

Darwinism: A Teetering House of Cards



Steve Cable examines four areas of recent scientific discovery that undermine evolution.

The Origin of Life: A Mystery

Confidence in Darwinism erodes as new discoveries fail to produce supporting evidence. Three books released in 2017,

- *House of Cards* by journalist Tom Bethel
- *Zombie Science* by biologist Jonathan Wells
- *Undeniable* by biologist Douglas Axe

address areas where Darwin's grand idea is weaker now than 150 years ago. As Bethel states, "Today, it more closely resembles a house of cards, built out of flimsy icons rather than hard evidence, and liable to blow away in the slightest breeze."[\[1\]](#) It

is not just critics who recognize this weakening. In 2016, the Royal Society in London convened a meeting to discuss "calls for revision of the standard theory of evolution."[\[2\]](#)



Four areas where Darwin hoped future work would support his theory will be examined. The first area is the origin of reproducing beings.

Darwin only hoped that life may have originated in a “warm little pond.” But as one scientist states, “The origin-of-life field is a failure—we still do not have even a plausible coherent model, let alone a validated scenario, for the emergence of life on earth.”[\[3\]](#)

Darwin assumed the first reproducing cells were very simple. In truth, the simplest cells are composed of impressively complex machines which could not have arisen directly from inorganic components. But there are no known simpler life forms. As Michael Behe commented, “The cell’s known complexity has increased immeasurably in recent years, and points ever more insistently to an intelligent designer as its cause.”[\[4\]](#)

The probability of even one of the amino acids necessary for life appearing by random mutations is effectively zero even given billions of years. As Doug Axe writes, “(Examining how) accidental evolutionary processes are supposed to have invented enzymes without insight, we consistently find these proposals to be implausible.”[\[5\]](#)

Another professor states, “Those who think scientists understand the issues of prebiotic chemistry are wholly misinformed. Nobody understands them. . . . The basis upon which we . . . are relying is so shaky we must openly state the situation for what it is: a mystery.”[\[6\]](#)

Facing insurmountable odds against life appearing, some materialists propose an infinite number of parallel universes.[\[7\]](#) With infinite chances, even the most unlikely events could occur. But, as Axe points out, “The biological inventions that surround us (are) fantastically improbable, with evolution explaining none and the multiverse hypothesis explaining only those absolutely necessary for wondering to be possible, . . . this hypothesis fails to explain what we see.”[\[8\]](#)

Even after resorting to unobservable fantasy situations, the

challenges presented by the origins of life cannot be overcome. A Darwinian model begins with a self-replicating life form. Currently, this appears to be a hill that no one knows how to climb.

An Example of Macro-evolution: Still Searching

Darwin's theory is dependent upon the unobserved concept of macro-evolution, i.e. intergenerational differences accumulating into different species over time. Darwin believed his magic wand of natural selection could direct this process toward increasingly complex beings. Has further research confirmed his belief?

Let's begin with fossil evidence.

The number of fossils studied has blossomed over the last 150 years. All the types of species which exist today appear in the fossil record over a relatively short period of time.[{9}](#) And, in most cases, with no transitional forms between them undermining Darwin's theory. As science historian Stephen Meyer concludes, "As more . . . fossils are discovered (failing) to document the great array of intermediate forms, it grows ever more improbable that their absence is an artifact of either incomplete sampling or preservation."[{10}](#)

And evolution proponent Stephen Gould wrote, "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees . . . have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference."[{11}](#) *Nature* editor Henry Gee put it this way: "To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story."[{12}](#)

Clearly, the fossil record challenges rather than supports

conventional evolutionary theory.

Let's continue by looking at experimental evidence.

Perhaps someone has recreated macro-evolution in the lab. Studies of fast replicating populations have shown no ability to accumulate multiple changes. Attempts to create macro-evolution in fruit flies, bacteria and viruses concluded "Neither in nature nor under experimental conditions have any substantial effects ever been obtained through the systematic accumulation of micro-mutations."[{13}](#)

Bethel points out, "The scientific evidence for evolution is not only weaker than is generally supposed, but as new discoveries have been made . . . , the reasons for accepting the theory have diminished rather than increased."[{14}](#)

Yet biology departments still spout their unfounded belief in the "magic wand" ability to produce an unimaginable array of advanced creatures in what "amounts to the triumph of ideology over science." Even some materialists see through this charade. One geneticist at Harvard wrote, "If scientists are going to use logically unbeatable theories about the world, they might as well give up natural science and take up religion."[{15}](#)

"Darwin might well have been dismayed (at) the meager evidence for natural selection, assembled over many years. . . . It is worth bearing in mind how feeble this evidence is any time someone tells you that Darwinism is a fact."[{16}](#)

The Challenge of Irreducible Complexity

Darwin wrote his theory would "absolutely break down" if an organ could not be formed by "numerous, successive, slight modifications."[{17}](#) Have such organs been found? Irreducible complexity and functional coherence say yes.

Irreducible complexity means that some known functions require

multiple parts that have no purpose without the other parts. For a Darwinian process to create these functions would require useless mutations to be indefinitely maintained until combined with other useless mutations. Michael Behe's analysis has shown the 4 billion years of the earth's existence are not sufficient for such complex functions to be created by random mutations.

Even if an improbable series of events occurred allowing **one** of these complex forms to arise through a set of random mutations, it would need to happen thousands, if not millions, of times to produce our complex life forms.

In *Undeniable*, Axe introduces "functional coherence," defined as "The hierarchical arrangement of parts needed for anything to produce a high-level function—each part contributing in a coordinated way to the whole." Axe examines the role of functional coherence as a microscopic level and concludes, "The fact that mastery . . . of protein design is completely beyond the reach of blind evolution is . . . evolution's undoing. . . . The evolutionary story is . . . something much less plausible than hitting an atomic dot on a universe-size sphere over and over in succession by blindly dropping subatomic pins."[18](#)

In *Zombie Science*, Jonathan Wells considers the number of irreducibly complex subsystems required to evolve fully aquatic whales. These features include flukes with specialized muscles, blowholes with elastic tissues and specialized muscles, internal testicles with a countercurrent heat exchange system, specialized features for nursing, and many others. For Darwinism, these changes are insurmountably large. Whales certainly appear to be the product of design, not unguided evolution.

He also points to advanced optical systems. The process by which light detection becomes an intelligent signal to the brain is irreducibly complex. Two scientists wrote, "the

prototypical eye. . . cannot be explained by selection, because selection can drive evolution only when the eye can function at least to a small extent.”[\[19\]](#) These scientists determined the eye was irreducibly complex and could not be developed by natural selection.

Richard Lewontin, a committed materialist, does not believe natural selection can explain complex life forms. He cannot conceive of any gradual set of useful incremental changes resulting in a flying being. Unless a small change gives an advantage, “the change won’t be selected for, and obviously, a little bit of wing doesn’t do any good.”[\[20\]](#)

So we can agree with Darwin on this issue: his theory “absolutely breaks down.”

