Discovering Creation Summary #6 2-10-21

Natural Selection, Genetics and Genetic Entropy

Review from last week, DNA and information– believing a single cell became a human by chance mistakes in DNA is like believing a little red wagon would become a bicycle, then motorcycle, then automobile, then airplane and then the space shuttle, by chance errors in the manufacturing process.

The full title of Charles Darwin's 1859 book was "*On the Origin of Species by Means of **Natural Selection**, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*." The idea that organisms with favorable characteristics will produce more offspring that survive makes sense. But Darwin didn't understand that environmental or behavioral changes (like giraffes stretching their necks to reach higher leaves, or apes standing up to see over tall grass) do not change the genes that are passed on to the next generation. New traits do not come from the environment, but only from changes in the genes. He did not know anything about genetics, but now we know the only change in the genes comes from mutations, which are random mistakes in the DNA. And mutations are bad. Just like mistakes in a computer code, mistakes in the genetic code destroy information. Medical science is currently working on over 2600 diseases that are causes by genetic mutations.

For evolution to happen there must be new genetic information (by chance) over long periods of time. But mutations don't do that. They corrupt and destroy information. Mutations corrupt at least 5X – 6X as much as they could help because of the multiple overlapping messages in DNA. Chance/randomness is the opposite of design/purpose. Mutations are mistakes and cant improve genetics. They cannot explain the arrival of new good information and new life forms.

Natural "Selection" does occur, but that is not an accurate word for it. "Selection" implies a choice, based on an intelligent being exercising its will. But evolution believes there is no intelligence or will acting. Natural Selection (NS) cannot create anything and **it does not add new genetic information**. It can only eliminate the unfit, not create the fit. Natural Selection will eliminate weak organisms, but it does not produce new ones.

The many breeds of **dogs** are an example of NS but not an example of evolution. Selective breeding eliminates some of the genes (say for long hair, or long legs) but it does not add anything new. All breeds of dogs are still the same "kind" and they can interbreed. If two organisms can breed together, they belong to the same

breed/kind. (Camel, llama, alpaca, vicuna; Lion, tiger, house cat; Wolf, coyote, dog) NS can produce "sub-species" by eliminating genes (red wolf – gray wolf, etc) but it cannot produce new kinds. **The "orchard" is a more accurate image than the "tree of life".**

Evolutionists use guppies, cichlids and stickleback fish as evidence for evolution, but they are simply evidence for Natural Selection. No new information is created—just adaptation from current genetic info. Evolutionists still cling to "Small Change x Millions of Years = Big Change". But just because a cow can jump over a fence does not mean that in millions of years it can jump over the moon or grow wings. Change is limited by what is in the genes.

Another form of "selection" is humans hunting animals, and in recent years there are very few trophy Big Horn sheep, large trout, or elephants with big tusks. Once those genes are gone, they are gone!

Antibiotic resistant bacteria

Is anti-biotic resistance in bacteria an evidence of evolution? No. Here's why.

1) Some bacteria had that resistance from before the antibiotic was ever made. We know this from finding those bacteria in the bodies of people who died in polar expeditions before the invention of those antibiotics. Antibiotics wiped out the rest of the bacteria and the only ones remaining are resistant, but no new information has been added. They have not "evolved" to become "superbugs". The weaker ones just died out.
2) Plasmid transfer - Genes from one bacteria can be injected in another, or move to another location in itself - but those genes were already present. There is no new information. It is like giving someone a new book. New info to that person, but not new info. Evolution must explain where the new info came from.
3) Some mutations give an advantage but weaken the organism.
   H Pylori - Bacteria in our stomach that causes ulcers - a mutation turns off an enzyme that converts the antibiotic into a poison. When the gene fails, the antibiotic is no longer a poison. The gene is broken, (not new information) but it is an advantage to the bacteria.
   The famous work of Dr Richard Lenski at Michigan State showed that after 31,500 generations, **E.coli** acquired a new trait. But as predicted by creationists, it was the result of a broken gene, not new information.
   Sickle cell anemia largely prevents malaria, but increases the risk of clotting and death. See creation.com/evolution-and-medicine

'**Evolutionary biology's deepest paradox**'. That was how a *Scientific American* article described an evolutionary problem concerning the so-called 'Cambrian explosion'. Cambrian' rocks are a system of fossil-bearing rocks containing certain 'index fossils'. In evolutionary theory, these rocks represent an 'age' from

about 540 to 500 million years ago (mya) . Within the animal kingdom there are 26 animal "phyla", which are the largest taxonomic groupings, (after phyla are class, order, family, genus and species) which are distinguished by the fact that each incorporates a unique body plan, with all smaller groupings within the phylum representing design variations on that basic theme. Representatives of every one of the 26 animal phyla are found In 'Cambrian' rock.

