

# The GEE-ology of Biology Education in America

© 2006 by Kevin Wirth

Updated 02/27/06

Word count: 5500

You may freely circulate this report as long as you do not charge a fee and keep all text intact.

It's come to this: **Extortion** is now the acceptable tactic for determining what our kids get taught. Think I'm exaggerating?

Then consider this: In recent years, Intelligent Design (ID) has come into the forefront of the culture war in American education as an explanation for how life came to be on our planet. In the battle over how to best present the origins issue in American schools, there seems to be a 'missing link' in the way the state understands how this is supposed to work. Like schoolyard bullies and thugs, ID opponents have been deliberately misrepresenting ID to the public as 'religion, and with the recent Kitzmiller decision, using the force of law based on that false premise, and others, to effectively ensure that only their view gets presented in our public schools. Attorney Richard Katskee, assistant legal director for Americans United for Separation of Church and State, recently commented on the \$1 million dollars in legal fees the Dover School Board has had to cough up:

*"I don't know whether \$1 million in legal fees is enough to deter a board determined to violate the Constitution," Any board thinking of trying to do what the Dover board did is going to have to look for a bill in excess of \$2 million... I think \$2 million is a lot to explain to taxpayers for a lawsuit that should never be fought," he said.<sup>1</sup>*

Gee. Don't thugs to that? I call this tactic the "Gee" factor because these obvious ploys – most recently evident in the Kitzmiller v Dover debacle, don't seem to be connecting in the neurons of our brilliant court judges. The whole concept of thuggery on the part of those who most actively oppose the notion of ID seems to conveniently escape the notice of our courts. In essence, it appears that we are beginning to see the start of a trend where blatant falsehood is now being upheld by our judiciary (or is that really new?).

The way education should work is, we hire the state to use their expertise and come up with standards, and they advise and facilitate the education process for our kids with the best available curriculum they can muster. Meanwhile, the state must answer to the people (esp. taxpaying parents) for what it produces. And, if the state, in its infinite wisdom, determines that some topics should be presented in a manner that a significant number of parents object to – regardless of what the state thinks about it - then the state needs to figure out an effective way to deal with it for all concerned instead of telling one group of parents their views cannot be accommodated simply because they are out of sync with the majority.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Legal bill could halt imitators](#): Dover cost might make districts rethink ID plans, by Christina Kauffman, in The York Dispatch, February 23, 2006.

It's come to the point where our educators are afraid of permitting a presentation of an intelligent agent at work in the natural world because they have been bullied and threatened with an ACLU-instant, budget-breaking lawsuit, and so they feel that the best policy is to duck and run.

It's not just crass intimidation – but also state-sanctioned felony extortion. It's like making a deal with your local school district “You don't teach ID and we won't sue you to the point where you can't afford to buy textbooks for the next 10 years”. **Thugs** do that. Not people who respect the right of others to evaluate the evidence and make up their own minds. We are told that this must be done to preserve the sanctity of science.

Ha! – that's a good one. It only serves to protect the sanctity of a dogma full of conjectures and extrapolations: Darwinism. Science is a more respectable enterprise.

I mean, come on – other education curricula includes perspectives from a HUGE variety of minority views. Yet somehow – the perspective that life on this planet might be the result of some (undefined) intelligent agent is just far too zany to be permitted because, we are conveniently (and falsely) told, that's a “religious” view. Whack! Even if it has no specific object of veneration or worship, we are told that to include ID in our science curricula would be ‘unconstitutional’. Whack again!

Don't you believe it. That's what the ideological opponents of ID would like us all to think – but it simply isn't accurate.

First of all, it's not unconstitutional if it doesn't advocate a religious belief system (which ID doesn't). Opponents of ID make this wild-eyed and totally erroneous claim of “it's religious!” because they think it's the only way they can keep ID out of our schools. No folks, **ID ISN'T RELIGIOUS!** When ID finally becomes acknowledged as good science, then it's all over (and they know it).