DNA and Molecular Science Muddy the Scenario

Has uncovering the role of DNA filled the gaping holes in Darwinism or created more?

A species’s DNA sequence, we are told, contains all the information needed to create new members. But Douglas Axe states, “(We) would be shocked to know the . . . state of ignorance with respect to DNA. The view that most aspects of living things can be attributed neatly to specific genes has been known . . . to be FALSE for a long time.”[\[21\]](#)

The higher-level components making up a species are not entirely specified by its DNA. As Wells explains, “After DNA sequences are transcribed into RNAs, many RNAs are modified so they do not match the original transcript. . . . (changing) over time according to the needs of the organism.” The claim that “DNA makes RNA makes protein” is false.”[\[22\]](#)

Creating new complex functions requires multiple changes in the DNA sequence AND in other elements making the chance of

random mutations creating new species untenable.

The original conflicting “trees of life” were created examining the morphology, i.e. the structures of species. These trees suggest different major nodes but almost no transitional forms. Can DNA analysis help? Research has shown that groupings based on morphology are not supported by DNA analysis. As Wells notes, these conflicts “are a major headache for evolutionary biologists.”[\[23\]](#)

This disconnect from recent gene research is not limited to a few cases. As reported in 2012, “incongruence between (trees) derived from morphology . . . , and . . . trees based on different subsets of molecular sequences has become pervasive.”[\[24\]](#)

But DNA analysis alone has a great degree of uncertainty. In one study looking at fifty genes from seventeen animal groups, multiple conflicting ideas on the evolutionary relationship between the animal groups were proposed.[\[25\]](#) All had seemingly absolute support from the DNA evidence, but all could not be true.

Originally scientists thought DNA was primarily junk sequences not contributing to the characteristics of a species. This junk represented functions which were replaced or had no current usefulness. As Francis Crick, one of the discoverers of DNA’s structure, said, “The possible existence of such selfish DNA is exactly what might be expected from the theory of natural selection.”[\[26\]](#)

But recent research shows at least eighty percent of the human genome contributes. As Wells reports, “The evidence demonstrates that most of our DNA is transcribed into RNA and that many of those RNAs have biological functions. The idea that most of our DNA is junk, . . . is dead.”[\[27\]](#)

The facts uncovered about the functioning of DNA and other elements in passing on characteristics to the next generation

appear to make more holes in evolutionary theory.

A Philosophy Props Up Its Poster Child

Recent, scientific insights have weakened Darwin's theory. Yet many are unwilling to discuss its weakness. Why this reluctance? It falls into two camps: 1) a commitment to materialism and 2) a desire for academic acceptance. Materialism is a religious viewpoint where everything has a natural explanation. A spiritual component or events resulting from an outside force are rejected. Science is not materialism. Science attempts to identify and quantify the forces that make the universe. A materialist scientist adds a religious restriction: only natural forces can be considered.

Bethel states, "Although Darwinism has been promoted as science, its unstated role has been to prop up the philosophy of materialism and atheism."

Wells suggests, "Priority is given to proposing and defending materialistic explanations rather than following the evidence wherever it leads. This is materialistic philosophy masquerading as empirical science, . . . zombie science." [\[28\]](#)

Atheist Colin Patterson offers an honest view regarding the theory of evolution as "often unnecessary" in biology. Nevertheless, it was (taught as) "the unified field theory of biology," holding the whole subject together. Once something has that status it becomes like religion." [\[29\]](#)

Until they have a better theory, they will stand behind it rather than consider alternatives. They fear any uncertainty will lead to questioning other aspects of materialism, such as that free will and love for others are simply a façade promoted by natural selection.

Bethel points out, "If our minds are . . . accidental products of a blind process, what reason do we have for accepting materialist claims as true?" [\[30\]](#) After all, our minds are

selected to improve our survivability, not to discern what is true.

Many scientists are not die-hard materialists. They believe there may be a spiritual aspect of our existence. Yet they promote the materialistic view. For most, this inconsistent approach is a reaction to the threat of censure from the establishment.

Axe claims, "The religious agenda is the enemy that threatens science. . . . Everything that opposes the institutionalized agenda is labeled 'anti-science.'" [\[31\]](#)

The same arguments used against intelligent design apply more accurately to Darwinism. Bethel states, "(Some) have said that design can't be measured and therefore it is a religious belief. . . . They might also have said the macro-evolution has not yet been measured, or so much as observed." [\[32\]](#)

In this review, we have seen

1. No materialistic concept for life's origin
2. Little evidence of transitional life forms
3. Strong evidence complex functions could not arise through random changes
4. DNA playing havoc with the basic tenets of Darwinism.

Now we wait for the façade raised by supporters of a flawed concept to collapse.

Notes

1. Tom Bethel, *Darwin's House of Cards: A Journalist's Odyssey Through the Darwin Debates*, Discovery Institute Press, 2017, page 20.
2. Ibid, page 20.
3. Eugene V. Loonin, *The Logic of Chance: The Nature and Origin of Biological Evolution*, FT Press, 2011, page 391.
4. See Behe, back cover comment for Thomas E. Woodward and

- James P. Gills, *The Mysterious Epigenome* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2012).
5. Douglas Axe, *Undeniable: How Biology Confirms Our Intuition That Life Is Designed*, HarperOne, New York, 2016, page 63.
 6. James Tour, "Animadversions of a synthetic chemist," *Inference* 2:2, May 19, 2016.
 7. Axe, page 227.
 8. Axe, page 230.
 9. Meyers and other quotes on the Cambrian.
 10. Stephen Meyer, *Darwin's Doubt*, New York, Harper Collins, 2014, page 70.
 11. Gould, *The Panda's Thumb*, page 181.
 12. Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time: Beyond the Fossil Record to a New History of Life*, New York: The Free Press, 1999, p. 32, 113-117.
 13. Soren Lovtrup, *Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*, New York, 1987, page 351.
 14. Bethel, page 45.
 15. Richard Lewontin, "Testing the Theory of Natural Selection," *Nature* 236 no. 5343, p. 181-182.
 16. Bethel, page 79.
 17. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 2nd ed., 1860, page 189.
 18. Axe, page 184.
 19. Gehring and Ikeo, "Pax6: mastering eye morphogenesis and eye evolution," *Trends in Genetics* 15, 1999, 376.
 20. James Schwartz, "Oh My Darwin!: Who's the Fittest Evolutionary Thinker of All?", *Lingua Franca* 9, no. 8 (1999).
 21. Axe, page 271.
 22. Wells, page 90.
 23. Wells, page .
 24. Liliana Davalos, Andrea Cirranello, Jonathan Geisler, and Nancy Simmons, "Understanding phylogenetic incongruence: Lessons from phyllostomid bats," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 87, 2012.
 25. Antonis Rokas, Dirk Kruger, and Sean B. Carroll, "Animal evolution and the molecular signature of radiations compressed in time," *Science* 310, 2005.

