

Dear NM Educators:

Do you desire to be clear that only the evidence “for evolution” and not against it will be in your new standards of teaching of science in New Mexico? Are you “worried that some of the wording (in the previous standards) led to the belief that the state supported teaching of creationism and intelligent design in the New Mexico schools” as Marshall Berman is quoted as saying? (Gallup Independent 10/8/99) This implies that you feel evolution is science and creationism is religion which is a common misconception.

Science as we know it today has been built on the foundation of an empirical method of observing and then manipulating the physical environs of the earth. Certain observations have then led to subsequent ideas on how to further utilize physical properties of matter. This is how technology has been successfully developed.

Evolution is not a verified scientific concept, at least as macroevolution. By macroevolution I mean progenic transmission of physical traits by progressive natural genetic alteration, resulting in one life form group being transformed into a completely different one, i.e., fish to amphibian, or reptile to bird, etc. It has never been empirically shown to occur. Nor has it been useful for predicting further experimentation. For example, experiments conducted attempting to demonstrate plausible mechanisms of spontaneous generation of life have been universally a failure, contrary to Dr. Miller’s and other hopes. Thus Dr. Crick (and others) have pressed the concept (or belief) in panspermia, that life (viruses/bacteria) traveled to earth on comets from other planets. But how did life start there? Then to explain the observed diverse complexity of life, the hopeful mechanism of mutational change acted upon by natural selection has been propounded. Natural, and artificial selection does work, but only within a given group of living things. It has never demonstrated, under natural conditions, macroevolutionary change. In fact it is a strong argument against it. For with the types of genetic changes required, in macroevolution, the observations of gene mutational load result in profound disability of life forms and their early demise. As an example, fruit flies pounded with radiation for thousands of generations remain fruit flies. Some develop 2 thoraxes, 8 wings, antennae instead of eyes, but they remain fruit flies and are debilitated.

Man has performed more sophisticated genetic manipulations but their relevance to any theoretical natural processes of macroevolution are still completely conjectural. Most are more supportive, philosophically, of intelligent design. For example, cloning of one species’ nuclei into another’s eggs occurs only under sophisticated not natural conditions, and reveals man’s incredible ingenuity. Gene insertion/deletion while it occurs in nature is generally debilitating unless directed for potential therapeutic effect by man’s intervention. To say that this is evolution (change) is in a sense true, but not as the evolutionists hope. Macroevolution as a theory has been largely falsified.

Many leading evolutionists including Drs. Gould, Sagan, Dobsansky, the Huxleys, and others have long advocated that evolution is the only basis by which man can understand everything regarding his past, present, and future. This belief goes far beyond the pale of assumptions needed to conduct simple observations and manipulations of physical matter and life. It is a religious/philosophical belief system called naturalism first presented by the Greek atomists and the Roman Lucretius. This system of beliefs presumes that all the issues of life, beauty, morality, likes/dislikes, along with observed properties of matter must be explained within the context of matter alone. But prominent philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Augustine, and Schaeffer among others, have all recognized the weaknesses of the naturalist position. Prominent scientists such as Kepler, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, Pascal, Boyles, Faraday, Einstein, Von Braun, and others looked for answers to the meaning of life outside of science. It is a huge presumption to interpret all of life in terms of "science"; it cannot be done.

Naturalism as a system of ideas has often been used as the justification for atheism and a belief in atheism requires some sort of a macroevolutionary mechanism to logically account for the diversity and complexity of observed life forms.

Evolution and creation are both philosophical paradigms in which people place the observations of science. Both the evolutionist and the creationist use virtually the same data to support their reasoned beliefs. The arguments of today are almost identical to those of one hundred years ago. Both groups strongly defend their position because for each it is a portion of the religious base of their lives. By religion I mean those fundamental principles that guide one's life. Thus, the debate is not science verses religion; it is with all its variations a conflict of worldviews or paradigms.

Dr. Berman wants to make it clear that the State of New Mexico does not support teaching creation or intelligent design. Yet is he advocating the teaching of naturalism? If all he wants taught is good science, then drop evolution and creation from the science curriculum. The current desired changes to the science curriculum only confound what should be taught as science. What should be done is to set the curriculum to instruct students on the methods of observing the properties of our physical environs and then how to test those observations. But the religious construct of evolutionary naturalism should not be blended into it. Put evolution and creation into the category of philosophy and religion where they belong and let them be taught there. To do otherwise you will only weaken the training of our students, promote a particular group's political agenda, and show yourselves unwise in the true goals of education. Other states like Kansas and Kentucky have recognized the complexities of the issue; change your course and follow their lead.

Sincerely,



Dr. John G. Leslie, MD, PhD  
Board Certified Internal Medicine/  
Pediatrics

Note: Permission is given to reprint this only in its entirety.