

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 14

DECEPTION THROUGH TERMINOLOGY - PART 5 OF 7 THE CLEVER DECEPTIONS

So far I have very clearly defined the terms "species," "microevolution," "macroevolution," "evolution," etc. according to the creation scientists.

Now let us start talking in earnest about the deceptive definitions of the evolutionists.

The situation for evolutionists is not good. They have plenty of evidence for microevolution, but they have never observed macroevolution, thus they have zero evidence for Darwinian evolution.

This is a major problem for the evolutionists. There is zero evidence for macroevolution, which is the only true "evolution."

Macroevolution (i.e. true evolution) has NEVER been observed in the wild or in a lab. Thus, true evolution (i.e. macroevolution) has NEVER been observed anywhere.

The only thing scientists **have observed** is one of two things: first, mutations which do not affect the structure of a DNA strand (i.e. they have never observed a new gene form), and in some cases these mutations have provided survival benefits, and second, they have observed microevolution many, many times.

But neither of these things can even remotely explain Darwinian evolution. Darwinian evolution requires the random formation of **millions** of highly sophisticated genes, highly sophisticated genetic algorithms, etc.

Scientists have never seen a single new gene be created by evolution. Scientists have never seen the length of DNA increase because of new genes. They have never seen a new and improved "morphing of the embryo" algorithm created by evolution (this will be discussed later). And so on.

So modern science has a problem: they have no scientific evidence for the theory of evolution, meaning they have no examples of macroevolution in action.

In fact, the mathematics of macroevolution is overwhelmingly **against** the theory of evolution as will be seen later.

So how in the world could the scientific establishment convince their students that they have evidence for Darwin's "theory of evolution" if they have never seen even a simple example of **macro**evolution??

Their answer is to bury the truth, mostly by using **very clever definitions**. With the discovery of DNA it was time for the evolutionists to invent some **creative definitions**!!

So let us start our discussion of the incredibly complex deceptions of the evolutionists with regards to terminology.

Tactic 1: Make the Term "Evolution" a Swing Term

This book has made it very, very clear that there is a massive difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution. They have absolutely nothing in common!!

So what scientists did was make the term "evolution" a "swing term," meaning it had two meanings. The term "evolution" could refer to either **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution. In my definitions, the two terms (**micro**evolution and **macro**evolution) mean totally different things, yet evolutionists only use one term: "evolution".

This gives the evolutionists flexibility when talking to their students. They can talk about **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution, but use the term "evolution." The students will then think about Darwin, which is their goal.

A swing term can mean one thing one minute and another thing the next minute. It is an ambiguous term that is unstable and unpredictable. You never quite know what the teacher is talking about when you hear the word "evolution."

And that is exactly what scientists wanted. **They didn't want their students to know the truth about the differences** between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution because that would get them thinking and thinking is forbidden.

So whether an instructor was talking about **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution, they could simply use the term "evolution." This is because the swing term "evolution" could mean **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution.

The evolutionists only wanted their students to think in terms of Darwin and the term "evolution" always gets students thinking about Darwin and atheism.

For example, they did not want their students to know that Darwin's finches were really examples of **micro**evolution because they are a symbol of Darwin's theory of evolution.

So they essentially used the term "evolution" no matter what they were talking about (even Darwin's finches). This way their students would constantly think about Darwin, and then atheism, which is what they really wanted.

While there is nothing wrong with using the term "evolution" for **macro**evolution, because they mean the same thing, the same does not hold true for using the term "evolution" instead of the term **micro**evolution.

The term "evolution" means "Darwinian evolution," meaning all species "evolved" from earlier species. Thus, it is **absolutely incorrect** to use the term "evolution" for the term "**micro**evolution." They are unrelated concepts.

While Darwin observed **micro**evolution (e.g. the finches), the whole purpose of glorifying Darwin was a tool was to get converts to **macro**evolution, meaning converts to atheism, because Darwin was a known atheist.

