



WWW.STANDINGFORTRUTHMINISTRIES.COM

REFUTING THE CRITICS

Answering “Creation Myths”: A Clarification on “14 Evidences” and Dr. Dan’s Critiques

When Creation Myths Collide with Creation Facts

by Donny Budinsky

📌 Highlights: Why Dr. Dan’s “Debunking” Collapses

🚫 **Semantics over substance** – Nitpicks my use of the word *prove* while ignoring the actual evidence (18:22).

🗑️ **Revisionist junk DNA defense** – Pretends evolutionists never equated noncoding DNA with junk, despite decades of textbooks and Dawkins, Crick, and Ohno himself.

🚗 **Car analogy dodge** – Scoffs “cars don’t reproduce” (7:40, 11:18) rather than dealing with the reasoning pattern of design analogies.

🧩 **Mosaics ≠ transitions** – Claims “tens of thousands” of transitional forms but recycles the same handful, ignoring that these are mosaics with mixed traits (Tiktaalik, Archaeopteryx, etc.).

 **Avoids the stronger works** – Skips over my published research on ERVs, junk DNA, Y-chromosomes, and radiometric dating—choosing instead to nitpick a cheat sheet article.

 **Rescue devices pre-refuted** – Every fallback claim (purifying selection, ENCODE nitpicks, TSD “signatures,” etc.) already fails under closer scrutiny.

 Bottom line: When “Creation Myths” collide with creation facts, the evolutionary case crumbles.

At *Standing For Truth Ministries*, we welcome challenges. Criticism helps sharpen arguments, clarify models, and demonstrate how biblical creation offers superior answers to evolution. Recently, evolutionary biologist **Dr. Dan Stern Cardinale** (“Creation Myths”) released an hour-long response to my article *The Ultimate Guide to Debunking Evolution’s ‘Best Evidence’*.

But here’s the key: that article was never intended to be exhaustive. It was a **cheat sheet**—a quick-reference resource for conversations and Bible studies, not a 300-page technical monograph. We’ve published books, articles, given lectures, and hosted various debate series where these issues are unpacked in great depth. In fact, many of the objections Dr. Dan raises are directly answered in those resources. These resources will be provided throughout this response. Instead of engaging those works, he zeroes in on rhetorical nitpicks and tries to discredit by tone.

This response isn’t to cover every minute of Dr. Dan’s video. Rather, it highlights a few of his objections to show why his “debunking” is underwhelming—and why his approach ultimately demonstrates the weakness of the evolutionary position.

1) The Word “*Prove*”

At **18:22**, Dr. Dan nitpicks my use of the word *prove*, especially in the Chromosome 2 section. His point? *Science doesn’t prove things; it tests hypotheses.*

Fair enough—in technical settings, that’s true. And to be clear, I’ve said the same thing myself many times. In my books, lectures, and debates, I’ve emphasized that science works by

formulating testable, falsifiable hypotheses and attempting to **disprove** them. As Einstein reportedly remarked:

“No amount of experimentation can ever prove me right; a single experiment can prove me wrong.”

That principle has long been part of my own teaching when I’m speaking in a scientific or technical context.

But here’s the distinction: this particular article was not written as a technical treatise. It was intentionally framed as a **cheat sheet for the general public**—a quick-reference tool for conversations, Bible studies, and discussions where the audience isn’t composed of professional scientists parsing the philosophy of science. In everyday discourse, people—including evolutionists themselves—regularly use the word *prove* in a nontechnical sense.

Textbooks, museums, and even science communicators often say things like “*chromosome 2 proves human-chimp ancestry*” where *prove* simply means “strong evidence for.” That’s exactly how I used the term in the article. It reflected the rhetorical shorthand that people are actually confronted with in everyday conversations, not a technical misuse of the philosophy of science.

When I’m speaking to scientists, I’ll use precise scientific language. But when I’m equipping lay audiences for real-world dialogue, I mirror the language they’ll actually encounter.

So to seize on that word as a fatal flaw is not serious engagement—it’s rhetoric over substance. Dr. Dan knows full well that I understand how science operates, because I’ve explained it repeatedly in other venues. His critique here is less about correcting a misunderstanding and more about playing semantics to distract from the actual evidence.

