

1: Talk Reason: arguments against creationism, intelligent design, and religious apologetics

Why Intelligent Design Fails assembles a team of physicists, biologists, computer scientists, mathematicians, and archaeologists to examine intelligent design from a scientific perspective. They consistently find grandiose claims without merit.

I treasure thoughtful ID critics when they come along, but Lents fails to connect. Wells had already done in *Zombie Science*. Unless I missed it, there was no response. Lents has sprayed insults at Mike Egnor, and got down in the weeds about the maxillary sinuses. He believes he understands more about the anatomy of the human head than a distinguished neurosurgeon like Professor Egnor. Lents studies how corpses decay. Egnor serves the living by rebuilding skulls, among other things. And you know what? That would presumably include John Paul I who held the office for 33 days before his death in September. Design proponents state their case in exclusively scientific terms. Egnor made that point as well, but again, there was no response to it. Any man or woman who has reached age 25 or so knows that the human body breaks down. Like any design in the physical world, it operates under constraints that can be frustrating, painful, or fatal. No ID advocate says otherwise. Why, on a deep level, are we all destined for death? There may be evidence of design flaws. This is not evidence against intention in biology, any more than it is in human technology. And there are good answers to those questions. Our speech apparatus is perfectly fit for communication. We can run long distances, better than a horse and rider sometimes. For an amusing comparison of our fastest times compared to various animals, have a look here. But bear in mind, not one of those animals can run, swim, and jump as well as we can. Then there is our capacity for abstract thought, an activity you and I are engaged in right now, and our incredible fine-motor skills. For a Darwinist or anyone else to trash the wonder of it all seems not only uncurious, but ungrateful. Darwinists, as you can see here, use the word to describe themselves. And as the forthcoming documentary *Human Zoos* demonstrates, the line of descent from 19th-century pseudo-scientific racism down to today is all too clear.

2: Why intelligent design fails | ScienceBlogs

Is intelligent design science, or not? Think carefully before you answer. The modern intelligent design (ID) movement is motivated by theological concerns and trades in on religious authority to.

Teach the Controversy The intelligent design movement states that there is a debate among scientists about whether life evolved. The movement stresses the importance of recognizing the existence of this supposed debate, seeking to convince the public, politicians, and cultural leaders that schools should "Teach the Controversy". Neo-creationism Advocates of intelligent design seek to keep God and the Bible out of the discussion, and present intelligent design in the language of science as though it were a scientific hypothesis. Dover trial in late and after President George W. Bush expressed support for the idea of teaching intelligent design alongside evolution in August Does God have a place in science class? Dover case, the court ruled that intelligent design was a religious and creationist position, finding that God and intelligent design were both distinct from the material that should be covered in a science class. Theistic science Empirical science uses the scientific method to create a posteriori knowledge based on observation and repeated testing of hypotheses and theories. Intelligent design proponents seek to change this fundamental basis of science [13] by eliminating "methodological naturalism" from science [14] and replacing it with what the leader of the intelligent design movement, Phillip E. Johnson, calls "theistic realism". Teaching both, they argue, allows for the possibility of religious belief, without causing the state to actually promote such beliefs. Many intelligent design followers believe that "Scientism" is itself a religion that promotes secularism and materialism in an attempt to erase theism from public life, and they view their work in the promotion of intelligent design as a way to return religion to a central role in education and other public spheres. Some allege that this larger debate is often the subtext for arguments made over intelligent design, though others note that intelligent design serves as an effective proxy for the religious beliefs of prominent intelligent design proponents in their efforts to advance their religious point of view within society. Philosopher of biology Elliott Sober, for example, states that intelligent design is not falsifiable because "[d]efenders of ID always have a way out". From a strictly empirical standpoint, one may list what is known about Egyptian construction techniques, but one must admit ignorance about exactly how the Egyptians built the pyramids. Inter-faith outreach[edit] Supporters of intelligent design have also reached out to other faith groups with similar accounts of creation with the hope that the broader coalition will have greater influence in supporting science education that does not contradict their religious views. The Roman Catholic Church has stated that religious faith is fully compatible with science, which is limited to dealing only with the natural world [26] —a position described by the term theistic evolution. Prominent scientists who strongly express religious faith, such as the astronomer George Coyne and the biologist Ken Miller, have been at the forefront of opposition to intelligent design. Slifkin also asserts that the intelligent design movement is inordinately concerned with portraying God as "in control" when it comes to things that cannot be easily explained by science, but not in control in respect to things which can be explained by scientific theory. National Academy of Sciences has stated that "creationism, intelligent design, and other claims of supernatural intervention in the origin of life or of species are not science because they are not testable by the methods of science. The fewer criteria are met, the less scientific it is; and if it meets only a few or none at all, then it cannot be treated as scientific in any meaningful sense of the word. Typical objections to defining intelligent design as science are that it lacks consistency, [48] violates the principle of parsimony, [n 13] is not scientifically useful, [n 14] is not falsifiable, [n 15] is not empirically testable, [n 16] and is not correctable, dynamic, provisional or progressive. The Daubert Standard governs which evidence can be considered scientific in United States federal courts and most state courts. Its four criteria are: The theoretical underpinnings of the methods must yield testable predictions by means of which the theory could be falsified. The methods should preferably be published in a peer-reviewed journal. There should be a known rate of error that can be used in evaluating the results. The methods should be generally accepted within the relevant scientific community. Dover Area School District, using these criteria and others mentioned above, Judge Jones ruled that "We have concluded that it is not, and moreover that ID cannot

