

## **Question and Answer Interview Sample**

### **Tell Us about *Nature Never Stops Talking***

#### **1. What's the name of the book?**

“Nature Never Stops Talking; the Wonderful Ingenuity of Nature”

#### **2. Tell us about your book?**

It is a compilation of about 100 articles that I wrote over a 10-year period for a small mountain newspaper in California. The articles are usually about some clever aspect of nature that shows off its ingenuity.

#### **3. Tell us about the articles.**

In the book, they are 1-3 pages. They each have a beginning, middle and an end. It usually has a tone of celebration and wonder and I usually “wink” at the reader with some comment hinting we both know this is not what a random accident looks like.

#### **4. Is this part of the Intelligent Design movement we see all over the country?**

It certainly supports the idea of Intelligent Design, but I never even heard the word until last year, 2004. I just wrote it in admiration of nature's ingenuity.

#### **5. Do you believe God made nature?**

Funny thing, I never mention God one time in the entire book, neither do I quote scripture, yet folks continually call any hint of intelligence behind design as a religious notion.

#### **6. So you don't believe God made nature?**

I am intentionally trying to keep the book and the discussion in the scientific arena. The scientific method and verifiable facts is the basis of true science. The theory of evolution is so embarrassingly far from provable they want to censor any and all criticisms of Darwinian evolutionary theory. Their primary tactic is trying to make it a religious issue instead of a scientific one.

#### **7. Is Intelligent Design provable?**

Let me re-emphasize the book kind of accidentally piles up evidence undermining evolution so I am forced to discuss the controversy that is now national.

To answer your question, Intelligent Design is a theory just like evolution is a theory. There is nothing wrong with theories in science. Murder investigations also begin with a theory. Courtroom dramas start with conflicting assumptions – Innocent or Guilty. I find Intelligent Design adheres far more comfortably with scientific evidence than does evolution. Simply make a scoreboard on what is provable in evolution theory and what is provable in Intelligent Design theory. Intelligent Design is way ahead.

#### **8. Aren't there other books like yours already out there?**

I thought there would be but so far I haven't found any. It is a little like a nature handbook but more personal. I comment on things. Of course, it doesn't credit evolution at all. It is a little like a creationist book, except it never mentions God or tries to discuss

the Bible. It just gives credit to nature for being beautiful and ingenious by looking at nature. It is not a presentation of any religions or philosophies – it centers on nature. I think this is what made it popular with local readers of the column. It is refreshing to most to enjoy nature without being told it was an accident and without the argument of evolution and without making it religious. Nature is so fantastic, who can improve on it? You just sit there and behold nature and I really think it does have a lot to say.

### **9. So is it a nature handbook?**

Well no, not entirely. After signing a publishing contract it occurred to me after 10 years of writing the column that certain patterns had bubbled into my thinking. I wanted to be more direct about what I was seeing in nature in contrast to my own culture. I didn't really want to attack evolution directly so I tried speaking in general terms of fairness in science. I gravitated to advocating not for religion, but true science. Like I said, I really didn't know about the Intelligent Design movement. I do support them though. The Intelligent Design movement is also asking that religion be completely left out of the discussion and like true scientists; they want everything filtered out of the conversation except observable facts.

### **10. What is it you added, then?**

I call them Alibrando's Laws and the way I flavor it for my readers is saying that all the 100 articles are like talking to company on the porch. After the company leaves, it's just us in the kitchen. I speak more directly with the company gone. So all the laws are prefaced with "In the Kitchen" Law #4 or whatever.

### **11. How many laws are there?**

There are 11 laws but two of them have multiple ramifications which I call "ripples" since it is a ripple effect of the law. Law #9 has 4 ripples and Law #10 has 3 ripples; so the list of laws is 17 including the ripples on the total of 11 laws.

### **12. So do you just list laws or explain them?**

I have a format just for the laws. First, they have a title like "Law #5 Extinction Science" Then I list 3 separate phrases. First, the Un-provable notion, then the Sensible Fact, and then the Technical Wording. It is actually logical and easy to follow. After that I have a simple graphic and then an explanation for 1-2 pages.

### **13. Can you give us an example?**

Let's go with #5. The Un-provable Notion is "Prehistoric, extinct species are all ancestors of modern creatures." That's what we all keep hearing but it is not proveable. The Sensible Fact is "When a creature becomes extinct it is gone, not evolving." And the Technical Wording is so I state more accurately what I want to say the the Sensible Fact communicates more easily. Here it is "The extinction of a species is not a species mutation." I then explain further that the absence of a species is not proof that it evolved into something different. I also point out that today's endangered species lists prove no confidence in evolution only in the end of a species. Lastly, I mention one or more articles that kind of exemplify the law.

**14. So the publisher liked the idea?**

Very much and included it in the book. An important addition, I think.

**15. Did you add anything else besides the articles and the laws?**

I came up with a few things that weren't really laws so I categorized them as rules that seem to be needed today.

**16. Rules for who?**

Mostly rules for science and the scientific community and the broadcasting of scientific information. I think scientists, the public, the teaching community and students are at least entitled to know what is theory and what is truly verified science. There are some other lines I believe need to be drawn as far as politics in science.

**17. How many rules?**

Oh, just 7 and they are just suggestions to point out some problems.

**18. So do you think *Nature Never Stops Talking* is unique?**

For now, absolutely. It refrains from a religious point of view while embracing the best of what science ought to be and constantly applauds the immeasurable marvel of science in us and all around us. No matter how we may debate, nature is flawlessly, quietly, powerfully working interdependently beyond what all scientists can comprehend and certainly not control. Nature is unequivocally the hero of this book. It is simple enough for High School readers but challenges the most educated evolutionist scientist. Church folks love it because it endorses their belief in a Creator but without a religious argument, but by simple, blue-collar type honesty.

**19. Are you a scientist?**

Ha. I dropped out of high school and remain 6 credits shy of an AA degree after getting a GED. I am as qualified as any journalist interviewing an expert. My expert is nature and frankly Nature Never Stops Talking.