

## Critique of A Framework for K-12 Science Education LS4 Core Content

The following is a critique of the wording found in the July 2011 Framework document. There are critiques to be made elsewhere in the Framework, but this section is the center of attention. Evolutionary ideas here are challenged and exposed. The content is not real science but origin science unsuitable for the K-12 classroom. This section reads as indoctrination into the philosophy of naturalism.

There are two models of origin that result in two different answers to life's most basic questions. Questions such as "Where did I come from?" or "What is the origin of life?" are two examples. The two models are-- intelligent design from a creator and materialistic causes expressed as Darwinian evolution. The facts of science corroborate the creation model and contradict the evolution model. Evolution is a self-contradiction. One must keep in mind that no human was present at the beginning, so this study of historical science must use other sources.

The NRC writers *want* to make evolution the only game in town and exclude intelligent design. Evolution requires belief in philosophical naturalism. That is a worldview. In this view, all knowledge is found by empirical evidence, especially knowledge in the life sciences. Thus they confine all approaches to the study of life in the box they call "naturalism". There are problems with this approach. First, no person has seen, tasted, nor touched macroevolution. Since all knowledge is gained by empirical observation, this approach is self defeating and must be questioned. In other words you can not prove this approach to science by its own standard. Therefore it stands refuted. Some may argue this is too philosophical, but worldviews influence how one approaches science. Darwinists know that, and you have been forced to play by their rules for several decades now, but their worldview is unscientific. For example, doing science involves the law of uniformity in nature. If evolution is true, then there would be no uniformity. If design or creation is true, it makes sense for uniformity to exist. What about the laws of logic or reasoning. Why should Darwinists use logic? After all thoughts are just chemical actions in the brain and there should be no standard of reasoning. A standard of reasoning is thinking "outside the box of naturalism." Darwinism is non-sense opposed to common sense and masquerading as scientific sense.

## **IDEA LS4: BIOLOGICAL EVOLUTION: UNITY AND DIVERSITY**

Biological evolution is a phrase meaning all life today can be traced back to the first life or first living cell. Chemical evolution is the phrase referring to life coming from non-living materials. There is no verifiable evidence of chemical evolution. As a result this section stands on a belief system with no evidence. Millions of dollars and many research projects looking for facts of evolution have resulted in failure. The only reason left to reinsert this content is due to the beliefs of the Darwinist. The public has been shielded from this truth. Evolution should have no part in this reform effort.

The phrase “unity and diversity” has a popular ring in our culture especially in humanism. Whatever NRC writers meant by this, the use here will be things that are the same and things that differ. Given that meaning, there is little in the title of this content beyond simple common sense. It is believed the NRC writers want to convey biological evolution as a unifying theme of science. It *is* to Darwinists but *not* to operational scientists, due to lack of verifiability.

*How can there be so many similarities among organisms yet so many different kinds of plants, animals, and microorganisms? How does biodiversity affect humans?*

Biodiversity means different things to different groups. The meaning here will be the sum total of living things on planet earth. In this sense, there are many living things that look similar and many things that differ. Again, this perspective can be gained by common sense. How can there be similarities and differences? One possible answer is a common designer. This would imply creation. This explanation was widely accepted by the scientific community. But from the Enlightenment until now the philosophy of naturalism began to be presented and is now a dominant approach to science. Recently, more scientists are seeing the flaws and problems of evolution and no longer adopt this viewpoint. The evidence should support the theory and not the other way around.

This question above asks, how present things can have this quality. The answer is they were designed. The next step would be to study the design of nature, but this has largely been done by the other standards in life science found in the Framework.

Biological evolution explains both the unity and the diversity of species and provides a unifying principle for the history and diversity of life on Earth [8].

The beliefs of those who hold to Darwinian evolution think their notions in their minds explain or provide answers. They don't; they are simply conjectures based on philosophical naturalism- a false, inconsistent, self-refuting and unscientific world view. Most of these notions, when put to pen and paper, reveal a belief system that is baseless and harmful. The harm is the forcing of conclusions and beliefs with no evidence. It would be better not to use the science classroom for this indoctrination. Biological evolution is supported by extensive scientific evidence ranging from the fossil record to genetic relationships among species.

Besides fossils and genetics what is included in the word “ranging”? This statement expresses the core belief that the first living cell underwent modification and over time developed systems and overtime grew in complexity and overtime became a vertebrate, amphibian, reptile, bird, animal and then man. According to Darwinists this conjecture is a fact of science and has been verified by evidence to the satisfaction of any impartial observer. Wrong. No evidence has been shown in the fossil record that interspecies ever lived on the Earth. For this reason alone this entire LS4 material should be removed from the framework. It is not science.