uncouple itself from its creationist, and thus religious, antecedents". At the Kitzmiller trial, philosopher Robert T. The intelligent design movement has not published a properly peer-reviewed article supporting ID in a scientific journal, and has failed to publish peer-reviewed research or data supporting ID. Dembski, Behe and other intelligent design proponents say bias by the scientific community is to blame for the failure of their research to be published. Some scientists describe this claim as a conspiracy theory. Because they are doing science, not religion. Critics and advocates debate over whether intelligent design produces new research and has legitimately attempted to publish this research. For instance, the Templeton Foundation, a former funder of the Discovery Institute and a major supporter of projects seeking to reconcile science and religion, says that it asked intelligent design proponents to submit proposals for actual research, but none were ever submitted. Meyer, it appeared in the peer-reviewed journal *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* in August. The choice of venue for this article was also considered problematic, because it was so outside the normal subject matter see Sternberg peer review controversy [n 20]. Dembski has written that "perhaps the best reason [to be skeptical of his ideas] is that intelligent design has yet to establish itself as a thriving scientific research program. In his ruling, the judge wrote: Critics, largely members of the scientific community, reject this claim, stating that no established scientific journal has yet published an intelligent design article. Rather, intelligent design proponents have set up their own journals with peer review that lacks impartiality and rigor, [n 21] consisting entirely of intelligent design supporters. William Dembski, for example, has written that "Intelligence leaves behind a characteristic signature". The characteristics of intelligence are assumed by intelligent design proponents to be observable without specifying what the criteria for the measurement of intelligence should be. Dembski, instead, asserts that "in special sciences ranging from forensics to archaeology to SETI the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, appeal to a designing intelligence is indispensable". The criticism is a counter to intelligent design claims about what makes a design intelligent, specifically that "no preprogrammed device can be truly intelligent, that intelligence is irreducible to natural processes". However, in studies of artificial intelligence, while there is an implicit assumption that supposed "intelligence" or creativity of a computer program is determined by the capabilities given to it by the computer programmer, artificial intelligence need not be bound to an inflexible system of rules. Rather, if a computer program can access randomness as a function, this effectively allows for a flexible, creative, and adaptive intelligence. Evolutionary algorithms, a subfield of machine learning itself a subfield of artificial intelligence, have been used to mathematically demonstrate that randomness and selection can be used to "evolve" complex, highly adapted structures that are not explicitly designed by a programmer. Evolutionary algorithms use the Darwinian metaphor of random mutation, selection and the survival of the fittest to solve diverse mathematical and scientific problems that are usually not solvable using conventional methods. Intelligence derived from randomness is essentially indistinguishable from the "innate" intelligence associated with biological organisms, and poses a challenge to the intelligent design conception that intelligence itself necessarily requires a designer. Cognitive science continues to investigate the nature of intelligence along these lines of inquiry. The intelligent design community, for the most part, relies on the assumption that intelligence is readily apparent as a fundamental and basic property of complex systems. Truth Sheet Does intelligent design postulate a "supernatural creator? A Journal of Mere Christianity. This is not to say that the biblical issues are unimportant; the point is rather that the time to address them will be after we have separated materialist prejudice from scientific fact". He traced this argument back to at least Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century, who framed the argument as a syllogism: Wherever complex design exists, there must have been a designer; nature is complex; therefore nature must have had an intelligent designer. Starting a Conversation about Evolution: Johnson, Phillip; August 31, [Retrieved]. This means that we affirm that God is objectively real as Creator, and that the reality of God is tangibly recorded in evidence accessible to science, particularly in biology. We are taking an intuition most people have and making it a scientific and academic enterprise. We are removing the most important cultural roadblock to accepting the role of God as creator. Our strategy has been to change the subject a bit so that we can get the issue of Intelligent Design, which really means the reality of God, before the academic world and into the schools. National Science Teachers Association. It is simply not fair to present pseudoscience to students in the science classroom.

