

# Patterns of Intelligence

## CHAPTER 21

### MORE ON THE POLITICS OF EVOLUTION

So how do creationists or creation scientists, the totally ignored and persecuted good guys who love truth, explain the existence of new genetic material?

The answer of "creationists," as to where DNA came from is this: all DNA was designed by God for each species.

In other words, they are saying that [accidental] **macro**evolution never happened, but what did happen is that the Intelligence of God designed the DNA of all species. How God did that we do not know, but we do know that DNA was not created by accident. There is nothing random in DNA, only careful design.

This puts the burden on the Intelligence of God to design and create the DNA of all species. In fact, this is a far better answer than the randomness of evolution because it focuses on intelligence as the source of new DNA, namely the Intelligence of God, who is a lot smarter than we are.

Furthermore, this claim does not fall into the trap of dealing with impossible statistical problems which would occur by trying to claim that **macro**evolution occurred by random mutations to DNA. This comment will be better understood later.

Evolutionists are well aware of the facts (at least some of them are aware) and they do everything they can to distract the attention of the student away from the statistical problems the discovery of DNA has created for evolution.

True "evolutionists," by commonly accepted definitions, say that there is no God and that the DNA in each species came from totally accidental mutations to the DNA of a prior species.

While there may be some that say that God and evolution both exist independently of each other, and that God "helped" evolution, this hybrid of religion and evolution is not really part of the evolution debate because God exists in this scenario, and the existence of God is the key difference between evolutionists and creationists.

While true evolution may have occurred two or three times for bacteria, in the history of this planet, the odds that these two or three instances were or will be observed by scientists is zero. Scientists only analyze the DNA, under controlled conditions, of an almost infinitesimally small percent of all single-celled

organisms on this planet. Thus, we can ignore these hypothetical events, but they could happen in theory.

In our hypothetical controlled experiment mentioned above, the modifications to DNA to generate new genetic material would have to be totally accidental, **unintentional** and without any direction in order for the study to be evidence for evolution!!

I use the term "**unintentional**" on purpose. There is no scientific evidence that "**wishful thinking**" on the part of an animal can initiate any changes to its DNA, much less generate the correct changes!!

### **MORE ABOUT RANDOMNESS**

Let us look at more examples of randomness.

In the real world, randomness never creates anything useful, much less highly sophisticated and functional; and human DNA is the most sophisticated and functional object on earth!!

To put it another way: randomness always creates total chaos, meaning total nonsense! But DNA is as far from chaos as can be imagined!!

For example, no physics book has ever been written purely by a computer program that created random letters, numbers and symbols. Every physics book has been written by an intelligent human being.

DNA is far more sophisticated than any physics book.

Furthermore, if you took an existing physics book, written by a human being, and randomly took chunks of the book (to represent genes) and randomly moved them around and pasted them into other parts of the book; along with randomly adding letters, adding randomly generated charts and adding random numbers; you would not end up with a more advanced physics book for more advanced physics students!! No "intelligence" has been added by randomly moving things around and randomly adding things.

Furthermore if you randomly combined an advanced physics book with an advanced chemistry book you would not end up with an advanced book on both physics and chemistry. But more importantly, you would not generate advanced concepts that were **not in either** of the original books.

Likewise, if you randomly combined two computer programs you would not end up with one superior computer program which does everything both of the

original programs did plus it did things **neither** of the original computer programs did!!

Even if you did this process very slowly, in small chunks, over billions of years of time, to simulate evolution in real time, it would still not end up being a superior computer program!!

Remember, evolution requires massive amounts of time. **But using massive amounts of time does not solve any statistical problems!!!** Computers can be programmed to work very, very, very slowly, but that doesn't solve any of the statistical problems of the theory of evolution, it only spreads the problems out over time. "Time" doesn't change statistics.

For example, suppose the probability that an existing physics book could be improved (by executing 30 random mutations) was one in a quadrillion. Would this probability change if a slow computer was used instead of a fast computer?

Of course not.

No thought-provoking novel has ever been written by a computer program that generated random letters of the alphabet. No cookbook has ever been written by a computer program that generated random letters and numbers.

No jet airplane has ever been designed by a computer program that generated randomly drawn schematics. Also, no jet airplane was built by an explosion in an aluminum factory.

No high-rise building has ever been designed by a computer program that randomly created architectural drawings. And so on.

Yet all of these things are childish compared to the sophistication and massive complexity of DNA!!

Evolutionists claim that the massively complex and sophisticated DNA of *millions* of different species were all created by a long series of total accidents, meaning random mutations to DNA!!

They claim that given enough time, the single, crude RNA or DNA strand of the "first living cell" could "evolve" by random mutations to nucleotides, into the DNA of human beings and millions of other species.

Lots and lots of "time" and very, very gradual changes are always the key argument for evolutionists that the theory of evolution is true. Given enough millions of years the statistical problems of the theory of evolution just seem to melt and vanish into thin air!!

But using "lots and lots of time" and "very, very gradual changes" to create a new computer program (written very slowly by a random number generator and a really slow computer processor) is not going to create a massively complex and functional computer program.

Adding "time" doesn't fix any statistical problems!!

