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Despite the protestations of its proponents, “intelligent design theory” (ID) is not science but creationism, making it in its essence a supernaturalist religious belief. This fact has been established conclusively for the legal record in Kitzmiller et al. v. Dover Area School District (2005) and for the public by a decade of scholarship, much of which helped to secure the Kitzmiller plaintiffs’ victory in this first legal case involving ID. Moreover, ID is not merely a religious belief but, more specifically, a narrow form of sectarian Christianity, as specified by its own proponents. The nature of ID as a creationist, therefore religious, movement has been revealed not only by its critics, but also, most importantly, by its proponents. The explication of ID by its critics as creationism, and therefore religion, reflects the way the movement views itself.

THE RELIGIOUS ESSENCE OF INTELLIGENT DESIGN

Although its proponents issue strenuous public objections to the contrary, ID is not science but creationism, making it, in its very essence, a supernaturalist religious belief. In Kitzmiller et al. v. Dover Area School District (2005), the first (and so far only) legal case involving ID, Judge John E. Jones III clearly recognized the religious nature of ID:

Not a single expert witness over the course of the six week trial identified one major scientific association, society or organization that endorsed ID as science. . . .

We have concluded that it is not [science], and moreover that ID cannot uncouple itself from its creationist, and thus religious, antecedents (Jones 2005).

In 2004, 11 parents in Dover, Pennsylvania, filed suit to prevent their children from being taught in biology class that ID is a scientific alternative to evolution. A decade of critical scholarship, much of which helped to secure the plaintiffs’ victory through the testimony of expert witnesses, has established conclusively, both for the legal record and for the public at large, the religious essence of ID (Forrest and Gross 2007; National Center for Science Education 2008c). Moreover, ID is not merely a religious belief, but, more specifically, a narrow form of sectarian Christianity, as specified by its own proponents. The nature of ID as a creationist, therefore religious, movement has been revealed not only by its critics, but also, most importantly, by its proponents. The religious essence of ID creationism as explained by its critics merely reflects the way the movement views itself.

Intelligent Design as Creationism

American creationism has developed in phases during the last 40 years, with its particular variations taking shape in response to its proponents’ consistent defeats in federal courts; ID is the most recent variant (National Center for Science Education 2008a). The ID movement is headquartered at the Discovery Institute (DI), a conservative Seattle, Washington, think tank that DI president Bruce Chapman established in 1990. In 1996, the creationist Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture (CRSC) was formally established as a wing of DI. Now called the Center for Science and Culture (CSC), its small group of leading operatives have fomented virtually every major creationist outbreak in the United States since 1999 (Forrest 2007; Forrest and Gross 2007). Most of them have no scientific credentials, although a few are trained scientists. Michael Behe is a biochemist at Lehigh University. Jonathan Wells has a Ph.D. in biology but has never been a practicing scientist, choosing instead to promote ID full time. CSC director Stephen C. Meyer is a philosopher, and William Dembski, ID’s chief intellectual, has degrees in philosophy, mathematics, and divinity (Forrest and Gross 2007). CSC associate director John West, a political scientist, works full time for DI (Center for Science and Culture 2009).

ID is best characterized as “progressive creationism,” a form of old-earth creationism in which God periodically intervenes in natural processes to produce progressively greater complexity in living things; ID proponents contend that natural processes cannot produce complexity (Scott 2005; Forrest and Gross 2007). However, these distinguishing features merely mark ID as the most recent form of creationism; it is the direct descendant of “creation science,” a biblically literalist—thus, young-earth—creationism (Forrest 2005a).

ID’s Development from Creation Science

Young-earth creationism was the standard form of American creationism from the Scopes trial in 1925 until the early 1980s, when the much-publicized ruling in McLean v. Arkansas Board of Education (1982) proved disastrous for “creation science.” Creation science developed in response
to a U.S. Supreme Court ruling, *Epperson v. Arkansas* (1968), that prohibited public schools from banning the teaching of evolution. After *Epperson*, attempting to gain entry for creationism alongside evolution in public schools, its proponents shifted to calling their project “creation science,” a nomenclature that they hoped would project a more scientific appearance, thus increasing their chances of surviving future judicial scrutiny. The strategy failed.

