

Re: black holes and intelligent design

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.chem/2005-02/1454.html>

From: Mark VandeWettering (wettering_at_attbi.com)

Date: 02/28/05

Date: Sun, 27 Feb 2005 21:04:31 -0600

["Followup-To:" header set to talk.origins.]

On 2005-02-27, cafeinst@msn.com <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.*

On the contrary, it explains absolutely nothing about how life got here.

Who is the intelligent designer? Nobody knows.

What methods did he use? Nobody knows.

What was his intention? Beats me.

What practical concerns constrained his design? Gee, I dunno.

When did he begin? Sorry, couldn't tell you.

Did he stop, or is his design work continuing? Haven't a clue.

Why so many beetles?

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

So, the inability of an intelligent being to create life is evidence that
an intelligent life must have created life?

What curious logic is employed by the Intelligent Design Theorists.

> *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.*

I'm too busy working on lightning bolts and tsunamis.

> *Therefore, life must have come about through
> intelligent design.*

Your failures of imagination do not constrain the universe.

sci.chem: Re: black holes and intelligent design

Your ignorance (or mankind's) is simply not significant.

- > *I am sorry if you don't want to believe it, but it is the best*
- > *scientific theory out there for explaining the origin of life.*

It isn't a scientific theory at all.

Mark

- >
- > *Craig*
- >