

# Patterns of Intelligence

## CHAPTER 8

### AN INTRODUCTION TO THE EVOLUTION DEBATE

Nineteen Fifty-Three (1953) was a pivotal year in the evolution debate. This was the year that DNA was discovered by Watson and Crick.

Just like we measure time in "B.C." (Before Christ) and "A.D." (*Anno Domini* or After Christ); we can also clearly delineate the evolution debate as: "before the discovery of DNA in 1953" and "after the discovery of DNA in 1953."

Prior to the discovery of DNA in 1953, scientists knew absolutely nothing about how plants or animals were created. Yes, they knew how an embryo morphed, and they knew about genetics, but they had no clue what was controlling the "morphing of the embryo" of humans, for example.

The "morphing of the embryo" is what I call the nucleotides on the DNA which control the trillions of "steps" (i.e. the trillions of asymmetric cell divisions) which convert the single DNA inside of a fertilized egg into a living entity with trillions of cells (in the case of humans), each of which has a full copy of the same DNA strand.

Prior to the discovery of DNA, scientists looked at the physical features of animals (or fossils) and claimed that similarities between their physical features indicated a proof of evolution by claiming these animals were "related" to each other on the "phylogenetic tree" or "evolutionary tree."

The "phylogenetic tree" is the tree that shows how different species are related to each other by evolution. Let me emphasize that, by definition, each plant or animal on the phylogenetic tree is a unique "species," though the term "species" is not always defined properly (which is actually a key piece of their deceptions).

For example, if I were to list myself, my parents, their parents (which are my grandparents), their parents (which are my great-grandparents), etc. I would have a **pedigree chart** (using a genealogy term), **not a phylogenetic tree**.

On a **pedigree chart** every person is the same species (i.e. a human being).

On a **phylogenetic tree**, however, each entity on the tree is a *different species*!!

On a pedigree chart you see terms like "father" and "son," but on a phylogenetic tree I refer to the relationships as being "parent species" and "child species." Sometimes other people also use that terminology.

"Morphology" is the science of studying the visible structures of different species to determine the evolutionary relationship between the species. Morphology became obsolete, as an argument for evolution, after the discovery of DNA, but it is still used.

The evolutionists continue to use archaic concepts because this has proven to be helpful in getting converts!! But from a scientific standpoint, "morphology" is obsolete as far as the evolution debate is concerned.

Prior to the discovery of DNA it was easy to support the theory of evolution. All you needed was someone to take a few species which had similar features and you needed someone to draw a phylogenetic tree.

Because of the vast number of animals which do live, and have lived, on this planet, almost all animals can be placed on a phylogenetic tree and be made to appear closely related to other species of animals.

Also, due to the vast number of animals which have lived on this earth, and do live on this earth, "transitional" species can usually be found. These are species which fill the gap (on the evolutionary tree) between two known species (which appear to be related to each other by evolution).

For example, with the right mix of a few key fossils; it can be claimed that there is evidence that land animals (e.g. hippopotamus) "evolved" into whales, as one of many examples of the **actual claims** of evolution.

But even with all of this visual "evidence" for the theory of evolution, all was not well for the evolutionists even before the discovery of DNA.

For example, there are many species of animals which do not appear to have "parent species" (the "parent species" is the species which had their DNA mutate into a "child species" on the phylogenetic tree) because of their unique and highly complex physical capabilities.

For example, the neck, heart, etc. of the giraffe and the unique, complex mechanisms which allow it to "stoop down" and drink without choking to death and having the blood vessels in their brain burst; do not have any parallels with other animals or fossils. In other words, giraffes have no obvious "parent species."

As a different type of example of a lack of parent species; let us consider the Cambrian Explosion. Many of the creatures found in the Canada Rockies have no known parent species.

The Cambrian Explosion brings up another issue. Darwin predicted that the number of new species found in the fossil record would gradually increase over time (i.e. this is called: "gradualism"), but the Cambrian Explosion discoveries do not fit that prediction. Many species, without any known "parent species," suddenly appeared in the fossil record.

One explanation for this lack of "parent species," in the fossil record, is that they simply haven't been found yet or that time has destroyed these transitional fossils.

Nevertheless, the problems for the theory of evolution are so well known that the scientific establishment coined the term "punctuated equilibrium" (i.e. that many species suddenly appeared in the fossil record) to take the place of "gradualism" because that is what they observed; based on many of the fossils they have found.

We immediately see a problem. Evolutionists embraced a term (i.e. punctuated equilibrium) which means exactly the opposite of what Darwin predicted (i.e. gradualism)!!

