

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 25

EVIDENCE FROM THE REAL WORLD

Let us expand on our use of computer programs to grasp the sophistication of DNA and the problems evolutionists have to explain.

To understand the problems with creating the intelligence needed to design the morphing of the embryo algorithm from one species to the next species (according to evolution) consider that you have a highly, highly complex computer program that does some amazing things (it will certainly be no where near as sophisticated as the morphing of the embryo algorithms).

Then suppose your boss comes up to you and wants you to change the program so that it has four more complex and useful features.

However, your boss tells you that the original "source code" of the program was accidentally deleted so you cannot look at the original "source code" to modify it.

He also tells you that the "compiler" used to compile the old program (a "complier" converts source code to executable code) was old and was intentionally deleted and is no longer available anywhere.

He also tells you that the microprocessor that was used to execute the program is now obsolete so there is zero documentation for the microprocessor and no technical support is available from the manufacturer, which went out of business several years earlier, meaning you have no idea how the bits of the executable program are processed.

In summary, you are asked to look at, and modify, the "binary code" (which has already been compiled) to write the new computer program. By looking only at the "binary code" of an incredibly complex computer program you are expected to modify the binary code and create a much more sophisticated computer program with specific new features!! And you must do this without any source code or any information about the compiler or any technical support for how the microprocessor works!!

In fact, you aren't really sure what language the original program was written in (i.e. COBOL, C, C#, BASIC, FORTRAN, etc.).

Could anyone fulfill this assignment? The answer is 'no' because they could not reverse-engineer the compiled code to obtain the original source code without knowing how the compiler created the executable code, among other problems.

Now comes the next question: could you fulfill this assignment by using a random number generator? Obviously not.

But yet this type of absurdity is exactly the way evolution had to happen!!! There is no "source code" for DNA and there is no "compiler," there is only "compiled code," which is the DNA sequence.

But DNA nucleotides are not binary, they are "base 4" (i.e. A, C, G, T). And the algorithms on human DNA are thousands of times more complex than any computer program ever written by a human!!

To evolutionists, this may be why the "Dark DNA" section of DNA is so difficult to understand. But as I said, not even the "Dark DNA" section could control the morphing of the embryo because too much information is needed.

If a team of intelligent people could not take existing DNA and figure out how to modify the DNA to add three new genes, and add nucleotides to support the creation of the new genes, via the morphing of the embryo, how could RANDOM ACCIDENTS do it for many thousands of child species on our phylogenetic tree??

In other words, the DNA includes genes and lots of other sections, and integrated into all of this, almost magically, is the morphing of the embryo algorithm.

Evolutionists must claim that it is easy to take an incomprehensible computer program (i.e. the DNA nucleotides of an advanced species) and randomly mutate this computer program (i.e. these nucleotides) and come up with a new and improved species with new genetic information and a new and improved morphing of the embryo algorithm!!

And they must have zero failures (i.e. evolutionists essentially claim that there were virtually zero failures when the morphing of the embryo of each "parent species" was randomly mutated into the morphing of the embryo of the "child species").

What have they been sniffing??

It is insane to think that you can make random mutations to the highly, highly, highly sophisticated morphing of the embryo algorithms of one species and end up with an even more sophisticated morphing of the embryo algorithms, etc. for an improved, new species!!

Yet evolution claims that this has happened millions of times on this planet!!

As another example, suppose an airplane manufacturing company builds a new jet airplane which has several major modifications based on the "old" model.

Are the changes to the blueprints from the old model to the new model created by random number generators built into computer algorithms?? Obviously not!!

Very bright people may spend years, or even decades, making thousands of small and large changes to the blueprints!! I heard of one military airplane being designed where the claim was made that the first pilots of this new jet had not even been born yet!! Yet a human is far more sophisticated than a jet airplane.

When a new species is made from an old species, and some physical characteristic is different, numerous very sophisticated and precise changes must be made to the morphing of the embryo algorithms in many different places on the DNA!!

