

AN ALGORITHMIC INFORMATION THEORY CRITIQUE OF STATISTICAL ARGUMENTS FOR INTELLIGENT DESIGN

Sean D Devine*
(Dated: February 6, 2020)

W. Dembski [9, 11] claims to have established a robust decision process that can determine when observed structures in the natural world can be attributed to design. Dembski's decision process first asks whether a structure as an outcome can be explained by the regularity of natural laws. If not, and the outcome can be "specified", a randomness test is devised to determine whether an observed low probability outcome indicates design.

It is argued in this paper that the Dembski test is unworkable as it provides no reliable way of assessing the probability of these events. Furthermore, the test is better formulated in terms of a Martin Löf universal randomness test. A universal randomness test will show that most observed outcomes in the natural world are non random; they are highly ordered. However this does not necessarily demonstrate design. The decision is not between chance and design, but between natural laws and design. Unless the chance hypothesis is eliminated in the first step of the decision process the decision will be strongly biased in favour of design. However, if chance is eliminated first, natural explanations of outcomes would seem to be more credible by far than postulating a design explanation. The Dembski decision process is flawed. Dembski also introduces a 4th law of thermodynamics, the law of conservation of information, to argue that information cannot emerge from random processes. However, if a more robust measure of information such as one derived from algorithmic entropy is used, the so called 4th law contains no more than the second law of thermodynamics. Introducing a 4th law obscures the fact that the second law allows order to arise by natural means. For example, low entropy outcomes representing order emerge when low entropy photons from the sun generate low entropy living systems on earth.

In conclusion despite the good intentions, the approach fails to offer any new insights into the adequacy of evolutionary theory and should not be regarded as demonstrable science.

keywords randomness test; Intelligent Design; dynamics of evolution; algorithmic information theory; algorithmic entropy.

PACS numbers: 01.70.-w, 89.70.Cf, 89.75.Fb, 89.75.Kd, 87.18.-h, 87.10.Vg, 02.50.Cw

I. INTRODUCTION

Dembski in a number of books including "The Design Inference" [9] and "No Free Lunch" [11] has argued that there is a robust decision process that can show when certain structures observed in the natural world are the product of design rather than natural processes. For example, is the flagellum that provides motility to certain bacteria (see Behe [1]) an outcome of evolutionary processes, or can such an outcome only be explained by design? Dembski's decision process considers first whether a structure can be explained by the regularity of natural laws. If not, a randomness test is devised based on identifying an event E that is independent of any side information. Such an event E is termed "specified" to distinguish it from other equally likely events. For example the random outcome of tossing of a coin 200 times can not be specified, but the ordered outcome of 200 heads is specified.

Dembski claims that if the probability of a specified event occurring by chance is low, the event can be deemed

to be due to design, as chance can be eliminated. If $P(E|H)$ is the probability of the specified event, Dembski defines the information I_D embodied in the outcome by $I_D = -\log_2 P(E|H)$. This information is known as "Complex Specified Information". Here this information measure will be called "Dembski-information" to distinguish it from other understandings of information. Dembski-information is designed so that the lower the probability, the higher is the Complex Specified Information and this indicates higher complexity. While this terminology can be used, there are ambiguities that can be confusing. Elsberry and Shallit [16] suggest the term "anti-information" to distinguish this information from that used in Algorithmic Information Theory. Algorithmic Information Theory would recognise those outcomes that have high Dembski-information as those that exhibit low algorithmic complexity, low algorithmic entropy and low algorithmic information. These outcomes are seen to be highly ordered. As is discussed later, the appearance of 200 heads in a row is a highly ordered outcome. It is simple to describe algorithmically and represents a low algorithmic entropy event. It could be termed a surprise event.

This paper shows that, as Dembski's approach does not adequately define a randomness test, his argument needs to be articulated in terms of a universal Martin Löf randomness test. While the universal randomness test

*Victoria Management School, Victoria University of Wellington, PO Box 600, Wellington, 6140, New Zealand; Electronic address: sean.devine@vuw.ac.nz

achieves Dembski's purpose, it becomes clear that the Dembski decision process to identify design is flawed, as it eliminates natural explanations for surprise outcomes before it eliminates chance. The fundamental choice to be made, given the available information, is whether natural laws provide a better explanation than a design intervention. The Dembski decision route avoids comparing the two most likely possibilities on equal terms and, by so doing, attributes design to events just because most natural events are not purely random. As a consequence, it will assign design to events when further knowledge would indicate natural causes.

Dembski also introduces his law of conservation of the information I_D , as the 4th law of thermodynamics. As has been mentioned, a complex specified event with a high Dembski-information content is a low entropy event. Such an event represents a highly ordered outcome as it can be algorithmically compressed. However as is outlined later, Dembski's law of conservation of information allows information to be conserved or decrease. It is equivalent to the statement that entropy can only be conserved or increase. While Dembski uses his law of conservation of information to explain how high Dembski-information structures cannot emerge by chance, the argument is invalid. Such a law obscures the mechanisms by which order can emerge in the natural processes in a way that is consistent with the second law of thermodynamics. Highly ordered living structures, such as those observed on earth, do emerge by natural processes when order, manifested as photons from the sun is harnessed to create new ordered structures. This order from the low entropy source is sufficient to ensure that the entropy of the total system does not decrease.

II. ALGORITHMIC INFORMATION THEORY AND THE MARTIN LÖF RANDOMNESS TEST

A. Algorithmic information theory

Algorithmic Information theory measures the algorithmic complexity of an outcome in terms of its shortest description. Consider the following two outcomes resulting from the toss of a coin 200 times, where heads is denoted by a 1 and tails by a 0.

