

=====

A Question of Magic - Version 1.2 (summary+ of Dear Sir Version 21.4)

===== (2010 July 13)

===== (Introduction To An Anti-Evolution Essay)

ClimateGate has shown, empirically, how perfectly politics + ideology can nullify so-called scientific-impartiality/ objectivity. Therefore ANY kind of so-called "Scientific Consensus", on anything, by anyone, anywhere, is dead, for all times.

Nothing so typifies the typical 'Defender' of Evolution as this: "liar."
Evolutionists are self-knowing liars. EVERYTHING noted in this essay, they already know. Everything. Each of the slightly bigger fish: they have been confronted by it all. When you reach the end, or as you read, remember, and consider just how very selectively you have been 'educated', and by whom.

===== (the Stupids vs the Scientists)

Observable patterns are present in the matter that comprises the physical-world. One group of people, the majority (let us call them the Stupids from now on), look at these patterns and THINK: "something with an intelligence was at work here." Another group of people (let us call them the Scientists from now on), a highly vocal minority of activists, present some of these patterns and DECLARE: "this all CERTAINLY occurred via natural processes ALONE."

The minority-group insists that the majority-group are IDIOTS, and DEMAND that their 'opinions' MUST be discarded. Wow. How to justify such a radical Big Brother approach? They say that "Science has spoken". Is "Science" some manifested OverGod-like entity? No. A bunch of old pro-NAMBLA hippies? Yes. The Cultist, Fanatical, hippies DEMAND that personal-reason be disregarded... that everyone MUST bow MINDLESSLY to their "Voice of Science."
YOUR Intelligence Is Not Required: Science has NOT 'spoken' because it is NOT an Intelligence (oh the irony): can the SCIENCE of gravity 'demand' your mental SUBMISSION? True and Proper -BLIND- acceptance of some "Scientific Consensus"? No? Then why may Magnificent Evolution do so? Mmmm?!
The minority group also states that Evolution is a FACT; more specifically, a 'Scientific'-fact; that their take on the patterns is 'correct' in an Absolute sense. Apparently the 'Theory' of Evolution is SO solid, SO perfect, SO pure, SO thoroughly proven according to all known 'scientific' principles... peer-reviewed by countless hordes of Scientists... that proper disagreement is utterly impossible. As will be seen, Evolution is not a "fact": the correct word is "figment."

Following all from the above two questions come to mind:

- a) Question: is there such a thing as single unassailable (or vaguely decent!) 'scientific' proof that Evolution is The One Correct Interpretation of the patterns.
- b) Question: do the mega-robust 'scientific' proofs of Evolution remove the 'intelligence' hypothesis from the table. (What alternatives do they consider?)

=====

===== (A Question Of Magic, Part 1)

= (Which is Primary: Reason versus Science)

Before the asking of any other question, it must first be asked: 'what is Evolution'.

The general, SCIENTIFICALLY accepted "Definition Of Evolution" is this:

e1) Descent,

e2) with Modification,

e3) Solely due to Natural processes.

This is, to put it very mildly, a highly problematic 'definition'. What is, to put it mildly, astonishing, is that the main stream scientific community accepts it, COMPLETELY. What is quite astounding is that there are people in this world who are so moronic that they accept such swill as their version of 'gospel'.

"Why the heavy dose of sarcasm?!" Well, since you asked:

Firstly, notice that proving (e1) would require, at the least, proof-of-parentage for every single breeding generation. For every living thing that has ever lived.

WHICH IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY!

Secondly, notice that (e2) is PERFECTLY vague: literally ANY change is 'Evolution'. No distinction is made between the new, the old, the lost, the shifted, the damaged, the singular or the group. WHICH IS CERTAIN TO BE 'TRUE'!

Thirdly, notice that (e3) would require that the COMPLETE genetic record be available, of every single living creature that has ever lived. At the very least.

Ideally, each and every 'mutation' must be detected and recorded as it occurs, in order to exclude the possibility of external influence. AN IMPOSSIBILITY!