3: As a Critic of Intelligent Design, Nathan Lents Fails to Connect | Evolution News

Why Intelligent Design Fails: A Scientific Critique of the New Creationism Edited by Matt Young and Taner Edis "This book is a readable and devastating scientific analysis of intelligent design creationismunlike ID's proponents, these authors have done the real science that deflates the claims of intelligent design.

One of the most popular and, in my view, compelling arguments against Intelligent Design Creationism IDC is that it is not a genuine scientific theory at all. The Demarcation Problem and Truth Telling Thoughts responds sort of to a point I made yesterday. In the course of arguing that creationists and postmodernists talk about science the same way as "microfascist," etc. Macht Evolution, Climate Change, and the Nature of Science Over at Real Climate, Raypierre has an exceedingly enlightening post about the similarities and differences between attacks on evolution and attacks on global warming. As someone who has explored both areas extensively--and who has also found striking similarities, if also some differences--I think. Where is the falsifiability? How can you prove that there is no intelligent designer? Sarkar goes into a bit of detail about falsifiability, etc. What I like about his method is that it not only shows the "scientific" portions of ID to be either undefined or incoherent, but it also helps reveals the religious underpinnings of the arguments of ID advocates. Log in to post comments By laelaps on 08 Jun permalink ID advocates go on and on about detecting "intelligence", but how are they defining "intelligence"? I remember reading a few years ago or so on the Pandas Thumb some discussion about that. Apparently Dembski had done some defining of intelligence in a way that included such things as beaches and, amusingly, natural selection as "intelligent agents". I seem to recall it was anything that could sort. My search-fu is weak. I know Dembski has been doing some waffling about his explanatory filter lately i. ID seems to be in a bit of a bind. The dress up negative arguments against evolutionary theory as positive examples of ID and have not carefully developed a "theory of ID. The main contributions towards that end have been made by Dembski, but as Sarkar has pointed out, his arguments like the explanatory filter and csi are either insufficient or incoherent. To ridicule religion is not a proof or disproof of anything; it merely shows the paltry supply of logical arrows in your quiver. If it makes you more comfortable, consider the possibility that aliens of immense power and intellect engineered the creation of our universe through an initial "Big Bang. By Kerry Soileau not verified on 08 Jun permalink I agree with pough. ID could be science e. Log in to post comments By qetzal not verified on 08 Jun permalink Kerry; I am a bit puzzled by your comment. No one here is ridiculing religion. Instead I merely pointed out how the religious beliefs of top ID advocates are influencing the concept they are trying to sell as science, even though they have not yet turned ID into a science. The point of this summary and the paper that inspired it was to show how ID advocates use terms loosely and have not formulated any "theory of ID. That ID advocates believe God is the designer, without fully developing their science, only undermines their position. By Blake Stacey not verified on 08 Jun permalink Colin 1: Where is the falsifiability? Please can we replace the horrible and misleading word "falsifiable" by "testable" or "provable" using "prove" in its older sense of to test? So they must be true! Those evil scientists admit it! In a way, the ToE is not falsifiable, simply because all attempts to falsify it have failed. But it clearly is testable, because it has been tested, tested and tested. Good science, bad words! But the whole of the ID as science or non-science argument is a red herring. Creationism is about politics and power, not about science and biology. ID is simply its rather tatty cloak of invisibility. It is a mistake to think that creationists can be won over with scientific arguments. Log in to post comments By Sam C not verified on 08 Jun permalink Log in to post comments By laelaps on 08 Jun permalink Where is the falsifiability? By pointing to any of the many instances of stupid design. Perhaps the Designer is just smarter than you. No self respecting Creator would release such a botched design. Talk "optimal design" instead of intelligent then we might get somewhere Certainly carnivorous predators having an easier time digesting saturated, even-carbon-numbered fats is a more optimal design if prey have saturated, even-carbon-numbered fats, yes? A vocal minority is also holding out for Diet Coke and Mentos. By Blake Stacey not verified on 08 Jun permalink The most important thing about intelligent design is that it is a group exercise in massive intellectual dishonesty. My hat is off to anyone who undertakes the search effort to see if there are any