- The outcome is random represented by a sequence of two hundred characters of the form "110011...1100".
- The outcome is 200 heads in a row, represented by the sequence of 200 1's, i.e. "111...111".

The random sequence can be generated by an algorithm of the form: *PRINT* "110011...10". If the notation $|\dots|$ is used to denote the number of characters between the vertical lines, $|p|$, the length of the algorithm p that generates the sequence is made up of:

$$|p| = |110011\dots110| + |PRINT| + c.$$

The length of the algorithm includes the length of the sequence or string to be printed, the length of the "*PRINT*" instruction, and a constant term reflecting the length of the basic instruction set of the computer implementing the algorithm. On the other hand, an algorithm that generates 200 1's is of the form *PRINT* "1" 200 times. In this case the algorithm does not need to detail the string but only to specify the number 200, the character printed, a loop instruction that repeats the print command, and again a constant c . I.e. in this case the length of the algorithm p' is:

$$|p'| = |200| + |1| + |PRINT| + |loop\ instruction| + c.$$

If p^* is taken to represent the shortest algorithm to generate a sequence or define a structure, then in the above cases; $|p^*| \leq |p|$ and $|p'^*| \leq |p'|$. In general, the length $|p^*|$ of the shortest algorithm p^* able to generate the sequence, is called the algorithmic complexity of the sequence. As any structure or outcome can be expressed as a sequence (or in computational terms a string). Those representing highly patterned structures will have a short algorithmic description compared with a random string where each character in the string will need to be specified exactly. In the above two examples, the 200 head outcome can be expressed by a short algorithm, while the random outcome requires the computation to express each character in the string.

The basic concept of Algorithmic Information Theory (AIT) was originally conceived by Solomonoff [24]. Kolmogorov [18] and Chaitin [4] formalised the approach and were able to show that the computer dependence of the algorithmic complexity can be mostly eliminated by defining the algorithmic complexity or information content of the string s as the length of the shortest algorithm that generates s on a reference Universal Turing Machine (UTM). As such a machine can simulate any other Turing machine [5, 21], the machine dependence can be quantified. However, there are two alternative formulations of the algorithmic complexity measure. The first is known as plain algorithmic complexity and has no restrictions on the coding used, whereas the second restricts the coding to sets of instructions that are self-delimiting or prefix-free. In the second case no code can be a prefix of another, so that no end markers of algorithms or instructions are needed [5, 20]. As is discussed below, the self-delimiting version has a number of advantages.

The formal definition of plain algorithmic complexity; i.e. the complexity measure where the computer instructions are not restricted follows. Denoting $U(p)$ as the computation using programme p on the Universal Turing Machine U the plain algorithmic complexity $C_U(s_i)$ is given by;

$$C_U(s) = |p^*| = \text{minimum } |p| \text{ such that } U(p) = s$$

As different Universal Turing Machines can be simulated on each other, the algorithmic complexity measure on a particular machine can be related to another by the constant term c given above. This term is of order 1, allowing the machine independent definition to be:

$$C(s) \leq C_U(s) + O(1).$$

If the computation starts with string t , i.e. t is given, the algorithmic complexity is denoted by $C(s|t)$. Provided that a simple UTM is used, the $O(1)$ term will be small as most instructions are embedded in the programme rather than in the description of the computer. Also, whenever different output strings are generated on the same machine, the computer dependence can mostly be ignored, as the difference between the measures is usually the relevant parameter. Furthermore, when algorithmic instructions such as “PRINT” are common to all situations, these can also be taken as given as they also do not affect differences between strings.

Ignoring common instructions and machine dependence the algorithmic complexity of the random string above becomes:

$$C(110011\dots110) = |p *| \approx |110011\dots110|.$$

Allowing for computational overheads, the algorithmic complexity is a little more than the length of the string. On the other hand, the ordered string of 200 heads is represented by

$$C(111\dots111) \approx |p' *| = |200| + |1| \quad (1)$$

$$+ |\text{loop instruction}|. \quad (2)$$

The algorithmic complexity $C(110011\dots110)$ requires at least 200 bits to specify the actual string, whereas $C(111\dots11)$ only needs to capture the algorithm that specifies the integer 200, and a few more bits to account for the loop instruction. This is a little more than 8 bits. As a consequence, the specification of the ordered string is close to 200 – 8 bits shorter than the random string as it has been compressed by nearly 192 bits. Kolmogorov introduced the term “deficiency in randomness” to quantify the amount of compression. Similarly Chaitin, [6], in referring to biological structures, calls the same measure the “degree of organisation”.

The above definition of the plain algorithmic complexity “ $C(s)$ ” has assumed that there is no restriction on coding. In this paper, $H(s)$ will be used to denote the algorithmic complexity using self-delimiting coding, as the complexity measure is identical to both the algorithmic entropy and the algorithmic information content of the string. The formal definition of the algorithmic complexity or algorithmic entropy is similar to the plain definition. I.e.

