

The Random Alternative

Prior to the 1850s, most people did not have to contemplate such a grave outlook. It was generally standard for a person to believe that some type of god had a hand in creation, whether Jehovah, Allah, Manitou, and so on.

Not long after that time, however, a small band of scientists and philosophers, influenced by the work of Charles Darwin, set out to expunge from science all theological aspects. Their alternative was firmly in place by the 1900s, and over time these people became our true atheists—that is, those who believe “god” is a psychologically generated illusion and an adult form of Santa Claus one should outgrow. You can also add to these the agnostics—people who believe the truth about “god” is unknowable and therefore a waste of time. And although agnostics may not have the strength of conviction that atheists do—and may even occasionally engage in a benign form of religion for reasons only they know—their aggressive defense of Darwinism is surprisingly often the same.

The growing late-1800s entourage of outspoken people believed science, not “god,” could answer *every* question on the origin of the cosmos and life, and they eventually were able to convince mainstream science of the total efficacy of natural processes. From there, the theory of evolution reigned supreme throughout most of the last century.

Let’s look at the theory of evolution in its pure form. The famous “Darwin Fish”—the fish with a legged body—is a well-known symbol of the theory. It implies that over time totally natural processes can change any life-form into something more advanced, like the fish that spontaneously grew limbs and climbed out on dry land to eventually become a walking reptile.



The essence of natural evolution could be summed up this way:

**KEY
CONCEPT**

In the beginning, our universe, our galaxy, our solar system, and our planet were produced over immense periods of time by random forces. Following that, cellular life on Earth arose spontaneously by another series of accidental biochemical events, and then was slowly driven forward to become today's complex multicellular life by yet another unintended process called *natural selection*. All this was possible by the science existing within the system, and no intelligent involvement was required.

That is my view of the mind-set of people who profess no faith, and this view is in the minority in our population. Interestingly, they are in contrast to that equally small number of people who will always practice a faith actively regardless of what they think science says.

An Unwarranted Arrangement

However, we are still left with the large majority of people. Though perhaps not practicing an active faith, they inherently believe that in the origin of the universe, "god" ...in some form...had a role...in some way. They show this belief on some highly charged issues, such as rejecting that a monkey turned into a human all by itself. Yet at the same time they generally accept the tenets of evolution—some to a lesser degree but others almost entirely—and have little or no objection to the fact that evolution dominates the scientific scene.

For this large majority, it is crucial to know that the many defenses for "self-made" that Darwinists have used for decades can be easily debunked by even the nonscientific mind—and that strict evolutionists are not telling you the full truth. You may well agree as you read further.

In keeping with the title of my book, I say we must break this unwarranted arrangement in which so few decide what science is taught to so many. I can guarantee you that aggressive or subtle evolutionists still dominate university science and philosophy faculty, school-board policymakers and district science supervisors, teacher licensing and hiring officials, grant funders and research underwriters, textbook authors and

adoption committees, media programmers and news reporters—even spiritual leaders and clergy of those aforementioned benign religions.

And let's not forget that Darwinism dominates even the science and philosophy teachers teaching in public elementary and secondary schools. This situation is now unacceptable because the evidence has gone completely against self-made. Yet Darwinists still insist that only strict evolution be taught in public-school classrooms, and any concept that even remotely suggests divine involvement be confined to religious programs outside of school time.

The ground is far from equal in public education. Though some non-believers may dismiss faith diplomatically, others say straight out what the rest believe—"Take your religious fables and your other superstitions and go join the rest of the Flat Earth Society." But their turf is slipping away. Debates in boardrooms, legislatures, and courtrooms are being less and less favorable to evolution, and even people in coffeehouses, teacher lounges, and business gatherings are less inclined to hold their tongues when Darwinists pontificate.

The Rise of a New Alternative

In large measure this change is coming about because of a revolution that began to get the general public's attention toward the end of the twentieth century. A group of scientists and mathematicians arose to challenge natural evolution in a new way. They were not invoking the names of deities, and they were using few or no quotations from religious or holy writings. Furthermore, these were not spiritual leaders who had learned to incorporate a touch of science into their rhetoric. They were professors and researchers with impeccable academic credentials and impressive scientific achievements who worked with formulas, specimens, charts, and glassware.

These thought-provoking individuals did not seek to dismantle sub-theories pertaining to origins, such as the big bang, primordial soup, or survival of the fittest. Instead, they were challenging the scientific community with new concepts such as *irreducible complexity*, *universal probability bound*, and *complex specified information*—"unreligious-sounding" concepts that forcefully explained how the blind luck so indispensable in Darwinism could never do the impossible. Though

they were working outside the monopoly of mainstream science and were frequently ostracized by it, from PhDs to people on the street, they were still turning heads. The reason? To borrow a political phrase, their logic “resonated” with the general population in a way Darwinism never had.