The fossil record is mentioned. What is meant by this inclusion? This is not clarified. It will be assumed for the purpose of this writing that the fossil record are those facts that can be studied from the rock layers found around the earth. These rock layers are made up, in many cases, by strata of sedimentary rock. It is believed these rock layers formed over long periods of time. Fossils have been found in these rock layers and some in the geological community have conjectured what is known as the geological column. The evidence in the rock conflicts with biological evolution, as it is absent of transitional forms and in many cases in direct opposition of the diagrams proposed and published by geologists. One example would be the existence of living fossils. There is now evidence from sedimentology that the rock layers may have formed over a short period of time and layers do not indicate chronology.

What is meant by genetic relationships among species and what is meant by species? There are many possible meanings. For this critique, genetic relationships are similarities and differences of the genetic information between life forms that can reproduce and between life forms that can not interbreed. Only recently has the abundance of information been made available for study. There has been no evidence that the existence of one type has caused or led to the creation of another type. The similarities could also be explained by common design of common systems for different life forms needing to exist in the same biosphere. This information has led geneticists to conclude separations of types due to molecular isolation. Genetic limits, cyclic change, irreducible complexity and non-viability of transitional forms also refute the teaching of Darwinism. In other words, there is no evidence for transitional genetics between types.

Researchers continue to use new and different techniques, including DNA and protein sequence analyses, to test and further their understanding of evolutionary relationships. This is very misleading, given that evolutionary relationships have only been established in the mind of Darwinists. This statement implies a relationship has been established by science and ongoing research will refine what has been concluded. That is not what is happening in this field.

Evolution, which is continuous and ongoing, occurs when natural selection acts on the genetic variation in a population and changes the distribution of traits in that population gradually over multiple generations or more rapidly after sudden changes in conditions, which can lead to the extinction of species.

What is meant by this statement? It is inconsistent. If evolution is on going then we should see today partial \_\_\_ and partial \_\_\_ animals. We don't. Notice the switch in the use of the word "evolution". Living things change in the world but dogs that change are still dogs. People know this but they may not know how this works. On what evidence is the statement "gradually over multiple generations" is made.

What is the difference between continuous and ongoing? Nature does not act. Human breeders act but nature is just ... nature. Nature does not change. This is ascribing intelligent cause to material things. If you can not make nature change in multiple generations over time, how can you make it work quickly?

Through natural selection, traits that provide an individual with an advantage to best meet the challenges in their environment and reproduce are the ones most likely to be passed on to the next generation.

Nature is material- it can not select. This is a fallacy in reasoning. Intelligence somehow is attributed to nature in an arbitrary manner. This is not science; this is a central tenet of philosophical naturalism. This can be understood also as pantheism- a religious belief that nature itself has power and governs.

Over multiple generations, this process can lead to the emergence of new species.

A process is an activity that takes purpose and intelligence. Nature is nature-- not a process. The only process going on is in the life form and its inherent design solving new environmental challenges. By new species, the writer may mean amphibian to reptile or ape to man. Where is the evidence? Saying something can happen is not evidence that it has happened.

Evolution thus explains both the similarities of genetic material across all species and the multitude of species existing in diverse conditions on Earth—its biodiversity—which humans depend on for natural resources and other benefits to sustain themselves.

Evolution thus? Thus infers a conclusion based on evidence. All we have been given are presuppositions and assertions. They are words not evidence. Statements do not make conclusions. Evidence does. There is no evidence for Darwinian evolution. The fact of such is only in the mind of the NRC writer and consensus committee members. Evolution is a belief system and cannot explain anything. People explain things and no person has been able to explain the evidence for evolution. So why is evolution presented as a fact in LS4?