The creation science movement reached its peak in the early 1980s. Equal time for evolution and creation science bills were proposed in at least 27 states in 1980 and 1981. Arkansas and Louisiana passed laws mandating “equal time” for the “two models” of evolution and creation science. . . . *McLean v. Arkansas* pitted a team of plaintiffs’ witnesses that included eminent scientists such as Francisco Ayala, [and] Stephen Jay Gould . . . against a team of creationist defense witnesses . . . who had the impossible task of defending the scientific merits of a young earth and global flood.

*McLean* put creation science on trial, and creation science lost badly. In the January 1982 decision, the judge wrote that creation science was biblical literalist Christianity in disguise, and that to teach it would be to promote a sectarian religious view. . . .

Even conservative Christians recognized that creation science had been a legal disaster . . . (Scott and Matzke 2007).

Creationists now pinned their hopes on the survival of the Louisiana law. In fall 1981, already anticipating a defeat in *McLean* (Scott and Matzke 2007), the Foundation for Thought and Ethics (FTE), a small Christian think tank in Texas, had begun two publishing projects: a book entitled *The Mystery of Life’s Origin: Reassessing Current Theories* (Thaxton et al. 1984) and a creationist high school textbook that was eventually published as *Of Pandas and People* (Kenyon and Davis 1993) after undergoing several name changes as FTE followed the phases of the Louisiana case (see below) (Forrest 2005b). FTE described *Mystery* as “a rigorous scientific critique of the theory of prebiotic evolution” and *Pandans* as “a two-model high school biology textbook that will fairly and impartially view the scientific evidences for creation side by side with evolution” (Scott and Matzke 2007). According to William Dembski, *Mystery* is one of the two seminal books (the other being Michael Denton’s *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*) of the ID movement (Denton 1986; Dembski 1999b). Years later, two of the *Mystery* coauthors, Charles Thaxton and Walter Bradley, along with Dembski, became founding fellows of the CRSC (see below) (Forrest and Gross 2007).

In June 1987, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Edwards v. Aguillard* that since “the preeminent purpose of the Louisiana Legislature was clearly to advance the religious viewpoint that a supernatural being created humankind,” the Louisiana law violated the First Amendment’s separation of church and state and was therefore unconstitutional (*Edwards v. Aguillard* 1987). Creationism was thus in need of yet another public makeover. In December 1988, Thaxton decided that the ostensibly new movement would be called “intelligent design” (Witham 2005). Although his proffered rationale does not mention the *Edwards* decision, this nomenclature was clearly motivated by the post-*Edwards* necessity of referring to creationism in a way that creationists hoped would be unrecognizable, or at least legally untouchable, by federal judges. Moreover, after *Edwards*, the young earth and global flood of Genesis had to be discarded if creationism was to have any chance of surviving future litigation. However, despite such semantic tactics, ID is the recognizable descendant of its predecessor, “creation science” (Scott and Matzke 2007).

**Intelligent Design Proponents Reveal ID as Creationism**

The ID proponents who in 1996 became CRSC fellows have identified their movement as creationism and have referred to themselves as creationists. Before the CRSC made its first high-profile public appearance in the Kansas Board of Education’s effort to remove evolution from its state science standards in 1999, its fellows had spent several years cultivating supporters by candidly stating their creationist, thus religious, agenda. The CRSC outlined this agenda to potential donors in a 1998 document, *The Wedge*, informally known as the “Wedge Document” (Forrest and Gross 2007; National Center for Science Education 2008d).

In this document, the CRSC outlines its 20-year “Wedge Strategy” for getting ID into public schools and the American cultural mainstream. The organization’s understanding of ID as creationism is revealed in the opening statement: “The proposition that human beings are created in the image of God is one of the bedrock principles on which Western civilization was built” (Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture 1998). The CRSC blames “Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, and Sigmund Freud” for the ills of modern society and vows that “Discovery Institute’s Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture seeks nothing less than the overthrow of materialism and its cultural legacies” (Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture 1998). Moreover, the CRSC aligns itself specifically with Christianity: “Design theory promises to reverse the stifling dominance of the materialist worldview, and to replace it with a science consonant with Christian and theistic convictions” (Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture 1998). The strategy explicitly calls for the use of “apologetics seminars” to recruit and train Christian supporters:

Alongside a focus on influential opinion-makers, we also seek to build up a popular base of support among our natural constituency, namely, Christians. We will do this primarily through apologetics seminars. We intend these to encourage and equip believers with new scientific evidences that support the faith, as well as to “popularize” our ideas in the broader culture (Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture 1998).

