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If You Believe in Evolution…

Evolution teaches that all of life occurred by random chance genetic mutations that benefited the mutated organism and enabled it to predominate and to perpetuate its mutations. As random beneficial mutations accumulated the mutated organism became a separate species. In this way all species, including man, were created.

The opposing explanation is special creation. Special creation teaches that there is a Creator (God) and that He created all things, including man.

But recent discoveries have disclosed an organization and complexity in life that is so vast that it could never have been formed from random chance.

So, what do you believe if you believe in evolution? You believe that the complexity contained in the following pages occurred by a series of accidents and dying animals.

That is simply impossible. It could never have occurred in that way. See for yourself.
If you believe in evolution, you believe that millions of fortunate mutations invented the chemical formulas for 90,000 proteins—and then came up with a language (a code) to record them, a transcriber that could read what they had coded, and an assembler to locate the correct atoms to make the correct protein and put all of the atoms in the right places to make a protein molecule. And then, because these amazing accidents wanted to preserve the formulas for future use, they inscribed them into a molecule and placed it in every cell in your body.

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 [different] proteins.

The human genome is what makes you you. It creates the chemicals necessary to keep you alive and healthy and creates all of your characteristics. It determines everything about you. Your genome is who you are. Your genome (your DNA) is written by arranging just four different molecules into various patterns.

1. “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
2. The Human Genome Project Completion: Frequently Asked Questions (National Human Genome Research Institute, 2010): 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 (100,000 different proteins).
3. What is DNA (National Institutes of Health, 2015): HTTP://GHR.NLM.NIH.GOV/HANDBOOK/BASICS/DNA; See also Wikipedia (Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., 2015), s.v. DNA: HTTP://EN.WIKIPEDIA.ORG/WIKI/DNA#CITE_REF-1;
Only four different molecules (called "bases") can describe 90,000 different chemical formulas because these four molecules can be arranged in 24 different ways, like the letters of an alphabet. The formula to determine how many different arrangements there are in 4 different things is \(1 \times 2 \times 3 \times 4 = 24\). In the DNA molecule, each of the four different arrangements is a letter used in a language. The scientific name for it is "code" but it means the same thing. But are there enough different arrangements of 24 different letters to write out 90,000 chemical formulas?

The formula to see how many different arrangements there are for 24 different letters is the same formula as used to figure out how many different arrangements there in four things, except it goes all the way to 24. It is \(1 \times 2 \times 3 \times 4 \times 5 \times 6 \times \ldots \times 24\). When we multiply this out, we find that the number of different arrangements of 24 letters is 620,448,401,733,239,409,999,872. So there are ample different arrangements in 24 different letters to accommodate 90,000 formulas.

This fact presents a significant problem for evolutionists, a problem that they never speak of. The problem is that evolution is firmly grounded in chance. It teaches that all of life came from random genetic changes. If each random change is a different arrangement of letters, how many random changes would have to occur in order for DNA to describe 90,000 formulas correctly? The answer is the number written above, a number that is so large that few people can even name it.

What is the chance that there could be another you somewhere? Effectively nothing. And that is the same chance that chances produced you in the first place.

The Creator states, "Behold, I have inscribed you on the palms of My hands." It is astounding how accurate that scripture is. Not only are you inscribed on the palm of God’s hand, you are inscribed on the palm of your hand.

But all of DNA is nothing but a language. How did all of these chance genetic changes come up with a language? This is another difficult question for evolution to answer because the language (the code) for all of these formulas and other instructions is not physical. It is logical; it is like machine language used by computers. It is a non-physical system that is used by a physical system, but the language itself is not physical. A non-physical language of 24 different letters that are described by the arrangement of 4 different molecules cannot have evolved because it is
not physical; it is logical. The random mutations would have to come up with a concept before devising the language. Which combination of letters will mean a molecule of this or a molecule of that? This has to be in place before the arrangement of the letters can be used to produce the molecules that they describe. Random mutations can’t think; they can’t conceptualize and they can write languages. Random mutations simply happen by accident and when they do happen they are deleterious rather than beneficial to a ratio of more than 100 to 1.5

And writing down the formulas does not produce the proteins. In order to produce the proteins, the same random genetic changes had to invent a mechanism that can copy the instructions of just one protein out of 90,000 coded formulas, leave the rest of the DNA unaltered. And then take the copy to a mechanism that has been programmed to read the language and create the protein from the translation. All of this by thousands of unseen beneficial genetic mutations?

