

## Intelligent design

By: Arnold Kennedy.

When talking to a local Waiheke identity in the public library, I was asked, “Arnold, I hope those articles you write in ‘The Waihekean’ are tongue and cheek”. “Well”, I replied, “they are designed to make people think but they are not all tongue in cheek”. This produced a reply on the value of racial mixing and the equality of all races together with an alleged lack of meaningful genetic differences between them. In reply I pointed out two things. Firstly a November article in the N.Z. Herald “*Genes Carry Indelible Imprint Of Social Rank*” where research showed there are distinctive genetic profiles between the Hindu castes in India. Secondly I pointed out the matter of race-specific diseases and how racial intermarriage could cause offspring to be liable to a greater range of diseases. This was not received; it seemed as if he was saying that *science* offended his religion, although I do not think he would class himself as being a religious person. Perhaps he was confusing *values* with *facts*, *values* being a religious non-scientific activity. But what he probably had in mind were matters of worth in the good sense that people in one restricted gene pool should not be treated differently than another, and this made him blind to biological differences, even if everyone who thinks about it knows visible features such as eye shape are because of biological differences.

What bothers me is the attitude of some people who will not believe something regardless of the evidence, and this is what I want to talk about. In the Western world *values* are considered matters of personal choice and things we should keep an open mind about. But *values* cannot rightly over-ride *facts*, and those who promote the idea that *values* should over-ride *facts* arrogantly seek to impose their beliefs upon others in a religious manner. People today tend to place *facts* within the scope of science whereas they say *beliefs* belong to the realm of religion. A person who will not accept scientific *fact* is essentially religious.

It is true that coherent thought demands that we must take some things as being defined, so we must always be explicit about all suppositions. Most of us take for granted the assumptions of our society without thinking too much about it. Because of this we tend to go along with a rotten financial system and self-serving secret-agenda politicians. Why do we tend to disbelieve something we have not fully examined or tried, that is, why do we not separate *values* from *facts* when they differ? Of course there is a good and a bad side to examination and testing. I remember at High School reading in a chemistry book that there was a lead salt which tasted very sweet and yet was deadly poisonous in small quantities - I wondered what happened to the taster! This shows we should not ignore experience. Experience here is in the nature of *science*.

When something is proved as being *fact* by a witness of integrity, is it ignorant or arrogant for him to make a confident statement about it? Not wanting to know about “*Genes Carry Indelible Imprint Of Social Rank*” is not going to make it any less of a fact, even if it is not ‘politically correct’ or personally pleasing to some peoples’ *values* to accept it. What I am saying is that we do not have to live without *facts* in a twilight zone where all cats are grey! Black and white is better, but a strong wide dash of colour is even better! In our society, there is actually less freedom to follow *facts* than there is to follow *values*, because the law of the land supports *values* rather than *facts*.

But what should the law and our lives be based upon? Should it not be upon *fact*? It cannot be based upon superstition or supposition. *Science* does not operate outside of laws which are inviolate. Scientific laws are also laws of God as Designer; buck them and you have to take what is coming. We just cannot argue! If we find genetic laws and *facts* about them, are we unwise not to accept them? Can personal abhorrence make them cease to exist? Is there any wisdom in ignoring undeniable *facts*? Society and government are paying a heavy price for denying *facts* which are equally true for every person. The laws of *science* do not discriminate on the basis of race, minorities, the poor or the disabled. *Values* may discriminate and allow the strong to prevail over the weak. No matter how much we may try to legislate to try to change *values* into *facts*, and pass

anti-discrimination laws, we cannot succeed. That is what we see in government; we see an assumption that it is more intellectually respectable to accept doubt above a creed and *facts*, placing *values* in their place. Scientific knowledge is a creed which allows no scope for pluralism. There is no scope for “*what is true for me may not be true for you*” in science. The so-called sciences of sociology and economics still operate on the myth of *values* and have no firm basis as science understands a basis; they absurdly operate on the “*values*” of personal choices, chance and cause. They provide a false lens to look through and view the world. For instance, we can all view the evil consequences of a money system based upon usury, a system which discriminates against the poor and the weak in society. Yet we join in with it as total hypocrites! This shows where *values* are placed, that is, they are placed above *facts*.

Science and faith have a lot in common. Science may produce a hypothesis and then seek to find out if it works in practice. Until it is proved, the hypothesis is on the level of a *value*. Now I have to admit that I cannot supply one small *fact* to prove that God exists. The only way I can change such a *value* to a *fact* for myself is by experience. For instance, if I have positive and negative leads on a fully-charged car battery, it is not until I have the practical faith to bring the two leads together that I can establish as a *fact* that such a short will produce a large spark. It is not until I see that spark that I can say that I am a believer who has moved beyond *values*.