$$H_U(s) = \text{minimum } |p| \text{ such that } U(p) = s,$$

but now the instruction in p are from a prefix-free set. In this case, because the computational instructions have no end markers, the instructions will implicitly include length information. Thus an algorithm using self-delimiting coding that otherwise would have been of length $C(s)$, implicitly includes up to $2\log_2 C(s)$ extra bits (see Li and Vitányi [21] page 194). Hence, the algorithmic entropy or algorithmic complexity $H(s)$ of string s using self-delimiting coding is related to the plain complexity by;

$$H(s) \leq C(s) + 2\log_2 C(s).$$

In physical situations, as has been mentioned, there are advantages in restricting algorithms to those that are self-delimiting as the Kraft inequality holds. Furthermore, while the algorithmic entropy is a measure for a particular state of the system, its expectation value is virtually the same as the Shannon entropy for a set of outcomes [2]. Indeed, for a typical outcome representing an equilibrium configuration, allowing for computational overheads, the algorithmic measure returns the same value as the Shannon entropy or, allowing for units, the Boltzmann and Gibbs entropies. Indeed, the Shannon entropy can be considered as a special case of the algorithmic entropy for strings exhibiting pattern and some randomness [12, 14]. The similarity with the Shannon entropy can be seen in relationships like $H(x, y)$ derived from the algorithm that calculates both strings x and y . However in the algorithmic case, not just x is required, but length information in the form of $H(x)$ needs to be part of the input of subsequence algorithms. For this reason, the algorithmic entropy $H(x, y)$ is given by:

$$H(x, y) = H(x) + H(y|x, H(x)).$$

For further details see Chaitin [5] and Li and Vitányi [21], while Zurek [25] applies this measure to physical systems. However in this paper, as the universal randomness test is defined in terms of plain complexity, most of the discussion will use plain complexity. Nevertheless, when the discussion involves algorithmic entropy, it will be understood that the entropy measure will be slightly greater than the plain algorithmic complexity by a \log_2 term.

Finally, the algorithmic complexity is not computable, i.e. there is no computable procedure to determine the shortest algorithm to specify a particular string. However, where a compressed description is required for structures, such as biological structures that show significant order, this is not a problem. The mere fact the structure is recognised shows the description can at least be partially compressed. Always an upper level of the algorithmic complexity exists. If more hidden structure is found, the description can be compressed further.

B. Nomenclature

In algorithmic information theory, structures that can be expressed by short algorithms are highly compressed. These structures are highly ordered, having low algorithmic complexity. The algorithmic measure of information, (i.e. the algorithmic entropy) for these ordered structures is low. On the other hand, Dembski would say that these ordered structures have high information. Most ordered structures that are observed in the living bio system are such structures. For example a tree can be specified in principle by specifying one cell in the tree; the different expressions of the simple cell, and how cells are assembled to make the tree. In the algorithmic sense a tree is a highly ordered structure, it has low complexity, low algorithmic entropy and low information content. The degree of organisation, or the deficiency in randomness then becomes high, as such structures have highly compressed descriptions. Similarly in Shannon information theory, the information is a measure of the number of decisions that need to be made to identify the outcome. In that sense it is a measure of the uncertainty of the outcome in the set of all outcomes. One can of course, as Dembski does, identify the information I_D associated with an event occurring with probability p by $I_D = -\log_2 p$. But, as is discussed later, the Dembski's approach will assign the same information content to an outcome of 200 heads tossed in a row and an outcome of 180 heads mixed with 20 tails. Both are ordered and both exhibit Complex Specified Information, yet the first outcome is far more ordered than the second. The algorithmic information theory approach does not fall into the ambiguity trap of Dembski's information definition. Furthermore, as is discussed, the deficiency in randomness provides an information measure with exactly the properties required by Dembski.

C. Deficiency in Randomness and the Universal Randomness Test

As was mentioned above the deficiency in randomness $\delta(s)$ of string s is a measure of the non randomness of an outcome s ; i.e.

$$\delta(s) = |s| - C(s).$$

As $\delta(s)$ is the difference between the uncompressed description $|s|$ and the compressed description $C(s)$, it measures the amount the description can be algorithmically compressed. It can also be seen to be a measure of the degree of organisation as it is a measure of how far the system is from equilibrium (i.e. from a random configuration) and therefore is a measure of the order embodied in the structure.

An outcome of 200 heads in a row has a deficiency in randomness close to 200-8. This outcome would be

considered a surprise, as it is extremely unlikely to be due to chance. Such a surprise outcome has low algorithmic complexity or low algorithmic entropy and represents a high degree of order or pattern.

A general Martin L f randomness test [22] involves defining a level α at which randomness can be rejected. If α is taken to be 2^{-m} , this level can be characterised by the integer m . The approach involves devising a test procedure to order all the possible outcome in terms of the value of m which specifies the rejection regime. Those that would be rejected at level $m + 1$ are nested within the set of outcomes or strings that can be rejected as random at level m . Thus m labels a nested level of subsets. At $m = 0$, all strings would be considered random while at $m = 1$ no more than half the strings would be considered random. This allows a function $Test(s)$ on the string s to be used to test whether an outcome falls in the reject region characterised by m . This test is valid test for randomness whenever

1. The value $Test(s) \geq m$; and
2. $Test(s)$ restricts the total probability of all outcomes in subset m (and its nested subsets) to be $\leq 2^{-m}$. Equivalently the total number of outcomes in the subset m is $\leq 2^{n-m}$ when there are n outcomes in total.
3. When the above conditions are satisfied, the outcome s can be rejected as being random at level m .

Clearly the larger is m , the more confidently such a string can be rejected as being random as it belongs to the rejection region α where the probability of all strings in the region is no more than 2^{-m} . The test makes sense as it restricts the number of strings in each subset. Furthermore, it also provides an upper level of the probability of any string in the subset characterised by m as the total probability for all these strings cannot be greater than 2^{-m} .

