

# The Darwinism vs. Intelligent Design Controversy—A Few Important Questions and Answers

**Q** *Is Darwinism synonymous with evolutionary science?*

**A** No. There are other scientific theories of evolution, such as the “sybiogenesis” of Dr. Lynn Margulis and the “fractal evolution” of Dr. Bruce H. Lipton.

**Q** *Is Intelligent Design (I.D.) theory synonymous with Creationism?*

**A** No. Creationism held that all species were created by God in the beginning. This is called the “fixity of species” doctrine. I.D. agrees with the mutability of species doctrine of Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, founder of evolutionary science, Charles Darwin and others. I.D.’s disagreement is with the Darwinian presumption that the universe is the product of chance. I.D. maintains that the universe evidences intelligent design.

**Q** *Is the presumption the universe evidences intelligent design a religious doctrine?*

**A** This presumption is a common sense conclusion that dates back to our earliest ancestors. The religions elaborated upon the presumption, but they did not invent it. Some excellent scientists have agreed with the presumption, including Alfred Russel Wallace, co-founder of Darwinism. Wallace argued that the universe can be explained only as a product of a great “Mind.”

**Q** *Is Darwinism “the best theory of evolution we’ve got” ?*

**A** Classical Darwinism, as formulated by Darwin and Wallace, is actually superior to our current orthodoxy—neo-Darwinism. Darwin acknowledged a “sublime Creator,” as did Wallace. That early Darwinism took a turn down Strictly Materialistic Street is due to the driving of Thomas H. Huxley, the chief promoter of Darwinism. Huxley detested religion and yearned to see to

the day when, in his words, Science would put its foot on the neck of Theology.

*Q To re-phrase the question: Is neo-Darwinism the best theory of evolution we've got?*

**A** In 1982, the eminent Stephen Jay Gould, who described himself as a “pluralistic Darwinist,” declared that neo-Darwinism was essentially dead, despite its persistence as textbook orthodoxy. As neo-Darwinism adheres to doctrines which are no longer considered to have scientific merit, it must now be classified as a scholastic exercise. This doesn't mean it is no longer influential. It remains very influential, as its theoretics underlie the GMO (genetically modified organisms) industry and “transhumanism,” a movement to enhance humans through genetic engineering.

*Q Might you describe one Darwinian doctrine that has been refuted?*

**A** Yes ... the “primacy of DNA” doctrine. According to this doctrine, the nucleus, which contains the DNA, is the brain of the cell. If the nucleus was in fact the brain of the cell, its removal would result in the death of the cell. That's not what happens when nuclei are removed from cells. The cells continue to behave normally, until such time as they need new components. The DNA contains the blueprints for all components. It's the Parts Department of the cell, so to speak. Where's the brain? It's in the membrane. When receptors are shaved off the surface of the cellular membrane, the cell goes comatose—and dies unless internal processes replace the receptors.

*Q Should I.D. be taught alongside Darwinism in schools?*

**A** Yes, if only for the sake of balance. Darwinism, as indicated, takes the position that evolution is a fortuitous process. Certainly the point of view that evolution is not a chance process ought to be represented. I.D. endeavors to prove scientifically the validity of the common sense presumption that the creation must have a creator. It sometimes happens that common sense views prove more correct than “scientific” views. For instance, Darwinism has always maintained that the evolutionary process is not “progressive” in any sense. Darwin defined evolution as simply “descent with modification.” Common sense tells us that evolution is progressive, and this view is supported by the work of Dr. Bruce Lipton, who has proven that evolution is “all about” increasing organismal intelligence. Perhaps the best

solution to the present Darwinism vs. I.D. controversy is to regard both views as “work in progress” and include both in a history of the science that fairly represents a variety of views and theories. Evolution is still a young science. There’s a great deal we have yet to understand.

Copyright 2006 TDHall

