

# IF YOU BELIEVE IN EVOLUTION

A COLLECTION OF COMMONLY KNOWN  
TRAITS AND GENETICS, WITH CITATIONS,  
THAT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN CREATED BY  
EVOLUTION

By Charles R. Chesnutt, Sr.

For God so loved the world that He gave  
His only begotten Son, that whosoever believes  
in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

John 3:16

**“Buy the Truth and sell it not.”**

Proverbs 23:23

©2019 by Charles R. Chesnutt, Sr. all rights other than those  
expressly relinquished below are reserved:

### **Free to Distribute**

This copy may be emailed to anyone. It (or any copy of it) may be downloaded, translated into any language, copied, printed and/or distributed in whole or in part, digitally or in print, without any fee or further permission from the publisher. But it may not be sold, nor may any portion of it be sold.

Distributed copies or parts of copies must contain this page.  
Quotations need only provide appropriate credit to the author and the website [BIBLEBOOKS.CO](http://BIBLEBOOKS.CO).

Revisions of this work are determined by the date published.

This edition was published on March 16, 2019.

## CONTENTS

If You Believe in Evolution...	<a href="#">4</a>
DNA	<a href="#">5</a>
A Quadrillion Connections	<a href="#">8</a>
Gene Editing	<a href="#">11</a>
Memory	<a href="#">15</a>
Vision	<a href="#">17</a>
<b>K</b>	<a href="#">18</a>
Anti-scientific Argument	<a href="#">20</a>
Hypothetical Falsifiability	<a href="#">23</a>
Knowing the Creator	<a href="#">25</a>

## If You Believe in Evolution...

WHAT DO YOU REALLY BELIEVE  
IF YOU BELIEVE IN EVOLUTION?

What do you believe if you believe in evolution?

1. If you believe in evolution, you believe that life was not created by God but was created by a series of thousands of accidental beneficial mutations that enabled some animals to survive when others died.
2. You believe that God never created anything.
3. But you may, as Darwin did, acknowledge that a significant degree of complexity in the design of life would disprove evolution:

"If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ could not have been formed by numerous successive, slight modifications my theory absolutely would break down."<sup>1</sup>

What about you? Would you believe in evolution if there was a complexity so vast that mutations and survival of the fittest could not account for it?

This paper shows you scientific discoveries of a complexity so vast that mutations and survival of the fittest can neither account for it nor explain it.



---

1. Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species* (John Murray, Albemarle Street, London, 1859) p.189: [HTTP://WWW.GUTENBERG.ORG/FILES/1228/1228-H/1228-H.HTM](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/1228/1228-H/1228-H.HTM)

# DNA

NINETY THOUSAND FORMULAS  
INSCRIBED UPON A MOLECULE



DNA is a molecule found in every cell of our body. It contains the chemical formulas for all of the different proteins that our body needs. All of the formulas are written in a code.<sup>2</sup> This is much like the Morse Code, but the Morse Code is written with dots and dashes. The DNA code is written by arranging four different molecules into various patterns.<sup>3</sup> The DNA code is the code for some 90,000 complex chemical formulas for proteins.<sup>4</sup>

So, if you believe in evolution you have to believe that accidental changes in animals (mutations) and survival of the fittest somehow came up with the correct formulas for 90,000 different human proteins, invented a language to write them all down and inscribed them upon a molecule.

But, of course, just writing down the formulas does not produce the proteins. In order to do that the accidental changes and survival of the fittest had to invent a tiny mechanism that can copy just one protein out of 90,000 formulas, leave the DNA unaltered, take the copy, translate the copy and then create the protein from the translation.<sup>5</sup>

---

2. "The sequence of bases in DNA operates as a true code in that it contains the information necessary to build a protein expressed in a four-letter alphabet of bases which is transcribed to mRNA and then translated to the twenty-amino-acid alphabet necessary to build the protein." *The Genetic Code in DNA* (Georgia State University): [HTTP://HYPERPHYSICS.PHY-ASTR.GSU.EDU/HBASE/ORGANIC/GENCODE.HTML](http://HYPERPHYSICS.PHY-ASTR.GSU.EDU/HBASE/ORGANIC/GENCODE.HTML)

3. *What is DNA* (National Institutes of Health, 2015): [HTTP://GHR.NLM.NIH.GOV/HANDBOOK/BASICS/DNA](http://GHR.NLM.NIH.GOV/HANDBOOK/BASICS/DNA); See also See *Wikipedia* (Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., 2015), s.v. DNA: [HTTP://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/DNA#CITE\\_REF-1](http://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/DNA#CITE_REF-1);

4. "The human genome contains approximately 3 billion of these base pairs, which reside in the 23 pairs of chromosomes within the nucleus of all our cells. Each chromosome contains hundreds to thousands of genes, which carry the instructions for making proteins. Each of the estimated 30,000 genes in the human genome makes an average of three proteins." *The Human Genome Project Completion: Frequently Asked Questions* (National Human Genome Research Institute, 2010): [HTTPS://WWW.GENOME.GOV/11006943](https://WWW.GENOME.GOV/11006943); See also *Inside Life Science* (National Institute of General Medical Sciences): [HTTP://PUBLICATIONS.NIGMS.NIH.GOV/INSIDELIFESCIENCE/GENETICS-NUMBERS.HTML](http://PUBLICATIONS.NIGMS.NIH.GOV/INSIDELIFESCIENCE/GENETICS-NUMBERS.HTML) (100,000 different proteins).

