Patterns of Intelligence

Chapter 27

The Concept of "Randomization"

The creation of a new species from an old species would have had to include many large, randomly created or modified sections of DNA. In doing this a species would *lose intelligence* in its DNA as the DNA was "randomized."

The term "randomized" means you are mixing "existing intelligence" (i.e. the DNA or RNA of an existing species) with "randomization" (which comes from the new and additional nucleotides which were randomly obtained) which will actually reduce the overall intelligence on the DNA.

As a simple example, suppose you took a highly sophisticated computer program which worked just fine and did some highly complex calculations.

Then suppose you created another, smaller computer program which didn't do anything because all of its 'bits" were randomly chosen by a random number generator.

Then, suppose you shuffled the two computer programs together. Would you end up with a computer program even better than the one that did highly complex calculations? Never would this happen because you have "randomized" the original program by shuffling worthless nonsense into the original program which was designed by intelligent programmers.

But with evolution, all new nucleotides for a new species must be randomly chosen, thus the "new nucleotides" for the new species, as a group, will be randomly chosen, by definition. When they are mixed in with the existing DNA, the existing DNA will be randomized and will lose intelligence.

Likewise, if we took all of the "new" or "changed" nucleotides of a new species, where all of the changes were randomly generated, and we only considered these additions and changes; this flagged subsection of DNA, regardless of where it was scattered on the DNA, would have no intelligence. We saw this above with the flat histogram.

Thus, if we mixed or merged DNA sequences from real human DNA (the above chart demonstrated intelligence on the DNA) with any randomly generated DNA (which cannot contain any intelligence, much less add intelligence - the flat histogram); the resulting DNA will have **less intelligence**, not more intelligence.

This is what "randomization" means, you have taken intelligence and lessened the intelligence by inserting worthless nucleotides which contain zero intelligence.

"Evolution," which by definition is pure randomness, can only **reduce** the functionality of DNA because it is mixing good DNA with randomly chosen DNA!!

You could do the same thing with a textbook. Take an electronic version of a mathematics textbook and insert random letters, numbers and symbols into the textbook. The usefulness of your math book will drop significantly.

Could you improve on a complex physics book by randomly peppering this book with random letters of the alphabet and random numbers in random locations? Of course not.

When you randomize DNA you end up with less intelligence, not more intelligence because you are essentially mixing good DNA with worthless, randomized DNA.

Thus, "evolution" from a "parent species" to a "child species" cannot do anything but lessen the intelligence on the DNA of the "child species" relative to the "parent species."

Yet, with evolution the "child species" is always considered to be an improvement from the "parent species." But in truth, the "child species" will always have **less intelligence** on its DNA than the "parent species" (if it even survives) because the added or changed DNA of the "child species" was randomized DNA which was added to, or mixed in with, the functional DNA of the "parent species."

The truth is that evolution, if it were true, would have started out with no intelligence (the RNA/DNA of the fictitious "first living cell") and progressively this worthless DNA/RNA would have gotten worse in each successive species by randomizing worthless DNA with mutations which also have zero intelligence.

How could human DNA have resulted from this process, which only goes backwards!!!!

Evolution claims life started out as a totally randomized section of DNA/RNA (on the "first living cell") and then evolution randomized it many thousands of times (once for each of our ancestor species) and then it claims the result was the highly sophisticated DNA of humans!! How much more absurd can you get!!

I am going to repeat that again:

>   Evolution claims life started out as a totally randomized section of
>   DNA/RNA (on the "first living cell") and then evolution randomized it

many thousands of times (once for each of our ancestor species) and then it claims the result was the highly sophisticated DNA of humans!!

Now perhaps you are beginning to understand why evolutionists quit talking about DNA in evolution debates and why they quit using the terms microevolution and macroevolution and they quit debating altogether and why they are currently talking about natural selection, phylogenetic trees, microevolution (but using the term "evolution") and why they continue to dig for "missing links."

As mentioned earlier, "natural selection" and "survival of the fittest," are valid scientific principles which apply to microevolution. These are not the problem.

Scientists must use deception because there is no evidence for macroevolution.

What about the issue of "time." Evolutionists claim that it took evolution many millions of years to create human DNA. Evolution took lots and lots of time.

Does that help the theory of evolution? Does it change the results of statistics?

I have talked about "time" before.

What if you slowly constructed a new physics book using very slow computers over a time period of millions and millions of years? Would creating the book slowly make the book any better than by doing it quickly? Obviously not.

These are yet more effects of randomness which evolutionists conveniently ignore. You don't increase intelligence when you randomize something, even if you randomize it very slowly.

"Time" does not add intelligence or change the laws of statistics.

Atheism, the official religion of evolution, prohibits any "intelligence" from "designing" the DNA of the "child species" from the "parent species," because that would imply the existence of God.

Darwin rejected any intelligence from above (i.e. God), thus only "random accidents," at the DNA level (Darwin knew nothing about DNA so I am applying his theories to DNA), can be used by evolutionists to explain how evolution created all species, all the way back to the "first living cell," which would now be extinct.

With the discovery of DNA, evolutionists now had to explain how human DNA could have been created by totally random mutations to the DNA of our "parent species" and all of our "ancestor species," all the way back to the "first living cell."

3

This is nonsense because randomization never makes things more intelligent, it always lowers the amount of intelligence.

Combining DNA

What if we combined the DNA of two species which had very similar DNA, but they were slightly different? Would that create a new and improved species?

Try that with two computer programs, which were about the same size but did totally different things. Would you end up with a new computer program that did sophisticated things that neither of the original programs did (in addition to the things that both of the original programs did)? Not a chance. At the DNA level you cannot create new intelligence by randomly mixing two existing intelligences.

On the other hand, those who believe in God claim that all people could theoretically (if the birth records existed) trace their genealogy back to Adam and Eve (who were created by God).

In fact, partially using Biblical records, some people *can* trace their ancestry all the way back to Adam and Eve (e.g. the genealogy of the wife of President George Washington has been traced back to Adam and Eve)!!

You have to have Jewish ancestors to do this because much of the genealogy, when you go far enough back, would come from the Bible.