

Argumentum ad Verecundiam

A logical fallacy that says, “this is true because it’s what the smart people believe.”

It’s science by democratic vote.

That doesn’t determine truth.

Textbook Assertions

- Textbooks present Evolution as fact, assert that certain specific things happened, but don't actually provide students with empirical evidence that demand these assertions.
- E.g. "How does this prove Evolution?" as opposed to "In what way would you interpret this evidence?"
- That's not science and does not meet the criteria established by the State Standards.
- Evolution should be identified as "what superficially resembles science (but fails to meet the criteria for science)" as stated in the standard.

SC.912.N.2.1

Identify what is science, what clearly is not science, and what superficially resembles science (but fails to meet the criteria for science).

Standard: The Characteristics of Scientific Knowledge -

A: **Scientific knowledge is based on empirical evidence**, and is appropriate for understanding the natural world, but **it provides only a limited understanding of the supernatural**, aesthetic, or other ways of knowing, such as art, philosophy, or religion.

B: Scientific knowledge is durable and robust, but **open to change**.

C: **Because science is based on empirical evidence it strives for objectivity**, but as it is a human endeavor the processes, methods, and knowledge of science include subjectivity, as well as creativity and discovery.

Blind Faith in Evolution

Naturalism requires a blind faith (i.e., is irrational), since several of its most fundamental, required tenets have absolutely no evidence to support them:

- the origin of the laws of nature;
- origin of matter/energy;
- origin of life;
- origin of genetic information;
- evolutionary change from one kind of organism to another (protozoan to man)

Two Examples

1. Spontaneous Generation/Abiogenesis (Darwin) vs Law of Biogenesis (Pasteur)
1. Recapitulation (Ernst Haeckel) and Vestigial Organs vs Observable Embryological Ontogeny

Ernst Haeckel's Lie



Empirical Evidence Against

Note: These are scientific criticisms of Evolution,
not religious teachings.

What We Are Asking

We are not asking to preach religious tenets and blind faith like the evolutionists have done for so long.

We are asking to be free to show the flaws of Evolution (and other controversial scientific topics) in light of known scientific laws without fear of losing our jobs.

To teach students how to think critically, it is imperative that we not present a one-sided view of things that are *not* scientific laws, and have no basis in empirical research.

Thank you. Are there any questions?