

The state of Intelligent Design – by John Blanton

With apologies to Dick Butkus, creationism in America is a lot like football.

Imagine you had a high school football team, and they never won any games. So they decided they had enough of that, and they went to college. And they now have a college football team. And they are still not winning any games.

In the past we had creationists like Don Patton, Carl Baugh, Ken Ham, Kent Hovind, and a few others. They may have tacked letters after their names, but they only had high school diplomas. And they never won any games.

Obviously, something was missing. Obviously it was not a problem of football skills. It was a matter of degree. They needed college degrees.

So the creationists shucked off the (metaphorical) overalls, and they put on business suits. And they went to college. But they are still not winning any football games.

All of this is not to be taken literally. The high school creationists did not end up going to college. What happened is that creationists realized that creationism without benefit of real academic credentials was not selling well. Also, the lack of any real science, but that is another matter.

So, Intelligent Design was born.

Intelligent Design was hatched by college-educated creationists with real degrees in science and other disciplines. Early on they seem to have been sitting back and giving only lip service, if even that, to the high school team. Apparently the college crowd jumped into the game when they noticed the home team was losing.

It's not that there were no college ringers playing high school ball. The creation science motif was engineered by some real college boys. The California-based (now Dallas-based) Institute for Creation Science (ICR) was founded by the late Henry Morris, Ph.D. Granted, his doctor's degree was in hydraulic engineering, but during all this time the principal speaker for the ICR has been Duane Gish, Ph.D. More pertinently, Gish's Ph.D. is in biochemistry from the University of California at Berkley.

Regardless, these distinguished scholars, along with their high school tag team, are young-Earth creationists.

Creationists of all kinds began to get the message in 1982 when federal judge William Overton handed down an embarrassing decision against young Earth creationists who had attempted to introduce *creation science* into the Arkansas public school curriculum. The lesson hit home in 1987 when the United States Supreme Court ruled in *Edwards v. Aguillard* that *creation science* is a religious doctrine and can not receive government backing by being taught in Louisiana public schools.

It was about this time that Michael Denton published *Evolution, a Theory in Crisis*. Denton received a Ph.D. in biochemistry from King's College London. His book argued for the existence of design in nature, particularly with respect to biological evolution. This is considered to be the root of the Intelligent Design movement.

One person who picked up on Denton's message was law professor Phillip Johnson. Johnson had purchased and read a copy of evolutionist Richard Dawkins' book *The Blind*

Watchmaker. *The Blind Watchmaker* argued against the two-centuries-old concept of intelligent design expounded by William Paley, a noted Christian apologist of his day. On a visit to London Johnson happened on Denton's book and apparently decided to take action to correct evolutionists' abuse of science as he saw it.

Johnson taught law at UC Berkley and was formerly law clerk for Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren. His background in the natural sciences is totally lacking, but he wrote *Darwin on Trial*, in which he challenged Darwinian evolution as though the issue were a legal matter. His argument got at best a big yawn from scientists.

In 1992 Johnson attended the conference on "Darwinism: Scientific Inference or Philosophical Preference" at Southern Methodist University (SMU). The conference was inspired by Jon Buell, a local creationist. Buell's Foundation for Thought and Ethics (FTE) published the book *Pandas and People*, an early work pushing Intelligent Design. At the conference the departure from young-Earth creationism was stark. Johnson and Buell were standing together when I asked them the question. Their answer was significant. Yes, the Earth and the universe really are billions of years old, and yes, present life forms share a common ancestry. These were not your grandfather's creationists.

But that is as far as it goes. For the old-Earth creationists, nature, unaided, cannot explain current life forms. There must have been some sort of divine intervention. For these people, scientists and serious scholars that they are, this has to be the case. Nothing is allowed that does not reconcile with their religious beliefs.

