

Dr. Donald Johnson, www.ussci.info don@scienceintegrity.net
Science Integrity, 5002 Holly Tree Rd, Wilmington, NC 28409
Dedicated to Exposing Unsubstantiated Science Claims
Unprecedented Time-Critical Opportunity for Scientific Integrity

The “Programming of Life” book notes on page 56 “Because of many recent findings, with many scientists now questioning the validity of neo-Darwinism as evolution’s mechanism, the next edition of this book may relegate more of neo-Darwinism to Appendix F, as a historical footnote. *‘A wave of scientists now questions natural selection’s role though fewer will publicly admit it’* [Maz10p20].” On a nearly daily basis, more papers are being published and conferences being held on what natural scenario should replace Darwinism as “TRUTH,” since Darwinism doesn’t fit the observations. Be assured that those committed to naturalism will agree on something soon as a void is opening up and needs to be filled. The leading candidate is the “Extended Synthesis” that incorporates all known scenarios as evolution’s cause to replace Darwinism. This synthesis is designed to be flexible, so that if a particular scenario is shown not to work, there would be more that supposedly “could” work, and more scenarios can be added as needed to “extend” coverage. While that may appear to make sense, it begs the question, and assumes that “evolution is true,” science just hasn’t figured out how it works, but will someday. This is actually a “naturalism-of-the-gaps” dogma, which has no more scientific validity than the “God-of-the-gaps” view for as yet unexplained phenomena.

If people who would like science to be based on evidence, rather than a presumed metaphysical belief, don’t act **quickly**, the new scenarios will soon become entrenched as science. Because of the realization that Darwinism doesn’t work, education at all levels will be in need of revision (new biology textbooks, for example). But how will we know this rush to a new dogma won’t be overturned by science in the near future? It seems more prudent to not make hasty endorsements until there is overwhelming evidence to support a scenario that is not only feasible (no scenario proposed to date is compatible with information science), but is likely, based on evidence. The required change provides a unique opportunity to make voices heard that are opposed to unsubstantiated dogmatism in science (Latin “scientia,” truth). Darwinism has been taught as unassailable scientific truth for the past 50 years, an embarrassment to science, since it is increasingly acknowledged as an insufficient cause of the empirical observations. The science is available to debunk Darwinism (PoL highlights that evidence). Please note that “micro-evolution,” due to genetic changes within a species is accepted as verified fact by all scientists, but such changes have NEVER demonstrated a net increase in functional information that would be required to form a “higher” species.

I have sent President Obama a PoL book, letters (became “open letters” on March 26), and the flyer highlighting the major reason that “The quality of our math and science education lags behind many other nations” (links to flyer & letters at www.ussci.info). I noted that because of foundational principles of our nation, many people’s brains shut down (and the program goes off) when Darwinism is proclaimed as the cause of species. This leaves them in a state of scientific ignorance, and completely uninterested in pursuing science as a field of study. We are much more susceptible to adverse effects of these claims than other countries (e.g. atheistic Chinese have no problem accepting purely naturalistic scenarios). In the second letter to President Obama 3/14/11, I note that “the constant barrage of unsubstantiated speculations portrayed as the truth for the origin of life and species has turned people off toward science. We are now seeing the results of that relentless barrage of pseudo-science of the past 50 years, with the low interest in science. The USA is very susceptible to adverse effects from these unsubstantiated pronouncements because of our nation’s foundational principles, with most citizens considering themselves people of theistic faith. Certainly it would not be appropriate to twist science to be compatible with any theistic religion, but it is likewise not appropriate to twist science to attempt to rule out any reality beyond matter and energy.” There is certainly no reason to avoid verified science.

I encourage cuts to programs supporting unsubstantiated speculations that have wasted considerable taxpayer-funded resources. I sent information packages to the many conservative Senators and Representatives to enlist support before sending packages to the remaining Congressmen. Ideally, unproven speculations would no longer enter the education picture, unless used to develop critical thinking skills by objectively examining science from conflicting viewpoints. This model of education would prepare students to develop the science mindset that will help lift our nation to a leadership position. If the Darwinian faith is presented as unassailable truth, no taxpayer funds should be used to support it, just as such funds shouldn’t be used to promote other faith-based scenarios such as creationism.

This endeavor needs involvement by others (than just me). Cases (76) of PoL books can be obtained for cost reimbursement (about \$2/book, including current media mail rate) if distributed without profit (neither my publisher nor I profit from these distributions). A professionally-produced video is available at www.programmingoflife.com. Thank you!

Donald E. Johnson

Ph.D. – Chemistry, Michigan State University

Ph.D. – Computer and Information Sciences, University of Minnesota

(This document, available at www.ussci.info, can be a double-sided half-sheet.)