Early on, evolutionary scientists called certain portions of DNA "junk DNA." They thought it was useless baggage left over by evolution.

But around 2014, those same scientists discovered that the non-coding portions of DNA are instructions for the implementation of the DNA. They are not junk at all. The study that made this discovery is called the encode project.

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?6

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. That’s more than 10 Encyclopedia Britannicas. How can that be?

5. Discussed below
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.
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 7200 letters on each page. Discounting the picture pages, there are approximately 900 pages in each volume. Therefore, there are 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.

So, if you believe in evolution, you believe that random genetic mutations and environmental pressures (natural selection) invented the 90,000 proteins used in human life. They also invented a language to write them all down and then they inscribed 462 volumes of data onto a molecule. Then they invented a way to copy one formula at a time; and constructed a transcription machine that was programmed to read the language, an assembler to use the information from the transcription to produce the protein, and then produce the protein, until the mechanism received a signal to begin producing a different protein. All of this was supposed to have been accomplished by a series of amazing random mutations and dying animals. You would have to decide in advance that there is no Creator before you could believe that.

What came first? Did the code come first or did the 90,000 proteins come first? The proteins cannot exist without the code. And code has no reason to exist without the proteins. So which came first? Neither. They both came together when God created life.

But there is far more complexity in life than just DNA. The complexity of DNA just scratches the surface.
There are 1,000,000,000,000,000 neurological connections in a human brain. Each one of these is organized into a massive network of electrical signals that are timed to the nanosecond or less.

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.

Evolutionists believe that the brain was created by a random mutations and dying animals.

Imagine trillions of wires connecting every one of the leaves in the forest for the purpose of effectuating a massive network that *thinks*.

"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!"\textsuperscript{7}

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 with every leaf connected with a wire, fully organized and able to produce thought, emotion and consciousness. It is simply impossible to sincerely believe that this happened by a series of amazing unobserved beneficial genetic errors.

Mother Nature, they say, just "fiddled around" succeeding here, failing there until, with the help of the survival of the fittest that weeded out the less competent, she ended up with a living computer with $100000000000000$ organized connections that thinks.

That is evolution at a rate of 2 new connections each minute for 4 billion years.\textsuperscript{8} And that is with no errors and with each new connection properly organized, timed and fully operational.

No one could sincerely believe that random genetic errors constructed that computer unless one’s mind has been firmly locked into an unalterable theological conviction that there simply is no Creator. And that, of course, is Darwinism. Darwinism is founded upon the conviction that there will be no Creator no matter what is discovered.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{8} There are 1460000000000 days in 4 billion years. When $10^{15}$ 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.
Gene Editing
THE ARCTIC OCTOPUS

There are three areas of the theory of evolution.

_The first area_ is where cross-breeding within a species and an external influence diminishes the population of one variety of the same species and leaves the other to predominate. For instance, where there are several different colors of moths in an area darkened by smoke, the moths whose color closely matches the color of the smoke stained background will not fall prey to birds. So the dark colored moths will predominate. But there is no genetic change and there is no creation of a separate species. They are all moths.

_The second area_ is called macro-evolution. Macro-evolution is where there are beneficial mutations in the genetic structure of a species that amplify the ability of the altered organisms to survive. Those altered organisms predominate (natural selection) and eventually create a separate species. This is classic Darwinian evolution that is supposed to account for all of life. But there is very little evidence, if any, that can be used to support macro-evolution. And it cannot explain the vast complexity that has been uncovered progressively since the 1960’s.