“Apologetics” is an evangelical term referring to the use of argument to defend Christianity against perceived attacks (Forrest 2005a). Such seminars are used to cultivate supporters who promote the CRSC agenda at the state and local levels (Forrest and Gross 2007).
In the early 1980s, as the Edwards case made its way through the federal courts, Thaxton and other creationists, more or less independently of one another, were seeking to develop a new version of creationism. After the 1987 creationist defeat in Edwards, some of the creationists who would later comprise the ID movement became acquainted at Thaxton’s 1988 conference, “Sources of Information Content in DNA” (Access Research Network 2001; Nelson 2002). Shortly afterward, they coalesced around University of California, Berkeley, law professor Phillip Johnson, who became and remains (although retired) the CRSC program advisor (Center for Science and Culture 2009). Founding CRSC fellow and young-earth creationist Paul Nelson explains Johnson’s revival of creationism as a cultural force following the Edwards defeat:

In that year [1987], a long cultural battle that had begun more than a quarter century earlier . . . appeared . . . to have come decisively to an end when the . . . U.S. Supreme Court declared “creation-science” to be a religious belief. . . .

. . . Edwards v. Aguilard . . . seemed to shut the door permanently on creationism (at least as an admissible dissent in public school science teaching). . . .

. . . A revolution from an unexpected quarter, however, was about to occur. . . . (Nelson 2002).

That revolution was Johnson’s becoming the catalyst for the formal organization of what is now the ID creationist movement in the United States (Forrest and Gross 2007).

In 1992, prefiguring what became a formal part of the CRSC’s strategy in the Wedge Document, Johnson and several of his new ID associates—Demsbski, Behe, and Meyer—invited mainstream, pro-evolution scientists and philosophers to participate in the movement’s first conference, “Darwinism: Scientific Inference or Philosophical Preference?” at Southern Methodist University (Forrest and Gross 2007). FTE, a conference cosponsor, described the event as “a remarkable exchange of views in a symposium between Darwinists and Intelligent Design proponents” (Foundation for Thought and Ethics [undated]). The Wedge Strategy calls for “direct confrontation with the advocates of materialist science through challenge conferences in significant academic settings” (Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture 1998).

Conferencing has therefore been central to the ID movement’s modus operandi, especially in its early years, when it was used as a way of enticing legitimate—and unsuspecting—scientists and scholars to share public platforms with ID creationists, allowing the CRSC to construct a façade of academic legitimacy for public relations purposes. However, in a 1995 article about the SMU conference by CRSC fellow Mark Hartwig for the religious Moody Magazine, aimed at the Wedge Strategy’s “natural constituency” of Christians, Hartwig described Dembski and his ID associates as “evangelical scholars”;

he wrote that “creationists and evolutionists met as equals to discuss serious intellectual questions” (Hartwig 1995).

The word “creationists” referred to his fellow ID proponents. In this initial stage of the Wedge Strategy, candor about the movement’s true nature and goals was essential to securing political and financial backing for its advancement (Forrest and Gross 2007).

In no single person is the transfiguration of creation science into ID more visible than in biologist Dean H. Kenyon, who created a stir by teaching creationism in his biology classes in the early 1980s (Associated Press 1980). In 2007, Kenyon explained that his transition “from evolution to a non-evolutionary view of cosmic and biologic origins . . . began with exposure to creationist literature for the first time in my eighth year of teaching evolution in the Biology Department of San Francisco State University after joining the faculty as a convinced Darwinist and chemical evolutionist” (Kenyon 2007). In the Edwards case, he assisted the defense by submitting a sworn affidavit in 1984, attesting to the scientific integrity of “creation-science”:

It is my professional opinion, based on my original research, study, and teaching, that creation-science is as scientifically sound as evolution . . . Moreover, I believe that a scientifically sound creationist view of origins is not only possible, but is to be preferred over the evolutionary view (Kenyon 1984).

