**Asbjørn Berland interviews Peter S. Williams, author of *An informed Cosmos*:
Essays On Intelligent Design Theory (Wipf and Stock, 2023)**

1. There are already many books about intelligent design. What made you write this book?

I'm a philosopher with a long-standing interest in the natural sciences that probably has something to do with the fact that both my parents worked as science teachers. As a young philosopher in the 1990s I considered myself a well-informed "theistic evolutionist;" but I was interested in the philosophy of science discussion about whether or not "intelligent design theory" (ID for short) could legitimately be called a "scientific" theory. I concluded that it was a legitimately scientific theory[1] (an opinion shared today by atheistic philosophers like Bradley Monton[2] and Thomas Nagel[3]).

Reading into the debate about ID, I also became convinced that, whether or not ID was "scientific," it was probably true. In the 2000's, I published a lot of material about ID in various venues (including a 2007 peer reviewed paper about the logic of the design inference in the philosophy journal *Philosophia Christi*[4]) and engaged in a couple of public debates about the merits of ID.

An informed Cosmos is part of a series of "essays on . . ." volumes pairing selected essays on different themes from my research over the past couple of decades, with new introductory material by myself and an invited foreword. In this volume, I've written a substantial new essay about my personal journey with the question of design in nature, and there's a foreword contributed by philosopher of science Stephen C. Meyer. The other essays have been updated here and there, and some illustrations have been added.

2. You are a philosopher, and many would think more about science than philosophy when they hear the term "intelligent design". How is philosophy relevant to the topic of intelligent design?

Philosophy is the academic subject that thinks critically about the ideas that underpin all the other academic subjects, including science. When I was a student I was particularly interested

---

[1] See: Stephen C. Meyer, "The Scientific Status of Intelligent Design: The Methodological Equivalence of Naturalistic and Non-Naturalistic Origins Theories" (2005), https://stephencmeyer.org/2005/11/13/the-scientific-status-of-intelligent-design/.

[2] See: Bradley Monton, "Is Intelligent Design Science? Dissecting the Dover Decision." http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/2583/1/Methodological_Naturalism_2.pdf; Bradley Monton, *Seeking God in Science*: *An Atheist Defends Intelligent Design*. Toronto, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2009.

[3] See: Thomas Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos*: *Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012; Thomas Nagel, *Secular Philosophy and the Religious Temperament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

[4] See: Peter S. Williams, "The Design Inference from Specified Complexity Defended by Scholars Outside the Intelligent Design Movement: A Critical Review," *Philosophia Christi* (Vol. 9, Issue 2, 2007), https://www.discovery.org/m/securepdfs/2021/03/Williams_PhilosophiaChristi_SpecifiedComplexity.pdf.

in the discussion within the philosophy of science about how "science" should be defined; whether, for example, "methodological naturalism" was a necessary or sensible part of the definition of how "science" should be practiced. I became convinced that "methodological naturalism" was a bad rule because it obscures the search for truth about the material world, and that the "open" philosophy of science advocated by intelligent design theorists was the best way to think about science.

Analytical philosophy is very interested in clear definitions and distinctions, and I think the debate about design in nature is often de-railed by a poor understanding of some important definitions and distinctions (for example, distinctions between various elements of the standard evolutionary paradigm, or between inferring design and inferring a particular source of design).

Finally, philosophy is interested in avoiding fallacious forms of argumentation. Some critics of intelligent design theory use fallacious forms of argumentation, both in critiquing ID and in defending their own ideas. A major focus of my writing on ID is to identify these fallacious arguments to clear the way to a serious engagement with the evidence for design in the natural world.

3. In chapter 1 of your book, you discuss how we can know that something is designed. Can you in short explain how to reasonably detect design?