_The third area_ 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. Since this is an actual adaptation within a species, it is called micro-evolution. There is clear and ample evidence of actual genetic adaptations within a species. If these adaptations were caused by random genetic mutations, this would be Darwinism’s strongest argument. If they were caused by a special mechanism in the organism itself that changes the chemistry of the organism in order to enable it to survive in a different environment, then it would be strong argument for Creation.
In order to demonstrate that a gene has mutated, one need only compare the original gene and the improved gene and show that the improved gene enabled the organism to predominate. With technology of today, this is not impossible. It can be shown with the gene-mapping techniques now used. And with evolution supposedly happening all the time, it should be easy to find. In fact, if evolution is true, then gene mapping should be able to locate ample evidence of mutated genes that improved the ability of one species to survive and predominate.

The Garrett and Rosenthal study set out to do exactly that. The subject that they chose to study was a warm water octopus that had adapted to live 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 lives and thrives in the frigid waters of the Antarctic. The reason why it can live in the Antarctic is because it produces a different kind of amino acid that results in a different kind of regulation of the transmission of nerve impulses.

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 because it speeds up the nerve impulses, whereas isoleucine does not. The gene that produces isoleucine in warm water and valine in cold water is the only relevant difference between the two octopi.

Garrett and Rosenthal9 predicted the obvious: that the gene that produces these amino acids will have to be different in each octopus because it produces isoleucine in one octopus and valine in the other octopus. Showing this difference would demonstrate an instance of evolution because the only viable explanation for the difference would be a beneficial mutation.

What they found, however, was not proof of evolution, but proof of creation. The first thing they found was 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 re-

spective environments. Surprisingly, the primary sequences encoded by the two genes were virtually identical, differing in only four positions.\(^\text{10}\)

But if the genes were identical, how could they produce different amino acids? How can a gene for isoleucine produce valine instead?

The answer to that question effectively closes the lid on evolution for anyone whose mind is willing to look only at the evidence and not at evolution’s theological belief that there is no God.

A gene is a section of DNA that contains a code that the cell uses to produce a molecule of a particular kind of amino acid. In order to make the amino acid, the cell makes a copy of that section of the DNA (the gene) and then it uses the copy to produce the amino acid. So, how could the code for isoleucine produce valine?

The Garrett and Rosenthal study discovered that there is a chemical machine inside the cell that takes the RNA copy that is normally used to produce isoleucine and reprograms just that copy to produce valine. So, here is an instance of the amazing random mutations creating a machine that edits (reprograms) RNA "extensively" to produce a different amino acid that will enable the octopus to survive in Antarctica.

[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.\(^\text{11}\)

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. The isoleucine RNA is not isoleucine itself, but instead it is an arrangement a series of 4 different DNA molecules written in a code that writes out the chemical formula in code. The cell’s replication mechanism has already been programmed by the amazing genetic mutations to be able to read the code and produce isoleucine. But now these same amazing accidents not only programmed it to read the formula for isoleucine, but also to rearrange the molecules of the RNA code to produce an entirely different amino acid that by coincidence was exactly what the octopus needed to survive in cold water. Is there a scientist anywhere who could come up with that? Perhaps those amazing mutations are smarter than all of them.

\(^\text{10}\) Id. at Abstract, paragraph 4
\(^\text{11}\) Id (emphasis supplied).
So, embedded in the octopus cells is a chemical machine that takes the isoleucine RNA and reprograms it to produce valine instead. In order to do that it has to rearrange the four molecules to write a different formula. So here is a mechanism that moves molecules of RNA around to change its meaning.

Whoever created this mechanism had to:

1. Know the DNA coding language;
2. Know that the “fix” for the cold-water octopus is valine and not something else;
3. Know the chemical formula for valine;
4. Know the genetic code for valine;
5. Know the chemical formula for isoleucine;
6. Know the genetic code for isoleucine;
7. Be able to locate and isolate the isoleucine RNA;
8. Know which molecules in the isoleucine RNA have to be moved;
9. Know where to move them;
10. Know which molecules in the isoleucine RNA need to be replaced;
11. Know what molecules to replace them with;
12. Be able to physically move the molecules that need to be moved;
13. Be physically able to replace the molecules that need to be replaced;
14. Know when the water is cold enough to require it to be done;
15. And know how to commence the process when necessary.

