

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 13

DECEPTION THROUGH TERMINOLOGY - PART 4 OF 7 THE BAD LOGIC OF EVOLUTIONISTS

When a student hears the term "evolution" they immediately think, like a Pavlov reaction, of Darwin.

When a student thinks about "Darwin" they immediately think, like a Pavlov reaction, of atheism because the whole goal of Darwin's teachings was to convince people that God does not exist.

Thus, when a student hears either the term "evolution" or "Darwin" they think that a proof has been found that God does not exist and that atheism is the true religion.

That is exactly what the evolution establishment wants!! They want converts to their cherished atheistic evolution.

Every other word out of the mouth of the scientific establishment is "evolution." When they say "evolution" they want students to think of Darwin and when the student thinks that Darwin was right they will therefore conclude that there is no God.

What is wrong with this logic?? Think about it before reading on and see if you can find the flaw in the above logic.....

The Bad Logic

Darwin and the modern "scientists" have convinced everyone that if Darwin was right, and if evolution is a true scientific doctrine, then God does not exist.

Thus, the goal of the scientific establishment is to use the term "evolution" over and over and over again so that people will think about Darwin over and over and over again and they will then think that God does not exist over and over and over again.

They want the term "science" and the term "atheism" to mean the same thing.

That is how they want to get converts to atheism.

It is a fact that when students hear the word "evolution" they think about Darwin.

It is a fact that when students think about Darwin they think about Darwin's claim that God does not exist.

But let us examine this logic in more detail.

First of all, how do you "prove" that God does not exist?

For example, suppose that all statisticians were idiots and they claimed it **was** possible to create a new DNA structure by random mutations to an old DNA structure.

Does this prove that God does not exist??? Absolutely not, it just proves that we need better statisticians.

However, BECAUSE Darwin was an atheist and an evolutionist, any "proof" that the theory of evolution is "true" is somehow considered a "proof" that Darwin was right and that there is no God.

But this is very bad logic.

Consider this logic (**this is a purely imaginary example**):

- 1) Henry Smith (in 1815) claims that the craters on the moon were caused by meteors,
- 2) The preachers in 1815 claimed that it was God's wrath, in the form of lightning bolts on the moon, which created the craters on the moon.
- 3) Henry Smith is well known to be an atheist and he dies in 1860.
- 4) Some scientists agree with Henry and others do not. It is a controversial topic in science for many decades.
- 5) Astronomers prove, in the year 1956, using very powerful telescopes, that the craters on the moon were caused by meteors.
- 6) **Scientists then conclude that Henry has proven that there is no God.**
- 7) Students of science start becoming atheists.

This is bad logic at its worst. The issue of whether God lives or not has absolutely nothing to do with whether the preachers were right or wrong or whether Henry Smith was right or wrong!!

While the general public may have believed, until 1956, that God's wrath created the craters on the moon, so what?? Just because they are wrong in that issue does not mean that God does not exist.

Suppose I said: "I believe that the moon is made of cheese and that if the moon is not made of cheese, then there is no God." Would that be good logic? Absolutely not!! There is no connection between what the moon is made of, or whether I am right, and the existence of God.

My point is that **to connect** the **theory of evolution** to the **existence of God** is very bad logic.

Let us assume the evolutionists were right, and evolution is possible. Does this mean there is no God? Consider this hypothetical logic:

- 1) Darwin believed that a species can "evolve" into a new species.
- 2) Darwin was an atheist.
- 3) Suppose the evolutionists prove that a species can "evolve" into a new species (of course this is not true, but let us assume that it is true to make a point).
- 4) We therefore claim that Darwin has **proven** that there is no God.

Does the fourth statement logically follow from the first three statements?

Absolutely not!! **The fact that species may or may not be able to "evolve" into a new species is a statistical issue, not a religious issue.** The issue has absolutely nothing to do with the existence of God.

For example, God understands statistics so if it were statistically valid that evolution was possible, the only species God would have needed to put on this earth would have been the "first living cell."

After creating the "first living cell," God could have taken a very, very, very long vacation and **never created another species on this planet!!** He would let evolution create all of the other species, including humans. When God got back from his long vacation there would be humans walking around on the earth.

