

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 12

DECEPTION THROUGH TERMINOLOGY - PART 3 OF 7 THE TERM SPECIES

Before formally defining the term "species" it is critical to understand **WHY** this term is so important to the evolution debate. So we will again work our way up to our objective in this chapter!!

Creationists and evolutionists use many of the same **words**, but the two groups frequently define words completely differently.

Because evolutionists have to create an imaginary world that cannot have existed in real life they must use a lot of imagination (to imagine things that never happened, such as the "first living cell") and creative thinking (to explain how a new DNA structure can form by accident) and deception (to cover-up and hide their lies).

I have defined **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution as defined by the creation scientists. As just mentioned, they are fundamentally different concepts.

But the evolutionists define these same terms totally differently than we do. For example, to the scientific establishment: **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean the same thing. How in the world is this possible??

It is not possible, but **it is necessary** because they have no evidence for the theory of evolution, thus they must use clever definitions to deceive students.

The **key, central deception** of the evolutionists is that **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean the same thing!! In fact, they don't even like to use these terms.

Why do they do that? So that they can use examples from **micro**evolution (which are abundant in nature) to claim they have observed **macro**evolution (which has never happened in nature).

For example, suppose someone said this:

Statement A: "An example of **micro**evolution is the same thing as an example of **macro**evolution."

What idiot would believe that statement!! Such a statement is absurd!!

But now consider that scientists did away with the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution or they said that **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution were the same thing.

Now Statement A can be converted into Statement B:

Statement B: "An example of evolution is the same thing as an example of evolution."

Now, by simply doing away with the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution, or by saying that **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution were the same thing, they have converted a blatantly absurd statement (Statement A) into a perfectly valid statement (Statement B).

Statement A is still absurd, but they have deceived their students into believing in the theory of evolution by using clever definitions!!!!

The purpose of this deception is so that evolutionists can use examples from **micro**evolution (which are plentiful) and claim they have observed **macro**evolution (i.e. for which there are **zero** honest examples).

Or again: by **not** using the terms **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution, they can use an example from **micro**evolution and call it an example of "evolution."

But scientists have never seen an example of **macro**evolution. But by using clever definitions, such as using the term "evolution" instead of using the correct term "**micro**evolution," scientists can "invent" evidence for evolution!!

Because there is no evidence for **macro**evolution, scientists have to use tricky definitions to pretend "they" have "evidence" for "evolution."

The student must remember that **micro**evolution **does not** change the length of DNA, by definition; but **macro**evolution **must** change the length of the DNA thousands of times in order for evolution to go from the "first living cell" to human DNA (which is the central issue in the evolution debate).

How can you go from the "first living cell" to human DNA without changing the length of DNA??? Does a bacteria (which is far more advanced than the imaginary "first living cell") have DNA of the same length as humans?? NO!!

If evolution were true, the length of DNA must be constantly changing.

There is zero evidence this has ever happened, so the solution is to deceive by using clever definitions.

So how can **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean the same thing?? They can't, but there is no integrity on the evolution side of the fence, only deception. They must use deception because they have no evidence for **macro**evolution!!

So instead of using evidence they use deception by using deceptive terminology. They have the power to define things in their textbooks and they use that power to deceive their students. This is at the heart of their tactics!!

In fact, textbooks have done away with the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution. By doing this they have achieved exactly the same goal: **use examples of **micro**evolution and pretend they are examples of **macro**evolution.**

So by simply ignoring the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution, they can use thousands of examples of **micro**evolution and pretend they have evidence for Darwinian evolution or **macro**evolution!!!!

So in summary, scientists have two choices to achieve their deception.

- 1) They can claim that **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean the same thing, or
- 2) They can eliminate the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

By doing either or both of these deceptive tactics, they can use examples of **micro**evolution and claim they are examples of **macro**evolution, meaning they are examples of Darwinian evolution!!

These concepts will be repeated over and over again in this book because they are the heart and soul of the deceptions of evolutionists!!!

Scientists must carefully obfuscate their terminology in order to pretend they have evidence for Darwinian evolution. Plus they use their power in the classroom and media to criticize the creation scientists (or more likely to ignore them).

They have to pretend to have evidence for evolution in order to get new converts to atheism. They have **no** physical evidence so they have to use tricky definitions, as will be seen as we go along in these seven chapters.

That is why I spend so much time talking about definitions!! And it is why I go over and over and over the definitions!! Tricky definitions are the very heart and sole of the bogus "evidence" of the theory of evolution.

If all definitions were based on "DNA structure," and if evolutionists were honest and used the correct definitions, they could never get a single convert to evolution or atheism because they have zero evidence for [macro](#)evolution.

