs belong to parents or to the high school science curriculum?

2.2. Problem 2: The use of biology textbooks in high school science curricula which use evidence from micro-evolution to substantiate a falsifiable hypothesis of macro-evolution that demonstrates purely natural means of the development of species, and which tends to promote an evolutionary worldview.

Biology textbooks in general used in high school classes today make inference that micro-evolution is evidence of macro-evolution. In other words, because there is variation in species, that represents evidence that a cow became a whale for example. It is fairly easy to find in local biology textbooks pictures or sketches of varieties of rice or corn used as evidence to support this hypothesis and the worldview of evolution; meanwhile, neglecting the obvious argument that it is still rice or that it is still corn even if it is a variant type of either.

Another instance of this questionable data can be found in attempts to mutate fruit flies with the express purpose to prove macro-evolution. “It is a striking, but not much mentioned fact that, though geneticists have been breeding fruit-flies for sixty years or more in labs all round the world- flies which produce a new generation every eleven days-they have never yet seen the emergence of a new species or even a new enzyme... They are still fruitflies!” (Author and journalist Gordon Taylor, 1984, cited in "Mutations"). Lee Spetner (2001, cited in Spetner 2011), a well-known physicist and author, is quoted as saying, “The mutations needed for macroevolution have never been observed.” Simply put, adaptation, as we see in species, provides variation within a genus or “kind,” i.e., creatures that can reproduce fertile offspring. Micro-evolution does not mean transformation from one kind to another.

What textbooks and the high school science curriculum, biology in particular, are emphasizing almost exclusively however, is an unverifiable hypothesis called macro-evolution, and until now the evidence for it is debatable and even questionable at best. What we do have

evidence for is micro-evolution, which is another way of saying ‘micro-adaptation’ where kinds bring forth after their kind without any observed sudden or gradual change into another kind. Micro-evolution does not scientifically or conclusively demonstrate macro-evolution, yet this information is presented to students in a matter-of-fact forum such as a science textbook without deeper discussion of contradictory facts of science, or any other issue or possibilities. This phenomena gives plausibility to the author’s observation of indoctrination rather than education taking place in local high school science classes. Science education entails the presentation of verifiable facts as opposed to conjecture and allow the student to make his own informed decision as to the matter of species modifications and descent.

2.3. Problem 3: The use of biology textbooks in high school science curricula which use false evidence of embryology that demonstrates purely natural means of the development of species, and which tends to promote an evolutionary worldview.

Falsified evidence from embryology is a perennial element in high school biology textbooks. In most, if not all cases these are sketches because the actual form of these embryos can be clearly seen to be different from the sketches presented in textbooks. This falsified evidence used in textbooks for an evolutionary worldview was manufactured by Ernst Haeckel (Grigg, 1998), a professor in Germany and discredited in 1874, over one hundred years ago, yet it is still presented in textbooks. The question raised; is this science?

One concern is that either the textbook makers are not aware of this and therefore negligent in their science and thus should not be used as educational resources, or they are aware of it and have left it in their texts in order to further promote an evolutionary worldview. In either case, curriculum developers are responsible for this material and its use as educational material

in high school science classrooms unless there is an intention for the collateral curriculum to be indoctrination into an evolutionary worldviews.

2.4. Problem 4: The use of biology textbooks in high school science curricula which use falsifiable evidence of the evolution of horses that demonstrates purely natural means of the development of species, and which tends to promote an evolutionary worldview.

Local high school biology textbooks use falsifiable charts of horse evolution that tend to reinforce an evolutionary worldview in students. This chart has been shown to be inaccurate: “The much-repeated ‘gradual’ evolution of the modern horse, [has] not held up under close examination.” (Wadsworth Biology, 1992, cited in Spetner, 2011). To keep this particular discussion concise, the author will rely largely on the work of Sepejhan (2011) who writes that the problems with horse evolution include: (1) It was made up by Othniel C. Marsh in 1874 from fossils scattered across the world, and not from the same location; (2) Modern horses are found in layers with and lower than “ancient horses”; (3) The “ancient horse” (hyracotherium) is not a horse but is just like the hyrax still alive in Turkey and East Africa today; (4) Ribs, toes and teeth are different between the horses, the next horse had fifteen ribs, then nineteen ribs, then back to eighteen; (5) South American fossils go from one-toed to three-toed (reverse order); (6) These fossils are never found in the order that they have been presented in the charts; (7) Three-toed and one-toed horses grazed side by side.

