

V  
Corrupted Codes  
*Mutations*



*“No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution... There is no law against day dreaming, but science must not indulge in it.”*

Pierre-Paul Grassé <sup>1</sup>



---

**Genetic mutations corrupt DNA codes  
while doing nothing to evolve  
entirely new and different kinds of life.**

---

After 44,000 generations of mutated *E. coli* bacteria, all descendants clung to their *E. coli* pedigree. None evolved into some other life form. Evolution has never been observed in the living world.

Despite more than two billion fossil finds from times past, the millions of intermediate life forms essential to substantiate the molecule-to-man hypothesis have yet to be discovered.

Except for Darwin's idea that first life evolved from some ancient "warm little pond," no scientific evidence confirms spontaneous generation to be a fact.

Far from a blob of protoplasm, molecular biology has shown that a living cell is a more complex mechanism than any machine invented by human intelligence.

As to the source of the prodigious strands of genetic information contained in a cell's DNA, the most sophisticated scientists lack any authoritative explanation.

Since 1859, evolution theory has been pitted against true science in an intellectual baseball game.

Evolution has yet to score or even put a runner on base.

At the bottom of the ninth, with the bases empty, two outs, and two strikes, evolution faces a season-ending loss.

The legendary “Mighty Casey,” batting for mutations, struts to the plate and whiffs at a fast ball down the center of the plate. Myth meets legend. They go down together.

Game over!

There’s no joy in Mudville or celebration in Evolution City!

### **Gregor Mendel’s Garden**

A single mathematical miscalculation can disrupt a rocket’s trip to the moon. A mistake in a pharmaceutical product can kill. Mutations are genetic wrong numbers that typically wreak havoc on a genome.

A word processing mistake corrupts communication!

Delete the letter “t” from that sentence. Then, replace the letter “e” with the # symbol. The garbled result:

*A word proc#ssing misak# corrupts communicaion!*

No Pulitzer Prize honors the author of gibberish.

Genetic mutations deliver no new information but only shuffle or corrupt existing genes. To suggest mutations evolve new and improved life kinds makes no more sense than suggesting disease generates good health.

When Darwin opted for life by random chance accident rather than by design, his perception of the living cell smacked of the superstitious mystical. He lacked the faintest perception of the cell’s origin and complexity, much less awareness of the sources of its genetic information.

He hadn’t heard the news about Mendel’s garden!

In a quest to explain evolution, he differentiated between “somatic” and “germ” cells by latching on to what he called “gemmules” to work the unexplainable magic his idea invited.

Darwin identified gemmules as the mechanism that would preserve and pass along acquired physical traits from somatic cells to germ cells and then on to descendant generations. Bit-

by-bit, gradual changes supposedly accumulated en route to an entirely new and different life kind.

The hopeful guru seized upon the towering neck of the giraffe, a top ten attraction at animal zoos, as prime evidence of the process. Fairy tale logic manufactured the fiction that when persistent droughts dried the fields of grass grazed by giraffe ancestors, survival hinged on stretching their necks toward the sky to nibble tree leaves.

Theoretically, the animal's bone and muscle structure managed to preserve each stretch of the neck and forward each miniscule change to the next generation, thanks to gemmules. Accrued over time, these modest adaptations supposedly evolved the long-necked giraffe that populates African plains.

Applied to humans, a muscle builder should be able to pass along to his children, a set of muscles enhanced by exercise.

The far-fetched myth made no sense.

Why didn't other animals, such as zebras, evolve longer necks as well?

Belief that acquired physical traits could be passed on to offspring proved to be gross error.

When the twentieth century dawned, the stage was set for a direct assault on a core component of the Darwinian notion that intrigued late nineteenth century academia.

By the time Mendel's Law surfaced, reliance on acquired physical traits blazing trails to new and entirely different species had lost credibility.

Gregor Mendel (1822-1884), an obscure Czech monk and Darwin contemporary, discovered fundamental genetic principles in the quietude of a monastery garden near the time Englishman Charles Robert Darwin postulated evolution---shifting changes in life formats driven by natural selection

picking from a smorgasbord of traits acquired by random chance over long stretches of time.

Mendel's experiment revolutionized knowledge of the mechanism of inheritance. He bred several generations of garden peas focusing on the plant's seven basic characteristics. What he discovered about hybrids clashed head-on with Darwinian conjecture.

