

Use browser back button to return to website

An Introduction to Intelligent Design:

(The following transcript is from a presentation on Intelligent Design given to a local high school)

The first question that is asked of any speaker regards qualification. Does one have authority to address the subject in question? Particularly in this case, how can a theologian or ethicist address questions of science. Some assume that one should possess a PhD in microbiology or paleontology before one can enter the debate between Darwinistic Evolution and Creationism?

It is the duty of God's prophet to represent God in all areas touched upon in the Scriptures. Human origin is addressed in Scripture, and the subject is an essential part of Christian theology. Theology does have something to say about science.

“The mouth of the representative of God should preserve knowledge and men should seek instruction from his mouth for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts” (Malachi 2:7)

Theology is the prince of sciences, and to know theology is the foundation of all knowledge. We can trust and rely upon the laws of science because we know that there is a lawmaker behind those rules. The Scriptures give the philosophical underpinnings of science, and it has often been conjectured that when scientist finally discover the real theories behind the universe and they climb to the top of the mountain of knowledge, they will find that the theologians have been sitting there all along waiting for them.

“The fear of the Lord is the beginning or foundation of knowledge.” (Proverbs 1:7)

When it comes to the question of origins, that is, how we got here, this is not so much a question of operational science as it is a question of philosophical science. This is a question that calls for logical deduction, falsifiability, scientific method, etc. Although most of the proponents of Intelligent Design are scientists, one of the most well known proponents, Phil Johnson, is not a scientist at all, but a lawyer. He entered into the debate not because he was a scientist, but because he was a rational thinker. He knew the difference between a good argument and a bad argument, and it was the faulty reasoning of Darwinism that led him to speak against the religion of Darwinism. An umpire doesn't need the ability to dunk a basketball in order to know when to call a foul! Scientists are not above the need for ethicists, theologians, and lawyers to call foul play when they leave the realm of science and resort to speculation, junk science or philosophical bias.

This should be an encouragement to students. One doesn't need a PhD in science to be able to figure out the evolution question; all you need is a good head on your shoulders and a general knowledge of basic science.

Who are the Players in ID

There are hundreds of scientific organizations promoting creation research. The best known are Institute for Creation Research, Answers in Genesis and the Discovery Institute.

In the recent debate in the Kansas school system as to whether Intelligent Design should be taught along with Darwinism, the Discovery Institute presented a statement signed by over 400 scientists questioning “the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life.” Those that signed the statement were no slouches academically. Included were professors from MIT,

Rice and Yale. Arguing for Intelligent Design before the Kansas school board were University of Georgia biology professor Russell Carlson, University of Missouri-Kansas City professor of medicine William Harris, and Lehigh University biochemist Michael Behe (Author of *Darwin's Black Box*). One creationist described the situation this way,

"The Darwinist establishment benefits enormously from portraying the origins debate as a tempest in a teapot, driven by a small, marginalized group of Bible-thumpers."

Also in support of Intelligent Design are Evolutionists themselves who have written books shedding doubt on Darwinism, such as *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* - written by agnostic Michael Denton. In 2004, Anthony Flew, the most well known proponent of atheism and Darwinism of our time, declared that after looking at the evidence, he has concluded that some sort of intelligence or first cause must have created the universe and life. Flew said in an interview, "Biologists' investigation of DNA has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangement needed to produce life, that intelligence must have been involved."

(Since the writing of this paper, Anthony Flew, shortly before his death, through being convinced by the arguments of Intelligent Design, renounced atheism)

Many evolutionists regard the time and environment on earth as a non-starter for chemical evolution. But since they are convinced evolution must be a fact, they look to outer space as the source for life on earth. Life must have begun in outer space, and the earth was seeded at some time in the past.

What is the Science Behind Intelligent Design

The science of Intelligent Design is not something new. It is the old classical teleological argument for the existence of God. Design implies a designer. The commonly held definition of I.D. is "Order and useful arrangement pervading a system implies intelligence and purpose as the cause of that order and arrangement." The Bible itself uses the teleological argument, or rather the intelligent design argument, extensively.

