

### 13. The 'Evolution' Triangle

As a term, *evolution* is general, vague and is impregnated with numerous meanings, some of which are agreed upon conforming with empirical observations and some of which are contested. Conveniently, the term evolution is defined and expressed in a manner **similar to that of horoscopes**. Extremely broad, non-specific and all-explanatory, such that it is easy to interpret experimental data to confirm predictions.

Just like individual experiences confirm horoscopes cast in very general, vague terms, then such is the experimental data in relation to broad and vague definitions of evolution such as *change over time*, *modification by descent*, *common descent*, *gradual development of something into a more complex form* and *increase in the frequency of alleles within a population*. These are not formal scientific hypothesis because they lack the necessary specificity and are catch-all explanations in the framework of which any observations can be fitted. This is how evolutionists convince the lay public of their religious beliefs. It is through the deception of language and clever terms and definitions.

It is useful to look at evolution from the evolutionist's point of view as a **triangle** with three points. Two of its points are observable facts. The third is a conjectural, philosophical belief system which incorporates belief in miracles and is theoretically assumed and extrapolated from the other two and presented in a complicated, cryptic manner mixed with ingenious story-telling<sup>163</sup> and purported evidence—in the form of bluster, smoke and mirrors—to make it sound as if it has been validated by the standards of scientific research: empiricism, logic and testability, when the stark reality is otherwise.

It is revealed in the statement of Ernst Mayr, one of the pioneers of the modern synthesis, who stated in 1963: “The proponents of the

---

<sup>163</sup> This is the speciality of Richard Dawkins who writes fantastic popular-science stories for laymen regarding blind watchmakers, improbable mountains and greatest shows on earth.

synthetic theory maintain that all evolution is due to accumulation of small genetic changes [mutations], guided by natural selection, **and that transspecific evolution [macroevolution] is nothing but an extrapolation and magnification of the events that take place within populations and species [microevolution].**<sup>164</sup> This extrapolation and magnification has no scientific, empirical basis and is but an article of pure “faith”.

Let us look at the three points of our triangle:

**The first point of the triangle:** There is *variation*, the changes we see within an organism. The term *microevolution* is commonly used here. Variation is a fact because it is observable. There is variation between father and son, brother and sister, great grandparent and great grandchild. The capacity for variation is in-built. All organisms have an in-built capacity to manifest slight variations in traits and to adapt to habitats, environments and circumstances but only within defined limits that cannot be transgressed.

This can be likened to a dot (the organism) and around it, a circle (the limits of variation, adaptability). We can draw lines from the central dot and extend them away from the dot in any direction. These lines may reach the surrounding circle line (the limit of variation in a particular trait or feature) or it may not. This is an analogy for all possible, potential variations within an organism, built upon its genetic code base and its environment.<sup>165</sup>

This first meaning that is included within the term evolution is outside the field of contention. A more accurate term for this would be *pre-engineered, in-built capacity for variable adaptation*.

---

<sup>164</sup> As cited by Stephen J. Gould (1980) in “*Is a new and general theory of evolution emerging?*” *Paleobiology* 6(1):119-130.

<sup>165</sup> “Your phenome describes all of the physical, biochemical and physiological traits you manifest as a result of both genetic and environmental factors. The phenome is the set of observable characteristics ranging from eye color to personality traits to disease resistance or susceptibility. Some characteristics are largely determined by your genetic makeup or largely determined by environmental factors, while others are determined by the interaction between your genetic makeup and your environment.” Refer to: <https://genos.co/resources/phenome.html>.

It is important to note that there can be physiologically similar organisms (which we can loosely call *species*) which are able to produce fertile, viable offspring with other *species* (interbreeding), leading to hybrids and variations, and example being wolves and dogs.<sup>166</sup> This is by design, it is intended variation in the creation through compatible genetic code-bases, allowing for variation and diversity. This is also outside the field of contention. Thus, we have accommodated novelty within a type (due to adaptations to environment) and novelty between types through reproduction—however such novelty and variation is always within limits that can never be transgressed as known empirically.

**The second point of the triangle:** Homology, this means that there are similarities in appearance, physiology, biochemistry and underlying genetic code between organisms. This is a fact because it is observable and it is also outside the field of contention.

The first two points of the triangle represent a) changes within boundaries within kinds and b) observable graduated differences between kinds that reveal underlying similarities. At this point we should note that the data for those who argue for a creator and those who argue for inanimate nature as a creative force is the same. The point of contention is regarding interpretation and how the abovementioned observations and realities should be accounted for.