Instead of dropping Darwin's theories, they coined a new term and continued to endorse the theory of evolution using what visual "evidence" they had!! What is wrong with this picture?

But even using clever terminology, such as "punctuated equilibrium," was not saving the theory of evolution because people remembered Darwin's claims and it was obvious that the data from paleontologists was never going to support some of the key predictions of Darwin.

The fossil record was so flawed in several different ways that according to one author the theory of evolution was dying a slow death.

With the discovery of DNA in 1953 the theory of evolution should have died on the spot. Scientists now had to explain how a series of accidents could have created the highly complex DNA molecules of *millions* of different species.

As time went on things got even worse. As scientists started to unravel the *complexity, sophistication and functions* of DNA, the theory of evolution was looking worse and worse because the more complex and sophisticated DNA was found to be, the harder it was to explain that the DNA of each species was created by a long series of *accidents* to the DNA of a "parent species."

**Note:** "Accidentalism" is a term which is occasionally used to describe the core beliefs of the theory of evolution. The opposite of "accidentalism" is "design" or "creation."

For example, could an explosion in a junkyard, which was abandoned in 1946, create a brand new 2013 Cadillac that had its engine running, a CD player playing music (CDs and CD players did not exist in 1946), a satellite telephone (which also did not exist in 1946) and its headlights on?? Obviously not, and that is precisely why newer discoveries regarding the sophistication of DNA made the theory of evolution look more and more absurd,

In addition, it was learned that all plants and animals, and even single-celled organisms, have their own unique DNA or RNA. Thus, there were literally millions of unique sequences of DNA for living species and for some relatively recent extinct species (e.g. Neanderthal man, who may or may not have been a different species than humans - there is evidence both for and against this theory).

Suddenly, with the discovery of DNA, the significance of the phylogenetic tree totally changed. Scientists now had to explain where these complex molecules, called DNA, came from for every living and extinct species of plant, animal, etc.

The key question became: "how was the DNA of a 'parent species' *accidentally* mutated such that a new species, the 'child species,' was created with a new and improved DNA molecule?" And to make matters even more absurd, *the "child species" was always considered to be a superior species compared to the "parent species."*

And just as importantly, the claim was that there were no errors in the evolutionary process, meaning there are not millions of giant graveyards of failed attempts to morph one highly sophisticated DNA strand into another highly sophisticated DNA strand (for the child species). The mutations were almost always perfect the first time!! What nonsense.

**Nowhere in all of science**, except the theory of evolution, is it claimed that random accidents ever created anything that was complex, functional and highly sophisticated. And evolution claims **it has happened millions of times with very few, if any, errors!!**

Has anyone ever taken a highly sophisticated computer program (DNA is largely a computer program which is a well known fact) and randomly mutated (i.e. modified) the binary code and ended up with a new computer program that did constructive things *the original program didn't do??* Never, not once!!!

Yet evolution takes DNA, which is a computer program far, far more sophisticated than any computer program written by a human; and claims that millions of new DNA strands have been created by totally accidental events!!

*The score is **zero** (zero new and improved computer programs have been created by **random accidents** to previously existing computer*

programs) to **millions** (millions of new and improved DNA strands, for a "child species," according to evolutionists, were created by **random accidents** to the DNA of a "parent species"). **This is absurd!!!**

What is wrong with these claims is that DNA is **far more sophisticated and complex** than any computer program!!!

As the theory of evolution became more and more absurd, as scientists better understood the sophistication of DNA, **a strange thing happened.**

Instead of scientists questioning how the massive sophistication of the DNA of every species came to exist; **scientists simply gave credit to the theory of evolution for the creation of DNA, without any explanation or a single shred of scientific evidence!!**

But they did not do this overtly; they did it very subtly using very, very clever definitions.

Was the discovery of DNA a "proof" of "creation science?" Absolutely!! Randomness never creates intelligence and certainly not millions of different kinds of intelligence with few, if any, failures in the process.

Yet, due to massive deceptions, particularly by using very clever definitions, very few people ever understood how dramatic the discovery of DNA demonstrated the absolute absurdity of the theory of evolution.

This book will make it very clear how absurd the theory of evolution is because of the discovery of DNA. My larger book, which is also free and on this website, goes into even more detail on this issue, but in a largely different way.

This book will also very carefully and slowly walk the reader through the maze of deceptions which are daily being used by the scientific establishment to mislead their students and the general public.

Their deceptions, as the reader will see, are so clever that those students who believe in the theory of evolution have nothing to be ashamed of, as was already mentioned!! **The theory of evolution is the most sophisticated scientific hoax of all time** and millions of people have been deceived by this fraud.

Before getting too technical, let us next talk about the "politics" of the theory of evolution.