We live in an information age. For example, when we buy an e-book we are empowered to download intentionally design *information*. More exactly, we download "complex specified information" or "specified complexity," terms describing events that combine high probabilistic complexity (i.e. they are very unlikely) with identifying patterns of low descriptive complexity.[5] The natural and rationally warranted inference from this type of information is to "intelligent design" (that is, of genuine rather than merely apparent design). In the words of Terry Rickard (PhD in Engineering Physics, University of California, San Diego):

> any complex event having both a briefly described specification and a small probability of occurrence - that is, small in light of all available probabilistic resources - must logically be attributed to design rather than chance.[6]

For example, as noted philosopher William Lane Craig observes:

> in a poker game any deal of cards is equally and highly improbable, but if you find that every time a certain player deals he gets all four aces, you can bet this is not the result of chance but of design.[7]

This combination of specificity and sufficient complexity warrants an inference to design, because in our experience "the creation of new [complex specified information] is habitually

---

[5] See: William A. Dembski, "Specification: The Pattern That Signifies Intelligence." *Philosophia Christi* 7 (2):299-343 (2005), https://billdembski.com/documents/2005.06.Specification.pdf; William A. Dembski and Winston Ewert, *The Design Inference*, 2nd edition, revised and expanded. Seattle: Discovery Institute Press, 2023.

[6] Terry Rickard, endorsement of William A. Dembski and Winston Ewert's *The Design Inference*, 2nd edition (Seattle: Discovery Institute Press, 2023), https://www.discovery.org/m/securepdfs/2023/10/THE-DESIGN-INFERENCE-Table-of-Contents.pdf.

[7] William Lane Craig, "Fine Tuned Universe" www.reasonablefaith.org/writings/question-answer/fine-tuned-universe.

associated with conscious and rational activity."[8] As noted mathematician Sergiu Klainerman (Higgins Professor of Mathematics at Princeton University, and a member of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences) comments, there are:

> plenty of well-motivated, non-biological examples on how specified events of small probability lead to a convincing inference of intelligent design. The same arguments become controversial only when applied to biology![9]

4. You mention that there are scholars who oppose the theory of intelligent design but agree on how design can be detected. Why is this important?

The first chapter of *An Informed Cosmos* is the peer-reviewed paper I published in *Philosophia Christi*, which shows how various atheistic and Christian critics of intelligent design theory implicitly or explicitly use the "specified complexity" design-detection methodology.[10] This is important because it shows that this criteria is not something peculiar to intelligent design theorists, or to people with a particular philosophical worldview, but a widely accepted rational method for positively inferring intelligent design as the best explanation of empirical data that meets the "specified complexity" criterion.

This focuses our attention on the primary question of whether any particular design inference grounded in empirical data is warranted, rather than the secondary question of what academic label should attach to such inferences. It seems to me that if a design inference from the origin of life,[11] or the Cambrian explosion of body forms,[12] or "irreducibly-complex" bio-molecular machinery in cells,[13] is unwarranted, then it doesn't much matter whether we call it bad philosophy or bad science. However, if any such inference is warranted, then it becomes implausible not to call it science.

---

[8] Henry Quastler, *The Emergence Of Biological Organization*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964, 16.

[9] Sergiu Klainerman, endorsement of William A. Dembski and Winston Ewert's *The Design Inference*, 2nd edition (Seattle: Discovery Institute Press, 2023), https://www.discovery.org/m/securepdfs/2023/10/THE-DESIGN-INFERENCE-Table-of-Contents.pdf.

[10] See: Peter S. Williams, "The Design Inference from Specified Complexity Defended by Scholars Outside the Intelligent Design Movement: A Critical Review," *Philosophia Christi* (Vol. 9, Issue 2, 2007), https://www.discovery.org/m/securepdfs/2021/03/Williams_PhilosophiaChristi_SpecifiedComplexity.pdf.

[11] See: Stephen C. Meyer, "Signature In The Cell: Intelligent Design and the DNA Enigma" in *The Blackwell Companion to Science and Christianity*, 2012, https://stephencmeyer.org/2012/05/21/signature-in-the-cell-dna-enigma/; Stephen C. Meyer, *Signature In The Cell*: *DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design*. San Francisco: San Francisco: HarperOne, 2010; Charles B. Thaxton, et al. *The Mystery Of Life's Origin*: *The Continuing Controversy*. Seattle, WA: Discovery Institute Press, 2020.

