

TRANSCRIPT OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS
IN THE CASE OF:
PEOPLE OF THE WORLD VS
THE “THEORY OF EVOLUTION”

Written by: Jonathan Conleigh

Author of: “The Hoax Called Evolution”

For more information and to purchase the book visit:

www.evolutionhoax.com

*Copyright 2008 – Jonathan Conleigh
All rights reserved*

The following is a transcript of a fictitious legal proceeding in which Jonathan Conleigh, attorney for the Plaintiff, questions an evolutionary scientist about the “Theory of Evolution”.

Opening remarks:

Jonathan Conleigh – Attorney for the Plaintiff

There is a widespread notion, especially among the mainstream scientific community, that all life forms of plants and animals evolved on our planet through a slow, gradual process of random genetic mutations and natural selection. This view is explicitly stated in the writings of almost all scientific literature, textbooks, articles and documentaries. It has been stated in numerous publications that evolution is an absolute scientific fact, although the exact process of evolution is still called a theory. Even having said this, it is written in many texts that a “theory” in scientific terms is far more than just a theory in the ordinary sense of the word. It is common to see phrases such as, “The evidence for evolution is overwhelming”.

What I intend to show here today is that scrutiny of the biological and genetic processes that would be necessary for evolution to occur, unequivocally shows that evolution in the way that it is currently presented is completely unfounded in scientific terms, and in fact, all scientific data point to the unmistakable conclusion that the “Theory of Evolution” does not begin to explain how life forms might have evolved in our world.

Jonathan:	Is it a fact that all species of plants and animals on earth evolved from inorganic chemical compounds, beginning with a prebiotic mixture of water, methane, ammonia, hydrogen, and carbon dioxide?
ES:	That is the generally accepted theory held by most mainstream scientists.
Jonathan:	Is it then a theory or a fact?
ES:	It is a fact that evolution has occurred, and occurs continuously today. It is a theory as to the exact mechanisms and processes that cause evolution to occur.
Jonathan:	So would it be accurate to say that it is a scientific fact that some type of primitive fish evolved into the first tetrapod?
ES:	Yes.

