

Let's Review, Why Evolution is True

by Nishaun Smith

Why Evolution is True, a book by Jerry A. Coyne, interesting book to say the least. I was attracted by a quote from Richard Dawkins on the back. "Anyone who doesn't believe in evolution [to a more complex organism from a less complex one,] is either stupid, insane or hasn't read Jerry Coyne['s book]." I had to check it out. Personally, I consider evolution this way... Evolution is like the devil taking out his heart, putting it on a table and asking the *students* to take notes. Some creationists may claim that evolution leads to atheism, I will take this a step further and say evolution is atheism... a complex understanding of atheism. Evolutionist arguments line up too close with atheist arguments, an atheist argues that a loving God would never allow sadness, hunger; while Jerry A. Coyne argues that a loving God would never allow any aspect of our DNA to decay, one argument, "But we still carry a total of eight hundred OR [olfactory receptor (smelling)] genes, which make up nearly 3 percent of our entire genome. And fully half of these are pseudogenes, permanently inactivated by mutations." He argues, we would never have genetic decay if we were "specially created." Why do bad things happen to good genes?

This book contains many arguments used to promote evolution and also a few attempting to explain it. *Surprisingly*, no argument explains how less complex energy systems can form more complex energy systems, the main hurdle of evolution. One of the most nonsensical arguments for evolution is the vestigial limb. When I try to explain this to evolutionists they never believe me, the truth is there is no such thing as a vestigial limb or organ. If I had been in a laughing mood when reading this book I would have been rolling on the floor laughing out loud, (rflol) as the author confirmed my argument. "Evolutionary theory doesn't say that vestigial characteristics have no function. [:^(o] A trait can be vestigial and functional at the same time. It is vestigial not because it's functionless, but because *it no longer performs the function for which it evolved.*" p58. Did you catch that bit of circular logic? (An evolutionist's favorite tool)...You have to believe it evolved before you can call it vestigial. So an evolutionist is simply claiming that if it looks like a wing it must be for flying. Cause a loving God would never give us wings that couldn't fly. (A solid line of reasoning?) "Tiny, nonfunctional wings, a dangerous appendix, eyes that can't see, and silly ear muscles simply don't make sense if you think species were specially created [by God]." (p.64) Earlier on page 61 he admits, "The appendix contains patches of tissue that may function as part of the immune system. It has also been suggested that it provides a refuge for useful gut bacteria when an infection removes them from the rest of our digestive system."

There is the interesting case of atavisms and embryonic development. Human embryos seem to have tails and other features the most shocking atavism is the fact that an occasional whale may be born with a leg. Why would a loving God do that? That, actually, is a fair

question. The answer actually deals with a load of evolutionist arguments. You have heard that the human genome is very similar to the genome of a banana and also even closer to a monkey, *maybe we are what we eat*. But to be serious, imagine eating a banana made of silicone, imagine if monkeys were genetically coded to breathe helium. How would that work? We all live on the same planet and have to breathe the same air (in the case of plants they 'breathe' the 'opposite' air.) So it is not a far stretch of the imagination to argue that we have to be coded similar by God because we eat, breathe and walk on the same planet. As I always say, by using the word 'similar' you are admitting difference or you would have said 'same.' So, why do whales have the occasional protruding leg? Well, if a loving God allows genetic decay, if a loving God created us similar, is it not within reason that a genetic disorder could make us look even more similar? Fair answer, no?