Tidbits from Johnson's writings and public statements reassure us of his religious purpose.¹

If we understand our own times, we will know that we should affirm the reality of God by challenging the domination of materialism and naturalism in the world of the mind. With the assistance of many friends I have developed a strategy for doing this, and a major purpose of this book is to interest young people, and persons with influence over young people, in preparing themselves to take part in the great adventure we have begun.

...

We call our strategy "the wedge."

Johnson was a cofounder of what is now called the Center for Science and Culture (CSC) at the Discovery Institute, a conservative think tank in Seattle, Washington. The *wedge strategy* Johnson mentions is a program developed about eleven years ago by the CSC for promoting their view of science. It was originally an internal memo not meant for public consumption. In 1999 somebody cruelly posted the text of the document on the Internet for all to read. The wording of the document was so frank and so straight-forward; it proved an immediate embarrassment to the new creationists. A quick read shows why. Here is an excerpt from the preamble:²

INTRODUCTION

The proposition that human beings are created in the image of God is one of the bedrock principles on which Western civilization was built. Its influence can be detected in most, if not all, of the West's greatest achievements, including

representative democracy, human rights, free enterprise, and progress in the arts and sciences.

Yet a little over a century ago, this cardinal idea came under wholesale attack by intellectuals drawing on the discoveries of modern science. Debunking the traditional conceptions of both God and man, thinkers such as Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, and Sigmund Freud portrayed humans not as moral and spiritual beings, but as animals or machines who inhabited a universe ruled by purely impersonal forces and whose behavior and very thoughts were dictated by the unbending forces of biology, chemistry, and environment. This materialistic conception of reality eventually infected virtually every area of our culture, from politics and economics to literature and art

The cultural consequences of this triumph of materialism were devastating. Materialists denied the existence of objective moral standards, claiming that environment dictates our behavior and beliefs. Such moral relativism was uncritically adopted by much of the social sciences, and it still undergirds much of modern economics, political science, psychology and sociology.

Materialists also undermined personal responsibility by asserting that human thoughts and behaviors are dictated by our biology and environment. The results can be seen in modern approaches to criminal justice, product liability, and welfare. In the materialist scheme of things, everyone is a victim and no one can be held accountable for his or her actions.

Finally, materialism spawned a virulent strain of utopianism. Thinking they could engineer the perfect society through the application of scientific knowledge, materialist reformers advocated coercive government programs that falsely promised to create heaven on earth.

The *Wedge Document* laid out the goals of the CSC's strategy.³

Governing Goals

To defeat scientific materialism and its destructive moral, cultural and political legacies.

To replace materialistic explanations with the theistic understanding that nature and human beings are created by God.

Five Year Goals

To see intelligent design theory as an accepted alternative in the sciences and scientific research being done from the perspective of design theory.

To see the beginning of the influence of design theory in spheres other than natural science.

To see major new debates in education, life issues, legal and personal responsibility pushed to the front of the national agenda.

Twenty Year Goals

To see intelligent design theory as the dominant perspective in science.

To see design theory application in specific fields, including molecular biology, biochemistry, paleontology, physics and cosmology in the natural sciences, psychology, ethics, politics, theology and philosophy in the humanities; to see its influence in the fine arts.

To see design theory permeate our religious, cultural, moral and political life.

The *Wedge Document* went on to describe a course of action for achieving these goals.

In due time the CSC owned up to the *Wedge Document*. To help defuse the damage done by the exposure, the CSC published a document titled *The Wedge Document: So What?* The document's second paragraph is pertinent:⁴

Darwinian activists and self-identified "secular humanists" claimed that the "Wedge Document" provided evidence of a great conspiracy by fundamentalists to establish theocracy in America and to impose religious orthodoxy upon the practice of science. One group claimed that the document supplied evidence of a frightening twenty-year master plan "to have religion control not only science, but also everyday life, laws, and education." Barbara Forrest, a Louisiana professor active with a group called the New Orleans Secular Humanist Association, similarly championed the document as proof positive of a sinister conspiracy to abolish civil liberties and unify church and state. Others have characterized it as an attack on science and an attempt "to replace the scientific method with belief in God."

