

12

The Wedge of Intelligent Design *Retrograde Science, Schooling, and Society*

Barbara Forrest and Paul R. Gross

From the sixth century up to the Enlightenment it is safe to say that the West was thoroughly imbued with Christian ideals and that Western intellectual elites were overwhelmingly Christian. False ideas that undermined the very foundations of the Christian faith (e.g., denying the resurrection or the Trinity) were swiftly challenged and uprooted. Since the Enlightenment, however, we have not so much lacked the means to combat false ideas as the will and clarity.

—William A. Dembski and Jay Wesley Richards,
Unapologetic Apologetics

Premodernity had one thing going for it that neither modernity nor postmodernity could match, namely, a worldview rich enough to accommodate divine agency.

—William A. Dembski, *Intelligent Design: The Bridge between Science and Theology*

Intelligent design creationists at the Discovery Institute's Center for Science and Culture (CSC), or "the Wedge," as they call themselves, have a paradoxical plan for carrying out their "Wedge Strategy": they will advance toward the future by resurrecting the past.¹ The past for which they yearn, driven by their abhorrence of the modern world, was by every reasonable human standard a failed one. But, as is evident in our epigraphs by two chief Wedge apologists, William Dembski and Jay Richards, they yearn for the premodern age when anti-Christian transgressions such as "denying the Trinity" could be dealt with in summary fashion by the faith's defenders. That it was the brutal excesses of such defense that led to the Enlightenment, which called for reason, science, and secular constitutional government to resist absolute political and religious power, apparently does nothing to recommend the Enlightenment to Dembski, who judges the "ideologies" of "Enlightenment rationalism" and "scientific naturalism" to be "false" and "bankrupt" (Dembski 1999, 14–15). He instead defends "premodernity," because, he asserts, "modernity, with its commitment to rationality and science, is wonderfully adept at discerning the regularities of nature" but "woefully deficient at discerning the hand of God against

the backdrop of those regularities" (44). That seems to be his argument against all intellectual life since the dark ages.

More than a decade after the Wedge's coalescence, intelligent design (ID) scientists have produced no science to support their claims that ID is a new, revolutionary scientific paradigm. The ID movement's "scientific" program is encapsulated chiefly in Phillip Johnson's assertion that "evolution is basically a hoax" (Johnson 2003). Although much attention has been given by scientists and philosophers to ID's putatively scientific claims, and also, in our book *Creationism's Trojan Horse: The Wedge of Intelligent Design* (2004), to its religious identity and political strategy, little has been written about the blatantly theocratic ambitions on which the Wedge Strategy depends. In this chapter, we begin to fill this important gap in the scholarly analysis of the ID movement.

As becomes obvious to any objective observer, the Wedge is dedicated to returning our culture to (1) premodern science and science education, based on *their* concept of science (i.e., natural theology, exemplified by William Paley's early-nineteenth-century version of the old argument from design), and (2) a premodern political paradigm, the Christian commonwealth—a republic whose political system incorporates and requires the official sanction of Christianity. This is the system that the American founding fathers designed the U.S. Constitution *expressly to avoid* but that their contemporary religious critics insisted, more than two centuries ago, was the only way to ensure a moral basis for American culture. Like the Wedge today, those critics of the Constitution demanded "cultural renewal" on the basis of sectarian Christian doctrine. And the Wedge, like these early opponents of the Constitution, rejects secular society, the only alternative to which is, of course, theocracy.

Antimodernism

Although the ID movement has had no discernible effect on the way scientists actually do science, the Wedge promotes in the public mind the idea that its premodern paradigm of science and science education is both feasible and desirable. Dembski has argued in the online (relatively mainstream) *Metanexus* forum that ID is *not* natural theology but *is* sound, modern science (Dembski 2001a). Yet in his book *Intelligent Design: The Bridge between Science and Theology* (1999), aimed at ID's Christian audience (its "natural constituency," as stated in "The Wedge Strategy," the movement's tactical document—see note 1), he defends the British natural theology of William Paley and Thomas Reid, as well as that of the American theologian and antievolutionist Charles Hodge. Dembski stresses that ID is linked "both conceptually and historically" to British natural theology and that his purpose in chapter 3 is to refute positivism, "the faulty conception of science" that "effectively did away" with natural theology. He argues that "the blanket dismissal of natural theology in the nineteenth century was not warranted and . . . its core idea of design remains viable" (16, 70–93).

Moreover, while Dembski aims in chapter 3 to "[reopen] the door to divine action" on the "scientific front," he devotes chapter 2 to reopening it on the "theological front" by defending belief in miracles. Displaying his religious motive for promoting

ID as science, he rejects modern science's defining naturalistic methodology, that is, the search for natural explanations for natural phenomena. He rejects it because it "leaves no room for a designing intelligence whose action transcends natural laws" and thereby precludes using miracles to explain the world (Dembski 1999, 68–69). Pointing to the work of Spinoza and Schleiermacher during the rise of modern science and the Enlightenment, Dembski condemns their exclusion of miracles because that makes ID impossible:

Since miracles had previously constituted the most direct evidence² for divine activity in the world, the rejection of miracles became tantamount to the rejection of all evidential support for the Christian faith . . . [T]he idea that God could act identifiably as a designing intelligence was lost. By rendering miracles incoherent Spinoza and Schleiermacher undercut all nonnaturalistic modes of divine activity and thereby rendered design incoherent as well. (Dembski 1999, 50–51)

This means, of course, that ID—which Dembski promotes as a scientific theory—*requires* miraculous interventions in the world's natural order to make it intelligible. Dembski's views are thus not merely premodern—they are archaic and scientifically unworkable. Once miracles are allowed, they explain everything and nothing, which is why modern science abandoned them once and for all in the nineteenth century. However, not only does the Wedge Strategy rest on a *premodern* framework, but it is markedly *anti-modern*, a rejection of Enlightenment rationalism, secularism, and religious pluralism—the foundations, as it happens, of American democracy.

For Phillip Johnson, the Wedge's founding father, the word "modernism" carries sinister connotations. He uses it as shorthand for "scientific naturalism" and "liberal rationalism," references, respectively, to modern science and to the Enlightenment centrality of reason, the intellectual foundation of modern thought (Johnson 1994a). Taking broad liberties with the rules of causal reasoning and definition, former law professor Johnson transforms the conjunction of science and reason into atheism and the decline of civic virtue: "Modernism is typically defined as the condition that begins when people realize God is truly dead, and we are therefore on our own . . . [T]he death of God makes people free from rules based upon what had been thought to be the word of God, and therefore invites a rethinking of such things as gender roles and sexual morality" (Johnson 1994a, 1994b). Citing increasing illegitimacy as an example of this, he warns that a "constitutional democracy is in serious trouble if its citizenry does not have a certain degree of education and civic virtue" (Johnson 1994b). Since, in Johnson's mind, civic virtue depends upon religion, and civic virtue is the cornerstone of democracy, democracy likewise requires a religious foundation. Q.E.D.

