

What If Anything Has Changed About Human Nature In the Last 2000 Years?

Post by “BrainToBeing” of January 9, 2024 at 10:07 AM

[Don](#) A cool word. So then we have the problem of deciding when it is "over" active. Yet, no question it does occur, and frequently. Human brain evolution made pattern-deciphering a primary goal. We are able to see the lion hiding in the grasses, the spatula only by its handle hidden in a drawer of kitchen tools, and such. We are programmed to look for "partial match" situations and then to invoke what might be their whole. Most of the time this serves us well, and we use it every day, and basically all day long. Yet, it can be over-zealous, as you point out.

So, is "Creation!" an over-zealous attempt to look for a pattern where there is none? Hmmm.

When I was in high school, I remember learning basics of organic biology and wondering: why do the atoms bother? Why bother to gather energy, form complex organic molecules and propagate organic life? What's "in it" for the atoms? I have never found an answer to that question.

In the 1950s the famous experiments of Miller and Urey tried diligently to start life in a test tube. And, the experiment has been repeated in varying forms many times. Yes, we can make amino acids. But, we cannot make them "come alive" (gather energy, create creatures, reproduce). Further, as far as we can determine, life only began one time on this planet (maybe twice if we accept the extremophile archea as separate forms of life). This isolated event(s) is in spite of incalculable seeming opportunities for it to happen again on a planet full of self-propagating life.

So, does this argue for "Creation!"? No. As I said, I currently consider that question unanswered (and I leave it at that). But, it does raise the question why the atoms bother, as I wondered in high school.