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Georgia County Opens Door to Creationism

The forces of creationism gained ground in Georgia last week when a local school board unanimously adopted a policy that opens the door to creationist-inspired critiques of evolution in biology classes. The policy follows the board’s decision in March to insert “disclaimers” into new elementary and high school biology textbooks saying that evolution is only a “theory.” The action directly affects only 95,000 students in Cobb County, a suburb of Atlanta and the 28th largest school district in the country. But many science educators say it is part of a national campaign to teach creationist ideas alongside evolution for the sake of “balance.”

An Accurate Disclaimer:

This textbook contains material on science. Science is built around theories, which are strongly supported by factual evidence. Everything in science should be approached with an open mind, studied carefully and critically considered.
Evolution Shares a Desk With 'Intelligent Design'

By Michael Powell
Washington Post Staff Writer
Sunday, December 26, 2004; Page A01

DOVER, Pa. -- "God or Darwin?"

WITNESS CITES SCHOOL BOARD'S ANTI-EVOLUTION BIAS

Religion behind intelligent design policy, former board member
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The Dover school board's effort to ban teaching of evolution is based on a bias against teaching anything that could be interpreted as a secular concept.
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Expert witness Robert Penick, director of the Michigan State University Center for Michigan Studies, testifies before the federal court in Harrisburg, Pa., Wednesday.
In 1925, John Scopes was found guilty of teaching evolution to Tennessee schoolchildren in "the trial of the century." On 26 September, a court in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, will look at the flip side of the controversy—whether a local school district can require that students be told about intelligent design (ID) as an alternative to Darwinian evolution.

The stakes are high. Although defenders of Darwin believe they have both the facts and the law on their side, a loss could be a disaster. "If we prevail, it's not going to be a knockout punch," says Witeili Walzak, a lawyer with the American Civil Liberties Union. But "if we lose, ... you're going to see intelligent design taught in schools all across the country."

The suit was brought last December by 11 parents of children in the 700-student Dover district after a school board, on a 6–1 vote, became the first in the country to instruct teachers not only to inform students of "gaps/problems in Darwin's Theory" but to tell them about "other 25 possible witnesses, including experts in philosophy, theology, science education, and mathematics as well as two veterans of the ID wars, Brown University biologist Kenneth Miller and paleoanthropologist Kevin Padian of the University of California, Berkeley.

The defense is now down to two scientists: Lehigh University biologist Michael J. Behe and Scott Minnich, a microbiologist at the University of Idaho in Moscow. Neither would comment on the pending trial. Two prominent figures who agreed to be witnesses—Stephen C. Meyer of the Discovery Institute, a think tank that promotes Dembski before the orders of the West, as Center is only that between: But 1 what's ge
cagey—1

Trial Description not just in SCIENCE magazine...

But in the ultimate news source:

Squaring off. Brown's Ken Miller (left) and Lehigh's Michael Behe (above, center) are veterans of the evolution debate who are scheduled to testify.

Kenneth Miller and paleoanthropologist Kevin Padian of the University of California, Berkeley.

The defense is now down to two scientists: Lehigh University biologist Michael J. Behe and Scott Minnich, a microbiologist at the University of Idaho in Moscow. Neither would comment on the pending trial. Two prominent figures who agreed to be witnesses—Stephen C. Meyer of the Discovery Institute, a think tank that promote Dembski before the orders of the West, as Center is only that between: But 1 what's genetic
Dover voters didn’t wait for the Court to Decide

Dover boots board

Board members who made changes to science class received the fewest votes.

By MICHELLE STARR
Daily Record/Sunday News
Wednesday, November 9, 2005

At bottom: INTELLIGENT DESIGN AND NEW BOARD

Dover CARES candidates swept the race for school board Tuesday, defeating board members who supported the curriculum change that was challenged in federal court.

After months of fierce campaigning that included

'Intelligent-design' school board ousted in Penn

Wed Nov 9, 2005 12:35 AM ET

By Jon Hurdle

DOVER, Pennsylvania (Reuters) - Voters on Tuesday ousted a Pennsylvania local school board that promoted an "intelligent-design" alternative to teaching evolution, and elected a new slate of candidates who promised to remove the concept from science classes.

The board of Dover Area School District in south-central Pennsylvania lost eight of its nine incumbents in an upset election that surprised even the challengers, who had been hoping for a bare majority to take control of the board.
Issuing Rebuke, Judge Rejects Teaching of Intelligent Design

By LAURIE GOODSTEIN
Published: December 21, 2005

A federal judge ruled on Tuesday that it was unconstitutional for a Pennsylvania school district to present intelligent design as an alternative to evolution in high school biology courses because it is a religious viewpoint that advances "a particular version of Christianity."