26. Francis Crick, *What Mad Pursuit: A Personal View of Scientific Discovery*, New York, Basic Books, 1988, page 147.
27. Wells, page 128.
28. Wells, page 17.
29. Bethel, page 149.
30. Bethel, page 174.
31. Axe, page 54.
32. Bethel, page 161.

©2018 Probe Ministries

Darwinist Arguments Against Intelligent Design Illogical and Misleading

I recently attended a debate on “Intelligent Design (ID) and the Existence of God.” One of the four debaters was Dr. Lawrence Krauss^{[\[1\]](#)} representing an atheistic, anti-ID position. I was looking forward to hearing what Dr. Krauss would say when speaking in the presence of other knowledgeable members of academia. Would he go beyond the tired, illogical talking points passed on without question by the mainstream media? Or would he present some thoughtful arguments *against* the validity of intelligent design concepts and/or *for* the current state of Darwinist explanations for life as we know it?

Since I believe there are some thoughtful, interesting arguments that could be raised against intelligent design, I was sorely disappointed to discover that Dr. Krauss did not deviate from the shallow arguments which consistently appear in media coverage of this topic. As one of the other debaters,

Dr. David Berlinski {2}, commented after Dr. Krauss' opening statement, "Everything you have said is either false or trivial."

However false and trivial they may be, these arguments are blindly accepted as reasonable by many people. As thinking Christians, we have a responsibility to be prepared to tear down these façades raised up against the knowledge of God. One way to do this is to be able to discuss with others the prevailing arguments in ways that reveal their weaknesses and inconsistencies. To help in that process, the remainder of this article will list several of the standard arguments offered up by Dr. Krauss and examine their reasonableness and validity.

Argument: Evolution is a proven fact. Scientific experiments and observation over the last 100 years have conclusively demonstrated that evolution is a fact.

*Analysis: Faulty logic resulting in false conclusion. In the context of the debate, "evolution is a proven fact" is implied to mean that random mutation coupled with natural selection is the sole process through which life evolved on this planet. **This meaning of evolution is not a proven fact.** What has been demonstrated through observation and experimentation is that the frequency of certain characteristics in a species will vary over time through random mutations and natural selection. These results provide some support to the theory that these undirected natural causes could be responsible for the development of life as we know it, but they do not come close to proving it. In logical terms, we would say that what science has demonstrated is necessary for the premise to be true but not sufficient to prove that it is true. That would be like saying, "Since we can demonstrate that wind and water erosion can produce regular geometric patterns, this proves the Statue of Liberty is the result of undirected natural forces."*

Argument: Origins science is the same as observational science. Both the study of origins (or other one-time events) and the study of ongoing natural processes are the same because they both look at data that was observed in the past. Therefore we can apply the same criteria to origins science as to observational science. Since observational science depends on repeatable experiments, we should reject out of hand any hypothesis (e.g. ID) that considers intervention by a designer because we cannot recreate it.

Analysis: False premise resulting in faulty conclusion. The study of origins is more akin to archaeology and forensic science than to observational science. In these fields, scientists look at the evidence left over by past events to help evaluate hypotheses on what caused the event to determine the ones that are most likely. As an example, consider the question, "Why does the earth have a large moon?" Scientists have a number of different theories on when and how our earth acquired a moon, but they would all agree that we can never be certain what actually happened (apart from the development of a time machine which would allow us to go back and observe the event). It is true that in observational science fields, scientists do look at results from experiments done in the past. But, they can choose to repeat those experiments in the future.

Regardless of whether one is considering the role of natural selection or the role of an intelligent designer, when you are developing hypotheses for the origins and development of life on earth the best that can be done is to assess which processes had the highest probability of contributing to the end results. If you eliminate all options other than random variations in natural processes, you tie the hands of scientists in considering how the evidence best fits all hypotheses.

Argument: Some things that have the appearance of being designed are not. Therefore, we cannot detect the presence of design.

Analysis: Faulty logic resulting in false conclusion. Yes, there are things found in nature from the geodesic shapes of carbon structures to the results of erosion that mimic shapes designed by man. Yet, most of us seem to have no problem distinguishing between the remains of ancient civilizations and the results of undirected natural processes. If you search enough beaches and tidal pools, you can probably find every letter of the alphabet produced by the interaction of tides and currents. But, if you come across the words "John loves Mary" in the sand, you will be very confident that these were the result of intelligent intervention.

Argument: The theory of evolution is a foundation of modern science.

Analysis: Switching definitions results in false conclusion. Understanding the processes by which bacteria, viruses, species and societies change in response to changes in their environment are important concepts in modern science. However, whether one believes these processes are solely responsible for the origin and development of life on earth or not has little or no impact on one's ability to make advances in science. To date, I have not been made aware of a single positive advance in modern science or engineering that required the developer to fully believe in Darwin's view of the origins of the species in order to make that advance. One's beliefs on origins are foundational to answering the metaphysical questions of life, but don't preclude someone from making contributions in science. Advances in science have been made by Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, Jews, atheists, etc.

Argument: Scientists understand how the bacterial flagellum

evolved, disproving the concept of irreducible complexity.

Analysis: False statement coupled with faulty logic. The bacterial flagellum is a complex device used to propel some types of bacteria. It is comprised of over 30 different proteins. Not only do these proteins perform different complementary functions, but they must be assembled in the bacteria in exactly the right sequence by other proteins. Since the flagellum will not function without all of these elements in place (i.e., it meets the definition of irreducible complexity established by Dr. Behe in his book *Darwin's Black Box*), the premise is that all of these parts would have to appear simultaneously in order for natural selection to favor carrying forward any of these mutations in the gene pool.

Dr. Krauss stated that scientists have shown that the bacterial flagellum is not irreducibly complex. To the best of my knowledge, this is a gross overstatement. The arguments I have seen presented fall far short of developing a plausible explanation for how the flagellum could have evolved^[3]. If a plausible argument coupled with experimental evidence exists, I am very interested in having my understanding updated. However, even if such evidence did exist, it would not demonstrate that the concept of irreducible complexity was false or that this unknown plausible path was the way the flagellum came onto the scene.

Argument: Intelligent Design can never be science because it is not falsifiable. You must have ways to prove a scientific theory is false in order for it to be a valid theory. Any observation that does not agree with the theory can be attributed to supernatural intervention.

