

# Patterns of Intelligence

## CHAPTER 11

### DECEPTION THROUGH TERMINOLOGY - PART 2 OF 7 THE TERM MACROEVOLUTION

#### Introduction

**Macro**evolution is a hypothetical and theoretical concept where an existing species is converted, via random mutations to its DNA, into a new species, meaning a **new and different DNA structure** is created.

According to the theory of evolution, **macro**evolution is how new species are created by evolution. It is how humans and all other species came to exist as descendants of the "first living cell."

**Macro**evolution, by definition, leads to a longer DNA structure because the new DNA structure (of the new and improved species) has **at least one new gene**, using my definitions.

In order to get from the "first living cell" to human DNA, and millions of other species, many millions of new genes must have been created for the millions of species which have and do live on this planet.

According to the theory of evolution, every species on this planet, except the "first living cell," was created by one or more sequential instances of **macro**evolution.

When you look at a phylogenetic tree, each species got there by a sequence of **macro**evolution events, ultimately beginning with the "first living cell," according to the theory of evolution.

For example, evolutionists might say that humans were the result of two thousand sequential instances of **macro**evolution, where each instance of **macro**evolution created a slightly more advanced species, starting with the "first living cell," until humans ultimately existed. Some of these species would have been primates.

However, the reader should understand that **macro**evolution has **NEVER** been observed, nor has it ever been proven to have occurred. It is a **purely hypothetical concept**.

By my definition of "species," **macro**evolution must create at least one new gene in order to create a new "species." Remember, my definition of a "species" is based on a unique **DNA structure**. Thus, to have a **new DNA structure**, meaning a new "species," by definition, at least one new gene must be created by purely random accidents (by my definition of **DNA structure**)!!

In other words, according to the theory of evolution, an existing DNA structure (of an existing species) is randomly mutated (i.e. changed), via accidental mutations, and a new species, with a new and improved DNA structure, with at least one new gene, results. This is the very definition of **macro**evolution and the very definition of a new DNA structure and thus the definition of a new "species."

There is a one-to-one correlation between a unique "species" and a "unique DNA structure." They mean the same thing.

In order for the theory of evolution to be true, **macro**evolution, as I define it, must have occurred on this planet **millions** of times to have created all of the species which have and do exist on this planet.

Scientists, in fact, do assume that **macro**evolution has occurred millions of times on this planet, but **they have never seen it happen** either under controlled circumstances or under circumstances in nature!!

So scientists don't really know how it can happen. All I can do is make some educated guesses as to how it might work if it were real. **But it is not real.** The reason I say it is not real will be understood later in this book.

Let us consider a species with both a male and female. Let us first ask: in which animal was the new gene (or genes) created (by random mutations): the mother or the father?

It is insane to think that the same mutations could occur in both a father and a mother in the same generation (more will be said about this later), thus let us assume (for the sake of argument) that it occurs in the mother.

This means that the mother must have at least two offspring (so that they can mate and have offspring with the new genes in order to perpetuate the new species for the next generation), at least one of which is a male and at least one of which is a female and both of which have her new gene(s).

**(Note:** I will make little attempt to refine this discussion, and discuss all possible scenarios as to how a new species, with new genes, can be created, precisely because this discussion is totally hypothetical, meaning a new species with new genes has never been created in nature, and never will, so I do not feel the need to discuss all possible scenarios, only the easiest to understand scenario.)

The male and female offspring must inherit the same mutations from their mother (when they are still eggs inside the mother) because they are different eggs. If they were identical twins, from the same egg, they would be the same sex and could not have offspring for the next generation.

When these two or more "children" grow up they must mate with each other to perpetuate the new "species," meaning the new DNA structure. Presto, we have a new "species" according to my definitions.

Later in this book we will talk about why it is statistically absurd that a new gene could be created on an existing DNA strand (e.g. in the mother).

Remember that the new DNA structure, by my requirements, **must have at least one new gene** and it must be a functional gene (i.e. it must create at least one protein which has a useful and functional purpose).

This is actually one of the **main reasons** that **macro**evolution is impossible. Not only must a new gene have a very unique sequence of nucleotides, it must make proteins which add to the functions of previously existing proteins. Etc.

