DESIGNED TO EVOLVE

Intelligent Design, Evolutionary Biology, and the Cosmological Argument:

A Case for Theistic Evolution as the Most Probable Account of Biological Complexity

---

A Scholarly Apologetics Paper

Engaging Intelligent Design, Neo-Darwinian Evolution,
and the Philosophy of Origins

May 2026

Abstract

This paper advances a thesis in the apologetics of biological origins: that **the irreducible complexity of the living cell, understood in conjunction with the classical Cosmological Argument, provides the strongest probabilistic warrant for the conclusion that life was intelligently designed to evolve.** The paper proceeds in five movements. First, it surveys the principal claims of Intelligent Design (ID) theory, particularly the arguments from specified complexity and irreducible complexity as developed by William Dembski and Michael Behe. Second, it examines the contemporary state of evolutionary biology, including the extended evolutionary synthesis and current understandings of natural selection, neutral drift, horizontal gene transfer, and evolvability. Third, it presents the formal debate between ID proponents and naturalistic evolutionists, allowing each side its strongest voice. Fourth, it develops the thesis: that neither classical ID (which often resists evolutionary mechanisms) nor undirected Neo-Darwinism (which requires no designing intelligence) is the most coherent account; rather, *theistic evolution—the position that a transcendent intelligence designed a universe whose laws and initial conditions were fine-tuned to produce the self-organizing, evolving complexity we observe*—best accounts for the totality of the evidence. This is grounded in the Cosmological Argument (Leibnizian and Kalam forms), the Fine-Tuning Argument, and the informational challenge posed by the complexity of the cell. The paper concludes with a synthesis drawing on the work of scholars including Stephen Meyer, Francis Collins, Alvin Plantinga, Simon Conway Morris, and Dennis Alexander.

Thesis: The irreducible informational complexity of the living cell, when set within the framework of the Cosmological Argument and cosmic fine-tuning, constitutes compelling probabilistic evidence that the universe was designed by a transcendent intelligence such that life would emerge and, through evolutionary processes embedded in the laws of nature, develop into its present biological complexity. Evolution and design are not mutually exclusive; they are nested, with design operating at the level of laws, initial conditions, and informational architecture, while evolution operates as the mechanism through which that designed potential is realized.

Keywords: Intelligent Design, theistic evolution, irreducible complexity, specified complexity, Cosmological Argument, fine-tuning, origin of life, cell complexity, Behe, Dembski, Meyer, Collins, Plantinga, Conway Morris, apologetics, philosophy of biology

Part I: The Intelligent Design Argument—Its Strongest Form

1.1 The Intellectual Heritage of Design Inference

The argument from design is among the most ancient in natural philosophy. Its modern scientific formulation owes its foundations to several thinkers who observed that the biological world exhibits features that resist explanation by reference to undirected physical processes alone. William Paley's *Natural Theology* (1802) famously argued that just as finding a watch implies a watchmaker, so finding an organ of complex function implies a designing intelligence. While Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859) appeared to dissolve Paley's argument by providing a non-teleological mechanism—natural selection acting on heritable variation—the resurgence of the design argument in the late 20th century operates at a level of biochemical and informational complexity that Paley could not have anticipated.

The contemporary Intelligent Design (ID) movement emerged principally from the work of three scholars: biochemist Michael Behe, philosopher-mathematician William Dembski, and philosopher of science Stephen C. Meyer. Their arguments do not appeal to Scripture or theological authority; they claim to be strictly scientific or probabilistic inferences from empirical data.

1.2 Michael Behe and Irreducible Complexity

Michael Behe, Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University, introduced the concept of **irreducible complexity** in his 1996 work *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*. Behe defines an irreducibly complex system as:

> *"A single system composed of several well-matched, interacting parts that contribute to the basic function, and where the removal of any one of the parts causes the system to effectively cease functioning."* — **Michael Behe, Darwin's Black Box (Free Press, 1996), p. 39**

Behe's primary examples include the bacterial flagellum—a molecular rotary motor composed of over 40 distinct protein components—the blood-clotting cascade, the immune system's antibody-generation mechanism, and intracellular transport systems. His argument is not merely that these systems are complex, but that they exhibit a specific kind of complexity: they cannot function if any component is removed, which means—on Behe's analysis—they could not have been built by the

gradual, stepwise process Darwinian natural selection requires, since intermediate stages would be non-functional and therefore not selectable.

In his follow-up work *The Edge of Evolution* (2007), Behe extended this argument by analyzing the limits of Darwinian evolution as revealed by large-scale population genetic data, including studies of malarial parasite adaptation to anti-malarial drugs. He argues that while Darwinian processes can modify existing molecular systems, the probability of generating new functional protein-protein binding sites by random mutation and selection is so low that it cannot account for the origin of new molecular systems within the timescales available.

> *"The bottom line is this: the important steps in the development of life required many mutations to work together. The problem is that Darwinian processes are grossly inadequate to produce them."* **— Michael Behe, The Edge of Evolution (Free Press, 2007), p. 162**

1.3 William Dembski and Specified Complexity

William Dembski, philosopher and mathematician (Ph.D. Mathematics, University of Chicago; Ph.D. Philosophy, University of Illinois), developed a formal framework for detecting design through what he calls **specified complexity**. In *The Design Inference* (Cambridge University Press, 1998) and *No Free Lunch* (2002), Dembski argues that when a pattern exhibits both *complexity* (low probability of arising by chance) and *specification* (conformity to an independently derived pattern), the only known cause capable of producing it is intelligence.