Analysis: Arbitrary, inconsistent definition. Academics in the field of philosophy of science do not agree that the ability to falsify establishes a boundary on what is and is

not science. Professor of philosophy and atheist Dr. Bradley Monton [\[4\]](#) pointed this out during the debate. He argued that we should not exclude a potentially valid hypothesis simply on the basis of a narrow definition of science. In addition, origins science cannot meet this standard. Proponents of neo-Darwinism have clearly demonstrated over the last few decades that it is not falsifiable either. Whenever the theory disagrees with the evidence, its proponents claim that natural selection found a way around the problem; we just don't know what it is yet. As Richard Dawkins stated, "Evolution is more clever than we are."

Hopefully, this summary will help you sort through the smokescreen of "conclusive" arguments offered up by the proponents of naturalistic Darwinism. Perhaps someday they will engage in a genuine discussion where both sides can state: 1) the reasons they believe their theory has merit and, 2) the observations that create problems for their theory. Such a discussion might actually prove helpful to someone trying to sort through the evidence to make an evidence-based faith decision.

Notes

1. Dr. Lawrence Krauss is the Foundation Professor in the School of Earth and Space Exploration and the Physics Department, Co-Director of the Cosmology Initiative, and Inaugural Director of the Origins Initiative at Arizona State University.

2. Dr. David Berlinski is a lecturer, essayist and a Senior Fellow of the Discovery Institute's Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture. Dr. Berlinski received his Ph.D. in philosophy from Princeton University and was a postdoctoral fellow in mathematics and molecular biology at Columbia University.

3. Additional information from the Reference Guide to

Redeeming Darwin available at RedeemingDarwin.com.

Example of Darwinist argument: Since design cannot be considered as an explanation, evolutionists maintain that complex structures like flagellum evolved slowly over time from less complex structures performing other functions in the cell. Kenneth Miller states: "At first glance, the existence of the type III secretory system (TTSS), a...device that allows bacteria to inject these toxins through the cell membranes of its unsuspecting hosts, would seem to have little to do with the flagellum. However, molecular studies of proteins in the TTSS have revealed a surprising fact—the proteins of the TTSS are directly homologous to the proteins in the basal portion of the bacterial flagellum.... The existence of the TTSS in a wide variety of bacteria demonstrates that a small portion of the "irreducibly complex" flagellum can indeed carry out an important biological function. Since such a function is clearly favored by natural selection, the contention that the flagellum must be fully assembled before any of its component parts can be useful is obviously incorrect. What this means is that the argument for intelligent design of the flagellum has failed." Response to Darwinist argument: The flagellum is an excellent example of an irreducibly complex function in one of the simplest life forms. Different proteins and structures work together to create a swimming mechanism. This complex interaction cannot be adequately explained by evolutionary processes. Mutations creating only one piece of the flagellum in a life form without the other pieces would not create any value to be carried on to the subsequent generations. Miller's statement that "the argument for intelligent design has failed" misses the point of irreducible complexity. The fact that one component of an irreducibly complex system may have another useful function does not remove the barrier that the irreducibly complex system requires the simultaneous appearance of multiple cooperating components to perform a function that has not been performed in that way before. In addition, William Dembski points out another problem with

Miller's argument:

The best current molecular evidence, however, points to the TTSS as evolving from the flagellum and not vice versa.... Miller has nothing more than the TTSS to point to as a possible evolutionary precursor. Behe and the ID community have therefore successfully shown that Darwinists don't have a clue how the bacterial flagellum might have arisen.

4. Dr. Bradley Monton is a philosophy professor at the University of Colorado at Boulder. His areas of specialization include the Philosophy of Science (especially Philosophy of Physics), Probabilistic Epistemology, Philosophy of Time and Philosophy of Religion. Previously he was on the faculty of the University of Kentucky, an Assistant Professor at The American University of Beirut and a Teaching Assistant at Princeton University. He earned his Bachelor of Arts in Physics and Philosophy at Rice University and his Ph.D. in Philosophy from Princeton University.

© 2008 Probe Ministries

Is Intelligent Design Dead?

What Is Intelligent Design?

On December 20, 2005, Judge Jones handed down his decision in the lawsuit brought by several citizens from Dover, Pennsylvania, who objected to a new policy adopted by the Dover School Board. This policy mandated a statement be read before all biology classes indicating that evolution was a theory that needed critical evaluation and that Intelligent Design was a rival theory that students could seek information

about from the library.

Judge Jones not only struck down the policy as unconstitutional; he went further to declare that ID is not science and was purely motivated by religion since it was just a repackaged creationism. His written opinion was scathing. This of course delighted proponents of evolution and many have declared that ID now is dead.

In what follows I will examine this “death certificate” and declare it null and void. ID is alive and well, and the coming months and years will demonstrate convincingly the health of ID. But first, let’s make sure we know what ID really is.

The media often simply portray ID in a negative context. One student reporter from Southern Methodist University recently put it this way: “Essentially ID is a theory that proposes that there are parts to a cell that are simply too complex to have been evolved.” He adds as an afterthought the idea “that rather they have been altered by some sort of ‘designer.’”^{1} But ID is truly more than just a critique of evolution. The Discovery Institute’s Web site describes ID this way: “The theory of intelligent design holds that certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by an intelligent cause, not an undirected process such as natural selection.”^{2}

It’s interesting to realize that many evolutionists recognize that living things in particular *look* as if they have been designed. British evolutionist Richard Dawkins said, “Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.”^{3} Many in the ID community simply reply, “If it looks designed, maybe it is!” So ID is simply an attempt to quantify scientifically what most people clearly recognize: the design of the universe and of living things.

The major contention with evolution is the claim that mutation

and natural selection can account for everything we see in living things. ID accepts that evolutionary processes do account for some change in organisms over time. But ID says certain structures, like the bacterial flagellum that closely resembles a human designed rotary motor, are better explained through an intelligent cause.

In particular, the universal genetic code has all the distinguishing characteristics of coded information or language. Our experience tells us that language only comes from a mind. If so, then the genetic code also likely came from a mind.

Is ID Science?

Judge Jones made several errors in his reasoning. The recent book from the Discovery Institute, *Traipsing Into Evolution*, answers Judge Jones on several levels.[\[4\]](#) I will focus on three areas: first, how a federal judge can tell us what science is and is not when philosophers of science continue to struggle with this; second, Judge Jones' claim that ID has been refuted by scientists; and third, Judge Jones' claims that ID has not been accepted by the scientific community. For these and other reasons, Judge Jones claimed that ID simply is not science and is religiously motivated; therefore it should not even be mentioned in a high school science classroom.

The first question that should occur to you is, Why does a federal judge with no training in science use his courtroom as a means of determining what is and is not science? This problem has been referred to as the "demarcation problem." How do we demarcate science from non-science? Philosopher of science Larry Laudan writes, "If we would stand up and be counted on the side of reason, we ought to drop terms like 'pseudo-science' and 'unscientific' from our vocabulary; they are just hollow phrases which do only emotive work for us."[\[5\]](#)

In addition, philosopher Del Ratzch argues that there are very real possible payoffs for science in considering ID.[\[6\]](#) Judge Jones knew of these positions but chose to ignore them.

