

Dr. Donald Johnson, don@scienceintegrity.net
Science Integrity, 5002 Holly Tree Rd, Wilmington, NC 28409, www.scienceintegrity.net
Dedicated to Exposing Unsubstantiated Science Claims

February 23, 2011 (*copy of the letter's content became an "open letter" on March 26 through www.ussci.info*)

President Barack Obama at The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Obama:

I noted with great interest your observation in your State of the Union Address that "The quality of our math and science education lags behind many other nations," and your desire that "we want to prepare 100,000 new teachers in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math." I believe there is a fundamental change needed to remedy the lack of interest in science by investigating "why aren't more Americans interested in science?"

Are we being deliberately misled? Polls have consistently shown that the majority of Americans reject the Darwinian scenario that is presented as unassailable truth, with only 33% agreeing with Darwinism [2009 Zogby poll]. A 1/28/11 paper in the Journal Science indicated that only 28% of high school biology teachers "consistently implement the major recommendations and conclusions" concerning Darwinism. Their recommendation is for those "who cannot accept evolution as a matter of faith to pursue other careers." Why should science be a matter of faith, instead of evidence-based? Why should those not adhering to the Darwinian faith be required to leave science? These questions are extremely important as America attempts to regain scientific leadership.

The Darwinian paradigm that is serving as the basis of science as presented today would not be a problem if it were indeed unassailably substantiated. For over 20 years I believed, taught, and defended the "truth" of chemical and biological evolution. But "Darwinism is NOT a mechanism for evolutionary change. A mechanism would explain how new structures develop" [from my enclosed best-selling (in molecular biology) "Programming of Life," 2010, p.77]. Unfortunately, "the public is unaware that its dollars are being squandered on funding of mediocre, middlebrow science or that its children are being intellectually starved as a result of outdated texts and unenlightened teachers" [Suzan Mazur, *The Altenberg 16: An Exposé of the Evolution Industry*, 2010, page ix]. Trying to fit the observations into a dogma that ignores known information science has stifled advances in medicine, many other sciences, and technology.

The time has come to look at what science is really telling us, instead of portraying as "truth" scenarios that in fact have no scientific basis. Presidential Medal of Science winner biologist Lynn Margulis writes, "this Darwinian claim to explain all of evolution is a popular half-truth whose lack of explicative power is compensated for only by the religious ferocity of its rhetoric... No evidence in the vast literature of heredity changes shows unambiguous evidence that random mutation itself, even with geographical isolation of populations, leads to speciation. Then how do new species come into being?" ["Acquiring Genomes: A Theory of the Origins of the Species," 2003, p29] Bacteriologist Alan Linton, looking for confirmed primary speciation states, "None exists in the literature claiming that one species has been shown to evolve into another." ["Scant Search for the Maker," *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 4/ 20/01, Book Section, p29]. In examining thousands of peer-reviewed papers purporting to show evidence of the origin or life or species, exactly zero have been shown feasible by known science (especially information science). 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" of Darwinism (e.g. 98% of DNA is "junk" and numerous "proven transitional forms"), only to have those "proofs" debunked by real science.

Are people interested in pursuing a field of study that consistently portrays as unassailable truth ideas that are believed to be wrong? Should they be interested in pursuing study in a field that belittles and downplays any dissenting views, with no discussion permitted? Science needs to stick to science (from Latin "scientia" or "truth"). Philosophical and religious (including both theistic and non-theistic religions, such as Atheism or Secular Humanism) presuppositions should not influence what is taught as science. Presenting only verifiable science, avoiding unverified speculations, should lead to a much better education that many more people would willingly pursue. Good science leads to improved engineering, increased innovation, better products, and more jobs

Please use your influence to actually promote science, as opposed to propagating pseudo-science masquerading as science. Page 83 of my book summarizes specific scientific challenges requiring scientifically sound (feasible) solutions instead of furthering unsubstantiated myths as science. If you want further input from me, just ask.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Donald E. Johnson
Ph.D. – Chemistry, Michigan State University
Ph.D. – Computer and Information Sciences, University of Minnesota

Dr. Donald Johnson, don@scienceintegrity.net
Science Integrity, 5002 Holly Tree Rd, Wilmington, NC 28409, www.scienceintegrity.net
Dedicated to Exposing Unsubstantiated Science Claims

March 14, 2011 (*copy of the letter's content became an "open letter" on March 26 through www.ussci.info*)

President Barack Obama at The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Obama:

I thought you should know that the letter (content enclosed) I sent with my "Programming of Life" book on February 23, along with this letter, will become "open letters" on March 26. Contrary to popular misconceptions, there are thousands of scientists who do not consider the Darwinian faith (described on the enclosed flyer) to be feasible (for over 1100 who dare to be identified, see pssiinternational.com/list.pdf and dissentfromdarwin.org). In fact, evolutionists are now frantically attempting to find a naturalistic paradigm to portray as "Truth" since Darwinism is acknowledged as incapable of explaining observations (Extended Synthesis is the leading condender).

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. Darwinism's main claim isn't to show how species adapt, but addresses their origin. For example, Darwin's Galapagos finches, which had been portrayed as 14 different species, are now recognized as a single species with a variety of beaks adapted for specific purposes.

Perhaps it is appropriate to consider the full title of Darwin's book: "On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life." Although Darwin didn't cause racism or inhumane treatment (e.g. of native Americans, Africans, or Australians), his writings provided perceived "scientific justification" for believing that non-Caucasians hadn't evolved as far as those that many thought were superior ["The Descent of Man," page 201]. Thankfully, science has completely refuted Darwin's portrayal of races!

As pointed out in my previous letter, 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. The unsubstantiated speculations have also wasted considerable taxpayer-funded resources. For example, there is no problem if a private person or organization wishes to pursue a search for origins (which is outside scientific "proof"), but such a search serves no functional purpose for our country, and thus should not be subsidized by taxes. This is especially true in our current economic state. Federal funding should not be used to support anything without clear benefits to our nation, including support for speculations claimed to be science, or the teaching of such speculations.

For our national problem of the lack of science knowledge, new avenues must be envisioned or we will continue toward science illiteracy for a large percentage of our population. Ideally, unproven speculations would not enter the picture, unless used to develop critical thinking skills by objectively examining science from conflicting viewpoints. This would allow a teacher trained in the Darwinian dogma to present Darwinism if the counter scientific evidence were also presented so that students could critically evaluate both sides. 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. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1779, "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors, is sinful and tyrannical" [draft of VA Bill for Religious Freedom Act].

Again, thank you for your consideration. I remain willing to offer advice on science issues.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Johnson
Ph.D. – Chemistry, Michigan State University
Ph.D. – Computer and Information Sciences, University of Minnesota