5. See *From DNA to Protein* (University of Illinois at Chicago): [HTTP://WWW.UIC.EDU/CLASSES/BIOS/BIOS100/LECTURES/F04AM/LECT14.HTM](http://WWW.UIC.EDU/CLASSES/BIOS/BIOS100/LECTURES/F04AM/LECT14.HTM)

It is hard to believe that accidental changes accidentally wrote down the formula for just one complicated protein. But 90,000 strains our common sense.

But there is more far more complexity, because there is much more to DNA than just the formulas for 90,000 proteins.

Evolutionary scientists called the other portions of DNA the "non-coding portions" because they did not believe that they contained anything of value. They called it "junk."

But now, those same scientists have discovered that the non-coding portions of DNA are part of the DNA design and are not junk at all:

The ENCODE project has revealed a landscape that is absolutely teeming with important genetic elements—a landscape that used to be dismissed as “junk DNA.” Were our old views of how the genome is organized too simplistic?<sup>6</sup>

If we consider all of the DNA molecule, there are three billion specific uses of the four "letters" of DNA. All of the information contained in all of DNA would fill 462 volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica.



How can that be? Each full page of print in that encyclopedia contains two columns of 72 lines. Each line contains an average of 50 letters. Therefore, there are approximately

---

6. *Hidden Treasures in Junk DNA* (Scientific American, 2012) Vol. 307, Issue 4: [HTTP://WWW.SCIENTIFICAMERICAN.COM/ARTICLE/HIDDEN-TREASURES-IN-JUNK-DNA/](http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/hidden-treasures-in-junk-dna/); There is controversy regarding whether all of non-coding DNA is utilized. The latest word (January 2015) comes from Francis Collins, the Director of the National Institutes of Health in the United States, "I would say, in terms of junk DNA...it was pretty much a case of hubris to imagine that we could dispense with any part of the genome as if we knew enough to say it wasn't functional." JP Morgan Healthcare Conference in San Francisco, January 13, 2015.

7200 letters on each page. Discounting the picture pages, there are approximately 900 pages in each volume. There are therefore approximately 6,480,000 letters in each volume. There are 3 billion letters in a DNA strand. Three billion divided by 6,480,000 equals 462 plus a fraction. The DNA strand is therefore approximately equal to 462 volumes of the Encyclopedia Britannica.

Therefore, if you believe in evolution, you believe that unobserved theoretical mutations (genetic errors) and environmental pressures invented all the proteins, put together a DNA molecule, invented the language to be used with the DNA, wrote down 90,000 complicated formulas into the *molecule*, invented a way to copy the formulas one by one, to translate them one by one and use that translation to produce 90,000 separate proteins accurately.

Anyone who believes that unobserved accidental genetic errors produced all of that would, perhaps, believe anything—at least anything necessary to avoid believing in God.

But there is far far more complexity in life than just DNA.



## A Quadrillion Connections

A QUADRILLION INSTALLED, ORGANIZED  
AND TIMED CONNECTIONS



*There are 1,000,000,000,000,000* neurological connections in a human brain. Each one of these is organized into a *massive* network and timed to the nanosecond.

This is a network that is so vast that it contains approximately the same number of organized connections as there are leaves on the trees in a forest that is half the size of the United States:

"In terms of complexity, an individual cell is nothing when compared with a system like the mammalian brain. The human brain consists of about ten thousand million nerve cells. Each nerve cell puts out somewhere in the region of between ten thousand and one hundred thousand connecting fibers by which it makes contact with other nerve cells in the brain. Altogether the total number of connections in the human brain approaches  $10^{15}$  or a thousand million million.

"Numbers in the order of  $10^{15}$  are of course completely beyond comprehension. Imagine an area about half the size of the USA (one million square miles) covered in a forest of trees containing ten thousand trees per square mile. If each tree contained one hundred thousand leaves, the total number of leaves in the forest would be  $10^{15}$ , equivalent to the number of connections in the human brain!"<sup>7</sup>

That is a forest approximately the size of Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Iran combined. Or the size of Continental Europe or twice the size of India. It is simply impossible to sincerely believe that this happened by a series of beneficial genetic errors (beneficial mutations).

---

7. Denton, Michael, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Adler & Adler, 1985), p 330. Dr. Michael Denton is a Australian molecular biologist and medical doctor who has lived and worked in London, Toronto and Sydney and who is best known for his biological research. This example assumes 100,000 leaves on each tree.



This is the equivalent of trillions upon trillions of minute wires connecting all of the leaves to form an incomprehensibly complex network, a network that produces thought, emotion, vision, smell, hearing, touch, taste, logic, wisdom, control of all autonomic functions and everything else the brain does.

Evolution's explanation for this is that beneficial mutations occurred over millions of years and that some of those mutations gave an organism a survival advantage by adding brain connections in the right spot. This allegedly happened over and over throughout all of the generations until finally we have a human brain that has 10000000000000000 organized connections all timed down to the nanosecond.