Judge Jones claims that ID has been refuted by mainstream scientists. He cites the work of Kenneth Miller in particular. This is rather strange indeed. For ID to be refuted means that it has been tested by science and found wanting. If it is testable scientifically to the degree that it can be refuted, then it is science after all. This logical contradiction does not seem to occur to Judge Jones.

The judge ruled further that ID cannot be science because it is not accepted by the scientific community. But science is not a popularity contest. New and controversial theories are never accepted by a majority of scientists at the beginning, but that doesn't make them unscientific. The Discovery Institute now lists over six hundred scientists from around the world who are willing to sign a list saying they are skeptical of Darwinism. Surely that counts for something.

ID uses empirical data to demonstrate the plausibility of a design inference. It's as scientific as Darwinism.

Is ID Just Reinvented Creationism?

Several parents challenged a directive by the Dover School Board allowing the mention of Intelligent Design in the science classrooms of this district. Judge Jones ruled the directive unconstitutional. One of his reasons was that ID is just reinvented creationism which the Supreme Court has already ruled is substantially a religious doctrine and not appropriate as science.

One of the texts that the Dover school board members made available was the supplemental text *Of Pandas and People*.[\[7\]](#) Having subpoenaed early drafts of the book from the late '80s, the ACLU tried to show that *Pandas* only began using the phrase

“Intelligent Design” after the Supreme Court struck down the Louisiana creation law. Therefore Judge Jones ruled that ID is in fact just creationism with a new label.

While it is true that the Supreme Court decision did indeed affect editorial decisions in *Pandas*, it’s not for the reasons Judge Jones assumed. The authors and editors of *Pandas* knew their ideas were not the same as creationism and were wrestling with what to call it. Once the Supreme Court ruled that “creationism” meant a literal six day creation, the authors of *Pandas* knew they needed to use a different term.[\[8\]](#)

In addition, the term Intelligent Design had been floating around for several years before *Pandas* was in print. Lane Lester and I used the term in our book *The Natural Limits to Biological Change* in 1984, three years before the Supreme Court decision in *Edwards vs. Aguillard* struck down the Louisiana creationism law. We said, “The simple point is that intelligent design is discernibly different from natural design. In natural design, the apparent order is internally derived from the properties of the components; in creative design, the apparent order is externally imposed and confers new properties of organization not inherent in the components themselves.”[\[9\]](#)

Furthermore, none of the leading scientists of the Intelligent Design movement were ever a part of the creationist movement. People like Phil Johnson, Michael Behe, William Dembski, Charles Thaxton, and Steve Meyer never considered themselves to be part of this group. Their ideas were always similar but definitely not the same.

Some creationist groups today even go to great lengths to distance themselves from the ID movement because ID essentially maintains that the Designer cannot be known from the science alone. Therefore, because of ID’s attempts to stop short of naming the Designer, some creationist groups will sell some ID books but not endorse their program. This would

be very strange indeed if ID is just relabeled creationism.

Once again, Judge Jones got it wrong.

Traipsing Into the Dover Court Decision

In their excellent discussion of the Dover decision, the authors of *Traipsing into Evolution* attack six accusations against Intelligent Design used by Judge Jones.[\[10\]](#)

On page sixty-two of the Dover decision Judge Jones said, “ID violates the centuries-old ground rules of science by invoking and permitting supernatural causation.”[\[11\]](#) The main problem for Judge Jones is that ID scientists said repeatedly prior to the trial and in direct testimony during the trial that the science of ID is not able to identify the Designer. It was expressly pointed out to Judge Jones during the trial that the type and identity of the intelligent agent supposed by ID is only identified by religious and philosophical argumentation. That does not mean that design itself cannot be detected scientifically. Indeed, if we ever receive an obviously intelligent message from outer space, we will most certainly be able to determine it has an intelligent cause even though we may have no idea who or what sent it.[\[12\]](#)

Judge Jones also states that “the argument of irreducible complexity, central to ID, employs the same flawed and illogical contrived dualism that doomed creation science in the 1980s.” What Judge Jones is referring to is his notion that ID is just a negative argument about Darwinism. If Darwinism can be shown to be false, then ID wins.

But this grossly misrepresents ID. Michael Behe’s formulation of irreducible complexity asserts that Darwinian evolution does not predict irreducibly complex machines in the cell where Intelligent Design expressly does predict such machines. So there is definitely a negative component to irreducible complexity. But Darwin himself said that “If it could be

demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.”[\[13\]](#) Darwin invited a negative critique.

But there is also a clear positive case for irreducible complexity. When we come across a machine, we intuitively understand it to be intelligently caused, whether we think it functions effectively or not. Intelligent agents can and do produce machines. The concept of irreducible complexity is one way to determine what a machine is.

Judge Jones’ third complaint against Intelligent Design was that the attacks on evolution by ID advocates have all been refuted by the scientific community. Judge Jones ignored the fact that at the time of the decision, over five hundred scientists had signed a statement acknowledging their dissent from Darwinism. That list now stands at over six hundred.[\[14\]](#) Certainly some scientists have challenged Behe, Dembski, and others. But their criticisms have been answered effectively both online and in print.[\[15\]](#)

Judge Jones’ fourth accusation was that Intelligent Design had failed to gain acceptance in the scientific community. But this is clearly a matter of opinion. As I mentioned previously, over six hundred scientists now express their dissent from Darwin, and most of those also support Intelligent Design, many of them at mainline universities.

No doubt there has been and continues to be strident opposition to Intelligent Design in the scientific community, especially among biologists. But there is always resistance in science to new ideas. And much of the opposition is for philosophical reasons, not scientific ones. Many Darwinists such as Will Provine from Cornell and Richard Dawkins from Oxford are very up front that their adherence to evolution and their disdain for Intelligent Design is over the issue of a

Designer by any name. The science is just a backdrop.

Judge Jones' fifth complaint against Intelligent Design was that proponents of ID have not published in the scientific peer-reviewed literature. This is simply not true. De Wolf et al., in their book *Traipsing Into Evolution*, document in Appendix B a list of thirteen different peer-reviewed articles and books by ID scientists advocating different aspects of the theory. This is admittedly a small number, but that is because there is clear evidence, documented in the same book, of editors having to shy away from ID papers and responses for fear of intimidation by the scientific community. One editor who followed established procedure in getting an ID article reviewed and published was nearly run out of his institution for the offense.