In other words, you cannot create a new species by accidentally copying one chunk of DNA and adding it to the DNA in some other place. You must, with incomprehensible precision, make **nucleotide-level changes in many thousands or millions of different places on the DNA strand**. In each of these places exact precision must be used in deleting, adding, and/or changing the nucleotides!!

Furthermore, you cannot damage the functionality of the DNA of the original species while designing the new morphing of the embryo algorithms. In other words, you must maintain the correct parts of the original DNA (which will apply to the new species) while you are making massive and sophisticated changes to the sections where changes are needed!! And these two sections of the algorithm (the parts being changed and the parts that are remaining the same), are all co-mingled together on the DNA!!

It is just as important to avoid changing some sections of the DNA as it is to add, delete or change other sections. You must go from precision to precision without reducing the original functionality that is not being changed.

For example, when animals supposedly "evolved" from walking on four legs to walking on two legs, very precise changes needed to be made in the DNA.

There were changes to the (DNA sections which designed the) bone structures. There were changes to the circulatory system to support the new bone structures. There were changes to the tendons and ligaments and there were new tendons and ligaments. There were changes to the brain to support the new concept of walking on two legs. Etc.

But there may **not** have been any changes to the liver or kidneys.

The changes would have not only involved many, many new genes and many new algorithms, but also the old morphing of the embryo algorithms had to be changed dramatically!!

Plus there were entirely new structures created from scratch, such as the semi-circular canal, which needed a new section of the morphing of the embryo algorithm to make!!

Changes to the DNA had to involve sophisticated changes to the **Morphing Of the Embryo Algorithms (MOEA)** in the redesign of the circulatory system, the muscles, the bones, the brain, the nervous system, etc. plus entirely new sections of the MOEA to create the new semi-circular canal, etc. etc.

All of these very, very sophisticated changes to DNA had to be made to the MOEA on the DNA of the previous species **without damaging the parts of the DNA that should be unchanged.**

And it all had to be done by a random series of accidents to the DNA of the "parent species" (there would have had to have been several generations of "parent species" to make all of these changes).

Would having several generations of "parent species," instead of one generation, make the problem easier or harder?? Think about that for a moment.

Let us assume that it took five different generations to make all of the changes to the DNA. I will call the first four of these generations: "incomplete species," meaning they had part, but not all, of the changes.

These animals would be very vulnerable because they would not be very good walking on two legs or four legs. For example, they would have had an incomplete "semi-circular" canal (their MOPA would be incomplete) and may not have been able to stand up at all.

So the changes to the DNA would need to happen fairly quickly in only one generation!!

But it is insane to think that you can create a new and improved species by taking the DNA of an existing animal and making many thousands or millions of precise, pinpoint and incomprehensibly sophisticated mutations to the MOEA on the initial DNA, create new genes, etc., at many thousands or millions of different locations on the DNA, and do this **without damaging the original good DNA** (i.e. the sections which do not change, which are co-mingled with the sections you want to change) in the process and do it in one generation!!

The theory of evolution is the ultimate in scientific absurdity after the discovery of DNA!!

Now does the reader understand why the scientific establishment has to use massively sophisticated deceptions using tricky terminology? They have zero evidence for **macro**evolution except deception.

In fact, the theory of evolution becomes more and more absurd as we study the sophistication of DNA. It is the sophistication of DNA which mandates that all mutations must be precisely placed and must yield the correct nucleotides and that you cannot damage the parts that should not be changed, even if you have no direction!!

But in spite of the absurdities and unproven claims of evolution, every time a new discovery is made by scientists regarding the sophistication of human biology, **evolution is automatically given credit for this sophistication!!** Is there no limit to the inane claims of the scientific establishment?!

How can you claim to have proven something happened by a long series of random accidents when you have absolutely no clue how it works and you cannot even remotely DESIGN the new mechanism which makes it work!!

But all of this does not prevent scientists from flippantly giving credit to evolution for everything that is discovered in biology.

But never forget, their "evidence" for evolution is completely generated by using deceptive definitions.