#### **LS4.A: Evidence of Common Ancestry and Diversity**

*What evidence shows that different species are related?*

Biological evolution, the process by which all living things have evolved over many generations from shared ancestors, explains both the unity and the diversity of species. See notes above. This is false. The ancestors exist only in the mind of the naturalists and drawn by willing artists. The unity is

illustrated by similarities found across all species; it can be explained from the inheritance of similar characteristics from similar ancestors. This is best explained by created kinds and reproduction within kinds. If Darwinism is the only game in town, and students are not aware of other knowledge, then they may reach this conclusion.. The diversity of species is also consistent with common ancestry; it is explained by the branching and diversification of lineages as populations adapted, primarily through natural selection, to local circumstances. This is a story based upon the writings of evolutionists using several core conjectures. The dotted lines of common ancestry are fictitious and purely hypothetical without any research to date to support them. Evidence for common ancestry can be found in the fossil record, from comparative anatomy, from comparative embryology, and from the similarities of cellular processes and structures and of DNA across all species. Living things are similar due to similar design and purpose. That would be a better explanation. They look the same in different situations. A small teapot looks like a kettle but it is not an ancestor. This is naïve and conjecture trying to be passed off as scientific knowledge. Darwinists make these statements frequently. Living things show similarity in stages of development, but this may be due more to common design and not a common ancestor. Just because things look the same, it does not mean one came from the other. Two compact cars may look similar but one did not literally and chronologically come from the other. This idea originated with Darwin and despite numerous attempts to make it substantiated by research, the evidence does not support Darwin's theory. It is true that there are similarities in the embryonic developmental processes of different species, but could very easily be explained by a common designer. This simplistic common ancestor approach reflects Darwin's naturalists view at the time that he lived and does not take into account all the complexities and discoveries in the years since he lived. In order to maintain this view one must ignore all other possible explanations for why similarities exist. The understanding of evolutionary relationships has recently been greatly accelerated by molecular biology, especially as applied to developmental biology, with researchers investigating the genetic basis of some of the changes seen in the fossil record, as well as those that can be inferred to link living species (e.g., the armadillo) to their ancestors (e.g., glyptodonts, a kind of extinct gigantic armadillo). The wording of this statement is unclear and quite ambiguous. Molecular biology has not discovered evidence that one life form caused a new form to appear. The facts of recent research support the opposite conclusion.

## **LS4.B: Natural Selection**

*How does genetic variation among organisms affect survival and reproduction?*

Genetic variation in a species results in individuals with a range of traits. First of all genetic variation is in life forms of each living thing. Variation is due to inherent properties of the life form. Living things have been programmed. The study of genetics has helped our understanding about the nature of this programming and how it works. To program something a programmer is needed. What makes more sense- an intelligent programmer or some arbitrary selector? In any particular environment individuals with particular traits may be more likely than others to survive and produce offspring. A better understanding of life forms in an environment is the belief they were made to reproduce and fill spaces or places in the environment. In other words they were designed to adapt and this ability is intrinsic to its origin and purpose. The same designer of the living creature is the same designer of the environmental systems. One is not competing with the other. In short this sentence is common sense. This process is called natural selection and may lead to the predominance of certain inherited traits in a population and the suppression of others. Process infers intelligence and lead implies something or someone acting. Natural selection occurs only if there is variation in the genetic information within a population that is expressed in traits that lead to differences in survival and reproductive ability among individuals under specific environmental conditions. That sure is a complicated way to say some things die and some live. A better way to say this is- living things were made to survive. Where is Natural Section? If the trait differences do not affect reproductive success, then natural selection will not favor one trait over others. Natural selection is a phrase made up of words; it cannot do anything by itself. Where is the selector that selects? Nature is being personified and given intelligence by the use of the word "favor". People favor- things do not.

## **LS4.C: Adaptation**

*How does the environment influence populations of organisms over multiple generations?*

It seems like this idea is already stated above. Living thing response to the changes in the environment based upon their programming.

When an environment changes, there can be subsequent shifts in its supply of resources or in the physical and biological challenges it imposes. Some individuals in a population may have morphological, physiological, or behavioral traits that provide a reproductive advantage in the face of the shifts in the environment. **Most people know this, and a good reason for this would be due to initial design.** Natural selection provides a mechanism for species to adapt to changes in their environment. **Again, nature is being attributed with intelligence and purpose. A better way of saying this is that living things are designed with intelligent mechanisms or ability to adapt.** All species possess a set of traits, but only some of the traits are expressed. Evolutionary theory does not begin to explain the means by which the material originated and fails to provide the process by which the genetic material of all living things has differentiated from one common ancestor. The resulting selective pressures influence the survival and reproduction of organisms over many generations and can change the distribution of traits in the population. **Define selective pressures. Again this is attributing to material nature an intelligent cause or action.** This process is called adaptation. Adaptation can lead to organisms that are better suited for their environment because individuals with the traits adaptive to the environmental change pass those traits on to their offspring, whereas individuals with traits that are less adaptive produce fewer or no offspring. **People lead labels do not. Most people would accept this as common sense. This statement draws upon evidence for adaptation in order to support a broad-based macro evolutionary theory.** Over time, adaptation can lead to the formation of new species. **This is true of the development of a species within a kind. However, this may not be what is meant. Adaptation doesn't produce new life forms, and there is no evidence that it may.** In some cases, however, traits that are adaptive to the changed environment do not exist in the population and the species becomes extinct. **A better way to say this is some offspring do not survive.** Adaptive changes due to natural selection, as well as the net result of speciation minus extinction, have strongly contributed to the planet's biodiversity. **This is another statement without foundation. For the purpose of this examination, it is assumed the NRC writer is meaning to say, "Because we know adaptation is true, it must be how the whole of living things on planet earth have come about and you should accept it."** Adaptation by natural selection is ongoing. For example it is seen in the emergence of antibiotic-resistant bacteria. **This bacteria example is misleading. The amount of information is lost in new, resistant bacteria. If the environment changed it may not survive. In other words resistant bacteria do not constitute an improved form. Information should**



