


The Most Exciting Science Related to Creation by Dr. Jay L. Wile, Ph.D.

Qualifications

- University Professor From 1990 - 1995
- Helped Develop Indiana's Only Residential High School for Gifted and Talented Students
- NSF-Sponsored Scientist with More Than \$200,000 In Research Grants
- Became Interested in Homeschooling Because of Excellent University Students Who Were Homeschooled
- Currently writes junior high school and high school science courses for homeschooled students

The Genetic Code is NOT Universal



The code that is used to make the translation from RNA to protein is called the GENETIC CODE.

Evolutionists Claim the Genetic Code is Universal

“For almost all organisms tested, including humans, flies, yeast, and bacteria, the same codons are used to code for the same amino acids. Therefore, the genetic code is said to be universal. The universality of the genetic code strongly implies a common evolutionary origin to all organisms, even those in which the small differences have evolved.” –*The Biology Encyclopedia*

This isn't even close to true!

Biology Professor Dr. Wayne Rossiter Says

“To date, the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), which houses all published DNA sequences (as well as RNA and protein sequences), currently acknowledges nineteen different coding languages for DNA.”

Many of them are quite different from one another.

Big News in Genetics

Junk DNA has been a fundamental idea in evolution for quite some time. Dr. Sydney Brenner, director of the Molecular Genetics Unit of Britain’s Medical Research Council, represented the majority view of evolutionists back in 1989:

“He argues that it is necessary to sequence only 2 percent the human genome: the part that contains coded information. **The rest of the human genome, Brenner maintains, is junk.**” [Sharon Kingman, “Buried Treasure in Human Genes,” *New Scientist* July 8, 1989, p. 36]

More Recently, Dr. John C. Advise put it this way:

“...the vast majority of human DNA exists not as functional gene regions of any sort but, instead, consists of various classes of repetitive DNA sequences, including the decomposing corpses of deceased structural genes...To the best of current knowledge, many if not most of these repetitive elements contribute not one iota to a person’s well-being. They are well-documented, however, to contribute to many health disorders.” [John C. Advise, *Inside the Human Genome: A Case for Non-Intelligent Design*, Oxford University Press 2010, p. 107.]

Avida, the “gold standard” of evolution computer simulations requires that 85% of the simulated genome start out as junk.

We Now Know the Vast Majority of the Human Genome Is Functional!

A scientific initiative that so far has analyzed 1,640 data sets generated for 147 different human cell types has revolutionized our understanding of the human genome. In an overview, the journal *Nature* declared:

“Among the many important results there is one that stands out above them all: more than 80% of the human genome’s components have now been assigned at least one biochemical function.”

[Magdalena Skipper, Ritu Dhand, and Philip Campbell, “Presenting ENCODE,” *Nature* 489:45, 2012]

That Number Will Probably Increase

Dr. Ewan Birney is the project's Lead Data Analysis Coordinator. He says:

“It's likely that 80 percent will go to 100 percent... We don't really have any large chunks of redundant DNA. This metaphor of junk isn't that useful.”

[<http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/notrocketscience/2012/09/05/encode-the-rough-guide-to-the-human-genome/>]

Evolutionists Were Surprised

Dr. John A. Stamatoyannopoulos was also on the ENCODE team. He said:

“I don't think anyone would have anticipated even close to the amount of sequence that ENCODE has uncovered that looks like it has functional importance...”

[Elizabeth Pennisi, "ENCODE Project Writes Eulogy for Junk DNA," *Science* 337:1159-1161, 2012]

Creationists Not Only Anticipated It, They Predicted It!

For example, Dr. David Dewitt made a video almost 10 years before the ENCODE project announced its results. The title was, “Junk DNA Is Not Junk.”

Consider What One Leading Evolutionist Says:

“For a theory to be considered scientific, it must be *testable* and *make verifiable predictions*... And if those predictions are met, it gives us more confidence that the theory is true.” – Dr. Jerry Coyne

[Jerry Coyne, *Why Evolution is True*, Penguin Group 2009, p. 15]

Another Creationist Prediction

There should be significant amounts of carbon-14 in dinosaur bones.

Carbon-14 has a relatively “short” half-life (5,700 years). It is used in dating fossils that are supposed to be less than 60,000 years old. It should not be able to date fossils older than that, because there should be no detectable levels of carbon-14 in them.

Creationist Prediction Confirmed!

Acrocantosaur fossils (supposed to be 100 million years old), carbon date from 23,760 to 30,640 years old.