"Oh grow up, surely only a brain-damaged child would ACTUALLY try and abuse the outrageous aspects of the Definition!" Well, since you have doubts, Thomas: The Stupids are of the opinion that 'Evolution' (present day-ish) is about new life-information coming into being. You know, new genes/ alleles. ('Allele'? Go read.) The Scientists think this Stupid opinion is Very INCORRECT. According to the Scientists, what MUST also be considered as being EVOLUTION is:

*1) The Effect of Natural Selection (ENS) (or equivalently the Effect of Genetic Drift (EGD).) I.e. simply the ALTERATION of gene-frequencies (how common a given allele is in a given group), as breeding-generations continue onwards through time. In actual, peer-reviewed, Scientific Journals, examples of such are USED as 'proof' of Evolution. No, I am not kidding. Despite the absolute fact that not one single new gene/ allele has come into being over the recorded history of the world, the mere act of shuffling alleles around like LEGO-blocks somehow PROVES Evolution, SCIENTIFICALLY. IN PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS!

According to the Way Of The Perfected Scientist, that groups of offspring are different (the REASON, or the MANNER, both being IRRELEVANT!) from their parents, is sufficient as SCIENTIFIC PROOF THAT EVOLUTION IS TRUE.

"Wow! That is SO retarded!" say the grown-ups in the room. Are you starting to get the reason for the sarcasm yet? (And you are missing the point: they know

EXACTLY what they are doing; they are NOT stupid, nor mistaken, nor ignorant.) (That a specific child is different from its parent may not serve as proof of Evolution. Do not ask me why. Call me a Stupid, but I fail to see why the basic logic of the Scientific Definition accepts the one case, and rejects the other. Maybe I'm just not enough of a Pure Scientist... or a spin-doctor/ propagandist.) NOTE: this specific phenomenon (E-NS, E-GD) is quite real - therefore Evolution has been proven to be true, SCIENTIFICALLY. I am not kidding. I am not exaggerating. THIS is mainstream, practiced, Science.

*2) But there is more. Also fulfilling aspect (e2) of Evolution is that viruses & bacteria have the nasty habit assimilating whole genes, from their environment, into their own DNA/ RNA. Like lots of tiny Borgs. A given Stupid might ask: "While this is interesting, since there are no new genes/alleles involved, why is this phenomenon held forth as examples of 'Evolution in action'?" Well, because, Scientifically speaking, the Definition makes it so, you blithering idiot. Can't you read, moron? The basics of the Scientific Method too complex for you, Stupid? NOTE: this specific phenomenon is quite real - therefore Evolution has been proven to be true, SCIENTIFICALLY. Again, I am not kidding or exaggerating.

*3) According to the definition, I would argue that simple aging is also an Example of Scientific Proof of Evolution. If all my cells are replaced every seven years or so, and since the copies are often imperfect/ different, present 'me' is a more (evolved) descendant of younger-'me'. Hey, as Big Brother Scientist TOLD YOU: No arguing is allowed with the Scientific Definition. Remember, slave?

*4) ANY genetic damage to any gene (effect/ cause being irrelevant of course), that is transmitted to the next generation, is also Scientific Proof of Evolution.

*X) Lastly, there is the Stupid version of Evolution, which the Scientists have graciously allowed to be included in the Definition. How very considerate of them. I'm not kidding about that either - they might have just left it out, you know.

(The above is perhaps the most blatant example of the Conflation Fallacy (considering different physical phenomena as if they were the same) in the recorded history of mankind. You have to be a real gen-u-ine retard to accept it: or equivalently, an Evolutionist; or equivalently, a mainstream Scientist.)

Before more interesting ideas can be discussed, it is first of all necessary for YOU to choose: the Scientific Definition of Evolution, or the Stupid Definition of Evolution.

*) Choose the Scientific Definition, the one the Real World Scientists use, the one which all the Scientific Journals accept, the one in the Biology textbooks, and there is nothing left to say: Evolution is true; Science has, indeed, 'spoken'.

*) If you are over 30, and are thinking that all this is the biggest load of bull-sh@t you have ever encountered, I have to disagree: there are other kinds of ideology ('sensible' atheism) and politics ('good' communism) and "religions" ('moderate' Islam) even more (or at least equally) ridiculous. Just saying.

A fork lies in the road before you: pick a path.