In mathematical terms the test can be expressed as:

$$\{\Sigma P(s) : Test(s) \geq m\} \leq 2^{-m}.$$

Or, in terms of number of outcomes $\#$ in the subset m ,

$$\{\#(s) \text{ where } Test(s) \geq m\} \leq 2^{n-m}.$$

While there are many valid Martin L f randomness tests, the master stroke of the Martin L f approach is that there are universal randomness tests. These dominate all other randomness tests. In other words no computable randomness test either known, or yet to be discovered, can out do a universal test. The test using deficiency in randomness is a universal test of randomness. If k is an integer representing the length of a string, there are $2^k - 1$ strings of length less than k . In the following the 1 is ignored, in which case, the number of strings with length k or less can be no more than 2^k . This puts an upper limit on how many strings can be compressed. Most

strings cannot be algorithmically compressed by much, as there are an insufficient number of shorter strings and, of these, many will not be available as they themselves may be compressed further, or they may be compressed descriptions of longer strings.

Given a set of strings of length n , such as those generated by the toss of a coin, the question is: “How many can be compressed by more than the integer m ?”. From the above it follows that fewer than 2^{n-m} strings will have the algorithmic complexity $C(s) \leq n - m - 1$. These compressible strings will have $\delta(s) - 1 \geq m$. As is discussed below $\delta(s) - 1$ is the basis of a universal randomness test as fewer than 2^{n-m} will have $\delta(s) - 1 > m$. Furthermore, the cumulative probability of all that do is less than 2^{-m} .

If all the different outcomes of a toss of 200 coins are placed in order according to how much they can be compressed; i.e. ordered by $\delta(s) - 1$, the strings can be divided into nested subsets by the integer m . Subsets with strings shorter than m are nested within the subset identified by m .

Furthermore $\delta(s) - 1$ is a universal randomness test [21]. In other words if a string can be compressed by more than m it is random at level m . An outcome of 200 heads in a row has $Test(s) = \delta(s) - 1 \geq 191$. This is random at level $m = 191$. It is a highly improbable outcome as the total probability of all outcomes at this level of compression is $p \leq 2^{-191}$. The advantage of this approach is that it tells us that an outcome like 200 heads in a row is extremely unlikely.

Thus if the Dembski test is a valid test for randomness it must be able to be represented by a universal test. Furthermore, as is shown in the next section, the use of randomness deficiency as the measure of complexity, avoids the difficulties of “specification” that Dembski raises. The measure δ by its very nature is detachable, as it is independent of the pattern it specifies and gives a robust test that also avoids the difficulty of calculating ephemeral probabilities.

III. DEMBSKI’S DECISION PROCESS TO INDICATE DESIGN

Dembski [9] claims to have developed a robust set of criteria that determine whether chance or design explains certain natural events. The decision process focuses on differentiating low probability events that occur by chance, from similarly low probability events that exhibit Complex Specified Information. Indeed Dembski claims that Intelligent Design is a theory of information [10].

For example a coin toss of 200 times is not a surprise if the outcome looks random, but is a surprise if the outcome is 200 heads in a row. The latter outcome indicates order embodied in pattern or structure. According to Dembski, in contrast to the random outcome, the ordered outcome has the following characteristics.

- The outcome can be specified using information that is independent of the outcome. I.e. a process exists to specify the ordered pattern in a way that distinguishes it from a random outcome.
- The probability of such an ordered outcome occurring by chance is low, even taking into account the possibility that everyone who ever existed spent all their time tossing coins. For example assuming that 1 trillion people have ever existed, and each spent 70 years tossing a coin every second, only something like 2^{64} different outcomes involving 200 tosses would occur. As there are 2^{200} outcomes, the chance of 200 heads in a row is still minuscule.
- In which case chance can be eliminated and the outcome exhibits design.

Before working through the logic and the mathematics of the Dembski approach the terminology needs to be clarified.

Dembski needs to distinguish events which he calls specified events from other events. For example, if a coin is tossed 200 times, a random sequence of heads and tails, has exactly the same probability of occurring as a string of all heads. Both are 2^{-200} . Dembski argues that the random sequence is different from the ordered sequence. He uses the example of an arrow being fired at a wall and a bull’s eye being painted around the arrow. That tells you nothing about the archer. However if the bull’s eye was painted first and the arrow hits the bull’s eye, the outcome is specified. Similarly an ordered sequence is specified and the random one is not. To be specified Dembski requires:

- That the probability of the event E must be independent of what he calls side information. I.e. $P(E|H, I) = P(E|H)$, where H is the chance hypothesis and I is information that will be used to specify pattern. The independence ensures that one cannot define the pattern by reference to the event, for example by painting the bull’s eye around where the arrow falls.
- The specification of the pattern is denoted by D . For example D might be the string representing the pattern in 200 heads in a row or a string representing the pattern embodied in, say, a biological structure.
- Where the event E conforms to a defined pattern D , D is said to delimit E . I.e. knowing D allows E to be specified. Thus a patterned sequence of 1’s and zeros can map on to a coin toss sequence of heads and tails. The patterned sequence D embodies the pattern in E . The side information in this case is information that leads to identifying the pattern in D . Information which defines the bull’s eye independently of the arrow is also such side information.

- A general complexity measure $\phi(D|I)$ is defined. To be consistent, the measure must have properties such as redundancy, monotonicity and subadditivity in relation to the given information I . In effect it is the measure of difficulty in defining the pattern D given the side information I . For example it could be the time, the effort, or the work needed to define D . Dembski points out that, as this measure could be the memory needed in a computer to define the pattern, the algorithmic complexity measure can be a complexity measure (see page 167 [9]). However the definition is more general and can include many different measures. As no specific complexity measure is actually defined, only examples are given, it is not clear whether, in a practical situation, a workable measure of $\phi(D|I)$ can be found, other than one based on algorithmic information theory as outlined below. However whatever the actual measure used, Dembski points out that the recognition process implied by this measure must be tractable: the pattern must be identified in reasonable time, or after a reasonable number of computational steps. As a consequence Dembski limits the degree of difficulty by requiring $\phi(D|I) < \lambda$ to ensure that the pattern is recognisable within the resource constraint λ .
- The specification process implies that the independent side information I cannot specify E directly; the pattern can only be specified via D . Hence, $I \not\Rightarrow E$ but E can be specified through $I \Rightarrow D \Rightarrow E$.