Therefore, it is known by the scientific method that the horse did not evolve from a four-toed ancestor. The hypothesis has been falsified and must be rejected according to the scientific method. However, the question is raised, why is this presented as science in local high school science textbooks? Paleontologist George C. Simpson (1950, cited in Sepejhan, 2011) is quoted

as saying, “Many examples commonly cited, such as the evolution of the horse family or of the sabertooth ‘tigers’ can be readily shown to have been unintentionally falsified and not to be really orthogenetic.” Again, the question is raised, why would a falsifiable hypothesis of horse evolution be presented in local high school science textbooks? Another concern raised; does this constitute education using the objective presentation of natural science, or does it entail indoctrination using fallacy?

2.5. Problem 5: The use of biology textbooks in high school science curricula which use a falsifiable geologic column / time clock based on falsifiable geological periods that demonstrate purely natural means of the development of species, and which tend to promote an evolutionary worldview.

Biology textbooks use a geological clock, timeline, or column to postulate an evolutionary way of thinking. However, geological dating makes use of what is called “circular reasoning” (“Geological”, Taylor, 2013, Woodmorappe 1999) where the fossils date the rocks and the rocks date the fossils. The observable fact of science is that fossils do not always line up in layers. Often only one layer of fossils is found at a given site. This is particularly common with vertebrates. Sometimes they are found in multiple layers, but a study of their distribution shows that even index fossils are seldom found layered on top of one another (“Geological”, Taylor, 2013, Woodmorappe 1999).

Furthermore, this “clock” is falsified if even one piece of evidence demonstrates to the contrary, and there are evidences which do this. For example, evidence around the earth raises doubt and falsifies the geologic column in the forms of out of place layers, out of place fossils, out of place artifacts, and unconformities (“Geological”, Taylor, 2013, Woodmorappe, 1999) all

present serious difficulties for evolutionary thinking, yet this data is not commonly found in local high school science textbooks if at all. If it were present, it would allow for a healthy discussion of the facts and permit students the opportunity to draw their own conclusions based on their own reasoning. The peculiar absence of this data infers a bias in science textbooks and lends itself to the notion of indoctrination rather than education.

2.5.1. Dinosaurs

One major area of conflict with the geologic column is that of dinosaurs. According to the geologic column presented in high school science textbooks, no human being would have interacted with or would have seen dinosaurs as they are separated by millions of years. Thus, if one were to actually see a living dinosaur, this would disprove the geologic column, rendering the evolutionary worldview suspect. It has happened.

Dinosaurs, possibly even some living today, disprove evolutionary time clocks. Pictographs, tapestries, and other artifacts from archaeological finds that depict dinosaurs are found all over the world (“Dragon”). “Dinosaur-like creatures are featured on Babylonian landmarks, Roman mosaics, Asian pottery and royal robes, Egyptian burial shrouds and government seals, Peruvian burial stones and tapestries, Mayan sculptures, Aboriginal and Native American petroglyphs, and many other pieces of ceremonial art throughout ancient cultures” (Smith, 2010). More instances from history include:

Records of Marco Polo in China show that the royal house kept dragons for ceremonies and dragons were hunted for meat and medicine in the Province of Karazan. Records of the Greek historian Herodotus and the Jewish historian Josephus describe flying reptiles in ancient Egypt and Arabia. In other cultures, it was a great honor to kill these creatures. There are

numerous records of warriors killing great beasts in order to establish credibility in a village. Gilgamesh, Fafnir, Beowulf and other famous legends, including the mythology of Egypt, Greece and Rome, include specific descriptions of dragons and other dinosaur-like creatures (“Dragon”).

The question here; if man and dinosaurs were truly separated by millions of years as evolutionary thinking presents, then how could ancient and even modern men have been able to create detailed images of known dinosaurs on these artifacts? These archaeological evidences alone are grounds for the rejection of the geologic timeline used in high school science textbooks as they are evidence that man and dinosaurs co-existed. To exclude this data from high school biology textbooks is to deprive the student of a holistic approach to the phenomenon of dinosaurs and allowing them to draw their own conclusions based solely on scientific fact. The absence of this data in textbooks however is the absence of data needed to make an informed conclusion and again, borders on, if not enters into, indoctrination.