"The heavens are telling of the glory of God; And their expanse is declaring the work of His hands. 2 Day to day pours forth speech, And night to night reveals knowledge. 3 There is no speech, nor are there words; Their voice is not heard." (Psalm 19:1-3)

"For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse." (Romans 1:20)

"For every house is built by someone, but the builder of all things is God." (Hebrews 3:4)

The Scriptures say that the existence of God is proved by the design found in the creation. Because the design of the creation, the knowledge of God is universal, intuitive, and revealed unless there is a moral agenda against believing in an almighty creator.

The claim of Scripture is that the earth looks like it is made by a superior designer, and God made it to look that way! What God has done is to give real evidence of His existence through man's investigation of nature. Creation Science is not opposed to the observation of the Scientific Method. If something is true, it is true in science as well as theology. Creationists are not afraid of real science; instead, they seek to promote more science and experimentation. It is not as if Christianity is worried that modern science will disprove God and the divine, immediate creation. Christians believe that the more science,

the more experimentation, the more discoveries in paleontology and biology, then the more mankind will be led to a knowledge of God. The Scriptures encourage us to do science. Nothing should be suppressed. Every Christian should be a scientist in one degree or another in order to discover the wonders of God for oneself and one's neighbor.

The Christian knows that it is atheism that needs to avoid true science if it is to survive, not Christianity. Therefore, Christians should never shy away from testing our beliefs through science. We can expect science to uphold the proposition that the design of the world can only be explained by a designer -- "The heavens declare the glory of God." This is not approaching science with a bias; honesty is still key. But we understand that the existence of a creator is testable science; and if it is testable, it does qualify as science. We certainly do not receive all theology from natural revelation. Special revelation [The Bible] is God's plan for revealing the gospel of salvation. Nevertheless, the very existence of God is taught in natural revelation.

The Expansion of This New Field of Study Called Intelligent Design

The expansion of Intelligent Design has come about because of more science, not less. Through advances in Information technology, the applications of mathematics to biology, the discoveries of the coding of DNA, and molecular biology, the scientific world is appreciating more and more the evidence for a designer.

In the early years of science, biological systems appeared very simply. It was, therefore, logical to conclude that these simple systems could create design by chance, like a cloud forming the shape of an animal. Ancient Egyptians would observe that frogs came out of the mud in the Nile. Not knowing that frogs were more than just green mud, they concluded that mud produces frogs. This is called Spontaneous Generation, the theory that life spontaneously generates out of non-living chemistry. Surprisingly, throughout the Middle Ages theologians defended the idea of spontaneous generation because, in their minds, it legitimized the concept that God was the active life force, and continual life giver. In a similar vein, theistic evolutionists in our day believe the process of evolution accentuates the power of God. Scripture and science are again replaced with theological assumptions, but this is a topic for another time.

When it comes to Spontaneous Generation, we laugh at such naivety. But given what scientists knew about biology in the Middle Ages, it was perfectly reasonable to conclude that the oozing goop that makes up a frog can generate spontaneously in mud, like gold in an alchemist's pot. It was a lack of information about the complexity of biological organisms that caused ancient scientists to conclude that non-living chemistry can give rise to living organism. In the same way, it is a lack of information that caused 20th century scientists to conclude that given more time, non-living chemistry can give rise to living organisms. Modern science still believes in a form of spontaneous generation; but now it is explained as a gradual process over millions of years. In the 20th century it was a simple view of biological systems that influenced philosophical opinions about origins in past centuries. But now that more is being discovered about the complexity of organisms, all bets are off concerning the modern theory of spontaneous generation--evolution.

Originally the arguments against evolution coming from the Christian realm avoided scientific empiricism and concentrated on metaphysical theology. The only practical science that the Christian community engaged in was showing that the evolutionist's extrapolation of the fossil records did not prove evolution. We were playing defense, not offense. But within the last 25 years, the new discoveries in information theory and DNA allowed the Christian community to go on the offense with empirical evidence for divine creation. When Darwinism swept across the intellectual world, the

Christian world was blindsided. It has taken 75 years to compile the Christian retort. What took so long is that we depended too much on intuition, and forgot that real science is on our side. Real science must be, and can be, used in our witness to this fallen world.

