

DNA & Similarities

DNA

DNA similarities between one creature and another are irrelevant — it is the differences that count. Genetic differences are such that no two species will ever accidentally mutate into a different species than what the DNA specifically codes for. DNA puts definite limits on how much a species can adapt, and this is against evolution and favors creation by a Designer who wasn't relying on natural selection. DNA differences are dramatic and unexplained. For even one gene to evolve by natural selection, it would take longer than the entire timeframe given by mainstream scientists.



JUNK DNA: “Junk DNA” or non-coding genomic regions, has been claimed in the past by some as the best evidence of Darwinian evolution. (Bob Enyart Debates Ph.D. Eugenie Scott <http://kgov.com/journal-nature-junk-dna-not-junk-bob-enyart-vseugenie-scott>) The “junk DNA” argument appears to be evaporating. Douglas Axe reported on the challenges of random mutations being responsible for the origins of functional protein folding in his publication in 2004 in the journal Science Direct. (Estimating the Prevalence of Protein Sequences Adopting Functional Enzyme Folds <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022283604007624>) According to Axe's experiments, “the overall prevalence of sequences performing a specific function by any domain-sized fold may be as low as 1 in 10^{77} .” For a comparison of that number, there are believed to be 10^{80} sub-atomic particles in the entire Universe. According to his research, relying on random processes to get “de novo” proteins is out of the realm of statistical possibility regardless of the billions of years that one could imagine.

RECENT MITOCHONDRIAL EVE: Scientists have also found that parents of the entire human race existed only a few thousand years ago: “If molecular evolution is really neutral at these sites, a high mutation rate would indicate that Eve lived about 6500 years ago — a figure clearly incompatible with current theories on human origins.” (Mitochondrial Eve, TREE, vol. 12, No. 11, November 1997, p422) The Nature Journal echoed these facts when it said, “Simulations based on a model of human population history and geography find that an individual that is the genealogical ancestor of all living humans existed just a few thousand years ago.” (John Hein, Nature, 30 September 2004, p518) If you don't need tens of thousands of years to find the original humans, those years probably do not exist!

Stephen Meyer in “Darwin's Doubt” summarizes limits of NeoDarwinism's genetic claims as follows: “1. Neo-Darwinism has no means of efficiently searching available combination space for functional genes and proteins and consequently 2. It requires unrealistically long waiting times to generate even a single new Gene or protein, and the new mechanism cannot produce body plans because 3. Early acting mutations, the only kind capable of generating large scale changes, are also invariably deleterious and 4. Genetic mutations cannot in any case generate the epigenetic information necessary to build a body plan.”

Meyer also makes these points against evolution's genetic claims in “Darwin's Doubt” as follows: 1. Mendel showed that Darwin's idea of blended inheritance is not correct. The discoveries of Mendel posed many problems for Darwin's theory. 2. Richard Dawkins had a computer program re-create a phrase, but this does not really mirror natural selection because natural selection isn't given a phrase to look for. 3. Evolutionists make claims about genes evolving that are as unsupported as alchemists' claims about lead turning into gold. 4. Evolutionists make claims about gene mutation very similar to taking a book, rearranging its paragraphs randomly, changing the spelling of words, reordering the page number, the page arrangement etc., and expecting a more advanced book to be made from this random process. 5. Given Earth's currently assigned age, there is not enough time for one single gene to evolve, much less an entire series of evolutions that make animals and humans. 6. Evolutionists come up with wildly imaginative scenarios and on the rare occasion when they attempt to put them to the test, the tests fail. 7. The types of mutations that do occur are not those required by macroevolution. 8. The types of mutations that do occur are not the types of mutations required by macroevolution. 9. There is no sufficient variation, which means there can be no sufficient selection, which means there can be no evolution of species. 10. Microevolution observed in nature only explains the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fittest.

98% SIMILAR CHIMP DNA CLAIM

- Chimps' genomes are 4.3% bigger. This doesn't match the claim of 98% similar DNA.
- They intentionally left out a lot of information. The **real similarity is between 66 and 86%**, which doesn't allow for the hundreds of millions of changes in the time allotted for evolution.
- We also have similar genetic similarities to cows and dogs and corn.
 - (About **40-60% similar with bananas**. About 84-94% similar to dogs. About 85% similar to mice. About 70% to slugs.)
- (Go figure, the same engineer used similar coding for his various creations!)
- The 98% similarity figure **ignores** roughly **18% of the chimp** genome and **25% of the human** genome that do not align well.
- Differences include **35 million** single nucleotide differences **and over 40 million insertion/deletion** events (indels).
- Common sense check: We seem pretty different to me!

HOMOLOGIES (SIMILARITIES)

There are similarities between humans and other animals. These similarities are over generalized and over simplified by evolution advocates. We also share many differences. Indeed, the fossil record shows significant differences between all species, and a lack of transitional fossils between various species. Many **museum displays** of human evolution, whale evolution, etc., include **theoretical figures** not yet discovered and other frauds (many of which are exposed by Dr. Carl Werner).

Common sense check: Hold up your hand next to your dog's, or the leg of your horse. They look pretty different to me!

Homologous structures were **known to be signs of a common designer** until evolutionary theorists foisted their dogmatic view on everyone, insisting that these rather mean a common ancestor. (See Stephen Meyer, “Darwin's Doubt”) Jonathan Wells points out the hypocrisy of Darwinists reaching into every field of science and claiming others' discoveries for Darwinism. Wells says we might as well coin a new verb of “being Darwined” when your ideas get stolen!

