

***Nature Never Stops Talking* by Samuel J Alibrando**

The Controversy of Intelligent Design

First, let's establish who you are for those listening [watching/with us].

You are the author of a book called *Nature Never Stops Talking* out August 2005. It is a compilation of articles you wrote over a 10-year period for a small, mountain newspaper in California. A little over 200 pages, it also includes "Alibrando's Laws" and some other goodies in the Appendix.

1. Can you tell us a little about the book?

It is mostly a pleasant look at the ingenuity in so many different aspects of nature. The human body, the animal kingdom, outer space, microscopic worlds, and sometimes just admiring the incredible coordination of so many systems that seem unrelated yet are interdependent. It has a bite-size format on each topic, usually 1-3 pages. So it is easy to start reading anywhere and not be lost. It is kind of a blue-collar science book in that it doesn't get technical and enjoyable for most folks.

2. Did you write this because of the Intelligent Design controversy?

Not at all. I started the column in 1994 and I don't even know "Intelligent Design" was a buzzword anywhere. The book is not an argument for Intelligent Design anyway. It is more of an upbeat look at how amazing nature is. I just couldn't help but wink to the reader that none of the genius in nature looks like an accident.

3. What are the Alibrando Laws?

There were numerous patterns that bubbled to my thinking over that 10 years that seemed strongly contradictory to the theory of grand design as the result of accidents - evolution. Alibrando's Laws, unlike the articles, moves more toward discussing that controversy of accidental vs. intentional design referencing the articles.

4. What do you think of this "Intelligent Design" movement?

I think it is always wonderful when thinking people ask questions. I think folks should get suspicious whenever experts refuse to give them straight answers. Evolution keeps piling up more theories without answering so many questions. The Intelligent Design movement is a thoughtful reaction to the evolutionary theory presuming itself science when in fact after more than 100 years and billion of dollars of grant money, it not only has not proven itself to be scientific, but there seems to be more evidence than ever that evolution is a bad theory.

5. I thought the Intelligent Design movement was an attempt to teach creationism in the schools. Is this not the case?

No, the Intelligent Design movement specifically is NOT Genesis vs. Evolution, nor is it the Bible vs. Science, nor is it Religion vs. Science. It is intentionally a challenge of non-religious science vs. evolutionary theory.

6. OK, so what exactly is the Intelligent Design movement?

I find myself accidentally in this controversy because of my book. It is the simple proclamation that there is overwhelming evidence that working technology is the result of conscious thought and this includes nature. On the evolution side, there is no real world model of working technology being the result of one or billions of accidents.

With nature, there is an innumerable number of outrageously complex systems working together in perfect harmony. That kind of luck just doesn't exist anywhere in the universe except as the backbone of the evolutionary theory. The more you look at evidence, the more you scrutinize evolution vs. genuine science, the sillier evolution looks and more sensible theories just begin staring you in the face like Intelligent Design.

7. Why do we constantly hear that the Intelligent Design movement is an effort to force religion back into the public school system?

That is the evolutionist leaders' tactics. Keep side-stepping the issue of how unscientific evolution is and tell the public intelligent design is just a plot to sneak in religion. In fact, once facts are presented, we see that evolution is far more dependent on public confidence than facts. That confidence is faith, not science. Scientists also have great faith/confidence in the expertise of other scientists. If facts were on the side of evolutionists, they would naturally try to direct all discussion to the facts. This is not their strong card and the sooner the public gets suspicious of this distraction tactic the better.

8. Some have referred to the Scopes Monkey trial saying this entire scenario has already played out with religion proven guilty of trying to censor science. What is your comment?

I'm so glad you brought this up because the main issue of the Scopes trial was "Academic Freedom". Evolutionists fought for the right to be heard and present their theory. The evolutionary theory is no longer the underdog but the overwhelming favorite. However, evolution is such a weak theory it dreads being criticized. It is so weak that it is demanding no other theories even be permitted alongside the theory of evolution. Now who is the censor? This is not academic freedom, it is academic monopoly. Monopolies want to eliminate the competition. I say, let folks hear both theories and make their own decisions. I have been watching the news and pro-evolutionists making dramatic overtures about how horrible it will be for everyone if they even hear another theory. How scientific is that? How open-minded is that?

9. So you are saying the Intelligent Design movement is definitely not a religious effort?

I am no spokesman but my understanding is that the Intelligent Design movement is NOT about religion and evolution is NOT about academic freedom. The Intelligent Design movement is advocating a review of the evidence using a side by side comparison with another theory both against provable science. It is not about God or aliens but about better quality control on what is called scientific. Most assume that *scientific* fact is provable. Evolution has piled up so many misconceptions it seriously needs an update and be categorized for whatever it really is.

10. But evolution's main tenets have been proven, right?

Right, not in 5 years, 10 years, 30 years, 80 years, 150 years ... still no proof.