Finally, Judge Jones declared that ID has not been the subject of testing and research. Indeed, any scientific theory needs to be testable in some form or it is not likely to be of some use. But ID microbiologist Scott Minnich testified right in Judge Jones' courtroom that in his laboratory at the University of Idaho he has demonstrated the irreducible complexity of the bacterial flagellum. Minnich also testified to other research he was familiar with which also was testing principles from ID.[\[16\]](#)

As I have summarized, Judge Jones failed to make a reasonable and fair evaluation of the evidence. Intelligent Design is far from dead. Rather, such a poor decision in the Dover case may actually serve ID well as it self-destructs in the years to come.

Notes

1. Brian Wellman, April 26, 2006, Merits of intelligent design, evolution debated, www.smudailycampus.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2006/04/26/444ef833078bc

2. The Web site of the Discovery Institute's Center for Science and Culture, www.discovery.org/csc/topQuestions.php.
3. Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1986), 1.
4. David De Wolf, John West, Casey Luskin, and Jonathan Witt, *Traipsing Into Evolution: Intelligent Design and the Kitzmiller vs. Dover Decision* (Seattle, WA: Discovery Institute Press, 2006), 25-57.
5. Larry Laudan, "The demise of the demarcation problem," in Michael Ruse (ed.), *But Is It Science?*, (Amherst, MA: Prometheus, 1983), 337-350.
6. Del Ratzch, *Nature, Design, and Science: The Status of Design in Natural Science* (Albany, NY: State University Press of New York, 2001), 147.
7. Percival Davis and Dean H. Kenyon, *Of Pandas and People: The Central Question of Biological Origins* (Dallas, TX: Haughton Publishing Co., 1989), 166 pp.
8. DeWolf et al., 22.
9. Lane P. Lester and Raymond G. Bohlin, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change* (Richardson, TX: Probe Books, 1984), 153-154.
10. DeWolf et al., 29-45.
11. *Kitzmiller et al. v. Dover Area School Board*, No. 04cv2688, 2005 WL 3465563, *26 (M.D. Pa. Dec. 20, 2005).
12. I don't expect we ever will hear from any extraterrestrials. Earth appears to be more and more unique with every passing day. See my article "Are We Alone in the Universe?" at www.probe.org/are-we-alone-in-the-universe-2/.
13. Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (New York: New American Library [A Mentor Book], 1958), 171 (this is a reprint of the 1872 sixth edition).
14. From the Web site of the Center for Science and Culture, www.dissentfromdarwin.org/ accessed October 11, 2006. The statement reads; "We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the

complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged.”

15. William Dembski, *The Design Revolution: Answering the Toughest Questions About Intelligent Design* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 334 pp.

16. De Wolf *et al.*, 56.

© 2006 Probe Ministries

“How Should I, as a Non-Christian, React to Creationist Claims?”

Hello, I’m a French science student interested in the creation/evolution debate. I have had no religious upbringing, and don’t take the Gospel as gospel truth, so I guess I must be an Evil Darwinist. Where I live, there doesn’t seem to be a great “debate” about evolution: I haven’t heard of any creationist scientists, besides from when I find Religious sites on the Internet. So I guess we haven’t yet been blessed with Pseudoscientific Creationists. True we have fanatics, but they’re Catholic and tend to be old Nazis dressed in black who want to go back to saying Mass in Latin, so don’t even go near calling themselves scientists. OK I’m being facetious ☐

Anyway, how do you advise me, a non-christian, to react to creationist scientific claims? I hope you’ll provide an answer other than “convert to Christianity” – you won’t get away that easily: If your claims are scientifically sound, I should be able to accept that. However I often find them a mere imitation of the scientific method, a rational method I understand and respect more than your personal interpretation

of the Bible.

By the way I worked on Genetic Algorithms a little (programs using genetic mechanisms to solve specific problems), and have therefore witnessed how complexity and ingenious patterns can arise out of chaos – and how the dominant pattern will switch in a fairly short time, not showing so many intermediate genomes (punctuated equilibrium, generally used to explain holes in the fossil record). I am aware that you don't seem to disagree with microevolution, but I don't believe that "micro-" and "macro-" evolution mean anything. You seem only to use that definition by defining "macroevolution" as what can't be witnessed directly at our scale, and is therefore false. Why not "micromechanics" and "macromechanics"? We can't prove that planets follow Newtonian mechanics, therefore the sun goes around the moon, 'cos I think the Bible says so.

Anyway, what should I think of your site? It seems cunningly made, maybe even honest. I wouldn't mind discussing this.

PS: I hope I get a better answer than "Go look at our site – it contains all the answers you need".

PPS: I hope you don't get too much of these. Actually I wish you get a lot and read them all. I don't want to be a nuisance, I'm just curious.

Thank you for your interesting message. I am glad to know a little of your background and familiarity with our site. I will therefore assume a few things as I talk with you and rely on you to let me know if anything needs clarification. I certainly do believe that the Intelligent Design movement has something to offer science today. I think the contributions of Michael Behe and William Dembski in their books, *Darwin's Black Box* and *The Design Inference*, lay the critical theoretical and evidential groundwork for a scientifically workable theory of design. It is crucial to realize that this does not mean a complete overhaul of science. Design is only

meant to allow for design to be a legitimate hypothesis when addressing questions of the origin of complex systems. Some systems will carry the earmarks of design and some will not.

Behe's concept of "irreducible complexity" claims to identify molecular machines within cells that require a design hypothesis due to the fact that they are composed of multiple parts which rely on each other for any activity. Our own experience tells us that when we see such things, like a mousetrap, an intelligence was necessary to put it together. Even things as ridiculous as a Rube Goldberg machine, inefficient and wasteful as they appear, are still designed. Arguments about the intent and intelligence of the "designer" are theological and superfluous to the scientific merit of the hypothesis.

Dembski's emphasis on complex specified information being an indicator of design is another crucial piece of the puzzle. The DNA code is both complex and specified. All other codes we know of from experience require an intelligence to bring them about. These codes may operate on their own once in existence, but require intelligence to put them together. Now this does not in itself require an intelligence to bring about the DNA code, but it should at least be a viable option. Science will currently categorically rule out this possibility since it does not propose a naturalistic process for bringing about the DNA code. I believe this is done out of a philosophical prejudice as opposed to a legitimate scientific problem.

The connections between irreducible complexity and intelligence, and complex specified information and intelligence, are the crucial components of a viable theory of Intelligent Design (ID). I think there is plenty of data from molecular biology and astronomy (fine-tuning parameters of the universe) which already make Intelligent Design a worthwhile scientific pursuit.

Even Richard Dawkins admits that biology is the study of

complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose. Maybe it isn't just an appearance. If they have been designed for a purpose, we should be able to tell and it should fall under the umbrella of science since science is primarily a search for truth.

Genetic algorithms are still operating from a computer program utilizing the designed computer itself to arrive at its designs. In other words the potential for design is built into the program and the computer. The genetic algorithm program will not write itself and the program will not run itself apart from the computer, a designed machine.

