

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 10

DECEPTION THROUGH TERMINOLOGY - PART 1 OF 7 THE TERM MICROEVOLUTION

This is the beginning of seven grinding chapters on terminology. With the discovery of DNA, the key definitions of biology should have changed dramatically. They did change, but instead of becoming more accurate they became **even more deceptive!!!**

For example, evolutionists do not distinguish between "microevolution" and "macroevolution" and claim they are the same thing. This is like saying a plastic toy boat, a child plays with in the bathtub, and a jumbo jet which can fly around the world, use the same technology!!

Microevolution and macroevolution are **fundamentally different concepts!!** But there is a reason that evolutionists intentionally try to claim they mean the same thing. This will become evident as the reader reads these seven chapters.

There are two key reasons for spending so much time on terminology.

First, the **central deceptions (i.e. "evidence") of the evolutionists are related to terminology. They do not use the same definitions as the creation scientists**, thus it is necessary to define **both** sets of terms (the definitions of the creation scientists and the definitions of the evolutionists) and to compare them and see why they are different.

Second, the reason they do not use the same definitions as creation scientists is because they have created the most sophisticated array of deceptive definitions in the history of humanity. Their definitions are designed to deceive so that people (specifically students) will fail to find the truth!!

Unraveling these deceptive definitions is a massive task because the deceptions are so cleverly disguised.

After the reader has finished reading these **seven chapters on the deceptions**, their mind will be numb with disbelief. Who was so sophisticated and so smart they could come up with the deceptive definitions in the field of biology I will talk about?

These seven chapters are very, very important because they will teach the reader how to **identify the use of deceptive definitions!!**

If the reader cannot **quickly identify** the use of tricky and deceptive definitions by the scientific establishment there is no hope they will ever understand how absurd the theory of evolution really is!!

In fact, the reader should read these seven chapters two or three times before moving on. That is how sophisticated and important the use of "tricky definitions" are to the evolution debate.

The definitions in this book will in no way coincide with the definitions used in textbooks!! That is precisely my whole point in writing these chapters.

The textbooks are written or influenced by evolutionists and they are designed to deceive students and prevent them from understanding the obvious flaws in the theory of evolution; meaning the definitions in textbooks are **designed to hide and cover-up the problems created for evolution by the discovery of DNA.**

ACCURATE POST-DNA DEFINITIONS

In this chapter and the next chapter several key terms, including the terms **microevolution** and **macroevolution**, **will be correctly defined**. The creation scientists, who developed these definitions, have done their job right.

The evolution establishment, as will be seen later, do **not** use these terms properly and their ignorance is **not** an accident.

Before the discovery of DNA in 1953, these terms did not exist and there was no reason for them to exist. But after the discovery of DNA, scientists had the necessary tools to accurately define these two terms and two related terms: "**species**" and "**evolution**." The terms "species" and "evolution" existed before the discovery of DNA and they should have been redefined to be consistent with the discovery of DNA. But they weren't, they were made even more obfuscated.

A fifth term, "DNA structure," which is at the core of the other four terms, will also be defined.

All five of these key terms will be defined, relative to DNA and creation scientists, in this and the next chapter. We will also talk about the way scientists intentionally obfuscate these terms to make it appear that evolution has some scientific evidence.

In fact, **the only "evidence" for the theory of evolution comes from using tricky terminology.**

Let us start with the term "DNA structure," to which the other key terms will be related.

Definition: "DNA structure" - every living and extinct animal, plant, bacteria, etc. has (if they are still living) or had (if they are extinct) DNA (or RNA). A **unique "DNA structure"** means a unique set of genes (counting only the functional genes, not vestigial genes), unique genetic algorithms, unique "morphing of the embryo" algorithms (if multi-celled), etc. that no other **species** has or has had.

It is the **DNA structure** that determines what a plant or animal will look like and its abilities. For example, the "DNA structure" of a human being is vastly different than the "DNA structure" of a mouse or an orchid.

