

Review: *Traipsing Into Evolution: Intelligent Design and the Kitzmiller vs. Dover Decision*, Discovery Institute Press, Seattle, WA, 2006

Pages: 123

Toothless Judicial Activism Exposed

A much-needed summary of Evolution's most recent legal propaganda victory, in preventing even a short statement of Intelligent Design from being read in a school science classes in Dover, Pennsylvania.

Judge Jones III is shown to be out of his depth philosophically and scientifically. He simply assumes consensus 'science' must be true, and is intolerant of Intelligent Design as a scientifically valid theory based on empirical observation and induction.

When the smoke is cleared away, the only precedent set is further stifling of free scientific enquiry at the expense of truth.

Introduction: Judicial Courage or Judicial Overreach? (pp. 7-14)

Alschuler believed Judge Jones thought, "Dover is simply Scopes trial redux".

Kitzmiller:

1. Pushes a partisan history of ID.
2. Makes an unpersuasive case against ID.
3. Is biased against religion.
4. Holds little value as precedent.

I) Painkiller's Partisan History of Intelligent Design (pp. 15-24)

In *Edwards v. Aguillard* (1987), SCOTUS struck down a Louisiana creationism law.

“Science can identify an intellect, but is powerless to tell us if that intellect is within the universe or beyond.”

II) Kitzmiller’s Unpersuasive Case Against the Scientific Status of Intelligent Design (pp. 25-57)

Judge Jones conflated whether something was scientific with which scientific theory is the most popular.

Martin Eger re: defining the scientific method, “demarcation arguments have collapsed”.

Intelligent agents, “find highly isolated and improbable functional sequences amid vast spaces of combinatorial possibilities”. [p36]

Irreducible complexity (IC) provides negative evidence against neo-Darwinism.

IC is a special case of specified complexity.

There are no detailed Darwinian accounts of any biochemical or cellular system.

Co-optation does nothing to refute IC.

Most biology research grants are pegged to Darwinism which keeps the religion going.

In *Daubert v. Merrel Dow Pharmaceuticals*, SCOTUS held, “publication ... is not a *sine qua non* of admissibility; it does not necessarily correlate with reliability.”

IC is easily testable via knockout experiments.

III) Kitzmiller’s Failure to Treat Religion in a Neutral Manner (pp. 58-71)

William Provine: “Evolution is the greatest engine of atheism ever invented.” [p61]

Heresy trials are foreign to the U.S. Constitution.

IV) The Limited Value of Kitzmiller as Precedent (pp. 72-76)

The Dover Area Scholl District in question were voted out of office six weeks before the case opinion was released. This means there is no party with a stake in correcting the judge's errors.

The district eventually agreed to pay \$1M in claims.

V) The Need to Protect Academic Freedom (pp. 77-78)

Appendix A) Whether ID Is Science: A Response to the Opinion of the Court in Kitzmiller vs. Dover Area School District (pp. 79-92)

The court took a “restricted sociological view” of science, i.e., scientific consensus.

Bare assertion that one kind of complex system can turn into another is no evidence at all.

Professor Behe provided evidence of IC in the bacterial flagellum, blood-clotting cascade mechanism, and the immune system.

ID relies on *induction* based on physical evidence, not analogy. Induction is falsifiable by showing that *dissimilarities* make a relevant difference to the phenomenon.

Darwinism cannot be proved by simply comparing organisms.

Appendix B) Selected Peer-Reviewed and Peer-Edited Publications Supporting the Theory of Intelligent Design (Annotated) (pp. 93-102)

Chance and necessity cannot explain sign systems.

Complex information refers to observed patterns which are highly improbable by chance alone.

Appendix C) Brief of Amici Curiae Biologists and Other Scientists in Support of the Defendants in Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District (pp. 103-123)

NS is so important because it permits ‘design’ of the natural theologian, solely by natural means.

Scientific critique of Darwinism logically begins with critique of it as an empirically adequate scientific theory.