Also, this fairly well summarizes my own interpretation of The Wedge. Please review the above excerpt from the *Wedge Document*.

Regardless of their protestations, the CSC creationists have waged a continual war against Darwinian evolution. At the same time they have given comfort and advice to creationists of all kinds.

One whose ears picked up some encouragement from all of this was Bill Buckingham, a member of the Dover Area Board of Education in Pennsylvania. Back in December 2007 we quoted Buckingham regarding the lawsuit *Tammy Kitzmiller, et al. v. Dover Area School District, et al.*⁵

Intelligent design, in my way of thinking, is, states that life is too complex to have happened at random, that there had to be a designer-uh, something to shape how things went, so to speak. In the Book of Genesis, the designer would be God.

We noted the following:⁶

Buckingham pushed to introduce the creationist book *Pandas and People* as a condition for adopting a biology text co-authored by noted evolution advocate Kenneth Miller. The school rejected the *Pandas* book, but a few weeks later an anonymous donor supplied 60 copies for use by students.

The CSC gave the Dover board early advice then pulled back when they saw this train was going over a cliff. Several CSC fellows were deposed for the trial, including college professor Michael Behe. William Dembski at the time was the CSC's recognized brain trust, and he made preparations to be deposed. But only preparations. He and other CSC fellows asked \$200 an hour for their services, and Dembski demanded to have his own

lawyer present at the deposition. That wish not being granted, Dembski withdrew his services and did not testify at the trial.

Kitzmiller, *et al.* won their case, and the federal judge threw the book (almost literally) at the defendants. PBS television recapitulated the Kitzmiller case in documentary called *Judgment Day: Intelligent Design on Trial*. We have previously printed some excerpts from the program transcript:⁷

Citing what he called the "breathtaking inanity" of the school board's decision, [federal judge John E. Jones] found that several members had lied "to cover their tracks and disguise the real purpose behind the intelligent design Policy."

Finally, from the December 2007 issue:⁸

Testifying on the stand, creationist Michael Behe was forced to concede his definition of good science would include astrology.

Research by Nick Matzke of the National Center for Science Education demonstrated the evolution of the Pendas book, switching from the language of creationism early on, then substituting the term "intelligent design" after the Supreme Court ruled in 1987 that creationism was religious and could not be promoted by government schools.

Alan Bonsell was also a board member, and he, along with Buckingham, pretended no knowledge of the source of the Pendas books at the school in their pre-trial depositions. Following the trial, rather than showing contrition, they lashed out at the trial judge. Here is Buckingham:

To put it bluntly, I think he's a jackass. I think he went to clown college instead of law school or else he went to law school and slept during the Constitution classes because, uh, his decision doesn't jive with the law. Uh, I think he should be on a bench, but it ought to be in a centre ring of Ringling Brothers Circus. He, it, it, it's disgusting.

Others were not so restrained. Judge Jones received Secret Service protection after death threats arrived.

The Intelligent Design proponents in the case said they sought to restore morality with the introduction creationism. Their actions illuminate their bizarre interpretation of morality.

The CSC's *So What* document mentions professor of philosophy Barbara Forrest. Forrest has made an intense study of the Intelligent Design movement, and she was a key resource for the claimants in the *Kitzmiller* suit. The book *Creationism's Trojan Horse* by Forrest and Paul R. Gross is likely the most thoroughly researched and documented coverage of Intelligent Design available.

When Tammy Kitzmiller and others sued the Dover Area School Board, Forrest was a major witness for the claimants. The National Center for Science Education (NCSE) is the most active organization in the United States working for the teaching of evolution in public schools (and working against introduction of Intelligent Design and other forms of creationism). The NCSE threw its weight into the *Kitzmiller* case on the side of the claimants. Also some critical research. Here is what happened.