*If solid empirical evidence for Darwin's claim is so lacking, thoughtful students can hardly fail to pose to themselves the question, what makes the theory of evolution so successful an idea? In answer to this perplexing question, one might assert that the phenomenon of acceptance ... is propelled to some degree by a deep-seated urge to formulate a non-religious model to explain the appearance of all living things through natural laws. With the establishment of a natural law model such as Darwinism, it is invariably true that **only ideas or theories based on natural principles will be accepted.**<sup>2</sup> (emphasis added)*

Secondly, the ID perspective actually DOES advocate for better science, not religion. It's a sad fact that the ideological opponents of ID have mischaracterized the issue as a ‘religious’ one when the architects of ID do not

---

<sup>2</sup> *Storm Clouds on the Horizon of Darwinism: Teaching the Anthropic Principle and Intelligent Design in the Public Schools*, by Jeffrey E. Addicott in *Ohio State Law Journal*, Vol. 63 No. 6 (2002) p. 1531

promote ANY religious doctrine in their approach. ID stands on its two feet as science. No chapter and verse is required! No one needs to “believe” in an intelligent agent, anymore than the Darwinians claim that the evidence points to the notion that an intelligence wasn’t necessary. So instead of good ‘science’, what the opponents of ID really want is exclusive state sanctioned permission to present only their ideology – which is totally nuts. With Kitzmiller, they really think they pulled off the perfect con and achieved their goal. I would caution them to put the cork back in their champagne bottle, because I don’t hear the fat lady singing yet.

Meanwhile, isn’t it interesting that while our education system is becoming more and more I.D. averse, it consistently cranks out a science curriculum that includes the following message: “No intelligence was responsible for the formation of life because life evolved by purely chance processes”. But, where is the evidence? Straight from the imagination of the Darwinians – certainly not in the fossil record. And certainly not in living systems.

It seems if you mention the possibility of an intelligent agent at work it’s somehow impermissible and unconstitutional, ***unless*** it’s to teach our kids that no such intelligence is necessary. So, mentioning intelligent design is actually just fine in our schools, ***as long as it’s the opinion that such an agent isn’t necessary.***

Cute.

Many pro-Darwinian educators and science professionals are absolutely gob-smacked that the number of Americans who believe that a Creator was responsible for life on Earth hasn’t changed at all, technically speaking, for over three decades.<sup>3</sup> How is that possible, after all that hard work to make sure our kids get ‘properly educated’ in the biological sciences? Could it be because even the common man can comprehend that the complexity of life could not be the spawn of chance? Nothing insults a well educated Darwinian more than being shown up by people with less than a stellar academic background. People who DO have an education equal to theirs, or who have proven their scientific ability and believe in ID, are simply ignored (like C. Everett Koop and Raymond Damadian).

In a Democracy we all understand the need for our kids to get educated in the basics – like reading, writing, and how to use a calculator. And we all understand the difficulties the state has in trying to be all things to all people. But having said that, the state does not have the right to infringe on the values parents seek to impart to their kids – that job belongs to parents. To suggest, as many opponents of ID do, that ID isn’t scientific, IS religious, and is inappropriate for study by high school students, is a bald and totally fabricated farce with the sole purpose of preserving the status quo. It becomes all the more onerous once we

---

<sup>3</sup> [Substantial Numbers of Americans Continue to Doubt Evolution](#), by Deborah Jordan Brooks. Gallup News Service, published March 1, 2001

begin to understand that the evidence for Darwinism relies wholly on assumptions stacked on conjectures regulated by extrapolations honed by smooth sounding suppositions in the name of 'science'. If ever there was a clarion call for students and parents to start a new revolution in science and academia, then I think this is it.

When a **majority** of taxpaying citizens politely ask the state to allow our schools to teach this controversy, and the state responds by saying that such a request is inappropriate, misguided, or worse – a non-issue - then the state just lost sight of its mission. Another whack! Gee, I thought that's what school was for – teaching our kids to think critically.

Darwinism doesn't deserve the status it currently enjoys as the sole explanation for the development of life on our planet because there IS an equally valid scientific alternative in ID. Period.

For example, as a growing multitude of critics have pointed out in recent years, Darwinism suffers mightily from substantial paleontological 'gaps in the graveyard' evidence.

*The facts in favor of evolution are often held to be incontrovertible; prominent biologists shake their heads at the obduracy of those who would dispute them. Those facts, however, have been rather less forthcoming than evolutionary biologists might have hoped. If life progressed by an accumulation of small changes, as they say it has, the fossil record should reflect its flow, the dead stacked up in barely separated strata. But for well over 150 years, the dead have been remarkably diffident about confirming Darwin's theory. Their bones lie suspended in the sands of time - theromorphs and therapsids and things that must have gibbered and then squeaked; but there are gaps in the graveyard, places where there should be intermediate forms but where there is nothing whatsoever instead.<sup>4</sup>*

Other evidence suffers from a mountain of similar hurdles, which combine to create a convincing explanation in the context of Darwinian principles. I'll save more comments on this for a different article.