Mendel read his findings before the *Brünn Society for the Study of Natural Science* in 1865---six years after Darwin published *Origin*. His report was published in the Society's *Journal* in 1866 and distributed to 120 libraries, including some in England and eleven in the United States.

Mendel's work, either ignored or overlooked, was referenced in the *Encyclopedia Britannica's* 1892 edition.<sup>2</sup>

The landmark findings, dormant and virtually unnoticed since his initial presentation, were translated into English and published in 1900.

Pushing the public release was 39-year-old British biologist, William Bateson (1861-1926), founder of the science of genetics and eventual president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, admired Mendel's scholarship. Publication rocked intellectual circles!

There is speculation as to whether Darwin's theory of evolution would have "evolved" and seen the light of day had he studied Mendel's findings.

Bateson, a British biologist, expressed doubts.

*"...Darwin would never have written the Origin of Species if he had known Mendel's work."*<sup>3</sup>

Maybe "yes," maybe "no," but we'll never know!

What we do know is that contemporary cell knowledge and its DNA strands, correlates with Mendel's law of heredity and does nothing to corroborate Darwin's theory.

Darwin's co-evolutionist, Alfred Russell Wallace, viewed Mendel's findings as a threat to evolution theory. *"On the general relation of Mendelism to evolution, I have come to a very definite conclusion. That is, that it is really antagonistic to evolution."*<sup>4</sup>

Mendel's pioneer research launched the science of genetics confirming life forms function through precisely expressed information codes with predictable results.

Mendel's law of genetic inheritance blew the cover off empty rhetoric embellishing make-believe. The discovery opened doors to genes, chromosomes, and DNA—the master genetic templates that determine and distinguish life prototypes.

*"Cell biologists identified chromosomes as the carriers of Mendel's heredity factors, and in 1909 Wilhelm Johanssen named them 'genes.'"*<sup>5</sup>

Primitive investigative naturalists lacked the first clue about complex life codes vested in a cell's DNA. They studied what they could see—embryos and bones. Similarities were interpreted as relatedness.

Embryonic transformation from misunderstood cells to a fully developed animal encouraged conjecture that comparable transformations of any cell could lead eventually to most any complex creature—given spin the bottle luck and mega years of evolutionary gestation.

Theories of origin came burdened with the same medieval hot air that floated spontaneous generation fallacy. Darwinists looked in the wrong direction—toward fully developed life forms and their fossils.

Oblivious to genes, evolution's pioneer guru went looking for theory confirmation in all the wrong places. He relied on the fossil record, despite its paucity!



**Despite today's awesome diversity of bird species,  
some Darwinian loyalists still insist that  
birds "evolved" from mutated dinosaur genes**

Darwin's optimism that evidence from fossil fields would reveal a continuous chain of organic life linking simple to complex, lay in disarray.

Superstition, tradition and personal bias crept into research prior to tools of sophisticated technology. Eloquence filtered through the stentorian tones of an English accent added cosmetic cover to supposition.

Knowledge as to ancestry and origins lay obscured in data invisible to the naked eye. Not until the advent of molecular biology did doors swing open, inviting comprehension.

The world might have been spared specious speculations had molecular biology been a nineteenth-century science.

### Genetic "Abnormalities"

What Mendel did with garden peas, Hugo deVries observed in the primrose.

He reported flowers rising "...*suddenly, spontaneously, by steps, by jumps. They jumped out among the offspring.*"

DeVries described variables as "*new species*" which he erroneously labeled "*mutations.*"

Given time, "*mutations*" were incorporated as an integral component of evolution's iconic lexicon.<sup>6</sup>

In 1908, Alfred Russell Wallace (1823-1913), sensed a threat to evolution theory and dismissed Mendel's discovery while discounting mutations as minimally significant.

*"As playing any essential part in the scheme of organic development, the phenomena seem to me to be of the very slightest importance. They arise out of what are essentially abnormalities, whether called varieties, 'mutations,' or sports."*

He saw "...*their extinction under natural conditions more certain and more rapid, thus preventing the injurious effects that might result from their competing with the normal form while undergoing slow adaptive modification...*"

*“Any species which gave birth to a large number of such abnormal and unchangeable individuals would be so hampered by them whenever adaptive modification became necessary that the whole species might be in danger of extinction.”*

Wallace scorned these abnormalities as *“refuse material of nature’s workshop, as proved by the fact that none of them ever maintain themselves in a state of nature.”*<sup>7</sup>

Inadvertently, and apparently unforeseen by Wallace, his negative appraisals of mutations ran diametrically counter to subsequently postulated neo-Darwinism’s *Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution!*

Wallace didn’t live long enough to learn that what he described as *“abnormalities”* and *“refuse material”* would be seized upon as the holy grail used to preserve a jeopardized tradition.