There is also evidence that demonstrates that dinosaurs may very well be alive today. One well-documented example is what appeared to be a Plesiosaur washed up on Moore's Beach in Monterey, California in 1925. The neck of this animal was 20 feet long (Niednagel, 2014). Another well-documented case of dinosaur sightings is mokele-mbembe in Africa.

Consistently over the past 100 years natives talk about mokele-mbembe, meaning blocker-of-rivers. These dinosaur sightings come from varied areas, but are startlingly similar. All of them involve a creature that spends most of its time in the water, though it climbs ashore during the day in search of food. Its size is approximately between an elephant and hippopotamus but with a long neck and small head. And the mokele-mbembe feeds off of specific vegetation and fruit growing along the water's edge. No matter where they have been

spotted in Africa, the natives all say that hippopotamus and alligators quickly leave the section of the river where this creature roams. It is very territorial and aggressively protects its area. Every time natives are shown pictures, they quickly identify a sauropod-type dinosaur, similar in shape to a small Apatosaurus (“Beast”, Gibbons, 2012).

There are many books about the subject of dinosaurs today. There is also more evidence that cannot be presented in this forum, such as polystrate fossils, and imprecise radio-carbon dating results, however, the issues of dinosaurs in modern times alone does make a case for inclusion in science textbooks in order to provide an opportunity for young and impressionable learners to make informed decisions regarding their beliefs and worldviews.

2.6. Problem 6: The use of biology textbooks in high school science curricula which use false, falsified, and falsifiable evidence of early homo-sapiens that demonstrate a hypothetical purely natural means of the development of species, and which tend to promote an evolutionary worldview.

There is an abundance of evidence to suggest error in the ancestry-of-man charts found in biology textbooks in local high schools. If we are dealing with science, then all of the facts must be presented, and falsified hypotheses and corresponding falsified evidence dispelled. However, only the evolutionary worldview is presented with any credence, this despite falsified evidence as well as falsifiable evidence. Time does not permit a full development of this subject, but commonly published evidence such as Nebraska Man, Java Man, Piltdown Man, Neanderthal Man, Cro-Magnon Man, and even the elusive “Lucy” (Australopithecus) have all been either falsified or found falsifiable (Wells, 2002; Oktan; “Evolution”). The reality is that no missing

link to man's descent that connects hominoids with homos-sapiens, or homo-sapiens-sapiens has been found.

2.6.1. Ancient man

A look at scientific evidence, in fact, demonstrates the opposite of what the evolutionary view infers; that early man lacked high-level intelligence and was evolving into a more intelligent being, i.e., evolution. On the contrary, man was indeed highly intelligent accomplishing and or performing feats that we have not been able to duplicate until recent times.

One example, ancient Ica stones from Peru, dated approximately twelve hundred years ago, shows heart surgery and what appears to be an I.V. (intravenous), as well as many other oddities (Anonymous, 2011). Another example is of an airplane model found in a grave in Columbia, South America estimated at about 1000 years old, now kept in the Smithsonian Institute, USA (Junku, 1996; "Ooparts"). Still another example comes from ancient Egypt where pictographs show Egyptians using electricity. "Contrary to what evolutionists claim, the history of mankind is full of proofs that ancient peoples possessed far superior technologies and civilizations than had been believed" (Oktar, 2009).

Yet, the majority of this information does not appear in school textbooks as contradicting the evolutionary worldview that appears to dominate the majority of the textbook discussions. The question is raised, why would students not be told of the intelligence of ancient man which contradicts the evolutionary ideology of a brutish ancient man? This data would certainly help learners understand the past better and draw their own conclusions about the origins of man. One evolutionist, Colin Patterson (1979, cited in Bates, 2014), the senior paleontologist at the Museum of Natural History, London offered this summation regarding transitional fossil

evidence of human or other descent: "... I will lay it on the line — there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument. ..."

3. SOLUTIONS

The solutions here are presented in no particular order and primarily in the form of questions in an effort to facilitate formation of the reader's own views of the solutions that address not only the previous six problems but these problems taken as a whole, as they are symptoms of deeper issues that will be discussed in the concluding comments of this paper.

First, what is the philosophy of education for Dep-Ed (The Department of Education) in the Philippines, has it been made known to the public, and has public discussion ensued as to which philosophy of education is to be accepted and agreed upon by the people of the country?