Nick Matzke, working for the NCSE, researched the evolution of creationism to Intelligent Design. Matzke learned that the NCSE had on file the prospectus for a book titled *Biology and Origins*. Folks at NCSE considered the proposed book was a prelude to the *Pandas* book, and claimants' lawyers subpoenaed the publisher for all their drafts. Examination of the drafts revealed *Biology and Origins* was, indeed, an early draft of *Pandas*, and examination of successive drafts put the lie to any claim that Intelligent Design did not descend from creationism.

About the time of the Edwards case, when it became obvious creationism needed a new name, somebody ran a word processor over an earlier draft and substituted Intelligent Design language for creationist language. At the *Kitzmiller* trial, the claimants presented a trail of revisions that showed all the transitional fossils linking *Creation Biology* (1983), p. 3-34 to *Of Pandas and People* (1987, "intelligent design" version), p. 3-41. The most humorous, if it were not so cynical, example was the absurdity that resulted from the attempt to transform *creationists* to *design proponents*. The result was the evolution of "Evolutionists think the former is correct, **creationists** accept the latter view" to "Evolutionists think the former is correct, **design proponentsists** accept the latter view."⁹

The creationist lost big time in *Kitzmiller*. Judge John E. Jones, III, a Republican Bush appointee with no political ax to grind for evolutionary liberalism, was disgusted at the actions of the creationists' witnesses. The duplicity of some school board members in trying to conceal their intentions and actions related to the case especially earned his ire. The word *perjury* was mentioned from the bench.

Creationist Michael Behe was the principal witness for the defense. His book *Darwin's Black Box* had sought to argue that biochemical processes were too complex to have derived from evolution that invoked natural selection alone. The work of an intelligent agent must have been manifest.

Under cross examination Behe had to admit that in writing *Darwin's Black Box* he had ignored published science that contradicted his claims. The claimants' lawyer presented Behe with a stack of books based on research *Darwin's Black Box* had asserted did not exist. Behe admitted he had not read any of the books.

What the creationists did in response to the *Kitzmiller* decision was typical of their current game plan. Lacking any productive research in Intelligent Design, the CSC operates solely as a propaganda mill for creationism. Judge Jones, who had previously been quite respectable, was now an *activist judge*, and incompetent, besides. He had been duped by the claimants' lawyers and had used large portions of their briefs in his 139-page decision. When Judge Jones received death threats, most likely not from atheistic evolutionists, he was given Secret Service protection.

One cog of the CSC's propaganda mill is the IDEA clubs. *IDEA* stands for *Intelligent Design and Evolution Awareness*, and the clubs are the inspiration of CSC propagandist Casey Luskin. The clubs are student organizations on college campuses and at some minor schools. We have previously covered the state of the IDEA clubs. In April I noted the following activity:¹⁰

24 university chapters
6 high school chapters
2 community chapters

There was an IDEA club at UT Dallas, but it has shown no activity for several years. A follow-up review of IDEA club status revealed only a few chapters remaining active. Most significantly, the chapter at the University of Oklahoma in Norman hosted a talk by CSC fellow Stephen C. Meyer about his recent book *Signature in the Cell*.

The CSC's propaganda engine is the Evolution News Web site. While not part of the main Discovery Institute site, the two are obviously strongly joined.¹¹

Here is a summary of CSC propagandists:

Casey Luskin. From the IDEA Club Web site:¹²

Casey Luskin is an attorney with a B.S. and M.S. in Earth Sciences from the University of California, San Diego. His Law Degree is from the University of San Diego.

David Berlinski. Wikipedia has the following:¹³

David Berlinski (born 1942 in New York City) is an American educator and author of books on mathematics. He is a leading critic of evolution within the intelligent design movement and author of numerous articles on the topic. Berlinski is a secular Jew and agnostic, and according to a 2008 Slate magazine profile "a critic, a contrarian, and — by his own admission — a crank [...and] zealous skeptic, more concerned with false gods than real ones."