2) Junk DNA

At **32:12**, Dr. Dan dives into the Junk DNA section of my article. He begins by saying: “*I’m comfortable calling this a lie right here.*” He insists creationists misrepresent evolutionists when we equate **noncoding DNA** with **junk DNA**. He asserts the two were never synonymous because

functional noncoding parts of the genome were documented prior to the coining of “junk DNA.” He also appeals to **purifying selection, conservation in pseudogenes**, and criticizes **ENCODE**.

Let’s set the record straight.

Historical reality vs. revisionism

The very term “*junk DNA*” was introduced by **Susumu Ohno (1972)** explicitly to describe **noncoding DNA** that he and others considered mostly useless. This framing dominated evolutionary literature and public science communication for decades.

Representative examples:

- **Ohno (1972)**: “Our genome too is filled with the remains of extinct genes.”
- **Richard Dawkins (1976, *The Selfish Gene*)**: described large stretches of DNA as “junk.”
- **Francis Crick (1980)**: advanced the “selfish DNA” view, reinforcing the idea that much of the genome was nonfunctional baggage.
- **Textbooks (1980s–2000s)**: regularly taught that 90%+ of the human genome was “junk.”

The overwhelming message was clear: **noncoding DNA = junk DNA**. That’s why the phrase became embedded in both scientific and popular discourse.

To now claim “we never equated them” is semantics. Imagine someone saying, “*This isn’t really my sock drawer, because I also keep two t-shirts in it.*” No one buys that—it’s still your sock drawer. Similarly, evolutionists overwhelmingly taught that the **noncoding genome** was junk, despite a few caveats about scattered functions.

I usually say, “evolutionists once taught, and many still do, that the noncoding regions of our genome are *largely* junk.” But more and more, I am now realizing that militant evolutionists are attempting to revise history due to the embarrassment of past claims on DNA function.

Therefore, I now feel this needs to be called out. Apologists of common descent rarely want to concede anything—and it’s important that we as creationists hold their feet to the fire.

Regardless of this, it is absolutely not true that the majority of our genome is junk.

ENCODE and the collapse of the paradigm

Dr. Dan appeals to **purifying selection** (when he looks at ERVs and pseudogenes) and notes that scattered noncoding functions were recognized before 1972. True enough—but these isolated cases never overturned the prevailing narrative. That’s why the 2012 **ENCODE project** results (showing at least 80% biochemical activity) were met with such controversy. ENCODE didn’t just “add nuance”—it **contradicted the junk paradigm itself**.

As I’ve documented in detail in my paper:

Budinsky, D. (2025). *Unmasking the Genome: The End of Junk DNA — Why the Myth of “Junk DNA” Has Collapsed Under Modern Science*

...the appeals to conservation, pseudogene purifying selection, and ENCODE backlash cannot erase the reality: **evolutionary models long minimized noncoding DNA**, while creationists predicted purpose and function.

In summary

- *Junk DNA = noncoding DNA* was the **dominant evolutionary framing** for decades.
- Saying “we knew some function existed” does not undo the fact that the genome was widely treated as **mostly junk**.
- ENCODE and subsequent discoveries revealed extensive functionality, undermining the evolutionary paradigm.
- Creationists predicted function—and have been vindicated.

Dr. Dan’s attempt to rewrite this history is revisionism, not science.

3) Cars Don’t Reproduce

This is my favorite part of his video. This showcases just how weak the evolutionary position really is. At **7:40** and again at **11:18**, Dr. Dan scoffs at my use of the car analogy: “*He goes right*

to the car analogy, which we've all seen a million times... Cars don't reproduce. It's not an analogy for biological systems."

This demonstrates rhetoric, not argument. Analogies are meant to **illustrate reasoning patterns**, not be literal equivalents.

The car example shows that **shared design features don't require common ancestry**. Engineers across continents independently produce vehicles with headlights, wheels, and windshields because those features are optimal design solutions. Similarly, homologous structures in biology can reflect common design.

And ironically, if cars *did* reproduce, manufacturers would rejoice—because self-replication is a design feature vastly superior to human engineering. Far from weakening the analogy, the reproductive capacity of life **strengthens** the case for design: the Creator built systems beyond anything humans can achieve.

4) Homology and Nested Hierarchies

Dr. Dan insists that nested hierarchies and homology are unique predictions of evolution. Yet evolutionary models originally assumed mutations over millions of years would **scramble DNA similarities**. Why, then, do we see such striking similarity between, say, humans and mice—or even humans and fruit flies?

These levels of homology were not what evolution expected, but they fit **design** perfectly. A common Designer would use modular blueprints across organisms, yielding recurring nested patterns.

Importantly, such similarities have enabled huge advances in **medicine**: we rely on shared features between mice and humans to study disease. Why? Because the Designer intentionally built life with such ordered patterns.

For my full exploration, see:

Budinsky, D. (2025). *Nested Hierarchies and Homology: Evidence of Design — Why Life's Patterns Are Blueprints, Not Family Trees*

At **13:44**, Dr. Dan also claims he's never received a satisfactory explanation for why creationists use the word *mosaic*. Let's give him one.

Bonus: Mosaics vs. Transitional Forms

At **13:44**, Dr. Dan mocks my use of *mosaics* to describe supposed transitional fossils. At **18:00**, he asserts there are “tens of thousands” of transitional forms, though he repeats the same handful always cited: Tiktaalik, therapsids, Archaeopteryx, and the whale series.

Creationists call them mosaics because that's what they are—creatures with a mixture of traits, not transitional stages of evolution. For example:

- **Tiktaalik**: a “fish-a-pod” with both fish and amphibian traits—a mosaic, not a step in evolution.
- **Platypus**: combines mammal traits with reptile-like features—clearly a mosaic, yet no one calls it transitional.
- **Therapsids**: mammal-like reptiles with mixed traits.

Think about vehicles:

- A **crossover SUV** blends minivan and SUV traits.
- The **1961 Amphicar** was both a car and a boat.
- The quirky **1970 Bond Bug** straddled categories.
- The **Chevrolet SSR** mixed muscle car and pickup truck features.

We don't call these “transitional forms of cars”—they're mosaics, designed combinations for specific purposes. Likewise, fossils showing mixed traits are mosaics, not evolutionary proofs.

And importantly: if evolution were true, there should be **tens of thousands of unquestionable intermediates**. Instead, we see a few disputed mosaics continually recycled. That's why "mosaic" is a more accurate and neutral descriptor than "transitional," which assumes evolution from the outset.

5) Avoiding the Stronger Articles

At **22:50**, Dr. Dan critiques my ERV section but ignores my recent research, including my **Segregated Design model**. He mentions TSDs (Target Site Duplications), presenting them as viral signatures. But literature shows TSDs can also result from **internal mobility**, meaning they are not exclusive to viral insertion and fit my design framework.

My published works provide detailed refutations:

- **When ERVs Go Solo: Making Sense of Polymorphic LTRs (2025)**
- **The Endogenous Retrovirus Handbook: Updated & Expanded (2025)**
- **Segregated Design: A New Way of Thinking About ERVs (Budinsky, 2025)**

Yet Dr. Dan doesn't engage them. Likewise, on **junk DNA**, he criticizes ENCODE and invokes purifying selection but avoids my detailed article (*Unmasking the Genome*). On the **Y chromosome**, he appeals to Gutsick Gibbon but fails to acknowledge I've debated her and published technical rebuttals (Budinsky, 2025). On **radiometric dating**, he ignores my detailed works on **C14 in diamonds** and **helium in zircons**.

Instead, he focuses narrowly on the cheat sheet article—precisely the format I warned was not exhaustive. This avoidance underscores the weakness of his case.

Conclusion: Why This Matters

Dr. Dan's critiques are long on rhetoric and short on substance. His video focuses on word choices (*prove*), semantics (*junk DNA*), or analogies (*cars don't reproduce*) rather than grappling

with the deeper issues. When he does touch the evidence, his counters misrepresent history, nitpick semantics, or sidestep stronger works that already address his claims.

The **junk DNA** debate is especially telling. For decades, evolutionary biologists dismissed most of the genome as junk. That assumption shaped textbooks, research priorities, and public teaching. Yet discoveries over the last two decades have overturned it—vindicating creationist predictions of function.

Homology, mosaics, ERVs, and radiometric data all tell a similar story: the supposed “best evidence” for evolution crumbles under scrutiny, while the creationist framework remains strong.

The original **14 Evidences** article was never meant to be the final word—it was a quick-reference guide. But even that concise format has proven resilient when tested. This follow-up shows why: because the core creationist points stand, while evolutionary counters collapse into rhetoric, revisionism, or avoidance.