Second, what action if any will be taken to address the high school science curriculum problems presented in this paper which demonstrate that 'non-science' which tends to support an evolutionary worldview is being used in high school science curricula.

Third, each problem presented in this paper is a representative part of a collective problem in education, that being, what is to be taught in the high school science curriculum and how it is to be presented. Therefore, should science be presented as objective facts and students permitted to draw their own conclusions, or will the responsibility be given to the school to direct the thinking of the students into a particular worldview?

Fourth, should curriculum developers be compelled to provide high school science curricula that allow for a complete education where all sides of a phenomenon are presented with objectivity to allow for healthy and informed discussion in an educational setting? Freedom of

discussion of all aspects of an issue within the science class should not only be allowed, but also promoted in order for learners to discover the truth and develop critical thinking skills.

Fifth, what worldview is being promoted in high school science classes and will an informed public accept efforts to indoctrinate students and the populace at large with it?

Sixth, to take the matter to another level, the reader should then seek to investigate the agenda behind such influence in what should be a purely objective education of all learners.

Seventh, what affect will the acceptance of an evolutionary worldview have on the students' thinking and behavior?

Finally, due to the potential sensitivity of this material, the author wishes to express that no explicit or implicit attempt has been made to replace or offer an alternative worldview but rather shed light on the apparent indoctrination of an evolutionary worldview in high school science curricula. An education should provide objective information without interpretation and allow the learner the chance to make the determination of how that information should be applied in their lives; an individual matter that may include family values, cultural and or religious influences; but nevertheless outside of the science classroom. It should not be the science teacher's role to influence the beliefs of a student without parental consent. This indeed ought to be the goal of education in general: to reveal truth to the students. Anything less than the revelation of truth would be the withholding of truth, for purposes of social, financial, political, or religious gain which would then fall under the realm of indoctrination.

4. CONCLUSION

Evolutionist mathematician and officer of the Archaeological Institute of America and member of the New York Academy of Sciences, I. L. Cohen (1984, New Research Publications,

Inc. pp 6-8, 209-210, 214-215, cited in Sepetjian, 2012, and cited in Ebifegha, 2007, p.70), wrote in his book entitled “Darwin was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities that “... every single concept advanced by the theory of evolution is imaginary and it is not supported by the scientifically established facts...” he also said:

“After all, it is not the duty of science to defend the theory of evolution, and stick to it to the bitter end – no matter what illogical and unsupported conclusions it offers. On the contrary, it is expected that scientists recognize the patently obvious impossibility of Darwin's pronouncements and predictions. If in the process of impartial scientific logic, they find that creation by outside superintelligence is the solution to our quandary, then let's cut the umbilical cord that tied us down to Darwin for such a long time. It is choking us and holding us back. An incredible amount of time, effort, talent, and money was spent during the past 125 years to argue and defend this theory. Modern microbiology has proven how the DNA works, mathematics has proven that no meaningful alignment of millions of molecules could possibly take place haphazardly, and fossils have constantly supported the ensuing conclusions. These are solid scientific facts that cannot be denied – in favor of creation by a superintelligence. Any further denial would simply be blindfolded bigotry – it would no longer be science.”

Posted on the Azusa Pacific University website (“Quotes”) one can see further elaboration of the quotes from Cohen (above) and are included here as supplemental information for the reader:

“We now have a debate within the scientific community itself; it is a confrontation between scientific objectivity and ingrained prejudice - between logic and emotion - between fact and fiction. (pp. 6-7)

...In the final analysis, objective scientific logic has to prevail - no matter what the final result is - no matter how many time-honored idols have to be discarded in the process. (p. 8)

... After all, it is not the duty of science to defend the theory of evolution, and stick by it to the bitter end - no matter what illogical and unsupported conclusions it offers.... If in the process of impartial scientific logic, they find that creation by outside superintelligence is the solution to our quandary, then let's cut the umbilical cord that tied us down to Darwin for such a long time. It is choking us and holding us back. (pp. 214-215)

... every single concept advanced by the theory of evolution (and amended thereafter) is imaginary as it is not supported by the scientifically established facts of microbiology, fossils, and mathematical probability concepts. Darwin was wrong. (p. 209)

... The theory of evolution may be the worst mistake made in science. (p. 210)"

These quotes from a well-known evolutionist who was willing to speak openly in loyalty to scientific integrity as opposed to sticking to an evolutionary worldview that lacks evidence, sum this paper up quite efficiently. There are more instances of falsifiable information and or questionable practices that support an evolutionary worldview that could be listed in this paper such as homology, vestigial organs, chemical evolution, and DNA. However, the discussion above ought to suffice in at the very least creating a question in one's mind as to the veracity of current science curricula throughout the city, the province, the country, and possibly the world.