Microevolution does not lead to atheism, only **macro**evolution leads to atheism. Thus, since modern atheists want the term "Darwin" to lead people to atheism, they started to use examples of "**micro**evolution" but call them examples of "evolution." In that way they could use the term "Darwin."

However, to justify using the term "evolution" for **micro**evolution, scientists essentially said that **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution meant the same thing. In other words, they said there was no difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

So they claimed justification for dropping the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

By using this tactic, they could use very common examples from **microevolution and claim that they were examples of **macro**evolution, meaning true evolution.**

In other words, they could talk about an example of **micro**evolution and claim it was a "proof" of Darwinian evolution in order to get their students to become evolutionists and atheists.

That is why it is a bad idea for a creation scientist to use the term "evolution" instead of the term **micro**evolution, because they lead to totally different thoughts. But it is hard to avoid this error.

Microevolution and **macro**evolution are totally different things and the term "evolution" should equate to only one of the concepts.

Creation scientists need to be careful to only use the term "evolution" to mean "**macro**evolution,"

But evolutionists have no examples of **macro**evolution, thus they use examples of **micro**evolution to "prove" the theory of evolution.

There is no scientific justification for doing this except that evolutionists want converts to atheism, therefore they use the term "evolution" to mean **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution (which they have never observed) and they justify doing this by claiming that there is **no difference between microevolution and macroevolution**, meaning they mean the same thing.

Today, the deception of using the term "evolution," when discussing or observing examples of microevolution, is by far the most damaging and commonly used tactic to get students to be deceived and to become evolutionists and atheists!!!

Every time the professor uses the term "evolution" the student thinks about Darwin. Every time the student thinks about Darwin they think about atheism.

Yet, the term "evolution" is constantly used as a substitute for the term **micro**evolution because **there are massive numbers of examples of microevolution**. Also, it is easy to create new examples of **micro**evolution by selective breeding.

By using this tactic the scientific establishment has an **unbounded number** of situations where they can use the terms "evolution" and "Darwin" to deceive their students!! In each case, however, the example is of **micro**evolution (if it is something they have observed).

This tactic is like manna from heaven for atheists!!! They have an unlimited number of excuses to use the term "evolution" and "Darwin" in their classrooms in order to get their students to think about Darwin and atheism.

This is the first layer of deceptive definitions they use.

Tactic 2: Quit Using the Terms: Microevolution and Macroevolution

The best way to not get "caught" using the term "evolution" for the term **micro**evolution is to claim justification for doing away with the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

Not only did they make the term "evolution" a swing term, and claim there was no difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution, but they also totally quit using and referring to the terms "**micro**evolution" and "**macro**evolution" and they **claimed these terms were silly "creation science" terms**.

The terms: **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution, when used properly, are highly technical terms that both relate to DNA structure.

However, the students quit hearing the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution but continued to constantly hear the term "evolution," especially when scientists talked about examples of **micro**evolution, which caused the students to constantly think about Darwin!!

The terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution were causing students to ask questions and wonder about how these terms fit in with Darwin. The term **micro**evolution was particularly something the scientific establishment wanted to do away with. That is why these terms had to go away.

Thus, students were hearing the term "evolution" and "Darwin" all the time. It is as if DNA had never been discovered.

Thus, many students became atheists or agnostics without ever seeing or hearing about a valid example of **macro**evolution. In fact, many students have never heard either the terms **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution because these are terms are usually only used by the "creation scientists"!!!

So the technical and accurate DNA-structure oriented terms of **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution disappeared and were replaced by the ambiguous term: evolution.

When asked about doing this, evolutionists simply said: "the two terms mean the same thing, so why use these 'creation science' terms."

Darwin had to be deified even if it took deception.

Thus scientists:

- 1) Obfuscated the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution,
- 2) Then claimed they meant the same thing,
- 3) Then quit using the terms.

Their deceptions became complete when they quit using the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

By doing this they literally created an unlimited number of "examples" of "evolution" and an unlimited number of opportunities to deceive their students by claiming there was "evidence" for evolution and justification for Darwin.

They did this **not with scientific evidence**, but with tricky definitions.