increase for evolution to be true. Operational genetics has indicated information moves in the opposite direction as Darwinian evolution. Why are these statements in the Framework. Such species as bacteria, in which multiple generations occur over shorter time spans, evolve more rapidly than those for which each generation takes multiple years. What is meant by evolve? A better way to say this is that bacteria, by innate design can suite the environment in less time due to rapid reproduction.

#### **LS4.D: Biodiversity and Humans**

*What is biodiversity, how do humans affect it, and how does it affect humans?*

Human beings are part of and depend on the natural world. This statement is either common sense or introductory to some philosophical viewpoint. Biodiversity—the multiplicity of genes, species, and ecosystems—provides humans with renewable resources, such as foods, medicines, and clean water. Humans also benefit from “ecosystem services,” such as climate stabilization, decomposition of wastes, and pollination that are provided by healthy (i.e., diverse and resilient) ecosystems. Humans benefit by how the world and universe is made to suit them. This is known as the Anthropropic Principle. There are over one hundred constants that make human life possible. These are facts of operational science and not statements of belief. There is little odds of this happening by chance. The resources of biological communities can be used within sustainable limits, but in many cases humans affect these ecosystems in ways—including habitat destruction, pollution of air and water, overexploitation of resources, introduction of invasive species, and climate change—that prevent the sustainable use of resources and lead to ecosystem degradation, species extinction, and the loss of valuable ecosystem services. A better way to say this is that humans can hurt the environment and need to be good stewards. The wording of the NGS writer here also adopts a religious worldview--environmental pantheism. Furthermore, the issue of climate change is another issue of contention. It is not fair to students to present these topics as if they are settled. This stifles true science.

**Overall conclusion. This section of the Framework could be rewritten. One suggestion follows.**

**The world of living things shows amazing design. Scientists can classify and study groups of living things. Genetics gives insight to how living things reproduce and fill spaces in the environment. Each living thing is programmed to survive and has innate capacity to adjust to changes in the environment. Sometimes living things become extinct. The origin of living things is an intriguing study of investigation. Our focus is learning how living things operate today and interact with their environment. Humans need to be good stewards of the environment.**

**Grade bands and concepts for instruction. They are not needed based on the following recommendations.**

There is little additional science content in these core ideas. This is, in essence, indoctrination in philosophical naturalism. The careful reader must ask if this reform effort has been co-opted by the Darwinist and this section inserted in order to promote and support their agenda. If you believe this is true, what should be done and when should action begin to address it? What does it say to leaders in science reform if they are unwilling to accept rational criticism and remove the content without delay?

It may be a better use of time to study life science in nature and how nature works in the everyday world. Students can easily understand this material, study it, and apply what they learn to the world around them. It would be a great way to create interest in the life sciences. This may be included in the other standards or core ideas for the life sciences. By including LS4 content the Darwinists are delaying the reform needed in our schools today.

It would be better to leave the study of evolution to a class on philosophy or world views offered as an elective outside the department of science or practice true science by presenting other models and ask students which model best fits the data. Perhaps operational science should be left to the K-12 science teachers for

use in instruction. Let us leave science to the science classroom.  
Now is the time to do so. We can then make needed progress.

The development of Next Generation Science Standards based upon  
the Framework needs to be reworked based upon this critique.  
Support from the public will drop and problems will plague the work if  
correction is not made. The solution is easy. Say no to the  
Darwinists and yes to quality science in each classroom.

Christians4Science  
March 12, 2012