

Truth Sheet #02-06

Critical Analysis of Evolution is *Not* the Same as Teaching Intelligent Design

A favorite Darwinist conspiracy theory is to claim that education policies requiring critical analysis of evolution are simply a guise for teaching intelligent design (ID). For example, Professor Patricia Princehouse was quoted saying “critical analysis is intelligent design relabeled, just as intelligent design was creationism relabeled.”¹ Here are five simple reasons why teaching critical analysis of evolution is very different from teaching about intelligent design:

1) The Educational Approaches are Logically Distinct:

One can critique evolution without discussing "replacement theories" such as intelligent design. For example, Ohio's Critical Analysis of Evolution Lesson Plan offered critiques of arguments for evolution from the fossil record, homology, antibiotic resistance, and endosymbiosis, without any appeals to ID. The theory of ID is not based upon mere refutation of evolution: thus teaching ID requires teaching positive argument for ID. Mere “critical analysis” of evolution does not logically lead to the conclusion of ID.

2) Explicit Statements of Intent to Not Require Teaching ID:

Many places where critical analysis of evolution standards exist have also included explicit disclaimers to ensure that teachers, students, and the public understand that the critical analysis policy does not call for teaching ID. For example, Kansas's State Science Standards, which are presently the strongest standards in the country calling for critical analysis of evolution, state “While the testimony presented at the science hearings included many advocates of Intelligent Design, these standards *neither mandate nor prohibit teaching about this scientific disagreement.*”

3) Scientific Critique is a Separate Legal Category from Teaching about Alternative Theories:

In *Edwards v. Aguillard*, the U.S. Supreme Court clearly distinguished between scientific critiques of prevailing scientific theories, and teaching alternative viewpoints to evolution.² Other courts have followed.³ Critical analysis thus exists as a separate and already-protected legal category.

4) Critics of Darwin that Don't Support ID:

Some critics of Neo-Darwinism, such as structuralists or self-organization proponents, have explicitly disaffirmed intelligent design. For example, in January, 2006, Dr. Richard von Sternberg testified before the South Carolina Board of Education in favor of critical analysis of evolution, yet Sternberg himself is not an ID-proponent. Other prominent Darwin-critics who are not pro-ID include Dr. David Berlinski and Dr. Stuart Kauffman. If critical analysis equals ID then these people apparently do not exist.

5) Final Proof: The Pudding (the Darwinists' own behavior):

It took Darwinists less than two months to file a lawsuit in Dover, Pa, after an explicitly pro-ID policy was passed. If they really believed that policies calling for critical analysis of evolution during science instruction are the same as teaching ID, lawsuits would have already have arisen over the many critical analysis of evolution policies around the United States. But such lawsuits haven't materialized, because they know that critical analysis of evolution is different from teaching about ID.

¹ “Ohio Expected to Rein In Class Linked to Intelligent Design,” by Jodi Rudoren, *New York Times*, February 14, 2006.

² *Edwards v. Aguillard*, 482 U.S. 578, 593, 594 (1987).

³ In *Selman v. Cobb County*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 432 (N.D. Ga., 2005), Judge Clarence Cooper explained in a lawsuit over a textbook disclaimer requiring that be “critically considered,” that “the issue before the Court is not whether it is constitutionally permissible for public school teachers to teach intelligent design.” *Id.* at *3