I require at least one new gene because the offspring are considered, by definition, to be a "new species." But it is not really a "new species" unless the new DNA has some new function and new functions require at least one new gene, by my definitions.

If the new DNA structure did not have a new gene, then by my definitions it would simply be a mutation, not a new species. A new species must have at least one new functional gene, by definition. This also means the DNA will have a longer length, which will become an important concept later in this book.

Regardless of the rules of engagement, no scientist has ever observed a new species, with at least one new gene, be created in the lab or in the wild!!

This turns out to be a very important fact because scientists are constantly claiming they have "observed" evolution occur. Much will be said about this false and absurd claim later. It turns out this false claim is the heart and sole of the **deceptions** (i.e. "evidence") of the evolutionists!! But I am telling you how the story ends.

**Macro**evolution is a purely hypothetical concept because it has **never happened** in nature or in the lab.

After reading all of this book, and especially all of the mathematical problems that **macro**evolution has to overcome, it will become self-evident to the reader that **macro**evolution is all smoke and mirrors.

It will also be required that the DNA structure of the new species be longer than the DNA structure of the parents because of the requirement of at least one new gene.

This is actually an important requirement because obviously the length of the RNA or DNA of the imaginary "first living cell" was massively shorter than the DNA of human beings and other animals with long DNA strands.

**Key Concept #1:** Remember that with **micro**evolution we were always very careful to make it clear that there was **never** a new species, meaning, by definition, there was *never a new DNA structure, meaning by definition there was never a new gene*. And with **micro**evolution the *length of the DNA is **never increased!!***

**Key Concept #2:** But with **macro**evolution, there is **always**, by definition, a new DNA structure. This means, by definition, there is at least one new functional gene, which by definition means the *length of the DNA **always increases!!***

Are you beginning to see the difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution? With **micro**evolution, the length of the DNA **never** changes, but with **macro**evolution, the length of the DNA **always** increases. These differences will turn out to be critical as this book progresses.

For now, remember that there is a fundamental and massive difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution. Only **macro**evolution can lead to a new species according to the theory of evolution.

***Micro*evolution can lead to new "breeds" and *macro*evolution can supposedly lead to new "species." There is a world of difference between these two concepts!!**

**Or to put it another way, **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution are fundamentally different concepts!!!**

By definition, with **macro**evolution the length of the DNA of the new species is always assumed to be longer because evolutionists always say that the new species is **superior** to the old species. Another reason it is longer is because I require at least one new gene.

I have never heard an evolutionist talk about an inferior species being created by evolution!! Actually no one has ever seen a new species be created by evolution (the way I define "species"), but they always assume the new species will be superior to the old species.

A significant reason for the absurdity of **macro**evolution is that there are only a very, very small percentage of permutations (i.e. unique ways to order nucleotides) that could create a new, functional gene.

Let me give you an example of "permutations" (e.g. unique ways of ordering nucleotides) using only 3 nucleotides, A, C and T. Here are the unique permutations, meaning unique ways to order, these three letters:

ACT  
ATC  
CAT  
CTA  
TAC  
TCA

Each is a unique "permutation," or unique way to order, 3 nucleotides, A, C and T.

How many of the above permutations are a word in the dictionary? The answer is two (ACT and CAT).

Likewise, not all permutations of nucleotides will create a "gene" or anything else that is useful.

Permutations create a probability issue for the theory of evolution because most attempts to create a new gene will fail because a random permutation of nucleotides will almost never create a new, functional protein, especially one that can be integrated into an existing structure of different proteins.

Any discussion of **macro**evolution is totally hypothetical because no one has ever observed it in spite of what you might think. This is just one reason why evolutionists must use tricky definitions to convince their students to become evolutionists.

But creating a new gene is only one type of problem for **macro**evolution.

## **The Problems With Adding A New Gene**

Let us dig a little deeper and talk about mutations in the DNA of an egg of a female (or male, but we will assume a female). I require at least one new protein on the DNA of each new species. A "protein" is a pattern or template to create a gene. Let us assume a new protein, created by evolution, is used as a pattern to create a new gene.