1. The decision process

Dembski's design filter is a decision process to ascertain whether design is needed to explain natural events. Once natural laws have been eliminated Dembski's decision process then becomes:

- Can an outcome, E , for example a highly complex biological structure, be explained by the regularity of natural laws?
- If not, does $P(E|H, I) = P(E|H)$, where H is the chance hypothesis? In which case E is independent of information I . For example the knowledge of how to recognise that an outcome is ordered does not change the probability of the outcome.
- Is there a process $\phi(D|I) < \lambda$ that allows the pattern to be specified?
- If so, this event has been specified independently of E . For example identifying two hundred heads in a row specifies the pattern independently of E .
- Is the probability $P(E|H)$ low? If E can occur through many repeated and independent trials Ω_E , but $P(\Omega_E|I) \leq 1/2$, then according to Dembski,

$P(E|H)$ can be considered low. (As is discussed immediately below, Ω_E captures the possibility that an event, such as the toss of 200 heads in a row might occur by chance if repeated an enormous number of times.)

- If the above shows that $P(E|H)$ is low, the outcome is the result of design.

Before offering an alternative and more robust test based on Martin L  f's randomness test, some points need to be made about multiple trials in which the event E might materialise. As repeating a trial many times, such as repeating the 200 tosses of a coin, makes a particular outcome more likely by chance. This needs to be taken into account in the decision process. The term "probabilistic resources" refers to the set of these repeated trials. For example if everyone who ever lived spent all their lives tossing a coin 200 times, the number of possible outcomes is the probabilistic resource Ω_E . Dembski claims that provided

$$P(\Omega_E|I) < 1/2,$$

$P(E|H)$ can be considered low and there is no need to define "low" in terms of a rejection level α . Dembski [11] somewhat surprisingly claims that this insight applies to more general testing of the chance hypothesis. Despite this claim, the rejection criterion that $P(\Omega_E|I) < 1/2$ fails when the number of probabilistic resources N is low. For example if N is much less than 100, the rejection region would not be sufficiently discriminating. It would be unwise, for example, to use this criterion for testing the effectiveness of a series of independent trials of a drug. If, in a series of many trials $P(\Omega_E|I)$ is just under $< 1/2$ it means the chance outcome will occur nearly half the time. This is far too high a limit. If one is to confidently decide that the random hypothesis can be rejected one would need $P(\Omega_E|I) \ll 1/2$. While Dembski's approach may be useful in comparing different sets of trials, the suggestion that it provides a robust method of deciding the rejection level for rejecting chance is not demonstrated. One cannot avoid making a judgment about the rejection region.

However the ambiguities and difficulties with Dembski's randomness can be resolved using the Martin L  f approach to randomness as is outlined in the next section

IV. THE UNIVERSAL RANDOMNESS TEST FOR DESIGN

The Martin L  f test for randomness was outlined in section II C. It involves using deficiency in randomness as the measure of the level of surprise the outcome has. Deficiency in randomness conveniently replaces the complexity measure $\phi(D|I)$ as it identifies a pattern D , that can generate the event E , given the side information embodied in programming Universal Turing Machine. The

TABLE I: Comparison of Dembski design template with one based on the universal randomness test.

Dembski decision process	AIT decision process
Regularity and necessity? I.e. a natural explanation	Omit this step
Is it chance?	Is it chance?
$P(E H, i) = P(E H)$	$\delta(D) - 1 \geq m$
$\phi(D i) \leq \lambda$	m high
D specified	Martin Löf test
Pattern D delimits E	$\delta(D) - 1 \geq m$
Probability low, i.e. $P(\Omega_E H) \leq 1/2$	Total probability in subset m $P(D) \leq 2^{-m}$
Not chance but design	Not chance
	If the system can access low entropy resources, and plausible natural processes exist to generate the outcome, design is unnecessary

measure is independent of the outcome E . Instead of a probability based test for randomness, the universal test is based on the deficiency in randomness less 1, i.e.

$$\delta(s) - 1 = |s| - C(s) - 1$$

as was outlined in section II C, can then be used to determine how non random an outcome is. Table 1 shows how the Dembski test aligns with the universal test. For example $\delta(s) - 1$ for the outcome 200 heads in a row in tossing a coin is 191 and, has been demonstrated, the probability of such an outcome can be no more than 2^{-191} . The Martin Löf version is a workable test as, given any observable structure, it is in principle possible to define the structure in terms of a pattern D . I.e. an algorithm that generates the string describing the structure. However, the randomness deficiency test will show that most living structures are not random. For example, the flagellum propulsion unit of bacteria is a very ordered structure. Its description is extremely compressed compared with a random structure made of the same materials. However does this indicate design? The answer is no, because the Dembski design filter; i.e. his decision process, is flawed.