In the nation's first case to test the legal merits of intelligent design, the judge, John E. Jones III, issued a broad, stinging rebuke to its advocates and provided strong support for scientists who have fought to bar intelligent design from the science curriculum.

Judge Jones also excoriated members of the Dover, Pa., school board, who he said lied to cover up their religious motives, made a decision of "breathtaking inanity" and "dragged" their community into "this legal maelstrom with its resulting utter waste of monetary and personal resources."

Judge Jones, a Republican appointed by President Bush, concluded that intelligent design was not science, and that in order to claim that it is, its proponents admit they must change the very definition of science to include supernatural explanations.
Why is Evolution under attack? Is it because it's scientifically suspect? Or is there a deeper reason?

Can we learn anything from the Dover trial?

Judge Jones’ Memorandum and Order in this case has been docketed.

342  Opinion  12/20/05
1) Arguments based on the fossil record as a “problem” for evolution failed.

The Fossil Record doesn’t support evolution?

“So many intermediate forms have been discovered between fish and amphibians, between amphibians and reptiles, between reptiles and mammals, and along the primate lines of descent that it often is difficult to identify categorically when the transition occurs from one to another particular species.”

National Academy of Sciences, 1999
Eocene evolution of whale hearing
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The origin of whales (order Cetacea) is one of the best-documented examples of macroevolutionary change in vertebrates1-3. As the earliest whales became obligately marine, all of their organ systems adapted to the new environment. The fossil record indicates that this evolutionary transition took less than 15 million years, and that different organ systems followed different evolutionary trajectories. Here we document the evolutionary changes that took place in the sound transmission mechanism of the outer and middle ear in early whales. Sound transmission mechanisms change early on in whale evolution and pass through a stage (in pakicetids) in which hearing in both air and water is unsophisticated. This intermediate stage is soon abandoned and is replaced (in remingtonocetids and protocetids) by a sound transmission mechanism similar to that in modern toothed whales. The mechanism of these fossil whales lacks sophistication, and land mammals use to hear airborne sound.

Evolution Of Whale Hearing Unfolds In Fossil Record

Arlington, Va. -- An international team of scientists has traced the evolution of hearing in modern cetaceans (whales, dolphins and porpoises). "This study of the early evolution of whales demonstrates the changes that took place in whales' outer and middle ears, required for the transition from a land-based to a marine-based existence," said Rich Lane, director of the National Science Foundation (NSF)'s geology and paleontology program, which funded the research.

The findings are published in the Aug. 12 issue of the journal Nature.

The ear is the most important sense organ for modern toothed whales, say scientists, because these whales locate their prey using echolocation. Directional hearing is critical: A blind such whale could find food without much trouble; a deaf one would starve.

The study documents how hearing in these whales evolved. The research is
A ‘Missing Link’ Is Found

With the discovery of fossils of the Tiktaalik, or "large shallow water fish," scientists have found a missing connection between fishes and walking land creatures.

Once we invoke Darwin's mechanism, we immediately place testable constraints on the patterns of natural history. If organisms show common ancestry, then we should find a nested series of relationships between existing organisms, which in fact we do. We should find that novel organs and structures are found only in the actual descendants of ancient species in which those structures first appeared, which is also true. Finally, and most importantly, we should find a consistent pattern of ancestor-descendant relationships that expands as new discoveries fill in the details of the fossil record. We have.

From Finding Darwin’s God
2) Data from whole genome sequencing could not be refuted by ID advocates

Chimp genetic code opens human frontiers
Genome comparison reveals many similarities — and crucial differences

By Alan Boyle
Science editor
MSNBC
Updated: 4:20 p.m. ET Sept. 1, 2005

Scientists unleashed a torrent of studies comparing the genetic coding for humans and chimpanzees on Wednesday, reporting that 96 percent of our DNA sequences are identical. Even more intriguingly, the other 4 percent appears to contain clues to how we became different from our closest relatives in the animal kingdom, they said.