Human development is another argument used to promote Darwin's delusion. Why does an embryo form a coat of hair, the lanugo? Well this could be explained the same way the obvious talelike structure is explained. Certain features develop before others. I am sure that the coat of hair that covered me as an embryo can't be much longer than the hair that covers me now, lol! The human vertebrate (backbone) is one of the more important and complex body parts therefore it develops earlier creating something that looks like a tale. There are also the gill-like (NOT GILLS) structures on the neck of a fetus (or tiny human) they are not gills they never were and they never will be. They eventually turn into neck bones, etc. There is also the claim that a baby's *ability* to grasp onto things (Palmar grasp reflex) is simply a result of the *fact* that baby ancient monkeys had to grab on to their mom while she swung through trees, and ran from predators. This was weird to me because in school I didn't hear about a "grasping reflex" I heard that babies simply don't *know* how to let go because their bodies don't produce much of the chemical (adenosine triphosphate) that allows muscle to relax, that is why they won't let go of your finger. I always thought it was more of an inability than an ability, but I am not a biologist so don't take my word for it. That reminds me of an episode of Jon and Kate plus 8 (my favorite show) where little Leah is the only one brave enough to hang from a shelving unit in their garage... There is no real reason to bother responding to the arguments of 'bad design,' when an evolutionist says, God if he existed, did it all wrong. We would need to see 'Adam's Genome' before we can argue for or against bad design. We don't know what God created us to be, we are far decayed from that. But I will touch on one argument, Jerry's favorite. Jerry Coyne argues that the Laryngeal nerve (the nerve that allows us to speak and swallow) is longer than it needs to be, instead of going directly from brain to the larynx it goes from brain into the chest wraps around the aorta and then comes back up to the throat. This may be a genius plan on God's part. I find it fascinating to know that God, wrapped our voice around our heart! The fact that the nerve that lets us control speech is actually influenced by the rhymes of our heart is actually a testament to God's wondrous design. We should always remember before we open our mouths that the signal is impacted by and also impacts our own heart, God wrapped our voices around our hearts, feel free to use that in a sermon. (Barack Obama may not have won the election if his voice was not wrapped around his heart.) To digress, in the language of 'science' one can argue that mammals are very vocal and expressive, sometimes as a defense mechanism. (Here comes a lion, run!) So one can argue that it is important to have vocal cords that can be easily stimulated directly or indirectly by the heart.

Jerry asks two direct questions one about why animals live in locations where you can find their 'ancestors' buried or why there are similar animals with different superficial traits. He

questions, why does Australia have marsupial *versions* of North American animals (marsupial being the superficial trait), they have a sugar glider which is like a flying squirrel, they have a banded anteater, they have a marsupial version of 'our' mole. He is simply asking why variety exists on this planet. He asks why Australia has a marsupial mole when North America has a 'regular' mole, this can be answered by saying God created variety and wants variety to exist still on this decayed planet. It is true that a marsupial mole can survive or even flourish in America but it may destroy the variety only leaving one mole version. So God separated his creatures whether animals or plants. On the more complex argument of creature location, there is *nothing* weird about an animal 'migrating' to the ark then returning to its natural habitat thereafter. (With the assumption that the continents had not yet separated.) God may have directly or indirectly altered migration habits. Scientists do not fully understand how animals find the locations they are seeking some say they follow the planet's magnetic field.

I have an argument I call the 99 Folly Principle, I ask, where are all the obviously weird animals like a monkey with a human looking finger on its back. (Or a banana with feet.) I argue that even with natural selection a large variety of obviously deformed creatures should exist. It seems like we live in a perfect world with quite a few imperfections as the Bible predicts not an imperfect world with quite a few perfections as evolution predicts. In a truly random world 50% of the mutations would be survivable and around 50% would be non-survivable. And an animal with a finger on its back would be one of these survivable mutations. One evolutionist argued against me saying that a finger on its back “would be too easily snagged on a branch [and could never evolve.]” A stegosaurus may disagree with this line of reasoning. Another counter-less-argument he used is the claim that a female will naturally find this new feature unattractive. This is called sexual selection, according to this book such direct forms of sexual selection, where a female is directly attracted to a specific gene does not exist. That is to say women do not choose specific genes, choice is made indirectly. A female may choose a bright bird because the color reminds them of a certain berry, etc... Trying to explain randomness he uses Richard Dawkins' explanation, “The non-random survival of random variants.” A nonsensical argument to say the least, because we know that adding or multiplying a random number will always give a random result. (There is that trick formula that always equates to 3 no matter the number used, but that is only because you deduct the original number, lol!) Randomness is in fact defined as randomness, nothing else! The only way you can have ordered design from random events is if before hand you have a set of rules that state something along the lines of (still using math)... All numbers with a value less than '500' and greater than '-500' will be survivable numbers, this would then limit the survivability and then bring order to the randomness because of the infinite possible values of $n+y=x$; even if you give a value to 'n' the value of 'x' will be unpredictable. If you limit the values of 'x' to say from -500 to 500 and you give a value to 'n' ('n' representing the factor of living on this planet) you will now have a limited set of possible values for y. And now you would be able to explain why you can't find an alligator with wings because that would be '501' and animal number '502' may be a monkey with a human finger on its back, metaphorically speaking; so these creatures can't exist because they have a value that is too 'expensive.' (Wings may attract prey and help with balance while sprinting on land, so an alligator with wings is evolutionarily plausible. All combinations are plausible.) That is a true definition of randomness not the 'perverted' definition that the natural scientists use while promoting their folly. One can say that mathematically randomness can never lead to ordered design. But to be more accurate one