Wallace was not the only man of influence reluctant to jump for joy when confronted with Mendel’s law of genetic inheritance. The news shook the faith of other devout evolutionists candid enough to express concern.

Princeton’s Prof. Scott complained the findings *“...rendered but little assistance in making the evolution process more intelligent, but instead of removing difficulties have rather increased them.”*<sup>8</sup>

A shaken Chair of Evolution professor for the University of Paris, voiced alarm to a 1916 Harvard audience.

*“It comes to pass that some biologists of the greatest authority in the study of Mendelian principles of heredity are led to the expression of ideas which would almost take us back to creationism...The data of Mendelism embarrasses us quite considerably.”*<sup>9</sup>

Zoology Professor, E.W. McBride, reminisced for *Science Progress* the year of the 1925 Scopes Trial. He recognized Mendel’s Law as a potential wet blanket cast over evolution theory after first being greeted with *“enthusiasm.”*

His *“cul-de-sac:”* reflection disclosed disappointment.

*“We thought at last the key to evolution had been discovered. But as our knowledge of the facts grew, the difficulty of using Mendelian phenomena to explain evolution became apparent, and this early hope sickened and died. The way that Mendel pointed seemed to lead into a cul-de-sac.”*<sup>10</sup>

Evolutionists grasped the sheer absurdity of the gemmule poppycock. Wracking their brains for some fashionable alternative, 1930's era Darwinists recognized pangenesis has hollow myth. The stage beckoned for a mechanism that might rally the faithful.

Saddled with the absurdity of primitive superstition, the moment demanded retrenchment, revision and revival. And not a moment too soon---already a crescendo of doubting voices were reacting negatively to eroding credibility.

*“[T]he theory suffers from grave defects, which are becoming more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge, nor does it suffice for our theoretical grasp of the facts...”*

*“No one can demonstrate that the limits of a species have ever been passed. These are the Rubicons which evolutionists cannot cross. Darwin ransacked other spheres of practical research work for ideas...but his whole resulting scheme remains, to this day, foreign to scientifically established zoology, since actual changes of species by such means are still unknown.”*<sup>11</sup>

Its more than a quantum leap to suggest a string of DNA from human cells stretching 50 billion kilometers into space could be built by multi-millions of random chance quirks of nature flowing seamlessly from the Planet Earth's first ever life form. But the task was handed to Wallace's *“refuse material.”*

### **Synthetic “Science”**

Evolution theory itself has shown evolving flexibility when necessary to survive. During the 1859 to 1872 interval, Darwin

repeatedly modified his *Origin of Species* manuscript by increasing the original 150,000 word text to 190,000 words.

A computerized comparison of the six editions can be checked out on Ben Fry's website, "The Preservation of Favoured Traces."

Theodosius Dobzhansky floated a theoretical life preserver in 1937 celebrating this very same "*refuse material*" as evolution's "*raw material*." He postulated "*mutations and chromosomal changes... constantly and unremittingly supply the raw materials for evolution.*"<sup>12</sup>

The innovative idea attracted attention in the post-Scopes Trial world despite its failure to explain the source, content or mechanism that assigned impossible tasks to the "*raw materials*."

Dobzhansky either ignored or perhaps didn't understand that mutations provided no new information to the genetic code---only disruptive impairment to genes already present.

Evolution's movers and shakers like Julian Huxley and George Gaylord Simpson grabbed Dobzhansky's straw in the wind. Putting heads together in an effort to resuscitate evolution without dumping the baby with the bathwater, they designated mutations as natural selection's new partner.

Revived and introduced to the world with bells and whistles, the updated dogma was awarded the grand title: *Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution*.

Inclusion of the word "*synthetic*" in the artificially ginned-up tandem linking *mutations* to *natural selection*, matched reality! Genetic chasms separating distinct kinds of organic formats have never been bridged by the quite synthetic combo!

Mutations paired with natural selection may shift a descendant organism laterally or down or laterally but never drives a vertical change up the down staircase to a different *phyla, class, order or family*.