Parents have every right to expect the science curriculum being presented to their children will accurately reflect the problems associated with a Darwinian view. But the ACLU and other groups, including the courts, have a problem with that, because for every inch of ground Darwinism loses, there is a corresponding gain for the notion of intelligent design. Of course, many Darwinians, and now our courts vehemently deny this<sup>5</sup>, but, let them deny it all they want – the evidence (not unlike many other types of evidence they allege we should believe) weighs heavily against such a view. The state does parents a huge disservice by going along with the blatant sham that ID is 'religious' in a contrived effort to scare school boards and teachers into submission. Thugs **do** that.

---

<sup>4</sup> [The Deniable Darwin](#), by David Berlinski. Commentary Vol. 101, No. 6, June 1996.

<sup>5</sup> See my paper entitled [The False Duality Argument Debunked](#). (February, 2006)

The December 2005 Kitzmiller decision <sup>6</sup> in Dover, PA will go down as the Big Stick used to whack IDers with the legal clout they have sought for so long. Like bullies on the playground, they will wield it threateningly whenever any of our School Boards or teachers dare to raise the issue of Intelligent Design. But how are bullies defeated? Only when the kids with good sense decide to band together and take a stand against them. This is the one thing that will defeat this onslaught of lies and deception: when the people who know better begin to speak up. It's about time.

The state just told parents that only evolution can (and will) now be taught to all Dover ninth grade students. And this is all just a warm-up message for any other state considering a move similar to what the Dover School Board did by publishing it's simple little disclaimer. So what will parents do now? When will these thugs finally meet their match?

In case you missed it, here is the message that the Dover School Board saw fit to give its students upon entering the door to its 9<sup>th</sup> grade biology classes. This is what all the fuss was about – THIS is what the Darwinians and the Kitzmiller court, in their infinite wisdom, saw fit to describe as unfit for presentation to our kids:

The Pennsylvania Academic Standards require students to learn about Darwin's Theory of Evolution and eventually to take a standardized test of which evolution is a part. Because Darwin's Theory is a theory, it continues to be tested as new evidence is discovered. The Theory is not a fact. Gaps in the Theory exist for which there is no evidence. A theory is defined as a well-tested explanation that unifies a broad range of observations. Intelligent Design is an explanation of the origin of life that differs from Darwin's view. The reference book, *Of Pandas and People*, is available for students who might be interested in gaining an understanding of what Intelligent Design actually involves. With respect to any theory, students are encouraged to keep an open mind. The school leaves the discussion of the Origins of Life to individual students and their families. As a Standards-driven district, class instruction focuses upon preparing students to achieve proficiency on Standards-based assessments. <sup>7</sup>

This is the Dover Board disclaimer in its entirety. It's didn't require any instruction about Creation, or a Creator, or 'religion' in any of its science classrooms. It merely published this simple message and made a book available (as an option – **not** required reading) in its library. What state or school board

---

<sup>6</sup> [Kitzmiller Opinion](#)

<sup>7</sup> [Kitzmiller Opinion](#), p. 39-43 (see this link for the full Court analysis of the Dover Disclaimer, and then see my analysis of it [here](#))

would have the nerve to move forward with it's 'ID-friendly' curriculum now that this type of statement has been ruled impermissible? That's the million-dollar question the ACLU is daring you to answer. Like I said – I call it intimidation, thuggery, and extortion as they exert their one-way witch hunt for 'religious' scientists and educators. All parents across America should be greatly concerned about what's next.

In essence, the Kitzmiller decision just said to Dover, PA parents: "Your kid will now learn evolution, and **only** evolution, whether you like it or not. And if you think evolution carries a message that is anti-religious, you're crazy. If it carries a message that runs counter to your values, too bad. There is no antagonism against any religion or God in the message of Darwinism – in fact, science cannot even address religious matters."

In the meantime, I've noticed that the IDers are quite often taken to task for their 'religious' views because, *quelle horror*, it would be such a terrible thing to infect our children with any idea that is remotely linked to 'religion'. But I've also noticed that this is most definitely a one-way street. I don't hear much talk about the 'anti-religious views' of the 'scientists' who are responsible for bringing us those 'scientific' discoveries for the origin and evolution of life that eventually find their way into the textbooks our children read. Of course, **that** isn't relevant, is it?