[12] See: Stephen C. Meyer, "The Origin of Biological Information and the Higher Taxonomic Categories" *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* (volume 117, no. 2, pp. 213-239), https://stephencmeyer.org/2004/08/04/intelligent-design-the-origin-of-biological-information-and-the-higher-taxonomic-categories/; Stephen C. Meyer, *Darwin's Doubt*: *The Explosive Origin of Animal Life and the Case for Intelligent Design*. Revised edition. Bravo, 2014.

[13] See: Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*: *The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, second edition. New York: Free Press, 2006.

5. Why do you then think that these scholars oppose intelligent design while they endorse the method?

Perhaps they aren't aware of empirical evidence within nature that passes the "specified complexity" test for design. Then again, they may hold philosophical presuppositions about how "science" should be defined and conducted, or about the ontological nature of reality, that foreclose the inference to design in advance of considering the evidence. The latter explanation may, in some cases, account for the former.

6. One heading in your book reads, "It is better to be unscientific and true than scientific and false." Can you explain what you mean by this?

There can be true propositions that are not "scientific" propositions, and warranted beliefs that are not beliefs in about "scientific" propositions. After all, the denial that beliefs can be true and/or warranted without being "scientific" is itself not a "scientific" proposition, and is thus self-contradictory. Therefore, the really interesting question about a proposition is not "is it scientific?" but "is it true?"

The core of intelligent design theory can be expressed as a simple syllogism, with two premises and a conclusion:

1) There exists at least one reliable test for inferring intelligent design.
2) At least one aspect of nature exhibits empirical data that passes the test referred to in premise 1.
3) Therefore, we can reliably infer intelligent design from at least one aspect of nature.

Since this is a logically valid argument, if both premises are true, it follows that the conclusion is true (though note that "reliable" doesn't mean "infallible"). If we think this argument is unsound, it's relatively unimportant how we categorize it. However, if we think the argument is sound, it is highly implausible not to categorize it as a "scientific" argument. Given that we believe the above argument to be sound, refusing to call it "scientific" implies a willingness to take funding away from university science departments to transfer elsewhere (e.g. philosophy departments) in order to support scholarship we believe increases our knowledge about the physical world by applying a methodology of design detection used within several scientific disciplines to empirical data from one or more scientific disciplines!

7. In your book, you write that intelligent design theory is not creationism and does not identify the creator. Why is this point important?

Both points are important because they are true![14] The "creation science" of "young earth creationism" begins with a particular (I think implausible) reading of certain biblical

---

[14] See: Stephen C. Meyer, "A Scientific History And Philosophical Defence Of The Theory Of Intelligent Design" in *Religion - Staat - Gesellschaft: Journal for the Study of Beliefs and Worldviews*, vol. 7, https://stephencmeyer.org/2008/10/07/a-scientific-history-and-philosophical-defense-of-the-theory-of-intelligent-design/; Jonathan Witt, "The Origin of Intelligent Design: A Brief History of the Scientific Theory of Intelligent Design" www.discovery.org/a/3207/.

passages,[15] and then approaches the empirical data of the natural world from the perspective of a research program based upon that reading. In this way, "creation science" is the mirror image of Darwinism, which approaches the empirical data with a presupposition of metaphysical and/or methodological naturalism that determines certain results of research *a priori*, regardless of the evidence.

Filling in the gap between "intelligent design" and "designed by God" (let alone "designed by the God of a particular religious tradition") takes us beyond "the design inference" made by ID and into the philosophical realm of "natural theology."[16] That is, a logically valid argument for theism from design can be *based upon* intelligent design theory, but *only by adding an additional, metaphysical premise to the core argument for ID*. Just as philosophers are free to build metaphysical arguments for theism upon the scientific theory of the Big Bang without thereby stripping cosmology of its scientific status,[17] so they are free to build metaphysical arguments for theism upon the scientific theory of intelligent design, without thereby stripping intelligent design theory of its scientific status.

In outline, such an argument would have to take something like the following structure:

1) There exists at least one reliable test for inferring intelligent design.
2) At least one aspect of nature exhibits empirical data that passes the test referred to in premise 1.
3) Therefore, we can reliably infer intelligent design from at least one aspect of nature.
4) The best explanation for intelligent design within nature is theistic.
5) Therefore, the presence of intelligent design within nature supports the case for theism.