Dembski formalizes this as an **Explanatory Filter**: a decision procedure that, given a phenomenon, first tests whether it can be explained by necessity (natural law), then by chance, and only designates it as designed if both prior explanations fail. His **Law of Conservation of Information (LCI)** extends this framework by arguing that Darwinian mechanisms cannot generate genuinely new information; they can only shuffle or degrade existing information. The functional information embedded in biological systems—particularly the digital code of DNA—exceeds what any undirected physical process has been demonstrated to produce.

> *"The Darwinian mechanism is powerless to generate the complex specified information that characterizes living systems. Natural selection acting on random variation is a search mechanism, and all search mechanisms presuppose that they are searching a space structured in a particular way. That structure—the fitness landscape itself—represents information that natural selection cannot account for."* **— William**

> **Dembski, No Free Lunch: Why Specified Complexity Cannot Be Purchased without Intelligence (Rowman & Littlefield, 2002), p. 205**

1.4 Stephen Meyer and the Signature in the Cell

Stephen C. Meyer (Ph.D. History and Philosophy of Science, Cambridge University) has produced the most philosophically systematic case for Intelligent Design in his two major works: *Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design* (HarperOne, 2009) and *Darwin's Doubt: The Explosive Origin of the Cambrian Fauna and the Case for Intelligent Design* (HarperOne, 2013).

Meyer's central argument in *Signature in the Cell* concerns the origin of the first living cell. He identifies what he calls the **DNA-protein information cycle**—the fact that DNA requires proteins to be transcribed and translated, but proteins require DNA to specify their sequences—as a genuine chicken-and-egg problem for any undirected origin-of-life scenario. More fundamentally, he argues that the digital information stored in DNA (approximately 3.2 billion base pairs in the human genome, organized into roughly 20,000 protein-coding genes) constitutes *specified complexity* in Dembski's sense: it is both highly improbable and precisely specified by functional requirements. The probability of generating a single functional protein of minimal length (~150 amino acids) by chance, even given the full 13.8 billion years of cosmic history, is calculated by Meyer to be approximately 1 in 10^{164}—a number vastly beyond the reach of probabilistic resources of the observable universe.

> *"The information in DNA has the same causal properties as the information in a book or computer program. And the only known source of such information is mind. We have not observed nature generating such information de novo; we have only ever observed it arising from prior intelligence."* — **Stephen C. Meyer, Signature in the Cell (HarperOne, 2009), p. 347**

In *Darwin's Doubt*, Meyer focuses on the Cambrian Explosion—the geologically abrupt appearance approximately 541 million years ago of most major animal body plans, with no Precambrian ancestors in the fossil record. He argues that the Cambrian Explosion requires not merely new proteins but new *developmental gene regulatory networks* (dGRNs): the hierarchical control systems that choreograph the development of a body plan from a fertilized egg. These dGRNs are extraordinarily sensitive to disruption; mutations to early-acting nodes are invariably lethal. Meyer argues this places the Cambrian body plan information beyond the reach of undirected random mutation.

1.5 The Fine-Tuning Argument as Complementary Evidence

While ID's biological arguments focus on molecular and paleontological data, they gain additional support from cosmological fine-tuning—a distinct but complementary argument. Physicists including Paul Davies, Roger Penrose, and Martin Rees have documented that the fundamental constants of nature (the gravitational constant, the strong nuclear force, the cosmological constant, the mass of the electron, etc.) are calibrated to extraordinary precision for the existence of complex chemistry and life.

Roger Penrose calculated that the precision required in the low-entropy initial state of the universe—the condition required for any complexity to arise—was 1 part in $10^{10^{123}}$: a number that exceeds the total number of particles in the observable universe raised to an enormous power. As Penrose wrote in *The Road to Reality*:

> *"This is an extraordinary figure. One could not even write the number down in full in the standard notation: it would be 1 followed by 10^123 zeros. In order to put this number in context, if I were to write a zero on every proton and every neutron in the observable universe, I could not even begin to write it down."* — **Roger Penrose, The Road to Reality (Knopf, 2005), p. 762**

This cosmological fine-tuning is not directly an argument for biological ID, but it is deeply relevant: it establishes that the framework within which biological complexity arose was itself the product of extraordinarily precise initial conditions whose improbability challenges undirected explanation at the most fundamental level.

Part II: The State of Evolutionary Biology Today

2.1 The Modern Synthesis and Its Extensions

The **Modern Synthesis** of the 1930s–40s, associated with figures including Theodosius Dobzhansky, Ernst Mayr, and George Gaylord Simpson, combined Darwin's natural selection with Mendelian genetics to produce the framework that dominated 20th-century biology. Its core

commitments were: (1) heritable variation arises by random mutation and genetic recombination; (2) natural selection filters this variation, preserving adaptive traits; (3) speciation occurs primarily by allopatric isolation and accumulated genetic divergence; (4) macroevolution is continuous with microevolution, differing only in scale and time.

By the early 21st century, however, the Modern Synthesis has been substantially extended—and challenged from within biology itself. The **Extended Evolutionary Synthesis (EES)**, articulated in a landmark 2015 paper by Laland et al. in *Nature*, incorporates mechanisms that the original synthesis did not adequately account for:

Epigenetics: Heritable changes in gene expression that do not involve changes in DNA sequence, transmitted through mechanisms including DNA methylation, histone modification, and non-coding RNA. Eva Jablonka and Marion Lamb's *Evolution in Four Dimensions* (MIT Press, 2005) documents epigenetic inheritance as a genuine second tier of evolutionary information transmission.