"We're really looking at an individual evolutionary event, and this is spectacular," said University of Washington geneticist Robert Waterston, senior author of a study in the journal Nature presenting the draft of the chimpanzee genome.
Example: the Evolutionary Hypothesis of Common Ancestry

Chromosome Numbers in the great apes:

- human (*Homo*) 46
- chimpanzee (*Pan*) 48
- gorilla (*Gorilla*) 48
- orangutan (*Pogo*) 48

**Testable prediction:** If these organisms share common ancestry, the human genome must contain a fused chromosome.
Chromosome Numbers in the great apes (Hominidae):

- human (Homo) 46
- chimpanzee (Pan) 48
- gorilla (Gorilla) 48
- orangutan (Pogo) 48

**Testable prediction:** The marks of that fusion must appear in one of the human chromosomes.
Chromosome 2 is unique to the human lineage of evolution, having emerged as a result of head-to-head fusion of two acrocentric chromosomes that remained separate in other primates. The precise fusion site has been located in 2q13–2q14.1 (ref. 2; hg 16:114455823 – 114455838), where our analysis confirmed the presence of multiple subtelomeric duplications to chromosomes 1, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 21 and 22 (Fig. 3; Supplementary Fig. 3a, region A). During the formation of human chromosome 2, one of the two centromeres became inactivated (2q21, which corresponds to the centromere from chimp chromosome 13) and the centromeric structure quickly deteriorated (42).

3) The “icons” of intelligent design were exposed as false

Specifically Refuted at the Trial:

- the bacterial flagellum
- the blood clotting cascade
- the generation of biological information
The bacterial flagellum actually contains many parts homologous to other systems.

ID advocates claim that the bacterial flagellum could not have evolved, because its set of unique protein parts is “irreducibly complex.”
Careful analysis of the bacterial flagellum matches evolutionary theory, not the design-creation model.
Emergence of Nylon Oligomer Degradation Enzymes in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* PAO through Experimental Evolution
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Through selective cultivation with 6-aminohexanoate linear dimer, a by-product of nylon-6 manufacture, as the sole source of carbon and nitrogen, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* PAO, which initially has no enzyme activity to degrade this xenobiotic compound, was successfully expanded in its metabolic ability. Two new enzyme activities, 6-aminohexanoate cyclic dimer hydrolase and 6-aminohexanoate dimer hydrolase, were detected in the adapted strains.

Recent developments in the chemical industry have resulted in the production and distribution of various synthetic compounds. Nylon-6 is produced by ring cleavage polymerization of caprolactam, in which the monomeric unit, 6-aminohexanoate (Ahx), is combined by amide bonds with a degree of polymerization of >100, producing by-products of linear or cyclic oligomers of Ahx (called nylon oligomers). We have previously isolated two microorganisms, *Flavobacterium* sp. strain K172 (7) and *Pseudomonas* sp. strain NK87 (6), that grow with the Ahx cyclic dimer (Acd) as the sole source of carbon and nitrogen. The degradation of xenobiotic compounds is highly dependent on specific enzymes, i.e., 6-aminohexanoate cyclic dimer hydrolase (enzyme I [EII]) (8), 6-aminohexanoate dimer hydrolase (EII) (9), and endo- and exo-type 6-aminohexanoate oligomer hydrolases (EIII) (11) and the acetyl-CoA acyl transferase (12) was then transferred to Acd minimal medium (3 g of Acd per liter containing salt mixture A) in a 1% inoculation. After observing slight growth (A_{600} of culture broth, 0.02 to 0.05) in the third week, this culture was retransferred to the Acd minimal medium (1% inoculation). It was only in the third month that the turbidity of the culture broth reached 1 at A_{600}. Strain PAO5502 selected from this culture on the Acd minimal plate (Acd minimal medium containing 1.3% agar) was able to grow to approximately 10^7 cells per ml in either Acd or Acd minimal medium (3 g of Acd per liter containing salt mixture A) within only 4 days. The newly obtained abilities of PAO5502 were retained even after five successive cultivations on Glu minimal medium (3 g of glucose plus 1 g of NH_4Cl per liter containing salt mixture A).

**Nylon: first synthesized in 1937**

*(information for a new enzyme, produced by evolution)*
Darwinian Explanations are Doomed:

“As scientists, we yearn to understand how this magnificent mechanism came to be, but the complexity of the system dooms all Darwinian explanations to frustration. Sisyphus himself would pity us.” (p. 139)

Why? Because the system has multiple parts:

“In the absence of the machine, the parts never get cut out and joined. In the absence of the signals, it's like expecting a machine that's randomly cutting paper to make a paper doll. And, of course, in the absence of the message for the antibody itself, the other components would be pointless.” (p. 130)

ID tells us not to bother with research. (Example: gene-shuffling in the immune system)
However — Between 1996 and 2005 each element of the “transposon hypothesis” of VDJ evolution was scientifically confirmed.