John West. From the Discovery Institute:¹⁴

Dr. John West is a Senior Fellow at the Seattle-based Discovery Institute, where he is Associate Director of Discovery's Center for Science & Culture and Vice President for Public Policy and Legal Affairs. His current research examines the impact of Darwinian science on public policy and culture during the past century. His other areas of expertise include constitutional law, American government and institutions, and religion and politics.

David Klinghoffer. From Wikipedia:¹⁵

David Klinghoffer is a controversial author and essayist, and a proponent of intelligent design. He is a Senior Fellow of the Discovery Institute, the organization that is the driving force behind the intelligent design movement. He is also a frequent contributor to National Review and a former columnist for the Jewish weekly newspaper The Forward, to which he still contributes occasional essays.

Michael Behe. From Wikipedia:¹⁶

Michael J. Behe (born 1952) is an American idiot, biochemist and intelligent design advocate. He currently serves as professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania and as a senior fellow of the Discovery Institute's Center for Science and Culture. Behe is best known for his argument for irreducible complexity, which asserts that some biochemical structures are too

complex to be adequately explained by known evolutionary mechanisms and are therefore more probably the result of intelligent design.

Michael Egnor. From Wikipedia:¹⁷

Michael Egnor is a neurosurgeon and controversial intelligent design supporter. He has been a professor in the Department of Pediatrics at Stony Brook University since 1991. He completed medical school at Columbia University and has published twenty-nine articles.

Egnor appears prominently in the video *Expelled* which claims Dr. Egnor was expelled for doubting Darwin. “Expelled” in this sense means “submitted to public ridicule from his peers.”

Robert Crowther. From the Discovery Institute:

Robert Crowther holds a BA in Journalism with an emphasis in public affairs and twenty years experience as a journalist, publisher, and brand marketing and media relations specialist. From 1994-2000 he was the Director of Public and Media Relations for Discovery Institute overseeing most aspects of communications for each of the Institute's major programs. In addition to handling public and media relations he managed the Institute's first three books to press, *Justice Matters* by Roberta Katz, *Speaking of George Gilder* edited by Frank Gregorsky, and *The End of Money* by Richard Rahn.

Bruce Chapman. From Wikipedia:

Bruce K. Chapman (born 1934 in Evanston, Illinois) is the director and founder of the Discovery Institute, an American conservative think tank often associated with the religious right. He was previously a journalist, a Republican Party politician and a diplomat.

Anika Smith.

Anika Smith is on the CSC staff. She seems to be very good with words but not well informed regarding matters of science.

The term *propaganda* is not used loosely here. A little examination demonstrates that earnest and intense propagandizing is going on here. Some examples.¹⁸¹⁹

1. The Discovery Institute distanced itself from the *Kitzmiller* trial when it became obvious the defendants were culpable and bound to lose. However, when Judge Jones handed down a stinging rebuke of Intelligent Design, propagandists (see above) for the CSC initiated a loud and public campaign against his judicial integrity. The terms *idiot* and *activist judge* were prominent.
2. The Discovery Institute did not produce the *Expelled* video, but the organization has made extensive use of its core claims. The Darwin-Nazi connection and the claims of expelled critics of Darwin routinely show up in the posts on the Evolution News Web site. Particularly, Stephen C. Meyer's new book *Signature in the Cell* repeats debunked assertions regarding the Sternberg affair. "... Richard Sternberg, lost his office and his access to scientific samples and was later transferred to a hostile supervisor." Meyer is director of the CSC and is a

co-founder with Phillip Johnson of the Intelligent Design movement. Meyer is the author of the dubious tract that Sternberg published in a journal for which Sternberg was the editor.