Reinventing evolution by reliance on mutations as the theory's "*raw materials*" is as fanciful as attempting to cut a stable path atop the Sahara Desert's shifting sands.

Mirages beckoning refuge don't necessarily deliver water!

Mutations have not yet found a respectable niche in the pantheon of proven science.



© Gentoo Multimedia, Ltd. – Sutterstock.com license

**To evolve a penguin from a dinosaur should take thousands of lucky mutations over millions of years! Has anyone yet seen even one of those fossil transitionals?**

## The Mutation Mirage

No question, nature bursts with dynamic change potential. Genomes display stunning versatility. But this capacity to diversify utilizes genetic information pre-existing within genes to preserve survival of the species.

Digging deep, the *Modern Synthetic Theory* inadvertently exposes two, not so synthetic, problems:

(1) Mutations typically corrupt the genetic code, never adding information; and (2) Five billion years is not enough time to accumulate the billions of mutations essential to accommodate the theory's demands. Eg.---random chance evolving an irreducibly complex *Homo sapiens* from an obscure, ancestral fish.

Faithful Darwinists met in Chicago in 1959 to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the publication of *The Origin of Species*. Sir Julian Huxley, grandson of the 19th century Huxley who ran interference for Darwin, made no apologies for the inconsistency.

Waxing eloquent, Sir Julian went overboard, assuring celebrants that "*Darwin's theory...is no longer a theory but a fact...We are no longer having to bother about establishing the fact of evolution...*"

He ruled out "*either need or room for the supernatural...*"<sup>13</sup>

Huxley's whistling-in-the dark more appropriately should have been an obituary for a concept confronting death throes. Despite Huxley's chest thumping, evolution's delicate threads had begun to unravel, reflecting Darwin's own unease by recognizing "*flaws*"; and "*holes*" in the fabric.

The synthetic theory drew jeers mixed with cheers.

"*The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination.*"<sup>14</sup>

*“...Let it be stated in no uncertain terms that there is no evidence that evolution ever has occurred or ever can occur across the kinds.”*<sup>15</sup>

*“Whoever thinks macroevolution can be made by mutations that lose information is like the merchant who lost a little money on every sale but thought he could make it up on volume.”*<sup>16</sup>

Genetic mistakes solve nothing.

When no new genetic information has been introduced to the genome, only the genetic card deck has been shuffled.

No mutation or series of mutations, collaborating with natural selection, can activate random chance change to a new life kind without the addition of new genetic information.

Redundant clichés citing finch beaks, fruit flies, and bacteria modifications as evidence of evolution, confirm only the versatility potential built into a preexisting genetic code.

Bacteria replicate prodigiously as bacteria, ad infinitum.

Thousands of generations later in the process, fruit flies remain fruit-flies, albeit horribly crippled and deformed.

Typically deleterious, mutations can degrade the organism, inducing loss of genetic information that can lead to extinction. Thanks to twelve enzymes, mutations themselves are subject to an organism’s self-correcting mechanism.. If the repair system itself mutates, the organism’s survival could be at risk.

*“Mutations take place, but they are either reversible, deteriorative, or neutral...If one must depend on mutation and natural selection to produce new species---let alone, new families, orders and phyla as evolutionists assume, then not even billions of years would suffice.”*<sup>17</sup>

### **A Roster of Impaired Genes**

Partnering mutations with natural selections brings new baggage to evolution’s equation.

Not only are mutations incapable of introducing new information, typically they impair what’s already there! *“The genome is fragile, subject to environmental insults (radiation, oxidation*

*etc.) Extensive repair systems are guarding the integrity of the genome second-by-second. Without their work, life would become extinct.”*<sup>18</sup>

There is belief that genetic codes are vulnerable to assault from radiation and chemical reactions. The ultimate villain may be virus parasites that invade cells and wreak havoc on nuclei.

*“When a virus penetrates a cell, it disappears inside the nucleus for four to eight hours, giving the outward appearance of complete normalcy. Then the viral particles that the cell has been coerced into making suddenly burst forth, shattering the host.”*<sup>19</sup>

While some argue “...that viruses were involved very early on in the evolutionary emergence of life,”<sup>20</sup> the contrary view questions just how such insidious, disease-causing critters could contribute anything other than genetic flaws, degrading the genome. Duplications, translocations, and deletions in the genetic machinery trigger debilitation and susceptibility to disease.

This reality deserves billboard prominence!

