

**Q** "I am curious about your organization's history with textbook analysis and censorship ...."

**A** **Market demand is not censorship.** It is settled law that schools do not censor if they choose one textbook over another, just as you do not censor if you buy Tom Clancy but not Stephen King. Publishers may offer any kind of texts they wish. We tell people what books say before they buy them.

**Q** "What are the guidelines used to determine whether material in textbooks is offensive or inappropriate ethically or ideologically, and why is a textbook considered an appropriate place to monitor ethics?"

**A** **The bar is higher for public school textbooks.** Unlike TV and movies, tax monies buy them. Unlike library books, captive audiences use them.

On ideological issues like environmentalism, feminism, or constitutional interpretation, our reviews show textbooks' shortchanging conservative policy options. Why does the "education" establishment call our challenging liberal monopolies "censorship"? Because they would sooner *reduce total coverage* or *drop topics altogether*, than fully explain politically incorrect alternatives.

On ethical issues, textbooks must respect the highest common denominator. They would never insult *ethnic* sensitivities of *racial* minorities (e.g., disrespectful epithets). They should never offend *ethical* sensibilities of *religious* minorities (e.g., "literature" books role modeling immorality without consequence, coarsening the learning experience without redeeming academic value).

**Q** "Who are the analysts chosen to go over the textbooks in question, and what qualifications have they?"

**A** This credential mongering is an *ad hominem* tactic to dodge inconvenient criticism. **If points raised are valid, what matters the source?** Why stoop to personalities rather than judge ideas on their merits?

**A bright high school student recently asked us ...**

**Q** "When evolution is considered a fact in America's modern scientific community (evolution has been seen in action over the years, and has yet to be logically and scientifically disproven), why is it required to be treated as a theory in biology textbooks?"

**A** Textbooks' treatment of evolutionary theories is about the art of persuasion, not the science of biology.

The claim is that because genetic variation has been observed, increases in net genetic complexity have occurred. But though the mechanism for genetic variation may be mutation, there is no proven mechanism for increased net genetic complexity, which evolution requires. **Rhetorical stealth phrases** in textbooks mask this scientific weakness. They define evolution as "change over time" or "descent with modification," that is, as two very different concepts — observed genetic variation (antibiotic-resistant bacteria, insecticide-resistant insects) and unobserved increases in net genetic complexity (i.e., new genes) — *the former supposedly validating the latter*. Yet with no mechanism for the appearance of more complex kingdoms, phyla, and classes, evolutionary theory cannot explain biodiversity.