A human DNA is used to create thousands of different proteins using the genes as "patterns." These proteins may be part of a complex structure of proteins or the proteins may have some technical function (such as a "supervisor protein") in the cell.

What goes on inside of cells is very, very, very complex. Scientists get PhDs for learning something new about the complexity of what goes on inside of cells. Even discovering a chemical reaction inside of a cell can get a person a PhD.

It is statistically absurd that a new gene can be created, or a longer gene can be created, either of which can create a new protein **which adds some new function to the cell** (remember: all DNA and all proteins are inside of a single cell, in this case the egg of the mother).

But the reason goes beyond statistics.

To understand this better, think about how a new gene could create a new protein that somehow **improves** on the complexity and function of the interrelated proteins that already exist in the cell. A new protein would be like throwing a wrench in the backseat of a car and expecting the engine to perform better!!

Let me explain.

**The individual parts of the engine of an automobile were designed to work together**, so how is a wrench in the backseat going to fit into, and improve, the synergistic design of an engine??!! It is the wrong shape, in the wrong place of something that is already working just fine.

The famous quote of Bert Lance: "if it ain't broke, don't fix it," applies to cells. The complex mechanisms which make a cell functional are not broken, so why add a new protein to them which doesn't add any value to what the existing proteins are already doing as they work together??

**Key Concept:** Thus, it is not just about making "any" protein, it is about making a randomly created protein that is synergistic, and adds value to, a network of fully functioning proteins that already exists and the existing proteins are already working together!!

Randomly adding a new protein, via a new gene, will almost certainly do more harm than good!!

Trust me, what goes on inside a cell is thousands of times more complex than what goes on inside of an engine!!

The vast, vast majority of randomly created proteins would have a permutation that was totally useless (meaning the protein would have a shape that was totally useless)!! But even if the permutation was somewhat useful, how it is going to integrate into a system of functioning proteins that are already working together!!

This is one of the many, many problems those who believe in **macroevolution** have to explain!!

## Formal Definitions

We have been talking about **macroevolution** (i.e. the creation of a new DNA structure), so let us formally define **macroevolution**:

**Definition: "Macroevolution"** means the creation of a **new species** (where "species" is defined by a unique DNA structure) by random changes to the DNA of an existing species. **By definition**, the new DNA structure must include at least one new functional gene ("functional" means the new gene creates a functional and useful protein inside the cell).

**Macroevolution** is when a new species, **meaning a new DNA structure**, is created via accidental mutations to the DNA. The new species is called the "child species."

## Defining the Term "Evolution"

We will talk about how the scientific establishment defines terms later, but for now let us continue to talk about how different terms **should be defined**.

So how shall we define the term "evolution?" The term "evolution" existed before the discovery of DNA, thus we need to contemplate how to define it after the discovery of DNA.

The entire concept of "evolution" is that humans "evolved" from the "first living cell." Darwin had no clue what the "first living cell" was, nor does anyone today, but he preached that each species of animals (including humans) "evolved" from a "lower" species of animals. We won't say much about plants in this book.

Darwin also knew nothing about DNA.

So today scientists **MUST** interpret the theories of Darwin by claiming that **human DNA "evolved"** from the very, very short and simple DNA or RNA of the "first living cell" via **thousands** of "intermediate" species (i.e. new species with

slightly more complex DNA). In each case, the DNA of the "child species" was **slightly longer** than the DNA of the "parent species."

(**Note:** Yes, I am aware that evolutionists now use terms like "self-sustaining chemical replicators," etc. but this is because they realize that all cells are so complex they could not have formed from the dust of the earth by accident so scientists constantly have to invent new tactics of deceit to pretend evolution is true.)

Note that evolution always assumes the new "child species" is a superior species from the "parent species."

**Note that the term "evolution" as envisioned by Darwin, and updated by newer technology, is identical to what I defined to be "macroevolution."**

Macroevolution is **defined** to be the ONLY way that a "new species" can be created, with a longer and more complex DNA strand, and the entire concept of evolution is that many **new, consecutive intermediate species** were created such that humans could descend from the "first living cell."

Each "intermediate species," **BY DEFINITION**, was a new child species.