So instead of using precise definitions which are connected to "DNA structure," their definitions are internally inconsistent, totally obfuscated and intentionally misleading.

When all is said and done, their only "evidence" for evolution is to use deceptive and tricky definitions!! There is certainly no evidence in nature for [macro](#)evolution, meaning Darwinian evolution.

The Definition of "Species"

The reader should have noted by now that my definition of [macro](#)evolution is tied to my definition of "species" and my definition of "species" is tied to the "DNA structure" of a plant or animal.

This is because the term "unique species" and the term "unique DNA structure" mean exactly the same thing.

This is far too simple for the scientific establishment even though they should know by now that DNA was discovered in 1953.

Why don't they just tie their definition of "species" to DNA structure!! I would like to hear their answer to that question.

With the discovery of DNA, within a few years every definition in every dictionary and science book should have been tied to the discovery of DNA, meaning every definition should reference "DNA structure"!!

Not only has that not happened, **it will never happen!!** The theory of evolution is just too important to them as a recruiting tool for atheism!!

While it is true that scientists do not have the DNA of many extinct animals and plants, they do have access to the DNA of all living species and some extinct species. They have plenty of DNA to look at. Plus, the technology of looking at DNA nucleotides has massively improved over the years.

But the truth is that even if they had the DNA of every plant, animal and single-celled animal in the history of this planet they still would not tie the term "species" to DNA structure.

Why not?? Because if they did they could not get converts to atheism.

The term "DNA structure" is too closely related to the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution. In fact, the entire DIFFERENCE between the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution is in how they relate to DNA structure!!!

Microevolution does **not** change the DNA structure of a species and **macro**evolution **does** change the DNA structure of a species.

So if they can eliminate the concept of "DNA structure," they can use the term "species" any way they wish, meaning they can avoid any discussion of the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution, which are both tied to DNA structure!!

The terms "species," "DNA structure," **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution should all be harmonious. But they are not harmonious.

Evolutionists are clever, but they are fools because their religion is based on fraud.

So let us formally define the term "species."

The Formal Definition of the Term: "Species"

I hope the reader can figure out by now that the scientific community is **not** going to define the term "species" correctly!! Duh.

But in fact, I cannot tell you how evolutionists define the term "species" because **they don't have a definition of "species."** This gives them a lot of flexibility in using the term "evolution." The leaders of the evolution movement love flexibility, obfuscation and atheism. They hate truth.

In other words, if they don't have a definition for "species" they don't have to tie the term "evolution" to "species" or "DNA structure" which gives them the flexibility to "prove" the theory of evolution without any reference to DNA or DNA structure!!

This is obvious because their "examples" of "observing evolution in action" are always **examples from microevolution** and they never even look for any new genes in the new "species."

Ambiguity breeds ambiguity and with an ambiguous definition of "species," or no definition at all in this case, they can pretend they have examples for "evolution" any time they want!!

Before explaining the definition of "species" by evolutionists, let me repeat my definition of "species":

Definition: Species: A unique "species" is defined by a unique "DNA Structure."

How simple can you get - I define the word "species" in one line!! And yet it is a very accurate definition because it ties the term "species" to the concept of a unique "DNA structure." **A unique "species" and a unique "DNA structure" mean the same thing!!**

But the scientific establishment doesn't like to tie things to DNA because that interferes with their flexibility, which they need to get converts to atheism.

For example, here is what a very famous evolutionist, Ernest Mayr, said about why evolutionists do not have a definition for the term "species." If you are not confused as you read this you are not paying attention!!

"Occasionally one cannot study the origin of gaps between species unless one understands what species are. **But naturalists have had a terrible time trying to reach a consensus on this point.** In their writings this is referred to as "**the species problem.**" Even at present there is **not yet unanimity on the definition of the [term] species.** There are various reasons for these disagreements, but two are most important. The first is that the term species is applied to two very different things, to the **species as concept** and to the **species as taxon.** A **species concept** refers to the meaning of species in nature and to their role in the household of nature. A **species taxon** refers to a zoological object, to an aggregate of populations that, together, satisfy the definition of a **species concept.**

The taxon *Homo sapiens* is an aggregate of **geographically distributed populations** that, as a whole, qualify under a particular **species concept.** The second reason for "the **species concept**" is that within the last 100 years most naturalists have changed from an adherence to **typological species concept** to acceptance of the biological species concept.

If the differences among the populations throughout the geographic range of a species are minor, not justifying taxonomic recognition, a species is called monotypic. Quite often, however, certain geographic races of a species are sufficiently different to be recognized as a subspecies. A species taxon consisting of several subspecies is called a polytypic species."

