

US Failure in Science Education is a National Security Issue

As acknowledged by President Obama in his 2011 State of the Union address, “The quality of our math and science education lags behind many other nations.” Since early 2010, the major reason for this has been highlighted [www.ussci.info], and was recently substantiated by the April 2012 peer-reviewed paper by atheist Jerry Coyne “Science, Religion, and Society: the Problem of Evolution in America” [doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01664.x]. He cites a 2011 Gallup poll that only “16% accepted that humans evolved from earlier species through a process unguided by God (nontheistic evolution),” and a 2005 Harris poll [PollingReport.com] that just 12% of respondents thought that schools should teach only naturalistic evolution. He acknowledges “that America’s resistance to evolution is truly a byproduct of America’s extreme [theistic] religiosity,” which has caused a resistance to science in general (why pursue a field of study that seeks to destroy core beliefs?).

Coyne’s solution to this problem “is to work actively to weaken the grasp of religion on America—or at least of those species of religion that immunize people against evolution and science,” effectively declaring jihad on theism. The US is now experiencing the result of Darwinism, that has been taught as unassailable scientific truth for the past 60 years. This is an embarrassment to real science, since it is increasingly acknowledged by thousands of scientists [pssiinternational.com/list.pdf & dissentfromdarwin.org] as an insufficient cause of the empirical observations. Rather than advancing the cause of scientific progress, Darwinism stifles it by forcing scientists to dogmatically ignore known scientific information. Darwinists have repeatedly declared “undeniable proofs” (e.g. 98% of DNA is “junk” and numerous “proven transitional forms”), only to have those “proofs” debunked later by real science. Note that 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.

Science should not be twisted to be compatible with any religion, whether theistic or atheistic (see other side), but it is likewise inappropriate to twist science so that it *a priori* rules out any reality other than matter and energy. We should not avoid verified science, but science should avoid unproven speculations based on imagination and assumptions that lack a solid empirical foundation (especially in public education). The question of origins should be addressed objectively with the view 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 creation science. This is the only “pro-science” position!

Double doctorate (in both natural and informational sciences) Donald Johnson’s “Programming of Life” DVD and books [djppl.info] highlight the scientific challenges that have eluded ANY feasible naturalistic explanation, especially for the presence of thousands (or millions) of real computers and computer programs in every living cell. Biology is an information science, not a physical science!

Religion Does NOT Mean Theism

The journal “Science” [1/28/11, p404] recommendation for biology teachers is for those “who cannot accept evolution as a matter of faith to pursue other careers,” a faith-based stance that is just as religious as a sermon from the pulpit. They also acknowledge that following this recommendation “would reduce the supply of teachers who are especially attractive to the most conservative school districts.”

The US Supreme Court has indicated that “religious beliefs... are based... upon a faith, to which all else is subordinate or upon which all else is ultimately dependent.... Some believe in a purely personal God, ... others think of religion as a way of life” [US v. Seeger, 380 U.S. 163, 1965]. A criterion requiring one to believe that “physicality is all there is” is a religious tenet, since it cannot be proven and all else is subordinate to it. The Supreme Court has also held that “The Establishment Clause stands at least for the proposition that when government activities touch on the religious sphere, they must be secular in purpose, evenhanded in operation, and neutral in primary impact” [Gillette v. U.S., 401 U.S. 437, 450, 1971]. Dogmatically teaching atheistic origins of life or species violates this ruling! A recent US Appeals Court ruling [Comer v. TEA, 5th Circuit, 7/2/10] rejected the claim that “Texas Education Agency’s neutrality policy constitutes an establishment of religion, in violation of the First Amendment’s Establishment Clause. Because we find no evidence to support the conclusion that the principal or primary effect of TEA’s policy is one that either advances or inhibits religion, we conclude that the policy does not violate the Establishment Clause. As such, we affirm the decision of the district court.” The National Center for Science Education supported the suit, claiming that the TEA policy was endorsing “creationism” (it wasn’t, but any evidence bringing Darwinism into question is thought by many to be creationistic).

Some may object to teaching anything that has theistic compatibility. However, the solution is not to promote only those ideas that have a compatibility with Atheism and Religious/“Secular” Humanism, which have been recognized by the Supreme Court to be religions: “Among religions in this country which do not teach what would generally be considered a belief in the existence of God are Buddhism, Taoism, Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism, and others” [Torcaso v. Watkins (367 U.S. 488), 1961]. A US Appellate court also affirmed that “Atheism is religion, and the group... was religious in nature even though it expressly rejects a belief in a supreme being” [7th Circuit, Kaufman, James v. McCaughtry & Gary, 8/20/05]. Because of these court rulings, one must use care when supporting the teaching of any speculative purely atheistic origins narrative, since transgression could be an establishment violation (with the same warnings as teaching creationism would bring). Blank’s law review article [31 WAUJLP 157, 2009] explains why Atheism is a religion for both Establishment Clause and Free Exercise Clause purposes. Excellent legal reviews of court rulings are available for further consideration [Calvert, Liberty University Law Review: 3(2), Spr 2009, p213-328 & Luskin, Hamline University Law Review: 32(1), 2009, p1-64].

Public support for ANY single religious view is not only wrong, but is hurting our great country by driving away people who should be interested in science!

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