

## SYNOPSIS OF REPLY TO RESPONSE OF COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP

- 1. Complaint:** Adding to the mission statement a goal that would help students make not only reasoned decisions, but decisions that are “INFORMED” is “far outside the mainstream of science.”

**Response:** The complaint is absurd on its face. Need we say more. “To educate is to inform.”
- 2. Complaint:** The definition of science proposed by the Majority is consistent with definitions used by National Science organizations.

**Response:** The complaint ignores the fact that it is not found in any other state standard or in the National Science Education Standards, the model for state science standards. The Board definition is rigorously objective and consistent with the way science is portrayed to the public.
- 3. Complaint:** The change to the introduction that the causes of many events such as the origin of life, etc, are not known is “incorrect.” “The science community has a good deal of information about the listed items.”

**Response:** Having information about an event does not explain its cause. Numerous PhD’s testified to the scientific accuracy of the change.
- 4. Complaint:** Suggesting changes to the standards that evolution postulates a process of “gradual change” is incorrect.

**Response:** The postulate was not inserted by the Board, rather it was inserted by the Majority in Teachers Note to Standard 3, BM 3, G 5-7. Further the “science community” recently stated: “The neo-Darwinian paradigm...is a gene-centered *gradualistic*, and externalistic theory according to which all evolutionary modification is a result of external selection acting on *incremental* genetic variation.”
- 5. Complaint:** We should not have an origin of life indicator because that is a subject not covered by biological evolution.

**Response:** The Response admits it is a part of life science and ignores the fact that all biology textbooks cover the subject. Testimony during the hearings showed the textbook coverage to be inadequate, thereby necessitating a standard.
- 6. Complaint:** It is false to say there is no known chemical or physical law that orders the sequence of nucleotide bases within genes because some data shows that those sequences have adapted to the environment.

- Response:** This begs the question of what orders the sequences. Adaptation occurs after the ordering. Also, the Majority's own expert states emphatically that no "scientist has ever suggested otherwise." Numerous experts validated the change during the hearings.
7. **Complaint:** The distinction between Micro and Macroevolution is no longer in common usage, therefore students should not be introduced to this idea.
- Response:** The response itself uses the distinction to make its arguments. It is contained in the current standards embraced by the Majority in 2001, and is used in current textbooks. Any non-use of the distinction is designed to mask a major challenge to evolutionary theory.
8. **Complaint:** It is incorrect to state that biological evolution postulates an unguided natural process that has no discernable direction or goal. Science is neutral as to whether evolution is guided or unguided.
- Response:** This is false and exceedingly disingenuous. The Response itself states that science does not allow "teleology." Teleology postulates a guided process. The mechanisms of evolution are random mutation in replicating populations that produce variations sorted by random changing environmental circumstances. This mechanism is unguided.
9. **Complaint:** There should be no teaching about testing historical hypotheses about the cause of singular, remote, unobserved and unobservable events that can not be duplicated in the laboratory and tested via experimentation because there is no distinction between historical sciences and all of science.
- Response:** Logic alone shows the distinction. It was recognized by the eminent evolutionary biologist who is referenced in the current science standards, Dr. Ernst Mayr: "*Evolutionary biology, in contrast with physics and chemistry, is a historical science – the evolutionist attempts to explain events and processes that have already taken place. Laws and experiments are inappropriate techniques for the explication of such events and processes. Instead one constructs a historical narrative, consisting of a tentative reconstruction of the particular scenario that led to the events one is trying to explain.*"
10. **Complaint:** "The Process is not being Followed."
- Response:** True, the Leadership has gone out of its way to suppress dissent. (e.g. holding public meetings to demean committee members and their proposals and not allowing a vote on the proposals)