

# Patterns of Intelligence

## CHAPTER 15

### DECEPTION THROUGH TERMINOLOGY - PART 6 OF 7 MORE TACTICS USING CLEVER DEFINITIONS

Now let us talk about the rest of their tactics.

#### Tactic 3: Pretend **Micro**evolution and **Macro**evolution Mean the Same Thing

We have already talked about this subject, but there is far more to this subject.

Because the pesky creation scientists continued to use the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution the evolutionists could not completely do away with these terms. Scientists were sometimes forced to answer questions about these terms.

So what scientists did was pretend the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution meant the same thing. This is their justification for trying to totally do away with these terms.

As I already talked about, their discussion of what a "species" is, is so ludicrous and absurd, that with such a ridiculous definition the terms "**micro**evolution" and "**macro**evolution" **don't have any meaning!!! So they can be the same thing because they have no clue what they are and they are undefined!!!**

In other words, if they don't even have a definition of "species," then they have forgotten about the discovery of DNA. Thus by ignoring DNA they claim they cannot define the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

Thus, to these people **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean the same thing because they have no clue what they mean because they apparently haven't learned that DNA was discovered in 1953.

Stupidity breeds stupidity. But in this case it is not stupidity that breeds stupidity, it is atheism that breeds stupidity.

How can you correctly define the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution when you don't even have a definition of "species." So it is no wonder that they claim that **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean the same thing!!

Now you can understand why I spend so much time explaining the difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution. These people are either morons at birth or they are self-inflicted morons because they love atheism more than truth. Obviously the latter option is true.



He adds zero plus zero plus zero, etc. etc. new nucleotides and zero new genes and comes up with massively larger and more complex DNA structures!! This is bad math.

**The truth is that if you had **micro**evolution for "millions of years," starting with a micro-organism, then every species on the planet earth would have DNA of the same length, with the same number of genes, as a micro-organism. In other words, every species on this earth would be a single-celled micro-organism and you would not be reading this book (and this book would not exist) because **you** would be a single-celled bacteria!!**

Dawkins does not seem to understand that "lots of time" combined with adding zero plus zero plus zero plus zero, etc. does not add up to 3 billion nucleotides!!

Since when does:  $0+0+0+0+0+ \dots$  new nucleotides = 3 billion new nucleotides

To continue this nonsense, let me quote from a pro-evolution web page, probably written more recently:

... when scientists (i.e. evolutionists) do use the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution, **they don't use them in the same way as creationists**... Why? Because for biologists [i.e. evolutionists], there is no relevant difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution. Both happen in the same way and for the same reasons, so **there is no real reason to differentiate them ...**"  
[http://atheism.about.com/od/evolutionexplained/a/micro\\_macro.htm](http://atheism.about.com/od/evolutionexplained/a/micro_macro.htm)

I agree with the claim that "evolutionists **don't use [these terms] in the same way as creationists**."

However, it is hard to imagine a more absurd claim that "there is no relevant difference" between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution!! Like Dawkins, this writer is also saying that **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean exactly the same thing!!

If **only** **micro**evolution existed on this planet, all of us would be single-celled organisms with very, very short DNA or RNA and we would have zero intelligence. Of course, this means we wouldn't exist as sentient beings!!

Only **macro**evolution can explain how the DNA or RNA of the "first living cell" could grow and grow and grow to become the DNA of humans.

Now you know why I spent so much time explaining that **micro**evolution NEVER increases the size of the DNA. You can have a trillion consecutive generations of **micro**evolution and the size of the DNA will not grow by one nucleotide!!

The concept that "lots and lots of **micro**evolution is equal to **macro**evolution" is nonsense!!!

Deception using terminology is a clever way to get people to believe in the theory of evolution, but as always, it is a giant lie. **Micro**evolution and **macro**evolution are totally different subjects!! **Micro**evolution is true science and **macro**evolution is false science. So to say they are the same thing is just another big lie in the long list of big lies pushed by the scientific establishment!!

#### **Tactic 4: Control Dictionary and Textbook Terminology to Favor Evolution**

Because of the ambiguity of how to define the term "evolution" (should it refer to **micro**evolution or **macro**evolution?), soon after the discovery of DNA the term "evolution" should have **disappeared** from the English language and all dictionaries because the term was now ambiguous.

**The ambiguous term "evolution" should have been replaced with the two new highly technical DNA-specific terms: **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.**

**Micro**evolution would mean "variety within the same species" and **macro**evolution would mean a "new species," with longer DNA, was formed which had a new DNA structure, as creation scientists have defined the terms.

In other words, after the discovery of DNA, the term "evolution" should have been **dissolved** and thus removed from all dictionaries and textbooks, **because it was a non-technical, ambiguous term. But evolutionists love ambiguous terms!!**

The ambiguous term "evolution," like many other archaic and ambiguous terms, should have been replaced by the scientific terms of "**micro**evolution" and "**macro**evolution," which refer to DNA.