Although all of this would be wholly useless to the survival of the octopus if it were not fully in place and operational, the Garrett study gives absolutely no credence to the possibility that this gene editing was created by an Intellect (the Creator) rather than sheer random chance.

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.12

---

12. Id.
The study states that cells devised a way to "produce specific mechanisms to optimize [change and improve] their genome in response to the environment." That is a profoundly stupid statement. Cells don't create or produce anything, including mechanisms to optimize genome response. Perhaps the highly intelligent scientist who said that had to say it or be ostracized from the scientific community.

How complicated is the recoding described in the study?

The mRNA code for isoleucine has 9 letters (ATT ATC ATA). The mRNA code for valine has 12 letters (GUU GUC GUA GUG), so the editing engine changes ATT to read GUU, changes ATC to read GUC, changes ATA to read GUA and then adds GUG on the end. So, at least 18 molecules have been changed. Note that it is the gene itself that is edited; it is not simply replaced with a different gene.

Evolutionists believe that random genetic mutations created a chemical machine that knows how to move and replace individual molecules in order to re-code a gene to produce a specific, different amino acid. That belief is absurd.

Evolution’s answer is always the same because it is forbidden to stray from the materialistic premise that evolution rests on—even though there are millions of gene editing sites:

In light of this and the fact that millions of editing sites have been identified in many different species, it is interesting to examine the extent to which these sites have evolved to be functionally important.\(^{13}\)

The chances of random mutations re-programming 18 separate elements into a particular configuration is 1 in \(6,402,373,705,728,000\).\(^{14}\) And after the amazing mutations had finally come up with the right arrangement, they still had to construct a mechanism to do it and figure out how to turn it on when necessary—and do this millions of times for millions of different gene editing sites. Accidental genetic changes that can do that exist only in the vain imaginations of highly intelligent people whose mind is locked into the unshakable theological conviction that there is no God.

---


14. The formula that yields the number of different arrangements of 18 elements is \(1\times2\times3\times\ldots\times18\). Try it.
For many of these scientists, no amount of complexity is sufficient to shake that conviction. Their entire career depends upon their yielding to the party line no matter what they discover. What about 90000 chemical formulas inscribed into a molecule? Ten trillion organized electrical connections that produce thought? Chemical machines that move molecules around pursuant to a pre-defined non-physical code?

They say what they have to say.

Why is the bare possibility of a Creator excluded in every article? Why is only one side ever shown? Where are the substantive explanations as to how millions of extremely fortunate unobserved beneficial mutations created a network with as many organized connections as the leaves on the trees in a forest half the size of the United States and molecular machines that write codes into molecules? And all this against whalebones that look like bird bones? Cows that must have wandered into the sea and turned into whales? A skeleton called Lucy? Really?

So, if you are an evolutionist you believe that millions of extremely fortunate mutations and dying animals not only devised the formula for 90000 proteins and amino acids and inscribed them upon a molecule, but also they also created millions of chemical machines that know how to re-program individual genes in order to produce a different amino acid that will benefit the same species in a different environment.

But that level of complexity pales beside the complexity found in memory.
If you are an evolutionist, you believe that random chance invented a non-physical code that could record memories. This includes all different kinds of memories, such as memories of people, of songs, of books, memories of logic, of sounds (music) and sensations like touch and everything else that you can remember.

And if you are an evolutionist you also believe that random chance devised, built and implemented a system for writing that code into the arrangement of individual molecules in a 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." 15

The molecules are coded with a binary electrical code, similar to the code used in your computer. 16 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.' 17

Perhaps even more inconceivable, you also believe that random mutations created a mechanism to index trillions and trillions of coded molecules so that particular discrete portions of them could be retrieved, portions that are defined by a thought.

---


16. "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.

What is evolution’s explanation for these things? Why it’s simple. All those animals that did not accidentally develop the molecular machine that writes memories into an unknown code into the arrangement of individual molecules—and indexes them and reads them—died. The others lived. Simple. Next question?