The necessity for premise 4 to bridge the logical gap from 3 to 5 disproves the claim that intelligent design theory is an inherently theistic project. Only those who think that premises 1, 2 *and 4* are jointly more plausible than their denial will think that the above argument is

---

[15] See: Conrad Hyers, "The Narrative Form of Genesis 1: Cosmogonic, Yes; Scientific, No." www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/1984/JASA12-84Hyers.html; C. John. Collins, *Science and Faith*: *Friends or Foes*? Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2003.

[16] See: W. David Beck, "God's Existence" https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1086&context=sor_fac_pubs; William Lane Craig, "Five Arguments for God" http://christianevidence.org/docs/booklets/five_arguments_for_god.pdf; Dallas Willard, "Language, Being, God, and the Three Stages of Theistic Evidence" https://dwillard.org/articles/language-being-god-and-the-three-stages-of-theistic-evidence; W. David Beck, *Does God Exist*? *A History of Answers to the Question*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2021; Paul Copan and Charles Taliaferro, ed.'s. *The Naturalness of Belief*: *New Essays on Theism's Rationality*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington, 2019; William Lane Craig and J.P. Moreland, ed.'s. *Naturalism*: *A Critical Analysis*. London: Routledge, 2014; William Lane Craig and J.P. Moreland, ed.'s. *The Blackwell Companion To Natural Theology*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009; C. Stephen Evans, *Natural Signs and Knowledge of God*: *A New Look at Theistic Arguments*. Oxford University Press, 2010; Stephen C. Meyer, *The Return of the God Hypothesis*. New York: HarperCollins, 2021; J.P. Moreland, *Consciousness and the Existence of God*: *A Theistic Argument*. London: Routledge, 2009; J.P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview*. Second edition. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2017; Colin Ruloff and Peter Horban, ed.'s. *Contemporary Arguments In Natural Theology*: *God And Rational Belief*. London: Bloomsbury, 2021; Peter S. Williams, *A Universe From Someone*: *Essays On Natural Theology*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2023; Peter S. Williams, *A Faithful Guide to Philosophy*: *A Christian Introduction to the Love of Wisdom*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2019.

[17] See: Paul Copan and William Lane Craig, ed.'s. *The Kalam Cosmological Argument, Volume 1*: *Philosophical Arguments for the Finitude of the Past* (Bloomsbury Studies in Philosophy of Religion, 2019); Paul Copan and William Lane Craig, ed.'s. *The Kalam Cosmological Argument, Volume 2*: *Scientific Evidence for the Beginning of the Universe*. (Bloomsbury Studies in Philosophy of Religion, 2019).

sound. The question of design must be approached in what physicist Sir John Polkinghorne (1930 - 2021) called a "bottom up" manner. *First* we detect design, *then* we ask who the best designer candidate is in this particular case. Substantiating an answer to *that* question requires additional argumentation. As atheist Sam Harris observes: "Even if we accepted that our universe simply had to be designed by a designer, this would not suggest that this designer is the biblical God, or that He approves of Christianity."[18]

8. Why do you believe that so many misunderstand the theory of intelligent design in that regard?

Unfortunately, many people's understanding of intelligent design theory is shaped by misinformed, "straw man" caricatures of what it is, the data its based upon, the structure of its arguments, etc.

9. You mention that even agnostics and atheist can agree with the theory of intelligent design. If agreeing with ID can lead one to still deny the existence of God, why does ID matter for Christians doing Christian apologetics?

I don't advocate intelligent design theory because I think its useful for "doing Christian apologetics."[19] I advocate intelligent design theory because I think its probably true; because I think its the most plausible explanation of the relevant data and helps us to approach understanding the cosmos in a more fruitful way.

The theory of intelligent design is compatible with agnosticism or atheism in the sense that one can posit that the ultimate source of design in nature is an intelligence, or set of intelligences, other than "God." One could attribute evidence of design to aliens, or hypothesize that our cosmos is actually a computer simulation.[20] The question with apologetic bite is whether explanations like these are *better* explanations than some kind of "God." I don't think they are. Others are free to disagree and to argue their case. Either way, this debate takes place within the philosophical discussion about which worldview is most plausible overall.[21]

Think of it like this: two forensic scientists could agree that "Jane Doe" died by suicide or murder rather than by natural causes, even if one scientist holds a physicalist anthropology and the other is a mind-body dualist of some kind. "Intelligence" can function as an explanation they agree upon within their science, even whilst they have a philosophical disagreement about how best to understand "intelligence." The same goes for inferring design within biology or cosmology.