So much religion is on the level of *values* with one set of values competing with another. To find out whether many Church-goers really “believe”, find out how most of their members vote in elections. I have found their vote is for what they think will give them the best financial advantage, rather than for what they profess to believe. What many forget is that the Bible is an intensely scientific book. People tend to forget the matter of *intelligent design*, a subject we cannot deny even if it is ignored and is dismissed as being a fancy new name for creationism. We do not tolerate physics teachers who deny the view that the earth is a sphere or doubt whether its motion is around the sun. We do not tolerate chemistry teachers who think that the periodic table is irrelevant to chemistry. To put the teaching of evolutionary theory in a *science* basket is not valid because at best evolution is still only a theory. It is because our teachers and leaders want to avoid the implications of believing *intelligent design* that they cling to a theory as being a *fact* when it is only a *values* theory. Evolution then is properly in the field of religion and we should not tolerate biology teachers or others who would place evolution in the field of science. There is no intellectual honesty when this is done. Some may have noted the front-page ‘Time Magazine’ headlines in 1998, “*Evolution is dead*”.

Evolutionary theory is failing as an alleged matter of science; its day of reckoning is arriving! Its appeal is to the non-purposive, undirected natural processes. But can we in truth explain the origin and development of life by natural causes? Can we really view intelligent causes as a by-product of natural causes? Intelligent causes must come from intelligence to produce the obvious *intelligent design* we can see in science. The laws of science prove *intelligent design*. The only universally valid form of inner knowledge of truth is *science* coupled with experience. This is in a different division to music, literature, philosophy and in the arts. It is in these where emotion may allow one thing to be true for one person but not for another.

To affirm *intelligent design* would demand responsibility, a responsibility that most refuse to shoulder, simply because of a *values* preference to please the natural in-born love of self-pleasing. When we look at the world and the features that show *intelligent design*, this shows that there must be more of worth than an un-designed mixture of conflicting *values*. *Intelligent causation* is more than a religious-*values* belief.

Evolutionary theory cannot account for the complexity of life where the removal of one component in a system causes malfunction. Whole branches of science such as anthropology, archaeology and forensic science display unequivocal marks of *intelligent causation* that are not necessarily human or earthbound. These are scientific *facts* and thus show that *intelligent design* is properly scientific and as such it should be taught in our schools as science, [provided that we do not allow religion to masquerade as science such as happens when evolution is taught].

When a person refuses to accept scientific *facts* in favour of *values*, we find him doing more than just refusing to accept his responsibilities. We find such people actively pursuing an agenda to bolster up what effectively is their religion; they seek to establish the dominance of naturalism within the scientific community. Because most in Government share the irresponsible position, they have the power to group together and support each-other. Their problems with the origin of the genetic code, the origin of sexuality, the gaps in the fossil records, the development of complex organic systems, and the development of irreducible complex molecules are not going to go away, but are problems which are going to grow worse with time. The time will come when they will no longer be able to artificially constrict the playing field by allowing *tolerance* to deny the free flow of *fact*", that is, if these moths in the fabric of civilisation do not destroy society first.

*Intelligent design* and *science* are windows into reality and it comes as a shock when one realises just how much they have in common. Few people realise the common design relationship that exists between the Bible and *science* but not between religion and science. The Bible in Hebrew and Greek and *science* share the same language of numbers and other peculiarities that do not feature in any other holy book of other faiths. This determines that the Bible and *science* are not separate having different designers and that both belong to the one seamless robe of Truth..

So, going back to the pride of people not believing something regardless of the evidence, their mere preferences and opinions as *values* hold greater weight to them than *facts*, and those supporting *values*, especially Human Rights *values*, pursue these *values* with a religious fervour, demanding so-called rights to their *values*, completely ignoring the matter of *intelligent design*, a denial that has contributed to the fall of past civilisations.

When individual liberty expressed as *values* becomes the only arbitrator of right and wrong, community disintegrates, because government then becomes nothing more than the referee between endless competing claims for "rights". Unlimited liberty demands that there is no objective good and so all lifestyles and convictions become merely subjective tastes and preferences. Could we possibly give all of these the same protection under law without having a corrosive effect? Could *facts* ever be subordinated to the requirements of a person's "liberty"? Is good really only what the individual personally prefers? Is justice to be based upon a person's *right* to act upon his preferences? The extreme of *values* of course is total permissiveness and therefore total chaos and anarchy. Without community beliefs and a public moral basis there can be no community. But the morals associated with *intelligent design* are creative and not destructive. To come to be a 'believer' is a choice! This is what "seek and you will find" is all about!