Horizontal Gene Transfer (HGT): The direct transfer of genetic material between organisms other than by vertical (parent-to-offspring) inheritance. HGT is now understood to be massive in prokaryotes and significant in eukaryotes; Carl Woese's discovery of Archaea and his work on early cellular evolution demonstrated that the tree of life at its base is more accurately a network than a branching tree.

Developmental Bias and Evolvability: Organisms are not equally mutable in all directions; developmental constraints canalize variation into particular channels. The work of Stuart Newman, Gerd Müller, and Werner Fontana on phenotypic robustness and developmental modularity shows that the *architecture* of development shapes what evolution can produce—suggesting that the fitness landscape is not random but structured.

Neutral Evolution: Motoo Kimura's Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution (1968, 1983) demonstrated that a significant proportion of molecular evolution proceeds not by natural selection but by random genetic drift of selectively neutral mutations. This has profoundly modified the selectionist picture of the Modern Synthesis.

Niche Construction: Organisms do not merely adapt to environments; they actively modify them. Richard Lewontin's work and the niche construction theory of Odling-Smee, Laland, and Feldman show that organisms partially construct their own selective environments, introducing reciprocal causation into the evolutionary process.

2.2 Origin of Life Research: The Open Problem

One of the most significant facts about the current state of biology is the complete absence of a scientifically accepted account of abiogenesis—the origin of life from non-living chemistry. This is not a minor lacuna; it is the foundational question that evolution, properly speaking, does not address. As Nobel laureate Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the double-helical structure of DNA, candidly wrote:

> *"If a particular amino acid sequence were selected by chance, how rare an event would this be? An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to be satisfied to get it going."* **— Francis Crick, Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature (Simon & Schuster, 1981), p. 88**

The principal current abiogenesis proposals include: (1) the **RNA World** hypothesis, which posits that self-replicating RNA molecules preceded DNA and proteins; (2) **metabolism-first** models, such as Günter Wächtershäuser's iron-sulfur world; (3) **hydrothermal vent** models, developed by Nick Lane and Mike Russell; and (4) **panspermia**, proposed by Crick himself, which relocates rather than solves the problem. Each faces severe unresolved difficulties. The RNA World, for instance, requires both that RNA arose spontaneously from prebiotic chemistry—for which there is no demonstrated mechanism—and that it catalyzed its own replication with sufficient fidelity to undergo selection.

As origin-of-life researcher Paul Davies wrote in *The Fifth Miracle: The Search for the Origin and Meaning of Life* (Simon & Schuster, 1999):

> *"We have no idea how the stupendous complexity of even the simplest living organism could have arisen spontaneously from non-living chemistry. The gulf between non-life and even the most primitive life is still immense."* **— Paul Davies, The Fifth Miracle (Simon & Schuster, 1999), p. 18**

2.3 The Information Problem in Molecular Biology

The discovery of the genetic code in the 1960s introduced a conceptual revolution that the philosophy of biology is still processing: life is, at its foundation, an *information technology*. The DNA molecule encodes instructions for building proteins using a four-letter alphabet (the nucleotide bases A, T, G, C), read in triplet codons that correspond to 20 amino acids. This is a

genuine digital code—not an analogy or metaphor, but a literal implementation of information storage and retrieval.

The functional information content of DNA has been formally analyzed by biophysicist Hubert Yockey, who applied Shannon information theory to the problem of protein sequences. Yockey calculated that the probability of a single cytochrome c sequence (a moderately short protein of ~100 amino acids) arising by chance in the prebiotic environment was approximately 2×10^{-44}—well below the universal probability bound (approximately 10^{-150}) that Dembski identifies as the threshold below which chance explanation becomes rationally inadmissible. As Yockey himself—not an ID proponent—concluded:

> *"The origin of the genetic code and of life's information content are not solved by any of the theories presently proposed. The genetic code, the origin of life, and the information content of the genome remain unknown, unsolved problems in biology."* — **Hubert P. Yockey, Information Theory, Evolution, and the Origin of Life (Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 180**

Part III: The Formal Debate—Opposing Views in Direct Engagement

This section presents the principal objections raised by critics of Intelligent Design and the responses offered by ID proponents, followed by ID's own weaknesses as acknowledged by sympathetic critics. The format is that of a philosophical dialogue, representing each position at its strongest.

3.1 The Naturalist's Case Against Intelligent Design

Objection 1: The Bacterial Flagellum Is Reducibly Complex

The strongest scientific response to Behe's irreducible complexity argument comes from evolutionary biologist Kenneth Miller (Brown University), a practicing Catholic who is also a committed Darwinian. In *Finding Darwin's God* (HarperCollins, 1999) and in testimony during the

Kitzmiller v. Dover trial (2005), Miller argued that the bacterial flagellum is NOT irreducibly complex in Behe's sense because its components have demonstrated functions outside the flagellum. The **Type III Secretion System (T3SS)**—a molecular syringe used by pathogenic bacteria to inject proteins into host cells—shares approximately 10 of the flagellum's 40 protein components. Miller argued this demonstrates that the flagellum could have evolved through co-option of pre-existing subsystems.