At *Standing For Truth Ministries*, we’ll continue the deeper work: ERV research, genomic studies, radiometric analysis, and model-building projects. But this exchange already makes one thing clear: **it’s a great time to be a biblical creationist**. The evidence is clear: when myths collide with facts, creation wins

Possible Follow-Up Claims by Dr. Dan Debunked

If past debates are any indication, Dr. Dan will not simply concede defeat. Instead, he will likely retreat to familiar “rescue devices”—tired talking points designed to salvage a collapsing paradigm. Anticipating those, here is what he will almost certainly say, and why each response fails.

Claim 1: “We never said *all* noncoding DNA is junk.”

This is semantics. The dominant evolutionary framing for decades was that noncoding DNA was

mostly junk, with only isolated exceptions. That claim collapsed once widespread functionality was revealed. “Mostly junk” is no more defensible than “all junk.”

Claim 2: “ENCODE exaggerated its results.”

Even critics of ENCODE admitted that the sheer level of biochemical activity across the genome was unexpected. Whether one quibbles about “function” vs. “biochemical activity,” the fact remains: the junk paradigm was wrong, and creationists were right to predict purpose.

Claim 3: “Conservation and purifying selection always showed function existed.”

Conservation arguments only covered narrow slivers of the genome. They do not erase the historical reality that the majority of noncoding DNA was dismissed as junk in both textbooks and research assumptions.

Dr. Dan often argues that lack of conservation or purifying selection proves lack of function. But this is a false dichotomy. Conservation is one signal of function, not the only one. Many regulatory elements, enhancers, and noncoding RNAs evolve rapidly yet remain functional (Kellis et al., 2014). Human accelerated regions (HARs) are another clear case: they are poorly conserved yet play critical roles in brain development and regulation. Even ENCODE’s critics admitted that widespread biochemical activity contradicted the “mostly junk” paradigm. In short, absence of conservation $\neq$ absence of function. The evolutionary narrative that equated noncoding DNA with junk cannot be rescued by pointing to small islands of conservation when the ocean of DNA was long dismissed as useless.

Claim 4: “Transitional forms exist by the tens of thousands.”

If that were true, evolutionists wouldn’t keep recycling the same small handful—Tiktaalik, therapsids, Archaeopteryx, the whale series, and the contested human fossils. These are mosaics with mixed traits, not unquestionable intermediates.

Claim 5: “Car analogies are bad because cars don’t reproduce.”

This misses the point entirely. Analogies are about reasoning patterns, not literal reproduction. Shared design features in cars illustrate common design in life. And the fact that living things *do* reproduce makes them *superior designs*—not products of chance. Adding reproduction amplifies the problem for Dr. Dan. It doesn’t make his position more convincing.

Claim 6: “TSDs demonstrate external viral infection; Donny’s model can’t account for these signatures”

This is incorrect. Many **retrotransposons** (internal mobile genetic elements) generate **Target Site Duplications (TSDs)** as part of their insertion mechanism. For example, LINE-1 elements (a well-studied family of retrotransposons) use a process called *target-primed reverse transcription* (TPRT), which involves cleaving the target DNA strands at staggered positions—this leads to duplication of short target sequences flanking the insertion. Thus, TSDs are not exclusive to viral insertion events.

If one’s model (such as mine) allows for internal mobility of designed retrotransposon-like sequences, then the presence of TSDs does *not* force the conclusion that an external retrovirus inserted the element. It merely shows that some insertion events occurred with the bump-duplication signature. To assert that *all* TSDs must come from viral infection is unsupportable given the literature.

- **See here:**
Moran, J. V., & Gilbert, N. (2002). *How do retrotransposons do it?* Current Biology, 12(21), R772–R774.
- **Mita, P., & Boeke, J. D. (2016).** *How retrotransposons shape genome regulation.* Nature Reviews Genetics, 17(11), 697–708.
- **Wei, W., Gilbert, N., Ooi, S. L., Lawler, J. F., Ostertag, E. M., Kazazian, H. H., ... Moran, J. V. (2001).** *Human L1 retrotransposition: cis preference versus trans complementation.* Molecular and Cellular Biology, 21(4), 1429–1439.

