

11/21/13

"Intelligent Design"  
Proof of Creationism

Isn't it somewhat redundant that evolutionists continue to harp away at creationists' use of the term "intelligent design", and dismiss it as an irrelevant religious belief? If it has no significance, why does it seem to bother them so much? I believe it is because they are very fitting words for the only logical argument for the origin of life, and other physical matter, in the universe.

Quoting from a newspaper article by Steve Olson (special to the Washington Post): "Creationists have not come up with a single scientific observation that undercuts evolution". To which I would say that even an honest, unbiased natural observation of the wonders of human, and other life forms would conclude that only the existence of a supernatural creator could explain the origin, and cause of the universe. And, those things should be evident to anyone, irrespective of religion.

The world is far too complex, and complicated to be the result of an impersonal source of random acts of nature, since, as the etiologist Richard Dawkins states, "The essence of life is a statistical improbability, on a colossal scale". I would say it is a metaphysical impossibility! At least, what Dawkins says, is an admission that you will not hear many of the leaders in the field make. And yet, in his elitist arrogance, he makes the following absurd remark, "It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet someone who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid, or insane....". To which, I would say, "If you meet someone who doesn't seriously believe in such a fantasy, that person is quite sane, and intelligent".

While, I wouldn't call an evolutionist stupid, or insane, the word ignorant fits, in the sense of not observing what the light of nature reveals, with rational reasoning, and common sense about the obvious evidence in human life, especially, that is overwhelming in its complexity, and amazing functionality. I further think that not to see any of the infinite wonders of the universe, as supernatural creation, is to refuse to be logical, objective, honest, or even reasonable!

There are, undoubtedly, highly intellectual, advanced studies of biological

discoveries, but they only prove processes; chemical, etc., instituted in nature that can show varying results, either by design, or within the parameters of the properties involved. But, in no way do they contradict purposeful creation, with possible changes to adapt to different situations, environmental, social, etc.

Science, by definition, also is affected by the influence of evolutionary claims, and assumptions, which reflects an arbitrary, authoritarian attitude of its intelligentsia, or hierarchy. Some Wikipedia definitions are (1) Science, "knowledge", is a systematic enterprise that builds and organizes knowledge in the form of testable explanations and predictions about the universe. (b) In an older and closely related meaning, "science" also refers to a body of knowledge itself, of the type that can be rationally explained, and reliably applied. Science, and philosophy are now closely related, since classical antiquity.

"Science most often refers to a way of pursuing knowledge; not only knowledge itself, it is also often restricted(?) to those branches of study that seek to explain the phenomena of the material universe". To enlarge on the subject, apart from Wikipedia, there is something very specious, and questionable about evolutionary "science". Theory becomes factual, simply because a biological test and observation of results constitutes an empirical fact. Which, even if the latter is true, cannot summarily be classified as proof of the origin, and cause of any form of life.

It may be the discovery of a certain phenomenon, that appears to the biased observer to be a form, or instance of evolutionary change. But, its like starting in the middle of a book, and commenting or explaining the first half of the book, with no knowledge of the material, and then fabricating or presuming to know the essence, or important details of the author's writing. In this case, the book is the Bible, and the author is God, who also is the creator and ruler of the universe!

How ridiculous, and futile it is, then, for puny little man to venture into the mysteries of the universe, and then concoct a contradictory theory of the origin and cause of life and matter, when the answer is clearly evident in nature itself, and attested to by the scriptures. The latter source of knowledge of the subject involved, is only understandable by those who are spiritually enabled, by virtue of their conversion to Christianity. But, as the scriptures declare, man has no excuse for his disbelief of supernatural creation, which is adequately revealed by the light of nature!

By evolutionists disallowing the self-evident, logical nature of the many forms of life, and material substances, is like arguing with the essential truth that George Washington Carver stated to his students, after they had dissected, studied and analyzed everything determinable about a cabbage, he congratulated them for their work, and told them to remember that only God can make a cabbage!

The application to evolutionary observations, and studies being that they too, may learn many interesting details of biological developments, chemical processes, etc., but they are only working on things that God has made! Even at that, they are in way over their heads, but keep deluding themselves that they are masters of the cosmos, or who needs God, when we are on the cusp of discovery, and enlightenment.