Johnson thus denies that "modernism" is a possible foundation for democracy; rather, he predicts that it will lead to "a growing doubt that there is any such thing as objective truth, with a consequent fragmenting of the body politic into separate groups with no common frame of reference" (Johnson 1994b). His criticism of a constitutional democracy that lacks a religion-based moral code demonstrates his wish not merely for religion as a source of solace and moral strength for individuals who embrace it, but rather for religion as the foundation of American social

structure and public policy. Consequently, consistent with its original nomenclature—the “Center for the *Renewal* of Science and Culture”—his renamed Center for Science and Culture seeks to renew American culture and education by returning them to what he and others claim to be the country’s religious foundations.³

Thus, the ID movement’s desire for a premodern science is interwoven with its desire for a premodern political system. Yet the premodern, religion-based political system the ID movement wants is *not* what the founders—with their memories of bloody European religious wars still fresh—had in mind, and it is *not* what they encoded in the Constitution of the United States. Isaac Kramnick and R. Laurence Moore, in *The Godless Constitution* (1997), point out properly that

the nation’s founders, both in writing the Constitution and defending it in the ratification debates, sought to separate the operations of government from any claim that human beings can know and follow divine direction in reaching policy decisions. They did this despite their enormous respect for religion, their faith in divinely endowed human rights, and their belief that democracy benefited from a moral citizenry who believed in God. (12)

An outcry arose from colonial religious critics when they saw that the Constitution would not codify their sectarian commitments as law. A Pennsylvania pamphleteer known pseudonymously as “Aristocrotis” penned a condemnation of the “religion of nature,” that is, deism, which was the religious view of many founders—and thundered that they were establishing “a government founded upon nature.” This meant, of course, that the founders had (in his view) shamefully devalued the *created* world. He decried their exclusion of God and Christianity from the Constitution, concluding sarcastically with a mock endorsement of its secularism:

What, [Aristocrotis] asks, “is the world to the federal convention but as the drop of a bucket, or the small dust in the balance! . . .” He argues that the “new Constitution, disdains . . . belief of a deity, the immortality of the soul, or the resurrection of the body, a day of judgement, or a future state of rewards and punishments,” because its authors are committed to a natural religion that is deistic nonreligion. He concludes with irony: “If some religion must be had the religion of nature will certainly be preferred by a government founded upon the law of nature. One great argument in favor of this religion is, that most of the members of the grand convention are great admirers of it; and they certainly are the best models to form our religious as well as our civil belief on.” (Kramnick and Moore 1997, 34–35)

This eighteenth-century railing against the “religion of nature” and “deistic nonreligion” survives intact, without change, in the Wedge’s twenty-first-century rejection of naturalism and deism. Dembski (1999) discards both in the same breath: “Theists know that naturalism is false. Nature is not self-sufficient. God created nature as well as any laws by which nature operates. Not only has God created the world, but God upholds the world moment by moment . . . Theists are not deists” (104). And Johnson’s complaints are virtually identical to those of Aristocrotis. Johnson regrets the Constitution’s establishment of secular rather than religion-based government; his distaste for the former surfaces in his complaint that “modernist naturalism” is the “established religious philosophy of America”: “Modernism is established in the sense that the intellectual community, usually invoking the power

of the federal judiciary and the mystique of the Constitution, vigorously and almost always successfully insists that law and public education must be based upon naturalistic assumptions" (Johnson 1994a). His disagreement with judicial decisions favoring church–state separation is therefore clear, since his rejection of the "naturalistic assumptions" upon which he says law and public education are based amounts to his endorsing institutionalized supernatural belief, that is, *an establishment of religion*. But Johnson wrongly equates "secularism" with "naturalism" (see Forrest 2004). His denunciation of "naturalism," aimed at American public institutions and policies, is actually a denunciation of the fact that these institutions are secular, that they are *not* governed by religious authority.

Antisecularism and Religious Exclusionism

The Wedge's antisecularism is of a piece with its antimodernism. It echoes throughout the offerings of leading Wedge members, who display an "us against them" mentality, portraying Christians as the victims of a modernist world:

For the last 100–150 years, maybe longer, Christians who have held to orthodox Christianity have really been beaten up a lot, . . . And we've not been able to overturn some ideologies that are inimical to the Christian faith—which undercut it and deny it. (William Dembski, as quoted in Hartwig 2001)

Modernism invades the sanctuary not only in the form of legal regulation, but through television, academic literature, and every form of cultural penetration. As a result, religious colleges, seminaries, and church bureaucracies are saturated with modernist thinking. As this becomes increasingly apparent, Christians are not likely to remain satisfied with a naturalistic culture that will not leave them alone. (Johnson 1994b)

Christians live in the world with non-Christians. We want to share the Good News with those who have not yet grasped it, and to defend the faith against attacks. Materialism is both a weapon that many antagonists use against Christianity and a stumbling block to some who would otherwise enter the church. To the extent that the credibility of materialism is blunted, the task of showing the reasonableness of the faith is made easier. . . . [M]aterialism has a tough time with a universe that reeks of design. (Behe 1998)

Despite denouncing secularism, Wedge leaders deny favoring theocracy. Johnson claims to reject it because of "the Christian teaching about the sinful heart of man" and because "theocrats wielding absolute power will not long remain Christian in any sense that I can recognize" (Johnson 2002a, 169). Publication of our book *Creationism's Trojan Horse* (Forrest and Gross 2004) prompted a similar denial from the Discovery Institute: "One can believe in God and not want to impose theocracy on our culture. One can reject theocracy and still think that religious believers . . . have a right to contend for their views in the public square—whether in science, the humanities, or politics" (Discovery Institute 2004, 5–6). Yet given the strain under which Johnson places his credibility by calling evolution a hoax, the credibility of this solitary denial is negligible, drowned out by his constant drumbeats against secularism. The Discovery Institute's denial is just as hollow.

Given ID's thoroughly religious foundation, ID's Wedge Strategy goal "to see design theory permeate our religious, cultural, moral and political life" translates to enacting ID leaders' religious preferences as public policy. The theological framework from within which they operate is so rigid that they cannot separate their views on either science or public policy from their theology. Indeed, doing so would be sacrilegious. Dembski (1999, 98–99) affirms that science without God is idolatry—a religious offense, a sin. By his own logic, then, the secular government protecting science and education is also a sin. Consequently, just as the only restorative measure for naturalistic science is an infusion of supernaturalism, so the only expiation of the sin of secular government is desecularization. What the Wedge envisions amounts to theocracy, and Americans need to know this.⁴

In 1996, at the first major Wedge symposium, the "Mere Creation Conference" at Biola University, Johnson named three events as symbols of the secularization of America, a polity that he asserts was founded consciously and deliberately upon divine sanction: the 1959 centennial of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*; the 1960 movie *Inherit the Wind*, based on the Scopes "monkey trial"; and the 1962 Supreme Court decision outlawing state-sponsored prayer in public schools. The latter particularly infuriates Johnson, as it does the Religious Right in general. He yearns for the good old days "before 1962, [when] America was unified by the concept that people of different races and religious traditions all worship their common Creator, the God of the Bible" and before "the 1959 Centennial proclaimed that a blind material process of evolution is our true creator" (Johnson 1996). He mourns the "tremendous change in the ruling philosophy of our country," meaning the *alleged* change from the sovereignty of religious doctrine over American culture and policy to the acceptance of secular ideas: "Science now teaches us that a purposeless material process of evolution created us; . . . and the courts teach us that the very notion of God is divisive, and so must be kept out of public life. The Pledge of Allegiance may say that we are 'one nation, under God,' but we have become instead a nation that has declared its independence from God" (Johnson 1996).

More recently, in 2001, Johnson continued to eulogize bygone days, except that now he portrayed America as an explicitly *Christian* nation—a religious exclusionism disturbingly prevalent in the views of leading Wedge members. Forecasting the demise of twentieth-century "scientific materialism," Johnson looked forward to a revival of America's Christian past: "Now as we enter the 21st century, scientific materialism is creaking and shaking . . . I'm sensing a renewed excitement as we come to realize that maybe we had a better grasp of the truth when we were a Christian country than during those decades when Christian truths were spurned" (Hartwig 2001). Johnson's vision of the past, however, is historically incorrect: the view of American government as founded upon religion is a fabrication of the Christian right. As Kramnick and Moore (1997) note, even the reference to God in the Pledge of Allegiance is not original to the nation's founding, but rather an attempt—which continues today—to bring about the gradual replacement of secular government with a Christian one:

For fifty years after its founding a strong national consensus existed on the utterly secular nature of the federal government, whatever local and state law and practice may have been . . . It is not true that the founders designed a Christian commonwealth,

which was then eroded by secular humanists and liberals; the reverse is true. The framers erected a godless federal constitutional structure, which was then undermined as God entered first the U.S. currency in 1863, . . . and finally the *Pledge of Allegiance* in 1954 . . .

