

# ORIGIN

## DISCUSSION GUIDE



### WATCH

Watch *Origin* with your small group. Allow participants opportunity to share their thoughts on images or points that particularly stood out, things that intrigued or raised questions for them.



### READ

Read Romans 1:19-20 and Isaiah 45:9-10 out loud with your group. Allow time to consider the texts and reflect on the case presented in the film.



### DISCUSS

1. Spacecraft designer, Stuart Burgess describes the complex linking mechanism found in the wings of insects to amplify their motion, citing it as an example of supremely optimal design. He further states the fossil record reveals no intermediate stages between simple hinges and these more complex compound mechanisms. What do you make of Burgess' conclusion that this is evidence of irreducible complexity and intelligent design? Is the argument convincing? Why? Why not? What other examples of irreducible complexity can you think of?
2. In the film, Professor Andy McIntosh lists at least five solid reasons why he believes the common idea that reptiles evolved into birds is flawed. Try listing as many of McIntosh's objections below. Are any of these ideas new to you? Which do you find the most/least convincing? Which do you find it easier to accept: evolutionary theory or intelligent design? Explain.
3. In 1964 Carl Sagan and Harvard geneticist Richard Lewontin found themselves on the stage of the Little Rock Auditorium, Arkansas, where they took the affirmative side in a debate: "That the Theory of Evolution is proved as is the fact that the Earth goes around the Sun." In another telling statement Lewontin once admitted: "We do have a tendency, now in biology especially to make up stories, to make theoretical biology a kind of game, in fact we have game theory in biology which is meant to use the theory of games to make predictions or explain things." How would you reconcile these two ideas? Where do you see evolutionary theory—as a proven fact or a story made up to explain things?
4. In a discussion about the origins of DNA, Oxford mathematics professor John Lennox states, "There is no evidence whatsoever that unguided natural processes produce information at all. Natural processes can transmit it, but they do not produce it." He further cites the GIGO rule of the IT world (Garbage In – Garbage Out) to back his claim. Is this a valid claim? How would you respond to the idea that given enough time, and an infinite number of rolls of the dice, any outcome is statistically possible? Is this type of random process sufficient to account for the origin of the universe? Discuss.



WATCH AND LEARN MORE AT [WAYMAKER.TV](http://WAYMAKER.TV)