The real question is: Is it more believable and reasonable that what appears to be designed and purposeful and what cannot be spoken of by naturalists, materialists and atheists except with the language of *agential thinking* and *teleology* should be ascribed to choice with intent (attributes of knowledge, will, power and wisdom) or to purely physicochemical random interactions, to chance and necessity alone, to ignorance, blindness, and purposelessness. This is the real argument all along.

---

<sup>166</sup> Thus it can be said that some “species” do have a “common ancestor” so to speak. However this cannot be generalised to say that all species have a “common ancestor” as this is fallacious reasoning (hasty generalisation).

As such, the naturalists and atheists simply employ clever semantic devices to conceal their ascription of divine qualities (knowledge, will, wisdom, pursuit of goals) to nature and to cause-effect mechanisms. This is the true and real secret of naturalists and atheists. If you grasp this reality, you will have become wise to their scam and how they are able to deceive the world with their fairy-tale stories disguised as science through extremely creative, ambiguous terminology. You will also be in a much better position to counter their primitive, conjectural beliefs.

**The third point of the triangle:** The creative force, **the deity**, the ignorant, purposeless 'blind watchmaker' which produces large-scale changes, or what is referred to as *macroevolution*. We will call this RMNS for short: **random mutations** being acted upon by **natural selection**.<sup>167</sup> This is the neo-Darwinian deity of the Modern Synthesis. Belief and blind-faith in this deity **is assumed and extrapolated** from the previous two points with speculative inferences and often by clever storytelling. It is not based upon the standards of scientific knowledge, which are empiricism, logic and testability. However, it is deceptively made to appear as such through:

- a) fallacious arguments which violate the logic of scientific inquiry (such as *affirming the consequent* and *begging the question*),
- b) baseless inferences,

---

<sup>167</sup> It is crucial to understand the very specific nature of what is being said here. Neither the occurrence of mutations is denied nor that the environment interplays with the genetic operating system and plays a role in the differential survival and reproduction of the superior members of each species on the basis of the fittest phenotypes. What is being referred to here is the the claim that a random mutation leads to an increase in prescriptive information in the code base leading to a novel feature providing an advantage to an organism which is then fixed in the population through its superior reproduction rate and survivability (over those organisms that did not undergo such a mutation). That, over time, this continues as a creative process leading to the 'evolution' of new species. This deity (RMNS) does not exist, is a figment of the imagination and does not have a shred of *scientifically valid* evidence.

c) redefining evolution to omit its central doctrine (RMNS) so as to enable successful prediction tests for more broadly-stated general, catch-all concepts such as *descent with modification* and *common ancestry*,<sup>168</sup> and this is from the greatest of the techniques used by faithful believers,

d) strawman arguments,

e) making hasty generalisations from data,

f) deliberate vagueness and

g) confusing *microevolution* with *macroevolution* so as to increase the amount of apparent evidence establishing the deity and its lofty attributes. This is often done by referring to microevolution by using the general term of evolution whilst allowing the listener to assume that you are speaking of macroevolution. Thus, it can be asserted, “Evolution is an undeniable fact” or “That evolution has taken place is an undeniable fact” and so on.

Most evolutionists claim that small-scale changes—changes within a type, microevolution—can account for large-scale changes—speciation, or macroevolution—over geological timescales. They speak as if this is factually proven when it is actually subject to ongoing controversy amongst evolutionists themselves **because empirical evidence for this claim does not exist, not a shred of it**. The claim is derived through *theoretical extrapolation*, not *empirical evidence* and is simply assumed to have happened. Thereafter, all available data is interpreted—*after the assumed fact*—in a manner that conforms with this conjectural belief.

This is what the research says on micro-macro-evolution:

1. Andrew Simons writes (emphasis added): “A **persistent debate** in evolutionary biology is one over the continuity of microevolution and macroevolution—whether macroevolutionary trends are governed by the principles of microevolution.”<sup>169</sup> David Reznick writes (emphasis added): “Darwin anticipated that microevolution

---

<sup>168</sup> This represents the changing of goalposts within scientific studies that are purported to provide evidence for evolution.