For example, if two animals each have 8,000 genes, and each of those genes has the same function (e.g. gene #1,670 determines part of the color of the hair on their body), then these two animals have the same "DNA structure." Even if the two animals look very different (such as a Great Dane and a Chihuahua), they still have the same DNA structure.

Now let us use this concept to define the term "species."

Definition: "Species" - a unique DNA structure defines a unique "species." If and only if two plants or two animals, etc. have the same DNA structure, they are in the same "species," by definition. If two plants or two animals, etc. do not have the same DNA structure, they are **not** in the same species.

Thus, there is a one-to-one relationship between those plants and animals that have the **"same DNA structure"** and which are in the same **"species."** **The two terms mean exactly the same thing and the terms can be used interchangeably.**

As mentioned, a Chihuahua and Great Dane are of the same "species" precisely because they have the same DNA structure. They are both "dogs."

This does not mean every nucleotide is identical in the genes, only that the genes that make up the DNA, in each animal, have the same length and function. The genes do not have to have the same set of nucleotides in the same order.

The set of nucleotides of a Chihuahua and Great Dane are very different, but their DNA structure is the same.

We could think of a gene as a steering wheel of a vehicle. A large truck and a small sports car will have very different looking steering wheels, but yet they are both "steering wheels" and they perform the same function. Their structure is the same, their function is the same, but in this case their size and shape are not the same.

The genes in a specific species **do** have to have the same size (i.e. **number** of nucleotides), but they **do not** have to have the same nucleotides in each position.

Thus, we could analyze the DNA structure of thousands of animals (without seeing the animals themselves, only their DNA) and determine which animals are in the same "species." Ditto for plants.

For example, in order for a Chihuahua and a Great Dane to be in the same "species" their DNA must be the same length, they must have the same set of genes (the same genes in each animal must have the same length **and function**), their morphing of the embryo algorithms must be the same length, etc.

In fact they do.

As other examples, the DNA structure of genes, algorithms, etc. used to create an orchid is very different than the DNA structure used to create a lion. Thus, an orchid and a lion are **not** in the same species.

Note that the phrases: "species," "unique species," "DNA structure" and "unique DNA structure" all mean exactly the same thing in this book. They all refer to a unique species and its corresponding unique DNA structure.

Differences in male DNA structures and female DNA structures, in animals that have a male and female, are included in the same species if the male and female can mate (either physically or using a test tube to fertilize the egg) **and have offspring which can also have their own offspring**, meaning their offspring are fertile (this will be true because the male will have the correct **male DNA structure** for that species and the female will have the correct **female DNA structure** for that species).

Thus, many species actually have two valid DNA structures, one for the male and the other for the female.

Why do I mention a test tube? Because of genetic diversity. Two animals, male and female, may have exactly the same DNA structure (e.g. valid DNA structure for male and valid DNA structure for female), but physically they are very different sizes, such as a huge female Great Dane and a miniature male Chihuahua. Two animals with the same DNA structure may not be able to physically mate. However, if their sperm and egg were put into a test tube they could have offspring **which could have their own offspring**.

A male Great Dane and a male Chihuahua have exactly the same DNA structure (e.g. the same genes that do exactly the same things), but the genes do not have

to have the same nucleotides within each gene. These differences give rise to differences in color, shapes and sizes.

THE TERM: MICROEVOLUTION

(**Note:** As the reader has already seen, sometimes I frequently color code some of the letters in a word, such as **micro**evolution. I do this either to emphasize that I am talking about details of the term or to help the reader keep the term isolated from another term, meaning a term which means something totally different, such as the term **macro**evolution. **Micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean totally different things.)

The term "**micro**evolution" references what happens when two animals or plants, *which are in the same species*, "mate." Their offspring will have the correct DNA structure, but will not necessarily have the same nucleotides in the same locations (as either parent) and thus they **may not look exactly like either parent**.

Definition: "Microevolution" means **variety within the same species**, meaning **variety within the same DNA structure**.

Remember we defined a DNA structure to be a unique set of genes, algorithms, etc. "**Micro**evolution" means that within a specific species the **gene structures** must be the same, but the individual nucleotides which make up the genes do not need to be the same nucleotides.