This perhaps provides a starting point. There are other places on our site that can give you some more details but this should do for now.

BTW, the micro-macro distinction is one that many evolutionists recognize and use so it is not just some creationist invention. But you are correct that it does have to do with the distinction between the minor changes we see happening all around us and the unobserved changes that must have occurred in the past which there is often no discernible fossil evidence for. There is also an embryological component to the distinction. Currently observed microevolutionary changes are all changes that would occur late in embryological development; the overall body plan is not affected. Body plans are determined very early in embryological development which, if all life is descended from a common ancestor, must have also changed in the past. But nearly all mutations observed that occur early in development result in catastrophic deformities. You can't just add up microevolutionary, late development changes and eventually get an early developmental, body plan mutation. They are very different things.

Respectfully,

Dr. Ray Bohlin

Darwin's Black Box

Michael Behe's book Darwin's Black Box was hailed by Christianity Today as 1996's Book of the Year, with good reason. This is the first book suggesting Intelligent Design that has received such serious attention from the scientific community. Dr. Ray Bohlin, with a background in molecular biology, reviews this book from a perspective as a creationist and scientist.



This article is also available in [Spanish](#).

Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemistry of the Cell

What do mouse traps, molecular biology, blood clotting, Rube Goldberg machines, and irreducible complexity have to do with each other? At first glance they seem to have little if anything to do with each other. However, they are all part of a recent book by Free Press titled, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* by Michael Behe. Michael Behe is a biophysics professor at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania and his book, released last summer, has been causing a firestorm of activity in academic circles ever since.

The stranglehold that Darwinism has had in the biological sciences for decades has already been weakened over the last 30 years due to the new creationist movement and more recently by the push from intelligent design theorists. But Behe's new book may end up being the straw that broke the camel's back.

Usually books like these are released by Christian publishers or at least a secular press that is small and willing to take a chance. Also, creationist books are rarely sold in secular bookstores or reviewed in secular publications. *Darwin's Black Box* has gained the attention of evolutionists not normally accustomed to responding to anti-evolutionary ideas in the academic arena. People like Niles Eldredge from the American Museum of Natural History, Daniel Dennett, author of *Darwin's Dangerous Idea*, Richard Dawkins of Oxford University and author of *The Blind Watchmaker*, Jerry Robison of Harvard University, and David Hull from the University of Chicago have all been forced to respond to Behe either in print or in person.

In summary, the reason for all this attention is that they readily admit that Behe is clearly a reputable scientist from a reputable institution and his argument is therefore more sophisticated than they are accustomed to hearing from creationists. Mild, backhanded compliments aside, they unreservedly say he is flat wrong, but they have gone to much greater lengths in the literature, from the podium, and in the electronic media to explain precisely why they think he is wrong. Creationists and intelligent design theorists are usually dismissed out of hand, but not Behe's *Darwin's Black Box*.

Behe's simple claim is that when Darwin wrote *The Origin of Species*, the cell was a mysterious black box. We could see the outside of it, but we had no idea of how it worked. In *Origin*, Darwin stated,

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find no such case.

Simply put, Behe has found such a case. Behe claims that with

the opening of the black box of the cell through the last 40 years of research in molecular and cell biology, there are now numerous examples of complex molecular machines that absolutely break down the theory of natural selection as an all-encompassing explanation of living systems. The power and logic of his examples prompted *Christianity Today* to name *Darwin's Black Box* as their 1996 Book of the Year. Quite a distinction for a book on science published by a secular publisher!

In this essay I will be examining a few of Behe's examples and detailing further just how the scientific community has been reacting to this highly readable and influential book.

Irreducible Complexity and Mousetraps

Behe claims the data of biochemistry argues strongly that many of the molecular machines in the cell could not have arisen through a step-by-step process of natural selection. In contrast, Behe claims that much of the molecular machinery in the cell is irreducibly complex.

Let me first address this concept of irreducible complexity. It's really a quite simple concept to grasp. Something is irreducibly complex if it's composed of several parts and each part is absolutely necessary for the structure to function. The implication is that such irreducibly complex structures or machines cannot be built by natural selection because in natural selection, each component must be useful to the organism as the molecular machine is built. Behe uses the example of a mousetrap. A mousetrap has five parts that are absolutely necessary for the mousetrap to function. Take any one of these parts away and the mousetrap can no longer catch mice.

The mousetrap must contain a solid base to attach the four other parts to, a hammer that clamps down on the mouse, a spring which gives the hammer the necessary power, a holding

bar which holds the now energized hammer in position, and a catch to which the holding bar is secured, holding the hammer in coiled tension. Eventually, the jiggling action of a mouse, lured to the catch by a tasty morsel of peanut butter, causes the holding bar to slip away from the catch, releasing the hammer to spring down upon the unsuspecting mouse.

It's fairly easy to imagine the complete breakdown of functionality if you take away any of these five parts. Without the base, the other parts can't maintain the proper stability and distance from each other to be functional; without the spring or hammer, there is no way to actually catch the mouse; and without both the catch and holding bar, there is no way to set the trap. All the parts must be present and accounted for in order for a mouse to be caught and the machine to function at all.

You can't build a mousetrap by Darwinian natural selection. Let's say you have a factory that produces all five parts of a mousetrap but uses them for different purposes. Over the years as the production lines change, leftover parts of no-longer-made contraptions are put aside on shelves in a storage room. One summer, the factory is overrun with mice. If someone were to put his mind to it, he might run by the storage room and begin to play around with these leftover parts and just might construct a mousetrap. But those pieces, left to themselves, are never going to spontaneously self-assemble into a mousetrap. A hammer-like part may accidentally fall from its box into a box of springs, but it's useless until all five parts are assembled so they can function together. Nature would select against the continued production of the miscellaneous parts if they are not producing an immediate benefit to the organism.

Michael Behe simply claims that we have learned that several of the molecular machines in the cell are just as irreducibly complex as a mousetrap and, therefore, just as unable to be constructed by natural selection.

The Mighty Cilium

One of Behe's examples is the cilium. Cilia are tiny hair-like structures on the outside of cells that either help move fluid over a stationary cell, such as the cells in your lungs, or serve as a means of propelling a cell through water, as in the single-celled paramecium. There are often many cilia on the surface of a cell, and you can watch them beat in unison the way a stadium crowd performs the wave at a ball game.

A cilium operates like paddles in a row boat; however, since it is a hair-like structure, it can bend. There are two parts to the operation of a cilium, the power stroke and the recovery stroke. The power stroke starts with the cilium essentially parallel to the surface of the cell. With the cilium held rigid, it lifts up, anchored at its base in the cell membrane, and pushes liquid backwards until it has moved nearly 180 degrees from its previous position. For the recovery stroke, the cilium bends near the base, and the bend moves down the length of the cilium as it hugs the surface of the cell until it reaches its previous stretched out position, again having moved 180 degrees back to its original position. How does this microscopic hair-like structure do this? Studies have shown that three primary proteins are necessary, though over 200 others are utilized.

