

## Recent News in Creation Science

Dr. Jay L. Wile

### 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]

Note that this is a lower limit, as they haven't analyzed all cell types at all stages of development!

### Some of the Scientists on the Team Expect the Percentage of Functional DNA to Rise Significantly

“It's likely that 80 percent will go to 100 percent,” says Birney. “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/>]

(Dr. Ewan Birney is the project's Lead Analysis Coordinator.)

While evolution is dependent on the concept of “junk DNA,” creationists have always maintained that there is little of it in nature.

### **More Problems for the “Geological Column”**

The geological column is a hypothetical construction of earth's geological record. The complete geological column (including the fossils) doesn't exist anywhere in nature, but it is used to “conclude” a great many things, such as the “fact” that dinosaurs and people didn't live during the same time.

Using the geological column, paleontologists long ago concluded that grasses did not exist at the same time as the dinosaurs.

“Bats, mice, squirrels, and many aquatic birds (including herons and storks) appear during this period [Tertiary], as do shrews, whales, and modern fish. All major plants make their appearance and **grasses evolve.**” [Christopher Potter, *You Are Here: A Portable History of the Universe*, Harper, 2010, p. 245]

### **Recent Fossil Evidence Refutes This Geological Column-Based Reasoning**

We can determine what dinosaurs ate by examining their fossilized dung, called coprolite.

Two studies (one in 2005 and the latest in 2011) confirm that the materials found in dinosaur dung indicate they ate grasses. [V. Prasad, C.A.E. Strömberg, A.D. Leaché, B. Samant, R. Patnaik, L. Tang, D.M. Mohabey, S. Ge, and A. Sahni, “Late Cretaceous origin of the rice tribe provides evidence for early diversification in Poaceae,” *Nature Communications* **2(9)**:480, 2011]

### **The Geological Column Indicates Something Crazy**

The most recent genetic analysis (using evolutionary assumptions) indicates that almost all currently-living SALTWATER fish evolved from these groups of FRESHWATER fish. [Greta Carrete Vega and John J. Wiens, “Why are there so few fish in the sea?,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 10.1098/rspb.2012.0075, 2012.]

However, according to the geological column, SALTWATER FISH CAME FIRST!

“Our results suggest that ancient extinctions in the marine environment may have wiped out the earliest ray-finned fishes living in the oceans, that the oceans were then recolonized from freshwater habitats, and that most marine fish species living today are descended from that recolonization.”

[“SBU Researcher Finds Surprisingly Low Fish Biodiversity in the Earth's Oceans,” Stony Brook University Press Release, Feb 10, 2012 – 10:36:20 AM]

## Comparing Human and Chimpanzee DNA

“Today, many a schoolchild can cite the figure perhaps most often called forth in support of [a common ancestor for apes and humans] —namely, that we share almost 99 percent of our DNA with our closest living relative, the chimpanzee.”

-PBS

The number varies from evolutionary source to evolutionary source, but the number usually ranges from 95%-99%.

### All Those Numbers Are Wrong

They were based on incomplete knowledge of the chimpanzee genome. In 2005, it was finally sequenced, and scientists started seriously comparing the two.

In 2008, Geneticist Dr. Richard Buggs took the sequenced chimpanzee genome and compared it to the human genome by “lining” them up as best he could. When he cataloged the differences, he said:

“...the total similarity of the genomes could be below 70%.”

[[http://www.refdag.nl/chimpanzee\\_1\\_282611](http://www.refdag.nl/chimpanzee_1_282611)]

### A Brand New Chromosome-by-Chromosome Study Agrees:

“Genome-wide, only 70% of the chimpanzee DNA was similar to human under the most optimal sequence-slice conditions.”

[<http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/arj/v6/n1/human-chimp-chromosome>]

### Soft Tissue in Bones that Are Supposed to be Millions of Years Old

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

[Mary H. Schweitzer, Jennifer L. Wittmeyer, John R. Horner, and Jan K. Toporski, “Soft-Tissue Vessels and Cellular Preservation in *Tyrannosaurus rex*,” *Science*, **307**:1952-1955, 2005]

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

## Since 2005, Many More Examples Have Been Found!

In 2009, Schweitzer and her colleagues found soft tissue in a hadrosaur fossil which is supposed to be 80 million years old.

[Schweitzer, M.H. *et al.*, “Biomolecular characterization and protein sequences of the Campanian hadrosaur *B. canadensis*”, *Science* **324**:626–631, 2009]

In 2009, Maria McNamara and her colleagues found soft tissue in a salamander fossil which is supposed to be **18 million** years old.

[Maria McNamara *et al.*, “Organic Preservation of Fossil Musculature with Ultracellular Detail,” *Proc. Roy Soc. B*, published online October 14, 2009]

In 2010, Johan Lindgren and colleagues found soft eye tissue in a mosasaur fossil which is supposed to be **80 million** years old.

[<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0011998>]

## An Even More Amazing “65 Million Year Old” Triceratops Bone Tissue Reported This Year

When a fossil horn from a triceratops was soaked in weak acid for a months, strips of soft, brown tissue were liberated from the fossil. The researchers examined the tissue under a light microscope to see what they could find.

**They Found Haversian Systems!** This is exactly what you would expect to see in bone from a recently dead animal.

According to analysis with a Scanning Electron Microscope:

“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*, doi: 10.1016/j.acthis.2013.01.001, 2103]

## The Record: 550 Million Years!

*Sabellidites cambriensis* is a tubeworm known only from the fossil record. Paleontologists were studying one fossil that is supposed to be 550 million years old. When they looked at it with an electron microscope, they found thin fibers of soft tissue. They say:

“The *Sabellidites* organic body is preserved without permineralization. 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.]

## **The Conclusions of the Team That Found the Soft Tissue in the Salamander Fossil**

“The muscle is preserved organically, in three dimensions, and with the highest fidelity of morphological preservation yet documented from the fossil record...Slight differences between the fossil tissues and their counterparts in extant amphibians reflect limited degradation during fossilization...Our results **provide unequivocal evidence that high-fidelity organic preservation of extremely labile tissues is not only feasible, but likely to be common.**”

## **Carbon-14 in Dinosaur Bones**

Samples of bone from 8 dinosaurs 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. Great care was taken to avoid contamination, and several tests were done to ensure the results were real.

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

## **The Latest Research Shows Our Eyes Are Wired for the Best Image Possible**

Some people say the vertebrate eye is wired “backwards,” since the light must pass by the nerves to get to the light-sensing cells.

“Any engineer would naturally assume that the photocells would point towards the light, with their wires leading backwards towards the brain. He would laugh at any suggestion that the photocells might point away from the light, with their wires departing on the side nearest the light. Yet this is exactly what happens in all vertebrate retinas.”

[Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, W.W Norton 1996, p. 93]

The most recent research, however, shows quite the opposite:

“The retina is revealed as an optimal structure designed for improving the sharpness of images.”

[A. M. Labin and E. N. Ribak, “Retinal Glial Cells Enhance Human Vision Acuity” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**:158102, 2010]

Why is this “backwards” wiring really optimal? Because the eye has Muller cells, which direct the light where it needs to go. This actually reduces light noise that would be caused by light rays that reflect in the eye itself.