At the same time, he was working as a coauthor on Of Pandas and People (Forrest 2005a). After the Supreme Court declared the Louisiana law unconstitutional in its Edwards decision, Kenyon became one of the earliest CRSC fellows, transitioning seamlessly into an ID proponent (Forrest and Gross 2007). However, as recently as 2000, he admitted that “scientific creationism, which in its modern phase began in the early 1960s, is actually one of the intellectual antecedents of the Intelligent Design movement” (Wiker 2000). Kenyon is a young-earth creationist, of which there are a few others, such as Paul Nelson, in the ID movement. Still a CSC fellow, he also serves on the Advisory Council of the Kolbe Center, a Catholic “lay apostolate,” which—putting itself at odds with the Catholic Church on both biblical interpretation and evolution—promotes the literal interpretation of Genesis, including the belief that Earth is only a few thousand years old (Kenyon 2007; Kolbe Center for the Study of Creation [undated]).

Kenyon’s transition from “creation science” to ID in the wake of the creationists’ defeat in Edwards is also illustrated in his role as Pandas coauthor (Kenyon and Davis 1993). As a central piece of evidence in the Kitzmiller plaintiffs’ case, Pandas provided direct proof that ID is understood by its proponents as creationism. Subpoenaed documents that plaintiffs’ attorneys obtained from the FTE yielded no fewer than five early drafts of this book—the first dated 1983, a second dated 1986, with the third, fourth, and fifth dated 1987—all of which Kenyon coauthored. Except for the fifth draft, all were written using explicit creationist terminology such as “creationist” and “creation biologist.” In the fifth, which was produced after the Supreme Court’s June 1987 Edwards ruling, the creationist language had been expunged and replaced with ID terminology (Forrest 2005b; National Center for Science Education 2008b). However, except for this selective alteration, the fifth draft was the same as the pre-Edwards drafts in which
creationist terminology had been used; thus, this draft constituted a virtual “smoking gun” for the plaintiffs.

The post-Edwards alteration of Pandas points clearly to the ID movement’s anticipation of the need to evade future court challenges. Hence, it shows that they planned to continue their effort to insert creationism into public schools—but as “intelligent design.”

**Intelligent Design as Supernaturalist Religion**

ID proponents at the Discovery Institute deny to the media and to mainstream audiences that they regard the intelligent designer as a supernatural being; indeed, they assert that ID cannot and need not determine the designer’s identity. A Discovery Institute “Truth Sheet” written by DI staffer Casey Luskin during the 2005 Kitzmiller trial exemplifies such denials:

**Truth Sheet # 09-05**

**Does intelligent design postulate a “supernatural creator?”**

**Overview:** No. The ACLU, and many of its expert witnesses, have alleged that teaching the scientific theory of intelligent design (ID) is unconstitutional in all circumstances because it posits a “supernatural creator.” Yet actual statements from intelligent design theorists have made it clear that the scientific theory of intelligent design does not address metaphysical and religious questions such as the nature or identity of the designer (Luskin 2005).

However, as early as the 1992 SMU conference, Dembski had committed himself in writing to specifying the designer’s supernatural identity. Remarkably, not only did he divulge this openly, but in his conference presentation, “The Incompleteness of Scientific Naturalism,” he also stressed that the designer’s supernatural nature is essential:

I want here to examine scientific naturalism. I am going to argue that this view has a serious defect—it is incomplete. As a consequence of this defect I shall argue that it is legitimate within scientific discourse to entertain questions about supernatural design. . . .

We are asking a transcendental question in the Kantian sense: What are the conditions for the possibility of discovering design (i.e., supernatural intervention, nonmaterial interference, divine meddling, call it what you will) in the actual world? This question must be answered at the outset. . . .

. . . By a super-intelligence I mean a supernatural intelligence, i.e., an intelligence surpassing anything that physical processes are capable of offering. This intelligence exceeds anything that humans or finite rational agents in the universe are capable of even in principle (Dembinski 1994).

When the Discovery Institute formally established the CRSC in 1996, Phillip Johnson explicitly defined ID in religious terms, making God as creator the core of his definition:

My colleagues and I speak of “theistic realism”—or sometimes, “mere creation”—as the defining concept of our movement. This means that we affirm that God is objectively real as Creator, and that the reality of God is tangibly recorded in evidence accessible to science, particularly in biology (Johnson 1996).

Johnson’s defining ID as theistic realism confirms its dependence on the existence of a supernatural deity. His alternate definition of ID as “mere creation” is a thinly veiled reference to its biblical basis (see below). The concept of “mere creation” is so important to the ID movement that another of its early conferences was devoted to it. Entitled “Mere Creation: Reclaiming the Book of Nature,” this 1996 event was held at Biola University, formerly the “Bible Institute of Los Angeles” (hence its current name) (Mere Creation 1996). Biola employs several CRSC fellows, holds pro-ID events, and offers a Master of Arts in Science and Religion that incorporates ID (Biola University 2009).