*“Major functional disorders in humans, animals and plants are caused by the loss or displacement of a single DNA molecule, or even a single nucleotide within that molecule...There is no evidence for beneficial spontaneous genetic mutations.”*<sup>21</sup>

Crippling mutations respect no human!

Mutations unload a bleak litany of physical flaws and debilitating diseases on the genome! Mutations have plagued humans with a list of 4,500 already identified bad results—and still counting.

A once monster of a man, now twisted and bent almost in half, totters feebly, aided by a walker. Parkinson’s disease, the insidious scourge, laid low the robust physique of the former football star. A mutated gene stands accused as the culprit!<sup>22</sup>

Harmful gene mutations discovered in 1996 alone, cast an eye-opening pall.

Progressive myoclonus epilepsy is caused by a gene mutation on chromosome 21. Treacher Callins Syndrome, hemochromatosis, is linked to a defective gene on chromosome 6.

A gene mutation on chromosome 5 generates deformities of the face, ears, down-slanting eyes, and deafness. Progressive blindness described as retinitis pigmentosa is a disorder linked to a gene from the X chromosome.

A chromosome 9 gene mutation causes skin cancer. A mutated gene on chromosome 16 is tied to fanconi anemia, affecting children who rarely live past their sixteenth birthday.

A gene missing from chromosome 7 causes Williams Syndrome. Anhidrotic ectodermal dysplasia, resulting from a mutation on the X chromosome, can afflict victims with baldness, loss of teeth, or deprive them of ability to sweat.<sup>23</sup>

*“...Not one mutation that increased the efficiency of a genetically coded human protein has been found. Instead of a ‘blind watchmaker,’ the mutations behave like a ‘blind gunman,’ a destroyer who shoots his deadly ‘bullets’ randomly into beautifully designed models of living molecular machinery. Sometimes the ‘bullets’ only cause minor damage; sometimes they maim and cripple; sometimes they kill.”<sup>24</sup>*

There are “genetic flaws that make people fat...”<sup>25</sup> Werner’s syndrome results from a mutated site on human chromosome 8 that causes victims to “age prematurely fast and usually die before they reach 50.”<sup>26</sup>

*“Best’s macular dystrophy...destroys the part of the retina responsible for the sharpest vision ‘has been linked to mutations’ in the gene now called bestrophin.”<sup>27</sup>*

Since 1990, “discoveries of heart-handicapping mutations have been pouring out of numerous labs at an ever-increasing rate, yielding more than 100 mutations in more than a dozen genes.”<sup>28</sup>

Another genetic mutation “...causes children to die of old age...Children with Hutchinson-Gilford progeria syndrome age at a rate five to 10 times faster than normal. They lose their hair, their skin wrinkles, and they die of arteriosclerosis, or hardening of the arteries, by their early teens.” The defect is in “...a gene that controls the structure of the nucleus...”<sup>29</sup>

“A genetic polymorphism called 11307K in either of...two APC genes doubles the risk of colon cancer.”<sup>30</sup>

Spontaneous blood clots can form with the power to cause sudden death where a “patient with the disorder has inherited at least one defective gene encoding protein C.”<sup>31</sup>

A mutated gene on chromosome 11 contributes to inherited hearing impairment.<sup>32</sup>

Then there’s the unappetizing smorgasbord of birth defects caused by mutated genes: muscular dystrophy, spinabifida, cystic fibrosis, Huntington’s Disease, hermachromatosis, and Down’s Syndrome.

Leukemia may result when a piece of chromosome translocates to another chromosome in the midst of cell division.

Regarding humans, researchers “calculated an unusually high rate of 4.2 mutations per generation, of which 1.6 diminish the fitness of the species...the species must survive in part because people who have accumulated dangerous mutations are least likely to successfully have children...”

“The human reproductive strategy helps purge harmful mutations in batches...they mix their genes with another’s, and presumably some of the worst defects aren’t passed along. That wouldn’t happen if humans reproduced asexually.”<sup>33</sup>

## Natural Selection

Natural selection is genuine!

But don't hold your breath expecting evolutionary change if selection relies on mutations.

Natural selection works counter to the other half of the evolution equation by screening out harmful mutations.