That is evolution at a rate of 2 new connections each minute for 4 billion years,<sup>8</sup> or 1,051,000 new connections each year.<sup>9</sup> And that is assuming no errors. The new connection would have to be installed, organized and operating to give the organism a survival advantage.

But science has shown beneficial mutations to be extremely rare. The most generous estimate is 1 beneficial mutation in every 150 mutations.<sup>10</sup> That means that the actual, observed rate of beneficial mutations could not possibly account for 2 new fully installed, organized and timed connections (without error) for 4 billion years.

---

8. There are 1460000000000 days in 4 billion years. When 1015 is divided by this number the result is 684 new connections each day. There are 1440 minutes in each day. This is a rate of two new connections each minute for 4 billion years.

9. There are 525,600 minutes in a year. At a rate of 2 connection per minute, that is 1,051,000 new connections each year.

10. "...there is a lot of disagreement about the frequency, and even the existence, of beneficial mutations. In any case, they certainly are rare (estimates range from 1 in 150 new mutations to completely nonexistent). And it is important to note that, while changes like those listed above are certainly helpful, it is hard to see how they can introduce any significant changes into a species overall. Even widespread changes like the increase in lactose tolerance are unlikely to contribute to any sort of macroevolution event." Erika Knott, *Examples of Beneficial Mutations in Humans* (U. of Alabama at Huntsville): [HTTP://RATIOCHRISTL.ORG/UAH/BLOG/POST/EXAMPLES-OF-BENEFICIAL-MUTATIONS-IN-HUMANS/2011#.VSQ4SVNF98E](http://ratiochristl.org/UAH/BLOG/POST/EXAMPLES-OF-BENEFICIAL-MUTATIONS-IN-HUMANS/2011#.VSQ4SVNF98E) (a pro-Creationism website).

"Most mutations are neutral. Nachman and Crowell estimate around 3 deleterious mutations out of 175 per generation in humans (2000). Of those that have significant effect, most are harmful, but the fraction which are beneficial is higher than usually thought. An experiment with E. coli found that about 1 in 150 newly arising mutations and 1 in 10 functional mutations are beneficial (Perfeito et al. 2007)." *Claim CB101* (The TalkOrigins Archive, 2008): [HTTP://WWW.TALKORIGINS.ORG/INDEXCC/CB/CB101.HTML](http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/cb/cb101.html) (a pro-evolution website).

Consider just one connection. First of all, the dendrite (the "wire") must connect to the single proper receptical out of perhaps hundreds of available recepticals.

Second, is timing and construction of the dentrite. The dendrite must be constructed so that the electrical signal travels through it at the proper speed so that the signal reaches the proper destination at precisely the right instant. The corresponding signal on the other end, or perhaps a transfer of the original signal charge, must be properly joined. That means that the signal as well as any corresponding signal must commence and arrive at the right place and at the exact instant that is necessary for the network to execute the requisite calculation. If not, then a cascade of innacuracies will inevitably follow. Remember, we are dealing with electricity travelling inconceivably small distances, so timing has to be down to the nano-second or less.

What happens if the dentrite does not connect to the proper location or what happens if the timing is off? Evolution argues that the inaccuracy is corrected in a later generation of the organism when a cosmic ray or something else alien to the organism alters the hereditary mechanism that constructs the dentrite and causes it to connect to a different location, or causes it to be timed differently. After a while, as mother nature fiddles around with the connection, she finally gets it right and the fortunate organism is better equipped for survival.

The problem, of course, is that there are 10000000000000000 of these connections in a human brain and all of them, as well as the language they use to communicate and the mathematical computations that they perform, are supposed to have been created, organized, timed and and installed by millions of unobserved extremely fortunate accidents for the accidental purpose of producing abstract thought, sensory perception and self-awareness.

It is beyond reason to conclude that all of this was created through the random effects of accidental mutations and environmental stresses. No one could believe that unless his mind has been firmly locked by an unalterable prejudice or by an unalterable theological conviction that there simply is no God.



## Gene Editing

### THE LAST NAIL IN EVOLUTION'S COFFIN

There are three areas of the theory of evolution.

The first is where there is cross-breeding within a species and an external influence diminishes the population of one variety and leaves the other to predominate. This is a change within a species but nothing evolves. It is the natural re-arrangement of previously existing dna; no new species new is produced.

The second area is where there is are beneficial mutations in the genetic structure that amplify the ability of the altered organisms to survive. Those altered organisms predominate (natural selection) and they do create a separate species. This is classic Darwinian evolution, also called macroevolution. But there is very little evidence, if any, that can be used to directly support macroevolution.

The third is where there is an actual genetic change within a species that enables an altered form of that same species to survive better than before. This is an adaptation within a species and it is called microevolution. There is clear and ample evidence of adaptation within a species.

What is the cause of this adaption? Darwinists theorize that the adaptation is caused by mutations of particular genes such that the resulting organism is better able to survive. If so, then adapted versions of organisms of the same species would be evidence of classic Darwinian evolution because more of those changes could result in a different species.

In order to demonstrate the mutation of particular genes, one need only compare the original gene and the improved gene and show that they are different. This can be done with the gene-mapping techniques now used.