Kapitonov & Jurka (2005) RAG1 Core and V(D)J Recombination Signal Sequences Were Derived from Transib Transposons. Public Library of Science, Biol. 3: e181..
Somatic diversification of variable lymphocyte receptors in the agnathan Seelauf. 

Transposition of hAT elements links transposable elements and V(D)J recombination.

The descent of the antibody-based immune system by gradual evolution.

Sharks and the Origins of Vertebrate Immunity.

Sharks, which have existed for as many as 450 million years, offer glimpses of a distant period in the evolution of the immune system.
“In fact, on cross-examination, Professor Behe was questioned concerning his 1996 claim that science would never find an evolutionary explanation for the immune system. He was presented with fifty-eight peer-reviewed publications, nine books, and several immunology textbook chapters about the evolution of the immune system; however, he simply insisted that this was still not sufficient evidence of evolution, and that it was not “good enough.”” (23:19 (Behe))."
How to Respond?

By fighting the presumption that evolution is anti-religious.

Partisans on both sides are eager to display the conflict as an either-or proposition.

If evolution is right, then creation is wrong (and vice versa).
But, hasn’t Darwin’s legacy, in league with modern biology, been to show that we are prisoners of chemistry and physics, the meaningless result of chance encounters between atoms and molecules in a pointless, purposeless universe?
Modern science directly implies that there are no inherent moral or ethical laws, no absolute guiding principles for human society.”

William Provine

If religion, including the dogmatic secular ideologies, can be systematically analyzed and explained as a product of the brain's evolution, its power as an external source of morality will be gone forever.

Daniel Dennett
Fact: There is no shortage of scientists willing to enlist evolution against faith.

Whatever the God implied by evolutionary theory and the data of natural history may be like, He is not the Protestant God of waste not, want not. He is also not a loving God who cares about His productions. He is not even the awful God portrayed in the book of Job. The God of the Galápagos is careless, wasteful, indifferent, almost diabolical. He is certainly not the sort of God to whom anyone would be inclined to pray.

David Hull
**Assertion:** That science alone can lead us to truth regarding the purpose of existence (which is, of course, that it does not have one).

**Reality:** That such statements are philosophical (not scientific) in nature, and therefore are not testable by the methods of science. In fact, they have no more scientific standing that faith-based assertions on the nature of existence.
The Key Question is whether science carries us as deeply into the mystery of life as we truly wish to go
People of faith would argue that it does not

• This is not a rejection of science, but a recognition of its limitations.
• An understanding of the validity of this choice is the first step in making peace between science & religion.
A God “who makes all things new” is certainly not one who would have imprinted a static, inflexible order into his living world. Nor is He one who could have created only in the simple and direct ways of human nature.

Isaiah Chapter 55:8-9

For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, says the LORD.

For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts higher than your thoughts.
1) Evolution contradicts the Genesis story of creation.
2) The chance, random nature of evolution rules out a Divine plan.
3) Evolution's naturalistic mechanism leaves no role for God's actions.
4) If God's intent was to create us, why use a mechanism as indirect and time-consuming as evolution?
5) The Darwinian cruelty of the "struggle for existence" is incompatible with a merciful God.
6) Evolution is inconsistent with the character of the Christian God.
2) The chance, random nature of evolution rules out a Divine plan.

- Evolution is unpredictable, but it is not “random.”
- Chance is genuine, and chance affects the lives of each of us.
- All histories (political, human, and natural) are contingent processes.
- The contingent and unpredictable nature of all historical processes leaves the future open and undetermined.
Even St. Thomas Aquinas argued that a world devoid of chance or contingency could not really be distinct from its God. "It would be contrary to the nature of providence and to the perfection of the world if nothing happened by chance."

Thus, the randomness and undirected features of evolution are not just "apparent" as some of the "separatists" would argue. They are, in fact, essential features of any world created by a gracious God.
5) The cruelty of a "struggle for existence" is incompatible with a merciful God. “Nature red in tooth and claw” doesn’t fit with the idea of a loving God.
• All organisms are born to die (An observable fact, not an invention of Darwinism).

• In a material world, life comes only at the cost of death (Again, a fact, not an invention of Darwin).

• Just as sin defines virtue, from the struggle for existence comes the evolutionary possibility of perfection.
Theological Point: Evolution defines a relationship between Creator and created based on moral independence and free will.