A proper education includes all sides of an issue. When only one side is presented, it is no longer education, but indoctrination. With the utter abundance of credible and scientific information available that contradicts the evidences of an evolutionary worldview used in

textbooks, one must wonder if education is the aim of the high school science curriculum. The author believes that it may simply be the case where choices in science textbooks at the local level made by curriculum developers, happen without critical evaluation of the material, i.e. blind acceptance of the data in these textbooks as accurate and without agenda, i.e. “it’s in the textbook, so it must be true.”

The purpose of this paper has not been to prove each point, but rather to raise valid points in order to create a reasonable doubt in the mind of the reader as to the veracity of the current science curriculum in Philippine high schools, public and private. With this doubt the reader may then come to question the particular worldview being promoted and if this worldview is being indoctrinated into the science curriculum; if so, whether this practice is acceptable to the parents or guardians of these students.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. Photographic Evidence of an Alternative History. 2011. Internet Archive. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <https://archive.org/details/PhotographicEvidenceOfAnAlternativeHistory>.
- Bates, Gary. That Quote!—About the Missing Transitional Fossils. 2014. Creation magazine 29(1). Creation.com. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://creation.com/that-quote-about-the-missing-transitional-fossils>.
- Beast Hunter: Mokele-Mbembe Encounter. 2013. National Geographic.com. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://channel.nationalgeographic.com/wild/beast-hunter/videos/mokele-mbembe-encounter/>.

- Boubacar, Barry. Totalitarian Essay ePortfolio, Bronx Community College. 2014. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from https://bcc-cuny.digication.com/bibrah/Mao_Stalin_Hitler_Totalitarian_Essay
- Conservation of Angular Momentum. Boundless Physics. Boundless, 03 Jul. 2014. Retrieved 26 Dec. 2014 from <https://www.boundless.com/physics/textbooks/boundless-physics-textbook/rotational-kinematics-angular-momentum-and-energy-9/conservation-of-angular-momentum-86/conservation-of-angular-momentum-328-11269/>
- Creation's Tiny Mystery. Chapter 11: The Trial Decision. 2004. Earth Science Associates. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.halos.com/book/ctm-11-b.htm>.
- Dragon History. 2014. The All About Creation.org. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.allaboutcreation.org/dragon-history.htm>.
- Ebifegha, Michael. "The Death of Evolution." 2007. Xulon Press. Retrieved 26 Dec. 2014 from Google Books.
- Education. WordWeb 7.03. WordWeb Software. 2014. Web: Open Source.
- Evolution Fraud and Myths. 2014. NW Creation Network. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.nwcreation.net/evolutionfraud.html>.
- Evolution/Creation Debate: A Time for Truth, BioScience volume 31 (1981), p. 559; Reprinted in J. Peter Zetterberg, editor, Evolution versus Creationism, Oryx Press, Phoenix, Arizona, 1983. Web: Retrieved 26 Dec. 2014.
- Freakes, John. 100 Reasons to Choose Biblical Creation Over Evolution. 2013. C.A.R.E. Ministries of Winnipeg. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.carewinnipeg.com/books/97-100-reasons-to-choose-biblical-creation-over-evolution>.