Jonathan:	And is it a fact that all other life forms evolved as well, such as reptiles, mammals, primates and man?
ES:	Yes, that would be an accurate statement.
Jonathan:	Would it be accurate to say that “evolution” refers to the slow, gradual, and stepwise process by which one species or life form changes into another?
ES:	Yes, that would be correct.
Jonathan:	So when you say that it is an absolute fact that plant and animal species in our world have evolved, that means to say that those species changed from one form to another in a slow, gradual and stepwise process. Would that be an accurate statement?
ES:	Yes.
Jonathan:	Would it then be correct to say that proof of evolution would require evidence that these gradual, stepwise changes actually happened?
ES:	That would be logical.
Jonathan:	To establish an absolute scientific fact, would you say that it is necessary to employ the “Scientific Method”?
ES:	Can you please clarify your question?
Jonathan:	You have stated for the record that it is a fact that evolution has occurred, and that all life forms have evolved. Is this fact based on the process of the Scientific Method?
ES:	There are numerous proofs that evolution has occurred and continues to occur today, and evolution is the guiding principle that makes sense of all of the other life sciences.
Jonathan:	That does not answer the question as to whether or not the ‘fact’ of evolution is based on the Scientific Method. Perhaps you could outline for the jury the proofs that all life forms have evolved?
ES:	Very well. The fossil record is very conclusive in showing that primitive life forms gained beneficial adaptations and evolved throughout history. It has been documented in numerous cases that over time, adaptations such as bigger and more powerful limbs; structural changes in the skull, jawbones and dentition; larger braincase for increased mental capacity, and many other features had occurred that fit in perfectly with the teaching of the evolutionary theory based on genetic mutation and natural selection. It is quite clear that the limbs of an early lobed-fin fish were modified into the limbs of the first walking tetrapod. A second area of conclusive proof of evolution is the DNA coding sequence. There is a great deal in common between the DNA of advanced life forms and that of far more primitive life forms. A third area of evidence is remarkably obvious, and occurs continuously. We see many times that bacteria have evolved a resistance to various antibiotics. A fourth area lending credence to the "Theory of Evolution" is embryology. It is clear that many advanced life forms have embryonic stages showing parts such as gill slits, tails, etc, which indicates that the more advanced life forms must have evolved from more primitive forms.
Jonathan:	Thank you. Now that you have delineated various lines of reasoning, I will ask again my original question. Are any of the above proofs borne out by the Scientific Method?
ES:	I do not see where you are going with this.
Jonathan:	For the sake of clarity and benefit of the jury I will elucidate. The scientific method refers to four basic steps:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Observation 2) Hypothesis 3) Experimentation / testing 4) Conclusion
	<p>If I put a paper cup filled with water into the freezer section of a refrigerator and leave it overnight, I will find that it has turned to ice by morning. My observation is that the water I left in the cup the previous night has turned into ice. If I had no knowledge at all of what makes ice, I might have assumed that something about the paper cup turned the water into ice. That would be my hypothesis. The next step of the scientific method is experimentation and testing. So the next night I put water in the paper cup and leave it on the kitchen counter. The next morning I find no ice, and conclude that it is not the paper cup that turns the water into ice. I then hypothesize that putting the cup of water behind a closed door causes the ice to form. To test my hypothesis I put the cup of water inside a kitchen cabinet and close the door, and leave it overnight. When I find no ice the next morning I conclude that ice is not formed when a cup of water is placed behind a closed door. Eventually I come up with the hypothesis that the water turns to ice because of cold temperature. To test my hypothesis I put the cup of water in varying degrees of temperature, and using controlled experiments and repeated testing I conclude that water always turns to ice at thirty-two degrees Fahrenheit.</p>
Jonathan:	<p>Now, let us scrutinize the proofs you offered for the "Theory of Evolution" in light of the Scientific Method. We will look first at the fossil record. First of all, I would state for the record that there are numerous documented gaps in the fossil record, and that transitional forms for the majority of species are lacking. But even if we were to assume that there was a complete fossil record for a particular line from one species to another, that would still be just an observation. If you were asked to prove that many species of plants and animals lived on earth over a period of time, then the fossil record would indeed be evidence. But, as we established before, "evolution" refers not to the existence of life forms, but rather <i>how</i> they change from one form to another. The fossil record says nothing about the steps and processes that would have been necessary to bring about those changes. Where is the experimentation and testing phase? True experimentation and testing would involve putting a quantity of amino acids or nucleotide bases in a watery environment, and finding that complete, functional proteins and organs actually take form.</p>
Jonathan:	<p>The same question would apply to the 'proof' that the DNA of advanced life forms is similar in some ways to that of primitive life forms. That is an incontrovertible fact, but again, is simply an observation. Where is the experimentation and testing that show how the DNA evolved? Indeed, ALL of the proofs that you offered are nothing more than observations.</p>
Jonathan:	<p>At this time I would like to restate the scientific definition of biological evolution, and trace – scientifically – how the process of evolution works, based on the currently defined terms and definitions of the evolutionary sciences.</p>
Jonathan:	<p>As stated before, evolution refers to the slow, gradual, stepwise process by which one life form changes into another. Is that correct?</p>
ES:	<p>Yes.</p>
Jonathan:	<p>Is it a fact that these gradual changes occur as a result of mutations in the</p>

	genetic code of the organisms?
ES:	That is correct.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that “natural selection” is the primary cause that determines which organism or animal succeeds in producing more offspring, thereby increasing its hereditary information in the gene pool?
ES:	That is the currently accepted theory.
Jonathan:	For the sake of clarity, please provide an example of how the evolutionary process works, based on genetic mutation and natural selection.
ES:	Very well. A genetic mutation causes a dark spot to appear on a body part of a particular animal species. Sight of this dark spot might startle a potential predator and cause it to hesitate for a moment before attacking, thereby giving the animal a little extra time to escape. The animal that evolved this ‘dark spot’ adaptation then passes along the new gene to its offspring, and gradually its offspring develop many of these new spots, further enhancing its ability to avoid predation.
Jonathan:	Would it be accurate to say then, that natural selection sees to it that the genetic code responsible for beneficial adaptations is maintained, and is likely to be copied and passed along to an animal’s offspring?
ES:	That is correct.
Jonathan:	What would be the expected result if a genetic mutation proved to be harmful to the animal, such as a dark spot mutation that covered over the eye of an animal so that its sight was severely impaired?
ES:	It is presumed that in such cases the animal would be ‘weeded out’ by natural selection.
Jonathan:	Is it possible that a genetic mutation can be neither beneficial nor harmful?
ES:	Yes. These are classified as neutral mutations.
Jonathan:	And what is the result of these neutral mutations?
ES:	In some cases they may be retained until such time as the environment in which the animal lives changes, and then the neutral mutation may in fact turn out to be beneficial.
Jonathan:	Per your testimony we have established that it is a fact that some type of primitive fish was the ancestor of, and evolved into the first tetrapod – a four-legged, walking land animal. Is that correct?
ES:	Yes.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that the first tetrapod would have had a skeleton and limbs made of bone?
ES:	Yes.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that at some point in time there was no such thing as bone? In other words, bone had not yet evolved?
ES:	Yes, that would be correct.
Jonathan:	So would it be correct to say that if the bone material had never evolved it would be impossible that there ever would have been any animals with bone?
ES:	Of course, that would be correct.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that that bone is built upon a matrix of a protein called collagen?
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that collagen is a three-part protein, made up of three different amino acid chains?
ES:	Yes.