The next question is this, "Why not consider that these things were intentionally constructed."

"We cannot consider that," says the Darwinist.

"Why not?" Asks the student.

"Because evolution cannot posit the existence of a Creator that it cannot measure. There is nothing that we cannot perceive. We do not perceive a Creator; therefore a Creator does not exist."

"Well," says the creationist, "Neither can you perceive the intellect necessary to create such a memory and DNA, so your conclusion is that there is no intellect at all?"

"Yes," says the Darwinist, "Intellect did not create a brain with a thousand million million organized connections. Since evolution cannot posit the existence of a Creator, it must conclude that random mutations created it. We can consider any reason for any observation, except for one. Under no circumstances will there ever be a Creator."

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].

"As open minded scientists are you free to consider and write about all reasonable implications of all observable truth?"

"Of course we are. But you are closed minded religious bigots and it is our job to enlighten you children. And as for the freedom of scientists to write about what they see, we are all perfectly free to write about whatever we observe and say whatever we wish. All scientific expression is free; but some scientific expression is less free than others."
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). All of these 126 million electrical signals change whenever the eye moves. So they are constantly changing. These electrical codes describe millions of different colors.

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

When the living computer (the brain) processes this data it creates an accurate full color, three dimensional, high density, full motion representation of what the eyes see.

The retina pre-processes images into at least 12 different streaming motion pictures, each one transmitting only its assigned part of vision. This method reduces the massive amount of data that is transferred from the eyes to the brain. For instance, one picture is the code that represents the edges of a moving image and defines exactly where they are in relation to the rest of what is seen. There is another that codes for the shadows and another that codes the highlights and the rest represent 9 other separate and discrete portions of constantly changing images that are focused on the retina. The light that strikes each one of the 126 million rods and cones has to be converted into a code that represents the light that struck it. Then, specialized nerve cells deep in the retina somehow convert all of the data into the different tracks that are then streamed to the brain over the optic nerve. These streaming motion pictures must be written into code that will be understood by the brain.

That means that there is something that determines where the divisions between the streaming images will be drawn. The brain must be programmed to read the code and assemble and superimpose the 12 changing tracks and instantly create an essentially flawless three dimensional color representation of a reality to which it is not connected:

19. 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/rod-cone.html

Overall, we have found that specialized nerve cells, or neurons, deep within the retina project what can be thought of as a dozen movie tracks - distinct abstractions of the visual world. Each track embodies a primitive representation of one aspect of the scene that the retina continuously updates and streams to the brain. One track for example, transmits a line-drawing line image that detains only the edges of objects. Another responds to motion, often in a specific direction. Some tracks carry information about shadows or highlights. The representations of still other tracks are difficult to categorize.

Each track is transmitted by its own population of fibers within the optic nerve to higher visual centers in the brain, where even more sophisticated processing takes place ...

According to Passaglia, the retina is programmed to identify certain forms as important and encodes them in "bold print" so to speak.

Each of the different streaming images change at different rates, so the brain is not required to decode them all at the same rate. There have to be numerous algorithms programmed into the brain that enables it to distinguish between each stream and process it separately. There are algorithms that separate the data into tracks in the retina and there are algorithms that assemble the tracks in the brain.

Another reason for the streams is that different tracks enable particular forms to be made prominent, such as predators or mates.

For instance, in Passaglia’s experiment, the retina in a male horseshoe crab is programmed to recognize the code that transmits an image of a female horseshoe crab to the brain—and emphasize it. How did certain neurons become "dedicated" so to speak to encode only certain portions of a scene so that when they all act together they create an essentially flawless representation of external reality? The neurons of the retina are not learning mechanisms, they don’t learn how to transmit only a portion of what is seen.

Evolution’s explanation is that random genetic changes created the algorithms that separate the data into tracks and emphasize particular shapes. Evolution is certain of this because 1) a Creator is not acknowl-

edged under any circumstances and 2) the algorithms exist. Therefore, random genetic mutations that wrote the algorithms and installed them in the retina cells.