The irony is that the proponents of evolution began with empirical evidence; but now that empirical evidence is turning against them, they may reject it as much as, if not more, than the theologians ever did.

In the words of John Wiester, chairman of the Science Education Commission of the American Scientific Affiliation, "Darwinism is naturalistic philosophy masquerading as science."

The Dogma of Evolution and the Proofs

How many of you believe Darwinian evolution has graduated from hypothesis to fact? How many of you believe evolution is being taught as a fact in the education system? Sadly, many people answer true to the first and false to the second. They are wrong.

In January of 2005 a federal judge ordered evolution disclaimer stickers be removed from public school textbooks in Marietta, Georgia. The disclaimer read: "This textbook contains material on evolution. Evolution is a theory, not a fact, regarding the origin of living things. This material should be approached with an open mind, studied carefully, and critically considered." Six parents sued to remove the stickers claiming that the disclaimers violated the principle of the separation of church and state. The judge agreed.

By some unknown authority this judge took it upon himself to declare evolution a fact and to assume that any contradiction of evolution is religion not science. Evolution is taught as fact in public schools. The Holt, Rinehart, and Winston textbook for Biology used in many public high schools states, "You are an animal, and share a common heritage with earthworms..."

Are there any experiments proving Darwinian evolution? This is the best kept secret of evolution. There have been no controlled experiments giving empirical proof of Darwinian evolution, and the Intelligent Design community always holds out the challenge for anyone to present a proof. What would such an experiment look like?

(1) It would be an experiment that shows cellular life has the ability to add high level information either through mutation or natural selection.

(2) It would be evidence of transitional species currently or in the fossil record

Darwinists have tried to make the case on both grounds. The first point will be dealt with in my detailed discussion of Intelligent Design, but I briefly want to address point two. The fossil record has been the classical argument for Darwinism, and we all remember those textbook pictures of man ascending from ape-like creatures. Serious scientists know that the bulk of these charts are extrapolations of the theory of evolution, not genuine fossil discoveries. The claim of Intelligent Design is that the fossil record does not prove evolution; it only proves extinct species.

The Darwinist approaches the fossil record and assumes that since there are extinct forms of life, these must have been lesser forms, or progenitors, of the species we have today. But the claim of Intelligent Design is that it is just as likely that these are merely extinct species, just as species are dying off the earth in the twentieth century. Because of the bias of evolution, the data is misinterpreted.

Another overlooked aspect is the dearth of fossil evidence. After 100 years of digging, evolutionists still haven't found the missing link—full skeletal remains of a transitional form of ape to man. The amount of evolution that had to take place on this planet in order to take random molecules and create

man is staggering. The window of opportunity for life to have evolved on this planet is considered 500 million years. Therefore, evolution had to take place rapidly. Today scientist would expect to find

(1) An innumerable amount of fossilized transitional species.

(2) Evolution observed through every generation of species, even currently. One change every 1000 years is not enough. For mankind to evolve, every generation of man should have contained observable change.

However, the observed science is that there are few, if any, fossils that can be shown to be transitional species, and there are few signs of evolution occurring presently. Darwinists themselves recognize this, and many claim that evolution has come to a rest for now. To explain the pause, some evolutionists speak of rapid jumps in the evolutionary process. Yet evolutionists themselves criticize this theory by saying they can't claim out of one side of their mouths that evolution is a gradual process that takes time and out of the other say it must have happened quickly in the past.

The data in the fossil record is adequately explained by the creation account. God created each species with genetic variety. Each species could reproduce after its kind (Genesis 1:24). For instance, the original dog had the genes for every variety of dog found today. Over time the genetic varieties have been isolated and many species, or their varieties, have become extinct. What we now see in nature is deterioration, not advancement. Christians believe in evolution, but an evolution downward, not upward. Man is becoming less strong, less intelligent, less resilient to disease. With every transfer of the genetic code there is a far greater chance of loss than gain. Natural selection is causing certain traits to disappear from species—traits that can never be regained when environmental changes demand them back.

