

Dear Editor

Pete Moore writes: 'when it comes to big questions we need to establish the correct attitude of humility within humanity' (*ACT Now*, Spring 2006). I agree with this statement, but disagree with Pete's argument that Intelligent Design lacks humility.

There are four fields of thought I would like to consider:

- Atheistic Evolution
- Theistic Evolution
- Creationism
- Intelligent Design

Atheistic evolution has a major philosophical problem. It is based on an assumption that can never be proven: that God had no part to play in the creation of life. Such assumptions are antithetical to a sound spirit of scientific enquiry, which considers all possible explanations and allows the evidence to speak for itself. Why do people make assumptions like this? It may be because people think that it is 'unscientific' to believe in the existence of something that can't be explained by science. Perhaps people 'rule out the possibility of God' because His existence implies the presence of moral authority which, in turn, challenges the notion of moral relativity and demands that they make a choice: to accept God's authority and live according to His values; or to reject God's authority and wilfully live disobedient lives.

Theistic evolution attempts to reconcile the belief in God with the supposed evidence in support of evolution. The two 'Darwin revisited' articles published in the Spring 2006 edition of *ACT Now* show an apparent disagreement about the amount of 'evidence' in support of the theory of evolution. Both Sylvia Baker and Pete Moore seem well acquainted with the creation-evolution debate, and I assume each has been exposed to the well-rehearsed arguments on both sides of the debate for some time. So why is there still a conflict? I believe this could, in part, be due to the fact that the same evidence can be interpreted in two entirely different ways. For example, evolutionists often cite the fact that more than 95% of the chimpanzee genome matches human DNA as evidence for evolution. I accept that this 'evidence' could support an evolutionary position, but it could also support the creationist argument that all life

was designed and made by a single Creator-God. (Here is an analogy: when we look through a clothes catalogue we may notice similarities between products that were designed by the same designer.) Although theistic evolution may find support from a lot of Christians who don't wish to dismiss such a widely accepted theory as evolution, it does face problems if we interpret Scriptures literally. Evolution relies on natural selection which relies on death, which clearly contradicts the teaching that death entered the world through sin.

In contrast to Pete Moore's position, I would like to argue that Intelligent Design (ID) does not use God as a convenient explanation whenever there are 'gaps' in our knowledge. In fact, ID actually relies on the extent of knowledge we do have and considers how that knowledge should be interpreted and understood. Here is a personal example: the more that I learn about the intricate and complex biochemical systems that are absolutely vital for life that continually occur in our cells, the more I am in awe of the God who designed them and the less I can believe that they are the result of a chemical accident!

Pete Moore warns us not to fall into the trap of thinking 'science is sufficiently advanced to reveal [God's] fingerprints and almost catch Him in action'. This almost implies that there is a level of scientific advancement, not yet reached, where we could 'almost catch God in action'. I don't believe it is a question of how much science advances; the fact is God has given humans the capacity to logically and rationally recognise the difference between something that has been designed and something that has occurred by chance and unguided processes. In the case of life, the level of apparent design is truly 'fearful and wonderful'! It should rightly lead us to a place of praise and reverence. It surely doesn't 'lack humility' to believe that the Creator's glory and power is displayed in His creation. In fact, it is a biblical teaching: 'For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made' (Romans 1:20).

Pete Moore suggests ID may be the result of a desire for 'concrete proofs', like Philip who asked Jesus to 'show him the Father'. I am not claiming that science has 'proved God'; I am saying that God has revealed His glory through His creation and, because of this, we can learn about His creation through science. But if we really want to know who God is and what He's like, then the only One to look to is Jesus: God has entered creation in Christ and revealed His love for all He had created by dying in our place on the cross.

Peter Tryon

I am saying that God has revealed His glory through His creation and, because of this, we can learn about His creation through science