Those random mutations are really smart. They figured out a way to take data from light and encode 16,000,000 colors, create a perfect, and instantaneous automatic focus on a curved surface with automatic aperture control, incorporate algorithms to create different visual tracks and send a massive stream of data to a living computer that can consolidate the tracks instantaneously and convert it not only into an extremely accurate three dimensional full color moving picture but turn that picture into conscious awareness. Can you figure out how do that? If you can’t then those random mutations are a lot smarter than you are.

Evolution’s tired response is that everything just got better and better until we have the vision that is described here. That is no explanation at all. The truth is that there is a clear and unmistakable design here that far exceeds what could ever have been accomplished by random genetic changes. Intentional design is written all over it. But if you are an evolutionist, close the book now because you are forbidden to consider anything but those amazing mutations.
There is a massive computer called K. It is in Japan and it is the largest man-made computer in the world. It 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 cubic yards, but by the number of aisles of computer cabinets. There are at least 12 long aisles. K has more than 80,000 interconnected 2.8 GHZ 8-CORE SPAR64 VIIIFX processors and it computes at the rate of 10.51 quadrillion computations per second. 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. A total of 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. There is a massive computer called K. It is in Japan and it is the largest man-made computer in the world. It 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 cubic yards, but by the number of aisles of computer cabinets. There are at least 12 long aisles. K has more than 80,000 interconnected 2.8 GHZ 8-CORE SPAR64 VIIIFX processors and it computes at the rate of 10.51 quadrillion computations per second. 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. A total of 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.

22. "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/

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

But in order to do it, K had to compute for 40 minutes. And that 40 minutes of computing was at K’s rate of 10.51 quadrillion computations per second. There are 2400 seconds in 40 minutes. That means that K had to perform 2400 x 10.51 quadrillion computations to equal 1% of what a brain does in one second. That is a total of 25,224 quadrillion computations.

If the brain does as many computations as K to accomplish the same task then 1% of the brain performs 25,224 quadrillion computations each second. That is 1,008.96 quadrillion computations in a 1/25 of a second. Written out, that is 1,008,960,000,000,000 organized, logical, purposeful and timed electrical computations in the time that it takes the shutter to click on a simple camera.

Click.

And that is only 1% of what the brain does in one second in normal course.

In order to do 1% of what the brain does in one second, K used the same energy that it takes to run 10,000 suburban homes for 40 minutes. The brain uses the energy derived from a crust of bread.

How much wiring is necessary to accomplish this?

... the total length of axons in the human brain of a 20-year old male is 176,000 km [109,361 miles]! For readers less familiar with the metric system, that's long enough to wrap around the equator of the earth four and a half times. This measurement includes only the brain "wires" that are coated with electrical insulation, called myelin. The researchers didn’t attempt to measure the bare axons as well.24

---

Evolutionary science has no idea how brains work or how evolution can account for them. But evolution scientists are certain that the brain was never designed. It was the product of millions of years of random genetic mutations. It just kind of "happened."

Somehow 109,361 miles of molecular wiring grew inside a space the size of a cantaloupe and organized itself into a network that contains as many perfectly timed connections as the leaves on the trees in a forest that is half the size of the United States (or all of continental Europe), and without being programmed, this computer computes at a speed of trillions of cycles per second to produce thought, reason, emotion, consciousness and all of the other senses.

It writes the memories of a lifetime into the arrangement of quadrillions of phosphorylated molecules on the surface of cells and indexes them to make them accessible to a retrieval mechanism that is operated by thought.

On the day K's brain simulation was tested, someone turned K's power switch to "on." At that time there were two kinds of computers present, the fast ones and the slow one. It took a team of renowned programmers approximately 4 years to program the slow one to process one second's worth of 1% of the processing power of the fast ones and it took the slow one 40 minutes to process it. So, if you are an evolutionist, you believe that only one of those computers was intelligently designed: the slow one.

