## **Technical Challenge on Design**

Written by Administrator Wednesday, 17 July 2013 02:02 -

Technical challenge on design as evolutionist writes; "Eukaryotes, such as ourselves, have several different biochemical mechanisms for generating energy, including glycolysis, Kreb's cycle and oxidative phosphorylation (based on the principle of chemiosmosis), the latter of which provides us with the most efficient use of food molecules, and is therefore considered to be the most advanced. However, the principle of oxidative phosphorylation via chemiosmosis seems very, very complicated, as if it were tailored to 'fit on the end of' the Kreb's cycle and glycolysis metabolic pathways, rather than as if it had been instantly designed from scratch. In other words, the design seems far too cumbersome, having to use huge ATP synthase enzymes, as well as several large transport proteins, all of which seems a bit wasteful for something designed instantly by an intelligent entity."

**Editorial Comment**: Just because enzymes are large does not make them wasteful. They actually need to be large to do their work. There is more to an enzyme that just the reaction centre. Enzymes must be regulated, and this means they must interact with other molecules in the cell. Furthermore, some enzymes need to be bound to cell membranes, in precisely the right place, in order for them to work. Like catalysts in industrial chemical processes, enzymes have to be in the right place at the right time and under the control of already existing feed-back and regulation mechanisms. Otherwise the whole system will not work. Study each enzyme in depth, and then try to make a smaller version of each one that actually does the same job, and you will find out the weakness of your evolving theory.

Since these enzymes work with greater efficiency than any man made machine, you should stand back in awe as you remember the modern science of nanotechnology gets much of its inspiration from the way biological molecules work. At a philosophical level: why does something that is designed "instantly" have to be simple? Time doesn't make systems complicated, knowledge and power does. The old rule applies -the smarter you are the faster the job gets done whether it is big or small. Furthermore, our sceptical friend admits that oxidative phosphorylation looks as if is "tailored to fit at the end of Kreb's cycle". Things that are "tailored" are the result of design and craftsmanship, not chance random processes.

**Evolutionist Continues**: "It seems more plausible to believe that the oxidative phosphorylation pathway developed after glycolysis and Kreb's cycle, as a way to make the already existing system more efficient, i.e. as a way to 'make do' with what was already in place, and incorporate it into an improved scheme, rather than completely redesigning it."

Editorial Comment: Please note that your thesis means that before the complex mechanism of

## **Technical Challenge on Design**

Written by Administrator Wednesday, 17 July 2013 02:02 -

Chemiosmosis came about, which produces ATP molecules by passing hydrogen ions through huge turbine-like ATP synthase enzymes, there had to be some biochemical machinery already present in the cell that produced Hydrogen ions, and then concentrate them into a specific area of the cell - exactly what the electron transfer chain now does. But your stage by stage theory means the enormously complex biochemical details of the basic electron transfer chain, the first part of oxidative phosphorylation, make no sense, as the electron transport chain only works with the Krebs cycle functioning - one is both pointless and useless without the other.

If you assume this system evolved in stages then what is the point of a cell having a pre-existing mechanism for making and concentrating hydrogen ions? They are not much good for anything else, apart from digesting food - a destructive process that occurs outside cells. Large amounts of Hydrogen ions are in fact dangerous if let loose anywhere inside a cell. Therefore, if the process originated within an evolving cell, it would destroy it - which means that it is absolutely vital that the whole system was designed as a complete process from beginning to end.

Both the editors of this newsletter studied biochemistry as evolutionists, and remember being impressed by the size and complexity of Kreb's cycles and its associated metabolic pathways, as displayed on wall sized charts in university biochemistry labs (and somewhat daunted by having to learn it all). However, we recognised that the complex multi-step system enabled energy to be efficiently extracted from food, and be constantly regulated according to the cell's needs at any one time.

**Evolutionist Continues**: "Thus, the entire mechanism for energy release in cell seems very clumsy and cumbersome for an intelligent design, but ingenious for a gradually changing, gradually improving system that began as a simple, inefficient metabolic pathway, and developed, evolved, into a highly efficient energy release mechanism."

**Editorial Comment**: No eukaryotic cells show any sign of having ever had a simpler system, so the belief that one existed is blind faith. If there was simpler system that worked why would a more complex one evolve?

The punch line: test your "step by step" theory by trying to make a copy of the Krebs system to find what you actually have to do to make it work, remembering that the scientist who worked out how the process of chemiosmosis works, (just one part of the whole process), received a Nobel prize for his creative intelligence. We recommend you swap your blind faith to objective faith in the creator Christ. In the end your theories won't satisfy your intellect, let alone your

## **Technical Challenge on Design**

Written by Administrator Wednesday, 17 July 2013 02:02 -

eternal soul. Neither will they deal with your sin. Jesus promises to do both and that if you seek him with all your Heart you will find him. We did.

Evidence News 9 February 2007