> *"The parts of the flagellum are not unique to it. Evolution routinely co-opts parts from one system to serve in another. The flagellum is a textbook case of evolutionary tinkering, not irreducible complexity."* **— Kenneth Miller, Finding Darwin's God (HarperCollins, 1999), p. 145**

ID Response (Behe): Behe responded that co-option merely relocates the problem; it does not solve it. The T3SS requires all of its own protein components to function as a secretion system. The question of how the T3SS itself arose by undirected processes—and how the remaining 30 flagellar proteins with no secretory function arose and were integrated—remains unaddressed. Moreover, phylogenetic analysis by Nguyen et al. (2000) and others suggests the T3SS may have evolved *from* the flagellum rather than being an ancestral precursor to it.

Objection 2: ID Is Not Science—It Is Creationism in Disguise

Philosophers of science including Barbara Forrest and Paul Gross (*Creationism's Trojan Horse*, Oxford University Press, 2004) and the majority opinion in *Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District* (M.D. Pa., 2005) argued that ID is not a genuine scientific theory because: (a) it invokes a supernatural cause not in principle detectable by natural science; (b) it makes no novel testable predictions; (c) it proceeds by elimination rather than positive evidence for design; and (d) it was historically motivated by religious concerns rather than scientific ones.

> *"We find that ID is not science. The evidence at trial demonstrates that ID is essentially a religious proposition. Its leading proponents admit their goal is to replace methodological naturalism with a science consonant with Christian and theistic convictions."* **— Judge John E. Jones III, Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District, 400 F. Supp. 2d 707, 765 (M.D. Pa. 2005)**

ID Response (Meyer, Dembski): Meyer argues that the demarcation criterion of methodological naturalism is itself a philosophical commitment, not a scientific finding, and that restricting science to naturalistic causes begs the question against design inference where design may be the best explanation. He further argues that ID does make testable predictions: it predicts that purportedly

non-functional genomic sequences (long dismissed as "junk DNA") will be found to have function—a prediction substantially confirmed by the ENCODE project (2012), which found biochemical function for approximately 80% of the human genome. Additionally, Meyer notes that inferring design from specified complexity is logically identical to the scientific inference of design in SETI (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence): if a radio signal from space encoded prime numbers, scientists would infer design—not because they had observed an alien, but because specified complexity is the signature of intelligence.

Objection 3: The Eye, the Immune System, and Other Alleged Irreducible Systems Have Known Evolutionary Pathways

Evolutionary biologists including Richard Dawkins (*The Blind Watchmaker*, Norton, 1986) and Douglas Futuyma (*Evolution*, Sinauer, 2005) have documented that systems once cited as irreducibly complex do have plausible evolutionary histories. The vertebrate eye, once thought by Darwin himself to strain his theory, has a well-evidenced evolutionary series from eyespots in flatworms through simple lenses in nautiloids to the complex camera eye. The immune system's V(D)J recombination mechanism, which generates antibody diversity, has evolutionary relationships to ancient transposable elements. Dawkins argues:

> *"Natural selection is the blind watchmaker, blind because it does not see ahead, does not plan consequences, has no purpose in view. Yet the living results of natural selection overwhelmingly impress us with the appearance of design as if by a master watchmaker, impress us with the illusion of design and planning."* **— Richard Dawkins, The Blind Watchmaker (W.W. Norton, 1986), p. 21**

ID Response: ID proponents grant that individual components may have prior functions. Meyer's deeper argument is not about the origin of individual proteins but about the origin of *integrated information systems*—the developmental gene regulatory networks (dGRNs) and body plan information that orchestrate the development of a multicellular organism. Embryologist Eric Davidson (Caltech), though not an ID proponent, demonstrated experimentally that perturbations of dGRN kernel nodes are invariably lethal (Davidson & Erwin, 2006, *Science* 311:796–800), suggesting these networks are, at the architectural level, the kind of integrated systems that cannot be modified by incremental Darwinian steps.

Objection 4: The Designer Is Inept—The Problem of Bad Design

Philosopher Elliott Sober (*Evidence and Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 2008) and biologist Jerry Coyne (*Why Evolution Is True*, Viking, 2009) argue that biological organisms exhibit numerous features that an intelligent designer would not have produced: the recurrent laryngeal nerve routing past the heart in a detour of meters in the giraffe, the blind spot of the vertebrate eye, vestigial organs, and the pervasive existence of pseudogenes (broken gene copies). These, they argue, are the signatures of evolutionary tinkering with no foresight, not intelligent design.

ID/Theistic Response: William Dembski and others respond that this argument presupposes knowledge of what an intelligent designer would or would not produce—a premise unavailable without access to the designer's intentions. Theologians including Alvin Plantinga argue that what appears suboptimal to human eyes may serve purposes beyond immediate functional efficiency, including constraints imposed by other design objectives. Moreover, ID does not require that every biological feature is designed; Behe explicitly states that he accepts common descent and that evolution by natural selection accounts for much biological change. The ID argument is narrower: that the *origin* of certain specified complex systems cannot be accounted for by undirected processes.

