

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 7

THE MODERN EVOLUTION DEBATE

Let us now start the discussion about the scientific issues of the theory of evolution.

While the scientific establishment is totally supportive of the theory of evolution, there are many individual scientists who consider the theory of evolution to be absurd from a scientific standpoint!! How can this be so??

In other words, **if the raw scientific data is exactly the same for the creation scientists and the evolutionists, why is there such a massive difference in the way this data is interpreted??**

This chapter will deal with this key question.

It turns out that the scientific data is almost irrelevant to what people believe because people can twist and turn the data to fit what they want to believe.

Before going on we need to clarify a term. A "naturalist" can be defined as someone who studies nature. A naturalist can be an atheist or someone who strongly believes in God.

However, a "philosophical naturalist" is someone who has the philosophy that nature came into existence by itself, which philosophy excludes any mention of God and is therefore identical to "atheism."

In this book, the term "naturalism" will be used interchangeably with "philosophical naturalism" meaning they both mean atheism. This is not always the way the term "naturalism" is interpreted.

I do this because both naturalism and atheism can be called "pure accidentalism," meaning all creation was totally accidental, which would be necessary if there were no God. There is nothing in (philosophical) naturalism which includes God or is any different than atheism.

While some people equate "Mother Nature" and God as being one in the same, that is not the case with the scientific establishment. To them "nature" or "naturalism" means accidentalism; meaning pure, atheistic evolution.

The way I use the term "Mother Nature," it means God.

There are no generally accepted definitions for some of these terms; I am just explaining how I will define them in this book.

So let us get started with the discussion.

Regarding those who do not believe in God, and who are behind the push for the theory of evolution, a well-known professor of law, who is also an author and "creation scientist," Phillip E. Johnson, has explained why so many scientists and others push the theory of evolution so hard.

In this comment Mr. Johnson is talking about the fact that [the theory of evolution is more of a philosophy than it is a science](#):

"Science [i.e. the scientific establishment] is committed to [philosophical naturalism](#) [i.e. atheism or a strong belief in the theory of evolution in this context] and therefore science must **assume** that no Creator, and no purposeful intelligence, is behind our existence ... All that science can address is the question of: **'granted that we are here as a result of [purposeless material mechanisms](#), what's the [most plausible purposeless material mechanism](#) that we can imagine?'**"

Phillip E. Johnson, professor, author, attorney; quoted on UCTV

What Mr. Johnson is saying is that "science" (i.e. the scientific establishment in this context) is committed to the philosophy of the theory of evolution (i.e. "[philosophical naturalism](#)"), thus science must assume there is no God (i.e. which is atheism) and therefore **they set as their goal** to find the [most plausible purposeless material mechanism](#) to scientifically justify their philosophy of atheism.

The key phrase here is "[most plausible](#)." The goal of the scientific establishment is to convince students that evolution is true, because many of the powerful members of the scientific establishment are atheists. Thus, their search is to find the "[most plausible](#)," meaning "[most believable](#)," arguments to convince students to become evolutionists.

In other words, [the theory of evolution is a "missionary tool" for atheists](#). It is not a quest for truth; rather it is a "missionary tool" to get converts to atheism.

Their goal is to find the "[most believable](#)" evidence to convince students to become evolutionists. It turns out, as will be seen below, that their "[most believable](#)" argument is to deceive and lie to students by using unbelievably sophisticated, tricky definitions. But we will talk about that later. For now, simply think of evolutionists as being "missionaries" for the theory of evolution and its associated atheism.

The important thing to remember is that ***the scientists are not looking for truth from a neutral, unbiased starting position***; rather they start their "search" from the rock solid position that they are atheists.

In other words: **their initial position is that there is no God; then with that assumption, they begin to look for the **best evidence** (i.e. "most plausible" evidence) they can find to justify their initial position of atheism (i.e. **to find the best evidence they can find to get converts to atheism**). There is no such evidence, as will be explained later, thus they must use **deception** to get converts.**

Note: Not all scientists in the scientific establishment are atheists or evolutionists. Many scientists strongly believe in God. But atheists and/or evolutionists have enough power to make sure the **"scientific establishment" itself** is strongly atheistic and pro-evolution (e.g. the National Academy of Sciences being one example).

Likewise, many teachers are not atheists, in fact many of them strongly believe in God, but they may find themselves in the position of teaching a philosophy they do not believe in.

Let us get back to Mr. Johnson's quote.

THE SEQUENCE OF LOGIC IN MR. JOHNSON'S QUOTE

It is important to note the sequence of logic in Mr. Johnson's statement:

First) The scientific establishment was committed to philosophical naturalism, meaning their starting position did not begin with a question, ***rather it began with an answer*** or more accurately a ***strong belief***.

Note that they had no desire to find any truth because they were atheists from the beginning. Atheism was their answer. Their quest was really to get converts to atheism via "justification," meaning their quest was to find the **best evidence (or in this case to invent the best deceptions)** they could find to convert people to atheism.

The term "justification" means a quest to find evidence, **not an unbiased search or quest to find truth**. With "justification" you start with what you perceive to be truth, so you are not really looking for truth, you are looking for justification for your beliefs.