“Of old You founded the earth, and the heavens are the work of Your hands. Even they will perish, but You endure; and all of them will wear out like a garment; like clothing You will change them and they will be changed”(Psalm 102:25-26).

This is the Biblical view of the creation, and it is fascinating that mankind has turned the whole thing on its head. While God says mankind is dying and deteriorating, man is saying he is living and improving. This reverse of the truth is incomprehensible, but Christians know that there are spiritual forces of wickedness helping to drive this lie. Satan is in the business of taking whatever God says and saying the opposite.

Proving Intelligent Design

Having asked the question as to what kind of experiments would prove evolution, the contrary question ought to be asked—“What kind of controlled experiment or observation is necessary to support the theory that Intelligent Design is the origin of life?” I believe it can be reduced to two.

(1) Observation and experimentation that concludes that no natural forces are present to explain the presence and complexity of biological organism

(2) Observation and experimentation that concludes that the information complexity of DNA demonstrates an intelligent source

Can the environment itself produce the information of DNA? Or are we left to conclude there had to be a designer? Since the environment has no personal power, what evolutionists are claiming is that random chance, working with the environment, is the power of life. This is evolution's own claim, and they have attempted to use laws of statistics to support their arguments. It is here that Intelligent Design finds support in the science of mathematics.

In the 1800s, scientist and theologian William Paley put forth the teleological argument of Intelligent Design using the illustration of a watch. The discovery of a watch means a watchmaker. Without going into the mathematical probability, it is intuitive that watches do not create themselves in the sea. Notice that God has so constructed His evidence that one does not need to be a mathematician to deduce origins. Paley also put forth the argument that when archeologists dig, they intuitively know what is natural and what is an artifact. There is a difference between an arrowhead and a pointy rock. Although there is the natural phenomenon called the Old Man on the Mountain in New Hampshire, we know this differs from Mount Rushmore. We intuitively know what is caused by nature and what takes intelligent design.

In our current day a computer is a good analogy. Imagine discovering a computer on an alien planet--not just any computer, but one that has mechanism to reproduce itself. While one visiting astronaut surmises that these computers must have been built and left by an advanced race of aliens, another insists that the elements on this planet randomly came together to create these computers. The first astronaut insists that inorganic matter has no power in itself to create such design; there is no way that sand randomly stirring in the seas can create a silicon microprocessor. The second astronaut insists that random chance has the power to design. Each astronaut views the other as insane. This is the argument between Creationists and Darwinists, except the human machine is far more complicated than the most advanced computer. The disagreement is not insolvable. Scientific discovery can determine what the environment is capable of designing.

In the 1860s there was a Creation-Evolution debate between Samuel Wilberforce and the famous Darwinist atheist Adlous Huxley. Huxley claimed that six eternal monkeys, typing on six typewriters, given enough time, could, by randomly striking the keys, produce a Psalm, a Shakespearean Sonnet, or a whole book. Therefore, random molecular movement, given enough time, could produce Adlous Huxley himself. The thesis: Even if the chances are incredibly high, given enough time, anything is possible--even evolution. This argument is fallacious, but many are fooled by it. Let's look the mathematics that Huxley failed to show his audience. How long would it take monkeys to come up with the Twenty Third Psalm?

Psalm 23

1 - The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.

2 - He makes me lie down in green pastures; He leads me beside quiet waters.

3 - He restores my soul; He guides me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

4 - Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me; Your rod and Your staff, they comfort me.

5 - You prepare a table before me in the presence of my enemies; You have anointed my head with oil; my cup overflows.

6 - Surely goodness and lovingkindness will follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

With fifty keys on a typewriter, and six monkeys making 1 strike/second, it has been statistically determined that it would take 34 hours to come up with the first word "the." The chances are 50^3 .

The chance of arriving at eight correct strikes -- "The Lord" is 50^8 . That is one in 39,062 billion. The time it would take the monkeys is an average time of 1.2 million years.

To complete the first verse of Psalm 23 is the chance of 50^{42} . That is an average time of 7.2×10^{63} years.

