

Genetic Similarity and Errors Regarding the Origin of Language on CNN.com

On December 14, 2003 , Cnn.com published a report headed "Study: Hearing, smelling differ in man, chimps." The report considered the analyses of human, chimpanzee and mouse genes performed by researchers from Cornell University and Celera Genomics in the USA , but interpreted the results from an evolutionist perspective.

On December 14, 2003 , Cnn.com published a report headed "Study: Hearing, smelling differ in man, chimps." The report considered the analyses of human, chimpanzee and mouse genes performed by researchers from Cornell University and Celera Genomics in the USA , but interpreted the results from an evolutionist perspective.

Attention needs to be drawn to one important point here: evolutionist claims based on genetic analyses may from time to time give the impression that evidence has been obtained confirming the theory of evolution. The fact is, however, that these studies, including the one on Cnn.com, do not confirm the theory of evolution in any way at all.

Right from the outset the researchers set out with evolutionist assumptions, and speculation is produced in the light of the data obtained. It is for that reason that we feel the need to prevent those people with a less than expert knowledge of the subject from being deceived, by setting out the erroneous logical progression on which the pro-evolution claims on Cnn.com are based.

In the study in question, published in the December 12, 2003 , of *Science* magazine, 7,645 genes in chimpanzees were compared with those in human beings and mice. [1](#) In those sections of the article carried by Cnn.com it emphasises those parts of human DNA which are different to chimpanzee DNA, and engages in speculation concerning them. Scientists who state that the relevant particular strands of DNA are linked to hearing and smell use these as a starting point for assuming that the human capacity for speech is connected to the so-called process of evolution, and claim that the sense of hearing may have specialised in such a way as to permit the capacity for speech to develop. Similarly, an attempt is made to account for the difference in the genes concerned with smell in terms of evolution, and this is linked to the difference between the human and chimpanzee habitats.

Yet it must not escape anyone's notice that such speculation is purely speculative. Indeed, the way the researchers use such expressions as "we speculate that ... it seems likely that ..." is one of the clearest indications of this. Moreover, the fact that the genes connected to hearing are identified in this study provides absolutely no support for the theory of evolution.

What evolutionists really need to do is to offer a consistent explanation not of which gene governs hearing, but rather "how," in other words "by what mechanism," this gene might have "evolved." The prominent evolutionary theoretician John Maynard Smith draws attention to this condition:

The idea that once you've found the gene that switches on X, you understand how it evolved is rubbish. [2](#)

As can be seen from these words of Smith's, identifying which feature a gene governs cannot be regarded as evidence that it has evolved, nor indeed of how it evolved.

Indeed, although the researches in the article on Cnn.com engage in various pieces of evolutionist speculation, one notices that they say not a word about how this evolution might have taken place. In short, these researchers are blindly defending evolution and interpreting the similarities between human and chimpanzee genes in the light of their own prejudices. This speculation is the product of an entirely one-sided, dogmatic mindset.

When the common structures of living things are examined it appears that the explanation for this is common design, one of the major features of structures created by intelligent design. For example, computers of different models share common structures such as chip, hard disk. There may also be some differences between computer models. For example, two different models may have different sound cards, and one of them may work more productively than the other.

Of course, however, the fact that computers possess such different components does not mean that they have evolved from one another. The computers in question are structures which perform processes for specific ends, and with these processes work together harmoniously within a large and organised system. These features show that they were intelligently designed, in other words that they were produced by a computer engineer.

The common genes in human beings and chimpanzees exhibit a far more complex common design than that in computer components. There is enough information concealed in the DNA in one human cell to fill around 100,000 encyclopaedia pages. DNA contains a very special packaging system capable of concealing all that information with a genetic alphabet. The DNA in a single human cell is like a piece of string, some 2 metres long yet only one five-millionth of a millimetre thick. Thanks to this special packaging system, a thread this size is folded up and concealed within a cell so small it cannot be seen with the naked eye.

The information storage capacity and packaging system in the DNA molecule are most impressive. According to calculations by Led Adleman of the University of Southern California in the United States , the information in **a single gram of DNA** molecule is equivalent to that in **1 trillion** CDs. ³ Furthermore, DNA functions like a computer program, and the productivity of this system goes way beyond that of technology. Bill Gates, the head of Microsoft and president of the company, writes in his book *The Road Ahead* that, "Human DNA is like a computer program, but far, far more advanced than any software we've ever created." ⁴

This complex design in DNA is a clear indication of the inconsistency involved in regarding the common genes in human beings and chimpanzees as the product of evolution. DNA is far superior to and more efficient than computer programs, themselves the product of intelligent design. The development of these computer programs is the work of long years, requiring millions of dollars of investment. To put it another way, these programs are produced using knowledge and means.

The common genes in human beings and chimpanzees are based on the far more complex design in the DNA molecule. Bearing in mind the complexity and fine tuning in DNA, it can be seen that the "**true**" explanation of common genes is not chance-based unconscious natural events—evolution in other words—but intelligent design. God has created living things in perfect form.

Our advice to Cnn.com is for it to be aware of the Darwinist dogmatism behind such reports of genetic analysis and to avoid adopting a one-sided approach to them.

1 Andrew G. Clark, *et al* , "Inferring Nonneutral Evolution from Human-Chimp-Mouse Orthologous Gene Trios" *Science* , Volume 302, Number 5652, Issue of 12 Dec 2003, pp. 1960-1963.

2 "Games and Theories", Interview with John Maynard Smith, *New Scientist* , 14 June 2003 , p. 50.

3 John Whitfield, "Physicists plunder life's tool chest", 24 April 2003, <http://www.nature.com/nsu/030421/030421-6.html>

4 Bill Gates, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Microsoft Corporation, *The Road Ahead* , [1995], Penguin: London, Revised, 1996, p.228.

<https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/genetic-similarity-and-errors-regarding-the-origin-of-language-on-cnncom>