Nature doesn't show signs for transitional species. As Henry Morris pointed out, if cats and dogs came from a common ancestor, **there would be 1000s of cat-dog** species — you wouldn't be able to tell where the cat began and where the dog ended, there would be so many cat/dog variants walking around. Some

comedians have pointed out that if we came from monkeys, why are there still monkeys? Why didn't they evolve? Are they the retarded monkeys? This is one of the many logical fallacies that keep evolutionists up at night scrambling to put together some kind of imaginative story to cover their tracks.

Scientists have argued about **which animal would have been the most direct ancestor** of humans. Some point to octopus, others to the rat, and so forth. Why? Because there are similarities we have with various animals on various levels. The octopus and human eye are similar, so did we descend from an Octopus? If so, then why are we so different from an octopus in almost every other way? Snakes and frogs are closer to humans than humans are to monkeys when it comes to the specific gravity of blood. This fact has some evolutionists saying our grandpa was more directly a snake than a monkey! The rat disease of the Dark Ages only attacked people and Norway rats. So, did we descend from rats more directly than all other animals? One scientist concluded that due to similarities in calcium phosphorous ratios in bone structures, we are directly related to turtles and elephants, and monkeys came from geese (or geese from monkeys), and that the dog was related to the horse, not the cat. Let's take it one further - my vacuum cleaner and I both have a long cord (I have a long intestine cord), so I must share a common ancestor with the vacuum cleaner! All hail the holy vacuum cleaner!

Scientist prophet Russel M. Nelson said, "Through the ages, some persons without scriptural understanding have tried to explain our existence by pretentious words such as *ex nihilo* (out of nothing). Others have deduced that, **because of certain similarities between different forms of life, there has been a natural selection of the species, or organic evolution from one form to another.** Still others have concluded that man came as a consequence of a "big bang," which resulted in the creation of our planet and life upon it. To me, **such theories are unbelievable!**" (Elder Russel M. Nelson p. 9, *The Power Within Us or The Magnificence of Man*, March 29 1987, BYU Devotional.)

GENETIC HOMOLOGY

Genetics don't match up with homologous structures. In research summarized by Jonathan Wells and Paul Nelson, it has now been discovered that at times "non-homologous structures [are] produced by organisms with supposedly homologous genes, but organisms with different genes can also produce similar structures." (Homology: A Concept in Crisis <http://www.arn.org/docs/odesign/od182/hobi182.htm>)

An article available in Trends in Genetics 2009 reported report that "10-20% of genes lack recognizable homologs in other species." (More than just orphans: are taxonomically-restricted genes important in evolution? <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19716618>) In other words 10 – 20% of genes in species don't have evidence of ancestry. This is further discussed in an article available in Nature Reviews, Genetics 2011. It said, "[E]very evolutionary lineage harbors orphan genes that lack homologues in other lineages and whose evolutionary origin is only poorly understood. Orphan genes might arise from duplication and rearrangement processes followed by fast divergence; however, *de novo* evolution out of noncoding genomic regions is emerging as an important additional mechanism." (The evolutionary origin of orphan genes <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=The+evolutionary+origin+of+orphan+genes%2C+Nature+Reviews>) This sudden appearance of genetic material by "de novo", or out of nothing, through material process, lacks credibility in the light of several other studies.

In the journal Nature in 2012, the ENCODE Project revealed that by their analysis, 80 percent of the human genome has a "biochemical function" (An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the human genome <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v489/n7414/full/nature11247.html>)

Ewan Birney, ENCODE project's Lead Analysis Coordinator, said, "It's likely that 80 percent will go to 100 percent." (ENCODE: the rough guide to the human genome, By Ed Yong | September 5, 2012 <http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/notrocketscience/2012/09/05/encode-the-rough-guide-to-the-human-genome/#.WImL0nllCM8>) This level of functionality in a genome removes most all of the opportunity for non-coding regions of the cell to be the incubators for the "de novo" or out of nothing sudden emergence of proteins.

Evolutionists claim both differences and similarities between animal species as evidence for their theory. (Hint: this is circular reasoning.)

VESTIGIAL 'LEFTOVER' APPENDAGES

At one time evolutionists listed 180 vestigial structures in the human body. (Darrow, Clarence and William J. Bryan. (1997). *The World's Most Famous Court Trial: The Tennessee Evolution Case* Pub. The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd. p. 268)

The human coccyx isn't useless like they thought; it supports weight, supports muscle, & helps balance. The whale pelvis isn't useless like they thought; it is essential for reproduction.

In the past these structures were routinely surgically removed and discarded. Today it is recognized that every one of these structures in the human body serves a purpose. (Vestigial Organs Not So Useless After All, Studies Find, National Geographic News, <https://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2009/07/090730-spleenvestigial-organs.html>) (See also Dr. Jerry Bergman, George Howe, *Vestigial Organs Are Fully Functional: A History and Evaluation of the Vestigial Organ Origins Concept Book*) (See also the book *Useless Organs: The Rise and Fall of a Central Claim of Evolution* 2019 by Jerry Bergman)

Things once working in organisms can break down. Fish living in a cave may, after a period of time, lose their sight, etc. But considering human life, each of these structures once claimed to be vestigial has shown function or purpose. (Dr. Jerry Bergman, George Howe, *Vestigial Organs Are Fully Functional: A History and Evaluation of the Vestigial Organ Origins Concept Book*)

EMBRYOLOGY

When we view human embryos as animals, is it any wonder that we have no shame in terminating them? As one evolutionist put it, "... some opponents of abortion respond that the fetus, unlike the dog or chimpanzee, is made in the image of God, or has an immortal soul. . . . But there is no evidence for these religious claims, and in a society in which we keep the state and religion separate, we should not use them as a basis for the criminal law. . . ." (Neo-Darwinist Peter Singer, Dept. of Bioethics, Princeton University, "Abortion, the dividing lines," Herald Sun, August 25, 2007)