worthwhile ideas floating in that sewer. Log in to post comments By Russell not verified on 08 Jun permalink There is a theory of ID in Intelligent Design message from the Designers, but the ID community does not yet appear to be aware of it. Recently an evolutionary biologist, suggested that if evolution were to be replaced, it would have to be with a better theory. I would venture to suggest the theory in the above mentioned book, could be a candidate for replacing evolution. The progressive design evidenced by the evolution was presumed to be nature. Given that our scientists are approaching the first rung of the ladder of artificially creating life, through the synthesis of DNA, can we not now start to consider the idea of progression of design by very advanced science? Then our scientists will become like those our ancestors , mistook for gods. If this is science fiction, then within the context of the theory, so are the dangers of nuclear war. We are on our own but not alone. It is up to our humanity to understand or unfortunately we will go the way of the many humanities that have existed on this very ancient planet. By Ben not verified on 08 Jun permalink Unless you define "stupid design," it is ridiculous to assert that the universe cannot be the result of ID because some of its features seem "stupid. How would one scientifically test the hypothesis: Aliens of immense power and intellect engineered the creation of our universe through an initial "Big Bang. From a probabilistic point of view, it is more likely that 1 Aliens of immense power and intellect engineered the creation of our universe through an initial "Big Bang" than 2 The universe and the life within it is the result of a design-free Big Bang and billions of years of evolution. By Kerry Soileau not verified on 08 Jun permalink Quiet, this ties to my previous comment toward David. By pointing out cancer as "botched" you have performed a subjective evaluation of a, for lack of a better work, "feature". If you were to design a mortal race how would you design in the mortality? Death is not pretty no matter how you do it be it cancer or exsanguination or a demyelinating disease or coronary atherosclerosis or Log in to post comments By Colin not verified on 08 Jun permalink " The non perfect, or sub-optimal arguments are based on a religious assumption that the designer is omniscient, and thus His designs must also be. Interesting that many atheists cite a Biblical description of the designer to make a vacuous point. Due to unavoidable pitfalls is the biosphere, anomalies occur, cancer being one. Modifications to the immune system could well reduce its occurrence, and could be considered sub-optimal design. But was biologic life intended to be perfect? Over vast time, the second scenario is viable. There are many more refutations of theodical result of theodicy philosophical arguments, including bioforms being vehicles for corporeal field trips by true life forms spirit. In short, they do nothing to remove design inferences. And ID "theory" immunizes itself from test by failing to specify anything at all about how the process it invokes -- "intelligence" -- does anything. As the man said, I may not be able to say exactly when day ends and night begins, but I sure as Hell can tell the difference between them. The PT discussion I just linked to is possibly the one pough was looking for. Where did the superior beings who created us come from, then? You still have to explain where that higher power came from. At some point, you have to actually answer the question. And the more powerful and higher up you go on the ladder of "what did it", the more bizarre and unlikely the explanation becomes. Log in to post comments By Dr. Kate not verified on 08 Jun permalink ID is easily definable as pseudoscience. It is a movement born of religious ideologues who in their wedge document designed a strategy to undermine existing science. It has been argued outside of the scientific literature, with no data. It relies on quote-mining and cherry-picking. It moves the goalposts, and does not accept when data conflicts or falsifies its claims. It is suspended on a bed of logical fallacies. This is not a gray area of the demarcation problem. This is classic, obvious, smack-you-in-the-face pseudoscience. This is religion using rhetorical techniques and PR to undermine a scientific consensus. It operates with no data, no publications, no peer-review, and no credibility. Who needs to hem and haw and question whether this is scientific? This is utter bullshit Brian.

