

1. October 2002 – Case Western Reserve University and University of Cincinnati - Poll of 460 science professors in Ohio. Between 90 and 97 % of professors:

- a. Are not aware of valid evidence or an alternate scientific theory that challenges the fundamental principles of the theory of evolution
- b. Believe that Intelligent Design is a religious view.
- c. Believe that high school students should be tested on their understanding of evolution.
- d. Do not believe that high school students should be tested on their understanding of intelligent design.
- e. Do not use the concept of intelligent design in their research.

These results were verified in a conversation with the study's author, Dr. George Bishop, Professor of Political Science at the University of Cincinnati.

2. Project Steve – Supporters of ID and other creationist ideas state that many scientists support them. The video handed out recently in Darby lists over 100 scientists that support irreducible complexity and intelligent design.

At the present time, over 400 scientists endorse this statement:

Evolution is a well supported, unifying principle of the biological sciences, and the scientific evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the idea that all living things share a common ancestry. Although there are legitimate scientific debates about the patterns and processes of evolution, there is no serious scientific doubt that evolution occurred or that natural selection is a major mechanism of

evolution. It is scientifically inappropriate and pedagogically irresponsible for creationist pseudoscience, including but not limited to “intelligent design” to be introduced into the science curricula of the public schools.

The scientists endorsing this statement are all named “Steve” in honor of Stephen J. Gould (Stephani, etc. are also allowed). They represent 10’s of thousands of scientists.

3. A long list of prestigious scientific and educational organizations support the teaching of evolution in schools but do not support the teaching of ID. A couple of examples:

1999-National Academy of Sciences. (Chartered in 1863 by Congress to advise the Federal Government on Scientific and Technical matters. Election to the Academy is considered one of the highest honors accorded a scientist.)

From the booklet “Science and Creationism, A view from the National Academy of Sciences.”

“The claim that equity demands balanced treatment of evolutionary theory and special creation in science classrooms reflects a misunderstanding of what science is and how it is conducted”.

“Creationism, Intelligent Design, and other claims of supernatural intervention in the origin or life of species are not science because they are not testable by the methods of science. “

“ No body of beliefs that has its origin in doctrinal material rather than scientific observation, interpretation, and experimentation should be admissible as science in any science course. Incorporating the teaching of such doctrines

into a science curriculum compromises the objectives of public education.”

We have ordered a copy of a book entitled “Teaching about evolution and the nature of Science” by NAS, as a reference, If there is truly an interest in improving the critical thinking skills and better understanding of science by students this would be an excellent foundation to built upon.

2002- American Association for the Advancement of Science. (The world’s largest general scientific society and publisher of Science. Science has been described as the single most prestigious scientific publication in the U.S. and the gold standard of peer reviewed scientific journals).

Passed a resolution that states in part – Therefore be it resolved that the lack of scientific warrant for so-called “Intelligent Design Theory” makes it improper to include as part of science education....further resolved that AAAS urges citizens across the nation to oppose policies that permit the teaching of “intelligent design theory” as part of the science curricula of the public schools.

4. The bibliography of articles is misleading.

The National Center for Science Education website contains analysis of this bibliography. According to NCSE the quotes below are from some of the authors about how their work is being used. Glenn Branch of NCSE compiled the analysis and communicated with the authors. Below are quotes from 4 of the authors, there are many others available.

Dr. David P Mindell (coauthor of item 14) Dr. Mindell is an Associate Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and the University of Michigan. This comment was verified in a conversation with Dr. Mendell.: "The words enclosed in quotation marks are accurate. however, the quotes are entirely misinterpreted and taken out of context. This is just as the scientific community, and at least some of the public, has come to expect from the Discovery Institute."

Dr. Scott Gilbert (coauthor of item 25 and 27). Dr. Gilbert is a Professor of Biology at Swarthmore College near Philadelphia. This statement was verified by Dr. Gilbert. "My research on turtles and my research into developmental biology is fully within Darwinian parameters. My gripe has been that neo-Darwinism has supposed that population genetics was the only genetics needed to explain Darwinian evolution. I claim that developmental genetics is also needed. So my research has been to include developmental genetics into the Darwinian mix."

David M Williams (coauthor of item 18): "The short answer to your question, 'Do you consider this accurate?', is no."

None of the 26 respondents (representing 34 of the 44 publications in the Bibliography) agreed that their cited work provided any support for "intelligent design"; many were indignant at the suggestion. For example, Douglas H Erwin (author of item 8 in the Bibliography), answered:

Of course not - ["intelligent design"] is a *non sequitur*, nothing but a fundamentally flawed attempt to promote creationism under a different guise. *Nothing* in this paper or any of my other work provides the slightest scintilla of support for "intelligent design". To argue that it does requires a deliberate and pernicious misreading of the papers.