Triceratops fossils (supposed to be 65 million years old), carbon date from 24,340 to 39,320 years old.

Samples of 8 dinosaur fossils from Texas, Alaska, Colorado, and Montana, China, and Europe had so much carbon-14 in them that they couldn't be more than 39,000 years old. Not a single sample tested as expected by evolutionists.

[Hugh Miller, et. al., "A comparison of $\delta^{13}C$ and pMC Values for Ten Cretaceous-Jurassic Dinosaur Bones from Texas to Alaska USA, China, and Europe," AOGS-AGU (WPGM) 2012 conference]

How Did Evolutionists Respond?

The facility that did the carbon-14 analysis now refuses any samples they send!

"The scientists at CAIS and I are dismayed by the claims that you and your team have made with respect to the age of the Earth and the validity of biological evolution. Consequently, we are no longer able to provide radiocarbon services in support of your anti-scientific agenda."

[<http://newgeology.us/presentation48.html>]

Speaking of Dinosaur Fossils...

In 2005, Mary Schweitzer found **soft tissue** in a *Tyrannosaurus rex* femur that was supposed to be **65 million years old!**

Laboratory studies indicate that soft tissue decays about **50 weeks** or so, it is thought that proteins break down after only **30,000 years**, unless special circumstances were present

Many evolutionists scrambled for another explanation, such as bacterial biofilms:

Schweitzer and her colleagues showed that the soft tissue contained a protein that would be typical for dinosaurs but not bacteria.

Famous paleontologist Jack Horner refused the offer of a \$10,000 to his museum to use carbon-14 dating on the tissue. He said that "the spin" creationists can get off it "is not going to help us."

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=szHNDAMfA0s>]

The \$10,000 grant was above and beyond the cost of the test. In addition to the \$10,000, the grant included the cost for four other artifacts of the museum's choosing!

Since 2005, Many More Examples Have Been Found!

Example: A “65 Million Year Old” Triceratops Horn

The horn was soaked in weak acid for a month to remove minerals, and strips of soft, brown tissue were recovered.

Since this tissue could be a lot of things, they looked at it under a microscope.

They Found Exactly What You Would Expect If It Is Original Bone Tissue!

An Electron Microscope Revealed This:

“Filipodial extensions were delicate and showed no evidence of any permineralization or crystallization artifact and therefore were interpreted to be soft.”

[Mark Hollis Armitage and Kevin Lee Anderson, “Soft sheets of fibrillar bone from a fossil of the supraorbital horn of the dinosaur *Triceratops horridus*,” *Acta Histochemica*, 115(6):603-608, 2103]

Note: The horn was carbon-dated to be $41,010 \pm 220$ years old.

[Alexander Cherkinsky, “Radiocarbon Analysis Report,” The University of Georgia Center for Applied Isotope Studies, August 14, 2012.]

How Did Evolutionists Respond?

The study’s principle investigator, Mark Armitage, was fired from his university position!

According to the lawsuit he has filed, one university official stormed into his office after the paper was published and shouted, “We are not going to tolerate your religion in this department!” [<http://www.thecollegefix.com/post/18549>]

He sued the university, and the suit was settled for an undisclosed amount. He has used that money to fund the Dinosaur Soft Tissue Research Institute (dstri.org)

Here Is The Current Record Holder

A microscopic examination of a worm fossil that is supposed to be 550 million years old revealed:

“Minerals have not replicated any part of the soft tissue and the carbonaceous material of the wall is primary, preserving the original layering of the wall, its texture, and fabrics.”

[Moczydlowska, M., F. Estall, and F. Foucher, “Microstructure and Biogeochemistry of the Organically Preserved Ediacaran Metazoan Sabellidites,” *Journal of Paleontology* **88(2)**:224-239, 2014.]

Another Creationist Prediction

Mutualism is common in nature. It involves two or more different species cooperating so that both benefit.

In 2003, creationist J.W. Francis predicted that mutualism should be easy to instigate, since it was part of the original creation.

In 2014, The Prediction Was Confirmed

An alga and fungus that had never encountered one another in nature were put together in an artificial environment, and they formed a mutualistic relationship. The alga even changed its cell wall structure to make the relationship easier!

This Is Opposite Of Evolution’s Prediction!

“Indeed, it is difficult to conceive of two organisms starting out in a mutualistic association. Most mutualistic symbioses probably began as parasitic ones, with one organism attempting to exploit another one.”

[Surindar Paracer and Vernon Ahmadjian, *Symbiosis: An Introduction to Biological Associations*, Oxford University Press 2000, p. 8]