=====

===== (A Question Of Magic, Part 2)

= (Causality versus Correlation)

The next question to ask is this: 'Science' - What is it?

Well, the Stupid version of science goes something like this:

*p1) making some observation(s),

*p2) drinking some beer and dreaming up something (rule / pattern) to explain it,

*p3) waking up the next day mostly sober-like, and then going out and trying to

(alpha) Positively Test, AND (beta) Destructively Test, AND generally (gamma) Re-Examine your beer-induced hallucination.

Presto. Science. The Use of: FACT. LOGIC. REASON. Finding the Rules and Patterns that infest the Real World. AND BLOODY VALIDATING THEM...

-) (px1) And do note that some things ARE unknown. Sad, unfortunate, but true.

-) (px2) And do not forget The Unspoken Purpose of 'science': with RARE AND SPECIFIC exceptions, it is supposed to be understandable by the average person (many non-scientists have high-ish IQ's), given time and the inclination.

A Dude Named Popper added another rule to the three above: it MUST be (*p4) Possible To Disprove the hallucination. The reason for this is simple, and rather blindingly obvious if you are an adult. As for the Eternal Children...

*) Lets take the Scientific Definition of Evolution. 'Proofs' 1,2, 3 and 4 ARE solid. Therefore Evolution IS true. Part X is part of Evolution, and Evolution is true... so Evolution is true. Childish? Moronic? A Lie? Why, yes: hence the Falsifiability Criterion. Yes, Popper was-&-is reviled-&-ridiculed by Honorable-Scientist Inc.

*) Adults consider the case FOR, and the case AGAINST, when examining the validity of something. Evolutionists, and little children who are prone to hissy-fits when faced with that which they do not want, do not. (The core section of this essay, Part 3, is in essence devoted to the concept of destructive testing.)

*) Falsifiability compliments old-school science: both oppose the new Science.

So why all this tongue-wagging? Well, there are two concepts in conflict:

*) In the new Science, "correlation" is ACCEPTED as proof. A methodology that 'proves' Evolution.

*) In the days of old science, "causation" was REQUIRED for proof. A methodology which renders Evolution unprovable/ non-existent.

The CORE weakness of ANYTHING based on correlation is this: correlations cannot DISCRIMINATE - correlations are SPECIFICALLY unspecific. Sure, correlation can indicate how much B -LOOKS- like A, whereupon the Scientists start screaming that B -CAUSED- A. But correlation CANNOT exclude that C caused A, and not B. Or A caused C and B, or... Or D and not B or C, or... E.tc.

A nice contrasting comparison, via examples, would perhaps be in order:

*) "Gravity" is a manifestation due to matter ATTRACTING matter. The Earth

sucks. While in an absolute sense the MECHANISM for this attraction is not understood, the EFFECT, namely the ATTRACTION itself, can be OBSERVED/ DETECTED. MEASURED. Over and over again. Just go drop something... voila!

*) "The FACT of Evolution": "Fossils show that, as millions of years followed upon millions of years, Evolution HAPPENED. The white-stuff-in-the-rocks became more and more 'complex'; i.e. organic information increased. The Evolution-EFFECT is an undeniable FACT." (paraphrased)

Um, no. Fossils show that as time passed, apparently, old organic information got lost (maybe!), and new information came into play (ditto). What is missing? (e3): the REASON for the changes is UNKNOWN: the rocks are silent about that.

(e1): the descendant-ancestor linkage has to be ASSUMED. Once assumed, the concept of Evolution LOOKS like it would explain the general patterns in fossils.

It is indeed possible to construct a strong correlation between the PHYSICAL OBSERVATIONS, and The IDEA of Evolution. But The IDEA of Super-Brains&Computers from Mars would also correlate. So would The IDEA an odd-ish God/ or a hyper-intelligent God with motives we ants could not comprehend. Can the Scientists SHOW that Evolution ALONE "did it"? Can they EXCLUDE the other two options? No. But it gets worse: Via the laws/ dictates of Reason/ Logic, correlation cannot ever be specific, so it CANNOT be used to SPECIFY Evolution, even GRANTED the assumption that the other two options are invalid.

So they crafted the following logic-abortion: "Because only natural process(es) are known to exist, therefore NO NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE -CAN- EXIST. Therefore some form of the Mechanism(s) of Evolution MUST exist." Ha. Ha. Ha.