What Evolution Is, by Ernest Mayer, pages 163-165

Have you ever heard such nonsense?? Why would the term "species" be tied to "geographically distributed populations" or "typological species concept" or "biological species concept," etc. Good grief, what is wrong with these people!!

Note that he took three long paragraphs and he still couldn't come up with a definition of species!! Nor did he mention DNA!!

Why don't these people simply define a "species" with reference to a unique DNA structure?? They act as if DNA had never been discovered!!

They are intentionally ambiguous because to tell the truth would destroy their craft!! They must obfuscate their terminology and appear to be sophisticated and educated. But more importantly, they don't want their students to figure out what is going on.

All they have to do is define a "species" to be a unique DNA structure, and then tie all of their terminology (such as **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution) to that definition of "species," meaning to DNA structure.

But they will never do that. Everything must be shrouded in a sophisticated cloud of obfuscated mystery.

Because creation scientists teach the truth, we don't have to invent clever and tricky definitions. We just tell the truth. All of our terminology is tied to a unique "DNA structure." We remember that DNA was discovered in 1953.

This is why I said earlier that my definitions do **not** coincide with modern biology books. Modern biologists don't even have a clear definition of "species"!! If you use my definitions on a biology test, your answer will be wrong.

As another example of their slight-of-hand, scientists talk about "speciation," which is when one species becomes two species. If they have personally observed the "speciation" of a species, from one species into two species, then they have observed an example of **micro**evolution because **macro**evolution has never occurred on this earth.

However, if they have not observed the speciation of a species, but only speculate on the speciation, it could be an example of **micro**evolution or it could mean God created the two different species (because **macro**evolution is mathematically impossible) and they have not personally observed the two species be created from one species.

But because they don't even have a clear definition of "species," much less one that is tied to DNA, you never really know what they are talking about!!

In other words, because they never, never compare the DNA structure of one species to the DNA structure of another species, you never know whether they are talking about a new "species" created by **micro**evolution, without using that term of course, or a new species created by God (i.e. a new DNA structure). Those are the only two honest choices!!

However, **ALWAYS**, as will be seen below, when they are talking about **observing** a new species, this new species was created by **micro**evolution (note that this is talking about **observing** a "new species" form), but of course they **never, never, never** use the term **micro**evolution because that is a DNA-oriented term, which they hate.

And, of course, they have never observed a "new species" form, using my definitions.

They have never seen God create a new species, but they have seen many, many examples of **micro**evolution creating a new "breed."

So in summary, we can make these two statements:

First, if scientists **have observed** one "species" separate into two species or into a new species, they have observed **micro**evolution (and a new breed), because that is the only thing they have ever actually observed.

On the other hand, if scientists speculate that one "species" has separated into two species, but the two species do NOT have the same DNA structure (this is something they did **not** observe), then God created both species.

If they claim they have seen **macro**evolution (i.e. a new species form), they must prove it is possible AND they must define their terms the way I define the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

So how can they prove the theory of evolution is true and possible? They can't because **macro**evolution is mathematically impossible, for multi-celled organisms, as will be seen later!!

To prove the theory of evolution (i.e. **macro**evolution) is possible they must **observe** a new DNA structure form by accident!!! To prove that is possible they must have taken a DNA sample BEFORE an experiment and AFTER the experiment. They must prove at least one new functional gene was created by pure accident. This is the only way to prove **macro**evolution, but **macro**evolution will never happen as will be seen later in this book.

So they have to resort to deceit and especially they have to resort to using deceptive terminology.

If they used my more technical definition of "species," the total number of "species" which exist, and have existed, on this earth (which would really be a count of unique DNA structures) would drop dramatically for two reasons: **first**, I do not allow **micro**evolution to create a new species (meaning I am really counting unique DNA structures), and **second**, many "species" (in their method

of counting) are actually genetic "cousins," meaning they both have the same common ancestors (and have the same DNA structures, which is the important point) if you go back enough generations.

So in other words, I want to know how many unique DNA structures there are and have been on this earth, which would tell us how many true "species" are and have been on this earth.

Their definitions, terminology and examples of "evolution" are obfuscated and deceptive for a reason: they want to totally deceive any truth-seeker.

Their goal is not truth, their goal is converts.

If they would simply use the definitions of the creation scientists, which are clear, precise and easy to understand, and are based on DNA structure, there would be no confusion. But truth is not their goal.

Their goal is to get converts to evolution, meaning converts to atheism, thus they have intentionally ignored the discovery of DNA and have obfuscated their terminology so much that I frequently have no idea what they are really talking about.

And if they cannot even define the term "species," imagine what flexibility they have in defining the other terms of biology!! We will see some of this flexibility in future chapters.