While tossing 200 heads in a row is an extremely unlikely to occur by chance it occurs in nature, every time lodestone (magnetite) is magnetised. Magnetising a mole of lodestone is equivalent to getting something like 10^{23} heads in a row. At a temperature below the Curie temperature all the magnetic spins associated with each iron atom can align and point in the same direction. At higher temperatures the magnetic spins will be randomly aligned. The point is that natural laws have brought about an event which, from a chance point of view, would be impossible in the lifetime of the universe. Clearly, if an event is not due to chance, natural causes must be eliminated before design becomes an option. The Dembski design filter completely fails as natural laws must not be eliminated at the first decision stage, but only at the last and critical decision point. The choice to be made is

not between chance and design, but between design and an explanation based on natural laws, allowing for the possibility that the laws may involve selection processes acting on variations in structure.

Furthermore, Dembski's approach cannot give a reliable value for the probability of the surprise outcomes that he calls Complex Specified Information. For example, when he attempts to determine the probability for the occurrence of the bacterial flagella that Behe considered to be irreducibly complex [1], the attempt fails. Dembski calculates the probability based on a random generation process as he has already eliminated natural processes. As the calculation did not take into the most likely causal paths that might produce such a structure, the calculation is meaningless (e.g. see Elsberry and Shallit [16] and Miller [23]). The evidence is, that taking natural causes into account, the observed structure becomes plausible [17].

In the Martin Löf approach, once it is known how much the pattern can be compressed, an upper limit of the probability of the outcome emerges as was discussed above. Furthermore, a universal Martin Löf test cannot be bettered by any test, even one not yet conceived [21]. As the above test, based on randomness deficiency is universal [21] no test Dembski can derive will outdo the universal test.

With a robust test of randomness, and with the recognition that the choice in the end is between design and natural laws, to explain surprising events, the design filter should be replaced by the following. Table 1, provides a detailed comparison of the Algorithmic Information Theory (AIT) approach and the Dembski design filter.

1. Can chance explain this event; i.e. is it random using a Martin Löf universal randomness test?
2. If it is not a chance event, can the system access more ordered or low entropy resources externally by natural processes?
3. If, and only if, an observed natural outcome cannot be explained by any of the above steps should design ever be considered.

The following sections indicate further difficulties and inconsistencies with the Dembski approach.

2. The meaning of complexity

Complexity means different things to different people. For example algorithmic information theorists would say that the most complex strings are those that are the most random. Scientists tend to use the word "complexity" differently, to mean structures that are highly ordered and are anything but random, but are not simple either. A leaf in this view is considered a complex structure, but it is certainly not random. In practice, these highly

ordered, but non-simple structures, would appear to be far from equilibrium. Provided researchers are consistent, and state clearly what they mean, there is little difficulty. However, Dembski uses the word complexity in a way that confuses. At times he identifies increasing complexity with increasing randomness, such as when he compares a Caesar cipher with a cipher generated by a one-time pad ([11] page 78). At other times he identifies increasing complex specified information with increasing complexity (see [11] page 156 and 183). These low probability outcomes, in contrast to the one-time pad cipher, are highly ordered. As the meaning of “complexity” changes according to the context Dembski’s arguments are unacceptably confusing (see also comments by Elsberry and Shallit [16]).

3. The meaning of information

Dembski argues that information is key to unravelling the central problems of biology quoting such notables as Manfred Eigen [10, 11]. The trouble with these sorts of arguments is that there is no common understanding about what “information” means. There is no reason to believe that Dembski-information is related to the question Eigen is raising. Dembski argues for his definition of information in a number of ways. One is by comparison with information theory where a message is transmitted by a source, through a communication channel to a receiver. In the Dembski case, the source message is D embodying the pattern, and the received message is the event E . The amount of information transmitted, according to Dembski, is given by $I_D = -\log_2 P(D|H)$, assuming the chance hypothesis H . While the expected outcome of Dembski-information is the same as the Shannon measure of information theory, it does not capture the uncertainty inherent in Shannon’s approach. Quite apart from that, Dembski uses his information in a way that creates difficulties. For example, an outcome of 200 heads in a row has the same Dembski-information content, as an outcome of 180 heads mixed with 20 tails both have $I_D = 200$. Both outcomes in Dembski’s terms are detachable, and therefore both exhibit Complex Specified Information. However the 200 heads can be expressed in a little more than 8 bits and the 180 head outcome requires a little more than 94 bits (based on a compression ratio of $p\log_2 p + [1 - p]\log_2 [1 - p]$). One outcome is far more ordered than the other. For this reason, it is hard to see how this measure addresses those fundamental information requirements of biology.

Algorithmic Information Theory identifies information with the algorithmic entropy. In which case information aligns with Shannon’s measure. The Dembski-information measure assigns the maximum information to ordered low probability strings; those that in algorithmic case would have a low information measure. However, deficiency in randomness, or degree of organisation, of event E denoted by $\delta(E)$, provides a consistent mea-

sure of information in the Dembski sense as was noted by Elsberry and Shallit [16]. It is a converse of algorithmic entropy as it is the difference between a random description and the algorithmic entropy. The argument is as follows, but to indicate that prefix free coding is used, a δ_p will be used instead of δ . The Martin L f test identifies that an outcome is non random, i.e. it is ordered, when the probability of the outcome is $P(E) \leq 2^{-m}$ and $\delta_p(E) - 1 \geq m$. If one takes the lowest value of m that satisfies the test criteria then $-\log_2 P(E) \geq m$. And as $\delta_p(E) - 1 \geq m$, it follows that $\delta_p(E) > m$. Hence $\delta_p(E)$, the converse of algorithmic entropy, can be taken to be an information measure for Dembski’s purposes. It is more robust, it does not have the ambiguities of Dembski’s definition, and it ties in with current algorithmic understandings of information, entropy and order.