“...evolution was much more than an indirect pathway to get to you and me. By choosing evolution as his way to fashion the living world, He emphasized our material nature and our unity with other forms of life. He made the world today contingent upon the events of the past. He made our choices matter, our actions genuine, our lives important. In the final analysis, he used evolution as the tool to set us free.”

*From Finding Darwin’s God*
#1) Evolution contradicts the Genesis story of creation.
#1) Evolution contradicts the Genesis story of creation.

• Assertions that Genesis requires an instantaneous, unchanging creation are inconsistent with scripture:

1:11 And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit..

1:20 And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

1:21 And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, ...
Assertions that Genesis requires a creation *ex nihilo* are inconsistent with a literal reading (Continued):

2:7 And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

2:9 And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food.

2:19 And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air.
Should the Bible be read as a scientific textbook?

“Even a non-Christian knows something about the earth, the heavens, ... the kinds of animals, shrubs, stones, and so forth, and this knowledge he holds to as being certain from reason and experience. Now it is a disgraceful and dangerous thing for an infidel to hear a Christian, presumably giving the meaning of Holy Scripture, talking nonsense on these topics; and we should take all means to prevent such an embarrassing situation, in which people show up vast ignorance in a Christian and laugh it to scorn.”

St. Augustine, 411 AD
On the Literal Meaning of Genesis, 1:19
Abbot of the Augustinian Monastery of St. Thomas in Brünn
63. According to the widely accepted scientific account, the universe erupted 15 billion years ago in an explosion called the "Big Bang" and has been expanding and cooling ever since. Later there gradually emerged the conditions necessary for the formation of atoms, still later the condensation of galaxies and stars, and about 10 billion years later the formation of planets. In our own solar system and on earth (formed about 4.5 billion years ago), the conditions have been favorable to the emergence of life. While there is little consensus among scientists about how the origin of this first microscopic life is to be explained, there is general agreement among them that the first organism dwelt on this planet about 3.5-4 billion years ago. Since it has been demonstrated that all living organisms on earth are genetically related, it is virtually certain that all living organisms have descended from this first organism.

69. The current scientific debate about the mechanisms at work in evolution requires theological comment insofar as it sometimes implies a misunderstanding of the nature of divine causality. Many neo-Darwinian scientists, as well as some of their critics, have concluded that, if evolution is a radically contingent materialistic process driven by natural selection and random genetic variation, then there can be no place in it for divine providential causality. .... But it is important to note that, according to the Catholic understanding of divine causality, true contingency in the created order is not incompatible with a purposeful divine providence. Divine causality and created causality radically differ in kind and not only in degree. Thus, even the outcome of a truly contingent natural process can nonetheless fall within God’s providential plan for creation.
July 7, 2005

Finding Design in Nature

BY CHRISTOPH SCHÖNBORN

Vienna

EVER since 1996, when Pope John Paul II said that evolution (a term he did not define) was "more than just a hypothesis," defenders of neo-Darwinian dogma have often invoked the supposed acceptance - or at least acquiescence - of the Roman Catholic Church when they defend their theory as somehow compatible with Christian faith.

But this is not true. The Catholic Church, while leaving to science many details about the history of life on earth, proclaims that by the light of reason the human intellect can readily and clearly discern purpose and design in the natural world, including the world of living things.

Evolution in the sense of common ancestry might be true, but evolution in the neo-Darwinian sense - an unguided, unplanned process of random variation and natural selection - is not. Any system of thought that denies or seeks to explain away the overwhelming evidence for design in biology is ideology, not science.

Consider the real teaching of our beloved John Paul. While his rather vague and unimportant 1996 letter about evolution is always and everywhere cited, we see no one discussing these comments from a 1985 general audience that represents his robust teaching on nature:
Leading Cardinal Redefines Church's View on Evolution

By CORNELIA DEAN and LAURIE GOODSTEIN

An influential cardinal in the Roman Catholic Church, which has long been regarded as an ally of the theory of evolution, is now suggesting that belief in evolution as accepted by science today may be incompatible with Catholic faith.

The cardinal, Christoph Schönborn, archbishop of Vienna, a theologian who is close to Pope Benedict XVI, staked out his position in an Op-Ed article in The New York Times on Thursday, writing, "Evolution in the sense of common ancestry might be true, but evolution in the neo-Darwinian sense - an unguided, unplanned process of random variation and natural selection - is not."