Why would an atheist like Russell object to Huxley's argument? Because when through probability one makes a very unlikely event possible, one opens the door to the possibility of God being the creator. Atheists must consider God a very unlikely event.

(2) Who are the monkeys organizing the molecules? With inorganic chemistry, there are no active agents binding these molecules together in various attempts and patterns. In probability, you have someone flipping a coin and someone to recording the results--not so in chemistry. The protein of DNA will not form meaningful information on its own, any more than ink in a jar will arrange itself into a copy of the New York Times. Ink just sits in a puddle; it doesn't have the power to write messages—only minds do. If you examine a solution of amino acids or proteins, nothing is forming. There are no attempts to form strains of DNA information. Natural selection is not even at work in inorganic chemistry. There are no monkeys at the typewriter. The irony is that in Huxley's illustration, he needed monkeys to do the designing. He needed intelligent, active designers. Huxley, and all those who speak of the probability of life forming, are wrongly associating theoretical probability with the realities of chemistry.

People speak of chance as having power. Philosophically, chance is “nothing.” It can do nothing. It is a fictitious word we use when describing events of physics that are too hard to describe. Does a coin land heads or tails by chance? No, the laws of physics determine the outcome. How much influence does chance have? None! Chance has no power of being. Yet, sophisticated scientists will say we have been created by chance. This amounts to nothing causing something. This is anti-science and logically impossible.

Not even modern scientists, using the most advanced tools to arrange molecules, can create the simplest one cell organism. But even if they someday succeed, it will only prove that it takes Intelligent Design to create life. Since proteins cannot design themselves, creating life requires the greatest scientific minds of our generation.

(3) Biochemical reactions in the formation of proteins reverse themselves immediately. If proteins (the basis for life) do form, they constantly break down as they form. Rather than organize, they naturally break down. There is always a tendency towards deterioration. So the analogy of the monkeys at the typewriters would be correctly described as every time the monkey types a letter on the paper, the ink drips off the paper. The reversibility of the reaction again explains why, in a pot of amino acids, the molecules are not forming themselves into either proteins or DNA strands.

(4)

A.E Wilder-Smith writes in his book *The Natural Sciences Knows Nothing of Evolution*

“The ocean is thus practically the last place on this or any other planet where the proteins of life could be formed. Yet nearly all textbooks of biology teach this nonsense to support evolutionary theory and spontaneous biogenics. It requires a great unfamiliarity with organic chemistry not to take into consideration the above mentioned facts when prosing postulates for biogenesis. In the case of biogenesis, these reversible reactions are all in equilibrium with one another, since there is no cell machinery to remove products selectively. In the body organic reactions such as the synthesis of proteins and the oxidation of fats occurs because of the intervention of specific enzymes (in the machinery of the cell) acting specifically at each step along the reaction chain. However, enzymes are proteins and one cannot claim synthesis for a product if one begins with the product one is trying to end up with.”

This is where the Second Law of Thermodynamics comes into play as a proven theorem to support Intelligent Design over Darwinism. This law states that in the natural world, the elements have a bias toward greater entropy (disorder) and toward less complexity. We do find order in the molecular world, but there is a difference between order and complexity.

Some have compared the random organization of molecules becoming alive as the probability of disassembling a typewriter and putting it into a barrel. Having rolled the barrel for millions of years, theoretical probability states that all the pieces would come together at some point in time. This works out well in probability but not in the real world. We all know that if a typewriter doesn't come together on the first roll, the chance of it coming together on the next roll is even less. After an entire day of rolling there would be a pile of typewriter dust. Over time, the chances of organization becomes less not more.

Any events in a system that favors disorder will mean complex organization has a probability of zero. This disproves Huxley's assertion that there is a probability of life coming together by chance.

This is the universe we live in. Matter does not organize itself into complex systems, but the systems tend toward disorder. If there is no mechanism or law in the universe to organize complex systems, then life cannot evolve. Secularist Paul Davies, professor of mathematical physics at the University of Adelaide, admits "There is no law in physics able to create information from nothing."