The media endlessly inspect the religious affiliations of Darwin critics, of course, supposedly because a scientist's religious views can be used to discount his scientific views. But, in contrast, they do not show us the views of the proselytizing atheists who host so many of the Darwinist organizations and websites, leading so much of the Darwinist campaign against ID.<sup>8</sup>

So, let's take a closer look at that right now, shall we? For example...

In Johnny and Suzie's science classroom, they are told that life began from an inorganic mixture that somehow, some way (again, based on pure conjecture), emerged from some pre-biotic soup on its own and without any need for a Creator. Even though the original idea proposed by Miller has a faulty premise that is well known, this concept it still taught – not because it's good science, but because of the a priori assumption leading (mostly atheist)<sup>9</sup> scientists are committed to.

---

<sup>8</sup> [Nature Magazines's Choice Blogger Has Heaps of Fun with the Crucifixion](#), Discovery Institute Blog - Posted by Bruce Chapman on December 12, 2005 01:05 PM

<sup>9</sup> I kid you not on this point. Read the poll results in [Leading Scientists Still Reject God](#), by Edward J. Larson and Larry Witham - *Nature*, Vol. 394, No. 6691, p. 313 (1998) Macmillan Publishers Ltd. Their report states in part that "Our survey found near universal rejection of the transcendent [e.g., GOD] by NAS natural scientists. Disbelief in God and immortality among NAS biological scientists was 65.2% and 69.0%, respectively, and among NAS physical scientists it was 79.0% and 76.3%" and the pollsters end with this comment: "As we compiled our findings, the NAS issued a booklet encouraging the teaching of evolution in public schools, an ongoing source of friction between the scientific community and some conservative Christians in the United States. The booklet assures readers, "Whether God exists or not is a question about which science is neutral". NAS president Bruce Alberts said: "There are many very outstanding members of

*"[W]e have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door."*<sup>10</sup>

The assumption of no God unavoidably creeps into not only the thought processes that form the experiments, but also shapes the expected results. How could it be otherwise? This so-called Darwin-centric 'science' is what eventually gets taught to our kids. Where is the philosophical control, or placebo, in this picture? Then we have the discoveries by Nobel winning scientists like Francis Crick and James Watson, who by the way, is an atheist and sees it as part of his mission to put less educated folks who don't agree with Darwinism in their place for holding to our "religious" beliefs.

*I never thought there was a spiritual basis for life; I was very lucky to be brought up by a father who had no religious beliefs. I didn't have that hang-up. My mother was nominally a Catholic, but that's as far as it went.*<sup>11</sup>

When Watson visited a college campus recently, here is what he had to say to college students:

More than 200 students listened to Watson as he told them he is a "total believer in evolution" and feels the Bible is "just not right" in the face of science.

"The easiest way to believe in the theory of intelligent design is to never go to school," he said. He also confessed that he does not believe in a soul or anything divine.

"So you don't believe in God?" one student asked.

"Oh, no. Absolutely not," the scientist answered.

"The biggest advantage to believing in God is you don't have to understand anything, no physics, no biology," he added. "I wanted to understand."

Notice that Watson adheres to an extremely perverted sense of people who "believe in God" as those who have no interest in really learning or discovering anything via scientific inquiry. This is no different than the view that black people are only fit to be slaves – yes – exactly the same form of crass, high-minded prejudice. In his view, faith, not knowledge, is the only tool 'religious folk' respect. Incredibly, he fails to see that Darwinism is a faith-based belief system. It is these kind of warped wholesale characterizations that have shaped the opinions of literally thousands who have become indoctrinated into believing in Darwinism. Another irony is that many Darwinists claim to be the advocates of 'reason over religion', yet Indoctrination is not reason at all. Watson's influence has had a huge impact in our culture via science education – not just his

---

*this academy who are very religious people, people who believe in evolution, many of them biologists." Our survey suggests otherwise."*

<sup>10</sup> Lewontin, Richard, "Billions and Billions of Demons", New York Review of Books, January 9, 1997, p. 28

<sup>11</sup> [A Conversation with James D. Watson](#), Scientific American, March 10, 2003

scientific achievements, but his views on 'religion' as well – let's be as candid about this as he is. Fortunately, not all students are easily influenced.