The Garrett and Rosenthal study set out to do exactly that. The subject that they chose to study was an octopus that had adapted to live both in the tropics and in the frigid waters of Antarctica.

The tropical version of the octopus cannot survive in frigid waters because the temperature of the water drastically slows the transmission of its nerve impulses. But the same octopus thrives in the antartic. The only difference between the warm water octopus and the cold water octopus is an amino acid that is produced by a the same gene in each

octopus. Therefore, if the octopus is a product of Darwinian evolution, a study of the same DNA in each octopus (the same gene) should show a mutation.

The gene in the warm water octopus produces an amino acid called isoleucine. Whereas the same gene in the Antarctic octopus produces an amino acid called valine. Valine works in cold water; isoleucine works in warm water.

Garrett and Rosenthal expected to find that the gene that produces these amino acids to be different in each octopus because the amino acids that it produces are different. But they did not. They found that both genes were the same. The gene had not mutated.

On the basis of conventional natural selection, we hypothesized that the channels' genes would have evolved mutations to help tune them to their respective environments. Surprisingly, the primary sequences encoded by the two genes were virtually identical.<sup>11</sup>

But if the genes were identical, how could they produce different amino acids? Where does the valine come from? If the DNA is the same then how can the amino acids be different? The answer to that question closes the lid of the coffin of evolution for anyone whose mind remains open.

The Garrett and Rosenthal study discovered that there is a molecular mechanism inside the cell that takes the RNA copy that is normally used to produce isoleucine and reprograms it to produce valine.

[T]he transcribed messenger RNAs are extensively edited, creating functional diversity. One editing site, which recodes an isoleucine to a valine in the channel's pore, greatly accelerates gating kinetics by destabilizing the open state.<sup>12</sup>

---

11. (Garrett, S. and J.J. C. Rosenthal. 2012. RNA Editing Underlies Temperature Adaptation in K<sup>+</sup> Channels from Polar Octopuses. *Science*, 334 (6070): 848-851)

12. (Garrett, S. and J.J. C. Rosenthal. 2012. RNA Editing Underlies Temperature Adaptation in K<sup>+</sup> Channels from Polar Octopuses. *Science*, 334 (6070): 848-851, quoting from the Abstract

How does this work? The cells of the octopus make a copy of the isoleucine gene for the purpose of producing a molecule of isoleucine. This copy is called RNA and this copying is a natural occurrence in all cells. The isoleucine RNA is not isoleucine itself but instead it is an arrangement a series of 4 different molecules that express a code that is used elsewhere to produce the isoleucine molecule.

But the octopus has something else. Embedded in the octopus cells is a chemical machine that takes the isoleucine RNA and re-programs it to produce valine instead. This machine physically changes the molecular arrangement of the isoleucine RNA to become the correct code for valine instead. So here is a mechanism that moves molecules of RNA around to re-code it. See Garrett, S. and J.J. C. Rosenthal. 2012. RNA Editing Underlies Temperature Adaptation in K<sup>+</sup> Channels from Polar Octopuses. *Science*, 334 (6070): 848-851)

Whoever created this molecular engine had to:

1. Know the DNA coding language;
2. Know that the “fix” for the warm-water octopus is valine.
3. Be able to recognize the isoleucine RNA;
4. Know the formula and the coding for valine;
5. Know the formula and the coding for isoleucine;
6. Know how to alter the arrangement of the molecules of the RNA instructions for isoleucine and change it to valine;
7. Physically rearrange the molecules of the isoleucine code into the code for valine;
8. Have a chemical switch that would activate the isoleucine gene-editing mechanism when the water reached a certain temperature;
9. Know how accidental mutations devised a non-physical code with only four letters and then used that knowledge to encode 20,000 chemical formula into a molecule is absurd.

All of this would be wholly useless to the survival of arctic octopus unless it were all in place and operational. So none of this can be incremental changes over generations.

This demonstrates that not all genome changes occur at random and that cells produce specific mechanisms to optimize their genome in response to the environment.<sup>13</sup>

How complicated is this recoding? The mRNA code for isoleucine has 9 letters (ATT ATC ATA). The mRNA code for valine has 12 letters (GUU GUC GUA GUG). With 12 letters, the chances for the valine code occurring by accident are 1 in 3,628,800 (and that is after reducing the chances to account for the double U in the first three and the double G in the last). And for this to have evolved through natural selection not only would the mechanism have to have evolved the ability to write the valine code, but also the mechanism itself would have to have evolved. And the mechanism itself could not have any effect on the survival of the octopus in cold water until the mechanism itself as well as the coding had been perfected.

If you believe in evolution you do not believe that accidental mutations changed the DNA of the octopus. You believe that somehow accidental mutations created a chemical machine that knows how to rearrange the RNA molecules that express the CODE that produces isoleucine to become the code that expresses valine instead. No open minded person could believe that. It is simply absurd.