*) A third example. Can smoking cause cancer? (No.) "Why, yes it can cause cancer! It is a scientific fact!" The Scientists say this was proven 'scientifically' using statistical methods (i.e. correlation-based methods; i.e. kindergarten look-ee like-ee Science; i.e. new Science: which is all JUST like Evolution Science!!)

VIA the New Science:: Statistics can give a weight "value" to correlations: i.e. it 'looks-a-LOT' like smokers get a whole lot more cancer than do non-smokers. This is an example of PROOF in the new 'Science', i.e. correlation-based 'proof'.

VIA the old-school scientific method:: certain specific chemicals can cause certain changes in certain of the organic molecules which comprise certain cells, changes that are identical to cancer-cells observed in nature. Microscopes are nice (in laboratories.) Nice ones that can map the organic molecules involved. Organic chemistry can show the various pathways this can happen along.

The relevant experiments are highly repeatable. Causation-based science Rules! See? SMOKING does NOT (sometimes) cause cancer. Ingesting/ inhaling carcinogens CAN cause cancer. And THAT is, again, the problem with correlation-based 'proof': it is NOT specific, it CANNOT discriminate.

If correlation-based 'proofs' are valid, then Evolution is Scientific & true. The matter is settled. If causation-based proof instead is valid, then Evolution does not exist. It is that simple, and that thorough, and that complete. (Which, given that Evolution is supposed to be so very absolutely 'true', is very weird...)

Another fork lies in the road before you: pick a path.

=====

===== (A Question Of Magic, Part 3)

= (Chasms-of-Reason in the Algorithm of Evolution: a.k.a. Fairy-Magic Logic)

With the Stupid definition for Evolution in one hand, and a better idea of what is sanely reasonable in the other, behold the Greatest Slight-of-Hand Trick ever pulled on mankind. (Atheists have NOTHING to calibrate a moral compass by...)

Causation. While the Scientists explicitly state that 'Correlation-Alone' is sufficient to PROVE Evolution, the hordes of Stupids are not quite sophisticated/ educated enough to just surrender their thoughts on a mere say-so: uppity little bastards... So. The Great Pseudo-CAUSAL Algorithm of Evolution was projectile vomited into this world by Charles Darwin. A sad little man, with a Magic Idea. An idea that would finally give the Hedonist-Atheists what they had long searched for: public acceptance. "No more public spitting on us! At last we are non-dripping!"

So it all becomes clear, over time. The hand-crafted 'demands' of "Science" are merely expressions of the totalitarian-ideologies of the Hedonist-Atheists.

The present-/ modern-day variant of the Algorithm is essentially the same as that which Darwin splattered this world with:

- *) The world is subsumed in a Great Ocean of Randomness: all things suffer change/ mutation (hah! read 'DAMAGE' in the case of DNA) over time.
- *) These random changes, via the Mechanism of Natural Selection (MNS) (or via Genetic Drift (MGD), or some other scapegoat) lead to advantageous changes, i.e. NEW, FUNCTIONAL, alleles/ genes, propagating into the world.
- *) Passing through the Awesome Mists of Time Machine (Powered with Fairy Dust), crawling goo goes in the one end, and pterodactyls fly out of the other.
- *) Rinse and repeat without end. Whee!

Presto. The Algorithm of Evolution. Inevitably True! Inevitably Obvious! Inevitably SCIENTIFIC! HOW! CAN!! THIS!!! NOT!!!! WORK!!!!!! HEE-HAA!!!!!!

(The Effect of Natural Selection (ENS) is to alter gene-frequency, i.e. how common a given allele is in the world. The Effect of Genetic Drift (EGD) does the same thing, but is due to the patterns that naturally arise out of randomness.)