When asked about his views of Watson, Tom Drummond, a senior education and physics major, said he is concerned about Watson's "close-mindedness" and his belief that humans have no spirit and no soul.

"Everything was compared to mechanics," Drummond said. "It's dangerous, very dangerous, for a prominent person to have that opinion, to compare a person to a diesel engine."<sup>12</sup>

All that notwithstanding, Crick and Watson are merely the discoverers of one of the great mysteries of science: DNA. Yet the bigger question of where DNA came from in the first place still remains unsolved.

*"The origin of the [DNA] code is perhaps the most perplexing problem in evolutionary biology. The existing translational machinery is at the same time so complex, so universal) and so essential that it is hard to see how it could have come into existences or how life could have existed without it. The discovery of ribozymes has made it easier to imagine an answer to the second of these questions, but the transformation of an 'RNA world' into one in which catalysis is performed by proteins, and nucleic acids specialize in the transmission of information [a DNA world], remains a formidable problem."*<sup>13</sup>

Perhaps parents would be amazed to learn that the very reason why Nobel Prize winners Crick and Watson decided to pursue their DNA experiment was precisely to put 'religious' folks in their place (at the back of the bus).

Speaking to *The Telegraph*, Crick, 86, said: "The god hypothesis is rather discredited." Indeed, he says his distaste for religion was one of his prime motives in the work that led to the sensational 1953 discovery [ed. note: of the Double Helix].

"I went into science because of these religious reasons, there's no doubt about that. I asked myself what were the two things that appear inexplicable and are used to support religious beliefs: the difference between living and nonliving things, and the phenomenon of consciousness."

...

...co-discoverer, [James] Watson, 74, told *The Telegraph* that religious explanations were "myths from the past".

"Every time you understand something, religion becomes less likely," said Watson. "Only with the discovery of the double helix and the ensuing genetic revolution have we had grounds for thinking that the powers held traditionally to be the exclusive property of the gods might one day be ours."<sup>14</sup>

Additional insight into Francis Crick:

---

<sup>12</sup> [Nobel Prize Winning Scientist wows some – worries others](#). By JoAnne Viviano, The Vindicator, Youngstown, Ohio

<sup>13</sup> *The Major Transitions in Evolution*, J. M. Smith and E. Szathmary, pg. 81 (W.H. Freeman: Oxford UK, 1995).

<sup>14</sup> [Do Our Genes Reveal the hand of God?](#) By Roger Highfield. The London Daily Telegraph, 3/20/2003

An early 1995 CNBC interview with Crick was prefaced by a quote from his then-released book, *The Astonishing Hypothesis* (1994), a book about the mystery of consciousness explained in scientific terms. In Crick's words, "The Astonishing Hypothesis is that *You*, your joys and your sorrows, your memories and your ambitions, your sense of personal identity and free will, are in fact no more than the behavior of a vast assembly of nerve cells and their associated molecules."<sup>15</sup>

OK, let's switch gears now...

We are told *emphatically* and in no uncertain terms by our courts and educators, "science has nothing at all to say about religion, and you parents are nuts to even think so. Don't you understand – science can't even speak about religion?"

And when parents complain that biology science education includes a message that is antithetical to the values they wish to teach their kids, what are they told?

"Sorry – you're barking up the wrong tree here. We're teaching your kids 'science', not 'religion'. Now if you don't mind, we'd like to get back to cramming more anti-religious indoctrination, er, education down your kids throat in the name of science. Do you mind? Get lost, you're beginning to irritate us."

Now please kick me if I'm making this up, OK? I don't want to come off like I'm just trying to be a troublemaker here.

You know, if I put a veterinarian in a room with a bunch of animals, I can predict what that vet is going to do: inspect all the animals to see how healthy they are.

If I put a mechanic in my garage I can predict what he's going to do: inspect the Shelby under my hood before he takes a look at the fly-fishing equipment hanging on my wall.

If I invite a florist over for a rib BBQ, I predict one of the first things she's going to want to do is inspect my Dahlia garden before sampling my BBQ'd ribs.

If I put an atheist in a lab and tell him to figure out how life began, I predict he's going to try and make the pieces fit into a picture without an intelligent agency. And then, whatever he 'discovers' (even if it can't be verified historically or empirically by 'science') will probably receive the accolades of the scientific community at large which, oh Gee, is populated primarily by non-religious folks just like him, and who see things from the same perspective.<sup>16</sup> And then of course, his ideas eventually find their way into our kids science textbooks. This IS how the GEE-ology process works.

