

Re: black holes and intelligent design

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.chem/2005-02/1447.html>

From: Craig Franck (craig.franck_at_verizon.net)

Date: 02/28/05

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 01:39:15 GMT

<cafeinst@msn.com> wrote

> *I sense hostility in many of the replies to my arguments. Why? The
> theory of intelligent design explains how life got here.*

The issue isn't what it explains — it explains everything simultaneously
— the issue is what kind of explanation or statement it is.

> *It is a good scientific theory which is testible*

This claim is the problem. ID is not a scientific theory.

> *and has passed the
> test: The fact that no one has ever been able to recreate life from
> scratch or even describe precisely the steps of how life evolved
> implies that the mechanism for producing life is too sophisticated for
> man to understand. And this implies that life could not have started by
> accident, since if so, man would be able to duplicate such an accident
> in a laboratory easily. Therefore, life must have come about through
> intelligent design.*

The reasoning:

we can't do or give a detailed explanation of X at the moment;
therefore,
X cannot be accomplished by a natural process

is not a test. It's not valid reasoning. I'd call it a folk argument.

Also, the idea that because man cannot understand something we must
leave the realm of normal scientific explanation is silly on the face of it.

> *I am sorry if you don't want to believe it,*

I'm sorry you can't accept that the vast majority of scientists consider
your test for intelligent design ludicrous.

sci.chem: Re: black holes and intelligent design

- > *but it is the best*
- > *scientific theory out there for explaining the origin of life.*

It only seems that way to you.

--
Craig Franck
craig.franck@verizon.net
Cortland, NY