Scientists published assumptions and the world assumed the scientists knew science. Whoops. It is now a zealously protected charade with the respectability of thousands of scientists and professors at stake. Imagine the US gov't spending billions of dollars looking for weapons of mass destruction and after 80 years they still claim the find is right around the corner. That's evolution.

11. But isn't there some evidence of evolution?

It has been 80 years since the Scopes Monkey trial. Billions of dollars or research and an almost innumerable quantity of research projects all attempting to unlock the secrets of evolution. Guess what? After all this, including international popularity, the evidence isn't there. We do have far more theories interwoven and based on other theories than 80 years ago. Though still unproven, we have volumes and volumes of books referring to evolution and tying in with every field of science. But just try putting evolution next to the scientific method and ... we got nothing.

12. Is there evidence disproving evolution?

Actually, there is far more evidence undermining the theory of evolution than there ever was. The more we learn about the systemized organization within cells and atoms and DNA the chance of chance and accident causing it is more and more ridiculous. Evolution has absolutely had more than enough opportunity to prove its case. There is no case, just assumptions and even pressure to believe it. It is like the Emperor's clothes.

13. So what remains?

The story of the century. A whole lot of scientists and professors all over the world that find themselves guarding tradition and reputations. The more they defend evolution, the more they need to keep what I am telling you from the public. They will fight to protect the aura of scientists being smart. Of course they want to be spared the embarrassment of years upon years convincing the public that the evidence that was "in the mail" still isn't coming. Watch how they use smear campaigns rather than science. They will talk about religion and the supernatural and say it has no place in science even though the Intelligent Design side makes no mention of religion or the supernatural. The evolutionists keep bringing it up to get away from science. They talk about presenting Intelligent Design leads to poor education, becoming a laughing-stock, the dark ages, combining church and state. Side by side, Intelligent Design will win the favor of the majority of logical folks and for that reason, the evolutionists must prevent this from happening at all costs.

14. You think the pro-evolution movement is a huge conspiracy?

No. I think the evolution movement started with a sincere pursuit of facts but after 150 years, it has become a public relations fiasco. Today the promise of proof has mutated to public opinion manipulation with statements like "evolution is a well-known fact". The world of science wants the whole world to accept the *widespread acceptance* as facts. Since facts are missing, they want us to look at "widespread acceptance". It wants us to embrace "public confidence" as evidence rather than facts. The only reason there is public confidence is because we assumed all these years the scientists were gathering facts, not piling up theory on theory.

15. You sound like you are describing a con. Are you?

“Con” is short for “confidence”. Rallying support around confidence doesn’t work in a courtroom and it should not work in science. I believe many honest scientists need to simply re-evaluate and consider these things. True science always prefers reviewing evidence or provable facts. True science is not about getting votes to make it true. There may be lots and lots of information that could be interpreted in one way to support the theory of evolution but many of those same facts could be interpreted to undermine evolution. Consensus never changes facts. When the whole world of science believed and taught that the world was flat, it was still round. As a matter of fact, they now have a \$700,000 annual budget for doing public relations for evolution and combating Intelligent Design. Since when do scientists need to protect facts with PR? Does the number of molecules in an atom need public relations if it is challenged? Just present facts, don’t manipulate the public with a campaign.

16. How can this ever change?

It is no exaggeration to say this is the story of the century. Basically, most scientists in the world are defending an unscientific theory and the proof of that is the tactics they are using to keep the conversation AWAY from a rational, scientific analysis.

They ignore the hundreds of scientists that find evolution highly unlikely.

The scientists, college professors and the thousands of books, films, magazines and various media forms publishing evolution as sound science are not going to say,

“Whoops, sorry. Let’s change this.”

I believe it has to become a grassroots outrage of simple direct questions that must be answered. I believe the masses need to realize the scientists are intentionally talking over our heads because even they can’t really explain what doesn’t make sense and cannot be proven.

17. Why isn’t there some kind of official challenge?

There is no such thing as “science police”. There is no watchdog with power and authority like the Securities and Exchange Commission has over stocks trade or the FDA over food safety. There is no legal recourse that I know of for citizens. Even a TV star can sue if someone lies in the press about them. We saw Dan Rather and others get in trouble for false reporting. There really is no accountability for scientific information unless it affects people’s health or environment. I think it may have to be public pressure similar to voters pressuring morality from government.

18. But there have been challenges to evolution. Why do you think there has been so little progress?

All voices that challenge the scientific credibility of evolution are immediately and quite effectively typecast as religious fanatics or anti-science forces trying to force religion down the public’s throat. That strategy has been working for years, especially since the Scopes Monkey trial.

19. Any closing comments?

More than anything, rather than believe these guys or those guys, I encourage listeners to make their own judgments based on their own logic. Pay close attention to the consistent

tactics of the majority of scientists to point fingers and use smear and scare tactics rather than simply presenting convincing evidence for the validity of evolution.

Secondly, I want listeners to know this debate is not beyond their grasp. You can tell when things don't add up. Don't choose between experts. Choose common sense over theories that contradict your common sense.