

I continue to see articles in the paper on Intelligent Design. I believe that the things that are missing are a critique of this whole idea from a religious standpoint and a scientific standpoint.

From my viewpoint Intelligent Design is both an insult to religion and to science. It is an insult to religion because it makes assumptions that are beyond religion. It is an insult to science because it is bogus science.

From everything I've read on this the folks who think that Intelligent Design makes sense believe that parts of the universe are "irreducibly complex". They mean to say that nothing the human brain can ever do will reveal how these irreducibly complex parts of the universe operate. Next, given such irreducibly complex things exist combined with faith that God exist, these folks, who believe in Intelligent Design, then attribute to God the understanding of these irreducibly complex systems. Then they further fold all this back into science and claim that this constitutes a proof of a new theory of creation.

The religion surrounding Intelligent Design is flawed on the same level as the persecution of Galileo was when he challenged the heliocentric theory of the universe, in this case religion is embracing a bit of bogus science rather than rejecting a bit of good science.

Religion has no place in embracing or rejecting any scientific theory, there is a fundamental disconnect between science and religion and the folks who embrace Intelligent Design from a religious stand point must understand this. To be perfectly clear here it must be said that the moral implications of scientific practices are most certainly the realm of religion (as they most certainly are of science itself.) The morality of science (and religion) belongs equally to both.

Religion is based on faith and to the extent that religious folks start to get away from this fundamental percept they are no longer practicing religion but something more akin to astrology. A more common name of such a practice is pseudo science.

Intelligent Design folks will do just as much good going back to astrology as they will when they pursue Intelligent Design as something that should be taught to our young people as a subject that is separate from religion itself, for example as an alternative to some part of science such as the theory of evolution.

The science of the existence of irreducibly complex phenomena is flawed on two levels. Irreducible complexity arises from attempts by human beings to understand their surroundings. This concept has both Biological and Mathematical flaws.

Understanding the biological flaw in the idea of irreducible complexity comes from the acceptance of what life, consciousness, and human intelligence is and more importantly is not. Life, consciousness, and human intelligence are all emergent phenomena.

Emergent phenomena are ones that clearly exist but a method that explains how they come to exist is not available by direct manipulation of some underlying or simpler model. There is nothing in the current understanding of emergent phenomena that says that such phenomena are forever stuck in that state. The current understanding of such phenomena is an ongoing process.

Understanding the Mathematical flaws with irreducible complexity comes from the idea that human beings understand the universe by making models of it. These models can be manipulated to explain and predict phenomena that can be observed.

The most critical part of all these models is what they all, necessarily leave out. They leave out the existence of the modeler. In other words they do not take into account that a human brain is coming up with the model. Attempts to incorporate the creator of the model into the model have so far resulted contradictions and incomplete theories on a fundamental level. The results of Gödel are a mathematical way of saying this.

The science of nonlinear dynamical systems that give rise to emergent phenomena and the mathematics of self referential recursive systems are both brand new. Most of the results obtained so far have come in the last twenty or thirty years. To claim that these two ideas represent any sort of mature understanding of the universe is the height of conceit.

There is absolutely no reason whatsoever to believe that human attempts at understanding the universe has come even remotely close to any sort of fundamental theory. It is certainly true that recent studies in quantum physics, emergent phenomena, and self referential recursive systems are exciting and promise to expand our understanding of the universe in ways that rival and even surpass the expansion that has occurred in the past few hundred years when we saw such things as the mathematics of Newton and Leibniz and the physics of Einstein come about.

However, to 'cherry-pick' ideas like irreducible complexity and emergent phenomena from science and wrap those ideas in the flag of religion are silly and stupid acts from a scientific and a religious standpoint.