Some evolutionists who have come to realize that the physical laws on earth have no power to create complex biological systems, have theorized that life may have had to begin on another galaxy which contained different laws of physics, different elements, and a different environment. But this is not the realm of science, but the realm of speculation. Nobody can describe what this special environment had to be or how it could have accomplished spontaneous generation. And at this point, one is arguing for all the elements of God.

* Something outside our current system

* Something that has the power to create complex arrangements

(4) Even if the code of life was produced by chance, there needs to be a human cell already existing to maintain, read and apply the information. It is analogous to the spontaneous creation of a CD. With no computer to read the CD, it is dead. Darwinists sometimes speak as if the chance formation of DNA is all that is necessary for life. DNA is actually dead material. It has no life without a cell to operate it. The cell is the machine to translate the message. If we throw all the raw materials of DNA together, even if it organized, nothing would happen. There needs to be a functioning cell. DNA is not life; it is the medium for the information. The CD is not the computer game; it is only the medium for the information.

(5) This brings us to the issue called "irreducible complexity." This is the subject of biochemist Michael Behe's work, *Darwin's Black Box*. Biological changes can't evolve in micro steps because they serve no function. Yet macro steps are impossible according to the theories of evolution. The whole theory of evolution is based on the idea that tiny molecular changes could create a higher complex organism.

The eye must be fully functioning in all of its intricate parts before it can benefit the organism. So how could an organism gradually develop complex improvements by natural selection? The organism that evolved a half finished eye, ear or lung had no better chance for survival than an organism that had none. Behe used the illustration of a mousetrap--it is useless until all of the parts are in place.

Information theory is a recent science developed in the field of communications. How can we tell whether electrical signals are static or information? We can detect intelligent design when any reduction in the information destroys the usefulness of the information. For example, if we take the information that describes and plots the random organization of gas molecules in a bottle, and we take 10% of that information away, there is little change. If we take away 10% of the information that makes up the human cell, its usefulness ceases. Therefore, if a reduction of information affects the object, it is a sign that the object was designed by intelligence. Since biological organisms must have all information to function, it is the fingerprint of an Intelligent Designer, not random selection.

Given the five arguments above, a probability figure for the spontaneous formation of one complete bacterium DNA is not 10^{-100} billion. The probability is zero. Was Harold Morowitz, professor of biophysics at Yale, wrong in his calculations? No, he was speaking strictly in terms of theoretical probability—that is if the molecules of proteins were attempting to arrange themselves orderly and could maintain any complex arrangement. Intelligent design proponents, therefore, believe Darwinism is falsifiable through mathematics, chemistry, and observable science.

The Darwinists Retort

Darwinists believe that there are mechanisms in the natural world that could have added all the information necessary to create the first one-celled organism, and then transform this one-celled creature gradually into plants, animals and humans. Let us address these mechanisms.

(1) Mutation and Natural selection

Natural selection is the foundation of evolutionary theory. It is the process by which organisms mutate and then the environment only allows favorable mutations to be passed on. Intelligent Design argues that in mutation, DNA is damaged. Mutation is a loss of information complexity, not a gain. In a few cases, the lose of information may bring temporary benefit. An organism may lose some trait that allows it to have an advantage in certain situations. In these cases, the trend is still downward and the benefit is short term.

Mutations have never been empirically proven to turn fish into people. The occurrence of accidents for the advancement of an organism has not been proven by science.

As more discoveries are made in the field of DNA coding, evolutionists may be disappointed to discover that when species change, new DNA information is not being written. Intelligent Design proponents are confidence that more science will show that mutation and natural selection cannot advance life forms.

In my research I have come across many evolutionists who find proof for evolution in the mutations of bacteria and viruses. These are organisms that reproduce rapidly, and demonstrate natural selection. The public is aware that strains of bacteria form resistances to antibiotics. Evolutions speak as if it is an undeniable fact that these organisms are evolving to combat modern medicine.

A technical answer to this question is beyond the scope of this presentation. Nevertheless, the Intelligent Design community does provide answers. I urge those interested to goggle the subject. In short, Darwinists provide no proof that these organisms are writing new DNA code. What you have is a tremendous variation in a single species. Just has humans have differences in height, color, weight, and intelligence; bacteria and viruses come in many varieties. When one variety is killed off through medicine, another variety which is resistant to the medicine will thrive. When Scientist can actually show on the DNA level that these organisms are writing new DNA information, then evolutionist will have found most of their proof.