- Geological Column*. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from http://creationwiki.org/Geological_column.
- Gibbons, William. Was a Mokele-mbembe killed at Lake Tele? March 2012. *The Anomalist*. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.anomalist.com/reports/mokele.html>.
- Goofy Galaxy Spins in Wrong Direction. CNN.com, Space. February 11, 2002. Retrieved 26 Dec. 2014.
- Grigg, Russell. Fraud Rediscovered. *Creation* 20(2):49–51, March 1998. *Creation.com*. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://creation.com/fraud-rediscovered>.
- Janku, Lumir G. Ancient Batteries and Electric Devices. 1996. *Enigmas.org*. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/ciencia/ciencia_hitech02a.htm.
- , Strange Artifacts: Ancient Flying Machines. 1996. *World Mysteries.com*. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from http://www.world-mysteries.com/sar_7.htm.
- Kazan, Casey. Richard Dawkins on the Origin of Life: A Galaxy Insight. *The Daily Galaxy*. February, 2009. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from http://www.dailygalaxy.com/my_weblog/2009/02/richard-dawkins.html
- Kridel, Craig. 2010. Indoctrination. *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies, Volume 1*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from *Google Books.com*.
- Law of Conservation of Angular Momentum. *City Collegiate*. Retrieved December 26 from http://www.citycollegiate.com/centre_of_mass3.htm.
- Niednagel, Jordan. Moore's Beach Monster. *True Authority.com*. December 2014. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.trueauthority.com/cryptozoology/moore.htm>.
- Oktar, Adnan. Light Bulbs Were Used for Illumination in Ancient Egypt. April 11, 2009. *Harun Yahya.com* Retrieved 28 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.harunyahya.com/en/Technological-Advances-of-Ancient-Ages/13770/light-bulbs-were-used-for>.

----- Mutations. Darwinism Refuted.com. Web: Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014.

Ooparts: Ancient high Technology: Top Eleven Mysterious Mysteries of the Pre-Columbian Americas That We Decided to Cram into One Article. 1996. s8int.com. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://s8int.com/phile/page54.html>.

Origin of Life Studies: Life is no Accident. 2013. C.A.R.E. Ministries of Winnipeg. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.carewinnipeg.com/articles/15-creation-evidences/42-origin-of-life-studies-life-is-no-accident>

Paul Davies on the Big Bang. Quote of the Day. Creation Revolution.com, posted April 26, 2011. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from <http://creationrevolution.com/paul-davies-on-the-big-bang/>

Quotes on Creation and Evolution. Section 5: Evolution as a Theory. Azusa Pacific University. Retrieved 26 Dec. 2014 from <http://home.apu.edu/~jsimons/Bio101/quotes5.htm>.

Richard Lewontin. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Richard_Lewontin.

Schiro, Michael Stephen. Curriculum Theory: Conflicting Visions and Enduring Concerns, Second Edition. Chapter 1: Introduction to the Curriculum Ideologies. (2013). Sage Publications, Inc.

Science. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from Google Search.

Sepetjian, R. K. Evolution Theory & The Scientific Method. May, 2012. Across the Fruited Plain. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://sepetjian.wordpress.com/2012/05/09/evolution-theory-the-scientific-method/>.

----- Horse Evolution: Fraud Exposed 60 Years Ago, Still in the Textbooks? Across the Fruited Plain. October 4, 2011. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from

<http://sepetjian.wordpress.com/2011/10/04/horse-evolution-fraud-exposed-60-years-ago-still-in-the-textbooks/>.

-----, What is the Big Bang Theory? Across the Fruited Plain. September 27, 2011. Retrieved 27 Dec. 2014 from <http://sepetjian.wordpress.com/2011/09/27/what-is-the-big-bang-theory/>.

Smith, Jerry. Dinosaurs Not Millions of Years Ago. Creation-Ed Blog. December 24, 2010. Retrieved, 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://c-ed.blogspot.com/2010/12/dinosaurs-not-millions-of-years-ago.html>

Spetner, Lee. Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue. True.Origin Archive. 2001. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp>.

Taylor, Paul. The Geologic Column: Is That a Fact? Creation Today, February 22, 2013. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://creationtoday.org/the-geologic-column-is-that-a-fact/>.

Totalitarianism: Case Study: Stalinist Russia. ClassZone.com. Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from [http://historywithmrgreen.com/page2/assets/Totalitarianism Case Study.pdf](http://historywithmrgreen.com/page2/assets/Totalitarianism%20Case%20Study.pdf)

Wells, Jonathan. Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong. 2002. Regnery Publishing, 2002. Retrieved 26 Dec. 2014 from Google Books.

What is Science. Science Council. 2014. Web: Retrieved 24 Dec. 2014 from <http://www.sciencecouncil.org/definition>

Woodmorappe, John. The Geologic Column: Does it Exist? Journal of Creation 13(2):77–82. November 1999. Creation.com. Retrieved 25 Dec. 2014 from <http://creation.com/does-geologic-column-exist>.