<sup>169</sup> Andrew M. Simons, *The continuity of microevolution and macroevolution*, *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 15 (2002): 688-701.

would be a process of continuous and gradual change. The term macroevolution, by contrast, refers to the origin of new species and divisions of the taxonomic hierarchy above the species level, and also to the origin of complex adaptations, such as the vertebrate eye. Macroevolution posed a problem to Darwin because his principle of descent with modification predicts gradual transitions between small-scale adaptive changes in populations and these larger-scale phenomena, **yet there is little evidence for such transitions in nature**. Instead, the natural world is often characterized by gaps, or discontinuities. One type of gap relates to the existence of ‘organs of extreme perfection’, such as the eye, or morphological innovations, such as wings, both of which are found fully formed in present-day organisms without leaving evidence of how they evolved.”<sup>170</sup>

2. David Stern writes: “One of the oldest problems in evolutionary biology **remains largely unsolved**... Historically, the neo-Darwinian synthesizers stressed the predominance of micromutations in evolution, whereas others noted the similarities between some dramatic mutations and evolutionary transitions to argue for macromutationism.”<sup>171</sup>

3. Writing about a new extended synthesis for evolution, Robert Carroll states: “Large-scale evolutionary phenomena cannot be understood solely **on the basis of extrapolation** from processes observed at the level of modern populations and species.”<sup>172</sup> Meaning, small-scale changes observed within populations and species cannot explain, through extrapolation, large-scale evolutionary changes.

4. Roger Lewin writes in the *Science* journal: “A wide spectrum of researchers—ranging from geologists and paleontologists, through ecologists and population geneticists, to embryologists and

---

<sup>170</sup> Reznick, D. N., Robert E. R. *Darwin's bridge between microevolution and macroevolution*. *Nature*, Vol. 457, 12 February 2009, pp. 837-842

<sup>171</sup> David L. Stern, *Perspective: Evolutionary Developmental Biology and the Problem of Variation*, *Evolution* 54 (2000): 1079-1091.

<sup>172</sup> Robert L. Carroll, *Towards a new evolutionary synthesis*, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 15 (January, 2000): 27.

molecular biologists—gathered at Chicago's Field Museum of Natural History under the simple conference title: Macroevolution. Their task was to consider the mechanisms that underlie the origin of species and the evolutionary relationship between species. . . . The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution. At the risk of doing violence to the positions of some of the people at the meeting, **the answer can be given as a clear, No.**<sup>173</sup>

5. In his paper titled “*Macroevolution is more than repeated rounds of microevolution*”, Douglas Erwin discusses macroevolution, speciation and novelty and concludes the link between microevolution and macroevolution is discontinuous. He states: “But discontinuities have been documented at a variety of scales, from the punctuated nature of much speciation, to patterns of community overturn, the sorting of species within clades by differential speciation and extinction, and finally mass extinctions. **These discontinuities impart a hierarchical structure to evolution, a structure which impedes, obstructs, and even neutralizes the effects of microevolution.**”<sup>174</sup>

6. In their paper for Nature magazine, “*Darwins Bridge Between Microevolution and Macroevolution*”, Reznick and Ricklefs write: “Macroevolution posed a problem to Darwin because his principle of descent with modification predicts gradual transitions between small-scale adaptive changes in populations and these larger-scale phenomena, **yet there is little evidence for such transitions in nature.** Instead, the natural world is often characterized by gaps, or discontinuities. One type of gap relates to the existence of ‘organs of extreme perfection’, such as the eye, or morphological innovations, such as wings, both of which are found fully formed in present-day organisms without leaving evidence of a transition between them.

---

<sup>173</sup> Roger Lewin. *Evolutionary theory under fire*. Science 210:883.

<sup>174</sup> Douglas H. Erwin. Macroevolution is more than repeated rounds of microevolution. *Evolution & Development*. Volume 2, Issue 2 March/April 2000, pp. 78–84.

**These discontinuities, plus the discontinuous appearance and disappearance of taxa in the fossil record, form the modern conceptual divide between microevolution and macroevolution...** Most evolutionary biologists think that Darwin explained macroevolution simply as microevolution writ large. In fact, Darwin had rather more to say about the relationship between microevolution and macroevolution and invoked additional principles to define it... An undercurrent of the debate about the mechanisms of macroevolution is whether natural selection (microevolution) is also the cause of macroevolution... Darwin's proposal carries a more general message for contemporary discussions of macroevolution, namely that microevolution alone cannot explain macroevolution."<sup>175</sup>

7. In another Nature magazine article titled, "The Big Picture", Sean Carrol writes: "Evolutionary change occurs on different scales: 'microevolution' is generally equated with events at or below the species level whereas 'macroevolution' is change above the species level, including the formation of species. A long-standing issue in evolutionary biology is whether the processes observable in extant populations and species (microevolution) are sufficient to account for the larger-scale changes evident over longer periods of life's history (macroevolution)... **Outsiders to this rich literature may be surprised that there is no consensus on this issue, and that strong viewpoints are held at both ends of the spectrum, with many undecided.** Traditionally, evolutionary geneticists have asserted that macroevolution is the product of microevolution writ large, whereas some palaeontologists have advocated the view that processes operating above the level of microevolution also shape evolutionary trends... One of the evolutionary phenomena for which the mechanistic discontinuity between macroevolution and microevolution has most often been asserted is the burst of innovation and diversification associated with major radiations of