should say there is no such thing as randomness. All limiting or empowering values must have a definite cause therefore something has to cause the mutation, it can't be random. Here is the problem, it is impossible to make a mistake, a person only makes a mistake when they are tired or distracted or certain other factors like weakness. So how does DNA make a mistake? Technically only 'weak or tired' DNA can make a mistake, making evolution to a more complicated and powerful energy system having organism a fantasy. So if an ultraviolet ray mutates your DNA you aren't gonna turn into 'superman' as the evolutionists claim. Only a complex action can break DNA and repair it at the same time, the laws of physics prevent random genetic movements. The funny thing is evolution can only make sense if it was perpetrated by a hateful god, implying intelligent design, lol. Survival of the fittest or as I like to call it, 'the spirit of death and murder' is not a place for God. There is no place for God in evolution and why would you want to put him there? Many proponents of the theory claim that most evolutionists are Christians, but others warn if you think there is a God in evolution you must not understand it as much as you think you do. Only God can pre-order the world and define '500' and '-500' as limiting values for acceptable mutations. The formula of life is more than $n+y=x$, the truth is there may be a million variables that have to equate to 'x'. A set of scenarios so complex that it eventually led to the creation of the human brain. As I always say the set of scenarios that led to a human brain have to be more complex than the human brain itself; implying, dare I say proving, God's existence. An evolutionist would like to limit your understanding of this world to sex selection, gluttony and murder but this beautifully powerful planet is far more complex. At best, on a good day an evolutionist may argue *survival of the luckiest* (or unluckiest, for those who seek Nirvana), but there is no evidence even of that, this planet is too ordered and too specific.

The 'evolution' of dogs, a popular creationist argument used to show how quickly species can develop and how easy it is for evolution (change within a system) to occur in a relatively short amount of time, is twisted to 'prove' natural selection. Remember the great variety of dog species was 'ordered' quite quickly by the guiding hands of humans.

I find it interesting that the author admitted he has never seen a virus turn into a bacterium, something necessary for evolution. The scientists brag about how easy it is to see true evolution in viruses and bacteria but then admit openly that there is no actual increasing change observed therein. Many creationists have argued, If only Darwin had a microscope, a one celled organism is as complex as New York City, this is a little known fact. One interesting point would be the bacterial flagellum, a small hair that acts like a propeller with proteins acting like a motor. So the main question is how can such a complex motor accidentally evolve. Evolutionists have presented other bacteria with less proteins in a less complex 'motor' and claim that this proves that evolution can happen. The truth is such a claim is no different than saying a motor scooter will evolve into a motorcycle over time.

In the section about 'Our Genetic Heritage' Jerry openly admits that human DNA is not as close to animal DNA as the evolutionists would like to pretend, I have found myself time and time again explaining to evolutionists who may not be in the know that DNA is extremely, extremely long. And a small difference translates to...well I will have Jerry explain it, he's the professor. "But recent work shows that our genetic resemblance to our evolutionary cousins is not quite as close as we thought [and still think]. Consider this. A 1.5 percent difference in protein sequence means that when we line up the same protein (say, hemoglobin) of humans and chimps, on average we'll see a difference at just one out of every hundred amino acids. But

proteins are typically composed of *several hundred* amino acids. So a 1.5 percent difference in a protein three hundred amino acids long translates into about... That oft-quoted 1.5 percent difference between ourselves and chimps, then, is really larger than it looks: a lot more than 1.5 percent of our proteins will differ... Since our genomes have about 25,000 protein-making genes, that translates to a difference in the sequence of more than 20,000 of them. That's not a trivial divergence. Obvious, more than a few genes distinguish us." p210-211 (Should I go on, lol!?)