Jonathan:	Is it a fact that each of the three amino acid chains is made up of approximately 1,420 amino acids?
ES:	That is correct.
Jonathan:	The genetic code that instructs the cells how to build a particular protein is made up of four nucleotide bases: Adenine; Cytosine; Thymine and Guanine. Is that correct?
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that every amino acid is coded for by a triplet of nucleotide bases?
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	So the genetic code for just one of the three amino acid chains necessary to make collagen would contain at least 4,260 nucleotide bases?
ES:	That is correct.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that the gene for the collagen protein evolved at some point in history?
ES:	Yes.
Jonathan:	Would it be accurate to say that at some time in history there was no such thing as a gene that coded for collagen?
ES:	Yes.
Jonathan:	Let us now take a look back in time. Let us imagine that we are living perhaps some 2.5 billion years ago, and looking through our microscope we see a cell nucleus with absolutely no part of a gene that would have coded for a part of a collagen protein. Let us now jump forward a few thousand years, and looking in the nucleus of a cell we find that mutations have occurred resulting in a string of nucleotide bases – a gene, if you will – let’s say with 99 nucleotides, that just happen to be in just the right sequence to code for the first 33 amino acids of one of the collagen chains. Would this be a possible scenario?
ES:	I imagine that might be a possibility.
Jonathan:	Now at this juncture, what beneficial adaptation would there have been for the organism that had evolved this string of 99 nucleotide bases that would cause natural selection to see to it that this new gene segment would be passed along?
ES:	As stated before, it is not necessary that there be a beneficial adaptation at every step along the process of evolution
Jonathan:	I see. Now let us continue. Over the course of perhaps the next thousand, or ten thousand or even a million years, we keep peering into the nuclei of cells, and find that random mutations have now produced a string of 1,200 nucleotide bases on a gene segment, which just happen to be in the correct sequence to code for the first 400 amino acids necessary to make one of the collagen protein amino acid strands. Can you say that at this juncture there was some beneficial adaptation because of this new partial gene that would be passed along to the animal’s offspring?
ES:	Perhaps there was some benefit.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that cells that waste energy and that are inefficient in maintaining metabolic pathways are more likely to be weeded out by natural selection, in favor of more efficient cells?
ES:	Yes, that would be true.
Jonathan:	So would it not then be likely that cells wasting vast amounts of energy reproducing useless gene segments, such as this partial gene for collagen, would be weeded out by natural selection?

ES:	That cannot be said for sure. We don't know what benefit might have accrued to this organism at any particular stage
Jonathan:	I see. So let us see what we have now. We go from a point in history when there was absolutely no genetic code in existence for a collagen gene. That is a fact. We then must assume that random mutations occur that line up a gene sequence of hundreds and hundreds of nucleotide bases on the DNA of a cell, and for which we would have to use our imaginations to come up with a reason why they would keep getting passed along to future generations. We would then have to assume that this slow, gradual and stepwise process of evolution continues until 1,400... 2,000... 2,600... 3,000.... up to 4,260 nucleotide bases were strung together, that would be necessary to code for just one of the three necessary amino acid chains to form collagen. Would you say that this is a likely scenario?
ES:	It is possible.
Jonathan:	Is it a scientific fact that this occurred?
ES:	We do not know that for sure.
Jonathan:	Then how can you say that it is a scientific fact that collagen evolved, when the very process of the formation of a gene for this protein is a mystery?
ES:	That is why we call it the "Theory of Evolution".
Jonathan:	So do you retract your earlier testimony that it is a fact that the gene for collagen evolved at some point in time?
ES:	No. It is a fact that the gene for collagen evolved.
Jonathan:	So you stated for the record that it is a fact that the gene for collagen evolved; you stated for the record that proof of evolution requires evidence of the necessary gradual, stepwise processes, yet when confronted with questions that cannot be answered as to the actual evidence for these processes, you said, "That is why we call it the Theory of Evolution". I believe that is a contradiction.
Jonathan:	Can you please state for the record the approximate number of proteins that make up a human being?
ES:	It is estimated that there are at least 50,000 proteins.
Jonathan:	Out of all of those 50,000 proteins, is there even one protein for which the exact evolution of the correct nucleotide sequence is known?
ES:	I cannot say that information is currently known.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that the proteins and enzymes that make up virtually everything in all life forms are manufactured in the cell by a process of "transcription and translation"?
ES:	That is correct.
Jonathan:	For the benefit of the jury I would like to outline now the basic steps of the transcription and translation process by which proteins are manufactured based on the genetic code.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that the genetic code is found on a twisted, helical ladder called DNA?
ES:	Yes.
Jonathan:	The DNA ladder contains two complementary strands of nucleotide bases, with base pairing of Adenine to Thymine, and Cytosine to Guanine. Is that correct?
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	There may be hundreds or even thousands of separate genes lined up along the