The need for the term **macroevolution** is to emphasize that **microevolution** cannot create a new DNA structure, meaning it cannot create a new "species," meaning it cannot create a new DNA structure with at least one new gene.

And certainly human DNA has a lot more genes than the hypothetical "first living cell."

**Remember:** **Microevolution**, by definition, does **NOT** lead to a new DNA structure, or a single new gene, because it does not increase the length of the DNA or add any new genes. **Macroevolution**, by definition, is the ONLY way to create a longer and/or improved DNA structure and/or a new gene.

Also remember this key concept:

**KEY CONCEPT:** "Evolution" and "macroevolution" mean exactly the same thing. The only difference is that "macroevolution" is a more precise term because it refers to a new DNA structure. The term "evolution" preceded the discovery of DNA so it does not refer to DNA. However, the **INTENT** of the term "evolution," **by modern evolutionists**, is to claim that humans "evolved" from the "first living cell," thus the term "evolution" means exactly the same thing as **macroevolution**, meaning **the creation of a new species with a new and improved DNA structure**.

So why don't we include **microevolution** in the definition of "evolution?" We could, but in fact **microevolution cannot** create a new DNA structure, by definition. For Darwin to be correct **millions of new DNA structures** would need to be created by evolution.

Thus, **microevolution** is **irrelevant** to what scientists are trying to achieve when they use the term "evolution"!! Evolution is all about "new species," not "new breeds." So that is why I do not include the term **microevolution** in the definition of "evolution."

**Nor should anyone include it because it is *irrelevant* to what the theory of evolution is designed to accomplish - the claim that humans descended from the "first living cell"!!**

Never forget that the **INTENT** of the term "evolution" is to get people to believe that humans "evolved" from the "first living cell." **Microevolution** has nothing to do with this process, only **macroevolution** can justify the atheistic claims of the theory of evolution. So it is ludicrous to include **microevolution** in the concept of Darwinian evolution.

The difference between a Chihuahua and a Great Dane have nothing to do with creating human DNA from the RNA or DNA of the "first living cell."

Creating a new "species" is the heart and soul of Darwinian "evolution" even though Darwin himself did not know anything about the difference between **microevolution** and **macroevolution**.

Yes, Darwin observed **microevolution** and called it "evolution," but the heart and soul of the theory of evolution today is that **humans** "evolved" from lower species (such as the "first living cell" and primates) and that **humans** were not created by God. This requires **macroevolution** to be true.

**IMPORTANT CONCEPT:** Even though Darwin used the term "evolution" to refer to examples of both **microevolution** and **macroevolution** (i.e. the creation of a new species); we have to consider the **INTENT** of the **theory of evolution**. The intent of the theory of evolution was to convert people into atheists, which could not be done without talking about a long series of new and more complex species leading from the "first living cell" to humans. Only **macroevolution** creates a new DNA structure and a new species. Thus, the **goal** of the theory of evolution was **identical** to what only **macroevolution** can accomplish. That is why the term "evolution" should exclusively mean **macroevolution**.

What the theory of evolution must explain, **to be true**, is the progression of species from the "first living cell" (the concept of the "first living cell" comes **only** from the theory of evolution) to human DNA. This would require many, many new DNA structures.

If evolution were true, the DNA or RNA of the imaginary "first living cell" would have been very, very small and simple because it had to be created by random acts to sand, air, water, lightening, etc.

Thus, in explaining where human DNA came from, scientists must start their explanation with the "first living cell" and then claim that many, many new species, with **progressively longer and more complex DNA**, eventually led to human DNA.

But the **progressively longer and more complex DNA** could only happen by **macro**evolution, because by definition, **micro**evolution does not change the **length or structure** of the DNA.

Thus, **macro**evolution, and ONLY **macro**evolution, was responsible for the "evolution" of all species on this earth except for the "first living cell" (which is a fictitious single-celled entity), because only **macro**evolution can create a new DNA structure.

The creation of **millions** of new DNA structures (to account for the "evolution" of all plants and animals which do or have existed on this planet), each of which is the result of random and accidental mutations to DNA, is required for the theory of evolution to explain where all extinct and living species came from.