If I put someone in the **exact same science lab** who believes that an intelligent agent was at work, I predict that person will find scientific explanations consistent

---

<sup>15</sup> [Watson and Crick describe DNA](#). Ronaldbrucemeyer.com

<sup>16</sup> [Leading Scientists Still Reject God](#). *Nature*, Vol. **394**, No. 6691, p. 313

with the notion that an intelligent agent was at work in much of the living systems we see in the natural world. Will his science get published in any of the “good ol’ boys’ peer reviewed journals? Of course not, because his assumptions about an intelligent agent are obviously contrary to what those who are in the majority believe. Will his ideas make their way into a textbook and become adopted by any school board in America? Heck no – not after Dover – unless you want to incur the wrath of the now slap-happy ACLU and NAS.

Gee, isn’t that obvious? That’s the Gee-ology of biology education at work.

But does it really mean that the scientist who believes in a Creator is really practicing religion in his science lab? Or that the book he writes about his scientific discoveries is really ‘religious’? The vast majority of people who would say ‘yes’ are those with an axe to grind or who have their heads so far into the Darwinian perspective that they can no longer acknowledge a legitimate scientific alternative.

The scientist who perceives an intelligent agent at work simply approaches science just like the atheist approaches science with his *No-Intelligence-Was-Necessary* prejudice. So what? Neither approach prevents either scientist from conducting true scientific investigation. There are plenty of examples of scientists who are religiously inclined but were able to produce excellent science, including Sir Issac Newton.<sup>17</sup> Yet, we are told that most of those scientists were creationists before evolution was discovered or because there was no other viable scientific alternative. Certainly, no educated and accomplished scientist today doubts Darwinism<sup>18</sup>, or agree with ID as many ID opponents assert.

Wait a minute. Not only is that untrue<sup>19</sup>, but it’s like comparing apples to oranges. That’s not the point here – the point is that believing in an intelligent agent didn’t prevent these people from doing good science. THAT is the point. As it turns out, there is a huge pile of accredited scientists today who do believe in an intelligent agent.<sup>20</sup> However, today we are being told right and left that believing in a Creator renders someone incapable of doing good science. I have seen it again and again, and that is something that is also impermissible because it’s pure discrimination and invective – not science.

The ID v Evolution conflict has revealed a new goal among educators that ought to send Big Brotherly chills up and down the spine of every student: “we’re not here just to impart knowledge, we’re here to make sure you give your assent as

---

<sup>17</sup> [Talk Origins list of creationist scientists](#)

<sup>18</sup> Actually, over 500 scientists and educators (many of them Ph.D. recipients) have signed a statement, ‘[A Scientific Dissent From Darwinism](#)’

<sup>19</sup> Many accomplished scientists are in fact advocates of ID, including former Surgeon General C. Everett Koop, and Raymond Damadian (inventor of the MRI). Furthermore, a growing number of scientists who are not creationists or ID advocates have become widely critical of Darwinism, such as microbiologist Michael Denton.

<sup>20</sup> [Creation Scientists and other biographies of interest](#) Answers in Genesis.

well". The ACLU and now our courts are hell-bent on making sure that Darwinism is not a matter of debate – but a matter of fact. Oh, and if you are student who doesn't believe in evolution, many professors think you should have a 'special note' attached to your transcript.<sup>21</sup> How Dinesque.<sup>22</sup> I've seen lots worse than that – how about losing your degree or having a letter of "recommendation" blasting your ability to do science simply because of your "religious" beliefs? Trust me, it happens – I've seen it firsthand.<sup>23</sup>

Let me say this again for emphasis, and for our hard of hearing friends in our courts and at the ACLU: both ID and Darwinian scientists are doing science, and their preconceptions don't disqualify them from doing that, nor does it render their work in any way 'religious' (except for their a priori assumptions...)

It's easy to call something 'religious' without defining what religious means. That's exactly what the Kitzmiller court did – and I call that a 'hit and run' tactic, no matter how well worded.

Amazingly, our courts and many activist scientists and legal groups have decided to tell us that any text suggesting an intelligent agent was involved in earth's history is tainted with 'religion' and is therefore impermissible in our classrooms. Either that or the 'scientific' findings of 'Creation-friendly' scientists are not being published by the world's most prominent science journals, and therefore, must not be worth publishing for a good reason.<sup>24</sup> They evidently don't seem to do much reading about why this might be a moot point.<sup>25</sup>

Biology teachers must not even talk about the notion that an intelligent agent might have been responsible because that is a strictly 'religious' idea. **But that restriction is based upon court decisions ruling on creationism, not ID.** Yet, who is listening to what the architects of ID are saying?