The dictionaries, student textbooks, etc. etc. should all have had this among their definitions:

Definition: "**Evolution**" - an archaic term which is no longer used in science. With the discovery of DNA the ambiguous concept of "evolution" was replaced by the far more precise scientific terms of "**micro**evolution" and "**macro**evolution," which reflect the **two distinct types** of DNA modifications.

But because scientists have never observed **macro**evolution, what scientists really wanted to do was to get rid of the terms "**micro**evolution" and

"macroevolution" so that the term "evolution" could mean either "microevolution" or "macroevolution."

So they have gotten rid of these terms and when they have to refer to them they say they mean the same thing or that one is lots of examples of the other, meaning they are different degrees of the same concept.

By getting rid of the two terms, which is what they really want to do, they could use the unlimited number of examples of microevolution, but exclusively use the term "evolution" which leads students to atheism!!!

In fact, whether the term "microevolution" existed by itself (without its mirror image macroevolution), or whether both terms existed, students would quickly figure out that examples of "microevolution" were being incorrectly used when the term "macroevolution" (i.e. Darwinian "evolution") should be used.

So they got rid of both terms and kept the term "evolution." This way students would not know the difference between microevolution and macroevolution and teachers could use the term "evolution" when using examples of "microevolution."

To put it another way, the evolutionists did not want students to think in terms of microevolution and macroevolution.

**Key Concept:** Thus, what happened is that the ambiguous term "evolution" did not disappear from the textbooks, rather the accurate, DNA-oriented and scientific terms "microevolution" and "macroevolution" disappeared from the textbooks and dictionaries and the term "evolution" always meant microevolution when discussing things scientists actually observed!!!

Why is this important?? Because scientists could use the term "evolution" every time they talked about an example from microevolution. When students heard the term "evolution" they assumed that Darwin was right and that God did not exist.

They wanted their students to be atheists. They wanted their students to constantly remember Darwin because Darwin was synonymous with atheism. This was the unseen driving force behind all of their deceptions.

And the best way to remember Darwin was to use the term "evolution" over and over and over and over again, even if it took deception.

Thus, it was the DNA-technical terms "microevolution" and "macroevolution" that had to disappear from the dictionaries and textbooks, not the ambiguous and flexible term "evolution"!!!

All of this was so that they could achieve their goal of pushing atheism!!

## Summary of The First Six Chapters on Definitions

### Deception #1:

The first deception for the theory of evolution was to claim that "microevolution" and "macroevolution" were the same thing or that "macroevolution" was nothing but lots of little examples of microevolution.

In other words, they did away with both terms either by ignoring the terms (i.e. removing them from textbooks) or pretending they meant the same thing or that macroevolution was lots of little pieces of microevolution.

Their preferred method was to ignore both terms and hope no student ever heard these terms.

### Deception #2:

**Because of Deception #1, scientists were able to use examples from microevolution and claim they were examples of Darwinian evolution!!!!**

In other words, they could use obvious examples of microevolution but use the term "evolution." which to the students meant "Darwin."

They now had "scientific proof" that Darwin was right!! But it was not a proof of anything except that scientists have no integrity.

The root purpose of all of these deceptions was so that the term "evolution" could be used in place of the term "microevolution" because scientists had no examples of macroevolution" to get converts to atheism.

They wanted converts to atheism and they could not use the term macroevolution (because no examples have ever been observed or ever will be observed) and they did not want to use the term microevolution by itself (which would have raised questions about whether it was really evidence for true evolution), so they used the ambiguous term "evolution" in place of the DNA-specific term microevolution by totally doing away with both the terms microevolution and macroevolution **so the students would not know what they were doing!!!**

Their "justification" for getting rid of these two DNA-specific technical terms was that they meant the same thing. They essentially did this by ignoring the concept of "DNA structures" and by not having a precise DNA-oriented definition of "species."

With their non-existent definition of "species" they could get away with ignoring the technical terms without raising any questions.

It was a brilliant tactic for evolutionists to use the term "evolution" (which Darwin used extensively and the term "evolution" was perceived to be the same thing as Darwinian atheism!!!!) instead of **micro**evolution, if you are an atheist!!!

So they **INVENTED** evidence for the theory of evolution (i.e. atheism) by using very, very clever definitions and using the never-ending examples of **micro**evolution.

Their "evidence" for evolution is nothing but deceptive definitions and non-existent definitions!!

They intentionally got rid of the DNA-technical terms "**micro**evolution" and "**macro**evolution" instead of the ambiguous term "evolution."

And this is why, when the subject reluctantly comes up, they pretend **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution mean the same thing. Without a definition of "species," and by ignoring the discovery of DNA, they can define anything any way they want.

Now let us talk about case studies of these types of deception.