---

13. (Garrett, S. and J.J. C. Rosenthal. 2012. RNA Editing Underlies Temperature Adaptation in K<sup>+</sup> Channels from Polar Octopuses. *Science*, 334 (6070): 848-851)

## Memory

MEMORY IS NOT WRITTEN INTO THE  
CONNECTIONS OF THE BRAIN, BUT  
INTO THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE  
MOLECULES FORMING  
THE NERVE CELLS

If you are an evolutionist, you believe that random chance produced a system for storing memories into the electrical arrangement of the individual molecules in your brain:

"Taken together, these findings suggest that the most likely unit of information storage during learning is not the neuron itself, but rather the molecules that comprise it."<sup>14</sup>

The molecules are coded with a binary electrical code, similar to the code used in your computer.<sup>15</sup> And they are time-stamped:

"An MIT team led by Institute Professor Ann Graybiel has found groups of neurons in the primate brain that code time with extreme precision. 'All you do is time stamp everything, and then recalling events is easy: you go back and look through your time stamps until you see which ones are correlated with the event.'<sup>16</sup>

Therefore, there is a mechanism that 1) writes what we perceive with our senses into a code, 2) time-stamps the code from a neurological clock,<sup>17</sup> 3) writes that code into the molecules that comprise the neurons in our brains and 4) indexes them for immediate retrieval.

---

14. Clark, Gregory A. and Hawkins, Robert R. D. (1988). *Learning and the Single Cell: Cellular Strategies for Information Storage in the Nervous System*. In Davis, Joel L., Newburgh, Robert W., and Wegman, Edward, J. (Eds.) *AAAS Selected Symposium: 105. Brain Structure, learning and memory* (pp. 1-31) Boulder, CO; Westview Press, Inc..

15. "We believe that NMDA receptor activation—and reactivation—may serve to inscribe the ensemble activity patterns of the neural cliques that encode memories, thereby linking memory traces from the molecular level to the network level" Tsien, Joe Z. *The Memory Code* (Scientific American, July 2007), pp. 52 at p. 59. In this article the memory code is referred to as a binary code.

16. *Time-keeping Brain Neurons Discovered* (ScienceDaily, Oct. 23, 2009): <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/10/091019162921.htm>.

17. "We have sensory receptors for light, sound, touch, hot and cold, and smell, but we don't have sensory receptors for time. This is a sense constructed by the brain." Id.

And how are these memories recorded? They are coded, just like DNA, with a non-physical, purely logical *language* that evolution cannot hope to account for.

What is evolution's explanation for these things? All those animals that developed the code and the means to write the code into the arrangement of molecules had a survival advantage. That explanation, as all of their explanations, sidesteps that true issue: How did rare beneficial mutations come up with a non-physical language and a way to write it on trillions upon trillions of molecules—and index it so as to be able to find the particular molecules that contained the coded memory and the demand of a thought? The answer to that question is not accidental mutations and dying animals. The answer is that this incomprehensibly complex design must have been designed by a Designer.





## Vision

THERE IS NO PROJECTOR INSIDE YOUR HEAD. IT IS ALL DIGITAL CODE THAT DESCRIBES MILLIONS OF COLORS



Each eye captures a pattern of light and then separates it into 126 million electrical signals (the number of rods and cones in both eyes).<sup>18</sup> All of these 126 million electrical signals change whenever the eye moves. So they are constantly changing. They are electrical codes that are used to describe *millions* of different colors.<sup>19</sup>

These codes are transmitted to a living computer that can read the code instantly and processes millions of electrical signals, all of which change whenever an eye moves.

When the computer (the brain) processes this data it creates an accurate full color, three dimensional, high density, full motion representation of what lies in front of our face.

The computer (the brain) then recodes it into memory packets that "summarize" what was seen and writes them into the arrangement of the molecules in the brain—and indexes them.

It is simply beyond reason to attribute this computing power to

Science solidly rejects a method where conclusions are based upon "no actual evidence." Thus, this particular evolutionist has abandoned the scientific method. He has abandoned the scientific method because use of the scientific method brings one to the conclusion that it is far more likely that a Creator designed our eyes and  $10^{15}$  organized neurological connections rather than a bunch of unobserved genetic mistakes.



---

18. The number of rods and cones in eyes is well established, as well as the fact that each one of them produces a coded signal. *Rods and Cones* (Hyperphysics, Georgia State University, 2015): [HTTP://HYPERPHYSICS.PHY-ASTR.GSU.EDU/HBASE/VISION/RODCONE.HTML](http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/vision/RODCONE.HTML)

19. Leong, Jennifer, *Number of Colors Distinguishable by the Human Eye*, ed. Glenn Elert (The Physics Factbook, 2006): <http://hypertextbook.com/facts/2006/Jennifer-Leong.shtml>.

# K

## THE MOST POWERFUL COMPUTER IN THE WORLD

If you believe in evolution, you believe that the human brain, which is a massive computer, was never programmed by anyone. Its programming simply happened because of dying animals, the environment and genetic mistakes.

There is another massive computer known as K. It is in Japan and it is the largest man-made computer in the world. According to Wikipedia, K is so large it requires 9.89 megawatts of electricity to operate. That is the equivalent of the amount of electricity needed to run approximately 10,000 suburban homes. Fujitsu, the maker of the computer, does not publish the physical dimensions of K, but photographs show that K is enormous. It is so enormous that one does not describe K by the number of feet, but by the number of aisles of computer cabinets. There are at least 12 long aisles. K has more than 80,000 2.8 GHz 8-core SPAR64 VIIIfx processors and it computes at the rate of 10.51 quadrillion computations per second.<sup>20</sup>

Recently, K was used for a human brain simulation program.