Thus two animals may look: no different, slightly different or significantly different, even though they have the same DNA structure.

This is exactly what we were talking about above when we were talking about dogs (which is a "species"). The term "**micro**evolution" means that if a male and a female can mate (live or in a test tube), and have offspring that are fertile, the DNA of the offspring will be a mixture of the two DNA, but the offspring will have the **same DNA structure** as one of its parents (i.e. the male or female) and thus be in the same species; **even though it may look different (i.e. the color and patterns on the fur may be different)**.

A male child will have the same DNA structure as the father and a female child will have the same DNA structure as the mother.

The term **micro**evolution essentially means that the offspring of two animals (with a male and female) will have the **same DNA structure** as its parents, but more than likely the patterns of nucleotides on the DNA of the offspring will be different (it will be a mixture) than either parent and the offspring will likely look different than either parent. But the DNA structure will be identical to one of its parents.

It should be clarified that the DNA of the offspring will have DNA of the **same length** and DNA structure as its parent **which is of the same sex**.

This means that the offspring of the two animals will be in the same species as its "parents."

Key Point: **Micro**evolution, by definition, **never** creates a new species. It creates a new member of an existing species and each offspring has the same DNA structure as one of its parents, even if it physically looks different.

The offspring may have different colors, different physical sizes, different shapes, etc., but they are still "dogs," for example, and they have the same DNA structure as one of its parents. This also means that the **length of the DNA** of the child will be the same as one of its parents.

When we see **consistent and significant** physical features, among two groups of animals which have the same DNA sequence, we may refer to these two groups as different "breeds."

The Chihuahua and Great Dane are two different "breeds" within the same species: "dogs."

In other words, two different **breeds** of dogs have the same gene structures, algorithms, etc. (i.e. the same DNA structure), but may not have the same nucleotides **within the same structures**.

A gene can be very long, but every "letter" of a gene is either an A, C, G or T (in this book we only care about the nucleotides on one side of the DNA strand to keep things simple).

Because of **micro**evolution the gene of one dog may have a different set of nucleotides in the same gene as another dog of the same sex, perhaps causing a different color of fur. But the length of the gene will be the same.

Thus, **micro**evolution is an abbreviated way to refer to three animals (two parents and a child) which have the same DNA structure (relative to their sex).

While the terms **micro**evolution and breeds, by definition, can affect the appearance, or ability to physically breed, or can affect some other function, of the offspring of two animals, **it CANNOT, by definition, affect the DNA structure of the offspring of the two animals**.

It is the DNA structure which defines the "species." [It is the nucleotides within a DNA structure that defines the variety](#), which can mean a different "breed." It is also this variety which defines [microevolution](#).

This is the key: "[with microevolution there is never a new species and there is never a new DNA structure, by definition!!](#)" There may be a new breed, but there is never, by definition, a new species, meaning a new DNA structure.

The creation of a new "[species](#)" requires a change in the DNA structure, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

All breeds are created by [microevolution](#), but not all [microevolution](#) creates a new breed. The term "breed" is defined on the basis of the same [DNA Structure](#), but a consistent and different appearance.

I repeat these terms over and over again in different ways because the definitions I use, and that all creation scientists use, do not coincide with what the reader sees in textbooks. The reader needs to see these terms over and over again because in school they have been taught definitions that are designed to deceive the student into believing in evolution, as will be seen below.

In summary, the term "species" and "[microevolution](#)" all refer to the same [DNA structure](#). If two animals or plants are in the "same species," but look significantly different, then they may be different "breeds." Breeds are created by [microevolution](#), by definition.

The term "breeds" is a subjective term, not a technical term.

It is critical to understand the term "species." The term "species," for animals with both a male and female, means the male and female will have a different DNA structure, but all males have the same DNA structure and all females have the same DNA structure in the same species.

Remember above that we talked about "fertile offspring." If two dogs, of different breeds, mate, will their offspring be fertile? The answer is yes.