Computers today are many quadrillions of times faster than evolution could have occurred, so doing things slowly and gradually is not necessary. The massive horsepower of computers can simulate billions of years of evolution in a few days or a few weeks.

But even with this massive computer horsepower, the theory of evolution has never been even remotely vindicated by computer simulations!! Quite the opposite is true. Computer simulations always demonstrate the absurdity of evolution, which is exactly why evolutionists don't use them and why they say they are useless (i.e. i.e. they try not to allow them in evolution debates)!!

Evolutionists are the only scientists standing on a deserted island when they make their claims that very slow random, undirected accidents over millions of years can create millions of new highly, highly sophisticated computer programs (called DNA)!! And they make their claims talking about the most sophisticated computer program on earth - human DNA.

To think that the highly sophisticated DNA of an existing species could randomly mutate into the DNA of an even more sophisticated species is as absurd as saying that a computer program written by a ten year old child could randomly mutate into a program that could launch an astronaut into space.

The truth is that the statistical problems of the theory of evolution have gotten worse and worse as the understanding of the capabilities of DNA, and how sensitive it is to mutations (i.e. errors), have become better understood.

Also, never forget the massive number of failures evolution would create when a randomly mutated DNA strand failed to create a viable new species. Where are these failures in the fossil record?? They do not exist!!

But scientists quickly figured out a way to deal with the massive, massive statistical problems of the theory of evolution. They very quietly have used their power to control information and have very carefully buried their embarrassments from public view and from their students by using deceptive definitions!!

They "blacklisted" or "ignored" or "buried" or "don't talk about" the problems with their cherished theory of evolution (at the DNA level) and continue to talk about their ubiquitous phylogenetic trees, natural selection, survival of the fittest and

above all: **micro**evolution (but using the word "evolution"). They see **micro**evolution in action and call it "evolution" in order to deceive their students.

They have continued to talk about how "gradual" and gentle evolution occurred over many, many, many gazillion years.

If you ever debate an evolutionist, ask them to show proof that a scientist has ever observed **macro**evolution, meaning they have observed at least one new gene be created by accidents of nature. Until they can do that, there is nothing to debate.

To them, truth is irrelevant and their statistical problems must be buried!! After burying their problems, they pretend there are no statistical problems and that the critics of evolution were "not true scientists" and are not playing fair.

To *this day*, the main "evidence" for the theory of evolution is still based on pre-1953 technology, meaning phylogenetic trees, natural selection, examples of **micro**evolution (i.e. deceptive terminology), etc. In fact, many "fossil digs" going on today are designed to find "missing links" on the phylogenetic tree!!

Scientists still refuse to honestly confront the issues of DNA and **macro**evolution, which are post-1953 issues, though they have now come up with some very clever statistical tricks to talk about DNA and evolution. But these new tactics don't look at permutations of nucleotides, nor do they demonstrate how evolution could have overcome its statistical problems.

If you read any pro-evolution book, you will see numerous references to natural selection, survival of the fittest, morphology, phylogenetic trees, etc. Rarely are the words "**micro**evolution" or "**macro**evolution" actually used.

If these words are used, they will claim they mean the same thing or that **macro**evolution is lots and lots of examples of **micro**evolution over a long period of time.

But above all you will see massive numbers of examples of **micro**evolution being used to "prove" the theory of evolution.

Never is a serious attempt made, by the evolution establishment, to test the validity of evolution by using random number generators in computer simulations or by using containment facilities and real animals!!

Several key examples of the mathematical problems of the theory of evolution will be given later in this book. The reader will see very, very, very clearly why the theory of evolution is scientific nonsense and why **macro**evolution has never been observed.

Before going on, let me repeat Mr. Johnson's brilliant quote because by now the reader should understand it better:

"Science [i.e. the scientific establishment] is committed to **philosophical naturalism** [i.e. atheism in this context] and therefore science must assume that no Creator, and no purposeful intelligence, is behind our existence ... All that science can address is the question of: 'granted that we are here as a result of purposeless material mechanisms, what's the **most plausible purposeless material mechanism** that we can imagine?'"  
Phillip E. Johnson, professor, author, attorney; quoted on UCTV

They chose the theory of evolution as the "**most plausible purposeless material mechanism**" because they were atheists. However, because the theory of evolution has failed to "prove" evolution because of the discovery of DNA (the discovery of DNA exposed the differentiation between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution), they have had to invent many types of deceptions. The most common types of deception they have used are the use of tricky definitions and to assume the theory of evolution is true.

Truth was never their goal and will never be their goal because the foundation of their "research" is based on philosophical naturalism (i.e. atheism). Anything that does not support philosophical naturalism is buried.

They will never consider anything to be "scientific" if it challenges their commitment to atheism.

This is why there is such a vast difference in scientific beliefs between evolutionists and creationists. It has nothing to do with science, but has everything to do with evolutionists protecting their core belief of atheism.

Now let us dive into the realm of the "morphing of the embryo" algorithms, the most sophisticated computer programs on earth by a wide, wide margin!!

It is the development of these highly sophisticated computer programs, and how they need to be changed from species to species, that makes the theory of evolution the most absurd "theory" on the planet earth. It takes two chapters just to provide an overview of these programs.

The next two chapters will be very challenging. **Don't get hung up if there is something you do not understand**, just more forward.