---

[18] Sam Harris, *Letter to a Christian Nation*. Vintage, 2008, 73.
[19] That said, I *do* think ID matters for Christian apologetics, inasmuch as I think it can be incorporated into a plausible philosophical argument for theism (see my answer to question 7).
[20] See: Ben Mines, "The Simulation Hypothesis." www.thinkingmatters.org.nz/2018/07/ the-simulation-hypothesis/; Parker Settecase, "Simulation Theory Debunked." https://thethink.institute/articles/simulation-theory-debunked.
[21] See: Stephen C. Meyer, *The Return of the God Hypothesis*. New York: HarperCollins, 2020.

10. You write that previously, you believed that God had made the world through macro evolution. What made you change your mind?

The arguments for intelligent design theory changed my mind! I became convinced that while the fine-tuning of the cosmos permitted the existence of biological life, it did not make either its existence, or everything about its diversification over time, sufficiently likely that one could avoid making an inference to design from the relevant biological data. Note that this is not to say that "blind" material processes (processes dependent upon cosmic fine-tuning) play no role in biology, because they obviously do play a role).[22]

11. Some Christians say they don't agree with the theory of intelligent design. However, as you mention in your book, many, like Cambridge biologist Denis Alexander, would still use the argument from the fine tuning of the universe. Why do you think they also should be open to design arguments from biology?

Plenty of theistic evolutionists accept the cosmic fine-tuning design argument, and often use pre-theoretic versions of the "specified complexity" criteria for design detection in making that argument. However, they think of it as a philosophical argument (albeit with a scientific premise) which shouldn't feature within "scientific" dialogue. I think folks like this should be open to design arguments from biology because these arguments use the same methodology they apply to cosmic fine-tuning, and if the biological arguments are supported by the evidence that warrants an inference to design that places the methodological rule against mentioning design in science (i.e. "methodological naturalism") into an unsustainable tension with the idea that science is about the pursuit of the truth about the physical world. As the atheist philosopher of science Bradley Monton argues:

> If science really is permanently committed to methodological naturalism, it follows that the aim of science is not generating true theories. Instead, the aim of science would be something like: generating the best theories that can be formulated subject to the restriction that the theories are naturalistic. . . . science is better off without being shackled by methodological naturalism.[23]

12. You claim that it is crucial to distinguish between intelligent design as a general approach to design detection and intelligent design as a theory. What is the difference, and why do you believe that the distinction matters?

As a general approach to design detection, intelligent design is simply the scientific process of inferring design from empirical data, e.g. via the detection of specified complexity. As such, intelligent design is already part and parcel of many sciences, such as archaeology, cryptography, forensic engineering, forensic science, and the Search for Extra-Terrestrial Intelligence (SETI).
"Intelligent Design Theory" fundamentally refers to the application of intelligent design in the above sense to data from the scientific fields of cosmology and biology. If we discover that intelligent design as a general approach to design detection applies to a wide

---

[22] See: Michael J. Behe, *The Edge of Evolution*: *The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*. New York: Free Press, 2007.
[23] Bradley Monton, "Is Intelligent Design Science? Dissecting the Dover Decision" http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/2583/1/Methodological_Naturalism_2.pdf.

variety of cases and physical domains (as I think we do), then "Intelligent Design Theory" designates a scientific research program that takes the presence of both design and "blind" natural processes (processes that can themselves be the product of design) seriously.[24] As biologist Jonathan Wells explains:

> On one level, ID is concerned with inferring from the evidence whether a given feature of the world is designed. . . . On another level, ID [functions] as a "metatheory," providing a conceptual framework for scientific research. By suggesting testable hypotheses about features of the world that have been systematically neglected by older metatheories (such as Darwin's), and by leading to the discovery of new features, ID [can] indirectly demonstrate its scientific fruitfulness.[25]

