

## **Just Thinking Apologetics**

One of the charges often leveled at Intelligent design is that it is not science, but purely religious in nature. As stated last week, the Intelligent Design movement does not assume that the universe was the result of the Judeo/Christian God, but that the universe does seem to show intelligence behind it all. The movement is only interested in the best evidence as to how the universe came to be. Intelligent Design welcomes scientific discovery in helping interpret the best explanation for the origin of the universe.

The main sticking point laid against ID not being science is that you can't test it by way of the scientific method and that ID makes no contribution to science itself. While it is true that some of the charges against ID are valid, it does not prove that a purely naturalist explanation is correct. The primary question to be addressed is, how one defines science. On a naturalist view of science, there is no room for the supernatural. However, if science is to follow the evidence wherever it leads, then room exists for the supernatural.

Aspects of science in fact use some of the same principles of ID. For example, forensics has to look at the evidence to make the best judgment as to what happened. Paleontology (the study of past life) interprets dinosaur footprints and fossils to reconstruct what the past earth was like. Finally, SETI (the search for extra terrestrial intelligence) tries to interpret messages from space to see if there are any other intelligent life forms trying to communicate with us. Some in the scientific community are clearly hypocritical when they say that ID is an invalid way to gather information based on the evidence when they operate by the same principles.