

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 20

THE ONLY WAY TO PROVE MACROEVOLUTION IS TRUE

There is only one way in the world to "prove" **macro**evolution. It involves a closely supervised experiment.

First, scientists must create a completely enclosed environment where there is only one species. Actually, there can be other species in the enclosure to be used as food (such as grass), but the species used for food cannot have DNA which could even remotely mix with the DNA of the main test species, which I will assume would be a small animal.

Second, this enclosure must be carefully designed and controlled to ensure that **no** other animals can get inside the enclosure and the animals inside could never get outside. Breaking this rule could allow two different species to mate together which would be a massive violation of the rules.

Third, a sample of DNA must be taken from each and every animal in the original population. The DNA structure in all of the males must be the same DNA structure and the DNA structure in all the females must be the same DNA structure!!

Fourth, scientists must monitor this enclosure for many, many decades looking for an animal (a descendant of the original animals) which has new genetic material (on a DNA strand) which creates a new function (e.g. there must be at least one new gene which creates a functional protein), meaning they have observed true "evolution," meaning "**macro**evolution."

Scientists have never followed these four guidelines except using bacteria as with the Lenski experiments mentioned above. But in this study they did not find any new genes. Considering that bacteria have very simple genes, and they divide very quickly, this should be a clue to the absurdity of having "evolution" create new genes for complex animals!!

My proposed experiment, using animals, would never lead to a new species. Yet, with zero evidence to support **macro**evolution, scientists constantly say that they have "proven" evolution is true and that they have "seen" evolution in action. This is a total and complete absurdity. No scientist has ever proven a single step of **macro**evolution, which is true evolution.

When someone uses the term "evolution" the reader should immediately ask themselves if there was any proof that there were **NEW** genes that have never

existed before on this planet AND that the study was done in a highly controlled facility. The answer is always 'no', what has actually been observed is **micro**evolution.

If you don't clearly understand the difference between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution you can very easily be deceived that there is scientific evidence for "evolution." There is no scientific evidence for evolution and there never will be. What there is instead is a great deal of deception!!

A TEST QUESTION

Let us consider another quote from Mr. Dawkins book in which he mentioned Lenski. Prior to the quote I am about to mention, he had talked about how much **micro**evolution (without using the actual term) was able to physically change the appearance of animals. This is the quote:

'If so much evolutionary change can be achieved in just a few centuries or even decades, just think what might be achieved in ten or a hundred millions years.' (page 37)

He is essentially observing how powerful **micro**evolution can change the physical appearance of animals, without changing their DNA structure. I agree. Then he uses this observation of genetic diversity to imply that **micro**evolution could have powered **all of evolution**, given enough time!!

In other words, he is implying that **micro**evolution could have powered the evolution between the "first living cell" and human DNA.

Here is your test question: wrong with Mr. Dawkin's logic??

His logic is nonsense because **micro**evolution does not, by definition, change the size or structure of DNA. True evolution, to go from the "first living cell" to human DNA, would require massive changes to both the size and structure of DNA.

For example, even breeders know that there is a limit to how much variety can be achieved with a single DNA structure, such as the DNA structure of a dog.

As another example, you cannot take the DNA of mouse, and use **micro**evolution over a billion years of time, and end up with an elephant.

There are several limits to what a DNA structure can accomplish.

As has already been mentioned, the length of the DNA or RNA of the "first living cell" was assumed to be 200,000 nucleotides. But human DNA is known to be 3.2 billion nucleotides.

Could a human being be created by a DNA strand of 200,000 nucleotides?? As will be seen later in this book, it is mathematically impossible to create a human being using 3.2 billion nucleotides!!

Microevolution, which is the only thing Mr. Dawkins talked about, cannot, by definition, change the length of DNA.

Only **macro**evolution can change the length of DNA.

You cannot take a 200,000 long DNA strand and create a human being, which is exactly what Mr. Dawkins was claiming!!

Mr. Dawkins never differentiates between **micro**evolution and **macro**evolution. He only talks about physical changes to animals (i.e. **micro**evolution) and then implies that all of evolution (from the first living cell to human DNA) could have been accomplished by **micro**evolution, if given enough time.

The **ONLY** way this could happen is if the "first living cell" and human DNA have the same length and the same DNA structure!! If that were true, then **micro**evolution could create human DNA from the "first living cell" DNA or RNA. But this is nonsense.

Remember, **micro**evolution cannot increase the size of DNA, nor can it create **ANY** new genetic material (such as a new gene), by definition. Thus, because all of Mr. Dawkins examples are from **micro**evolution, then the DNA structure of the "first living cell" would also be the DNA structure of human DNA!!

We know this is not true even without the DNA or RNA of the "first living cell" to look at because we know that different species do not have the same size and/or structure of DNA (Note that there is not always a clear connection between the length of DNA and the complexity of the species, but in general there is a correlation).

He is using a very clever tactic to avoiding the issue of creating new DNA structures, such as creating entirely new genes and entirely new algorithms. He simply says that all of evolution occurred because of **micro**evolution plus a whole lot of time.

In summary, Dawkins is implying that the only difference between the DNA of all species, including the "first living cell" and human DNA, is **micro**evolution. This is absurd. It is bad enough to think that human DNA is **only** 3.2 billion nucleotides long.

As stated above, the DNA or RNA of the imaginary "first living cell" and human DNA have nothing in common. To get from the "first living cell" to human DNA

you need to have a whole lot of new genetic information. This can be done by **macro**evolution and only **macro**evolution, no matter how much time you have.

But Mr. Dawkins did not give any verifiable or observed examples of **macro**evolution in his book.

This is yet another instance where evidence from **micro**evolution is used to deceive the reader into thinking that true evolution (i.e. **macro**evolution) has scientific evidence behind it.