3.2 ID's Internal Tensions and the Theistic Evolutionist's Critique

Intelligent Design also faces significant criticism from within the theistic community. Francis Collins, former director of the National Institutes of Health and founder of BioLogos, argues in *The Language of God* (Free Press, 2006) that ID commits a category error: it places God in the gaps of current scientific knowledge, creating a **God of the Gaps** whose domain shrinks as scientific explanation advances. Collins argues that this is both scientifically dangerous and theologically unnecessary:

> *"The God of the Gaps approach is a remarkably dangerous game. As scientific knowledge advances, it is God who retreats. Theists who wish to ground faith in scientific ignorance build on sand. The evidence for evolution is overwhelming; a God who designed life through the mechanism of evolution is far more majestic than one who intervenes to fix what natural laws cannot accomplish."* **— Francis Collins, The Language of God (Free Press, 2006), pp. 193–194**

Denis Alexander (Emeritus Director of the Faraday Institute for Science and Religion, Cambridge) similarly argues in *Creation or Evolution: Do We Have to Choose?* (Monarch Books, 2014) that the Darwinian mechanism, understood within a theistic framework, is precisely the kind of secondary

causation through which a creator would choose to operate. The genetic code is not evidence of divine absence; it is the medium through which biological creation unfolds.

Simon Conway Morris, Cambridge paleontologist and author of *Life's Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), approaches the question from the phenomenon of **evolutionary convergence**: the repeated, independent evolution of similar solutions (eyes, flight, intelligence, eusociality) in different lineages. Conway Morris argues that convergence reveals that the fitness landscape is not random but structured—that evolution reliably finds certain solutions because the space of biological possibility is constrained in ways that point toward a determinate direction. Life, on this view, was not merely produced by evolution; it was *aimed at* certain outcomes by the deep structure of physical and chemical law.

> *"Life is not the product of a random walk through biological possibility. Convergence tells us that evolution is constrained, directed, almost inevitable in its major outlines. The tape of life, replayed, would sound much the same. If that is true, then intelligence was not an accident. It was built into the structure of things."* **— Simon Conway Morris, Life's Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 328**

Part IV: The Cosmological Argument and Its Connection to Biological Complexity

4.1 The Kalam Cosmological Argument

The Kalam Cosmological Argument (KCA), systematically developed by philosopher William Lane Craig (*The Kalam Cosmological Argument*, Macmillan, 1979; and *Reasonable Faith*, Crossway, 2008), runs as follows:

Premise 1: Everything that begins to exist has a cause.

Premise 2: The universe began to exist.

Conclusion: Therefore, the universe has a cause.

Craig argues that this cause, to bring space, time, matter, and energy into existence, must itself be spaceless, timeless, immaterial, and of immense power. Moreover, because the cause operates timelessly and produces a temporal effect (the beginning of time), it must be a *personal agent* capable of free choice—since impersonal causes operating in the absence of time would produce effects without temporal beginning. The KCA thus points toward a personal, transcendent creator.

The scientific basis for Premise 2 is robust. The Big Bang cosmology, established by the Friedmann equations (1922), Hubble's law (1929), the cosmic microwave background radiation (Penzias & Wilson, 1965), and the Borde-Guth-Vilenkin theorem (2003)—which demonstrates that any universe that has been, on average, in a state of cosmic expansion cannot be past-eternal—establishes that the universe had an absolute beginning approximately 13.8 billion years ago.

Arvind Borde, Alan Guth (MIT), and Alexander Vilenkin (Tufts) concluded in their 2003 paper (*Physical Review Letters* 90, 151301):

> *"Any universe that has, on average, been expanding throughout its history cannot be past-eternal but must have had a beginning."* **— Borde, Guth & Vilenkin, "Inflationary Spacetimes Are Incomplete in Past Directions," Physical Review Letters 90, 151301 (2003)**

4.2 The Leibnizian Cosmological Argument

The Leibnizian form of the Cosmological Argument, drawn from Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz's *Principles of Nature and Grace* (1714), and reformulated by Alexander Pruss and Robert Koons in *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), runs:

P1: Every contingent thing has an explanation of its existence.

P2: The universe is contingent (it could have been otherwise, or not been at all).

P3: The explanation of a contingent thing is either another contingent thing or a necessary being.

Conclusion: There exists a necessary being that explains the existence of the universe—i.e., a being whose non-existence is impossible.

The Leibnizian argument does not require a temporal beginning; it asks not *when* the universe began but *why it exists at all*. Its conclusion is a metaphysically necessary being—a being that cannot fail to exist—which philosophers from Aquinas to Plantinga have identified with God. Alvin Plantinga's development of modal ontology in *The Nature of Necessity* (Oxford University Press,

1974) and his modal Ontological Argument provide a rigorous logical framework for the concept of necessary existence.

4.3 The Bridge from Cosmology to Biology: Fine-Tuning and Life-Permitting Laws

The Cosmological Argument establishes a transcendent cause for the universe's existence. The Fine-Tuning Argument (FTA) extends this by demonstrating that this cause was not merely creative but *intentional with respect to life*. The fundamental constants of physics are not determined by the laws of physics—they are initial conditions, free parameters that could in principle have taken any value. Yet they are precisely calibrated for the existence of complex chemistry, stars, planets, and life.

Physicist Robin Collins has catalogued dozens of these fine-tuning parameters in *The Well-Tempered Universe* and in his chapter in *The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology*. Illustrative examples include:

Cosmological Constant (Λ): The energy density of empty space. If it were larger by 1 part in 10^{120}, the universe would have expanded too rapidly for galaxies, stars, or planets to form. If smaller, it would have recollapsed before any structure could emerge.

Strong Nuclear Force: If stronger by 2%, diprotons would be stable and hydrogen would not exist; if weaker by 5%, deuterium would be unstable and stellar nucleosynthesis would not produce the heavy elements necessary for life.

