

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 17

MICROEVOLUTION VS MACROEVOLUTION - DIGGING DEEPER

Let us again talk about the difference between the DNA or RNA of the "first living cell" versus the DNA of human DNA, but in this case we will focus on complexity and sophistication issues.

If the "first living cell" did exist, how would its DNA compare to the DNA of human beings in terms of complexity and sophistication?

It would be like comparing a small, hand-held wooden rowboat (the DNA of the "first living cell") to a modern cruise ship with a modern jet fighter sitting on its deck (the DNA of human beings)!!

For evolution to jump from a small, wooden rowboat to a modern cruise ship with a jet fighter sitting on its deck; massive amounts of **new and complex genetic material** had to be generated by **macroevolution for each species** on our phylogenetic tree back to the "first living cell," by definition.

As the length of the DNA increased, the complexity and sophistication of the algorithms on the DNA also increased exponentially.

For example, the "first living cell" (if evolution were true) would have had a very small number of nucleotides compared to the 3.2 billion nucleotides of human DNA!! Let us pick a number out of the air and say the DNA of the "first living cell" had 200,000,000 nucleotides (to keep the math simple).

How did "evolution" **add** the roughly 3 billion nucleotides to the DNA of the "first living cell" to create human DNA??

Obviously the DNA would have been added in small chunks over many new "child species."

Evolution claims that each of these "child species" was a new species with longer DNA and more complex DNA.

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that each child species between the "first living cell" and human DNA averaged 300,000 additional nucleotides than the prior child species.

Before going on, try to calculate roughly how many different species there would have been to get from the DNA of the "first living cell" to human DNA, on average.

The answer is **10,000 different species**. 10,000 times 300,000 equals 3 billion new nucleotides.

These represent 10,000 *consecutive species*, one after the other, not 10,000 species that can pop-up any time they want. *They must be consecutive, meaning one at a time, and one after the other.* The order of these species is very important.

Also, the order of the mutations is also critical. Thus, it is not 10,000 sets of mutations, in any order, it is 10,000 precise sets of consecutive mutations in the correct order.

In other words, the first species (after the "first living cell") must exist before the second species can exist. The second species must exist before the third species can exist. The third species must exist before the fourth species can exist. And so on.

Also, many of the genes, during this process, must disappear. For example, I cannot image that any of the genes of the 50th species, after the "first living cell," would be part of human DNA.

Thus, many thousands of genes were disappearing at the same time as many thousands of newer, usually longer and always more sophisticated genes were being added.

Eventually, each new species would need a new and improved "morphing of the embryo algorithm." This will be discussed later.

While many genes would have been added, I cannot image than that any gene of a single-celled organism would be embedded in the genes of human DNA.

But creating a *single* new species by accidental mutations of DNA is far worse than trying to win a lottery!! In fact, winning a lottery would be a lot easier than creating a new species.

And the lotteries must be won consecutively, one after the other, because new species must be created one after the other.

*Thus, from a statistical probability standpoint, the probability of evolution would be like the **same family** winning 10,000 consecutive multi-state lotteries!!*

Actually, the probability of a new species forming by a series of accidents is far, far worse than winning a multi-state lottery. This will be understood later.

Furthermore, this family would only be allowed to purchase one lottery ticket per lottery. This is because evolutionists claim that there are few, if any, failures when a new species is created. Each ticket is a "winner" every time.

The concept of "consecutive impossible probabilities" is one of many examples of the mathematical absurdity of the theory of evolution.

This concept requires an event, with an impossible probability, and means it must happen 10,000 independent times, one after the other, in the right order.

Thus, the phylogenetic tree of humans would have 10,000 different species, one after the other, based on my definitions and assumptions.

Obviously, with 10,000 "parent," "grandparent," etc. species on our phylogenetic tree, the entire theory of evolution depends on it being very easy to add new DNA to an existing DNA strand (i.e. an existing species), but it will be shown below that it is impossible that a single new species could ever be created by evolution on this or any other planet.

Remember, in order for "evolution" to have created the 10,000 unique species, each with unique DNA, between the "first living cell" to human DNA, **new genetic material** must have been added (i.e. **an average of 300,000 new, highly sophisticated nucleotide sequences per new species**) to **each of the 10,000 consecutive "child species"** on the phylogenetic tree from the "first living cell" to human DNA.

Remember, microevolution, by definition, never adds new genetic material, thus **microevolution** can never create a new species and does not belong on any phylogenetic tree.

I should also mention that the theory of evolution does not claim that all "parent species" have "child species." For example, humans do not have a "child species" even though there are billions of humans on this earth.

The 10,000 new species applies to humans, but what if we consider ALL species, not just humans.

If we consider ALL species, living and extinct, there would have to be **millions** of new species (i.e. new DNA structures created by accidents), each with a new and unique highly sophisticated DNA structure (which was a different DNA structure than its "parent species"). Each must be created by totally accidental, totally unintentional and totally without direction, mutations to the **DNA structure** of its "parent species," **by macroevolution**.

If our planet was a hundred trillion years old, this could not happen ten times on our planet (speaking mathematically).

The concept of "new DNA structures" is a critical issue in the evolution debate, but it is totally ignored. As always, the significant issues are ignored and replaced with deceptive definitions and many other tactics to distract the attention of the student away from the real issues.