Evolutionists acknowledge this is a problem for evolution theory, namely that all the major groups (phyla) of life which we know today appear in the Cambrian with no evolutionary ancestors. This is why they refer to it as an 'explosion' of evolution. There are no groups which have been identified as ancestral to any of the phyla, and geologically these phyla 'seem to have appeared suddenly and simultaneously'. The evolutionary conundrum, the deep puzzle to which the Scientific American article refers, is not, however, this absence of ancestors. Evolution's 'deepest paradox' is that in rock layers above the 'Cambrian' (the next 500 million years) no new or different body plans appear. According to evolution theory, enormous and radical evolutionary changes have taken place in this time, and evolution has not ceased today. So why no new 'body plans' since the time they all allegedly evolved in the Cambrian?

(See the document I sent you called *Advanced Design in "Primitive" Animals)*

There are over 2600 known diseases caused by genetic mutations which are being studied to eliminate those diseases. The #1 cause of mutations is radiation and pollution. Have you ever heard of a scientist saying if we had more radiation or more pollution we would have more mutations and we would be better? That we would evolve into some improved "super-humans"? Of course not. But they want us to believe that in the past, mutations changed the first single celled organism into all the amazing life forms on earth today. "A process that steadily degrades a genome (increases genetic entropy) cannot produce a better organism in the long run." The late biologist and member of the National Academy of Sciences Lynn Margulis stated, "*New mutations don't create new species; they create offspring that are impaired."* Over 950 PhD scientists have signed the "Scientific Dissent from Darwinism" list, affirming that they are "*skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutations and natural selection to account for the complexity of life*."

Genetic Entropy

Dr John Sanford "Our declining genome"

We see **degeneration** all around us. **Energy** goes from an ordered state to disorder. (Your coffee gets cold – the heat is dissipated into the room. Cooling off means it was hotter in the past, so there was some cause and source of the heat.) **All Physical**

systems wear down and break down. **Information** degrades. **Living organisms** age and die. **Populations** of species go extinct. That means there was more order in the past. The only way to overcome disorder is by intelligent will.

Mutations (typos in our DNA) are killing us- molecular mistakes are entropy on the genetic level. Dr Michael Lynch, prof of population genetics at IU says we have 1-5 mistakes in every cell division in our body. Average cell in a 15 year old has up to 6000 mutations. And every cell has its own distinct mutations. Average skin cell in a 60 year old has 40,000 mutations. Those mutations are causing aging and death. So Lynch says "there is little potential for substantially increasing the upper limit of the human life span." There is zero potential for a medical breakthrough that will stop aging or defeat death. Mutations scramble the specific info in our DNA, which causes dissipation of our information and systematic breakdown of our biological functions. Even worse, as the mutation load goes up, the rate of breakdown also goes up. This is **mutational meltdown**. The repair genes cannot keep up with the decay rate.

Genetic entropy is not only true of individuals, but of whole populations. Mutations are passed from parents to children. This causes whole species to die. Many species are already extinct (90% of all the species that have ever lived on earth?) and many more are going extinct. Environmental factors are one cause, but the primary cause is genetic entropy. The human strain of H1N1 "swine flu" virus that killed millions in 1918, and other outbreaks later, finally had an internal mutation rate of 10% and became extinct in 2009. A "cousin" form remains but with a different name.

Human genomic entropy – our reproductive cells (germ cells) divide less often than our somatic cells (like skin cells), so they do not have as many mutations or pass on as many, but we do have about 100 new mutations per person per generation. Babies are born with tens of thousands of mutations, and increasing every generation. 2-3% of babies worldwide have visible birth defects. For every visible one there are tens of thousands that are not yet visible. There are thousands of diseases caused by known genetic problems, and many more not yet identified. "We are genetically inferior to the cave-man." Dr. Lynch says even assuming a rate of only 60 mutations per generation, we are declining in fitness 1-5% per generation, but it could be as high as 10%! That would be a 50% decrease in 6 generations! If he is correct, we face rapid extinction as a species. Geneticist Alexei Kondrashov, believing "humans" have been on earth over 100,000 years wrote an article entitled "Why are we not dead a hundred times over?" Lynch proposes allowing more people to die to eliminate the weaker ones. But most humans have pretty similar mutations, so eliminating the worst (if it were possible) does not appreciably change the outcome.