*"Natural selection can serve only to 'weed out' those mutations that are harmful, at best preserving the 'status quo.'"*<sup>34</sup>

*"Natural selection can act only on those biologic properties that already exist; it cannot create properties in order to meet adaptational needs."*<sup>35</sup>

*"No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection."*<sup>36</sup>

Natural selection offers no more than tautology's circular reasoning. *"...The Darwinian theory of natural selection, whether or not coupled with Mendelism, is false."*<sup>37</sup>

Gravity stands secure as an irrefutable landmark in the science of physics.

Mendel's law of genetic inheritance is no less a fact of biology. Evolutionists like Wallace, Scott and McBride reacted with concern, recognizing that Mendel's law not only didn't track with the theory of evolution but also threw a monkey-wrench into its mechanism.

So, which approach deserves objective respect?

The irrefutable findings of Gregor Mendel?

Or the conjectured role of mutations as stand-ins for discredited gemmules?

### **Fat Chance Odds**

*"Genetic variation depends on the process of mutation, and mutations are rare events. Any particular new DNA mutation will occur only once in about 100 million gametes. Moreover, when a single mutation occurs in a single newborn, even if it is a favorable mutation, there is a fair probability that it will not be presented in the next generation because its single carrier may not, by chance, pass it on to its few offspring."*<sup>38</sup>

Change in a single nucleotide would be the smallest possible modification of a genome. One of neo-Darwinism's architects guesstimated that as few as 500 mutations could evolve a new species.

Mathematic odds challenge the possibility.

*"...It's a matter of chance that a mutant survives. It might spread through the population and take it over, but more likely it will just vanish...even good mutations are likely to disappear from the population"* if it occurs just once.

*"The chance of 500 of these steps succeeding is 1/300,000 multiplied by itself 500 times. The odds against that happening are about  $3.6 \times 10^{2,738}$  to one, or the chance of it happening is about  $2.7 \times 10^{-2,739}$ ...It's more than 2,000 orders of magnitude smaller than...impossible."*<sup>39</sup>

Impossible trumps improbable.

Computations of the likelihood for any single event beyond  $10^{50}$  chances qualifies as impossible unless absolutism is willing to concede the intrusion of a miracle.

No matter how many billions of chances and multi-millions of years allocated, the chance of those 500 allegedly beneficial mutation steps succeeding continues *impossible* ad infinitum.

Even an artfully loaded pair of dice will never roll a number higher than 12 no matter how many tosses.

As to the tired cliché that mutations benefit bacteria by building immunity to antibiotics such as streptomycin, reality indicates *"the mutation reduces the specificity of the ribosome protein, and that means losing genetic information"* with *"a loss of sensitivity."*

Despite some *"selective value,"* this mutation *"decreases rather than increases genetic information."*<sup>40</sup>

*"...Antibiotic resistance is the result of loss of a protein, loss of the binding capacity of a protein, or the loss of a transporting system...It's a loss of something...If you're removing a transport protein to eliminate the*

*bacteria's sensitivity to antibiotics, then how is that explaining common descent by modification...?"*<sup>41</sup>

*"There aren't any known, clear, examples of a mutation that has added information." Instead, mutations lead "to a loss of sensitivity to the drug...the effect is heritable, and a whole strain of resistant bacteria can arise from the mutation...A change in one of its proteins is then likely to degrade the organism...Information cannot be built up by mutations that lose it."*<sup>42</sup>

*"For information to build up in living organisms, it must be created somewhere...Although in some special cases a loss of information can lead to an advantage for the organism, the large-scale evolution for which the NDT [neo-Darwinian Theory] is supposed to account cannot be based on such mutations."*<sup>43</sup>

As to the neck of an 18 foot-tall giraffe with a heart 2 ½ feet long, mutations contribute nothing more to explain its origin than do make-believe gemmules.

The heart powerful enough to pump blood up the extended neck to the brain is also powerful enough *"to burst the blood vessels of its brain"* when it reaches down for a drink of water. But when the giraffe bends down, *"a protective mechanism"* kicks in causing *"valves in the arteries in its neck"* to begin to close.<sup>44</sup>

*"...Most mutations which cause changes in the amino acid sequence of proteins tend to damage function to a greater or lesser degree...most of the amino acids in the centre of the protein cannot be changed without having drastic deleterious effects on the stability and function of the molecule."*<sup>45</sup>

*"There's no mutation that gives them [evolutionists] what is necessary for common descent with modifications. There are all kinds of mutations that eliminate proteins. They may eliminate transport protein, an enzyme, the action of an enzyme, or regulatory systems."*

Mutations are *"...not making new transport proteins! They're not making new regulatory systems! Antibiotic resistance is an example ...Every time you read about antibiotic resistance...they're going to talk*

*about this as...an absolute example of evolution.*” One of Darwin’s false assumptions “...was that natural selection had a building or creating capacity, and it doesn’t...” It removes information.<sup>46</sup>

*“...Every molecular example of a mutation we currently have fails to provide a mechanism that can account for the origin of any genetic activity or function.”*<sup>47</sup>

Natural selection functions but it doesn’t power evolution.