The Mechanism of Natural Selection (MNS) is UTTERLY critical to the PRACTICALITY of Evolution: it serves the 'Mega-Brain' of Evolution, and is to have effect of SUPER-DRASTICALLY reducing the number of breeding-generations required to reach some given new gene/ allele. GD might also, theoretically, have a minor general impact, but nothing even close to the sheer magnitude-of-effect of MNS. Quite simply: given the randomness-requirement, without MNS, Evolution CANNOT occur. Well, MNS does exist, so how could that possibly be a problem, you may ask. Well, the real world is complex, and the "thought experiment" fails when trying to practically lock Evolution onto MNS:

=- (3-1: Anti-Magic Chasm #1, Y-X, Coarseness)

For the sake of brevity:

*) Let's call the Great Ocean of the Randomness of the Universe, EntropyY.

*) Let AEvolution be a loss of Evolution-process products (ex. genes/ alleles.)

Mutation versus Damage. EntropyY causes genetic DAMAGE as time ticks by. Scientists re-name this damage as 'mutation'. Mutation made the X-Men, you know, and gave some people super-powers. I saw it on TV, so it must be true.

Why not call the apple, 'apple'? Well, that is problematic, because if you call the apple, 'apple,' then the very first question a Stupid would ask is this:

"Isn't this like a Perpetual Motion Machine of some kind?"

Why yes, you idiot, it is. (EVERY molecular machine (specie) in the bio-sphere.)

X: Hand one: EntropyY is busy, d-i-r-e-c-t-l-y, ANNIHILATING genetic information; in a multi-dimensional fashion (i.e. multiple angles of attack.)

Y: Hand other: EntropyY is the root-driver of the unknown (hypothetical) processes that are to i-n-d-i-r-e-c-t-l-y increase genetic information.

(Let: $\Delta = Y - X$; for some time-period.)

Evolution itself is then a net-effect of this hypothetical conflict: IF Y exceeds X THEN the result is Evolution, ELSE the result is AEvolution.

A Stupid would look at this situation, and suddenly feel like it is really, really unlikely that this bird is going to fly: positive Delta is NOT some kind of 'obvious', or 'inevitable' outcome, now is it? (The Scientists come from the other direction: Evolution is "obviously true", so of course none of this "idle speculation" matters.)

The ENTIRE discussion on Evolution is predicated on this single, great reality: The Great Xknife-Ydge.

At this point I would like to ask you, oh Stupid reader: have the Really Honest and, like, Objective, Scientists ever explained this to you? No? Why not?

Q: Care to speculate? (A: If a pathway towards personal, factual, reasoning is not known/ available/ feasible, then the alternative is "belief"-via-authority/ "best guess." So why is it important that YOU "believe" in Evolution? Because The Theory of Evolution, along with the New Sciences of Psychology & Sociology, are the primary foundation stones for atheism, liberalism, communism, socialism, etc. The Western-world political-system is BUILT on this "Secular Humanism." The elites NEED to be free of the KJV Bible: "Evolution" the pathway to the goal.)

Oh. But there is more. The Great Xknife-Ydge #2: Pekinese were bred from wolves. In the process, the overwhelming majority of the wolf-alleles were lost to the Pekinese. Wolves can become Pekinese, but Pekinese CANNOT become wolves. (This was done via Unnatural (Human) Selection.)

Given the random nature of the world, it is a given that similar events happen all the time, via the Mechanism of Natural Selection (MNS). So. Whole, entire, alleles are being lost. Entire species! FOREVER AND EVER. Constantly. But not

one single new gene/ alleles has been recorded as coming into existence. EVER. But there is still more! The Great Xnife-Ydge (#3)... the silence of the requisite Evolutionary-Activity (i.e. functional attempts at new-gene generation) on the molecular-level is... deafening. And don't forget the required SUB-activities (i.e. partial attempts at getting one single functional new-gene: can likely only be determined in retrospect) required for even one instance of Activity... there is so much NOTHING happening, that it is almost interesting to watch.