**Note:** there are probably more than a **billion** different "genes" that have existed or do exist, which would not have existed on the "first living cell." Yet **not a single new functional gene**, which creates at least one functional protein, has ever been **observed** by scientists to be accidentally created. Only by using tricky terminology, to be discussed later in this book, do scientists "trick" their students into believing there is "evidence" for **macro**evolution.

And if not a single new, functional gene has ever been observed to have been created by random mistakes/mutations, how is it possible an entirely new species has been so observed?? Obviously, no new species has ever been observed to have been created by random accidents to the DNA of an existing species.

In summary, according to the theory of the theory of evolution (i.e. **macro**evolution), every "species" on this planet, except for the "first living cell," was created by **totally random accidents** to the **DNA structure** of a "**parent species**," which random accidents created a **new DNA structure** and thus a **new**

species, called a "child species" in this book, is created. (Note: a parent species and child species are not required to have both a male and female.)

To look at things in a slightly different way:

"Microevolution" does not affect the DNA structure; it only affects the sequences of nucleotides within the same DNA structure. Microevolution can create new "breeds," but cannot create new "species" (i.e. a unique "species" is defined by its unique DNA structure), **by definition**. Thus, microevolution has absolutely nothing to do with the theory of evolution because it does not change the length or structure of the DNA.

Thus, humans could not have descended from the "first living cell" or even any primate by microevolution because the DNA structure does not change. If only microevolution existed, the DNA of humans would be the same length, and have the same number of genes, as the "first living cell." In other words, humans would not exist as sentient beings because we would not have the complex genes needed to create all of our organs, etc.!

"Macroevolution," on the other hand, does create a new and unique DNA structure and is the only way to create a new "species" with a new DNA structure. Thus, only macroevolution can have anything to do with the theory of evolution because only macroevolution can create new DNA structures for the millions of species which have and/or do exist on this planet.

Note that by definition the terms microevolution and macroevolution are totally different concepts and each leads to totally different outcomes!!

Microevolution does not result from accidents and does not create a new species, but macroevolution does result from random accidents and does create new genes and new species.

Remember, in this book, in order to use the term macroevolution, I will require that **the new species has at least one new gene which did not exist in the "parent species" (or either of the "parent species" if two different species mate) and that the new DNA includes the supporting nucleotides needed to support this new gene). The gene must create at least one useful protein.**

Of course, we have already seen the problem of adding a "useful protein" to a set of proteins that are already working quite well together.

In many cases, the new DNA structure **must also be changed** to support necessary changes to the "morphing of the embryo" algorithms, which are computer programs on DNA which are incomprehensible to humans and will be explained in later chapters in detail.

So why do I spend so much time talking about definitions? The purpose of these definitions is to avoid endless debates about irrelevant subjects. In other words, these definitions delineate between a new "breed" (**micro**evolution) and a "new species" (**macro**evolution).

Evolution did not occur by creating new **"breeds."** If evolution existed, it occurred by creating millions of new **"species."**

If someone is going to claim that "evolution" happened in nature, they need to show that **new genes** have been created many millions of times, which by definition means a new DNA structure has been created, with the supporting nucleotides to support this new gene.

If there is no new gene, there is no "evolution" because to get from the "first living cell" to human DNA there had to be many millions of new and unique genes created by the total blindness and total randomness of evolution.

The "new gene" must have some function for the new species (i.e. it must create one or more functional proteins for the new species) and it must have the supporting nucleotides.

By now, hopefully the reader will understand that the terms "**micro**evolution" and "**macro**evolution" are **totally different concepts.**

**Micro**evolution does **NOT** change the length of the DNA, nor does it add any new genes. It is simply variety with species.

**Macro**evolution **DOES** change the length of the DNA and does add new genes and must also change the "morphing of the embryo" algorithm, which will be discussed later.

**Micro**evolution and **macro**evolution are **fundamentally different concepts!!!**

True evolution and **macro**evolution are the same thing and have nothing to do with **micro**evolution, which is nothing but variety within the same species.

**All of this is by definition.** These definitions are consistent with the definitions of creation scientists, but not evolutionists, as will be seen as we go along.

We have used the term "species" above, but we have not formally defined it. That is what we will do in the next chapter.