	DNA ladder. Is that correct.
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	At the beginning of the transcription and translation process, a protein called a helicase, breaks apart the hydrogen bonds that connect the nucleotide bases of the DNA ladder. A number of proteins, called transcription activators, then attach to the promoter region on the DNA, which is actually a site some distance away from the beginning of the gene being transcribed, but yet directs the beginning of the process. These proteins recruit an RNA polymerase which is responsible for building a messenger RNA. Is that correct?
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	The messenger RNA created by the RNA polymerase is actually a complementary copy of the gene being transcribed. So if a gene for a protein had the sequence A-T-T-G-G-C, the mRNA created would have the sequence, U-A-A-C-C-G, with Uracil replacing thymine on the RNA. Is that correct?
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	The mRNA then travels out of the nucleus of the cell and attaches to a ribosome. The ribosome is actually assembled from two parts, and contains some RNA and up to 50 different proteins. The genetic code is then read in sets of three, and amino acids are brought over to the ribosome by transfer RNA molecules that have complementary base codes on one end that match the original DNA coding sequence, and matching amino acids attached to another end. Proteins in the ribosome attach the amino acids one to another; move over the 'reading frame' three base pairs, and continue the process until a 'stop' codon is reached, which is a triplet sequence from the original DNA that tells the ribosome to cease production of this particular protein chain. Is this accurate?
ES:	It is greatly oversimplified, but the basic process outlined is accurate.
Jonathan:	Is it an absolute scientific fact that this entire process evolved?
ES:	Yes, it is.
Jonathan:	Please describe for the court how this process evolved in the slow, gradual and stepwise fashion prescribed by the "Theory of Evolution".
	(Silence)
Jonathan:	Will you please describe for the court how this process evolved?
ES:	All of the fine details are not exactly known. No one was there to record on video how this happened.
Jonathan:	But you know for a fact that it did evolve?
ES:	We know that this is a possible model for how this process may have come about.
Jonathan:	But did the process of transcription and translation evolve?
ES:	Yes.
Jonathan:	Then I ask again, how? What were the steps?
ES:	Then I answer again. We do not currently have all of the details.
Jonathan:	Are any of the detailed steps known?
ES:	I cannot say that we currently have that information.
Jonathan:	Is it a fact that many animal species have evolved numerous systems such as the auditory system; olfactory system; digestive system; reproductive system; immune system; cardio-vascular system; pulmonary system, and others?
ES:	Yes, it is.

Jonathan:	And is the process by which ANY of these systems evolved known to science?
ES:	No, I cannot say that the exact processes are known.
Jonathan:	Has there ever been any experimentation or testing that shows that any of these systems ever did actually evolve, or that shows how these processes might have evolved?
ES:	No, not to my knowledge.
Jonathan:	<p>Thank you. So now let us summarize.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evolution refers to the slow, gradual and stepwise process by which species of plants and animals allegedly evolved 2. Proof for evolution would entail providing evidence of the individual steps and processes necessary for evolution to occur, which would involve experimentation and testing of these steps 3. No experimentation and testing has ever shown how even one, single protein, or an organ, or a biological system has evolved.

Closing comments – Jonathan Conleigh, attorney for the Plaintiff

Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen of the Jury:

It should now be abundantly clear to all that the "Theory of Evolution" is completely without merit. The "theory" states that mutations in the genetic code – accumulated over millions and millions of years – sometimes produced beneficial adaptations to a particular species. 'Natural selection' saw to it that the organisms or animals that experienced these beneficial adaptations passed along the new and improved genes to their offspring.

We have demonstrated that at every single step along the way the theory fails. At any given stage in the formation of a protein, process or biological system, it is just pure fantasy to think that the small part of that protein, process or system could be worked on by natural selection.

It must be noted that we have just scratched the surface in light of the true complexity of biological systems. We have not discussed the incredibly complex energy-producing systems of the cells, nor have we mentioned anything about how sexual reproduction could ever have evolved, nor the "evolution" of arteries and veins; capillaries and cell membranes.

I submit that scrutiny of any and all of these processes clearly shows that the "Theory of Evolution" is based on nothing save some logical inferences, wild speculation and a generous helping of imagination. Indeed, there is not one single area – not one step or process necessary for species to "evolve" that is substantiated by scientific experimentation and testing.

Your Honor, I rest my case.