. . . In recent years the Christian right, unsuccessful in its attempts to change the godless Constitution, has totally reversed its strategy. In a staggering historical flip-flop, it now celebrates the Constitution by denying its godless foundation . . . Its adherents have falsely dressed the founders in godly Christian garb, which, they argue, later godless generations have systematically torn off . . . Such is the distortion of American history offered by today's preachers of religious correctness. (143, 148–149; emphasis added)

The inconvenient realities of history, however, like those of evolutionary science, do not deter the Wedge from promoting its cultural agenda. Wedge members see themselves pitted against the modern evil of secularism. They distort the meaning of secularism by equating it with atheism. And since they view atheism as unequivocally evil, they see secularism as an evil to which (their) religion is the only antidote. Should there be doubts of their antisecular intentions for American culture and education, Wedge members themselves have been ready to dispel them. Cited in a July 2001 article by CSC fellow Mark Hartwig in *Boundless* magazine (of the rightist Focus on the Family), Johnson foresees Christianity becoming central to public education and policy:

Secular society, and particularly the educational institutions, have assumed throughout the 20th century that the Christian religion is simply a hangover from superstitious days, . . . With the success of intelligent design, however, we're going to understand that, regardless of the details, the Christians have been right all along—at least on the major elements of the story, like divine creation. And that, I think is going to change society's understanding of what constitutes knowledge, of what things are worth knowing. (Hartwig 2001)

Johnson concludes that as a result of ID's (claimed) successes in confirming the Christian account of creation, the argument that "Christian ideas have no legitimate place in public education, in public lawmaking, [and] in public discussion generally" will no longer be credible. In short, ID's confirmation of a religious creation story will have a revolutionary effect: it will return religion to public education and public policy.

Johnson's statements are thus unambiguous: contrary to the Wedge's denials, ID is creationism and is therefore a religious belief.⁵ And the expressed religious views of Wedge members reveal not only antisecularism but also a thoroughgoing religious *exclusionism*. Johnson's dream of a country reunified by religious devotion turns out to be less than inclusive, as revealed, for example, in his astonishing reaction to the World Trade Center attack on September 11, 2001:

The strength of America is not in its towers or in its battleships, it's in its faith . . . This isn't the same country we were in the previous decades. Now we're seeing how the country is almost cringing in fear of these Muslim terrorists from the Middle East. I see professors afraid to discuss the subject because they're afraid of what the Muslim students will do . . . I never thought our country would descend to this level. We are afraid to search the truth and proclaim it. We once knew who the true God was and

were able to proclaim it frankly. But since about 1960 we've been hiding from that. We've been trying to pretend that all religions are the same. (Johnson 2002b)

Such exclusionism exists also in the views of Henry "Fritz" Schaefer, a founding Wedge member who maintains an active lecture schedule at universities around the country. In one of his public lectures on his "Leadership University" website, "Questions Intellectuals Ask About Christianity," Schaefer's answers reflect his own brand of exclusionism:

12. *Will not God accept those of other religions who are sincere?*

[Schaefer] All other religions are diametrically opposed to Christianity on the most crucial question . . . They deny that Jesus is God, . . .

No one questions the sincerity and intensity of the faith of . . . a Buddhist monk. But sincerity or intensity of faith does not create truth . . .

. . . *Not every religion can be true . . .*

18. *Many non-Christians are offended by the "exclusiveness" of Christianity. Can anything be said in response?*

A) Christianity is "universal" . . . Jesus invites people everywhere to receive the gift of eternal life . . .

B) Since many basic tenets of different religions are contradictory, someone has to be wrong.

C) Exclusivity seems unavoidable . . . The exclusion of exclusivity is also exclusive. (Schaefer n.d.)

Despite the twisted logic of Schaefer's last remark, which appears to be the nonsensical assertion that *inclusiveness* is *exclusionary*—that is, religious tolerance excludes religious exclusionists—his position is clear: non-Christians *will be excluded* from heaven.

The most disturbing example of ID proponents' religious exclusionism is in *Unapologetic Apologetics: Meeting the Challenges of Theological Studies* (2001), edited by William Dembski and Jay Wesley Richards and to which they contributed as authors. At first, the book seems unconnected to the ID movement, since it consists largely of essays written in the mid-1990s by students in a Princeton Theological Seminary seminar group. But these students, who organized the seminar to protest Princeton's decreasing emphasis on Christian apologetics, were also organized as the Charles Hodge Society in honor of the nineteenth-century theologian and anti-evolutionist. And they were led by Dembski and Richards, now leading Wedge figures (Dembski and Richards 2001, 13). Phillip Johnson wrote the foreword, declaring that behind the student movement founded by Dembski and Richards—whom he regards as "Christian revolutionaries"—is "a more general intellectual movement that will bear fruit in the coming century," that is, intelligent design (Johnson 2001a, 9). Johnson's declaration mirrors a goal in the Wedge's strategy document: "Seminaries [will] increasingly recognize & repudiate naturalistic presuppositions" (see note 1). And Dembski's and Richards's essays enunciate the anti-Enlightenment, antinaturalist, and antiseccularist viewpoints that underlay the 1996 formation of the Wedge as the Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture.

Dembski and Richards voice an unmistakable desire to return to the days when Christianity was the dominant, not just the majority, religion and when science,

education, and society were governed by it. To be sure, Dembski and Richards (2001) recognize that “the inquisitorial method cannot fulfill God’s redemptive purposes for the world” (19). But they renounce, too, the idea of secular society, lamenting that “we have permitted the collective thought of the world to be controlled by ideas that prevent Christianity from being regarded as anything but a harmless delusion” (19). They argue that “Christians have a mandate to declare the truth of Christ,” which requires “bringing every aspect of life under the influence of this truth.” And while acknowledging the “elitism and intrusiveness” of this mandate, they press their point resolutely: “But in fact, unifying every aspect of life under the truth of Christ is the only hope humanity has to find true freedom and fulfillment.” Such a holy mission permits no waffling: “Humans must decide their allegiances. There is in the end no straddling of fences. Jesus says that we are either for him or against him. There is no middle ground. This truth is the dark side of the gospel . . . For those who reject it, the gospel signifies sorrow and loss” (18).

Dembski, moreover, takes seriously the notion of heresy; and if the price of defending the faith is civic peace and Christian unity, so be it:

Within late twentieth-century North American Christianity, *heresy* has become an unpopular word. Can’t we all just get along and live together in peace? Unfortunately the answer is no. Peace cannot be purchased at the expense of truth . . . There is an inviolable core to the Christian faith . . . Harsh as it sounds, to violate that core is to place ourselves outside the Christian tradition. This is the essence of heresy, and heresy remains a valid category for today. (Dembski 2001b, 43)

In light of these sentiments, his next comment, “This is not to endorse a McCarthyism that finds heretics under every rock,” is hardly reassuring. Though Dembski and Richards may renounce the methods of the medieval faith’s defenders, they obviously embrace its aim: theocratic Christian dominion.⁶ Such devotion to their salvific duty raises the unavoidable question: are they willing to follow the logic of their own theology regarding the ultimate fate of the few members of their movement who are not only nonevangelicals, but non-Christians? According to Center for Science and Culture fellow Nancy Pearcey, Michael Denton, a long-time member of the Wedge, is an agnostic, and senior CSC fellow David Berlinski is Jewish (Pearcey 2000). Muzzafar Iqbal, who endorsed Dembski’s *No Free Lunch* and is a fellow of Dembski’s International Society for Complexity, Information, and Design (ISCID), is a Muslim (ISCID, n.d.).

Fortunately, most Christians have moved far beyond the medieval Christianity that expended such terrifying energy in uprooting “false ideas.” They have embraced a more tolerant, more humane faith that can accommodate the workings of nature as explained by modern science; they value the secular, constitutional democracy that makes room for people of all faiths and for people of none. The modern world, with its secular government and naturalistic science, does not threaten them but has enabled them to flourish in their faith and to participate in the wonders of scientific discovery. And the modern, secular academy, at every level, must welcome students regardless of religious preference, including the preference for no religion at all.