Will their offspring look like either parent? This is where it gets interesting. The offspring may have the size and shape of one of the parents or it may not. The offspring may have the same color (we are talking about dogs) and patterns as one of the parents or it may have some new color, pattern or even shape.

Breeders of exotic animals have learned by experience that [there is a limit](#) to how much variety they can achieve by selectively breeding (i.e. by [microevolution](#)). This is because there is no new DNA structure when two animals of the same species breed and there is a limit to how many useful gene

permutations (i.e. ways to order the nucleotides) exist for a particular physical feature.

The key point is that the offspring of a male and female will be in the same species and will have the same DNA structure as one of its parents. Thus, by definition it will be fertile itself under normal circumstances and it will be the same species (but not necessarily the same breed).

I suspect that everyone has seen a "mutt," which is a dog which does not look very attractive because it was the offspring of a male and female which were of the same species, but not the same breed. The "mutt" may look very nice (in which case it may be a new breed) or it may look awful (in which case it is likely not a new breed and it may be removed from the gene pool, meaning it may not be allowed to breed).

Darwin's finches were a good example of **micro**evolution. All of the finches were of the same species (they had the same DNA structure), but each breed of finch had different nucleotide sequences within some of their genes which, for example, may have created a different size or color of feathers, or hardness and/or shape of beak.

"Natural selection" or "survival of the fittest" may apply to the different finches because of their different colors, beaks, etc. These are perfectly valid terms to use with **micro**evolution.

Before the discovery of DNA, no one could define "**micro**evolution" or "**macro**evolution" (to be discussed next). Thus, Darwin's finches were legitimate examples of "evolution" in Darwin's day. But today they would be considered as examples of **micro**evolution, **not macro**evolution.

After the discovery of DNA, Darwin's finches suddenly belonged to the same species because their DNA varied only by **micro**evolution. They may have been considered different "breeds" (using my terminology), but they were the same species if they could mate and have offspring which could mate and have offspring.

And this is something the reader needs to understand. In Darwin's day **micro**evolution was always referred to as "evolution" because DNA was unknown and the term **micro**evolution did not exist.

Different sequences of nucleotides can create different sizes, shapes and functions of beaks, different patterns and colors of feathers, different survival skills, etc., but they do not constitute a new species (as **creation scientists** define "species") because each finch had the same DNA structure.

Microevolution CAN lead to better survival skills, such as fur that blends in with a certain kind of tree or sharper teeth. "Natural Selection" can apply to microevolution. "Survival of the Fittest," which is essentially the same thing, can apply to microevolution.

Darwin was wrong to call them different species (using the DNA-oriented terminology of creation scientists), but he lived before the discovery of DNA so he was not at fault for doing that. There was only one term before the discovery of DNA - evolution.

The important point to make in this chapter is that microevolution, by definition, cannot create a new species (i.e. it cannot create a new DNA structure which is longer or has new genes or new algorithms, etc.). The DNA structure is the same, thus the offspring are going to be of the same species.

Remember for future reference:

Microevolution does not change the length of the DNA, microevolution does not change the **number of genes** or the **function of the genes** or the **length of each gene**, and so on. But it can affect which nucleotide is in a specific nucleotide position. Thus, microevolution **cannot** create a new "species" (i.e. a new DNA structure), but it can affect the physical appearance of an animal (or plant) and it can create a new breed.

In future chapters it will be important to remember that microevolution does not change the length of the DNA!!! Remember that part of the definition.

If scientists put several species of dogs, both male and female in each species, on a new planet which had no other life (plus they put plants for oxygen and much smaller animals for food), and left them there for a million years; when future scientists visited this planet there would be a large variety of sizes and shapes of dogs, **but the DNA of every dog on the planet would be the same length**, every DNA would have the same number of genes, the same functions of the genes, etc.

In short, all of the DNA would be the same size and have the same functions, but there would be a great deal of variety due to variety within the genes!!!

For our purposes in this book, it is critical to understand that the **length** of the DNA of every dog would be the same. **Microevolution** never changes the length of the DNA, by definition!!