According to design theorist Casey Luskin, "ID makes a variety of testable and successful predictions."[26] For example:

> intelligent design theorists have long argued against the idea that non-protein coding DNA is useless evolutionary junk, instead predicting that it serves important biological functions. Year after year for over a decade, new evidence has emerged revealing such functions and vindicating ID scientists.[27]

13. You quote Emory professor, Scott O. Lilienfield, who says, "it is Darwinian evolution, not ID, that is glaringly inconsistent with common sense. . ." What role do you think common sense has in science and the big questions in life? After all, scientist could point out that several scientific discoveries contradict common sense, so why use common sense?

It is true that some scientific discoveries contradict "common sense;" but in the final analysis we accept those discoveries on the basis of "common sense." Both rational argumentation and empirical investigation of the world are inescapably grounded in a common sense, *prima facie* acceptance of a "properly basic" trust in our cognitive and sensory capacities. It is only the existence of a sufficiently strong rational case, grounded in such "common sense" epistemic trust, that convinces us to accept scientific conclusions that clash with "common

[24] See: Brian Miller, "Engineering Principles Explain Biological Systems Better than Evolutionary Theory" in Frederik van Niekerk and Nico Vorster ed's. *Science and Faith in Dialogue*. AOSIS, 2023, https://books.aosis.co.za/index.php/ob/catalog/view/334/514/7440-3; David Snoke, "Systems Biology as a Research Program for Intelligent Design" *BIO-Complexity* 2014 (3):1–11, https://bio-complexity.org/ojs/index.php/main/article/viewFile/BIO-C.2014.3/BIO-C.2014.3; Jonathan Wells, "Using Intelligent Design Theory to Guide Scientific Research" https://intelligentdesign.org/articles/using-intelligent-design-theory-to-guide-scientific-research/; Jonathan Wells, "Do Centrioles Generate a Polar Ejection Force?" Rivista di Biologia / Biology Forum 98 (2005), pp. 71-96, www.discovery.org/m/2020/05/Rivista-Biologia-Wells-Centrioles-Polar-Force.pdf; Stephen C. Meyer, *Signature In The Cell*: *DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design*. San Francisco: San Francisco: HarperOne, 2010, "Appendix A: Some Predictions of Intelligent Design."
[25] Jonathan Wells, "Using Intelligent Design Theory to Guide Scientific Research" https://intelligentdesign.org/articles/using-intelligent-design-theory-to-guide-scientific-research/.
[26] Casey Luskin, "Science Stopper? Intelligent Design as a Fruitful Scientific Paradigm" https://evolutionnews.org/2022/05/science-stopper-intelligent-design-as-a-fruitful-scientific-paradigm/.
[27] Casey Luskin, "Junk DNA's 'Kuhnian Paradigm Shift'" https://evolutionnews.org/2024/01/casey-luskin-on-junk-dnas-kuhnian-paradigm-shift/. See: Jonathan Wells, *The Myth Of Junk DNA*. Seattle, WA: Discovery Institute Press, 2011.

sense." In other words, theories that clash with "common sense" have the burden of proof, and that's just common sense.

14. The intelligent design movement has progressed both in scope and in its advancement of arguments since its inception. How do you anticipate the future for intelligent design?

At a scientific level, I anticipate both that the evidence for design will continue to accumulate in various fields, and that an increasing amount of research will be conducted from a design-theoretic perspective.[28] At a philosophical level, I expect debate to centre around a) the viability of appealing to the hypothetical existence of a multiverse in order to undermine design inferences, and b) the viability of accepting intelligent design theory whilst advocating various non-theistic answers to the question of what worldview best accounts for the evidence for design exhibited by and/or within the cosmos.

For more information about *An Informed Cosmos*: *Essays On Intelligent Design Theory* (Wipf and Stock, 2023) visit www.peterswilliams.com/publications/books/an-informed-cosmos-essays-on-intelligent-design-theory/

---

[28] See: Peer Reviewed Intelligent Design Publications @ www.discovery.org/a/2640; The Evolutionary Informatics Lab - Publications: https://evoinfo.org/publications.html.