In this case, God created ONLY the "first living cell," and evolution created all other species on this planet, **meaning the theory of evolution was perfectly true, but the existence of God WAS ALSO TRUE!!**

Why would God work any harder than He needs to? Humans don't like to work any harder than they need to.

If evolution were true, all God had to create was the "first living cell." But evolution is mathematical nonsense, so God had to create all of the species (i.e. all of the unique DNA structure), as the Bible implies. **The Bible is more mathematically/statistically accurate than the theory of evolution!! It should be, it was written by God's prophets.**

But that is not the point. The point is that even before the discovery of DNA, there was no logical connection between Darwin's claims and whether God existed!!

After the discovery of DNA, the same truth holds: there is no logical connection between the mathematics of whether the theory of evolution was possible (after the discovery of DNA) and whether God exists!!

It is bad, bad logic to connect the possibility of the theory of evolution to the existence of God.

The Bible says that God created all species. This is absolutely correct and is even mathematically and statistically correct, as will be seen below and can be seen even better in my larger book, which is also free and online on this "www.prophetsorevolution.com" website.

But more importantly, it is **logical nonsense** to claim that:

- 1) if the theory of evolution were statistically possible, therefore
- 2) God does not exist.

Trust me on this one: if the theory of evolution were statistically valid, then the probability of God is also statistically valid!!

That is the irony of all of this. "Scientists," as they refer to themselves, claim that the inane probability of evolution is NOT a disproof of the theory of evolution, but that the inane probability of God IS a disproof of the existence of God.

This is called a "double standard." The probability of both is insanely impossible.

I do not claim that the probability of God is anything but inane. But I do claim that the evidence is overwhelming that God does exist (just look at the order in the Universe by looking at distant galaxies through a powerful telescope).

I suspect this is what the evolutionists are thinking:

If God did not exist, then the existence of humans (e.g. human DNA) could only have been created by the theory of evolution.

This is good logic and I agree with it.

However, this example of logic is **NOT** good logic:

If God **did** exist, then the theory of evolution would be **false**.

While it is true that God does exist and it is true that evolution is false, it is poor logic to say that **BECAUSE** God exists, the theory of evolution is false.

Likewise, this is bad logic:

If the theory of evolution is true, then God does not exist.

I am not trying to support the existence of God by trying to prove the theory of evolution is scientific nonsense because there is no connection between the existence of God and the statistical probability of the theory of evolution.

Darwin was wrong to claim that if evolution were true then God did not exist.

It is bad logic at its worst!!

The validity or falsity of the theory of evolution has nothing to do with the existence of God. The validity of the theory of evolution is purely a statistical issue and is totally independent of the existence of God.

It is also nonsense to say that if evolutionists can lie and deceive their students enough such that the students falsely believe in the theory of evolution, then their students should become atheists.

The existence of God and the statistical problems of evolution are not in any way connected.

To say that a person can "prove" whether or not God exists by predicting His behavior is also nonsensical logic. God doesn't think like we think (or to be more accurate: humans are not smart enough to think like God thinks).

My point is that scientists are not only bad at definitions, they also have really bad logic.

Even if everything Darwin said was shown to be [mathematically correct](#), this still would have [absolutely nothing to do](#) with whether God lives.

Why Do Evolutionists Believe Macroevolution is Possible?

As another example of bad logic, though in this example it is more a case of bad mathematics, evolutionists believe that [macroevolution](#) is possible.

Why do evolutionists even think [macroevolution](#) is possible after the discovery of DNA? Did they flunk all of their statistics courses??

Why would anyone think that random mutations to DNA can create increased sophistication, meaning a new and improved DNA structure, with at least one new gene??

Could a person take an existing "country music" CD, randomly mutate its "bits" and end up with a new Rachmaninoff piano concerto or a new blueprint of a rocket ship or a new calculus book or anything else that is useful?? [Never!!](#)

Could a person take a complex computer program and randomly mutate its "bits" and end up with a new computer program that had useful functions the old program didn't have?? **Never!!**

Could a person take two complex computer programs (that were significantly different and did completely different things), and randomly combine their bits and end up with a new computer program that had all of the functions of both original programs plus had useful functions that neither of the original programs had?? **Never!!**

Could a person take an extremely complex computer program, and randomly and **slowly** mutate it (in many small steps over a long period of time to simulate evolution in real time) and end up with a new computer program that had millions of new and useful functions the original program didn't have?? **Never!!**

That is correct. The massive number of unique genes on this planet, from all animal and plant species, is massively larger than the genes on the "firstly living cell" would have been.