### **Limits to Change**

Mutations can’t breach genomic barriers to change.

*“...The degree of change that can be experimentally induced in a wide variety of organisms, from bacteria to mammals, even under the most intensive selection pressures, is always limited by a distinct barrier beyond which further change is impossible.”*<sup>48</sup>

Wheat, corn, chickens, strawberries, and dogs can be bred to size, shape, and color by shuffling the gene cards. But genetic codes define limits to change unless something like gene splicing (guided by intelligence) introduces new information into the genome.

Even then, modified products continue as selected strains of wheat, corn, chickens, strawberries, and dogs.

Luther Burbank made the case alluding to what he defined as *Reversion to the Average*. “...I can develop a plum half an inch long or one 2½ inches long, with every possible length in between, but I am willing to admit that it is hopeless to try to get a plum the size of a small pea, or one as big as a grapefruit ...there are limits to the development possible, and these limits follow a law.”<sup>49</sup>

Plant breeders were able to increase sugar content in sugar beets from 6% to 17%.<sup>51</sup> Apple growers managed to convert the Hawkeye, “a round, blushed yellow apple of surpassing sweetness,” discovered in 1880 in a Madison County, Iowa orchard, into Washington’s once popular Red Delicious, with unique points at its base.

*“Breeders and nurseries patented and propagated the most rubied mutations”* altering the color, shape, flavor, skin and juiciness.<sup>51</sup>

Natural selection occurs, but the apples remained apples.

A living genome provides inherent capacity for variety!

Sharing similar genes does not equate a genetic link nor prove common ancestry any more than different songs, derived from the same octave of sounds, establish musical relationship.

The genetic mix, sequences, and formulas vary radically, just as songs fashioned from the same sound options, produce radically different musical compositions!

God-given versatility, inherent in a given genome, enhances both the diversity and survivability potential of that genome---a non-evolutionary reality recognized by creationists.

As the specific capability and function of a gene (or a combination of genes) is identified, its purpose seems as predictably reliable as the characteristic atomic structure and function of any element found on the Periodic Table.

Then there is the atom, invisible to the naked eye, with its positively charged nucleus encircled by an array of electrons---the smallest unit of any element charted in the classic Periodic Table displayed in High School classrooms.

Inorganic matter is so reliably constant in its identifiable properties that elements can be combined pursuant to chemical recipes producing results readily replicated ad infinitum.

If structure of the atom and gene information can both be measured with predictable precision by an intelligent act, how can it be argued seriously that some mindless, accidental corruption of gene information explains living *“progress towards perfection?”*

From the microscopic minutiae to the cosmic; from the inorganic to the living; natural world science exemplifies precision!!!!

The glaring exception to this universal commonality of the science of order and the mathematically real is evolution's mutant "science" of origins where the logic of the measurable equation is thrown to the winds in favor of assumptive myth.

Evolution ignores the real and postulates the unreal. Empty rhetoric lacks even the mantle of substance once all hype, bells, and whistles are removed.

Slick diagrams, catchy slogans and colorful imagination can't guarantee scientific respectability. Against impossible odds, evolution attracts minds to the obscenity that an ancestral, grand pappy fish spawned all humanity by chance.

Truth stands tall in three dimension; it needs no defense.

Falsehood collapses on itself, melting to nothingness under the relentless scrutiny of the morning sun. Evolution *"...is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless."*<sup>52</sup>

Evolutionist Stephen J. Gould, undercut the core essence of neo-Darwinism with cold-eyed logic. *"You don't make new species by mutating the species...A mutation is not the cause of evolutionary change."*<sup>53</sup>

Rather than a silver bullet to save the theory, mutations usually cripple evolution's gene pool.

So where does that leave evolution's iconic lynchpin?

**Copyright © Warren L. Johns, 2009. All rights reserved.  
No text or content of this chapter may be used or reproduced  
without the prior written consent of the Editor**