Nowhere, however, do Dembski and Richards see a greater threat to their aggressive efforts to save Christianity from the modern world than the “secular

academy." Consistent with the Wedge's goal of reversing the accommodation of modern seminaries to evolution, Dembski and Richards (2001) stress the need not only to "transform the mainline seminaries in particular" but also "the secular academic world in general" (14). This includes a great deal: public elementary and secondary schools as well as colleges and universities. But more troubling than their evangelical vision of academic revolution is the fact that, while they want to transform the secular academy, Dembski and Richards do not consider themselves bound by its rules (which, thanks to the Enlightenment, are in principle dedicated to rational argument based on evidence and sound reasoning). Rather, they feel free to ignore the rules governing teaching and learning since the seventeenth century: "The secular academy sets ground rules that doom Christianity from the start. For Christian apologists to play by these rules, whether in the name of ecumenism or pluralism, is to capitulate the faith" (15).

But the only rules by which Christian apologists—and ID theorists—are bound in the secular academy are those which properly bind all scholars: the rules of logic and empirical evidence. These rules have always been the bane of supernaturalists who want respect in the intellectual world, because supernatural claims simply have never yet met the burden of evidence required by rules of responsible scholarship. It is therefore no surprise that Dembski and Richards refuse to abide by them, but they have also conveniently adjusted their *attitude*: "Our work as Christian apologists must be of the highest quality and rigor to deserve the respect of the secular academic community . . . Our attitude must combine . . . the desire to produce work worthy of respect, and a repudiation of any desire for actual acceptance or respectability" (Dembski and Richards 2001, 14).

Although the Wedge seeks acceptance of ID within the secular academic mainstream, its representatives appear to regard the secular academy—indeed, the secular world—with contempt. They seem in their writings not really to consider themselves part of it, but to have positioned themselves as its adversaries: "We are to engage the secular world, reproving, rebuking and exhorting it, pointing to the truth of Christianity and producing strong arguments and valid criticisms that show where secularism has missed the mark" (Dembski and Richards 2001, 15). In Dembski's case, the dichotomy is both literal and attitudinal. With seven academic degrees, Dembski, who has very little teaching experience even in sectarian universities, appears not to have participated fully and professionally in academic-scholarly life since the 1996 completion of his second Ph.D. (he held a 1997–1999 adjunct teaching job at the [Catholic] University of Dallas). In his August 2003 curriculum vitae he listed not a single affiliation with any secular professional organization; the lengthiest organizational affiliation listed was with the Discovery Institute (Dembski 2003). (After the publication of our book [Forrest and Gross 2004], in which we noted his lack of secular affiliations, he added the American Mathematical Society to his list of "Professional Associations" [Dembski 2004b].) His Discovery Institute fellowship, however, now almost a decade long (1996–present), remains his only long-term affiliation. Dembski, who has no formal science credentials but does have an M.Div., has been hired as the first director of the new Center for Science and Theology at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, which he admits is "theologically quite conservative" and where he will be

“moving within a natural constituency” (Roots 2004). Yet he wants to “transform” the secular academy. (Given ID’s inherent religiosity, and Dembski’s thinly disguised description of his International Society for Complexity, Information and Design [ISCID] as a science organization without “programmatic constraints like materialism, naturalism, or reductionism”—in short, science via the supernatural—it hardly qualifies as a secular organization.⁷)

Johnson likewise positions himself in opposition to secular academia and intellectuals, with comments such as this: “Given this widespread misunderstanding [that the success of Darwinian science is proof of a materialist metaphysics], secular intellectuals generally assume that texts such as John 1:1–14 express a prescientific mythology that modern people cannot take seriously” (Johnson 2001b). (The Wedge substitutes this New Testament reference to creation for Genesis 1 to downplay differences with young-earth creationists: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. / The same was in the beginning with God. / All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.”) Persistently and falsely conflating secularism with atheism, Johnson indicts the secularism of fellow academics in a 1995 article in *Academe*, the publication of the American Association of University Professors. Using Yale as an example, he disparages valuable intellectual and political ideals while implying that sectarian Christian doctrines should be integral to academic life:

By [1951, when Yale had abandoned its Christian orientation,] the Christian atmosphere . . . represented little more than a religious veneer over the secular [E]nlightenment values of freedom of inquiry, political equality, and public service . . . To the extent that Christianity asserts such distinctive doctrines as that a creator brought about our existence for a purpose, or that Jesus really rose from the dead, it is generally regarded in academic and legal circles as inherently bigoted . . . Thus a belief system that retains great vitality in the culture at large is . . . marginalized and shut out of academic discourse. (Johnson 1995a)

As always, he sees a direct, causal connection between the academic marginalization of Christianity and “evolutionary naturalism”: “The contempt with which many evolutionary biologists regard anyone who doubts their theories has to be experienced to be believed. Evolutionary naturalists like to think of themselves as playing the role of Galileo defying an authoritarian church, but to those of us who are skeptical of naturalism, they would be more appropriately cast as the College of Cardinals” (Johnson 1995a).

Decrying modern higher education’s secularism, Johnson never acknowledges the obvious conceptual and epistemological malfunctions of theism as an explanatory principle in science, and indeed as the starting point of much serious inquiry outside science—difficulties that many theistic academics acknowledge honestly and deal with personally in various ways. He also ignores the religious and ethnic diversity of modern American campuses as factors in modern academia’s increasing secularization. And quite conveniently for his indictment of the academy’s supposed religious bigotry, he ignores the widespread presence on campuses of Christian faculty and student groups—organizations, moreover, that host Johnson’s lectures at those universities!⁸

Antirationalism

As noted above, Dembski (1999) rejects Enlightenment rationalism, insisting that rationalism and naturalistic explanations in science “are on their way out” (14–15). Johnson, too, combines antisecularism with a deeply rooted antirationalism. In 1993, as a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley, he criticized R. Kent Greenawalt, the noted Columbia University legal scholar, for his acceptance of “the crucial modernist assumption that there exists a common secular rationality capable of resolving some important public issues without relying upon controversial and unprovable (i.e., nonrational [religious]) assumptions” (Johnson 1993). This criticism of Greenawalt stems from Johnson’s conviction that true “reason” cannot be divorced from religion, betraying Johnson’s deep distrust of rationality. Not only, then, does Johnson’s antirationalism imply his wish to disenfranchise academics with honest doubts about religion; it also insults those whose intellectual humility (or wisdom) allows them to encompass both reason and religious commitment.

For Johnson, reason is worthless unless built upon a “biblical theistic” foundation: “From a biblical theistic standpoint, human reason possesses a degree of reliability because God created it in His own image. When human reason denies its basis in creation, it becomes unreason. Those who have thought that they were wise in rejecting God end up as fools, carried along by every intellectual fad and approving every kind of hateful nonsense” (Johnson 1993). Consequently, Johnson sees the secular use of reason as dangerous. He justifies this by appealing to ID’s all-purpose bogeyman: evolution, and by indicting secular intellectuals as apostates:

Modernist thinking assumes the validity of Darwinian evolution, which explains the origin of humans and other living systems by an entirely mechanistic process that excludes in principle any role for a creator . . . Secularised intellectuals have long been complacent in their apostasy because they were sure they weren’t missing anything important in consigning God to the ashcan of history. (Johnson 1993)

And Johnson considers reliance upon reason, when taken as the backbone of higher learning, to be a distinct threat to Christian students:

The mind has a tendency to believe what it wants to believe . . . So you [students] may be going and getting an education not in order to find out some new truth, but in order to rationalize some error that you want to believe in. For academically gifted people, for bright people, for intellectuals, that’s the biggest problem of the mind, because the mind that is clever at test-taking and reasoning is also clever at deceiving itself. So you see, you can’t rely on your own mind, because it will betray you. It will trick you. You have to be grounded in something more reliable than your own thinking. (Johnson 2000)

For students, that something must be the Bible and religion, which are the only effective inoculation against reason.

Soldiers in the Culture War

The views and words here examined are those of principal Wedge figures. Johnson founded and has been the Wedge's driving force; Dembski has risen rapidly to its intellectual leadership. Their views are broadly representative of the Wedge as a whole (there are at present over forty fellows in the CSC, and numerous, well-placed supporters outside the organization proper). Clearly divergent views are either scarce or absent within the Wedge. Understanding the premodern theological and political framework upon which the ID movement is built illuminates the strategies and tactics they are using to advance their ultimate objectives, which include the wholesale dismissal of political and intellectual (scientific) paradigms that first appeared in the Enlightenment—and that guided the hopes of America's founders.