The key concept to understand is that the DNA or RNA of the "first living cell" was vastly different than the DNA of humans today or any other animal or plant. Thus, many, many new DNA structures (i.e. species) would be on the phylogenetic tree from the "first living cell" to human DNA. Ten-thousand consecutive "child species" are assumed in this book.

And on average each child species needed 300,000 new and improved sequences of nucleotides to create new genes, new algorithms, etc.!!

Surprisingly, if you lowered the size of new nucleotides on each new species, you don't even remotely increase the probability of evolution because then you would need even more consecutive species!!

For example, if we assumed each new species had 150,000 new and improved sequences of nucleotides, then it would take **20,000 generations** of new species. That is not very comforting.

THE KEY POINT

Here is a fact: while **micro**evolution is a highly proven scientific fact, and has been demonstrated many, many times; **macro**evolution is a theory which **has never been proven to have occurred a single time in nature or in the lab in the history of this world.**

In other words, nowhere in all of science has new genetic material, meaning a new DNA structure, been shown to have been created by **macro**evolution.

Macroevolution is an "assumption" or a "theory" with zero proven examples.

Microevolution is a proven fact with many proven examples, including Darwin's finches.

If evolution (i.e. **macro**evolution) were true, then for many millions of different situations (looking at all species, not just humans); one "species" (the "parent species," which had a unique DNA structure), "evolved" (i.e. via **macro**evolution) into a new and different "species," the "child species," which, by definition, had its

own, new and unique DNA structure, meaning its DNA structure was different than the DNA structure of its "parent species."

But not once in the history of science has this ever been proven to have happened!!

Thus, evolution (i.e. the "theory of evolution") remains a "theory," not a proven fact. But from a mathematical standpoint, it is not really a "theory," it is wishful thinking.

What has been proven many times is **micro**evolution.

PONDER: If someone today uses examples from **micro**evolution as "evidence" for Darwin's theory of evolution then they are either totally ignorant or they are *intentionally trying to deceive their students* to believe that there is "evidence" for the theory of evolution.

I am going to say that again because it is the central concept in this book:

If someone today uses examples from **micro**evolution as "evidence" for Darwin's theory of evolution then they are either totally ignorant or they are *intentionally trying to deceive their students* to believe that there is "evidence" for the theory of evolution.

There is not one shred of scientific evidence for the theory of evolution (i.e. the phylogenetic tree) because there has never been a single proven example of **macro**evolution!!!

In addition, if anyone claims there is evidence for **macro**evolution they are either intentionally lying or they don't have a clue what they are talking about.

Anyone who used examples of **micro**evolution as examples of **macro**evolution (i.e. evolution), prior to 1953, however, were not at fault because before the discovery of DNA in 1953 no one knew the difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.

To understand the difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution requires an understanding of DNA.

It was not until several years after the discovery of DNA in 1953 that the terms "**micro**evolution" and "**macro**evolution" could be defined.

Thus, Darwin himself was not at fault for saying his finches were evidence for evolution because DNA (i.e. **macro**evolution, the true engine of evolution) was not discovered until long after Darwin died.

The flaw of Darwin was his effort to use evolution to justify atheism and his refusal to admit that if God existed, God could have designed all species, as taught in the Bible.

In other words, when Darwin saw the different shapes of the beaks of his finches he could have said: "What God has done is amazing." But that is not what he said. He used the beaks as evidence that humans evolved from apes and were not created by God and that there was no God.

He did not say that new species could have been created by God and/or by accident, he said they *only* came to exist by accident because he was an atheist like his grandfather.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF DECEPTION

The Lenski experiments, discussed above, only dealt with single-celled organisms, but can similar mutations affect the survival of animals?

A "mutation" to DNA may lead to a survival benefit of an animal, but it does not necessarily constitute "evolution" or "macroevolution" because there is no **new** (meaning **additional**) genetic material, to include at least one new gene, along with supporting nucleotides. It takes new DNA segments to constitute macroevolution.

For example, suppose scientists find an animal that can survive better than other animals of the same species due to a mutation. They may say that this animal "evolved." To the student, this should imply that **new** genetic material, including at least one functional new gene, has formed by random mutations of DNA.

But a new gene has never been observed to form by accident.

As Dr. J.C. Sanford, PhD states in his book: Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome, never in the history of mankind has a survival benefit been proven to have occurred by new genetic information in the DNA. He states that every time there is a survival benefit, and the DNA structure has been changed, the survival benefit resulted from a **loss** of genetic material via a mutation.

How can a loss of genetic material create a survival benefit?

Let us take an example from his book of a loss of genetic information. Suppose an animal has a genetic defect (i.e. a mutation or loss of one or more nucleotides) which causes it to be hairless. In Chicago, that would be a severe survival detriment. But in Florida it may provide a significant survival benefit!!

But the survival benefit in Florida was not due to new genetic material, it was the result of a **loss** of genetic material **combined with a specific environment**. It is not an example of a new species (i.e. "evolution") because true evolution requires new genetic material (e.g. at least one new functional gene). The loss of one or more nucleotides by a mutation is not even remotely the same thing as a new functional gene!!

In other words, this observation was an instance of a destructive mutation which just happened to create a survival benefit because of a specific environment.

This is another example of why the student must have a perfect understanding of the terms **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution.