

are effectively protected and a mechanism to guarantee progress to the goal is ensured. The essence of what was allegedly being modelled is now easier to grasp. Whether one does this by having a lower mutation rate and larger number of offspring to ensure that some are the same as the parent, or one copies the parent and then mutates another, it has fundamentally the same effect—protection of desired letters, which is not the real world. My program clearly demonstrates the ‘fail-safe’ nature of any such ‘simulation’ of evolution.

The statistical analysis¹ demonstrates Dawkins’ program is a meaningless gimmick which cannot fail to converge to the same predetermined goal every time, which is evolutionary and biological nonsense *contra* Dawkins’ protests.²⁵

Acknowledgement

I appreciate Bart Read’s thoughtful comments, both in his letter to the *TJ* and in discussing this reply to Curtis.

References

1. Truman, R., Dawkins’ weasel revisited, *CEN Tech. J.* **12**(3):358, 1998.
2. Truman, R., ‘Royal Truman replies’, Letters, *CEN Tech. J.* **13**(2):74, 1999.
3. Dawkins, R., *The Blind Watchmaker*, Penguin Books, London, p. X, 1986.
4. Dawkins, R., Creation and natural selection, *New Scientist*, **34**:34, 1986.
5. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 48.
6. Dawkins, Ref. 4, p. 34.
7. Details showing the workings of Dawkins’ and my algorithms can be found at http://www.answersingenesis.org/Home/Area/Magazines/tj/docs/TJ_v15n2_truman.asp
8. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 49.
9. Gitt, W., Weasel words, *Creation* **20**(4):20–21, 1998.
10. ReMine, W., *The Biotic Message*, St. Paul Science, Minnesota, p. 235, 1993.
11. Read, B., ‘Dawkins’ weasel revisited’, Letters, *CEN Tech. J.* **13**(2):72, 1999.
12. Behe, M.J., Dembski, W.A. and Meyer, S.C., *Science and Evidence for Design in the Universe*, Ignatius, San Francisco, p. 38, 2000. ‘(1) Start out with a randomly selected sequence of 28 capital Roman letter and spaces ... ; (2) randomly alter all the letters and spaces in this initial randomly generated sequence; (3) whenever an alteration happens to match a corresponding letter in the target sequence, leave it be and randomly alter only those remaining letters that still differ from the target sequence. In very short order this algorithm converges to Dawkins’ target sequence.’
13. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 124.
14. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 78.
15. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 47. Dawkins’ run which converged in 43 generation already had 3 letters lined up in the initial random sequence and the (corrected) example on p. 48 which converged in 64 generations had only 1 already lined up.
16. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 48.
17. A century of genetic research world-wide under optimal laboratory conditions using quick reproducing organisms has produced a very large number of mutations with probably none useful from the evolutionary viewpoint: fitness enhancing, information increasing to produce biological novelty. A very large number of destructive mutations have been reported, however.
18. Reidhaar-Olson, J. and Sauer, R., *Proteins, Structure, Function and Genetics*, **7**:306, 1990; Bowie, J. and Sauer, R., *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* **86**:2152, 1989; Bowie, J., Reidhaar-Olson, J., Lim, W. and Sauer, R., *Science*, **247**:1306, 1990; Behe, M., Experimental support for regarding functional classes of proteins to be highly isolated from each other; in: Buell, J. and Hearn, G. (Eds), *Darwinism: Science or Philosophy?* Haughton Publishers, Dallas, pp. 60–71, 1994. Discussed in Ref. 11, p. 75.
19. Yockey, H., *Information theory and molecular biology*, Cambridge University Press, p. 254, 1992.
20. $(10^{10} \text{ yrs}) \times (365.25 \text{ days/yr}) \times (24 \text{ hrs/day}) \times (3600 \text{ sec/hr}) \times 10^9 \text{ members} = 3 \times 10^{26}$ attempts using an average generation time of 1 second, 1 billion years and 10^9 offspring.
21. Each position has one chance out of 27 of being correct. Getting 27 positions correct by chance has a probability of $(1/27)^{27} = 2 \times 10^{-39}$.
22. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 123.
23. Wilson, R.K., How the worm was won. The *C. elegans* genome sequencing project, *Trends in Genetics* **15**(2):51–58, 1999.
24. A *C. elegans* Database (ACeDB).
25. Dawkins, Ref. 3, p. 72. After discussing another program (biomorphs) we read: ‘It sounds, once again, as though evolution deals in distant targets, homing in on things like scorpions. As we have seen, it never does’.

Doubtful climb

Evolutionary biologists would agree that a change requiring a number of base changes, each of which is without value until all are present, cannot occur by natural selection. They have therefore concluded that the origin of major groups has been a stepwise process, with each genetic change being an advantage on its own. ... If there is no stepwise path up the mountain, natural selection won’t climb it. Much thought has been given to the nature of the intermediate steps.

John Maynard Smith
Population genetics revisited.
Nature 403:594, 2000