Robert Pennock (1999) writes accurately that "Phillip Johnson portrays himself as a soldier in the 'culture wars.'" InterVarsity Press's marketing web page for Johnson's 2002 book *The Right Questions* suggests relevant "Resources for Study and Action"; included is Kreeft's *How to Win the Culture War* (2002), in which Kreeft assumes the combative posture of the culture warrior bent on making "our democracy . . . become democratic":

You *can* turn a clock back, both literally and figuratively. And you'd better, if the clock is keeping bad time . . . This book will offend many people . . . [and] delight many others: because it is not only *about* a war—a "culture war," a spiritual war, a jihad—but it is itself an *act* of war . . . For it is written on a battlefield, in the heat of battle. It is written for soldiers or potential soldiers, enlistees. It is therefore not a carefully researched, . . . politely academic argument. It is not a sweet violin; it is an ugly, blaring trumpet. On a battlefield, a trumpet works better than a violin. (10–12)

This is exactly how Dembski sees the Wedge. In the foreword to a book by one of his CSC fellows, Dembski himself applies a militaristic metaphor, capturing perfectly the essence of the movement he hails as a scientific research program: "The challenge of Intelligent Design to the evolutionary naturalism of Darwin is not the latest flash in the pan of the culture war but in fact constitutes ground zero of the culture war" (Dembski 2002a). And the metaphor extends to education of the young, where CSC fellow John Mark Reynolds invokes it as a guiding principle of Biola University's Torrey Honors Institute, of which he is director and founder, and which is closely allied with the Wedge. (Biola is one of two universities advertised on Access Research Network as "ID Colleges."⁹) Reynolds declares that "Torrey Honors Institute is at war with the modern culture. Torrey does not want to 'get along' with materialism, secularism, naturalism, post-modernism, radical feminism, or spiritualism. We want to win over every facet of the culture, from the arts to the sciences, for the Kingdom of Christ" (Reynolds n.d.).

Another tactic, rejection of the "ground rules of the secular academy," enables Dembski to use false, overblown rhetoric to denounce the modern scientific worldview: "The scientific picture of the world championed since the Enlightenment is not just wrong but massively wrong. Indeed entire fields of inquiry, especially in the human sciences, will need to be rethought from the ground up in terms of intelligent design" (Dembski 1999, 224). It enabled him in July 2002 to say in the

preface of an upcoming book that readers should see the work as a “handbook for replacing an outdated scientific paradigm (Darwinism) and as giving a new scientific paradigm (intelligent design) room to develop and prosper” (Dembski 2004a, 21), but to tell attendees at his October 2002 “RAPID Conference” that “because of ID’s outstanding success at gaining a cultural hearing, the scientific research part of ID is lagging behind” (Dembski 2002c). Exempting himself from the academy’s rules explains the insincerity of his broad-brush attacks on evolutionary science while lacking scientific credentials in any of the research fields needed to give him credibility. Dembski has no formal scientific training in evolutionary biology or elsewhere (Dembski 2003; 2004b).

The Wedge’s cynical view of the “secular academy,” which includes public schools, fuels their plan to use public education as the vehicle of their advance. They see the secular system as a false system that must be discarded, or if not discarded, then altered sufficiently through pressure on public opinion, through politics, and by favorable judicial rulings, to allow the inclusion of ID creationism *in science classes*. (John Mark Reynolds has gone so far as to sign the “Proclamation for the Separation of School and State”: “I proclaim publicly that I favor ending government involvement in education” [Alliance for the Separation of School and State n.d.].) Dembski views public schools as recruiting grounds for future Wedge followers—to whom he hands off the real task of some day producing that convincing science of “design” that he and his contemporaries in the movement promised more than a decade ago and have so far failed to produce:

Why should ID supporters allow the Darwinian establishment to indoctrinate students at the high school level, only to divert some of the brightest to becoming supporters of . . . evolution, when by presenting ID at the high school level some of these . . . students would go on to careers . . . to develop ID as a positive research program? If ID is going to succeed as a research program, it will need workers, and these are best recruited at a young age. (Dembski 2002b)

This cynicism explains the Wedge’s systematic political intrusions into the scheduled processes of reviewing state science standards—for example, in Kansas and Ohio, where they played a major role in attempting to influence the standards.

Finally, the Wedge’s portrayal of themselves as victims of discrimination enables them to tap into a scientifically uninformed public’s sense of fairness. Notably—and incongruously, given their denial that ID is religion—while condemning the Enlightenment, ID proponents invoke on their behalf the central Enlightenment principle of religious tolerance when they advertise themselves as victims of religious persecution. In light of the regressive religious and political goals underlying the movement, it is both ironic and amusing for the Wedge thus to have co-opted the vocabulary of liberalism and civil liberties: they cry “viewpoint discrimination” and “religious bigotry” whenever their designs upon science education are thwarted. Stephen C. Meyer testified before the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in 1998:

Biology texts routinely recapitulate Darwinian arguments against intelligent design, yet if these arguments are philosophically neutral and strictly scientific, why are evidential arguments for intelligent design inherently unscientific and religiously charged? The acceptance of this false asymmetry has justified an egregious form of

viewpoint discrimination in American public science instruction. (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1999, 217)

Yet Meyer's testimony was given as part of the commission's "Schools and Religion Project"!

What Is to Be Done?

The aspects of the Wedge Strategy discussed above reflect the ID movement's integral place—and its proponents' consciousness of their role—in the larger "culture war" of which serious observers of contemporary American society are aware. The Wedge's place in the war is that of a key expeditionary force within the larger manpower base of the Religious Right. This is not to imply that the entire Religious Right is of one mind as to goals, or that all its members are irredentists, determined to restore the theocracy of some remote yesteryear. But their own words identify the Wedge's leadership as just such irredentists. And as expeditionary forces, they need to be particularly well trained and to keep ultimate purposes as much in mind as immediate tactics. Their most powerful weapon is their ability to turn respect for science and religious pluralism—the "weapons" of the enemy (modern, secular society)—upon that enemy. They must convince the public and the politicians who sooner or later listen to it that intelligent design *is a sound, scientific theory for which sound empirical evidence has already emerged* and is emerging every day, and that ID must therefore have a full hearing and a recognized place in the education of children. That such a public conviction would have disastrous consequences, not only pedagogically but politically and socially, follows from the fact that the claim is false. So what, then, is to be done?

There are two broad categories of responses and possible solutions to the problem posed by the ID movement: long term and short term. Neither the long- nor the short-term initiatives offer a guarantee of success, and this is deeply worrisome. The terrible strains of modern life, in a world already in the grip of rising religious-fundamentalist violence, are much more likely to enhance the appeal of sectarian religious devotion than to foster cool, analytical reasoning. And they are as likely to breed annoyance and impatience with the U.S. Constitution—that wonderful product of the Enlightenment's children—as to enhance support for it.

Long-Term Initiatives

The longest term initiative, and the most difficult to accomplish, is greatly improved science education across the board: in the K–12 public and private schools, in the colleges and universities, and in the media of public communication. Only when the currently low scientific literacy of the American population rises to the level of accurate and sympathetic understanding of science will the appeal of nonscience, pseudoscience, and just plain bad science diminish sufficiently to disable the

quackeries that today prey upon people. But let it be noted: at least in America and probably in the United Kingdom as well, no improvement is to be expected until there are major changes in the way schoolteachers are trained to teach science.¹⁰

Most important is the undergraduate education of future science teachers. They should learn science in content-heavy curricula in which pedagogy courses are secondary to science courses. The science taught in schools is too often filtered through the teacher-education process in the schools of education. That filter not only thins the real material but often distorts it, sometimes with simple errors of understanding, but sometimes with irrelevant politics. It is not uncommon today for schools to declare that they are teaching physical and earth science by having children participate in mock legal proceedings against polluters.