In short, every likely “rescue device” amounts to semantics, selective memory, or circular reasoning. None change the historical record that evolutionists were wrong about junk DNA, wrong about transitional forms, and wrong about how homology and nested hierarchies fit the data. And none address the stronger works they consistently avoid. At the end of the day, these rhetorical fallbacks only highlight the weakness of the evolutionary position—and the strength of the creationist framework.

References/Resources

- Budinsky, D. (2025). *Unmasking the Genome: The End of Junk DNA — Why the Myth of “Junk DNA” Has Collapsed Under Modern Science*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Budinsky, D. (2025). *Nested Hierarchies and Homology: Evidence of Design — Why Life’s Patterns Are Blueprints, Not Family Trees*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Budinsky, D. (2025). *Segregated Design: A New Way of Thinking About ERVs*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Budinsky, D. (2025). *When ERVs Go Solo: Making Sense of Polymorphic LTRs*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Budinsky, D. (2025). *The Endogenous Retrovirus Handbook: Updated & Expanded*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Budinsky, D. (2025). *Refuting Dr. Stefan Frello—Again (Part One): The Y Chromosomes of Humans & Great Apes*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Budinsky, D. (2025). *Radiocarbon Revelations: Why Earth’s Timeline Might Be Far Shorter Than You Think*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Budinsky, D. (2025). *Helium in Zircon Crystals: What Tiny Atoms Reveal About Earth’s Age*. Standing For Truth Ministries.
- Crick, F. (1980). *Selfish DNA: The Ultimate Parasite*. Nature.
- Dawkins, R. (1976). *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University Press.
- Ohno, S. (1972). *So Much “Junk” DNA in Our Genome*. Brookhaven Symposia in Biology, 23, 366–370.

Appendix: Video Notes & Reader's Toolkit

Why This Appendix?

This section provides time-stamped notes from Dr. Dan's own video so readers can verify context for themselves. It also compiles my published works, leaving no excuse for evolutionists to recycle already-debunked arguments. If critics want to engage seriously, they must deal with the full body of evidence.

Video Documentation (time-stamped)

All time codes refer to Dr. Dan's video: *"Creationist 'Cheat Sheet' Only Cheats Creationists"*

 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q6eEIFAnoYY>

- [7:40] – Dismisses the car analogy: “we’ve all seen it a million times... cars don’t reproduce.”
 - [11:18] – Scoffs again at the car analogy rather than addressing the reasoning pattern.
 - [13:44] – Expresses “confusion” about mosaics; claims he’s never received a satisfactory answer.
 - ~[18:00] – Asserts there are “tens of thousands of transitional forms” while citing the same handful of classic cases.
 - [18:22] – Nitpicks my use of “prove” in Chromosome 2 discussion, despite the article’s author’s note.
 - [22:50] – Moves to ERVs; mentions TSDs as if unique to retroviral insertion (they’re not).
 - [32:12] – Opens the junk DNA section, calling creationist framing “a lie” and attempting historical revision.
-

Selected Resources (deep dives)

- Unmasking the Genome: The End of Junk DNA (2025)
 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Unmasking-the-Genome-The-End-of-Junk-DNA-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>
- Nested Hierarchies and Homology: Evidence of Design (2025)
 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Why-Lifes-Patterns-Are-Blueprints-Not-Family-Trees-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>
- Segregated Design: A New Way of Thinking About ERVs (2025)
 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Segregated-Design-A-New-Way-of-Thinking-About-ERVs-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>
- When ERVs Go Solo: Making Sense of Polymorphic LTRs (2025)
 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/When-ERVs-Go-Solo-Making-Sense-of-Polymorphic-LTRs-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>
- The Endogenous Retrovirus Handbook: Updated & Expanded (2025)
 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/The-Endogenous-Retrovirus-Handbook-Updated-and-Expanded-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>
- Refuting Dr. Stefan Frello—Again (Part One): The Y Chromosomes of Humans & Great Apes (2025)
 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Refuting-Dr-Stefan-Frello-Again-Part-One-Y-Chromosomes-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>
- Radiocarbon Revelations (2025)
 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Radiocarbon-Revelations-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>

- Helium in Zircon Crystals (2025)

 <https://standingfortruthministries.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Helium-in-Zircon-Crystals-by-Donny-Budinsky.pdf>