*Intelligent design is not a form of anti-evolutionism. Intelligent design does not claim that living things came together suddenly in their present form through the efforts of a supernatural creator. Intelligent design is and never will be a doctrine of creation.*<sup>26</sup>

Meanwhile, the scientist who is an atheist, say the courts, is allowed to contribute his ideas to our textbooks because he is doing 'honest science'. And it's not considered 'religious' even if it carries an anti-religious message because, 'science doesn't do that'.

---

<sup>21</sup> [Quick, Let's Discriminate Against the Creationists](#), by Bert Thompson, Ph.D. and Brad Harrub, Ph.D., and Wirth, Kevin (1984), "A Call for Dialogue," *Origins Research*, 7[2]:2, Fall/Winter.

<sup>22</sup> [Dispute Over Darwin and Divine](#) by Stentor Danielson, 11 February 2003.

<sup>23</sup> Thomas Jungman, please stand up!

<sup>24</sup> [Do Creationists Publish in Notable Refereed Journals?](#) By David Buckna, in Answers in Genesis.

<sup>25</sup> Frank J. Tipler, *Refereed Journals – Do They Insure Quality or Enforce Orthodoxy?*, in *Uncommon Dissent*, William A. Dembski, editor. (Wilmington Delaware: ISI Books, 2004).

<sup>26</sup> Dembski, William A. *No Free Lunch*. (Lanham: Rowan and Littlefield 2002), p. 314.

The atheist scientist sees a universe that is Godless, and that's his right. But the work he produces is also imprinted (tainted?) with his perspective. And many parents, quite frankly, don't care to have their kids immersed in a perspective that does not acknowledge what to them is as plain as the nose on the atheist's face, ie, that there was an intelligent agent at work in the Universe.

Gee. You don't need to be a Ph.D. to see that.

Parents really don't care HOW many judges you get to call evolution a fact, and after the ridiculous ruling in the Kitzmiller Opinion, they have every right to suspect that the idea of evolution is being given preferential treatment.

Parents are saying: "What, you think we can't read our children's biology textbooks? You tell us that there is NO anti-religious message in science education when our kids are taught that..."

- life began all on its own, with no intervention by a Creator (and you observed this how?)
- life evolved by chance processes alone
- this critter evolved from another one (but you can't tell us for sure which ones, nor can you cobble together a convincing stream of fossils for more than a handful of examples when you should have hundreds if not THOUSANDS of them)

Most parents will agree that religion doesn't belong in the science classroom. But when your science classes are legally **required** to teach our children **only** the message that no intelligent agent was necessary, guess what? You just started giving kids 'religious instruction'.

Where is the logic in a court ruling that says we must exclude the idea of an intelligent agent on 'religious' grounds at the front door of science while allowing science to come in the back door and **insist** that our kids accept the notion that no intelligence was required?

What our courts seem to forget is that public education is something that is conducted *In Loco Parentis*, i.e., "in place of the parent". Getting an education in America is mandatory, however, it is also still a privilege that the state (including judges) are entrusted with rather than a "Father Knows Best" role they are entitled to. The role of the public servant is to advise and facilitate the education of children on behalf of and with the consent of the parents. It is not the role of a public servant to dictate to the parents that an unsupportable scientific message is mandatory. And while you're at it – it's also not the responsibility to the state to tell us that we're imagining things, and that there is no conflict between religion and science, and that it is a "contrived duality".

The public education system in America must embrace and meet the needs of *all*

Americans, not just a few - otherwise, it will soon become an exercise in dictating the values sponsored by those who take advantage of our patience rather than an exercise in helping our students down the road of discovery. Thuggery won't work. Gee-ology won't work. And requiring students to memorize state-sponsored facts they don't agree with is not a far cry from state sponsored religious coercion.

About the Author: Kevin Wirth is a Freelance writer and ARN correspondent living in Port Orchard, WA. He has been an interested observer of the evolution debate for over 30 years. You can read his blog posted at [www.arn.org](http://www.arn.org), and you can also find quality education videos and books on ID related topics. You can reach Kevin at kevin @ kevs-korner.com.