These new spokespersons eventually coalesced under the banner of the word *design*, and going into the twenty-first century, the phrase *intelligent design* became the most recognized and repeated identifier. Regardless of their backgrounds, the arguments by these dissenters to Darwinism were, and still are, basically the same. In contrast to the above summary of evolution, the key concepts of Design could be stated thus:*

KEY
CONCEPT

The processes and phenomena currently operating within the universe and on Earth are insufficient to produce themselves. No amount of natural evolutionary theory can account for the complexity and compatibility that are continually observed by science. Therefore, there must be a guiding intelligence repeatedly involved in creating the complexity, but not subjected to it. Such complexity must always be the result of intended information because there is a mathematical limit to what blind luck can accomplish.

The strength of these words becomes more evident when we see how Design has helped level the playing field. Now people in state and national legislatures, governor’s mansions, courts of law, and school boardrooms are calling for the academic honesty to at least allow theories challenging natural evolution to be taught as well.†

Design’s superior appeal is not evident just from the many high-profile governmental initiatives promoting it, but also from the surging grassroots approval of people who study it. By comparison, Darwinism’s influence is waning as further probes beneath the attractive artificial turf

* Throughout this book, I use *Design* (capital D) to refer to theories of origins that propose the involvement of a guiding intelligence.

† See chapter 14 for some comments on key legal cases.

of blind-luck continue to hit only infertile soil. Additional evidence of the failure of Darwinism is that in debates or response papers over Design, strict evolutionists increasingly look like people backed into a corner, resorting more and more to name-calling, irrational statements, and temper flashes rather than scientific rebuttal.



Where We're Headed

From the table of contents and this introduction, it should be evident I intend to demonstrate the need to reclaim science from Darwinism with a wealth of challenges to natural evolution. Part one will further discuss the two basic choices to explain our existence—luck or intent. Part two will then look at mathematical impossibilities, part three will expose weaknesses in supposed chemical evolution, part four will examine challenges from physics and the laws of thermodynamics, and part five will show the difficulties with the fossil record and supposed genetic changes. Finally, part six will look at some concluding thoughts about individual issues a person should resolve. I also add for your further reading an appendix on the true substance of Darwin's famous book *The Origin of Species*.

Many excellent writers have covered the above subjects in other books, and I heartily recommend them for their depth. But between the covers of this volume you will find an overview of just about *all* of the key objections to self-made. Furthermore, you will find the challenges explained in clear and concise language, and reinforced with diagrams and graphics to make them understandable.

After more than three decades of personal laboratory research and teaching in the biological sciences, I am thoroughly convinced that the

Choice, Not Chance

If you haven't already noticed, I have been adding the word *natural* to the term *evolution*—thus, "natural evolution." I consistently do so because when scrutinized, Design generally says there is no reason to abandon the view that life has changed over long periods of time (the basic meaning of "evolve" without the recent anti-theological connotation). Neither does the more specific Intelligent Design object that some of the change mechanisms espoused by science might have happened as described (the big bang, for instance).

These processes were not the result of chance, though, but of choice ("Let there be light!"). Therefore, science, math, and logic dictate that "natural" can no longer be the only force necessary to drive all of creation. In a paraphrase of biochemist Michael Behe, "*Natural science may be able to explain mountains, but not Mt. Rushmore.*"

However, I do not hold to the view that the power of science is to be revered in the same measure as the power of a Creator. Have you ever heard something akin to, "Well, maybe God started it, but then science took over and did all the rest"? Even if this is true, all scientifically observed processes are the creation of their Creator, and this is where *sole* credit belongs. If the science we study exists only because of intelligence outside the system, then "natural" still operates only where and when intended. It has no power to redirect or reinvent itself by itself.

And further, if a Designer has been operating, the information in this book will show that He has to have been *actively* orchestrating scientific processes throughout geologic history, even in the most recent of times. But we do need the flexibility to break free from the confining human interpretation of time. After all, cannot the unfettered Creator choose to work first in a microsecond and then in a millennium?

very scientific fields once liberally employed by Darwinism through sleight of hand, so to speak, have thoroughly betrayed it in the end.

Today the arguments against natural evolution come from physics, chemistry, astronomy, molecular biology, zoology, botany, genetics

human biology, and paleontology—to name just the headliners among the branches of science.

If you doubt this, look at the present flow of scientific discussion on origins. No longer is it people of faith searching for a bit of scientific leverage, but the faithless frantically trying to explain...

- the perfect universe, solar system, and planet
- the near-total lack of fossil intermediates
- the complexity in molecular machines
- the idea of “good” mutations, which is unsupported by observation
- the math that never ceases to confound “self-made”

Make no mistake. Strict Darwinism—the “self-made” portion—is destined to become a footnote in scientific history. The jury of academic inquiry has already made its ruling, and the public currently reviewing the decision concurs: Natural evolution must release its stranglehold on science.

This does not mean, as some accuse, that the acceptance of Design will halt or even curtail scientific research in any field, especially in the origin of life, because all is now “magic.” On the contrary, Design merely says the processes whose secrets we try to unlock were not the result of chance. That’s it.

The only real caveat is that further investigations cannot be done under the untenable assumption that science alone has done the impossible. Rather, reclaiming science from Darwinism will lead to more exacting conclusions, fewer dead ends, and greater harmony between what is proposed and what is observed.