Dembski’s and Johnson’s supernaturalist stipulations concerning ID explain why its proponents reject utterly the naturalistic methodology of modern science. Although creationists have always rejected the naturalistic methodology that has made modern science so successful at explaining the natural world, Johnson’s attack on naturalism, along with his crafting of the Wedge Strategy, is his signature contribution to the ID movement. His earliest article, in 1990, 3 years after the Edwards decision, set the tone for the message that he has consistently broadcast as the movement’s organizer, advisor, and now doyen. According to Johnson, scientists have stacked the deck against creationism by arbitrarily defining science as naturalistic; consequently, having made an a priori philosophical commitment to naturalism the condition for admission to the inner circle of mainstream science, they have unfairly shut creationists out of the (putative) debate about evolution. In 1990, before the ID movement coalesced around him and he became the CRSC advisor, Johnson was not yet so cautious as to avoid the term “creationism”:

Creationists are disqualified from making a positive case, because science by definition is based upon naturalism. The rules of science also disqualify any purely negative argumentation designed to dilute the persuasiveness of the theory of evolution. Creationism is thus out of court—and out of the classroom—before any consideration of evidence. Put yourself in the place of a creationist who has been silenced by that logic, and you may feel like a criminal defendant who has just been told that the law does not recognize so absurd a concept as “innocence.”

With creationist explanations disqualified at the outset, it follows that the evidence will always support the naturalistic alternative (Johnson 1990).

ID proponents also consistently—and therefore, one must conclude, deliberately—conflate the methodology of science with the metaphysical commitment to naturalism (hence, atheism) that takes one beyond methodology. They further conflate naturalism with a crude materialism, as Robert Pennock points out:

ID creationists typically use the term naturalism interchangeably with materialism, even though metaphysical naturalism is a richer concept that says that nature and its
laws are all that exist, but it allows that nature may not be limited to matter per se. More important, they regularly conflate these metaphysical concepts with the related methodological norms that are actually employed by science (Pennock 2007).

Yet, ID proponents go much further than simply rejecting the methodological naturalism of science. Dembski goes so far as to assert that using the naturalistic methodology of science without a “transcendent” designer—i.e., without invoking a supernatural agent as an explanatory principle—actually “stifles” scientific inquiry.

Dembski’s contention that science cannot advance if its methodology is limited to the search for only natural processes raises an unavoidable question: What, according to the religious essence of ID, he also makes Christianity integral to ID in the same article, as one example suffices to show:

Now, within Christian theology there is one and only one way to make sense of transcendent design, and that is as a divine act of creation. . . . My aim is to use divine cre-
ation as a lens for understanding intelligent agency generally. God’s act of creating the world is the prototype for all intelligent agency (creative or not). Indeed, all intelligent agency takes its cue from the creation of the world. How so? God’s act of creating the world makes possible all of God’s subsequent interactions with the world, as well as all subsequent actions by creatures within the world. God’s act of creating the world is thus the prime instance of intelligent agency (Dembksi 1998a).

This article was absorbed into Dembski’s 1999 book Intelligent Design: The Bridge between Science and Theology, in which Jesus Christ has an essential role vis-à-vis both ID and mainstream science. With respect to ID, Jesus’s incarnation and bodily resurrection are part of what Dembski calls the premodern “logic of signs,” i.e., signs of God’s (the designer’s) divine agency—the virgin birth being the sign of the incarnation and the resurrection a sign of both Jesus’s and humankind’s mastery over death (Dembksi 1999a). Rejecting both modernity, “with its commitment to rationality and science,” and post-modernity, which “offers a plurality of separate discourses of which none is privileged,” Dembski prefers a premodern worldview, which is “rich enough to accommodate divine agency” (Dembksi 1999a). His goal is to resitute both science and ID on the foundation of this premodern logic of signs:

My aim in this book then is to take this premodern logic of signs and make it rigorous. In doing so, I intend to preserve the valid insights of modern science as well as the core commitments of the Christian faith.

The rigorous reformulation of the premodern logic of signs is precisely what intelligent design is all about. The premodern logic of signs used signs to identify intelligent causes. Intelligent design is the systematic study of intelligent causes and specifically of the effects they leave behind. . . . (Dembksi 1999a).