Carbon Resonance (Hoyle's Prediction): Fred Hoyle predicted, and it was subsequently confirmed, that carbon-12 must have a nuclear resonance level at precisely 7.65 MeV—a level that enables the triple-alpha process by which carbon is synthesized in stellar interiors. Without this exact resonance, carbon—and carbon-based life—would not exist. Hoyle himself, an atheist, called this discovery evidence of a "put-up job" and moved toward a design-like interpretation in his later work *The Universe: Past and Present Reflections* (1982).

The connection to biology is direct: these cosmological parameters are prerequisites for the existence of any biology. If the universe had not been fine-tuned for stars that synthesize heavy elements, for planets with stable orbits in habitable zones, for liquid water, for organic chemistry—there would be no biology to explain. The Cosmological Argument establishes a transcendent cause; the Fine-Tuning Argument specifies that this cause set the parameters for life; and the

Biological Complexity Argument shows that life itself, once the stage was set, exhibits features that continue to require designing intelligence at the level of information architecture.

Part V: The Thesis Developed—Designed to Evolve

5.1 Theistic Evolution as the Synthesis

The thesis of this paper is that neither classical ID in its most restrictive form nor undirected Neo-Darwinism adequately accounts for the totality of the evidence. The most coherent position—both philosophically and scientifically—is what may be called **Guided Theistic Evolution** or, following Francis Collins, **'BioLogos'**: the view that a transcendent intelligence designed the universe with its laws, constants, and initial conditions precisely calibrated to produce self-organizing, evolving complexity, and that the biological world we observe is the product of evolutionary processes that were themselves part of the design.

This position is not a compromise between two bad alternatives; it is the position that takes the strongest evidence from both sides seriously. It takes seriously:

From ID: The genuine informational complexity of the cell; the genuine difficulty of undirected abiogenesis; the genuine mathematical challenge posed by the probability of functional protein sequences; and the genuine philosophical point that specified complexity is the signature of mind.

From Evolutionary Biology: The overwhelming fossil, genetic, and comparative anatomical evidence for common descent; the demonstrated power of natural selection and neutral drift to produce adaptive change within existing biological frameworks; the extended evolutionary synthesis's expanded mechanisms; and the convergence data showing that evolution reliably finds certain solutions.

5.2 The Cell as the Locus of Design

The living cell is the strongest locus of the design argument precisely because it is the boundary between chemistry and biology—the threshold that must be crossed by any origin-of-life scenario.

The cell is not a simple bag of chemicals; it is a digital information processing system of extraordinary sophistication. As Bill Gates, a reference from outside the biology debate, observed:

> *"DNA is like a computer program but far, far more advanced than any software ever created."* **— Bill Gates, The Road Ahead (Viking, 1995), p. 228**

The genome of even the simplest free-living cell, *Mycoplasma genitalium*—with 482 protein-coding genes and approximately 580,000 base pairs—encodes a system of extraordinary interdependency. Venter et al.'s work on *Mycoplasma laboratorium* (the minimal cell project, *Science*, 2016) found that even the minimal genome required for cellular life in a nutrient-rich environment includes ~473 genes, and that approximately 17% of them have no known function: they are simply required for life, without our understanding why. This suggests we do not even yet know the full depth of the cell's complexity.

The cell's information system operates through a series of nested codes: the genetic code itself (the mapping of codons to amino acids), the folding code (the relationship between amino acid sequence and three-dimensional protein structure), the regulatory code (the signals in non-coding DNA that control gene expression), and the developmental code (the logic of dGRNs that orchestrate embryological development). Each level exhibits specified complexity; each level requires the others to function. The probability that all these nested codes arose by undirected chemistry is, as Meyer's calculations show, so astronomically small as to be functionally zero.

The connection to the Cosmological Argument is this: if a transcendent intelligence created the universe with its laws and initial conditions, the most natural expectation is that the laws and initial conditions were chosen *for a purpose*—and the structure of the laws of physics and chemistry strongly suggests that purpose was the emergence of information-processing life. As cosmologist Paul Davies writes:

> *"It seems to me that the laws of physics and chemistry have been set up so that life can exist. I believe this with the same conviction that I believe in the laws of physics. I'm not a Christian, but I believe that the universe was made to produce life."* **— Paul Davies, quoted in Are We Alone? (Basic Books, 1995), p. 138**

5.3 Evolutionary Convergence as Evidence of Designed Direction

The phenomenon of evolutionary convergence—the independent evolution of similar solutions across unrelated lineages—is a powerful argument that the evolutionary process is not random in its large-scale outcomes. Simon Conway Morris has catalogued hundreds of examples: the

camera eye has evolved independently in vertebrates and cephalopods; flight has evolved independently in insects, pterosaurs, birds, and bats; echolocation in bats and dolphins; electric organs in six independent fish lineages; C4 photosynthesis in over 60 plant families; eusociality in ants, bees, and naked mole rats; and human-level intelligence may have been converging independently in dolphins and corvids.