4. The law of conservation of information

Dembski [11] page 172 also introduces a law of conservation of information as a 4th law of thermodynamics. According to this so called law, Complex Specified Information must come from somewhere as it cannot be generated by natural causes. Effectively as Dembski-information is conserved or can only decrease [11], outcomes that indicate design, cannot occur by chance.

The argument for this law involves a somewhat convoluted discussion of the problems with Maxwell’s demon [11]. Dembski seems unconvinced that the resolution of the demon issue by Landauer [19] and Bennett [2, 3] is satisfactory as Maxwell’s demon is seen to be constrained by physical laws. To avoid this, a 4th law, the conservation of information is required to allow the possibility of an intelligent agent (one hesitates to call this agent a demon) unconstrained by physical laws. However there would appear to be a somewhat circular argument here. As the law is needed to justify the intelligent agent behind design to avoid natural explanations, the law cannot be used as an argument for design.

This can be avoided if the converse of algorithmic entropy is used as a robust Dembski measure of information as was discussed in the previous section. The second law of thermodynamics requires entropy (including algorithmic entropy) to never decrease in the longer term. The modified Dembski-information measure is the converse of the algorithmic entropy; it is the difference between randomness and algorithmic entropy. The second law then becomes Dembski-information (modified as above) can never increase. There is no need for a law of conservation of Dembski-information as it arises directly from the second law of thermodynamics.

What the second law is implying is that more order cannot arise from less order. However as is commonly known this is not a problem. The earth is not a closed system, highly ordered low entropy structures (i.e. high Dembski-information structures) emerge because the system accesses external order as high grade energy from the

sun. There is no point in claiming as Dembski does in reference [11] page 173 that, as entropy cannot decrease in a closed system, and therefore if entropy decreases, it is because of access to Complex Specified Information. Such an argument is invalid unless there is such a closed system where entropy decreases. This is a more highly sophisticated version of an argument that has refuted many times over the last fifty or more years. Section V below indicates how algorithmic information theory allows one to track entropy and information at the scale of the universe.

Without the need to justify design, the so called law of conservation of information would not have any traction even if, as is done here, Dembski-information is defined consistently. Current understandings of the second law explain all that so far needs to be explained.

5. The probabilistic resources of the universe

Dembski [9, 11] attempts to provide an upper limit on the probabilistic resources of the universe since its beginning. The figure of 10^{150} is the estimate of all possible outcomes of the universe. This, according to Dembski, gives the rejection limit for any event in the universe occurring by chance as $10^{-150} \log_e 2$. The argument however is invalid, as the states of the universe, given its initial state, are correlated. If a highly ordered configuration existed at an early time in the universe, which is certain, even allowing for the uncertainty principle, highly ordered and non random events will continue to occur as the universe moves through its state space. In other words, the alignment of about 10^{23} magnetic spins in a mole of lodestone is possible because the configuration at the present time, is strongly correlated with past highly ordered configurations. If Dembski's argument has been introduced to try and show design is needed to explain improbable events, it is flawed.

The following clarifies how algorithmic entropy tracks the evolution of the universe.

V. ORDER IN THE UNIVERSE

Algorithmic information theory provides some particular insights into Gödel's theorem [7, 8]. The algorithmic complexity of a formal logical system consists of the algorithmic complexity of the axioms and the rules of inference. If these and the possible theorems are represented in string form, such a system only identifies as theorems those strings that can be compressed by algorithms manipulating the axioms and rules of inference. Strings that are more algorithmically complex than the logical system are deemed as random. They represent theorems that are undecidable, they may be true or false within the formal system. If the known physical laws of the universe constitute a formal system, strings that represent possible theorems representing laws that are

algorithmically more complex than the physical laws are unknowable. They may represent highly ordered strings, but they are unable to be compressed using physical laws. By definition, what we take as the initial state of the universe is incompressible and unknowable from a Gödel point of view, as the part (ourselves) does not have the algorithmic complexity to compress the whole, which is a more algorithmically complex system. Alternatively, one can see that an observer, as part of the universe, has insufficient degrees of freedom to model the universe as a whole. Once the knowable, or partly knowable, physical laws emerge, humans can make some sort of sense. Shortly after the Big Bang, the universe would be in a highly ordered configuration which, at least in principle, could be compressed in terms of the logical system embodying the physical laws. Nevertheless, as the universe evolves from a highly ordered initial configuration, the algorithmic entropy increases. Because the process is far from equilibrium it is like a free expansion as new states are accessed during the evolving process.

Taking the initial unknowable state as given, and the laws as algorithmically relatively simple, the algorithm that specifies the universe will be dominated by the number of computational steps undertaken. As each step in the evolution of the universe as a whole is reversible, the description of a state following the t steps to the present time determines the algorithmic entropy of the universe (e.g. see Zurek, [25]).

```
STATE = initial state
FOR STEP = 0 to t
  Compute next STATE.
NEXT STEP .
```

(3)

The length of the reversible algorithm is

$$\approx |initial\ state| + \log_2 t + |physical\ laws|$$

and the entropy increases with $\log_2 t$. If the universe is assumed to be closed, the most likely configurations are the completely disordered equilibrium states. These will emerge after time t' where, $\log_2 t' \gg \log_2 t$. An external observer would describe the universe initially with a highly compressed algorithmic specifying the initial ordered state, but after a time t' the universe would appear to be in a random or disordered configuration.