In addition, it is essential for practicing scientists and other professional scholars of science, working through their agencies, to become regularly involved in public education. Such involvement is today insignificant.¹¹ Every university should have effective scientific outreach programs for local schools. There are already good ones; there must be many more, and the initiative should come from scientists themselves. A model program in this respect is the one established in conjunction with the annual Darwin Day program at the University of Tennessee–Knoxville (UTK). Staffed by UTK's "Tennessee Darwin Coalition," composed of science professors and graduate students, it offers teacher workshops with other Darwin Day events.¹² Coalition members are avid spokesmen for evolution education, but they should be joined by many biological scientists (not, as now, just a few unselfish ones), all of whom are responsible for confronting and refuting false claims about evolution. The same goes for philosophers and historians of science, for example, in respect to such pseudophilosophical arguments as those of Phillip Johnson on "naturalism," "materialism," "theistic science," and the like. There are now a few who do so, and we should be grateful to them, but there need to be many more.

In addition, there should be closer, regular working relationships between professional, disciplinary science organizations and education societies at all levels: local, state, and national. There are such relationships now, of course. The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), for example, devotes major resources to such outreach. But it is not nearly enough. More organizations must become involved, and all must be more aggressive. Reasonably enough, the national organizations prefer not to make powerful political enemies—such as members of the U.S. Congress. Yet at some point, they must rock the political boat. Working in unison, they would be powerful enough to resist political reprisals. Commendably, AAAS has spoken out forthrightly against ID (AAAS 2002). So has the always-courageous National Center for Science Education (NCSE). Now it is the turn of those powerful scientific organizations that represent the specific disciplines of science, especially the historical sciences: evolution, geology, cosmology. All, not just AAAS and NCSE, should become engaged. A good start would be to emulate the Society for the Study of Evolution, which, at the urging of its 2003 executive vice president, Massimo Pigliucci, established a permanent taskforce devoted exclusively to counteracting creationism.¹³

Finally, there is the perennial issue of individual scientists acting on their own initiative with proscience school board members and legislators during conflicts

such as those created by the Wedge. We refer not just to college and university faculty, but to all scientists, including those in industry and government. This is a huge population of substantively trained people, many also parents of school-children, others in positions of community leadership. Far too few of them get involved in arguments over school curricula, or over legislation with scientific content or implications. We know the usual answer: they are too busy, doing what clearly *is* important work. These days, it takes most of one's intellectual and emotional energy just to keep abreast of the advances in one's scientific field, let alone to survive in the intense competition for grants, academic and professional recognition, and—in industry—a share of the profits. But scientists who do not help are letting others, often laypeople and scholars without relevant scientific expertise, fight the battles from which they, with much at stake for the future of their disciplines, are benefiting.

All scientists are indebted to their excellent colleagues who, sometimes to the detriment of their professional work, have engaged in such creationist conflicts as those in, for example, New Mexico, Kansas, Ohio, and Georgia. In 1998, New Mexico physicist Marshall Berman ran for a seat on the New Mexico Board of Education after the board removed evolution and the age of the earth from New Mexico's public school science standards in 1996. Berman won, and he succeeded in getting that decision reversed (Thomas n.d.). In May 2001, biologist Joseph L. Graves, Jr., joined by Louisiana biologist Dave Schultz of Nicholls State University—with final exams approaching!—testified before the Louisiana legislature's House Education Committee. Both opposed a resolution by African-American legislator Sharon Weston-Broome declaring Darwin and evolution to be the source of modern racism. Graves, also African-American, came on his own initiative to help the handful of scientists who were actively involved (Morgan 2001; Schultz 2001).

But there are not nearly enough such scientist-citizens. The creationist opposition doesn't need that sort of input: it has a well-oiled, well-funded public relations machine that echoes the *feelings* (not knowledge) of many, perhaps most, of the well-meaning but scientifically ill-educated public. If you can't fight a public relations machine with one of equal size and weight, then you must fight it with many individuals who obviously know what they're talking about in science, and who *will* talk.

Short-Term Initiatives

Individual scientists (and qualified scholars in other disciplines) can quickly and easily join, or otherwise ally themselves with, organizations already engaged in defense of scientific truth. But even more to this point, such alliances can be made quickly and easily by *groups* or *organizations* of like-minded scientists. The battle to keep religion out of the science classroom is one of the most clearly focused of all church-state separation battles, and there are active organizations working to preserve the principle and the reality of church-state separation. They operate from the national level, such as Americans United for Separation of Church and State, to the state level, such as the Texas Freedom Network. Their work has often included fighting the legal battles against creationism. We are a diverse society, and our

diversity is not just racial and ethnic: it is an enormous cultural diversity, and that includes both religious and nonreligious citizens, all of whom have an interest in preserving secular government and education. There is every reason why scientists and their organizations should now stand up to be counted. The coalition of highly qualified scientists and educators with those groups who have fought the lonely fight, decade after decade, against sectarianism in education and in law-making would have a hugely uplifting effect on those groups—and on those joining them, too.

Finally, there are the issues surrounding the principles that are the legacies of the Enlightenment, the scientific revolution, and the rise of parliamentary democracy. Whatever arguments there are about the consequences (intended and unintended) of various features of modernity, among those principles are some that have earned the understanding and acquiescence of most people, at least, but not solely, in the “developed” world. We refer here to full religious and ethnic tolerance, to the requirement for rationality and evidence-based justification in law and other public undertakings, and to the necessary incubator of all the above—secular government. These issues are too infrequently discussed, much less acted upon, in the hard and detailed business, politics, and political correctness (in each era) of scientific and scholarly societies. But surely, if the threat to those principles from the ID movement *is* as indicated by the words of the Wedge’s leaders—a threat of cultural revolution to undo those principles—then scientists and their professional organizations ought right now to stop pussyfooting, stop worrying about potential political enemies or the current speech codes of their universities, or for that matter about their fundraising or parking allotments, and give strong voice to what is right.

There is an efficient way to do this promptly. It can and should be done, especially in states whose boards of education and legislatures are beleaguered by creationists and other religious organizations with political muscle (such as Focus on the Family and its state affiliates). The method is the formation of “truth squads,” teams of honest, trained, well-credentialed scholars who can communicate forcefully with school boards, politicians, and the media. (The entire Wedge is an *untruth* squad, in effect.) No single individual can be a truth squad. But a group of honest scholars can, if they are qualified in the subject matter and especially if they have the clerical and organizational machinery of their college or university, or their scientific society, or their company, to support them. There are already groups such as the Center for Media and Public Affairs, which monitors, for example, the use of statistical and other social research “studies” in the media.¹⁴ There are also groups like Kansas Citizens for Science and Ohio Citizens for Science, which sprang up in response to ID efforts in their states; they need help.¹⁵ How appropriate it would be, for example, for the state zoological, geological, physical, and science teachers’ societies to mount regular watches on the media, on school science standards, on education committees of legislatures now under intense pressure to please a subpopulation who want God (back) in the science class, and to take early, frequent, and proactive measures! The American Geophysical Union (AGU) has an e-mail alert system for developments affecting geophysical science. AGU also offers workshops on counteracting creationism. The American Geological Institute (AGI) provides e-mail alerts and special updates to its members. The American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS) has

listservs in each state to facilitate communication among concerned activists.¹⁶ State science and education organizations should do likewise, extending their contacts to the local level and linking their efforts with these national ones.

This sort of effort, which can be organized in a matter of a few weeks or months, must exist *before* there is a stealth attack on science education, not *after* one has begun. It doesn't take much time or effort until a skirmish actually starts, but only if the truth squad—ready with a scientifically competent response—is set up and ready to go, is there a chance of putting out the brushfire. Once it starts, the resulting conflagration needs real troops and celebrities to fight it, and that takes more dedication and resources than single scientists or local groups of them can usually manage ad hoc. Scientists are essential in this effort: *they are the only people who know the science needed to fight the pseudoscience*. But they have valuable community allies who can provide assistance: parent-teacher organizations, mainstream clergy, humanist groups, civil liberties organizations—in short, anyone who benefits from the Enlightenment legacies upon which America truly was founded.