Evidences of genetic entropy: World wide there is a decline in male sperm count. 25 years ago, only 2% of people 85+ years old had dementia/Alzheimer's, now it is 50%!
There is a sharp increase in autism rates, and allergies and autoimmune diseases.

Age spans of patriarchs in Gen 5. There were 10 generations living ~770 to 970 years because God created Adam and Eve with perfect genomes. They lived long and their offspring could intermarry without genetic problems. Adam lived 930 years, had ~250 year overlap with Methuselah, who was Noah's grandfather. He lived ~250 years after Noah was born, so Noah could have received much info about creation and the garden of Eden from Methuselah who heard it directly from Adam! Methuselah died the year of the flood.

Noah lived ~350 years after the flood. Noah's son, Shem, lived 600 years, 500 after the flood. Then the next generations lived, 483, 433, 464, 239, 239, 230, 148, 205, 175 (Abraham), 130 (Isaac), 110 (Joseph). Why the drop off? After the flood all future children came from three brothers. There was a genetic bottleneck, much less genetic diversity. Dr Sanford says those ages plotted on a graph show a "classic biological decay curve".

For about the last 40 years there has been much talk about "**Mitochondrial Eve**" the "mother" of all humans, based on measuring mutations in the DNA which is in the mitochondria. There are only ~17,000 base pairs there, as opposed to the 6 billion base pairs in the nucleus, so it is much easier to measure mutations. Originally, scientists believed the rate of mutation was about 1 in 600 generations, because they assumed "Eve" lived about 200,000 years ago. A 1998 article in *Science* said scientists were "stunned" to find 10 base-pair changes, which gave them a rate of one mutation every 40 generations', indicating this "Eve" lived only about 6000 years ago.

Dr Nathaniel Jeanson, Harvard PhD, has shown that the mitochondrial mutation rate of humans, round worms, fruit flies, water fleas and yeast all fit with a 6000 year Biblical timeframe, but are totally inconsistent with the evolutionary timeframe.

Haldane's dilemma –Natural Selection does not create new information. It only eliminates weaker forms of organisms. JBS Haldane, the founder of Population Genetics, said it would take (on average) 300 generations (more than 6000 years) to select a single new mutation to fixation. For an entirely recessive beneficial mutation to increase fitness 1% would require 100,000 generations (2 million years) to reach fixation. If a gene were half formed (by chance) it would degrade many times over before ever becoming functional. Genetics shows that evolution is impossible!

Chromosome 2 Fusion?

Humans have 23 chromosome pairs. Apes have 24. Evolutionists often claim that two smaller chimp chromosomes fused to create human chromosome 2 at some early point in human history. They base this claim on the fact that the banding patterns in two smaller chimpanzee chromosomes are similar to the banding pattern on human chromosome 2. However:

1. The bands actually do not line up perfectly, thus the supposed evidence for the fusion event on human chromosome 2 is in the wrong place.

2. While chromosome fusions have been documented in other species, there are no other examples of two chromosomes joining at the ends. The telomeres help prevent this.

3. If a head-to-head fusion occurred, it should leave behind evidence of the original telomeres, i.e. characteristic repetitive telomere sequence (TTAGGG), in both forwards and backwards direction. There are telomere motifs in this area, but they rarely repeat in a tandem fashion as they would if they were truly telomeric, and they can be found in other parts of the genome as well.

4. Since every chromosome has a centromere, a head-to-head fusion should produce a chromosome with two centromeres. But centromeres have a distinctive repeating sequence of 171 units that are specific for a species. Human Chromosome 2's supposed vestigial centromere looks nothing like a chimp centromere, but it does match several other places in the non-centromeric *human* genome.

5. If a head-to-head fusion occurred, there is no way that it happened in the middle of an active gene, for two halves of a single gene would not be found on different chromosomes. Yet the supposed fusion site is located in the middle of a highly expressed and tightly controlled human gene.

Considering all this, there is little evidence that human chromosome 2 is the result of an ancient fusion event.

Assignment for next week: Ch 5 The Geologic Record