For the brain simulation, a team of programmers programmed K to simulate a neural network of 1.73 billion brain cells that interconnect with 10.4 trillion synapses; 82,944 processors were necessary and the memory required was in excess of that contained in 250,000 PC's. This massive programming effort was accomplished by an international team of programmers working together from 2009 through 2013. The task was enormous because computer programmers had to incorporate every one of the 10.4 trillion virtual synapses into the program. The result of the work was to create a brain simulation program that would simulate 1% of a human brain for one second.<sup>21</sup>

---

20. "The K computer is the world's first supercomputer that broke the 10 petaflops barrier. So how fast is 10 petaflops? The number ten "peta," or 10 quadrillion corresponds to 1 followed by 16 zeros. In Japanese, this is expressed as one "Kei." That is why this supercomputer is called the K computer. 10 quadrillion worth of computations is equivalent to the world's 7 billion people each performing one computation per second, 24 hours a day for about 17 days. The K computer is able to do all of those computations in just one second." *The K Computer is Incredibly Fast* (Fujitsu, 1995-2015): [HTTP://WWW.FUJITSU.COM/GLOBAL/ABOUT/BUSINESSPOLICY/TECH/K/WHATIS/SYSTEM/](http://www.fujitsu.com/global/about/businesspolicy/tech/k/whatis/system/)

21. *Largest Neuronal Network Simulation Achieved Using K Computer* (Riken, 2013): [HTTP://WWW.RIKEN.JP/EN/PR/PRESS/2013/20130802\\_1](http://www.riken.jp/en/pr/press/2013/20130802_1), which article, as well as others on the Internet describes K and its brain simulation program.

At this speed, K can process 52 billion computations in the brain simulation program in 1/25 of a second, which is the time it takes to open and close a conventional camera shutter. Each computation is logical and each one occurred pursuant to a pre-designed computer program that had been written by the team of programmers.

When all was ready, they tested their program and it processed approximately 1% of the data that a human brain processes in one second. And K did it. The test was successful.

But in order to do it, K had to compute for 40 minutes. During this time, it executed 124.8 quadrillion organized computations and used enough electricity to run 10,000 suburban homes for that same period of time.

There are 2400 seconds in 40 minutes. Therefore, it took K 2400 times as long as it takes the human brain to execute the same number of calculations, and that is only 1% of what the brain does. And the brain does it on the energy derived (perhaps) from a crust of bread. To process 100% of what a brain computes, K would have to process 100 times more data (K's 1% is 1/100 of the brain capacity). Taking these figures into account, the brain is 240,000 times as powerful as K. This is not really much of a surprise. The brain has  $10^{15}$  timed, organized connections, vastly more connections than K.

The point is that when K started there were two kinds of computers in that room: a human brain and K. It took a team of renowned international programmers approximately 4 years to program one of them to process one second's worth of 1% of the other and 40 minutes to process it. If you are an evolutionist, you believe that only one of these computers was actually programmed: the slow one.

As far as the other one goes, it was the cosmic rays, the environment, dying animals and genetic errors that programmed that one.

No logical, realistic person could possibly believe that without simply, by force of will, rejecting the obvious truth. And indeed that is exactly what happens in Darwinist academia:

Even if there were no actual evidence in favor of the Darwinian theory...we would still be justified in preferring it over rival theories [Creationism]<sup>22</sup>



---

22. Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (NY Norton Publishing, 1986), page 287.

## Anti-scientific Argument

EVOLUTION IS FOUNDED ON THE  
BELIEF THAT GOD  
DID NOT CREATE ANYTHING

Evolution says that it cannot make any conclusion about God because a supernatural being cannot be measured. And since it cannot measure God, it must exclude the possibility of God creating life.

But then evolution says that it has proven that God had nothing to do with creation.

Evolution has not proven that God did not create, because Evolution has refused to consider whether He created or not. It has rejected Him *ab initio* (from the first). If I say there must be a reason for something but under no circumstances will the reason ever be X, I have proven absolutely nothing about X. And I cannot use my argument to prove that X does not exist. In the context of creationism, all I have proven is that *if I exclude the possibility of a Designer* then evolution is the only explanation.

But once one includes the possibility of a Designer, a Designer is the best explanation of the observed facts. It is for that reason that evolution will not—and never will—consider the existence of a Designer. If it did, it would spell its own demise.

It is not creationism that is anti-scientific. It is evolution, because science is founded upon the scientific method and evolution is not. The scientific method is systematic observation and the formulation of a theory to explain what has been observed. Evolution does not do this because it precludes the existence of a Creator as a possible explanation.

Certainly evolution points to things that can be explained by evolution, but the theory of evolution is so broad it claims to explain everything. \

Evolution argues that anything that benefits survival is evidence of evolution. That is no argument at all. Obviously all creatures are created to survive, whether they were created by the Creator or by genetic mistakes.