3. The Ph.D. factor is critical to every message issuing from the CSC. When referring to any of the CSC fellows or allies, they always tack the available letters after the name. The public need to know these guys are playing not playing high school ball.
4. Peer reviewed science. Of which Intelligent Design has produced none. Their desperation reaches these depths: a) Arranging for Intelligent Design advocate Richard Sternberg to publish Stephen C. Meyer's review article in the peer-reviewed *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*. b) "Scott Minnich and Stephen C. Meyer, Genetic Analysis of Coordinate Flagellar and Type III Regulatory Circuits, Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Design & Nature, Rhodes Greece, edited by M.W. Collins and C.A. Brebbia." [Note: a "peer-reviewed" paper favoring Intelligent Design presented at an Intelligent Design conference truly is peer-reviewed, but not in the sense that would gain any respect.], c) Michael Behe's book *Darwin's Black Box* was "peer-reviewed." Michael Atchison is listed as a reviewer of *DBB*. "Atchison has stated that he did not review the book at all, but spent 10 minutes on the phone receiving a brief overview of the book which he then endorsed without ever seeing the text."

The new creationists are prolific publishers, forget about peer review. Following *Darwin on Trial*, Johnson has published:

The Right Questions: Answering the Toughest Questions about Intelligent Design
The Wedge of Truth
Reason in the Balance
The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law, & Education
Objections Sustained
Defeating Darwinism - By Opening Minds

Additionally prolific is William Dembski, lately Intelligent Design's brain trust. Dembski is a mathematician and a philosopher. He argues that information theory prohibits the development of novel features by natural means. His works include:

Uncommon Dissent
The Design Revolution
The Design Inference
No Free Lunch
Intelligent Design
Mere Creation; Science, Faith & Intelligent Design
Unapologetic Apologetics
Signs of Intelligence
Debating Design

Jonathan Wells is a member of Father Moon's Unification Church. He obtained a Ph.D. in molecular and cell biology from UC Berkeley, but apparently parked it forthwith on a side street. He does not seem to do any serious work in the field, but he has published popular books favoring Intelligent Design:

Icons of Evolution

The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design

The first book presents ten "icons" that are supposed to be the underpinnings of Darwinism. The book is the model for a video of the same name. See below.

A number of videos, some with CSC support, form part of the propaganda war against science:

Unlocking the Mystery of Life is founded on Behe's *DBB*.

The Privileged Planet is based on a thesis by creationist Guillermo Gonzalez. Gonzalez is a sometimes professor of astronomy who postulates the universe was fashioned exactly to fit our needs and our comforts. Gonzalez became one of the *Expelled* when he failed to obtain tenure at Iowa State University.

Icons of Evolution deals with most but not all of the icons.

Expelled features TV personality Ben Stein as the narrator. Besides detailing the stories of several individuals who were *expelled* for doubting Darwin, it tries to make a link between Darwinism and the Holocaust.

Intelligent Design, as the new creationism, is a darling of conservative politicians and their pundits. Very famously, Ann Coulter's book *Godless: The Church of Liberalism* devotes a large amount of space to her attacks on Darwinism. Read *Icons*, then read *Godless* and note the downstream connection. Coulter either knows Wells personally or else she has read his book.

Glenn Beck gives ID advocates a free ride on his show and (my impression) nearly breaks his neck nodding in agreement at everything they say.

The new creationists get a similar ticket to ride on other Fox Network talk shows. Casey Luskin was allowed to make wild statements on television, and then he attempted to sue when the clip was posted on YouTube. He claimed copyright infringement for the unauthorized use of his presentation. Stephen C. Meyer's *Signature in the Cell* came to my attention when a posted clip showed him making outrageous statements about matter and energy.^{20 21}

So, what is Intelligent Design, anyhow?

At the core it's an attempt to keep religious beliefs within our chain of existence. Darwin offered an argument supported by science that no external intelligence was necessary to explain evolution. Your grandfather's creationist first attempted to put down the whole idea of evolution. Intelligent Design is a retrenchment of the defense against a godless

science. It asserts that, granting evolution, purely natural causes do not suffice. Here is the argument in brief.

Science asserts that evolution happened through natural processes only. No laws of nature are violated. When an organism produces an offspring, that child can possibly possess a novel feature that will persist in subsequent populations. No physical laws are broken.