As for the fast ones that process 1,008,960,000,000,000 organized, logical, purposeful and timed electrical computations in the time that it takes the shutter to click on a simple camera, it was the cosmic rays, the environment, dying animals and genetic errors that programmed those.

That is absurd.
Anti-scientific Argument

EVOLUTION IS BASED 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 turns around and says that it has proven that God had nothing to do with creation.

Evolution has proven nothing about creation because evolution has refused to consider whether there is a Creator 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 agree that since I have not discovered X, X does not exist.

If I exclude the possibility of a Designer then evolution is the only known explanation. But it is the only known explanation if I exclude the Creator.

But once we consider 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 evolution that is anti-scientific; not creationism. 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 and a Creator is the best explanation.

Certainly evolution points to things that can be explained by evolution, but this is no proof because the same observations can be far better and far more consistently be explained by pointing to the Creator.

Evolution argues that where organisms in one group are more complex than similar organisms 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 genetic changes within a species is evidence of evolution. This is not evidence of evolution. It is evidence of changes within a species. Changes in color and shape within the same species prove 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.

Which explanation is most reasonable to an open mind? If one makes no assumption about whether a Creator exists or does not exist, which is the more reasonable explanation? Were the following things the product of chance or were they designed?

- A neuronet that accurately computes 100,008,960,000,000,000 in 1/25 of a second;\(^{25}\)
- 90,000 complex chemical formulas invented and inscribed upon a molecule using an immaterial (purely logical) code;
- 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, 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 very high resolution, 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, acting upon the whim of a thought, can locate a particular group of them for instant retrieval.

Evolution has no answer for these wonders.

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

\(^{25}\) See K on page 28
accept the tenets of Darwinism. And once the Darwinist presumes that God does not exist, he is no longer basing his science on observation, but upon a theological premise.

Evolution is founded solidly on materialism. It presumes that what cannot be measured is non-existent. Hence, God is irrelevant to the theory of evolution because God is immaterial and incapable of being measured. But the discoveries related in this booklet show that although God cannot be measured, what He created can be.

Evolution is founded upon materialism, but science is not. Science is founded upon observation. And if that observation points to something that is immaterial, then the scientist with integrity should have the courage to say it, or at the very least, not deny it.
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.

A foundational tenant of evolution is that the simple existence of an organism is proof of evolution. If the organism is fully developed (as all organisms are) that is proof of evolution because it was evolution that made it so. If the organism is not fully developed, that is proof of evolution because it demonstrates that evolution is still in process. If an organism is inconceivably complex that is proof of evolution because, by definition, there is no Creator and evolution is the only answer.

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. Otherwise the theory cannot be tested and is specious.

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 excludes all other theories but itself.

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 a more credible explanation for what has been observed. But that cannot happen because Evolution has no substantive evidence and it cannot hope to explain the inconceivable complexity of creation.
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 some people perceive 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 and recognize that if there is a God, then it’s 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. They know it but they don’t know how to fix it.

The way to fix it is Christ because Christ makes people spiritually alive by giving them eternal spiritual life.

... Everyone who lives and believes in Me will never die...27

Salvation is the receipt of spiritual life—and 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.

26. Romans 6:23 “The wages of sin is death.”
27. John 11:26
Instead of finding God, 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 begins when 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 the spiritual death that was been caused by sin. That is what Jesus Christ did. He paid our sin-penalty for us. But to receive the benefit of what He did, we must ask Him. We must come to Christ.

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.\(^{28}\)

After we have received the gift of eternal life, we can experience the knowledge of God\(^{29}\) and experience His immense peace.\(^{30}\) 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.\(^{31}\) 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.\(^{32}\)

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.\(^{33}\)

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

---

28. Romans 6:23
29. John 17:3 “This is life eternal, that you may know God…”
30. Philippians 4:7 “And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.”
31. 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.”
32. John 14:21. The meaning of this verse is that God will make Himself known to you.
33. John 14:23
And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. 34

It is in this way that we can know God.

If you are ready to trust in Him and sincerely yield to His will, you will discover for yourself that it is all true.

34. John 17:3