Does doing something slowly fix its statistical problems?? Not a chance.

Yet the DNA of a cat is far more sophisticated than the object code of any computer program ever written by a human being or any team of human beings!!

Obviously, no cat has ever "evolved" into a new species with a new DNA structure. Would someone really expect that you could randomly mutate the highly sophisticated and complex DNA of a cat and end up with a new species that had all of the capabilities of a cat, plus new capabilities, such as understanding calculus, created by a new DNA structure??

Why would anyone believe in evolution, knowing that the DNA of a cat is far more sophisticated than a country music CD and no country music CD has ever "evolved" into a more sophisticated anything??

If scientists tried to mutate a country music CD into something that is useful, and they tried to do this one million times, there would be one million useless CDs that didn't do anything. None of them would be useful.

It is a fact that if scientists took a new planet and experimented trying to create a single new species, starting with a male reindeer and a female horse, the planet would eventually be 100 feet high, from pole to pole, with deformed and dead infant reindeer/horses. **None of their offspring would survive and even if they did, they certainly couldn't have had their own offspring.**

All of this, and many other examples, are why it is obvious that with the discovery of DNA the theory of evolution instantly became nonsense.

Even if evolution were true, there would be trillions of dead animals (which did not survive because their mutated DNA could not lead to viable new species), for each new species that did survive (actually the statistics are far worse than that).

The planet earth would be millions of miles high, literally, with mutated animals that had fatally defective DNA in the attempt to create a single new species between a house cat and a lion.

Where are all of these defective and dead animals??

Not only do the statistically challenged evolutionists claim that evolution has happened, but they claim that there were virtually ZERO ERRORS with evolution (or there would be millions of miles high of dead, mutated baby animals).

If there no limit to their absurd claims? No, because they are not looking for truth, they are looking for converts.

Scientists have never randomly mutated the DNA of a bacteria and ended up with some new function, such as the ability to see or hear. All they have seen develop is one or two nucleotide mutations that provided some very small survival benefit. But there was **never, never a new gene** that was developed by random mutations!! There was only an accidental survival benefit via a change to one or two nucleotides!!

Many thousands of times scientists have seen **micro**evolution occur in real life. **Micro**evolution can be intentional (e.g. a breeder can carefully breed a pure, new species) or unintentional (e.g. in nature new breeds can occur).

Microevolution (in the form of selective breeding) can assist in developing new features, some of them functional, such as the ability of a genetically bred mouse to jump higher.

Microevolution is a scientific fact, and it can do a lot of things, but it is limited in what it can do. It CANNOT create a new DNA structure.

Not once in the history of this Universe has a scientist observed a new species form by accident which had a new DNA structure (i.e. it had at least one new functional gene with supporting nucleotides).

In other words, no scientist who ever lived on this planet, or does live on this planet, **or will ever live on this planet (this is a mathematical prophesy)**, will see a new DNA structure form by accidental mutations because it is mathematical nonsense.

The reason for my prophesy (well, it is not really a prophesy, it is just good mathematics) will be clear later in this book when I dig into the mathematics of evolution. This will be understood later in this book, but my larger book is even better to understand this mathematical prophesy.

Let me get back to definitions. To me a unique "species" means the same thing as a unique DNA structure because the term "species" is defined by a DNA structure.

When the evolution establishment uses the term "species" they could be talking about a whole range of topics. But this obfuscation is intentional. They don't want to talk about the real issues.

In fact, over many centuries, two animals with the same DNA structure (i.e. because they have common ancestors) can look massively different. Image how many "breeds" of dogs and cats, whether intentional or in the wild, will exist in one million years (if the earth existed that long in its current form)!! And imagine the vast variety!!

However, the variety is limited, we just don't know all of the limits.