4: Intelligent design and science - Wikipedia

The intelligent design movement argues the latter. Why Intelligent Design Fails assembles a team of physicists, biologists, computer scientists, mathematicians, and archaeologists to examine intelligent design from a scientific perspective.

WHY INTELLIGENT DESIGN FAILS pdf

5: Why Intelligent Design Fails: A Scientific Critique of the New Creationism by Matt Young

In Why Intelligent Design Fails, a team of scientists call on their expertise in physics, biology, computer science, and archaeology to examine intelligent design. They take design claims at face value, without attempting to rule out the hypothesis of a designed universe just because of its supernatural overtones.

6: Why Intelligent Design Fails | NCSE

In this video I will attempt to give a description of one reason that ID fails in its attempt to be considered scientific. The explanation I give is based on the fact that, while all supported.

7: Taner Edis Â» Why Intelligent Design Fails: A Scientific Critique of the New Creationism

Lady Book Notes blog reviews Why Intelligent Design Fails, Thursday, March 08, (this review is the same is the one in www.enganchecubano.com). Austin Cline, Review of Why Intelligent Design Fails, undated.

Economics of fisheries management Catia v5 macro programming with visual basic script Smart 450 service manual Among The Holy Places Human Figures in Movement Swahili for beginners book Life in earnest. Six lectures, on Christian activity and ardor. By the Rev. James Hamilton . The Guns of Dallas American Storytellers and Songsters Morgan, Sister Gertrude Template benchmark advance planning sheet The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians (SBL Dissertation Series, 12) Primary school projects Connectionist Modelling In Cognitive Neuropsychology Annex 3: Income Tax Act 1974123. Rewriting the rules of conflict Jack russell savvy The travelers guide to Middle Eastern and North African customs and manners Grounded in Prayer Ldr (Grounded in Prayer) Total disc replacement through the XLIF approach Luiz Pimenta . [et al.]. My Very Own Fairy Tales Treasury (Twelve Volume Set) Legal secretary training manual Sundays Best for Baby (Leisure Arts #3616) Amazing Nellie Bly. The formation of the Exodus tradition. Human blood plasma proteins structure and function Argument from verbal classification What are magnets? Animal physiology book The Federal Election Commission Cat 2008 Calendar Robert C. Schenck. Sea of Cortez and other plays Islamic short stories in urdu Tax manager job description Prosperity decade; from war to depression: 1917-1929 Ritual healing in suburban America New headway pre intermediate workbook 3rd edition Memory management in c programming Linux operations and administration