

Testimony in strong opposition of SB2355

Dear Chairman and Members of the Committee,

I strongly urge you to give a DO NOT PASS recommendation to this bill that would require the teaching of a religious concept in North Dakota science classrooms.

Here are my reasons:

- Intelligent Design is **creationism**, i.e. religion, since its main point is that life is so complex that it can only have been created by God (the intelligent designer)
- Intelligent Design is **not based in science**. There is no scientific support of any kind for a creator God of all life. Evolutionary theory can easily explain the complexity of the human eye and other structures that may seem miraculous to the untrained person.
- Intelligent Design has been **ruled to be in violation of the Establishment Clause**. See *Kitzmiller vs Dover School board (2005)*
- Teaching Intelligent Design as a science **undermines the integrity of the excellent North Dakota science standards**
- Intelligent Design creationism, like all creationism, is **advanced by people who misunderstand the meaning of a scientific theory**. Scientific theories are not barely-supported guesses – “just a theory” – but are well-supported by a vast body of scientific research. Evolutionary theory is no more controversial than the theory of the atom, the theory of gravity, or cell theory.
- Passing this bill will undoubtedly lead to **law suits that have to be paid by the North Dakota taxpayer** and are bound to fail

Here is an excerpt from the 12/20/2005 decision by Judge Jones in the *Kitzmiller vs Dover* trial:

“Intelligent Design (ID) is not science. We find that ID fails on three different levels, any one of which is sufficient to preclude a determination that ID is science. They are: (1) ID violates the centuries-old ground rules of science by invoking and permitting supernatural causation; (2) the argument of irreducible complexity, central to ID, employs the same flawed and illogical contrived dualism that doomed creation science in the 1980s; and (3) ID's negative attacks on evolution have been refuted by the scientific community. ... It is additionally important to note that ID has failed to gain acceptance in the scientific community, it has not generated peer-reviewed publications, nor has it been the subject of testing and research. Expert testimony reveals that since the scientific revolution of the 16th and 17th centuries, science has been limited to the search for natural causes to explain natural phenomena.”

Sincerely,

Alex Deufel, PhD Biology
Professor of Biology
Minot State University

– District 40