For good material on this subject see Sean Pitman's website and his article on "Evolving Bacteria."

<http://www.naturalselection.Ocatch.com/>

The argument of Intelligent Design is that through natural selection no new DNA information is being produced. The environment simply destroys the variety of the species that cannot cope. No new species are appearing, and information is actually reduced. There is further decline in usable traits through specialization.

There is no doubt that natural selection changes a specie's DNA information; however, evolutionists have yet to prove natural selection actually increases the complexity of DNA information.

(2) Self-organizing Chemistry

There must be something about the elements of organic chemistry that is different from the laws of non-organic chemistry. Even though we don't see elements being able to self-organize, there must be some principle or law that explains the origin of biological information. Chemist Manfred Eigen writes in his book *Steps Towards Life*, "Our task is to find an algorithm, a natural law that leads to the origin of information." Yet scientist have not found such a law.

The favorite analogy used by evolutionists is that of the crystal. Elements can form intense geometric structures all by themselves. In Information Theory, crystals are of low information content. It is the natural attraction of positive and negative forces. This is not the information complexity of biological organisms.

(3) Designer Genes

This is the theory that once life began, it was lucky enough to develop genes that have the ability to create and improve on the DNA coding—like a science fiction self-improving computer. To date no gene has been found that is able to do this. Furthermore, a designer gene does not explain how life formed in the first place.

These are the three basis mechanism Darwinists claim to have produced evolution. Have these mechanisms been proven true through the scientific method? Not really. John Maddox, the editor of *Nature*, wrote "the mystery of naturalistic origins of life will be solved soon." Even proponents of Darwinism must admit that they do not have all the scientific evidence backing their theories; they are still working in the realm of faith and mystery.

Let me share the testimony of Norris Anderson. Anderson was a textbook writer, who considered himself an evangelist for evolution. He helped prepare the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study which dogmatically taught evolution as a fact. Now he is working in the movement to insert in biology textbooks disclaimers which say evolution is a theory not a fact. Anderson says his turnabout came when a colleague told him, "Don't get me wrong. I believe human evolution happened, but there's absolutely no evidence for it." Anderson explains, "That is when my idealism began to crumble. I began to see that scientists were presenting a false image of scientific certainty."

Why does Evolution thrive?

If Darwinism isn't a provable theory and Intelligent Design is the natural conclusion to the evidence, why has the scientific community adopted Darwinism as the origin of life? For me this is the big question. How can an error take over the whole scientific community? Well, it is not as if the majority

on this planet has never been wrong. Man is a moral creature, and he has a moral agenda that transcends scientific facts and, therefore, interprets scientific facts.

If naturalism (the belief that there is not God, only us) is considered true by faith, then Darwinism has to be true no matter what the evidence. Darwinism is not so much an inference from the facts as it is a deduction from naturalistic philosophy. The affection for Darwinism can be attributed to the implications of Darwinism. In a debate with creationist Phil Johnson, Cornell biologist and avid evolutionist William Provin said proudly that Darwinism implies

- (1) No life after death
- (2) No ultimate foundation for ethics
- (3) No ultimate meaning for life
- (4) No free will

Darwinism does have an agenda even as Intelligent Design has an agenda. An agenda is not wrong in itself if one is honest with the facts and if one has an agenda that is consistent with reality.

This is where Romans chapter one comes into play: the goal of sinful humanity has been to get rid of God. Therefore, any talk of theism has been marginalized by the majority of humanity.

“For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness,

because that which is known about God is evident within them; for God made it evident to them.

For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse.

For even though they knew God, they did not honor Him as God or give thanks, but they became futile in their speculations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Professing to be wise, they became fools,”

(Romans 1:18-22)

The Scriptures state that in this world there is a moral bias; and it is so powerful that the data contained in God’s natural revelation will be interpreted according to the disposition of the heart, not the head. This fact is crucial to an understanding of the Darwinism-Intelligent Design debate.

