

The Falsification of Irreducible Complexity?

Isn't it fun to see how the study "Evolution of Hormone-Receptor Complexity by Molecular Exploitation" by Bridgham et al (2006) published in the April 7 issue of Science is being trotted out as the death knell for Irreducible Complexity (IC). But wait, weren't we told years ago, that IC was already roundly trounced by 'hundreds if not thousands' of peer reviewed research studies? You know, the ones that Michael Behe supposedly overlooked, when he wrote Darwin's Black Box; those studies? So what's so special about this study? If IC has already been roundly refuted, then what's the big deal about this study? It seems to me that Bridgham et.al. apparently weren't aware that IC was long ago laid to rest, and this study wasn't really needed to, um, 'falsify' IC.

Why are those in the anti ID camp getting so excited about this this study? What's the big deal if IC was already dead on arrival, over 10 years ago? Something is clearly amiss. Either rumors of the death of IC were greatly exaggerated, or someone doesn't understand the real challenge that IC poses for Darwinian evolution.

Then there is the small problem of the scientific status of IC. Supposedly, IC as a concept within ID isn't really "scientific" because (so we're told) it isn't testable, it isn't falsifiable, it makes no predictions, yadda yadda etc etc. But wait again. This study is now being touted as the falsification of IC. How can that be, if IC isn't really scientific?

The famous Avida computer game, er, I mean simulation study, supposedly also falsified IC. How can that be, if IC isn't testable or falsifiable? Sure seems to be testable, and potentially falsifiable to me, and therefore scientific, which, by the way, is exactly what Michael Behe has claimed all along.

The Darwinians can't have it both ways. If IC isn't scientific, then why tout studies like Bridgham et.al. as falsifying IC? If IC is scientific, then why keep pretending it isn't. I wish they would make up their minds.

The only problem for the Darwinian crowd is that we still do not have a single, peer reviewed study in any scientific journal that actually has falsified IC. There is not even one research study in any peer reviewed journal in the ten years since Behe's book was published that provides a detailed, testable model of how any of the IC systems Behe described in his book, could have come about through Random Mutation / Natural Selection (RM/NS). Not one. Zip, zero, nada. And this latest attempt by Bridgham et.al. fares no better, for all the reasons Behe has already pointed out.

The game is simple for the Darwinians: provide a detailed, testable model of how evolution, that is to say RM and NS, built any of the IC systems Behe described in the book. Which part of detailed and testable is not understandable? Instead, they change the rules by changing the definition (sneakily at that) of what constitutes an IC system, just as we see in the Bidgham et.al study. Worse still, the Darwinians try to make it appear as if Behe himself, is the one who re-defines IC! (Just take a look see at the some of posts at Panda's Thumb about this study) What a sham!! And its all "just science" right?!?!?! Unbelievable!!

From a post by DonaldM
<http://www.uncommondescent.com/index.php/archives/1038>

Aslo see Michael Behe's post at
http://www.idthefuture.com/2006/04/the_lamest_attempt_yet_to_answ.html