Evolution argues that where organs in one group are more complex than similar organs in other groups, then this is evidence of evolution. That is no evidence at all because the different organisms have different purposes and different designs.

Evolution argues that since there are genetic changes within a species, this is evidence of evolution. It is not. It is evidence of changes within a species. Changes in color or shape within the same species proves nothing. Mankind is filled with an uncountable number of various shapes and colors, and one cannot change man from being man by placing some of mankind in one category and others in another category.

Evolution has missed the point.

The point is this: What explains the observed creation better? Creation by a Designer or Evolution? If one approaches the question with an open mind and without any opinion regarding a Creator or a Designer, which one better explains:

- A neuronet that accurately computes at 240,000 times faster than 10.51 quadrillion computations per second;<sup>23</sup>
- 90,000 complex chemical formulas inscribed upon a molecule, the purely logical code that writes them down and the mechanism for reading them one at a time and assembling the molecule described;
- Electrical networks containing as many organized connections as there are leaves on the trees of a forest that is half the size of the United States;
- A logical code that describes 7 million separate colors, create a mechanism to receive millions upon millions of electrical instructions per second relating to color perception, depth perception, motion perception and extremely fine detail and transform them all into a consistent, full color, three dimensional, moving "image" that is an exact duplicate of what the eye sees;
- A mechanism that can transform all sensory perceptions into a consistent non-physical code and then, utilizing that same code, encode the experiences of a lifetime into the arrangement, the charges, of quadrillions of molecules—and then create a mechanism that acts upon a thought and locates any group of them for instant reply.

If one makes no presumption whatever regarding the existence or non-existence of a Designer, it is logically impossible to conclude that all of this happened through genetic errors, the environment and dying animals. One must first presume that God does not exist before one can accept the tenets of Darwinism. And once the scientist presumes that God does not exist he has based his science upon a theological premise.

---

23. See [K](#) on page 18

Evolution is, of course, founded solidly on materialism. It presumes that what cannot be measured is wholly irrelevant and it denies the existence of anything that is immaterial. Hence, God is irrelevant to the theory of evolution because God is immaterial and incapable of being measured. But recent discoveries have largely reversed the foundational concepts and presumptions of materialism.

Things are material because they have mass and can therefore be measured. But the discovery of the Higgs Boson particle shows that mass comes from the Higgs Boson field, not from matter itself.<sup>24</sup> Higgs has shown that matter exists separate from mass. Can an object or even a person exist without mass? If so materialism itself is without substance. Is massless existence spiritual? Perhaps that is the reason why physicists refer to the Higgs-Boson particle as "The God Particle."



---

24. See the [SMITHSONIAN EXPLANATION OF HIGGS BOSON](#).

## Hypothetical Falsifiability

IN ORDER FOR ANY THEORY TO BE CREDIBLE  
THERE HAS TO BE A WAY TO PROVE IT FALSE

If you believe in evolution, you follow a theory that cannot, by its own terms, ever be falsified.

It is a principal of logic that any valid theory must be hypothetically falsifiable or it is logically irrelevant. That is, in order for any theory to be initially credible there has to be a logical way to prove it to be false. That is, one must be able to check to see if the theory is true.

For instance, if one has a theory that purple spiders weave the snowflakes that fall in the winter time, the theory is obviously foolish, but it is hypothetically falsifiable because anyone can fly a plane to the clouds to see if there are any purple spiders making snowflakes. On the other hand, if the theory is that purple spiders weave snowflakes and the purple spiders are invisible, the theory is illogical on its face because it is not hypothetically falsifiable. One cannot then point to falling snow and call it proof of purple spiders in the clouds.

Evolution argues "No matter how complex life is, it had to have evolved because there is no Designer." Creation asks, "How do you know that there is no Designer?" And evolution responds "Because everything evolved." That is not a logical argument. Evolution is not hypothetically falsifiable because it refuses to even consider the existence of a Designer.

On the other hand, Intelligent Design *is* hypothetically falsifiable because it does not refuse to consider the theory of Evolution. Intelligent Design may be falsified by showing that Evolution is simply more credible. But that cannot happen because Evolution has no substantive evidence and evolution cannot hope to explain the inconceivable complexity of creation.

Specifically, Intelligent Design may be disproven by showing evidence that 10000000000000000 fully timed and organized neurological connections in the human brain occurred by a series of random genetic mistakes. Or by providing some evidence that cosmic rays, genetic accidents and environmental pressures caused the formulas for 90,000 human proteins to be inscribed into the arrangement of the atoms inside a molecule. Or by showing that a living computer that computes 240,000 times faster than 10.51 quadrillion computations per second was created and programmed by some extremely fortunate mutations.

But evolution cannot win that argument, so it argues things like whale bones or a species of fish that have different colors. The refusal of evolution to even consider the existence of a Designer disqualifies the theory *per se* from arguing that a Designer does not exist.

Evolution claims to be proven simply by the existence of anything living. It claims to be proven by the existence of any trait that aids an organism in its survival and it claims to be proven by the existence of any trait that does not aid an organism in its survival. It does not consider the possibility that anything other than evolution could have created creation and a priori excludes the possibility of a Creator.