Answers to Some Questions

1. If there is a God, why doesn’t He give the type of evidence that would convince everyone of His creative power? Why does He even allow room for Evolution?

One must understand what God is doing in the world. He is not interested in revealing Himself to everyone.

Judas (not Iscariot) said to Him, “Lord, what then has happened that You are going to disclose Yourself to us and not to the world?” Jesus answered and said to him, “If anyone loves Me, he will keep My word; and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our abode with him.

John 14:22-23

God doesn’t play in the same ball park of reasoning as fallen humanity. People think coming to God is all about using physical proofs to determine whether God exists. God says, “No, it is a matter of one’s

will.” The head follows the heart. Choices of the will are not something scientists can test in their laboratories, and this irritates men in their pride. *“For My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways My ways, declares the Lord”* (Isaiah 55:8)

Blaise Pascal wrote, “ The same God that reveals Himself to those who love Him, hides Himself from those who hate Him.” People will stumble in their faith if they don’t understand how God is testing people’s hearts by giving them only a certain amount of evidence.

2. What is the difference between God being the first cause and nature being the first cause? Is not the concept of God only postponing the question of evolution? After all, where did God come from?

The difference is that God has the power of life in Himself; nature does not have that power.

“In Him was life, and the life was the Light of men.” (John 1:4)

“For just as the Father has life in Himself, even so He gave to the Son also to have life in Himself;” (John 5:26)

There is nothing within nature that has been found to create life; but by definition, a personal God, who is eternal and omnipotent can create life. Since nature cannot, God is the only explanation.

God is revealed as the uncaused cause. He is revealed as being eternal, as having life in himself, and as above the closed system we call the universe. Materialistic evolutionists do not have a universe that can do what God does. By definition the universe is finite in size and in time, and without intelligence. The universe is unable to cause all things. The universe is also unable to create a person, for it takes a person to create a person. The lesser cannot create the greater. God is the only reasonable explanation. Note that Christians are not proving God. Proving God is theoretically impossible because the lesser cannot prove the greater. How can we prove that God never had a beginning and has all power? We have to take His word for it. We are not proving God; we are only showing that His existence and nature are consistent with reality.

One of the greatest theological and philosophical concepts is that of being. God is the author of being, and you cannot be apart from God because you, or your environment, does not have the power of being. *“In Him [God]we live and have our being”* (Acts 17:28). No one has the power of being in himself. Somewhere there must be someone who has the power of being in himself. This is God.

Let’s say a man’s car has a flat tire, and I go to get for him a new tire. When I return I find that his car already has a new tire on it. He then tells me that he was able to make the tire himself. Yet, he did not have the time or the vulcanization plant to make the new tire; Someone outside his system had to give him that tire. Therefore, there is a real difference between saying God is the first cause, and nature is the first cause. God being the first cause makes sense; nature being the first cause is impossible.

3. Is there any possibility that God used evolution to create living organisms? This is called Theistic Evolution

If there can be no conclusive empirical evidence for evolution, how can we claim God used evolution? If the systems within the universe cannot produce evolution, then the only conclusion is that God had to miraculously intervene in the movement of the molecules. This would in effect be claiming Intelligent Design.

One may surmise that God may have created man from the dust of the ground by a combination of both miraculous intervention and the processes of natural selection and mutation. This conclusion would take scientific evidence which currently is absent. The record of creation contained in Genesis leads the

reader to conclude an immediate creation of man.

I humbly acknowledge that there may be some mistakes in logic and facts in this article. I understand how easy it is to reason illogically without even realizing the fallacies one is making and the contrary arguments one is missing. If someone finds me wrong, don't be angry; simply correct me with scientific facts and sound reasoning. If your contrary position is correct, it should be able to refute error without any trouble.

This manuscript was not meant for publication, but for a pastoral chat with those who want a brief introduction to Intelligent Design. For this reason there are no formal citations. The information contained herein comes from years of reading many articles and books on this subject. To my knowledge nothing is plagiarized. Most of the information contained within this manuscript is common knowledge and is commonly shared amongst Intelligent Design proponents.

Use browser back button to return to website