

# 2004 High School **BIOLOGY** Textbook Rating

Texas has approved the regular (non-AP) Biology books of three major publishers for 2004 local adoption. State law requires them to present scientific strengths *and weaknesses* of scientific theories. We analyzed how closely they conform to this rule in their *treatment of evolution*.

<b>FAIR</b>	<p><b><i>Biology: The Dynamics of Life</i></b> (Glencoe, 2004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evolutionary, but lower overall intensity of evolutionary dogmatism; generally fewer redundant affirmations of the truth of evolution; occasional greater tentativity of evolutionary interpretations</li> <li>• Superior photos and text narrative on human fetal development, including how soon a baby shows human characteristics</li> <li>• Reading level seems a little easier.</li> </ul>
<b>POOR</b>	<p><b><i>Prentice Hall Biology</i></b> (Prentice, 2004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incoherent Time Line of Evolutionary Events</li> <li>• Contradictory Conclusions from Identical Data</li> <li>• Uncoordinated Discussion of <i>Archaeopteryx</i></li> <li>• Chaotic Definitions of "Convergent Evolution"</li> <li>• Conflicting Statements on Phylogenetic Relationships</li> <li>• Protection of Students from Controversy over Fossils</li> <li>• No Critique of the Endosymbiotic Hypothesis</li> <li>• Neglect of Weaknesses in Miller-Urey Experiments</li> <li>• Rhetorical Art over Inductive Empiricism</li> <li>• Presentation of Evolutionary Theory as Fact</li> </ul>
<b>WORST</b>	<p><b><i>Holt Biology</i></b> (Holt, 2004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Mention of Shortcomings in the "Bubble Model" Theory</li> <li>• Censorship on the Endosymbiotic Hypothesis</li> <li>• Exclusion of Defects in Evidence from Homologies</li> <li>• Silence on Difficulties with "Convergent Evolution"</li> <li>• Systematic Concealment of Discrepant Phylogenies</li> <li>• Expurgation of Controversies on the Fossil Record</li> <li>• Evasion of Scientific Flaws in "Coevolution"</li> <li>• Multiple Conflicting Definitions of Evolution</li> <li>• Emphasis on Teaching Students What to Think, Not How to Think</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Poorest edited</b> <b>Highest combined total of factual errors and technical defects</b></p>

*Contact us for full reviews of these books, which document this ranking. We can also send the **110 factual errors** missed by publishers and the state review panel, plus the **159 technical defects** overlooked as well. Ask too for publishers' written admissions of both, in response to our filing these lists with the Texas Education Agency.*

No publisher funded our reviews in any way. We have no financial stake in any textbook company. Unlike publisher sales reps, we have no monetary interest in any textbook adoption outcome. Our support comes from concerned individuals and a few small foundations, which to our knowledge have no ties to the public school textbook industry.

Get this info e-mailed or Priority Mailed from:

*Educational Research Analysts* • P.O. Box 7518 • Longview, Texas 75607-7518  
phone 903/753-5993 • fax 903/753-8424 • info@TextbookReviews.org