Evolution admits of nothing that could theoretically falsify it. Evolution is therefore a theory that is not hypothetically falsifiable. In order for a theory to be valid, it must be hypothetically falsifiable. Evolution is not. Therefore evolution is, at its core, irrational.

One thing that could certainly invalidate the theory of evolution is a complexity that must have been created and designed by a Creator and could not have occurred by a series of accidents. But, as stated, evolution will not consider that argument because, according to evolution, the Creator simply does not exist. Therefore evolution is the only answer. Thus evolution is, by its own admission, not hypothetically falsifiable.





## Knowing the Creator

NO ONE EVER REALLY BELIEVES IN GOD  
UNTIL HE MAKES HIMSELF KNOWN

There are really only two ways to see life. Either there is a spiritual part of man or there is no spiritual part of man.

If there is no spiritual part of man, then life is purely material and morality, virtue and the like are simply constructs that arise from the circumstances of existence. This is materialism.

If the materialist view is correct, then any spiritual side of man and all sense of anything spiritual is simply imaginary. Evolution is the creed of materialism.

On the other hand others perceive either the presence (or the absence) of a spiritual part of themselves. The absence of this spiritual part takes various forms. Many describe it as an internal void. Many recognize that if there is a God, then His job is to fill that void.

Many seek God but cannot find Him so they lapse into agnosticism. Many sense a lack of purpose or they simply know that they are somehow incomplete. But most feel as if they are searching for something, but they don't know what it is.

Most people who live with these sensations are spiritually dead. Sin causes spiritual death.<sup>25</sup>

Salvation is the receipt of spiritual life—and spiritual life can be experienced.

Of course, by very definition, spiritual life can never be self-generated because it would forever be discredited by the realization of its source. We must therefore despair of ever finding God by simply trying.

Instead of finding Him, we must set our sights on *Him finding us*—and disclosing Himself to us in such a way that we know the source to be Him alone. In short, just believing that God exists doesn't work. There must be something more.

The something more is having all sin forgiven. All sin must be forgiven because sin causes spiritual death and if we are to have spiritual life, we must be rid of spiritual death that has been caused by sin. That

---

25. Romans 6:23 “The wages of sin is death.”

is what Jesus Christ did. He paid our sin-penalty for us. But receive the benefit of what He did, we must come to Christ and appropriate what He did.

Coming to Christ is a sincere decision to trust in Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of all sin. If we decide to come to Christ and accept the gift of forgiveness, then we will be forgiven and receive the gift of eternal life. It is a free gift:

...the gift of God *is* eternal life through Jesus Christ.<sup>26</sup>

*After* we have received the gift of eternal life, we can experience the knowledge of God<sup>27</sup> and experience His immense peace.<sup>28</sup> We can experience knowing God through yielding to Him and keeping His word:

He that has my commandments and keeps them, he it is who loves Me.<sup>29</sup> And he who loves Me shall be loved by My Father, and I will love him, and will disclose Myself [make Myself known] to him.<sup>30</sup>

If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.<sup>31</sup>

When God discloses Himself to us, we come to know Him, and this knowing Him is what eternal life is:

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.<sup>32</sup>

It is in this way that we can know God.

---

26. Romans 6:23

27. John 17:3 “This is life eternal, that you may know God...”

28. Philippians 4:7 “And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.”

29. To know God and to enter into a relationship with God is to love Him, because He is love. See First John 4:8 “...God is love.”

30. John 14:21. The meaning of this verse is that God will make Himself known to you.

31. John 14:23

32. John 17:3

## In Summary

Our sin causes spiritual death. If we do not trust in Christ, then we will die in our sins,<sup>33</sup> and our spiritual death will find its ultimate conclusion in our eternal death.<sup>34</sup> So we have a choice. We can continue to live a life being spiritually dead or we can see what happens if we make a truly sincere decision to trust in Christ and a heartfelt surrender of our will to God's.

Jesus Christ died in our place. When we appropriate the gift of Christ's sacrifice, we are made righteous by that gift.<sup>35</sup> If we decide to trust in Christ for the forgiveness of sin, we will be forgiven.

After having been forgiven, God discloses Himself to us as we yield our heart to Him through sincere obedience to scripture.<sup>36</sup> The experiential presence of God must come through obedience because knowing God is eternal (spiritual) life<sup>37</sup> and one cannot embrace spiritual life<sup>38</sup> and at the same time embrace spiritual death by committing sin.<sup>39</sup>

This process is not a theoretical religious exercise. It is actually experienced.<sup>40</sup> The result may come slowly or it may be sudden. Either way the result is astounding.



---

33. John 8:24 "Therefore I said to you that you will die in our sins; for if you do not believe that I am *He*, you will die in your sins."

34. Revelation 21:8 "...unbelievers...shall have their part in the lake...which is the second death."

35. Second Corinthians 5:21 "God made Him [the Messiah] who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in Him we might become the righteousness of God."

36. John 14:21 "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me: and he that loveth Me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him."; John 14:23 "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them...we will come to him and make our abode with him."

37. John 17:3 "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

38. John 14:6 "I [Jesus Christ] am ... the life."

39. Ephesians 2:1 "...you...were dead in trespasses and sins;"

40. Philippians 4:7 "And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."