

# Intelligent design is scientific, is supported by evidence, and offers testable theories.

Bruce Simat and Walter Remine 2006

The astonishing complexities of the simplest known life-forms, strongly suggest design, just as something vastly simpler (your car engine) demands a designer. That conclusion is eminently reasonable and moved by the evidence.

Just as important, the ID theory -- that intelligent design is required for the origin-of-life from nonlife -- is risky and testable. This makes it a scientific theory (under the same criteria used by Darwinists in all the court cases). In fact, Intelligent Design is amongst the most rigorously tested theories in biology.

On the other hand, Darwinists have no scientific theory for the origin-of-life. The simplest known life-forms, are vastly too complex to have originated (directly from nonlife) through known processes, plus time and chance. This is acknowledged by evolutionary specialists and would seem to falsify the evolutionary view.

To evade such outright falsification, evolutionists have splintered into various contradictory speculations, which claim the first life form was: 1) only amino acids, or 2) only nucleic acids, or 3) only crystalline clay, or 4) "came from space." These speculations are not driven by the evidence. Instead, they are an attempt to avoid outright falsification of the evolutionary view. Just as importantly, they are neither risky or testable. They are simply convenient stories, with no risk or testability. Thus, when considering the origin-of-life, the evolutionary view is either false or unfalsifiable -- and either way, it is thus not scientific.

Intelligent design is scientific, and evolution is not. This is opposite to the usual stereotype.

## Contradictions of evolution

All known life-forms are unified by a shared abundance of complex biochemical features, [such as DNA, RNA, the triplet genetic code, ATP, the bilayered phosphatide cell membrane, the use of 20 amino acids (a special subset from several thousands of available amino acid types), right-handed sugars, polypeptides (made exclusively from left-handed, alpha-bonded amino acids), special proteins (such as ubiquitin), and many others]. Each one of these features is used in all, or virtually all life-forms. Dobzhansky called these the "biologic universals", and used them as major evidence for evolution, as many evolutionists still do today.

This view is contradicted by evolutionists who study the origin-of-life. They have found that each of these features, is too complex to have been in the first life-forms. In effect, these origin of life specialists claim that life-forms, without any of these unifying features, must have existed on our planet in the past -- life without DNA, without a cell membrane, without a genetic error-correction mechanism, without ribosomes, and so forth down the list. Where are those other life-forms today? The absence of such life-forms would seem to falsify the evolutionary view. To evade such outright falsification, evolutionists again offer stories. They claim that all earlier life-forms were either eaten or environmentally crowded-out -- claims that do not expose themselves to any risk or test. Thus on the origin of life issue, evolution is either false, or unfalsifiable -- and either way it is not scientific, using the same criteria evolution supporters used in all of their court cases.

These faults go unnoticed because evolutionists artificially separate evolution from the origin-of-life -- as though the two are unrelated problems. They are wrong! Evolution is either all the way from rocks to rock stars, or intelligent design was involved.

The origin-of-life is not a separate issue, and ID theorists now appear to own it. If policy-makers are serious about giving students a solid science education (rather than merely materialist worldview indoctrination), they will include study of the origin-of-life, where there is an abundance of good science available. The evidence just doesn't happen to favor undirected evolution.

## Testing intelligent design

Many people claim ID offers no testable scientific theories. They are mistaken. Message theory is precisely such a testable theory. Message theory claims (among other things) that life was designed to look like the product of only one designer (not multiple designers acting independently See "The Biotic Message" by Walter ReMine at [www1.minn.net/~science](http://www1.minn.net/~science)).

The biomolecular unity between yeast and elephants is not accidental; rather it may be an intentional message, that all life came from one designer. This idea explains the unity of all life, and does so in a testable (risky), scientific manner. If we find life-forms disunited from the remaining system of life, then message theory could be refuted. If for example life-forms are found based on silicon, instead of carbon, or the previously mentioned primitive life-forms, that evolutionists claim must have existed, are found on this planet.

Evolution and message theory claim opposite things on this point. Message theory is consistent with the

facts, while being risky -- and that makes it scientific.

Evolution is either false or unfalsifiable -- and that makes it unscientific. Message theory goes on further seeking to explain all the major patterns of biology, and does so in a risky, testable, scientific manner.

There is a scientific alternative to evolutionary theory, and evolutionists are mistaken to claim otherwise.

Originally, science was a search for truth. Evolution proponents now claim that science can, by definition, only search for "natural" explanations. They forbid intelligent design from being science. This is silly. Detectable intelligent agents may act in secret with no witnesses. That is the universally accepted scientific explanation for the Piltdown Hoax -- an evolutionary hoax perpetrated in 1912 by someone whose identity remains unknown. An unidentified intelligent agent did it. Another example is a murderer, an intelligent agent who designs someone's death. Based on science alone (and with no eye-witnesses), we even execute murderers. Science has always allowed theories of intelligent design.

The metaphysical in evolution

If you think scientists do not include the "metaphysical" within their theories, think again, because they do. In recent decades, physicists have discovered an abundance of evidence, that the universe itself, is exquisitely finely tuned for our existence. That evidence strongly challenges naturalism and strongly implies design. (See [www.privilegedplanet.com](http://www.privilegedplanet.com).)

To avoid the inference to design, evolutionists now claim there are an infinite number of other universes, different from our own. The trouble is that such "other universes" cannot possibly be examined (much less confirmed to be different from our own). This is the naturalists' own version of the supernatural, and it is postulated solely, to keep naturalism from being falsified, by the clearly observed evidence of design.

Darwinian theory predicted two large-scale patterns would be found in the fossil record: gradualism and clear-cut ancestors (missing links). Both large-scale patterns are largely absent from the record. These findings have been documented by leading evolutionists themselves. This is why Darwinism (and the very basis for evolution itself) remains highly disputed. It is claimed by many that decades of research have led to a solid theory of evolution. In reality the theory is not solid, and leading evolutionists cannot agree on very much, other than the so-called "fact" of evolution.

The principal mechanism of evolution, remains highly disputed by leading evolutionists, as well as what predictions result from those mechanisms. Thus the very basis for evolutionary 'evidence' itself is under dispute. (See [www1.minn.net/~science](http://www1.minn.net/~science).)

Evolution is evolving as an ever increasingly complex theory of intricate, unintelligent design, having more power than a god, and defying all odds.

The theory of unguided evolution is, by virtue of both its own philosophical self-definition, and its self-referenced, circular reasoning, intelligently designed by its supporters to be insulated from falsifiability, and is struggling to bolster an intellectually unsatisfying atheism.

Bruce Simat teaches immunology, biology and physiology at Northwestern College in Roseville. Walter ReMine is author of "The Biotic Message."