

General Resolution on the Need for the Theory of Macroevolution to Be Taught Objectively

PLEASE NOTE: This resolution does *not* promote "six-day creationism." Rather, it emphasizes the need for the theory of macroevolution to be taught objectively, *even assuming* the multitudinous forms of life on earth have come into existence over a period of millions of years.

WHEREAS the theory of macroevolution teaches that: (1) the first form of life came into existence through the random interaction of molecules in a "primordial soup"; and (2) all forms of life thereafter have come into existence through the operation of natural selection on randomly-produced genetic mutations;

WHEREAS macroevolution is to be distinguished from microevolution, which refers to the operation of natural selection within a species and which is an established fact;

WHEREAS there are very serious scientific problems with the theory of macroevolution, *even assuming* the multitudinous forms of life on earth have come into existence over a period of millions of years;

WHEREAS the vast majority of high school biology textbooks used in public schools do not present any scientific arguments against the theory of macroevolution;

WHEREAS the failure to present any scientific arguments against the theory of macroevolution may lead a student to conclude that he or she is in fact the result of random, chance processes, and has not been created or designed for any special purpose;

WHEREAS this view can have a dramatic effect on the student, leading him or her to devalue human life and possibly engage in drug abuse, sexual promiscuity, or violence, or even commit suicide;

WHEREAS it is critical that a scientific theory that has potentially disastrous social consequences be presented objectively;

WHEREAS the Conference Report for the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, signed into law by President Bush on January 8, 2002, provides in part at H.R. Rep. 107-334, p. 703, "Where topics are taught that may generate controversy (such as biological evolution), the curriculum should help students to understand the full range of scientific views that exist...";

WHEREAS the cause of truth *and* the general welfare of society are both promoted if the strong scientific arguments against the theory of macroevolution are also presented; and

WHEREAS the presentation of the scientific arguments both for and against the theory of macroevolution does not in any way violate the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution;

BE IT RESOLVED THEREFORE, in the interest of objectivity, critical thinking, and the general welfare of society:

Administrators of the public schools of _____ should take such action as is necessary to ensure that the theory of macroevolution is presented objectively in the classroom, with the valid scientific arguments both pro and con presented.

(Some of the scientific arguments against the theory of macroevolution are set forth in the following Appendix.)

APPENDIX

The scientific arguments against the theory of macroevolution are of two types: (1) those that relate to the origin of life; and (2) those that relate to the origin of species.

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE

There are two main reasons why the theory of macroevolution is not a satisfactory explanation for the origin of life:

1. The theory is inconsistent with the second law of thermodynamics, i.e., entropy (disorder) increases.
2. Given the complexity of DNA, the possibility that life could have arisen in a primordial soup through random, chance processes is akin to the possibility that an intricate sand castle could have arisen through the operation of the wind and the waves. Those natural forces simply do not have within them the capacity to produce such a structure.

It should be noted that Darwin himself believed that the first form of life was the result of intelligent design. *See* last paragraph of Darwin's *The Origin of Species* (Sixth edition, January 1872): "There is grandeur in this view of life ... having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one"

THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES

There are five main reasons why the theory of macroevolution is not a satisfactory explanation for the origin of species:

1. Virtually all genetic mutations are detrimental to organisms.
2. Even if a beneficial mutation did occur from time to time, many complex structures of organisms (such as eyes, ears, lungs, and feet) would have required many intermediate forms, each of which would have required a beneficial mutation to a form that had previously been produced by a beneficial mutation.

The probability of this happening to form one complex structure, let alone many, is virtually nil.

3. Predictions based on the theory are inconsistent with the facts:
 - a. One would expect many transitional forms in the fossil record. However, as stated by the late Stephen Jay Gould, formerly a biologist at Harvard University, "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology."
 - b. One would expect the fossil record to show life forms coming into existence in a slow and gradual process over vast periods of time. However, the fossil record shows that virtually all the major body plans of the animals we know today arrived fairly simultaneously in terms of geologic time (the "Cambrian explosion").
 - c. One would expect to find many useless features on organisms, *i.e.*, features that serve no purpose -- they are simply random features that are neither good nor bad. For example, since teeth are supposedly the result of random, chance processes, one would expect to find them elsewhere on our bodies, not just in our mouths.

If the response is that teeth that were formed elsewhere were weeded out through natural selection because they "sapped the resources" of the organism, then it is even more difficult to explain the formation of complex structures. Intermediate forms of such structures almost always would have served no purpose, and thus would have been weeded out before the final complex structure came into existence.

- d. One would expect to find features arranged more haphazardly. For example, one would expect to find teeth arranged in our mouths in a haphazard way, rather than in semicircles. An archaeologist looks upon a circle of stones and concludes it is not the result of random, chance processes; why doesn't a biologist look at a semicircle of teeth and reach the same conclusion?
4. The theory is grounded in philosophical materialism and cannot account for such entities as sounds, pains, and thoughts. Most evolutionary biologists either ignore the problem, deny the reality of such entities, or simply assert that somehow atoms and molecules "give rise" to such entities.
5. The theory, which is built on the assumption that knowledge is possible, teaches that the brain is the result of random, chance processes. This, however, leads one to doubt whatever the brain might lead one to believe, and thus to doubt that knowledge is possible, the very assumption upon which the theory is based. Thus, the theory results in a *reductio ad absurdum*.

A Chinese paleontologist recently stated, "In China, we can criticize Darwin but not the government; in America, you can criticize the government but not Darwin." It is time for this to change.

(Further discussion of the scientific arguments against the theory of macroevolution may be found in *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1986) by Michael Denton, a molecular biologist at the University of Otago in New Zealand; *Darwin on Trial* (1991) by Phillip Johnson, a professor of law at the University of California at Berkeley; *Of Pandas and People* (1993), a supplemental high school biology textbook; *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (1996) by Michael Behe, a professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University; and *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism* (1997) by Richard Milton, a science journalist and design engineer based in London.)