Three thoughtful statements from Paul K. Feyerabend, one of their own, should be heeded as words of caution against excesses in evolutionary conclusions. They are (1) Science does not have evidence for its philosophical precepts, particularly the notion of uniformity of laws, and uniformity of process across time and space. (2) He believes the dominance of science in society, is authoritarian, and unjustified. (3) Science should not consider supernatural explanations themselves, but should not claim them to be wrong either.

Too bad in the third item, supernatural creation, that evolutionists deny themselves a working hypothesis of the only real evident, and logical source of cause and effect of universal life, and matter! Charles Krauthammer, despite his renowned intellect, and knowledge, betrays that reputation when he makes such disoriented statements as, "Intelligent design may be interesting as theology, but as science it is a fraud". Of course, he has bought into the "advanced, progressive, professionally revised meaning of science, which tends to exclude or minimize the basic definition of science, being "knowledge".

The subtlety of evolutionary science practitioners changing the traditional meanings of words to fit their philosophy, is expressed in the following Wikipedia quotation, "Science" most often refers to a way of pursuing knowledge", or gaining knowledge. It could be left right there as a concise and accurate definition. But, watch the specious manipulation in the rest of the quote, (pursuing) "not only the knowledge itself, it is also often restricted (poetic license?) to those branches of study, that seek to explain the phenomena of the material universe".

And, little do they know, of how little they know! They spend so much time

zeroed in on a biological discovery, that even if they were on the right track, at the rate of one millionth of universal mysteries, they won't live long enough to make any serious headway, especially since it can never refute the overwhelming evidence, and logic of supernatural creation.

And, of course, those branches of study referred to, do not recognize anyone, or anything connected to theology, that is, faith-related, and therefore, unscientific, according to the exclusionary rules of the "enlightened" elite! The fact, hypothetically at least, that creationism is the only obviously logical answer to the question of the origin and cause of the universe, means that evolutionists will wander in the cosmological wilderness forever, and as the bible says, ".....ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth ( the larger, essential truth of supernatural creation, in addition to the spiritual truth of life, mainly intended)".

In another comment by Krauthammer, he cites the persistent battles over evolution in the U. S., as a national embarrassment", and that, "Intelligent Design is today's tarted-up version of creationism".

My reaction (not that he could bring himself to care what a Christian thinks, and believes), is if anyone can believe in the preposterous (read: impossible) fantasy of evolution, and not be embarrassed, surely the incontrovertibly logical truth of creationism, should be a positive theorem for a true scholar, especially!

Note on "logic": Modern-day science is not governed by logic, but by empirical theory (which the evolutionists classify as fact). How about matching the unfounded terms that Krauthammer used for creationism, "anachronistic", and "retrograde", with "iconoclastic", and "progressive" for evolution? "Iconoclast", per Webster's New World Dictionary, Ed. 4, Def. 2, "one who seeks to attack and destroy (at least, discredit) widely accepted ideas, beliefs, etc., (esp. religious ones). "Progressive", a misnomer grammatically. Definition 5 (b), per dictionary cited, "of, or having to do with a person, movement, etc., thought of as being modern, or advanced, as in ideas, methods, etc.", even to the extent of changing dictionary meanings of "knowledge" and "science" to accommodate their evolutionary concept, when the conventional meanings of those words don't fit their rationale.

It is commonly known that most of the hard core evolutionary scientists, and their cohorts are especially emphatic that they either do not believe in God, per se,

or don't want to connect any part of their field of work to God. So, what do they do, ironically? In effect, they make a work of God, nature, their god, as in their reference to the world, as Mother Earth! It is, of course, a form of idolatry but they are every bit as dedicated, and servile at that altar of worship, as many religions of the world are in their belief systems.

Krauthammer says further, "How ridiculous to make evolution the enemy of God". Well, since evolution is a counter-theory to the truth of creation, God would rightly (righteously) oppose it, even hate it, as He would anything that is untrue, and denigrates His sovereign works. "This is my Father's World" (as in the hymn), which He completely administers and controls, and there are no second causes regarding the origin of universal life and material.

He (C.K.) credits everything in the vast universe as having, ultimately been "derived from accumulated variations in a single double-stranded molecule". While, he makes that beginning of the universe sound a lot more scientific than the "big bang", or "primordial ooze", where did the molecule come from?

They can't take something from the creation side of the controversy, of which molecules, and atoms are the building blocks, and claim, or imply that they existed independently, in space, with developmental properties to mysteriously become advanced life forms. How much more rational to believe that they had to have a supernatural cause, including the capacity, programmed by God, to do exactly what they may be observed to do, along with everything else in this magnificent world and beyond; all according to design and purpose, by the supreme creator and ruler of the entire universe!