The "evidence" in this case is not unbiased "evidence" but rather it is "evidence" which is carefully chosen and groomed to convince people there is no God and that Adam and Eve never existed.

The important thing to remember is that they started with their "answer" (i.e. atheism), then they sought to manufacture "evidence" (i.e. justification) to support their answer. **Never at any time was their quest to find truth.** Their quest from the beginning was to justify their atheism and get converts to atheism!!

Second) Because many of those in the scientific establishment were atheists, they had to assume that no Creator or purposeful intelligence is behind our existence (i.e. 'granted that we are here as a result of purposeless material mechanisms').

They essentially eliminated God by assuming that philosophical naturalism was true and that no God was necessary to explain where nature came from. Thus, they were **not** looking to find the truth about the existence of God. They eliminated God long before their "science" (i.e. "justification") even began.

Third) With atheism and their goal firmly in place, scientists then searched for the **most plausible purposeless material mechanism** they could imagine to justify their beliefs. This item was necessary to maximize the number of converts they could get.

Think about this question: How would you convince people that God didn't exist when the very existence of the Universe, our Sun, this planet, human DNA, the DNA of millions of other species, etc. etc. are all irrefutable evidences that God exists!??

But yet their goal was to convince people that God doesn't exist!! How in the world could they do that?? The answer was to use deceptive definitions and other tactics.

In fact, there is no amount of evidence that will convince a hard-core atheist to become a creation scientist. That is because the real debate is not about evidence. It is one group of people with a core belief in atheism debating another group of people with a core belief in God. Evidence is irrelevant to the main debaters. It is rare when someone changes sides, but it has happened.

Why would scientists not want people to believe in God? I am sure there are several reasons, but what I have personally seen is that scientists are very arrogant and they have no interest in truth because they consider themselves to be the most "intelligent" beings on earth. What they really want is to be revered by their students and that means to get their students to believe what they believe.

People who believe in God would believe that God was a lot smarter than any scientist. So the underlying reason for atheism, at least for some scientists, was to stroke their egos and do away with their competition (i.e. God) so that

scientists would be considered to have the highest intelligence on earth and thus in the Universe (since we are the only intelligent life in the Universe as far as they are concerned).

However, we cannot lose track of the fact that they needed some **scientific excuse** (i.e. **"most believable" purposeless material mechanism**) to convince students and others that God does not exist.

The **"most plausible"** or **"most believable" purposeless material mechanism** they could find (i.e. their best evidence to justify philosophical naturalism), according to Mr. Johnson, was the theory of evolution.

The key words are "most plausible" or "most believable." Having started with their answer (atheism) they needed to find the best theory they could find (i.e. the most plausible theory) to gain converts.

They embraced the theory of evolution as their "most plausible" tool to accomplish their goal of converting people to atheism.

But since there is no valid scientific evidence for evolution, especially after the discovery of DNA in 1953, they ultimately resorted to massively sophisticated deceptions in terminology, as will be seen below.

The above steps summarize the goals and methods of the scientific establishment.

These items can be summarized in one sentence: "scientists first believed in philosophical naturalism (i.e. atheism) and second, they started looking for ways to justify their beliefs and thus gain converts to the theory of evolution."

THE ORIGINAL QUESTION

Let us get back to our original question: **how is it possible that the scientific establishment can be so supportive of the theory of evolution, and yet other scientists consider the theory of evolution to be absurd from a scientific standpoint, yet everyone is looking at the same data?**

The reason there is a vast gulf between evolutionists and creation scientists **has nothing to do with scientific discovery** and has everything to do with **initial assumptions**.

Those who have no interest in God begin their "quest" with an assumption there is no God and that evolution is true. They then look for "evidence" to support their beliefs and gain converts.

Those who believe in God begin their "quest" with a belief that God created all things. They then look for "evidence" to support their beliefs and they may try to gain converts.

Thus, the "gap" between evolution and creation science **did not begin with scientific evidence, it began and ended with different foundational beliefs.**

Instead of starting with **no beliefs**, and then looking for evidence, both sides of the debate typically started with their **core beliefs** (atheism or a belief in God), then **they started looking for evidence** to support THEIR beliefs.

This is exactly why the scientific evidence can be identical, but the end beliefs can be so far apart. The two parties in the debate did not start from the same starting point, nor did they have any intentions of changing their initial assumptions or beliefs.

This is what Mr. Johnson was saying: **their starting position did not begin with a question, rather it began with an answer.**

This explains why the same data can yield totally different groups of interpretations.

Because the foundational beliefs were so different, and because *their "science" was designed to justify their beliefs (not to find unbiased truth)*, the final beliefs (i.e. final conclusions) were vastly different.

These groups are like two people going down different paths. The first path leads northwest to the first city and the second path leads southwest to the second city; which is many miles from the first city.

Where the paths separate is their initial philosophies or beliefs. Along these different paths the two groups are looking for "evidence" to support their beliefs as they head towards their respective cities.

