

## God Made Me

### MAN – Psalm 8; 139:13-16

#### Some Background to our Study

In 1993, **Philip Johnson**, a professor of Law at the University of California, Berkeley, convened a group of scientists and philosophers from across the world at Pajiro (Pahiro) Dunes, CA to discuss the evidence of recent science as it related to the mystery of life's origin. Ultimately, the discussion turned to the question of whether life came about by chance and necessity... or did it result from intelligent cause? (Was there purpose, plan, design due to intelligent causation?)\_Johnson invited an array of scholars with unquestioned academic credentials who had done major work involving the origins of life.

**Michael Behe** (Ph.D. in biochemistry; University of Pennsylvania; dissertation research on sickle-cell disease; postdoctoral work on DNA structure at the National Institute of Health; professor of Biochemistry, Lehigh University)

**Dean Kenyon** (professor of biology at San Francisco State University; Ph.D. biophysics from Stanford University; National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Fellow in chemical biodynamics at the University of California at Berkeley; research associate at NASA-Ames Research Center, and a visiting scholar at Trinity College, Oxford University).

**Steven C. Meyer** (Ph.D. Cambridge, England, in history & philosophy of science; specialist in the methodology and Interpretation of Origin of Life studies; professor, Whitworth College)

**Paul Nelson** (Ph.D. from the University of Chicago department of philosophy; specialist in recent developments in embryology and developmental biology; author of *On Common Descent*, volume sixteen in the University of Chicago department of ecology and evolution's "Evolutionary Monographs" series (the first in this prestigious series to critique neo-Darwinism).

**William Dembski** (mathematician, Ph.D. University of Illinois, Ph.D. University of Chicago, Post-doctoral work at MIT, Taught at Northwestern and Notre Dame, Author: *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance Through Small Probabilities*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998)

### **Their questions were basically these:**

“How can natural processes have assembled the intricate structures found in living cells?”

“In light of recent biochemical findings, can chemistry (chemical change) account for life on earth?”

“Should we seek new approaches to our teaching concerning the origin of genetic coding in living organisms and how they came to be?”

The good news is that there is a rising awareness that Evolution is bad science. Science purports to follow the evidence, relying on empirical verification for its conjectures. And it is increasingly evident that the evidence is mercilessly denying randomness as an explanation for the elegant designs embodied in the machinery of the universe. The writings of Denton, Behe, Johnson, Dempski, and Meyer have turned the thinking of objective scientists upside down. The rebuttals to Darwinism come from virtually every field of science: paleontology, chemistry, physics and, quite conclusively, microbiology.

### **More Darwin**

In the last 50 years we have learned more about nature than since the beginning before that time. Darwin wrote ORIGIN OF THE SPECIES in 1859 (ALMOST 150 YEARS AGO)...He did not have the science behind him we have today. The basis of Darwin's theory is that nature presents variety, then nature selects from that variety the parts that can survive the best, they are the ones which can bring forth the next generation with improvements. And over long periods of time, lots of those improvements makes a new kind (species).

Darwin said in Origin of Species, p. 219: “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.”

The more we know about organisms and life, the more problems Darwinism has. The more obvious it is that his answer is flawed.

### **“Irreducible Complexity”**

Knowledge of the cell exploded in 1950s...the cell is not just a blob of plasm. A thimble full of cultured liquid can contain more than 4 billion single cell bacteria, each packed with circuits, assembly instructions, and miniature machines... the complexity of which Darwin could never have imagined.

Cells are complex machines holding, carrying, and transferring more data than any computer. Cell functions are controlled by these millions of mini-machines. They are called “Bacterial Flagellum.” They are like outboard motors... no chance assemblage of the parts. Each of the multiple parts is necessary for function.

Now this leads us to what is called by Behe, “Irreducible Complexity.” In cells, there are multiple parts. All the parts are necessary for the cell to live & function (Behe illustrates this with a mousetrap). You remove one part and you lose the function of the whole.

This principle applies to biological machines. There are forty protein parts necessary to the function of the bacterial flagellum. If any is missing, it won't work. This could not have evolved in individual stages. How can you build it gradually when no function till all is in place??? Darwin's theory is destroyed. And this relates to all life (because there is DNA, proteins, bacteria in all life).

## **The Eye**

Darwin could not have known at the time that his illustration with the eye of a finch would not work. The eye is too complex. If one part does not work, none works. So how could one part begin by itself and be passed on to another generation. Not only must all the parts be present, but they must be put together in certain ways at certain times... like building a house.

Remember Darwin's Words in Origin of Species, p. 219: “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.”

Can you think of a complex organ that could not possibly be formed by numerous successive, slight modifications. THE HUMAN EYE!

Darwin himself said, “To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree.” Origin, p. 217.

Your eye adjusts its focus.

The eye adjusts for light.

The eye automatically fixes aberrations.

On the next page (218), Darwin tries to explain why it is wrong. He said first eye was simple and not complex what we have. There are creatures which have a photosensitive spot only. So that is the original eye and all other eyes came from that. What about that???

In last fifty years we have learned how the eye functions at the chemical level. The chemistry of vision. Retina is where light received and signal sent to brain (simplified). Individual rods and cones which make up the retina... Neurons can be seen now. Darwin knew nothing about it. See even deeper. All the microscopic elements. Now we know that the membranes operate in a very complex way. This chemistry had to work in the simplest photoreceptor... could not have developed because every element in it had to be there for all the levels of eyes. Change in shape of molecule changes the proton then chemical changes. There is an ion chain...all this together determines if you can see or not. Charges and currents go to the brain... If all of this is not in the cell at once, you do not see... you are blind. There is also a set of enzymes which starts reproducing the elements while the system is balancing itself. I won't bore you with the chemical terms but any level of sight requires all this. Did this happen by accident... Darwin didn't realize that if you take one piece of this out, none of it works.

This had to be designed. And we have not talked about the conscious effect of all that on the brain.

### **Biochemistry of Blood Clotting**

We take healing for granted. How does your blood know to clot at the right time, not too much, not too little. You can clot to death (blood clots give heart attacks and strokes). Or not clot (hemophiliacs). Our system ordinarily works properly at the chemical level. Intrinsic pathway and extrinsic pathway of blood clotting. In cross-link clotting, 13 separate proteins required and must be in order. Every step depends on the previous one. Nothing will happen unless you have it all. Can't have evolved a little at a time. You die without it all.

### **Other Bodily Systems may be examined in the same way:**

Cardiovascular system, Digestive system, Reproductive system, Immune system, Nervous system, Neurological system, etc.

**C. G. "Colly" Caldwell**