---

<sup>175</sup> David N. Reznick and Robert E. Ricklefs, "Darwins Bridge Between Microevolution and Macroevolution." *Nature* 457:837,838,841, 12 February 2009.



forms—for example, the dramatic phyletic and morphological evolution seen in the explosive Cambrian radiation of animal phyla.”<sup>176</sup>

8. The reality is exposed in some words cited from **Theodosius Dobzhansky**, a central figure in the development of the *Modern Synthesis* of Darwinian evolution which dominated the 20th century. In his paper “Macroevolution: The Morphological Problem”, Keith Thomson writes: “**The basic article of faith** of a gradualist approach is that major morphological innovations can be produced without some sort of saltation. But the dilemma of the New [neo-Darwinian] Synthesis is that no one has satisfactorily demonstrated a mechanism at the population genetic level by which innumerable very small phenotypic changes could accumulate rapidly to produce large changes: a process for the origin of the magnificently improbable from the ineffably trivial. This leads to skepticism about the microevolutionary approach... In looking back over the literature of the last 60 years, it is fascinating that throughout the whole grand development of the New Synthetic theory, the macroevolutionary question remains as a constant undercurrent... In one of the most influential books of the New Synthetic approach as it evolved in Britain and the United States, Dobzhansky (1937) was quite circumspect about ‘the mechanisms of a macroevolution, which require time on a geological scale.’ However ‘...**we are compelled at the present level of knowledge reluctantly to put a sign of equality between the mechanisms of macro- and micro-evolution, and proceeding on this assumption, to push our investigations as far ahead as this working hypothesis will permit**’.”<sup>177</sup>

This statement from Dobzhansky reveals the secret regarding the argument for evolution and the true scientific status of the claim that microevolution is the same as macroevolution but on longer timescales. It is a mere assumption (conjecture), asserted as fact

---

<sup>176</sup> Sean B. Carroll, “*The Big Picture*.” *Nature* 409:669, 8 February 2001.

<sup>177</sup> Keith Stewart Thomson, “*Macroevolution: The Morphological Problem*.” *American Zoologist* 32:106,107, 1992.

through the use of a “*sign of equality*”, an equals sign. In reality, it is a “*basic article of faith*” and is but a theoretical extrapolation from empirical observations motivated by religious materialism.

These citations come from evolutionists who are honest about the current scientific status of the claim that macroevolution and microevolution are essentially the same process. Knowing that no empirical evidence exists, they are nevertheless hopeful—having faith—that this problem will be resolved in the future. This also proves what was mentioned at the beginning of the book that the scientific literature about the scientific status of certain evolutionary claims is often in stark contrast to what is claimed within textbooks and popular science writings and the brainwashing that takes place in educational institutions, especially in lower age groups.

In short, there is zero empirical evidence for macroevolution being microevolution on larger timescales. This is an imagined, concocted religious belief. It is assumed so as to give emotional relief and comfort from symptoms of cosmic authority syndrome which is to resent that there should be an authority over the universe at all.

Everything that evolutionists use to argue for their religion are small-scale observations (variations) in populations over a limited number of generations. These variations are in-built by design. The DNA-gene-cell cybernetic system has in-built variability and adaptability. The first (variability) allows changes in appearance, form, fitness and so on between parent and child on account of the code base itself, the 23 chromosomes from each parent. In the second (adaptability), the skilfully designed cybernetic system changes the code base at various nodes, switching code on and off, in response to the environment, allowing the child to adapt to challenges. As a result, no two organisms within a species will be identical in every respect. When we look within a family, we see general similarities in appearance as well as large variations.

All of this is in built, by design. The underlying molecular, biochemical computational processes behind all of this are studied by evolutionists and adduced as evidence—*through logically fallacious reasoning*—for their conjectural, primitive belief system in which

nature possesses divine attributes and is the creator and lord of the worlds. **In short, evolution is a religion, with a deity.** This deity has attributes and is the masterful creator, but is totally blind, ignorant and directionless, despite the fact that intentionality and wisdom abound in what it has created. The reality is that these evolutionists who deny a knowing, willing, creating force behind life are nothing but polytheists and nature worshippers who ascribe divine qualities to nature and then pretend otherwise through clever, technical knowledge, knowing that they would be laughed at, even by children, if they stated their claims in plain, simple language and through analogies that common people can understand. It was only in the 20th century that it was possible to do pull off such trickery and to deceive otherwise intelligent people. Prior to this, people were too smart to believe such nonsense, because the technical means to camouflage and hide such ridiculous, baseless assertions simply did not exist.