Thus, the **difference in scientific data** (i.e. **the distance between the two cities**) is driven by the different paths they are on!! The ending differences are largely irrelevant and the initial assumptions (i.e. where the paths separate from each other and the direction they are headed) turn out to be everything because the initial assumptions define the direction of their paths!!

In other words, the "gap" is not caused by science, but by initial assumptions compounded by **biased science** (the direction of their paths).

The scientific establishment is dominated by atheists, thus they claim God does not exist and they then search for scientific justification for their atheism. The

method or **justification they chose to focus on was the theory of evolution** (which is their path). **This is how they get converts to atheism!!**

The theory of evolution was the strongly held explanation of human existence prior to the discovery of DNA. With the discovery of DNA everything should have changed because the theory of evolution instantly became scientific nonsense, but in fact nothing really changed.

And that is exactly the problem. **In truth, the discovery of DNA instantly made the theory of evolution scientific nonsense.** For example, how can you take the amazingly complex DNA of one advanced species and randomly mutate that DNA and end up with a superior species **every time??!!** **This is an absurd claim with zero scientific data in any field of mathematics, statistics or science!!**

But showing an atheist the absolute absurdity of the claims of the theory of evolution, **after the discovery of DNA**, is not going to get many converts because they are not likely to be looking for the truth, they are probably looking to debate.

The absurdity of their position will be better understood after the chapters which discuss the "morphing of the embryo" algorithms. The "morphing of the embryo" algorithms totally decimate the theory of evolution, as do many other scientific and mathematical facts.

So how is a student going to know who to believe, if both sides start with an assumption and then proceed to look for the "best evidence" to get converts???

There really is no problem. The overwhelming evidence, after the discovery of DNA, is that the theory of evolution is absurd. This will be evident below.

Also, this book will unravel, like a banana peel, the layer after layer of deceptions (deceptions by using clever terminology) used by the scientific establishment.

They would not need to use deceptive terminology if they had valid scientific evidence!! And that is the key to remember.

As will be seen, creation scientists don't need to invent deceptive terms, but the evolutionists must use **highly deceptive terminology to get converts!!!!!!**

Look for integrity. The side that doesn't need to lie to get converts will have the truth. The side that does have to lie and deceive to get converts is the side you want to avoid.

As will be seen below, the scientific community has totally ignored the discovery of DNA (as an element of the evolution debate) as if it never happened!! In fact,

they use deceptive terminology as their main tool of deception, as will be shown later.

Note: The tactics of the scientific establishment to justify evolution could not have been invented by accident or stupidity!! Their tactics are very, very clever, well designed and highly calculated to deceive their students, as will be seen below. Their push for evolution is a cleverly designed fraud and could not have been put together by someone who was looking for the truth. Remember, I am talking about the **scientific establishment**, and not necessarily individual scientists. Evolutionists need to use clever deceptions because the real scientific evidence, after the discovery of DNA, is overwhelmingly in favor of the creation scientists.

The creation scientists believe in God. They have no problems justifying their belief in God because human DNA, the laws of physics (which will not be discussed in this book), the Universe and many other things are obvious proofs that God lives!! All of the valid data is on the side of the creation scientists.

In summary, the huge gulf between the scientific establishment and creationists **did not begin** with scientific differences, they began with **philosophical differences**. **These philosophical differences then led to biased science** (including outright lies) **and to huge scientific differences!!**

The tactics of the scientific establishment to justify evolution are nothing new. Many, many times a group of people have wanted something to be true and thus they invented all kinds of arguments to get others to believe them.

Mr. Johnson was right on target. Enough of the leaders in the scientific establishment are atheists that they have enough power to insure the theory of evolution (i.e. atheism or naturalism) is the official doctrine of the scientific establishment.

This is not to say that everyone who believes in the theory of evolution has a problem with pride or atheism. Many people believe in the theory of evolution because they have never heard the powerful arguments of the creation scientists or because they want to be popular with the powers that be. But perhaps the main reason people become evolutionists is because of the highly sophisticated tactics of deception that are used by the evolutionists.

The end result of the efforts of the scientific establishment has been that a lot of students have been deceived by false information.

The deceptions are so good that there is absolutely no reason a person or student should feel guilty if they believe in the theory of evolution!!

I am going to repeat that because it is very important: **there is absolutely no reason a person or student should feel guilty if they believe in the theory of evolution!!**

Almost all students have been subjected to a massive amount of false information and very, very clever deceptions by many of those in authority!!

Even many instructors have been misled!!

As just mentioned, the deceptions were not accidental!! They are very, very clever and carefully designed in order for scientists to continue to "justify" evolution.

However, the purpose of this book is **not** to "prove" that God lives. That is beyond the abilities of science and logic. My personal knowledge that God lives did not come from my study of science or mathematics!! It came from reading the scriptures, attending church, providing service to others and other things.

The main purpose of this book is to prove that the claims of the scientific establishment (**these claims are NOT necessarily the claims of all science teachers** because there are **many science teachers** who believe in God) were carefully designed to generate massive amounts of false information and deception in order to carefully lead students into thinking the theory of evolution has scientific merit!!

In other words, the purpose of this book is to prove the theory of evolution is scientific nonsense!! Doing this is not easy, which is why this book is so long.