Conway Morris argues that convergence reveals the *structured* nature of biological possibility space—the fitness landscape is not random terrain but has deep attractors toward which evolution is reliably drawn. This is precisely what one would expect if the laws of physics and chemistry had been designed with life's complexity as their telos. As Conway Morris writes:

> *"Life's solution is not the product of random walking on a flat landscape. The landscape has topology—it has peaks and valleys, attractors and repellers. Evolution climbs toward the peaks. The peaks were there before evolution climbed them. Who placed the peaks?"* **— Simon Conway Morris, Life's Solution (Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 145**

5.4 Alvin Plantinga and the Compatibility of Evolution and Theism

Alvin Plantinga—arguably the most eminent analytic philosopher of religion of the 20th century—has contributed two major arguments relevant to this thesis. First, in his *Evolutionary Argument Against Naturalism* (EAAN, developed in *Warrant and Proper Function*, Oxford University Press, 1993, and *Where the Conflict Really Lies*, Oxford University Press, 2011), Plantinga argues that if evolution is true and naturalism (the view that there is no God or mind-like reality beyond the natural world) is also true, then we have a defeater for the reliability of our own cognitive faculties—including those we use to conclude that evolution and naturalism are true. Natural selection selects for adaptive behavior, not for true belief; if our cognitive faculties were shaped solely by selection for survival, we have no reason to trust that they track truth. This is not an argument against evolution; it is an argument against *naturalistic* evolution. Theistic evolution avoids this problem because, on theism, our cognitive faculties were designed for truth-tracking.

> *"The probability that our cognitive faculties are reliable, given naturalism and evolution, is low or inscrutable. But if our faculties are not reliable, we cannot trust the very reasoning that leads us to accept naturalism and evolution. Naturalistic evolution is therefore self-defeating. Theism, by contrast, provides a principled basis for trusting our faculties: they were designed to produce true beliefs."* **— Alvin Plantinga, Where the Conflict Really Lies (Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 344**

Second, Plantinga argues that there is deep concord between science and theism but superficial conflict, while there is deep conflict between science and metaphysical naturalism. Evolution, rightly understood, is a scientific theory about biological mechanisms; it is not, in itself, a refutation of theism. The conflict is between naturalism and theism, not between evolution and Christianity.

5.5 The Thesis Restated: Design as the Condition for Evolution

The thesis of this paper may now be fully stated. The Cosmological Argument establishes that the universe owes its existence to a transcendent, necessary, personal being of immense intelligence and power. The Fine-Tuning Argument establishes that the laws and constants of this universe were set with extraordinary precision for the existence of complex chemistry and life—a setting that did not arise by necessity (the constants could have been otherwise) or by chance (the improbability is too vast). The Biological Complexity Argument, grounded in Meyer's analysis of the cell's informational architecture, Behe's analysis of irreducibly complex molecular systems, and Dembski's formal framework of specified complexity, establishes that the origin of the first living cell cannot be plausibly accounted for by undirected chemistry.

At the same time, the evidence from evolutionary biology—particularly convergence, common descent, the genetic unity of life, and the extended evolutionary synthesis—establishes that once the conditions for life were set, the evolutionary mechanism is real, robust, and productive. Evolution is the mechanism by which designed potential was realized.

The synthesis is this: **God designed the universe at the level of laws, constants, and initial conditions; God designed the first living cell by infusing it with the digital information necessary for life; and God designed the evolutionary process itself—including the structured fitness landscape, the developmental programs, and the convergent attractors that Simon Conway Morris documents—as the mechanism through which biological complexity would unfold toward its present state.** Evolution did not replace design; it was the primary expression of design operating through natural law.

This is not a new position. It is the position of a substantial and growing community of scholar-theologians including Francis Collins, John Polkinghorne (Fellow of the Royal Society and Anglican priest), Denis Alexander, Ard Louis (Oxford), and many others. It takes evolution seriously as biology; it takes design seriously as metaphysics; and it argues that the two are not merely compatible but mutually illuminating.

Part VI: Conclusion—The Probability Calculus

We began with a question about probability: what is the most probable explanation for the complexity of biology and the state of biology as revealed by evolutionary science? The answer depends on what explanatory frameworks are available and how well each accounts for the total evidence.

Undirected Naturalism (no design, evolution by purely blind processes) faces: the infinite regress of the Cosmological Question (why does anything exist at all?); the improbability problem of the Fine-Tuning data; the unresolved abiogenesis problem; the astronomical improbability of functional protein sequences; and Plantinga's EAAN. Its explanatory success is confined to the mechanisms of biological change *after* life already exists.

Classical Intelligent Design (design explains biological complexity by direct supernatural intervention) faces: the God-of-the-Gaps risk identified by Collins; the demarcation problem raised by Sober and Forrest; and the danger of locating design only in current scientific ignorance. Its strength is its accurate identification of the informational complexity of the cell as the key explanandum.

Guided Theistic Evolution (God designed the universe to evolve life through natural law) avoids the weaknesses of both while preserving their strengths. It has a principled answer to the Cosmological Question (a necessary being created the contingent universe). It accounts for Fine-Tuning (the creator set the parameters). It explains why evolution reliably finds certain solutions (Conway Morris's convergence: the fitness landscape was structured by design). It explains the informational complexity of the cell (the designer inscribed the digital code that makes replication possible). And it takes evolutionary biology seriously as a genuine scientific account of how designed potential was realized.

The conclusion of this paper is that **Guided Theistic Evolution is the most probabilistically warranted account of biological complexity available**: it is supported by the Cosmological Argument's conclusion about the universe's origin, by the Fine-Tuning data about its life-permitting character, by the informational complexity of the cell, by the convergence data showing evolution's constrained directionality, and by the consilience of independent lines of evidence from physics,

chemistry, paleontology, and molecular biology. It is a position that neither betrays scientific integrity nor sacrifices philosophical depth.