If you made a cross-section of a cilium and made a photograph of it with an electron microscope, you would see that the internal structure of the cilium is composed of a central pair of fibers surrounded by an additional 9 pairs of these same fibers arranged in a circle. These fibers or microtubules are long hollow sticks made by stacking the protein tubulin. The bending action of cilia depends on the vertical shifts made by these microtubules.

The bending is caused by another protein that is stretched between the pairs of tubules called nexin. Nexin acts as a sort of rubber band connector between the tubules. As the

microtubules shift vertically, the rubber band is stretched taut, the microtubules continue to shift if they bend. Whew! I know this is getting complicated, but hang with me a little longer. The microtubules slide past each other by the action of a motor protein called dynein. The dynein protein also connects two microtubules together. One end of the dynein remains stationary on one microtubule, while the other end releases its hold on the neighboring microtubule and reattaches a little higher and pulls the other microtubule down.

Without the motor protein, the microtubules don't slide and the cilium simply stands rigid. Without nexin, the tubules will slide against each other until they completely move past each other and the cilium disintegrates. Without the tubulin, there are no microtubules and no motion. The cilium is irreducibly complex. Like the mousetrap, it has all the properties of design and none of the properties of natural selection.

Rube Goldberg Blood Clotting

Rube Goldberg was a cartoonist in the earlier part of this century. He became famous for drawing weird contraptions that must go through many seemingly unnecessary steps in order to accomplish a rather simple purpose. Over the years, some evolutionists have alluded to living systems as Rube Goldberg machines as evidence of their construction by natural selection as opposed to being designed by a Creator. Things such as the Panda's thumb and the intricate workings of the many varieties of orchids are said to be contrived structures that an intelligent creator surely would have found a better way of doing.

If you have never seen a cartoon of a Rube Goldberg machine, let me describe one for you from Mike Behe's book, *Darwin's Black Box*. This one is titled the "Mosquito Bite Scratcher." Water falling off a roof migrates into a drain pipe and

collects into a flask. In the flask is a cork that floats up as the glass fills. Inserted in the cork is a needle that eventually rises high enough to puncture a suspended paper cup filled with beer. The beer then sprinkles onto a nearby bird that becomes intoxicated and falls off its platform and onto a spring. The spring propels the inebriated bird onto another platform where the bird pulls a string (no doubt mistaking it for a worm in its intoxicated state). The pulled string fires a cannon underneath a small dog, frightening him and causing him to flip over on his back. His rapid breathing raises and lowers a disk above his stomach which is attached to a needle positioned next to a mosquito bite on a man's neck allowing the bite to be scratched, causing no embarrassment to the man while he talks to a lady.

Well, this machine is obviously more complicated than it needs to be. But the machine is still designed and as Behe claims, it is also irreducibly complex. In other words, if one of the steps fails or is absent, the machine doesn't work. The whole contraption is useless. Well, there are a few molecular mechanisms in our bodies that are very similar to Rube Goldberg machines and therefore irreducibly complex. One is the blood-clotting cascade. When you cut your finger an amazing thing happens. Initially, it begins to bleed, but if you just leave it alone, after a few minutes, the flow of blood stops. A clot has formed, providing a protein mesh that initially catches the blood cells and eventually closes up the wound entirely, preventing the plasma from escaping as well.

This seemingly straightforward process involves over a dozen different proteins with names like thrombin, fibrinogen, Christmas, Stuart, and accelerin. Some of these proteins are involved in forming the clot. Others are responsible for regulating clot formation. Regulating proteins are needed because you only want clots forming at the site of a wound not in the middle of flowing arteries. Yet other proteins have the job of removing the clot once it is no longer needed. The body

also needs to eliminate the clot when it has outlived its usefulness, but not before.

Now it's easy to see why some, when considering the blood-clotting cascade, wonder if a Creator could have devised something simpler. But that assumes we fully understand the system. Perhaps it absolutely needs to be this way. Besides, this doesn't in any way diminish the fact that even a Rube Goldberg machine is designed just as the blood clotting system seems to be.

Silence of Molecular Evolution and the Reaction

Clearly, the irreducible complexity inherent in many biochemical systems not only precludes the possibility that they evolved by Darwinian natural selection, but actually suggests the strong conclusion that some kind of intelligent design is necessary. Behe makes a very significant point by recognizing that the data that implies intelligent design doesn't necessarily mean one knows who the designer is. Inferring that intelligent design is present is a reasonable scientific conclusion. Planetary astronomers, for example, claim that we will be able distinguish a radio signal from space that was sent by an intelligent civilization from the surrounding radio noise even though we won't initially understand it and won't know who sent it.

Yet the astounding complexity of the cell has gone largely unnoticed and greatly unreported to the general public. There is an embarrassed silence. Behe speculates as to why; he says,

Why does the scientific community not greedily embrace its startling discovery? Why is the observation of design handled with intellectual gloves? The dilemma is that while one side of the elephant is labeled intelligent design, the other side might be labeled God (p.233).

This may also help to account for another curious omission that Behe highlights, the almost total lack of scientific literature attempting to describe how complex molecular systems could have arisen by Darwinian natural selection. The *Journal of Molecular Evolution* was established in 1971, dedicated to explaining how life at the molecular level came to be. One would hope to find studies exploring the origin of complex biochemical systems in this journal. But, in fact, none of the papers published in *JME* over the entire course of its life as a journal has ever proposed the origin of a single complex biochemical system in a gradual step-by-step Darwinian process.

Furthermore, Behe adds,

The search can be extended, but the results are the same. There has never been a meeting, or a book or a paper on details of the evolution of complex biochemical systems (p. 179).

Behe's sophisticated argument has garnered the attention of many within the scientific community. His book has been reviewed in the pages of *Nature*, *Boston Review*, *Wall Street Journal*, and on many sites on the Internet. While some have genuinely engaged the ideas and offered serious rebuttal, most have sat back on Darwinian authority and claimed that Behe is just lazy or hasn't given the evolutionary establishment enough time. Jerry Coyne in *Nature* (19 September 1996, pp. 227-28) put it this way:

There is no doubt that the pathways described by Behe are dauntingly complex, and their evolution will be hard to unravel. Unlike anatomical structures, the evolution of which can be traced with fossils, biochemical evolution must be reconstructed from highly evolved living organisms, and we may forever be unable to envisage the first proto-pathways. It is not valid, however, to assume that, because one man

cannot imagine such pathways, they could not have existed.

But that's precisely the point; it is not one man but the entire biochemical community that has failed to elucidate a specific pathway leading to a complex biochemical system.

I highly recommend Behe's book. Its impact will be felt for many years to come.

©1997 Probe Ministries