*) Related to the Great Xnife-Ydge (#1 & #2) is the issue of Genetic Rot. As time goes by, entropY damages genes. These genes/ alleles have to either be Replaced(1), or Repaired(2)... (by the Magical Evolution Fairies, of course.) Or otherwise just Discarded(3) via MNS/ GD/ Etc... (yet another net loss.) What is to drive Evolution is RANDOMNESS: that means that, via the general rules describing randomness, some of those bad genes will be Sticking(4) around. As time goes by, they are likely to aggregate to a certain level; a certain percentage of bad genes will always be around. So what is Genetic Rot? It is when Evolution makes a 'healthy' gene adapt to the presence of a bad gene: resulting in a rotten gene. Which makes the bad genes less bad: i.e. (bad + rotten) is better than (bad + healthy). This makes the bad gene less likely to be removed via MNS -- which is really, really bad. Also, the rotten genes will themselves tend to be adapted to: more rotten genes being the result. ('bad', 'rotten', 'healthy', are considered in terms of level-of-FUNCTION in the molecular machine, i.e. living thing.) The Mechanism(s) of Evolution is trapped in a limited kind (the complexities of machine function should allow only so much deviation) of downwards spiral. To overcome this nightmare scenario, a random-acting process to address a SPECIFIC problem is needed (i.e. must find-&-do-something-to one bad-gene amongst many good-genes.) It is rationally REQUIRED that such a random-acting process have a VERY high rate of activity... and as already noted, such activity is noticeable by its extremes of absence. But, of course, it gets even worse:

*) The Brush-Width of the Mechanism of Natural Selection. CAN Natural Selection 'obviously' and 'inevitably' detect-and-select for even the smallest gene-advantages/ disadvantages? Is there no LIMIT on this process? Can MNS, in the non-imaginary real world, 'discriminate' between similar alleles (i.e. genes of the same function-type)? There are tens of thousands of genes involved in the functioning of a living creature: the advantage/ disadvantage due to variation in a SINGLE new gene WILL be lost in the sea of practical variability, UNLESS its magnitude-of-advantage/ disadvantage is sufficiently high. (All those other alleles in a given creature, all existing in a highly variable-over-time environment...) Why does this matter? Because MNS is supposed to be the 'Mega-Brains' of the Mystery Evolutionary Machine: MNS CANNOT select what it CANNOT detect. And without MNS the number of breeding-generations to achieve some given end-effect goes way up... and remember those Great Xnife-Ydges, ticking away as they corrode all life into dust?

=- (3-2: Anti-Magic Chasm #2, "There is no spoon"; The Infinite Flexibility Myth 1)

Complexity is the planetoid-sized Death Star reflecting off the cataracts of the Scientists. Chasm #1 was concerned with practicalities relating to real-world complexity which the Scientists simply... ignore. Chasm #2 is concerned with a conceptually similar, but more wishy-washy, Wish-It-Away scam.

One of the primary Techniques used by the Scientists is this: There is a possibility that A is true. IF given A, there is a possibility that B is true. IF given B, there is a possibility that C is true. IF given C, there is a possibility that D is true. THEREFORE proposing D is a valid Scientific Argument. (This could be described as 'correlation-'logic', since that is what is used to connect-the-dots.) Trying to bring clarity to this sort of Toddler-like 'Argument' is HIGHLY frustrating, since the counter-statements boil down to showing that A, B, C and D are each UNLIKELY. And that the linkages are invalid/ unlikely. Boring! (In classical science these correlation-driven 'possibilities' would not have been accepted at any stage: proof would have been REQUIRED for each link in the chain. This is yet another ridiculous aspect of the new Science.)

Chasms 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 are linked (via Scientific correlation-'logics'.) Each is linked to yet more 'possibilities'. Scientists use this systemic-confusion to confound Single-Topic 'debates': an essay response is the only tool feasible. If you are an adult, hopefully what has been written will make sense to you.

Let's start with a kitten. It is an incredibly complex, functioning, molecular machine. The Scientists would have it be that one can simply wade into the DNA of a kitten, make lots of changes, and the machine just keeps on ticking: rat-machines and bird-machines beware. (Why, its JUST like Wishing-on-a-Star!) IF it is NOT true that s-p-e-c-i-f-i-c Gene-VARIANTS -DO- -NOT- -MATTER-, then Evolution, literally, CANNOT occur. Magical flexibility... Let me explain.

*) Let us take a gene that works with some sugar inside the kitten. There are only so many POSSIBLE constructions/ designs/ Options for sugar-genes of this function-type available to choose from. THIS IS A FACT.

*) For the sake of argument, let's say that 25 different major options of this sugar-gene are known to exist in nature. Each of them can have very minor variations, resulting in 5 alleles each. An additional 75 major options have been 'designed' in the laboratory-computers that cover the full range theoretically possible for the sugar-gene-options. THIS IS THE REALITY, OF, UM, REALITY.

