

## Review of Biology Textbooks for SC

**Textbook No. 4 under Biology-Advanced Placement, grades 11-12**  
**Glencoe/McGraw-Hill, Glencoe Biology, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition**  
**Authors are Raven, Johnson, Losos, Singer**  
**2005(?) SC Edition**

Definitions in Glossary: these do not agree with other biology textbooks.

G-6 Evolution is simple to complex organisms.

G-8 Macroevolution is creation of new species and extinction of old species.

G-9 Microevolution is evolutionary process itself.

G-14 Species is kind of organism.

Page 8: Charles Darwin's only degree was in Theology not natural sciences and the use of **concept** is a more correct term than theory. Terms like fixity and immutable are not appropriate in this context.

“who believed in a literal interpretation of the Bible and thus accepted the idea of a fixed and constant world, largely unchanged since it was created by God”. This statement is incorrect and is not applicable in a biology textbook.

Page 10: 14 Species of finches are recorded (31 species noted on Page 454 and 469??) whereas, Miller and Levine noted 13 species of finches.

Malthus's theory not true for humans and his theory is no better than evolutionary theory accredited to Charles Darwin although no proof is provided that Charles Darwin wrote a theory of evolution.

Page 11: “evolution occurs because of natural selection” and yet, the term, evolution, is not used by Darwin in Origin of Species.

Herbert Spencer and not C. Darwin developed “survival of fittest”.

Page 13: If the fossil record is so rich, then authors should give one example of evolution from a simple cell to one complex organism. And show how much of each fossil is real versus how much is man-made.

The Nebraska man used previously to show descent of man was fabricated from one tooth in 1922. And this tooth was proven to be an extinct pig's

tooth and in 1972 the extinct pig was found to **demonstrate a fraud** used to promote the evolutionary worldview point in textbooks for 50 years.

Statement that earth was formed about 4.5 BYA is speculation.

“Genetics accounts in a neat and orderly way for the production of new variations in organisms” is an accurate statement but it does not prove evolution.

Page 14: The % difference is not the key point but what these differences do like in speech, languages, and thinking skills. A 2% difference is about **60 million base pairs** which leaves lots of room for distinct differences. If processes like photosynthesis were the result of random chances, why wouldn't we have thousands or at least hundreds of pathways for Ps?

“--fossil, genetics, anatomy, and molecular biology all strongly support Darwin's theory”. To use ALL is a gross overstatement of facts and scientific date. It would be most helpful to give a reference and date **when Darwin wrote his theory of evolution.**

Page 16: “Biologists believe that all living things have descended from some simple cellular creation that arose about 2.5 BYA”. This is an overstatement of facts (some may believe as claimed) and the key word is BELIEVE which correctly reflects a worldview, religious aspect of evolution. This is a religious viewpoint, secular humanism, using historical science and interpretation through their filter. **Such an approach should be moved to religion or philosophy and not paraded as science or biology to high school students who are a captivated audience.**

Page 17: Under Darwin's evidence, characteristics of similar species and change gradually as species migrate are mentioned. And yet Darwin did not define “species” in Origin of Species, so it is hard to understand how he would be accredited with this evidence. When in fact, Charles Darwin had to get someone else to key out “his finches”.

Page 350: Junk DNA is noted as non-coding DNA and authors indicate that 99% of the DNA has little or nothing to do with genes. Some indications of other functions of the non-coding DNA are given. To their credit, the **authors did not call it junk DNA** even when its functions are not known at this time.

Page 456: Peppered moths are mentioned, but no indication of the fraudulent science put forth as operational science.

Page 459: It is unscientific to extrapolate from changes in species to macroevolution!

Page 460: Dating methods are often unreliable and not stated as if there are no controversies.

Page 461: **Since *Archaeopteryx* was a bird**, it should not be used to show “evolution of a dinosaur to bird”.

Page 465: Statements on vestigial organs are grossly misleading. In recent reports, it was shown that the appendix, often cited as a vestigial organ, provides beneficial bacteria to intestines. **This whole section should be deleted or updated to accurately reflect the state of knowledge.**

Page 468-1: Authors incorrectly refer to the Theory of Gravity when it is the **Law of Gravity**. Just as there is a big jump from hypothesis to theory, there is another big jump from theory to law and proper citation should be noted.

Page 468-2: As noted on Page 13, **authors have an opportunity** to give one example of evolution from a simple cell to one complex organism to prove their claim.

Page 468-3: **Authors have an opportunity** to include a flow chart with the progressions of slight improvements to reach the human eye.

Page 468-5: **Authors have an opportunity** to show the proper application of probability to this issue.

Page 468-6: Microevolution in other texts is defined as variation within species, not evolution within species. The term, microevolution, is not even needed and was not used until recent years. “seen clearly in the fossil record”, **please give one example** per note on Page 13.

Page 468-7: Scientific data should be presented to confirm this argument and not just dotted lines and speculation noted here.

Page 468: Bold statement is grossly inaccurate. And to limit it to some in the general public ignores many scientists with PhDs in science who do not concur with the evolutionary concept and moreover, the statement is an **insult to the average American and students in classes.**

Page 471: Darwin in Origin of Species did not define the term, species, and there continues to be a problem with defining species amongst biologists.

Page 483: Darwin's finches **encompass 5 genera**, which are more than just variation within species, but this aspect was not addressed.

Page 486: "Evolution can be slow and gradual or rapid and discontinuous" demonstrates the inconsistencies and wide disagreement amongst supporters of Darwin as a super icon.

Page 517: Evolution of birds from dinosaurs does not account for the differences in lungs between these two organisms.