

Is Darwin Down for the Count in the State Science Standards?

By Vincent Newmeyer
The Catalyst Group
Lindon, Utah
For Immediate Release

The battle between ideologies with the current science standards debate are not about vanquishing the teaching of Darwin's ideas on evolutionary origins. The Catalyst Group, representing parents, concerned citizens and scientists accept the teaching of Darwinian Evolution, the Big Bang, Man Caused Global Warming, and so on, but only if these ideas are taught scientifically. That is to say that these theories need to critically address the evidence that speaks in favor as well as the evidence that challenges them.

Students are all too often given the impression that science taught in the science classroom is "as solidly supported by data as gravitational theory or relativity theory."¹ Ph.D. Physicist Lee H. Pearson, displays a different perspective:

"Most of what's in the [proposed] standards is good. The problem is the dogmatic approach in teaching Darwinian Evolution, the Big Bang theory, and Man-Made Global Warming. There is little room in the standards to present data, scientific facts, or other well proven scientific laws that contradict these theories. Science is a place where open mindedness is essential."

Dr. Pearson is not alone in his skepticism of the soundness of the theories he mentioned^{2 3}. There are over 1000 Ph.D.s or M.D.s that signed a petition stating that "We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life."⁴ In fact two scientific conferences⁵ were convened recently because many scientists are seeing that Darwinian evolution is failing in it's explanatory power to account for the complexity and diversity of life.⁶

This open minded attitude of competing ideas contrasts greatly with the objective clearly stated by some of Utah's science teachers and Professors who made their intentions known in a paper they authored⁷ and which was published in the scientific journal PLOS ONE:

-
- 1 "Evolution theory is as solidly supported by data as gravitational theory or relativity theory." Richard Tolman a key advisory for Utah's 6-8 grade science standards and previous Utah science standards. Quote expressed in a science standards committee email.
 - 2 Tens of thousands of scientists agree that there is no evidence that human release of CO2 is causing catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere Global Warming Petition Project <http://www.petitionproject.org/>
 - 3 Educated Intelligent People Don't Doubt Darwin Right? <https://sciencefreedom.org/educated-intelligent-people-dont-doubt-darwin.html>
 - 4 A Scientific Dissent From Darwinism <https://dissentfromdarwin.org/>
 - 5 First the Royal Society Meeting, Now Cambridge's "Evolution Evolves": Paul Nelson Reports <https://www.discovery.org/multimedia/audio/2019/05/first-the-royal-society-meeting-now-cambridges-evolution-evolves-paul-nelson-reports/>
 - 6 The Royal Society in England, a scientific organization, in November 2016 held a conference, New Trends in Evolutionary Biology, to discuss whether evolutionary theory (specifically the neo-Darwinian mechanism) can adequately explain the diversity of life, or if other propositions are necessary. <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rsfs.2017.0015>
 - 7 "A longitudinal study of attitudes toward evolution among undergraduates who are members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0205798&fbclid=IwAR3o1ppCvuXqLO1WzCyhOuidndTb0iNazrkhLno-eY_YkLO7PiajtOL-Fuk

"Our experience may serve as a case-study for prompting changes in **acceptance of evolution** in other conservative religious groups."

"[K]nowledge of evolution does not appear to be equivalent to **acceptance of evolution**. Studies have demonstrated that religious objections to evolution are resistant to change, even after thorough instruction in the subject."

"The present study, therefore, presents an important example of **how greater acceptance of this foundational scientific principle might be achieved** in the face of competing viewpoints in a highly conservative community."

"'People have a right to hear both sides of the question, don't they?' Careful analysis in this instance demonstrates that **fairness does not apply...**"⁸(emphasis added)

It is not enough for these instructors that students understand Darwin's theory, and how Darwin proposes that the diverse kinds of life including man came to be. These students must have a core belief in what Darwin and those who built upon his theory espouse. Anything less they count as a failure.

The teaching of Intelligent Design in Utah's public schools also is not the objective of The Catalyst Group. Simply put

We believe our Utah students should be free to hear the full breadth of scientific evidence. Science teachers should not be shackled to sterilized arguments and filtered scientific facts that disregard the scientific evidence pointing to what have become politically unpopular conclusions.

Science is questioning. Science is being willing to think outside the box and consider possibilities that even the most revered aspects of what we think we know in science is rightfully open to further review and testing. This is how science advances. The Catalyst Group urges that State Board of Education will create a final version of the K-5 & 9-12 science standards scheduled to be voted on today (June 6th), will reflect the objectivity and the skepticism that is an integral part of the scientific mindset and should be part of what we instill in our science students, our sons and daughters of Utah.

More resources can be found at:

ScienceFreedom.org

and the Science Elevated YouTube Channels

###

Media Contact: Vincent Newmeyer

8 This last quote is more complete as "'People have a right to hear both sides of the question, don't they?' Careful analysis in this instance demonstrates that fairness does not apply—ID is a religious-based concept, not a scientific alternative to evolution." However Intelligent design is not a religious-based concept as these professors claim. see What is Intelligent Design? <https://www.discovery.org/v/what-is-intelligent-design/>