In a telephone interview from a monastery in Austria, where he was on retreat, the cardinal said that his essay had not been approved by the Vatican, but that two or three weeks before Pope Benedict XVI's election in April, he spoke with the pope, then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, about the church's position on evolution. "I said I would like to have a more explicit statement about that, and he encouraged me to go on," said Cardinal Schönborn.
July 22, 2005

His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI
00120 Vatican City

Your Holiness:

In his magnificent letter to the Pontifical Academy in 1996 regarding the subject of Evolution, Pope John Paul II affirmed that scientific rationality and the Church’s spiritual commitment to divine purpose and meaning in the Universe were not incompatible. The Pope accepted that biological Evolution had progressed beyond the hypothetical stage as a guiding principle before Earth, including human significance that one day scientific theories them selves lack of divinity, and/or the Church.

The Holy Father understanding of Scripture make it mean something of their own proper field.

July 13, 2005

Questions for Pope on Evolution Stance

By CORNELIA DEAN

Three scientists, two of them Roman Catholic biologists, have asked Pope Benedict XVI to clarify the church's position on evolution in light of recent statements by Cardinal Christoph Schönborn, an influential theologian, that the modern theory of evolution may be incompatible with Catholic faith.

The scientists asked the pope to reaffirm earlier statements on the subject by Pope John Paul II and others "that scientific rationality and the church's commitment to divine purpose and meaning in the universe were not incompatible." It is crucial, their letter says, "that in these difficult and contentious times the Catholic Church not build a new divide, long ago eradicat ed, between the scientific method and religious belief."

Lawrence M. Krauss, a physicist at Case Western Reserve University, wrote the letter on behalf of himself and the two biologists, Dr. Francisco J. Ayala of the University of California, Irvine, a former Dominican priest, and Kenneth R. Miller of Brown University, a Roman Catholic who has written on the reconciliation of science and faith.
Kenneth R. Miller: The cardinal's big mistake: Darwin didn't contradict God

01:00 AM EDT on Wednesday, August 10, 2005

IT'S NEVER BEEN EASY being Charles Darwin. Rodney Dangerfield talked about getting "no respect," but the brickbats thrown Darwin's way are putting poor Rodney to shame. Alabama pastes warning stickers in any textbook that mentions evolution; a member of the Kansas Board of Education pronounces evolution "biologically, genetically, mathematically, chemically and metaphysically impossible." And now even a cardinal of the Catholic Church has taken a potshot at poor old Charles.

Austrian Cardinal Christoph Schonborn, editor of the Church's Catechism, recently wrote that any notion that neo-Darwinian theory is "somehow compatible with Christian faith" is simply "not true."

The cardinal asserted that evolution is an "unguided, unplanned process of random variation and natural selection." Evolution, in his view, isn't science so much as a "materialistic philosophy" that denies the existence of a creator's plan. It's anti-Christian, and it's bad science to boot.
“I see no difficulty in reconciling a belief in Creation with the theory of evolution, given one precondition: that the proper boundaries of a scientific theory are respected.”
Vatican newspaper (L'Osservatore Romano) condemns "intelligent design" considering it only confuses children if corroborated with evolutionary theory

The author of the article in the Vatican newspaper “L'Osservatore Romano”, Fiorenzo Facchini, is teaching evolutionary biology at the University of Bologna:

“This isn’t how science is done. If the model proposed by Darwin is deemed insufficient, one should look for another, but it’s not correct from a methodological point of view to take oneself away from the scientific field pretending to do science. It only creates confusion between the scientific plane and those that are philosophical or religious.”

Intelligent design “doesn’t belong to science and the pretext that it be taught as a scientific theory alongside Darwin’s explanation is unjustified.”
"We are not some casual and meaningless product of evolution. Each of us is the result of a thought of God. Each of us is willed, each of us is loved, each of us is necessary"
The point of the pope's homily was not to take issue with evolution itself, but with the philosophical view that humans are nothing more than the casual and meaningless products of that process. Schönborn's ill-considered op-ed made the same point, but erred in its mistaken assertion that these philosophical views are an inherent part of neo-Darwinian theory. The authentic lesson to be stressed is that “divine causality can be active in a process that is both contingent and guided,” a process like evolution.

The Holy Father's concerns are not with evolution per se, but with how evolution is understood in our modern world. Biological evolution fits neatly into a traditional Catholic understanding of how contingent natural processes can be seen as part of God's plan, while "evolutionist" philosophies denying the Divine do not. That was the point of the pope's coronation homily.

Despite claims to the contrary by the ID camp, a careful reading suggests that the new pope will give quarter neither to the enemies of spirituality nor the enemies of evolutionary science. And that's exactly as it should be.
“There is grandeur in this view of life; with its several powers having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most wonderful and most beautiful have been, and are being evolved.”