I will close with one last attempt to challenge the disingenuous argument against the use of "intelligent design" as compelling evidence of creation vs. evolution. Forget the "religion" rap, and at least acknowledge that there are surely innumerable people who are not religious, but see the clear logic of the term, and are convinced that it establishes the most obvious truth of supernatural creation. What unacceptable category do they belong in?

It is a copout for evolutionists to deny, and refuse to face the foregoing fact! Ironically, by their obstinate opposition, they exclude the most decisive factor (ID) involved in the controversy. Which convinces me, and multitudes of others, that they do not seek the truth objectively, but are so committed to their philosophy,

that they would do anything to perpetuate their fantasy!

The automatic exclusion of faith-related beliefs, is a decision that again defies logic, or rational reasoning, which is a typical trait of the whole evolutionary philosophy. Faith is trust in God, and that has to include everything in life, and since the bible is the main way by which He communicates with Christians, why wouldn't that be the best way to learn of His creative works.

A non-Christian cannot have spiritual knowledge or assurance of the reality of supernatural creation, but is naturally able to intellectually observe and reason that there is overwhelming evidence of the creative genius of the source of the amazing universe that surrounds us. God's word in Romans 1 tells us in a caption before Romans 1:19 that "The universe is a revelation of the power and deity of God"! In verse 20 it says, "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse.....".

Notice it doesn't say "...things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are *evolved* (vs. made).....".

Krauthammer acknowledges divine creation, in mentioning God deciding to make a lemur in a given instance, but nowhere in scripture does it make any reference to evolution, though Krauthammer implies that God incorporates both methods

Other than to keep the scheme alive for their own selfish purposes, why claim initial elementary creation by God, leaving further advanced development to a nondescript, imaginary evolutionary process--that has no way to progress without a built in capacity, and propensity to accomplish its destiny? Surely, it cannot be seriously thought that such ideas as "natural selection" or any other mythical system of development is possible.

That is why nothing but that old nemesis of the evolutionary theory (theory, in the unproven sense), of "intelligent design", and purpose is the "missing link" that exists before anything further can occur. Only God can make something out of nothing, but evolution is a misnomer, for the process of development instituted and managed , or controlled by God.

Evolution may say that it started with some kind of raw material, so it is not a primal originator, and if the matter had any kind of chemical or biological life, evolution is not the origin of a life principle. And, however secondary its cause of a

different species or organism is, a first cause, or creation is the true origin of it.

So, that leaves evolution as a non sequitur--a conclusion or inference that cannot result from its stated premise! It can claim scientific discovery of an early stage of life development, that was already caused supernaturally, and track its progressive changes into the finished form for which it was designed.

George Will's citing of Thomas Jefferson's objection to infusing theism into public education, has no real application to the fundamental question of how life and matter came to be. First off, the subject is not theism. as such. It is primarily philosophical, as in a dictionary definition: "theory or logical analysis of the principles underlying conduct, thought, knowledge, and the nature of the universe....".

Scientifically, it is biology, and physics (or, natural science) Together, they are the study of (1) the origin of life and resulting developments and (2) inorganic or material substances in the universe. Those are natural pursuits of knowledge, of which the bible is not a textbook source, except that its revelations lead to the logical belief of creation by the God and ruler of the universe. There is a saying that "all roads lead to Rome", that is, at the height of its prominence and power in an earlier era of civilization

In the greater picture of universal history, all roads, excluding the evils of life, lead back to God! It is His universe, entirely, with no natural institutions traceable to any other source or cause. Or, again, there are no second causes of any forms of life or original matter, or natural laws and forces. Whatever may be discovered and observed, are effects, resulting from prior causes. As for the two sides of the origin controversy, there is the light of God's natural creation, and spiritual re-creation, while sadly, the evolutionists continue to grope around in their philosophical darkness, that will never see the light of day.

As for the Vatican astronomer who said that intelligent design is not science, and has no place in the classroom, his statement violates true science (not the conceptual version of the evolutionary philosophy). Because, in truth, the phrase "intelligent design" represents the only logical deduction, and thereby the most convincing evidence of supernatural creation. Conjecture, and imaginary theory, are very poor substitutes for rational reasoning!





