



AmoLatino.com

I am  between the ages of  and

seeking a

AmoLatino.com Feedback - Ads by Google



TUESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2005

## USA Today Does Terrible Job On Evolution "Debate"

by Michael in New York on [8/16/2005 11:56:00 AM](#)

USA Today devoted its opinion page to the "debate" on evolution (a debate which doesn't exist in the scientific community, of course). It gives one half of the page to **the people from the Discovery Institute**, the group devoted to pushing its religious beliefs into our classrooms. The other half is given to **the real scientists**. Fine.

The problem is the primer provided by USA Today's Alejandro Gonzalez getting readers up to speed on the definition of "Neo-Darwinism," "Theory of Evolution," "Intelligent Design" and "Creationism." (You can find it under either link.) The first two are okay as far as they go, though USA Today makes no reference to the 150 years of evidence and studies and experiments that support them nor the widespread acceptance they enjoy, how they are bedrocks of modern biology, etc. Apparently out of fear of offending anyone, USA Today simply gives a dictionary definition of "Creationism," as if to say, "Don't blame us for saying it's religious; that's what Webster's says."

The real problem is USA Today's definition of Intelligent Design. Both Neo-Darwinism and Theory of Evolution are properly termed theories. And ID?

**"A new and developing theory** that says certain features of living systems are best explained by an intelligent cause rather than an undirected mechanism...."

A new and developing theory? That is simply ridiculous for a major newspaper to say. ID is not a theory in any sense of the term as it's used in science. Moreover, it is simply wrong to describe it as a "new and developing theory" alongside Neo-Darwinism. It is not a theory because a theory in science must have mountains of evidence and years of study before an idea gets elevated to that level of seriousness. More importantly, ID is not a scientific idea in any way shape or form. It is a religious belief, pure and simple. It cannot and has not been proved or disproved by experiment. It cannot and has not inspired any experiments or studies. It cannot and has not predicted certain patterns or behaviors for scientists to look for. After decades of proselytizing, ID remains absolutely outside of science for the simple fact that it isn't science.

USA Today was not being respectful by describing ID this way. USA Today was lying, pure and simple, or grossly incompetent. They really should run a correction. Any scientists, any science foundations out there, any university professors, please write to USA Today and correct this error. It's absolutely crucial to this fight that major newspapers not start to lie to their readers