I came to an interesting epiphany while reading this book, I was reading through his argument about how a population that breeds cows for milk and meat will have less cases of lactose intolerance, implying natural selection, and the converse with a population having no cows. The author claims that natural selection causes the people with no problem drinking milk to reproduce more efficiently... I find it hard to believe, that with all those useless genes we have, that somehow the people without cows will just lose their tolerance genetically. I know there may be other factors to why or why not certain humans can tolerate lactose... Then I thought, could this be the hand of God, is it possible that what evo's call natural selection is actually God creating and recreating his planet? Is God constantly altering our genes giving us the best shot at life on this decayed planet? Natural selection seems way too smart, there are way too many variables, as I said before, who is setting the limiter of '500'? It just does not make sense that people who don't need the ability to break down lactose will start becoming intolerant. Natural selection seems too perfect, why would the people with the ability to tolerate lactose just stop reproducing when there are no cows?

When dealing with the folly of 'selection' we have to understand, if one animal species dies it can collapse a whole ecosystem, if one animal is introduced accidentally it can destroy a whole ecosystem ask the polar bears, or people with HIV. (HIV being the invader.) I wonder if all environmentalists are anti-evolutionists, lol. Probably not.

I found the following quote interesting, "Genetics' does not mean, 'unchangeable'." p230. I hope all who blame DNA for their sin and claim that they were just born this way understand this. Jerry also has another recurring argument that catches my attention, over and over Jerry reminds us that it was not the evolutionists who ordered the fossil record, he reminds us that it was not the evolutionists who ordered the creatures into different species, he makes it a point to inform us that it was creationists who ordered the sciences that led to evolution. This is an interesting admission if you remember the quote by Richard Dawkins that I started off with. "...stupid, [or] insane," he claims. Hmm, if creationists are stupid then why does Jerry over and over admit that evolution at its core was built on observations made by honest, smart, faithful, god-fearing Christians? Doesn't this throw out any argument that tries to imply that the main problem with creationism is they believe in God? ...and this belief seems to negatively impact the 'evidence seeking' parts of our brain?

As a point of fact I like to remind people that children need mothers and fathers, everyone needs a daddy. As I said earlier, this is the main problem with evolution. And before you question as all others do, *who is God's daddy?* I will finish my thought. Everyone needs a daddy because of all the dangers of this world, we are constantly bombarded with wind, rain, hail, fire, brimstone, violence, sadness, meteors. It is this constant merciless movement of existence that deters a fatherless child, I dub this **depressing** movement, 'Hurricane Darwin,' the storm of life. Nothing in the universe can ever be ordered, there are no straight lines, because Hurricane Darwin will never relinquish its fury. So if we see ordered design we can

know it was guided through the tempest. God is greater than this storm, “What manner of man is this? For he commandeth even the winds and water and they obey him.” The Bible warns that it is God who is holding back Hurricane Darwin. God's angels are keeping back the four winds of this world. (Revelation 7:1-3)

I have always wondered why living creatures did not just evolve, *functional immortality* that is to say they could still be killed but otherwise, their bodies would maintain itself to a ripe old age of *forever*. When you think about it the reproductive cells are technically immortal, a person has a baby that baby has all their reproductive cells they grow up and have children. Why not just be immortal, why have zero creatures evolved functional immortality?

At the end of the book Jerry goes on and on about how only a few can see the beauty of science and adds some quotes by Einstein claiming he was religious about science. We have to understand that there isn't a person whether Muslims, Buddhists, atheists, etc that can't see the beauty of Jesus. That's all the proof some need. It will be far easier for creationists to show the science behind, 'In the beginning was the logic (logos) and the logic was God,' than it will be for the scientists to show the beauty behind, *the spirit of death and murder*, or as some call it survival of the fittest. If you want a name for evolution call it this, an explanation! Creationism is also an explanation. There is *no* proof for either only an interpretation of evidence. Provability is in the eye of the beholder.

www.nishaun.com

www.about-god.org

Copyright © 2009 by Nishaun Smith

Feel free to copy **do not alter or sell.**