Conclusion

Frederick Clarkson, who writes invaluable and underutilized exposés of the Religious Right for *Public Eye* magazine, warns that not only are the culture wars *not* over, but that views once considered extreme are entering the mainstream: “The major institutions of the Christian Right, once bastions of fire and brimstone rhetoric and a transcendent vision of the once and future Christian Nation, have become practitioners of political compromise and coalition building . . . and perhaps most important, the Christian Right is now largely institutionalized throughout society” (Clarkson 2001). We have described a facet of the ID movement that has not received the scrutiny proportionate to its pivotal significance in this larger effort—national in scope—to restructure American institutions and government policy on a sectarian, theistic foundation.

Christian philosopher Robert Audi, in his *Religious Commitment and Secular Reason*, acknowledges forthrightly the difficulties that theists face when they attempt to influence public policy according to their religious loyalties. He also points out the danger of allowing personal religious faith to erupt into politically charged fanaticism. One passage reads as though it might have been crafted especially to describe the Wedge, especially Dembski, whose comments on “heresy” are so chilling:

There is a danger not only of one religion's dominating others or non-religious people, but also of one person's doing so, or one religiously powerful coterie's doing so . . . , or at least of one or more zealots taking themselves to be important in a way that makes them uncooperative as citizens. This may be in or outside politics. The belief in a supreme God with sovereignty over the world should induce humility, but it need not. Indeed, the better one thinks one represents God—especially when God is being ignored or disobeyed—the more important one may naturally think one is oneself . . . There is a kind of zeal that . . . can erode citizenship and, sometimes, substitute a personal vision for genuine religious inspiration. (Audi 2000, 102)

Audi conveys well the message we have tried to communicate in seeing the Wedge as part of the larger Religious Right network. But if we who value the secular, constitutional democracy constructed by the country's founders, and the understanding of nature made possible by modern science, wish for these legacies to survive for our children and grandchildren, we would do well to heed not only Audi's moving expression of concern, but Kramnick and Moore's more pragmatically phrased one in *The Godless Constitution*:

Should we be worried? The answer given in this book is yes, . . . [We] are concerned about current pronouncements made by politically charged religious activists, . . . the Religious Right. Their crusade is an old one . . . Whenever religion of any kind casts itself as the one true faith and starts trying to arrange public policy accordingly, people who believe that they have a stake in free institutions, whatever else might divide them politically, had better look out. (1997, 12)

Notes

1. The plan is outlined in "The Wedge Strategy," formulated by the CSC under its original name, Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture. See Discovery Institute, Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture, n.d. Forrest and Gross (2004) discuss the document's authenticity. Discovery Institute now acknowledges ownership of it. Written sometime in the late 1990s as a fund-raising tool, the ten-page document outlined the Wedge's short- and long-term goals, followed by a "Wedge Strategy Process Summary."

2. Please note the implied definition of "direct evidence."

3. The CSC's stated reason for its 2002 name change is that "the former was simply too long and we got tired of saying it." A more likely explanation, ironically, is its desire to pose as a secular entity for strategic purposes, e.g., presenting itself to school boards as a scientific organization. The CSC announced the change in early 2003 in "The Center's Name Change" at www.crsc.org/TopQuestions/nameChange.html. See also the National Center for Science Education's "Evolving Banners at the Discovery Institute" at www.ncseweb.org/resources/articles/4116_evolving_banners_at_the_discov_8_29_2002.asp (Oakland, CA: NCSE). Accessed on December 12, 2004.

4. Theocracy has historically taken different forms and has several meanings. According to Dewey D. Wallace (1987), "Theocracy . . . refers to a type of government in which God or gods are thought to have sovereignty, or to any state so governed" (427). Although the concept of theocracy has no rigorous definition in either social science or the history of religion and does not denote a specific political system (as does "monarchy," e.g.), it "designates a certain kind of placement of the ultimate source of state authority, regardless of the form of government" (427). Four types are designated: "hierocracy, or rule by religious functionaries; royal theocracy, or rule by a sacred king; general theocracy, or rule in a more general sense by a divine will or law; and eschatological theocracy, or future rule by the divine" (427). The meaning we intend with respect to the Wedge's theocratic ambitions is general theocracy, which is "by far the most common, . . . that more general type wherein ultimate authority is considered to be vested in a divine law or revelation, mediated through a variety of structures and polities" (429). This type embodies an ideal shared by the theocracies of John Calvin, Oliver Cromwell, and the Massachusetts Puritans: "a holy community on earth in which the sovereignty was God's and in which the actual law should reflect the divine will and the government seek to promote the divine glory" (429). In Cromwell's England and the Massachusetts Bay Colony, "there was both a hearkening after Old Testament theocratic patterns and a sense of the

importance of government entrusted to truly regenerate persons—or the saints—in an effort to create a holy commonwealth,” in which “rule was exercised . . . more through a godly laity than through the clergy” (429). This is the closest description of what the Wedge seems to favor. For example, in “Nihilism and the End of Law” (Johnson 1993), Johnson’s disapproval of secular law and longing for a God-based legal system pervades his entire discussion. Johnson, in *Reason in the Balance: The Case against Naturalism in Science, Law, and Education* (1995b), speaks nostalgically of a time when law was biblically based, but disapprovingly of modern, secular law:

For much of Western history, lawmakers assumed that authoritative moral guidance was available to them in the Bible and in the religious traditions based on the Bible . . . [But] modernist culture retains the prohibition of theft and murder, retains the sabbath merely as a secular day of recreation, discards the admonition to have ‘no other gods before me’ as meaningless, and regards ambivalently the prohibition of adultery and the command to honor parents. (39)

Johnson’s subtitle indicates the “structures and politics” through which he believes divine law should be mediated: science, law, and education.

5. For an example of such denials, see West (2002). For the evidence establishing that ID is merely the most recent form of traditional creationism, see Forrest and Gross (2004, 273–296).

6. For a more detailed discussion of the ID movement’s alliances with theocratic individuals and organizations, see Forrest and Gross (2004, 270–273).

7. See the ISCID website at www.iscid.org.

8. See Forrest and Gross (2004, chs. 7, 9), in which we discuss the Wedge’s inroads into secular higher education and their alliances with evangelical student and faculty organizations.

9. The other is Oklahoma Baptist University. See “ID Colleges,” at www.arn.org/college.htm (Colorado Springs, CO: Access Research Network).

10. For discussion of this and related issues, see Gross (2000).

11. For a good discussion of the need for scientists to become involved in addressing the problem of creationism, see Massimo Pigliucci (2002, ch. 8).

12. The details of this program are available on the Tennessee Darwin Coalition website at <http://fp.bio.utk.edu/darwin/bios.html>. Accessed on December 10, 2004.

13. See Pigliucci’s July 19, 2001, announcement of the establishment of the taskforce as a subcommittee of SSE’s Education Committee at www.csicop.org/list/listarchive/msg00248.html. Accessed on December 10, 2004. Barbara Forrest, as president of Citizens for the Advancement of Science Education (CASE), provided a letter of support.

14. See the CMPA’s “Science and Health Studies” web page at www.cmpa.com. Accessed on March 1, 2004.

15. See their respective websites at www.kcfs.org and www.OhioScience.org. Accessed on December 10, 2004.

16. For details on AGU, AGI, and AIBS efforts, see www.agu.org/sci_soc/policy/sci_pol.html, www.agiweb.org/gap/email/index.html, and www.aibs.org/mailling-lists/the_aibs-ncse_evolution_list_server.html, respectively. Accessed on December 10, 2004.

References

AAAS. 2002. “AAAS Board Resolution on Intelligent Design Theory” (October 18). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. Accessed on March 1, 2004, at www.aaas.org/news/releases/2002/1106id2.shtml.