Having located ID’s premodern foundation in the person of Jesus, Dembski subsequently explains Jesus’s essentiality to modern science:

My thesis is that all disciplines find their completion in Christ and cannot be properly understood apart from Christ.

If we . . . view Christ as the telos toward which God is drawing the whole of creation, then any view of the sciences that leaves Christ out of the picture must be seen as fundamentally deficient. . . .

Christ is indispensable to any scientific theory, even if its practitioners don’t have a clue about him. . . . [T]he conceptual soundness of the theory can in the end only be located in Christ. . . . (Dembksi 1999a).

In another publication, also aimed at a religious audience, Dembski explicitly reveals the Christian foundation of ID in his definition of it: “Intelligent design . . . embraces the sacramental nature of physical reality. Indeed, intelligent design is just the Logos theology of John’s Gospel restated in the idiom of information theory” (Dembksi 1999b). In a 2007 interview with Focus on the Family, a Christian Right organization, he stated forthrightly that “the Designer of intelligent design is, ultimately, the Christian God” (Williams 2007). He followed with the immediate but wholly implausible assurance that “the focus of my writings is not to try to understand the Christian doctrine of creation; it’s to try to develop intelligent design as a scientific program” and that his research is “going to change the national conversation” (Williams 2007). (As seen below, his own CSC colleague Paul Nelson had undermined that assurance several years earlier.) Most recently, Dembski says that his 2008 book Understanding Intelligent Design: Everything You Need to Know in Plain Language (Dembski and McDowell 2008) “is geared at Christian young people (junior high and high schoolers) as well as for Church groups (e.g., Sunday Schools) to help get out the word about ID” (Dembski 2008).

Despite Dembski’s belated assurance in 2007 of his scientific intentions for ID, his work heretofore shows undeniably that, whereas “creation science” is based on Genesis, the biblical basis of ID is the New Testament Gospel of John. (To avoid disputes with their young-earth creationist allies regarding the age of the earth, the CRSC supplanted Genesis with the New Testament Gospel of John as the biblical basis of ID.) We thus have Dembski’s testimony, written in his own hand, that ID is not only a religious belief, but also a sectarian Christian belief.

The Truth about ID: From Its Own Proponents

In the same publication in which Dembski had defined ID in terms of John’s Gospel in 1999, Nelson gave a candid answer in 2004—in an interview that included Dembski—when asked, “Where is the ID movement going in the next 10 years? What new issues will it be exploring, and what new challenges will it be offering Darwinism?”

Nelson: Easily the biggest challenge facing the ID community is to develop a full-fledged theory of biological design. We don’t have such a theory right now, and that’s a real problem. Without a theory, it’s very hard to know where to direct your research focus. Right now, we’ve got a bag of powerful intuitions, and a handful of notions such as “irreducible complexity” and “specified complexity”—but, as yet, no general theory of biological design (Macosko 2004).

Nelson had been equally candid in 2003, when he told a Dartmouth College audience that he opposed teaching ID in schools: “It isn’t a fully-fledged theory—there isn’t yet enough there to actually teach” (Barry 2003). (In the 2004 interview, responding to the same questions as Nelson, Dembski made a dire prediction about the future of evolutionary theory: “In the next five years, molecular Darwinism—the idea that Darwinian processes can produce complex molecular structures at the subcellular level—will be dead. . . . I therefore foresee a Taliban-style collapse of Darwinism in the next ten years. ID will of course profit greatly from this” [Macosko 2004]).

In 2006, only a few months after the Kitzmiller ruling handed ID proponents a sound defeat, Phillip Johnson, who by that time had devoted 16 years to promoting ID, was equally candid. Revealing that he had viewed the Kitzmiller case as “a loser from the start,” he added,
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I also don’t think that there is really a theory of intelligent design at the present time to propose as a comparable alternative to the Darwinian theory, which is, whatever errors it might contain, a fully worked out scheme. There is no intelligent design theory that’s comparable. Working out a positive theory is the job of the scientific people that we have affiliated with the movement. Some of them are quite convinced that it’s doable, but that’s for them to prove. . . . No product is ready for competition in the educational world (D’Agostino 2006).

Just as ID proponents themselves have confirmed the religious essence of intelligent design, so have they confirmed its scientific bankruptcy.
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