The significance of this is that while we are far from equilibrium, the order of the universe is extremely high as the physical laws compress the information embodied, in the universe. It is this order that leads to the emergence of highly ordered structures as the universe evolves. Devine [13, 15] has argued that replicating systems play a key part in generating new ordered structures, by repackaging the existing order. Algorithmic Information Theory allows this order to be tracked consistently. Replicating processes access existing order from more ordered structures by natural means. Simple replicating systems include crystallisation processes, alignment of magnetic

spins, DNA replication and stimulated emission of photons. In such cases the emergence of new forms of order gained by repackaging existing order is no surprise. The simple example of order created by the alignment of magnetic spins discussed above, illustrates the mechanism. Order does not come from nowhere.

The replication process requires latent heat to be passed to the external environment. I.e. the thermal disorder is passed to the more ordered external environment. While the external environment becomes more disordered (its temperature increases), the system becomes more ordered by repackaging the external order. From a thermodynamics point of view, the immense amount of order inherent in the universe makes it unlikely that any external order needs to be injected in to create local ordered systems.

VI. CONCLUSION

Dembski has claimed that an explanatory filter provides a decision template that is able to provide clear evidence that structures observed in the universe require a design explanation. There are many serious flaws with this approach that are summarised below.

- Dembski's randomness test is too ambiguous to be workable and should be replaced by a universal Martin Löf randomness test based on Kolmogorov's deficiency in randomness.
- Dembski's design template eliminates natural causes too early, thereby forcing a design explanation when none is warranted.

- Dembski's attempt to define an information measure, Complex Specified Information is inconsistent. The converse of algorithmic entropy, i.e. the deficiency in randomness is a far more consistent and useful measure of the order implied by low Dembski-information.

- Even if Dembski's information measure is modified to be made consistent, the supposed law of conservation of information offers no new insights. This modified measure shows that the law of conservation of information is no more than the second law of thermodynamics. Dembski seems to need this law to justify the injection of external order into the universe for ideological reasons.

- Dembski's claim that establishing a limit on the total probabilistic resources Ω_E available requires $P(E|H) \leq 1/2$ is overly optimistic. While this does not necessarily invalidate his arguments, it does suggest that too little thought has been given to establishing rejection limits in randomness testing.

In conclusion, Dembski's approach is speculative and there is no evidence that it offers anything from a scientific point of view. That is not to say the questions Dembski raises are not worth considering. However, in contrast to the Dembski approach, the universal randomness test, and the more rational decision process considered here are consistent with current science thinking.

-
- [1] M. Behe. *Darwin's Black Box*. The Free Press, New York, 1996.
 - [2] C. H. Bennett. Thermodynamics of computation- a review. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 21(12):905–940, 1982.
 - [3] C H Bennett. Demons, engines, and the second law. *ScientificAmerican*, 257:108–117, 1987.
 - [4] G. Chaitin. On the length of programs for computing finite binary sequences. *J. ACM*, 13:547–569, 1966.
 - [5] G. Chaitin. A theory of program size formally identical to information theory. *Journal of the ACM*, 22:329–340, 1975.
 - [6] G. Chaitin. Toward a mathematical definition of "life". In R. D. Levine and M. Tribus, editors, *The Maximum Entropy formalism*, pages 477–498. MIT Press, Massachusetts, 1979.
 - [7] G. J. Chaitin. Information-theoretic limitations of formal systems. *J. ACM*, 21(3), 1974.
 - [8] G. J. Chaitin. Gödel's theorem and information. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 22:941–954, 1982.
 - [9] W. A. Dembski. *The Design Inference: Eliminating chance through small probabilities*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1998.
 - [10] W. A. Dembski. Intelligent design as a theory of information. http://www.arn.org/docs/dembski/wd_idtheory.htm, 2002.
 - [11] W. A. Dembski. *No Free Lunch: Why specified complexity cannot be purchased without intelligence*. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, Maryland, 2002.
 - [12] S. D. Devine. The application of algorithmic information theory to noisy patterned strings. *Complexity*, 12(2):52–58, 2006.
 - [13] S. D. Devine. An algorithmic information theory approach to the emergence of order using simple replication models. In *First International Conference on the Evolution and Development of the Universe*. 2008.
 - [14] S. D. Devine. The insights of algorithmic entropy. *Submitted to Entropy*, 54, 2009.
 - [15] Sean D. Devine. An algorithmic information theory approach to the emergence of order using simple replication models. http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0807/0807.0048v3.pdf, 2008.
 - [16] W. Elsberry and J. Shallit. Informa-

- tion theory, evolutionary computation, and Dembski's Complex Specified Information. <http://www.talkreason.org/articles/eandsdembski.pdf>, 2003.
- [17] D. Jones. Engines of evolution. *New Scientist*, 197:40–43, 2008.
 - [18] K. Kolmogorov. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Prob. Info. Trans.*, 1:1–7, 1965.
 - [19] R. Landauer. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5:183–191, 1961.
 - [20] L.A. Levin. Laws of information (nongrowth) and aspects of the foundation of probability theory. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 10(3):206–210, 1974.
 - [21] M. Li and P. M. B. Vitanyi. *An introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and its Applications*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1997.
 - [22] P. Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. *Information and Control*, 9:602–619, 1966.
 - [23] K. R. Miller. The flagellum unspun: The collapse of “irreducible complexity”. In W. A. Dembski and M. Ruse, editors, *Debating Design: From Darwin to DNA*, pages 81–97. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge:UK, 2004.
 - [24] R. J. Solomonoff. A formal theory of inductive inference; part 1 and part 2. *Information and Control*, 7:1–22, 224–254, 1964.
 - [25] W. H. Zurek. Algorithmic randomness and physical entropy. *Physical Review A*, 40(8):4731–4751, 1989.