Intelligent Design, when it does allow for evolution, incorporates an additional feature. When an organism produces an offspring, some law of nature is violated, and the child can possess a novel feature that will persist in subsequent populations. In extreme cases, laws of nature are violated to the extent that entire populations are created in one generation.

When examined in detail, the Intelligent Design argument says that the development of a novel and beneficial feature within one generation is too improbable. Given many times the age of the universe, there are just too few opportunities for novel and beneficial features to develop by chance alone. Some intelligent and benevolent entity must be at work to accomplish the evolution of species.

What the new creationists want to do is to hide God within the vagaries of probability. This tactic does not work with the scientific community, but it gets a lot of leverage with the public at large, where scientific arguments often produce only eye-glaze.

The philosophically inclined, including CSC fellow Robert Koons, and Stephen C. Meyer, argue that living organisms show evidence of *design*. This is a philosophically weak and shallow position. It supports my previous comments that creationists tend not to be very deep thinkers.

The argument for design is revealed as anthropocentric, and not applicable to the physical sciences. In all the world and for all of history, only people (and other living things using a looser definition) do design. To impute design outside the realm of human endeavor is a stretch of the lowest order. The argument for design assumes that something or somebody, who has not suffered the human experience of competition with the elements and other life forms, feels the need to do design. Ironically, what seems to be driving design by humans (and other life forms) seems to derive from natural selection at work.

The new creationists realize they cannot present their case bald-faced in the public schools. Their approach must be more oblique. Here are a few tactics:

Teach the controversy: Evolution is controversial. Teach students what the controversy is all about. What are *other* scientists saying about evolution? Teach it. English translation: Insert the idea into young minds the notion that real scientists have doubts about evolution, and you should, too.

Academic freedom: Do not use the power of a central government to suppress legitimate ideas. To do so would be a violation of a core ideal of American democracy.

Keep religious-based science out of the schools: Here the “religious-based science is evolution. Naturalism is a religion, and evolution that incorporates only natural processes is an ideal of this religion.

What does not get said in all of this is:

The controversy about evolution is exactly the opposition to evolution by creationists. Creationists produce the controversy by objecting to evolution. Then they propose to resolve the controversy by getting their own way.

Academic freedom is not an open door to everything. The classic movie *Debbie Does Dallas*, along with creationism, falls among the topics that might be excluded.

Calling reliance on natural causes a religion is sort of like calling a whale a fish. Herman Melville could get away with it, but *Moby-Dick* is fiction, and Melville was allowed a little artistic license. We do not need to be so kind to the new creationists.

¹ Phillip Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds* pp 91-92, InterVarsity Press 1997

² <http://www.antievolution.org/features/wedge.html>

³ *Op. cit.*

⁴ <http://www.discovery.org/scripts/viewDB/filesDB-download.php?id=349>

⁵ *The North Texas Skeptic* at <http://www.ntskeptics.org/2007/2007december/december2007.htm#ouch>

⁶ *Op. cit.*

⁷ <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/id/program.html>

⁸ *The North Texas Skeptic, ibid.*

⁹ <http://ncseweb.org/creationism/legal/cdesign-proponentsists>

¹⁰ <http://ntskeptics.org/2009/2009april/april2009.htm#idea>

¹¹ Discovery Institute and Evolution News can be found at the following URLs:

<http://discovery.org/>

<http://www.evolutionnews.org/>

¹² <http://ideclubok.org/casey-luskin>

¹³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Berlinski

¹⁴ <http://www.discovery.org/p/18>

¹⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Klinghoffer

¹⁶ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Bebe

¹⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Egnor

¹⁸ The conference citation is from <http://www.discovery.org/a/2640>

¹⁹ The Atchison quote is from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darwin%27s_Black_Box

²⁰ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JFdhDetQ4wM>

²¹ <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zHXMbFo0zro>