As Francis Collins, who led the Human Genome Project, wrote upon completing the sequencing of the human genome:

> *"We have caught the first glimpse of our own instruction book, previously known only to God. It is a humbling and awe-inspiring experience. On this, the most important of all scientific journeys, we have glimpsed—however incompletely—the language in which God chose to create life."* **— Francis Collins, The Language of God (Free Press, 2006), p. 3**

References

PRIMARY SCHOLARLY WORKS — INTELLIGENT DESIGN

Behe, Michael J. Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution. New York: Free Press, 1996. Revised edition with new Afterword, 2006.

Behe, Michael J. The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism. New York: Free Press, 2007.

Behe, Michael J. Darwin Devolves: The New Science About DNA That Challenges Evolution. New York: HarperOne, 2019.

Dembski, William A. The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance Through Small Probabilities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Dembski, William A. No Free Lunch: Why Specified Complexity Cannot Be Purchased without Intelligence. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

Dembski, William A. The Design Revolution: Answering the Toughest Questions About Intelligent Design. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

Dembski, William A., and Jonathan Wells. The Design of Life: Discovering Signs of Intelligence in Biological Systems. Dallas: Foundation for Thought and Ethics, 2008.

Meyer, Stephen C. Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design. New York: HarperOne, 2009.

Meyer, Stephen C. Darwin's Doubt: The Explosive Origin of the Animal Phyla and the Case for Intelligent Design. New York: HarperOne, 2013.

Meyer, Stephen C. Return of the God Hypothesis: Three Scientific Discoveries That Reveal the Mind Behind the Universe. New York: HarperOne, 2021.

PRIMARY SCHOLARLY WORKS — EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY

Coyne, Jerry A. Why Evolution Is True. New York: Viking, 2009.

Darwin, Charles. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection. London: John Murray, 1859. Facsimile of 1st ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Davidson, Eric H., and Douglas H. Erwin. "Gene Regulatory Networks and the Evolution of Animal Body Plans." Science 311, no. 5762 (2006): 796–800.

Dawkins, Richard. The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design. New York: W.W. Norton, 1986.

Dawkins, Richard. The Selfish Gene. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976. 40th Anniversary Edition, 2016.

Futuyma, Douglas J. Evolution. 3rd ed. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, 2013.

Jablonka, Eva, and Marion J. Lamb. Evolution in Four Dimensions: Genetic, Epigenetic, Behavioral, and Symbolic Variation in the History of Life. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005.

Kimura, Motoo. The Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Laland, Kevin N., et al. “The Extended Evolutionary Synthesis: Its Structure, Assumptions, and Predictions.” Proceedings of the Royal Society B 282, no. 1813 (2015): 20151019.

Miller, Kenneth R. Finding Darwin’s God: A Scientist’s Search for Common Ground between God and Evolution. New York: HarperCollins, 1999.

Venter, J. Craig, et al. “Design and Synthesis of a Minimal Bacterial Genome.” Science 351, no. 6280 (2016): aad6253.

PHILOSOPHY, COSMOLOGY, AND APOLOGETICS

Borde, Arvind, Alan H. Guth, and Alexander Vilenkin. “Inflationary Spacetimes Are Incomplete in Past Directions.” Physical Review Letters 90, no. 15 (2003): 151301.

Collins, Francis S. The Language of God: A Scientist Presents Evidence for Belief. New York: Free Press, 2006.

Collins, Robin. “The Teleological Argument: An Exploration of the Fine-Tuning of the Universe.” In The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology, edited by William Lane Craig and J.P. Moreland. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Conway Morris, Simon. Life’s Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Conway Morris, Simon. The Runes of Evolution: How the Universe Became Self-Aware. West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press, 2015.

Craig, William Lane. The Kalam Cosmological Argument. London: Macmillan, 1979. Reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000.

Craig, William Lane. Reasonable Faith: Christian Truth and Apologetics. 3rd ed. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008.

Craig, William Lane, and J.P. Moreland, eds. The Blackwell Companion to Natural Theology. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Crick, Francis. Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981.

Davies, Paul. The Fifth Miracle: The Search for the Origin and Meaning of Life. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999. (Published in the UK as The Origin of Life.)

Davies, Paul. The Goldilocks Enigma: Why Is the Universe Just Right for Life? London: Allen Lane, 2006.

Forrest, Barbara, and Paul R. Gross. Creationism's Trojan Horse: The Wedge of Intelligent Design. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Alexander, Denis. Creation or Evolution: Do We Have to Choose? Oxford: Monarch Books, 2008. Revised edition, 2014.

Penrose, Roger. The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2005.

Plantinga, Alvin. The Nature of Necessity. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Plantinga, Alvin. Warrant and Proper Function. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Plantinga, Alvin. Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Polkinghorne, John. Belief in God in an Age of Science. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Polkinghorne, John. Quantum Physics and Theology: An Unexpected Kinship. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Pruss, Alexander R. The Principle of Sufficient Reason: A Reassessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Rees, Martin. Just Six Numbers: The Deep Forces That Shape the Universe. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1999.

Sober, Elliott. Evidence and Evolution: The Logic of Darwinism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Swinburne, Richard. The Existence of God. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Yockey, Hubert P. Information Theory, Evolution, and the Origin of Life. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL SOURCES

Kitzmiller v. Dover Area School District, 400 F. Supp. 2d 707 (M.D. Pa. 2005). Opinion by Judge John E. Jones III. Full text available at: https://ncse.ngo/kitzmiller-v-dover-documents.

ENCODE Project Consortium. "An Integrated Encyclopedia of DNA Elements in the Human Genome." Nature 489 (2012): 57–74.