- Alliance for the Separation of School and State. n.d. "VIP Endorsements of the Separation of School and State." Fresno, CA: Alliance for the Separation of School and State. Accessed on December 10, 2004, at www.HonestEd.com/vips/index.php.
- Audi, Robert. 2000. *Religious Commitment and Secular Reason*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Behe, Michael J. 1998. "Tulips and Dandelions." *Books and Culture* (September/October). Accessed on February 5, 2004, at <http://web.archive.org/web/20030622153241/http://www.christianitytoday.com/bc/8b5/8b5034.html>.
- Clarkson, Frederick. 2001. "The Culture Wars Are Not Over: The Institutionalization of the Christian Right." *Public Eye* (Spring). Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.publiceye.org/magazine/v15n1/State_of_Christian_Rt.htm#TopOfPage.
- Dembski, William A. 1999. *Intelligent Design: The Bridge between Science and Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- . 2001a. "Is Intelligent Design a Form of Natural Theology?" Philadelphia, PA: Metanexus Institute (May 11). Accessed on February 5, 2004, at www.metanexus.net/metanexus_online/show_article.asp?3130.
- . 2001b. "The Task of Apologetics." In *Unapologetic Apologetics: Meeting the Challenges of Theological Studies*, edited by William A. Dembski and Jay Wesley Richards. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- . 2002a. Foreword to *Moral Darwinism: How We Became Hedonists*, by Benjamin Wiker. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press. Accessed on March 13, 2004, at www.designinference.com/documents/2002.06.foreword_ben_wiker.htm.
- . 2002b. "Then and Only Then: A Response to Mike Gene." "Intelligent Design Forum" (July 26). Colorado Springs, CO: Post to Access Research Network. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.arn.org/ubb/ultimatebb.php?ubb=get_topic;f=13;t=000220#000000.
- . 2002c. "Becoming a Disciplined Science: Prospects, Pitfalls, and Reality Check for ID." Address delivered at Research and Progress in Intelligent Design (RAPID) conference (October 25). Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.designinference.com/documents/2002.10.27.Disciplined_Science.htm.
- . 2003. "Curriculum Vitae" (August). Design Inference Website: William A. Dembski. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.designinference.com/documents/CVpdf.aug2003.pdf.
- . 2004a. *The Design Revolution: Answering the Toughest Questions about Intelligent Design*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- . 2004b. "Curriculum Vitae" (July). Design Inference Website: William A. Dembski. Accessed on December 11, 2004, at www.designinference.com/documents/PDF_Current_CV_Dembski.pdf.
- Dembski, William A., and Jay Wesley Richards. 2001. "Reclaiming Theological Education." In *Unapologetic Apologetics: Meeting the Challenges of Theological Studies*, edited by William A. Dembski and Jay Wesley Richards. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Discovery Institute. 2004. "The 'Wedge Document'—'So What?'" Seattle, WA: Discovery Institute. Accessed on February 20, 2004, at www.csrc.org/TopQuestions/wedgeresp.pdf.
- Discovery Institute, Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture. n.d. "The Wedge Strategy" [Fund-raising proposal]. Seattle, WA: Discovery Institute. Accessed on December 11, 2004, at www.antievolution.org/features/wedge.html.
- Forrest, Barbara. 2004. "A Defense of Naturalism as a Defense of Secularism." In *Sidney Hook Reconsidered*, edited by Matthew J. Cotter. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Forrest, Barbara, and Paul R. Gross. 2004. *Creationism's Trojan Horse: The Wedge of Intelligent Design*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gross, Paul R. 2000. "Politicizing Science Education." Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Accessed on March 1, 2004, at www.edexcellence.net/doc/Gross.pdf.

- Hartwig, Mark. 2001. "The Meaning of Intelligent Design." *Boundless* (July 18). Colorado Springs, CO: Focus on the Family. Accessed on February 5, 2004, at www.boundless.org/2000/features/a0000455.html.
- ISCID. n.d. "Society Fellows." Princeton, NJ: International Society for Complexity, Information, and Design. Accessed on March 13, 2004, at www.iscid.org/fellows.php.
- Johnson, Phillip E. 1993. "Nihilism and the End of Law." *First Things* (March). New York: Institute on Religion and Public Life. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft9303/articles/pjohnson.html.
- . 1994a. "Is God Unconstitutional? The Established Religion of America," Part 1, *The Real Issue* (September/October). Addison, TX: Christian Leadership Ministries. Accessed on February 5, 2004, at www.leaderu.com/real/ri9403/johnson.html.
- . 1994b. "Is God Unconstitutional? The Established Religion of America," Part 2, *The Real Issue* (November/December). Addison, TX: Christian Leadership Ministries. Accessed on February 5, 2004, at www.leaderu.com/real/ri9404/johnson2.html.
- . 1995a. "What (If Anything) Hath God Wrought?" *Academe* (September/October). Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.arn.org/docs/johnson/aaup.htm.
- . 1995b. *Reason in the Balance: The Case against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- . 1996. "How to Sink a Battleship: A Call to Separate Materialist Philosophy from Empirical Science." *The Real Issue* (November/December). Addison, TX: Christian Leadership Ministries. Accessed on February 5, 2004, at www.leaderu.com/real/ri9602/johnson.html.
- . 2000. Interview by Hank Hanegraaff. *Bible Answer Man* radio program (December 19). Rancho Santa Margarita, CA: Christian Research Institute.
- . 2001a. Foreword to *Unapologetic Apologetics: Meeting the Challenges of Theological Studies*, edited by William A. Dembski and Jay Wesley Richards. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- . 2001b. Letter. In "Edward T. Oakes and His Critics: An Exchange." *First Things* (April). New York: Institute on Religion and Public Life. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft0104/correspondence-oakes.html.
- . 2002a. *The Right Questions: Truth, Meaning and Public Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- . 2002b. "The Dick Staub Interview: Phillip Johnson." *Christianity Today* (December 3). Accessed on February 5, 2004, at www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2002/147/22.0.html.
- . 2003. Interview by Hank Hanegraaff. *Bible Answer Man* radio program (February 20). Rancho Santa Margarita, CA: Christian Research Institute.
- Kramnick, Isaac, and R. Laurence Moore. 1997. *The Godless Constitution: The Case against Religious Correctness*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Kreeft, Peter. 2002. *How to Win the Culture War*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Morgan, Fiona. 2001. "Louisiana Calls Darwin a Racist." *Salon* (May 4). Accessed on February 6, 2004, at <http://archive.salon.com/news/feature/2001/05/04/darwin/>.
- Pearcey, Nancy. 2000. "We're Not in Kansas Anymore." *Christianity Today* (May). Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2000/006/1.42.html.
- Pennock, Robert T. 1999. "The Science Pages." *Books and Culture* (September/October). Accessed on February 14, 2004, at www.ctlibrary.com/bc/1999/septoct/9b5031.html.
- Pigliucci, Massimo. 2002. *Denying Evolution: Creationism, Scientism, and the Nature of Science*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.
- Reynolds, John Mark. n.d. "Origin of Torrey." La Mirada, CA: Torrey Honors Institute, Biola University. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.biola.edu/academics/torrey/about/reynolds.cfm.

- Roots, Kimberly. 2004. "Dembski to Head Seminary's Faith and Science Center." *Science and Theology News* (November). Quincy, MA: Science and Theology News. Accessed on December 11, 2004, at www.stnews.org/archives/2004_november/news_dembski_1104.html.
- Schaefer, Henry F. n.d. "Questions Intellectuals Ask about Christianity: A Public Lecture by Henry 'Fritz' Schaefer," Leadership University. Addison, TX: Christian Leadership Ministries. Accessed on February 5, 2004, at www.leaderu.com/offices/schaefer/docs/questions.html.
- Schultz, Dave. 2001. "Dave Schultz on House Education Committee Resolution 74—Published in the *Houma Courier*." New Orleans, LA: New Orleans Secular Humanist Association. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at <http://nosha.secularhumanism.net/essays/schultz1.html>.
- Thomas, Dave. n.d. "Creationism in New Mexico." Albuquerque, NM: New Mexicans for Science and Reason. Accessed on February 6, 2004, at www.nmsr.org/nmevhist.htm.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1999. *Schools and Religion: Executive Summary and Transcripts of Proceedings Held in Washington, DC, New York City, and Seattle, WA, Spring/Summer 1998*. Washington, DC: United States Commission on Civil Rights.
- Wallace, Dewey D., Jr. 1987. "Theocracy." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Mircea Eliade, 427–430. New York: Macmillan.
- West, John G., Jr. 2002. "Intelligent Design and Creationism Just Aren't the Same." *Research News and Opportunities in Science and Theology* (December 1). Accessed on December 10, 2004, at www.arn.org/docs2/news/idandcreationismnotsame011503.htm.