| Name: | Time : Mon., Dec. 7, 2009, 1:15-4:00pm |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Course: PHILO 2483, Intelligent Design | Place: F-15 |
| Instructor: William A. Dembski | Grader: Jack Greenoe |
| | |

FINAL EXAM

Please answer the following questions in the space allotted—do not write outside the given borders. Answer all the parts of each question. Be concise. **This exam is closed-book**.

Identify the person or item that matches the description; give first name where applicable [1 point each]:

| give first name where applicable [1 point each]: |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1 The author of <i>On the Origin of Species</i> |
| |
| 1.2 The author of <i>Natural Theology</i> (1802). In this book the author makes a famous watchmaker |
| argument |
| 1.3 The author of <i>The Blind Watchmaker</i> |
| |
| 1.4 The Cal Berkeley law professor who is widely regarded as the architect of the ID movement |
| |
| 1.5 Author of <i>Darwin's Black Box</i> |
| |
| 1.6 The book by Henry Morris and John Whitcomb that deeply influenced Karl Giberson early on |
| |
| 1.7 The school teacher who in 1925 stood trial for teaching evolution |
| |
| 1.8 Best known current defender of theistic evolution (hint: recent became head of the NIH) |
| |
| 1.9 Chief organization defending intelligent design |
| |
| 1.10 Author of <i>The Design Inference</i> |
| |

| Ι | Define the following terms and briefly note their significance [3 points each]: |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | 2.1 intelligent design |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 2 | 2.2 creationism |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| 2 | 2.3 Darwinian evolution |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| <u> </u> | |
| 2 | .4 Cambrian explosion |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| <u> </u> | |
| 2 | 2.5 irreducible complexity |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| 2.6 specified complexity |
|------------------------------------------------|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 2.7 methodological naturalism (or materialism) |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 2.9 constancy of nature |
| 2.8 constancy of nature |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 2.9 the two books that God has given us |
| 219 the two cools that con this given in |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 2.10 theistic evolution |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

Answer the following questions [10 points each]: 3. Why did materialistic scientists resist the Big Bang when it was first proposed? How has the Big Bang been used to support theism? Describe some of the arguments used by cosmologists to argue for the intelligent design of the universe (recall the video *The Privileged Planet*).

| 4. How have coevolution and co-option been used to refute Michael Behe's contention that irreducibly complex biochemical systems are beyond the reach of Darwinian evolution? Indicate why coevolution and co-option do not in fact overcome the challenge posed to Darwinian evolution by irreducible complexity. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| 6. Imagine that you are about to debate Richard Dawkins in a public forum. He is charging that ID is pseudoscience. Turn the tables on him and argue that (1) ID is in fact science and (2) Darwinism itself stands in danger of being a pseudoscience. Outline your argument here. |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| stands in danger of being a pseudoserence. Summe your argument nere. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| 7. Imagine that you are about to debate Karl Giberson in a public forum. He is charging that ID is bad for both science and Christian theology, and that the only way to be an intellectually responsible |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Christian in this age is to accept evolution. How do you answer him? |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

| 8. Outline Stephen Meyer's argument that ascribing the molecular machinery in the cell to design |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| constitutes an inference to the best explanation. Why isn't this an argument from ignorance? |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |