MY THREE PURPOSES:
1. to create doubt in a theory.
2. to emphasize evidence for intelligent design
3. to force an explanation from DNA

NOT:
a. to create belief in creationism. *That is step #2.*
b. to humiliate scientists
c. to answer evolution's claims

25 "Genes" No Evolutionist Can Explain

It's all about the DNA.

Even evolutionary scientists are prone to agree to the nickname the following traits and instincts are called the "God genes." We know they're there, but we can't find them in the human genome.

The non-genes that make us human

Not all carry the same weight.

The *sine qua non* of evolution is DNA.
All development and all traits are carried in the chromosomes.

Ask any knowledgeable evolutionist to please give a cogent explanation from the DNA theory of macro-*[and hyper-]* evolution. Ask him/her why every one of the following *[25]* items appeared fully developed and universal to every human, never skipping one social group anthropologists have ever encountered. Ask him why not one of these "genes" has been found to be universal in any animal genus. The human species is the widest spread organism on the face of the earth which can reproduce.

Please explain why
all of these qualities of human life came into being full blown
without much change in the last 25,000 years.

1) The **cemetery** gene—evidence of an awareness of life after death, every human demonstrates that he cares for dead loved ones, no animal cares for its dead this way.
2) The **library** gene—the need to pass on accumulated knowledge, assumes a long-term memory gene, consciousness of helping the next generation. Some social groups pass it along orally.
3) * **Language** gene—all animals have communication, none have a language: vocabulary, grammar, innuendos, idioms, figures of speech, *[dolphins and whales' grunts are summarily rejected]*. Only humans talk.
4) **Incest** is a universally negative item—there is no moral code of any kind among animals. Every human society has a group moral code. Ahh, yes, there are aberrations.
5) Gene for consciousness of **time** as a commodity.
6) **Art** & **beauty** gene—hair styles, house styles, admiration for sunsets or skills *[Jonathan Livingston Seagull excepted]*. No animal paints.
7) **Architectural** gene—buildings are adapted to seasons and materials available with sense of beauty *[same as the art gene?]*.
8) * **Stay-with-mom-n-dad-gene**—no animal species has maternal ties past 3 or 4 years. Humans have exceedingly strong ties well past the age of full physical & reproductive development which is about age 15—*many offspring stay until ages 20-30+*.
9) **Tool** gene—*[ok, I'll give you otters and seagulls which use rocks, chimpanzees use sticks but no species passes the family toolbox on to its kids, and the theory of evolution has given chimps many millennia to produce those DNA adaptations]*. No species claims improvement in a million years.
10) * **Cooking** gene—no animal makes fire or cooks or refrigerates or preserves food or adds spices or makes recipes to pass along.
11) * **Jails-for-legal-violations** gene—*[eh, yes, animals enact revenge for trespassing personal space as well as threats against their young—hardly juris prudence]* no courts of law, no clearly demarcated concept of right & wrong nor sentences *[ahh yes, banishment sometimes]*.
12) **Mathematics** gene—some people believe that math can answer enormous numbers of questions, but no animal ever uses math *[Wow, did you see the horse "count" at the fair?]*
13) **Bartering** gene—*debatable*.
14) * Monogamy [**faithfulness**] gene—is known in every society even though multiple partners is practiced as well. Rarely does monogamy occur in nature at the species level, never in a whole genus.
15) **Intimacy** in marriage. They mate and, universally, never stick around to cuddle.
16) **Teaching** the little ones gene—*[ahh, the baby bear would learn how to swat salmon out of the stream even if his mom were shot by hunter-foragers]* Yes, the kids do watch mom, but catching your own food is a genetic instinct.
17) There is no "**Pay-attention-kid-this-is-important**" gene.

18) No system of **correcting-impolite-behavior** gene—or reprimanding the young consistently.
19) No political gene—**government**, voting, representation, organized retaliation for marauding enemies, taxes, although there is cooperation, sharing, caring, and storing for winter *[squirrels horde but don't share]*.
20) * No **medical** gene—surgery, care for the sick *[debatable, true]*, medicines *[though they do know intrinsically, what not to eat]*, no bandages, splints, only a wait-and-see-whether-he-dies caution, no progress in caring for their sick in a million years, no shared knowledge of successful treatment of illness.
21) No **crying** gene—yes, a very few *[perhaps mammals only, not leeches, not amphibians, reptiles, or fish]* grieve over hurt, loss, and death—no obits, no funerals, no return to tombstones *[don't bring up the myth of the elephant graveyard, yes, I've seen the pictures, too. Name the country, if you can, if you dare.]*
22) **Morality-is-positive** gene—while some human societies occasionally value some sorts of treachery, self-aggrandizement, greed and other generally negative traits, it is universally accepted that human society generally promote a positive moral view. Good is appreciated more than evil. Honesty, diligence, kindness, and goodwill are valued over negative traits. Animals? Nope.
23) **Humor**—ahh, some monkeys "laugh," but not genus-wide
24) * Concept of **God**, **prayer**, group **worship**.
25) **Culture**—ethnic foods, social dancing, tourism, high level division of labor, music or musical instruments, museums—nope, all unique to humanity the most different creature on the face of the earth.

It can be argued from ignorance that we don't have enough scientific evidence to ratify that every one of the above is totally absent from every specie, but although we have hundreds of thousands of research scientists alive today, many of whom are examining evolutionary advancements, none that I have found have stepped forward with any statement that he/she has passed from conjecture to affirmation that even one of the above human traits is characteristic of any single genus. No one is brave enough to stake his/her reputation, yet.

Intelligent design *is a new term for many. It is embraced by non-religious scientists as well as Bible believers. It is not exactly creationism, because it is simply a theory that a* ***creation must have a creator****. Some atheists are willing to call it the "God factor" is responsible outside the information of DNA. Similarly, the concomitant theory of "nuclear glue" (a technical term) might also be considered by physicists to be "divine."*

Tell me if it isn't true that you have been applying a great number of these "traits and instincts" to mammals who are creatures which can display emotions and smile, rather than to roaches, amoeba, crustaceans, or even birds. And yet, these animals are theorized to have been around for a billion years or so and should have been quite capable through your theory of chance mutations, to produce a great number of the "advances" attributed to humans. Certainly one or two anyway.

Darwin had no concept of DNA. His primary contribution was to suggest "survival of the fittest" because of beneficial mutations. He didn't go much further than that. Many Bible believers will accept that precept at face value. After all, we concur that the Dodo bird wasn't one of the"the fittest."

QUESTIONS FOR EVOLUTIONISTS WHICH ARE UNIVERSALLY NON-ADDRESSED

DNA has no *[uniform]* response to the 25 above philosophical objections to their fundamental postulates.

Those who hold to evolution are absolutely stumped by the above characteristics. But they are willing to postulate that there is no need for animals developing any of these.

Man is not an animal. He came complete into this world with all 25 of the above "God-genes."

By the by, any evolutionist can trust Jesus Christ as the Savior even though
he believes firmly in evolution.
He simply must embrace the truth that Jesus Christ died for his personal sin.

MY SERIOUS PROPOSAL TO A "DNA" EVOLUTIONIST

I understand that you believe in evolution. Is that right?

I have a simple question for you that explains the reason I do not have the confidence to believe that evolution provides a reasonable solution which leads to the formation of life on our planet.

Am I correct to assume that you think that, given enough time and sheer chance, that modifications in the DNA in chromosomes is responsible for all the variations of life forms on earth?

If you answer, "Yes," then I can assume you have also concluded:

A. Atoms already sprang into existence out of nothing.
B. Electricity sprang into being to polarize electrons.
C. That all the elements on the Periodic Table of the Elements sprang into existence somehow.
D. And that chromosomes which constitute all DNA also sprang into being without any "God force."

Given your faith that these three things happened, let me state a fact *(which I just made up)* that the formation of a single strand of double-helix DNA is one million times more complex than the bolt, washer, and nut which I hold in my hand. So I propose a simple experiment and ask for your opinion about the outcome.

I am going to separate these three objects and instead of throwing them into an empty cosmic parking lot I'm going to put them into a small container and begin to shake them gently for a year. My question to you is this. How long do you think it will take for the washer to slip onto the bolt and the nut screw itself onto the nut halfway up the shank of the nut?

If you tell me that there is no way to predict that, I'll add another element. I'm not going to allow you the magic coin of time, *(billions of years)* which evolution demands, but I'll give you as many millions of years as you'd like. This, of course, requires a bolt which will never wear out.

Give me a wild guess. How many millions of years will it take before you give up?

Your **faith in the impossibility** of forming the first chromosome or simplest atom convinces me that evolution can't possibly be correct. Time is not the answer to the question.