*) So what Evolution is supposed to do, is mess around, and periodically Hop from one sugar-gene-option to another sugar-gene-option. (Like exchanging a shovel for a pick-axe or a hammer.) Of course, part of the Hop-process is that eventually the alleles that go with the given option have to be Evolved into being.

*) A given gene/ allele exists as PART of a highly complex molecular machine. Change/ damage a single gene/ allele just a tiny bit too much, and it can easily have drastically negative effects on the overall function of the machine.

Q1) Can one just stick in any old sugar-gene-option into the kitten? Well no, it will die. Rather horribly. Hopefully its death would be quick...

Q2) A question to ask would be: out of the 100 sugar-options, how many CAN be plugged into a kitten? And function properly for its ENTIRE LIFESPAN. But the better question is this: which sugar-gene-options can be plugged in, AND require the least number of changes from the presently used sugar-gene alleles. (Keep in mind that a given sugar-gene option actually consists of ALL its 5 alleles.)

Q3) Alleles have great practical utility: MNS is powerful. Hopping to a new sugar-gene will have the effect, at least after a few Hops, of rendering older alleles worthless. So just how much value does "Evolution" get out of this whole process? Mmmm? So not only does the Idea of Evolution require that EVERY molecular machine must be able to handle several options of the sugar-gene, it must also be able to handle all the alleles associated with each one.

Oh, and this must be true of EVERY gene-type! ALL AT ONCE!!

FOR EVERY SPECIE ON THE PLANET!!! FOR ITS ENTIRE LIFESPAN!!!!

!WTF!) IS THIS EVEN POSSIBLE? ("Complexity, where?! There is no such thing as complexity, you Stupid peasant!! Just BELIEVE in the Science!!!")

There is (of course) a way to examine this idea, in practice, in the real world. Check if the 'alleles' for a given gene-type contain members of the other gene-options. Presto. Such occurrences must be MASSIVELY common (see logic of STP later), or else the Hypothesis of Evolution is directly counter-indicated. Yet from what I've read (if understood correctly) is this NOT the case, AT ALL. Oops.

Ask yourself this: Is it really POSSIBLE to convert a kitten into a puppy?

SAYS WHO?

*) First, remember that Evolution is supposed to be driven by RANDOMNESS.

*) Second, recall that the Idea of Evolution requires that this conversion be done step-by-step; AND that each successive step be functional-&-competitive in the real world (i.e. each iteration has to survive-&-flourish - AND IN GENERAL BE BETTER THAN THE PRECEDING STEP.)

*) Given the above, and noting the whole sugar-gene-option spiel, just how many PATHWAYS exist from kitten to puppy? Sure, you could start anywhere, BUT there are points where in order to progress, it would become necessary to make certain very SPECIFIC changes to other genes: and achieving that with 'randomness' will require massively MORE breeding-generations... which is the One Single Thing that the Scientists simply cannot allow: so they just... ignore it.

Scientists like to pretend that the questions asked above, and problems posed, do not exist. They like to pretend that Evolution has "infinite" gene-possibilities to work with. They like to pretend that ANY specie can handle ANY kind of gene-activity. (What about PROOF of those Magnificent Assumptions? Surely things so REAL, cannot be THAT invisible? "Dreams" are cute, but proof is great.)

The Scientists NEED to ignore ALL the negative-indications, because the alternative is the following nightmare "possibility": WHAT IF 'EVOLUTION' SIMPLY CANNOT OCCUR, AS A LOGICAL/ PHYSICAL FACT.

Again. What if it is impossible, in practice, for Evolution to occur?

=- (3-3: Anti-Magic Chasm #3, "There is no spoon"; The Infinite Flexibility Myth 2)

Not one single new (non-trivial) allele has ever been documented as coming into existence. The Scientists say that the time-scale is too small (in terms of breeding-generations) for that. Really? Even with rapidly breeding bacteria in a laboratory where the mutation rates can be increased (via radiation or chemicals), where the environment is perfectly controllable to any MNS-setup imaginable? Really? You mean that HAS NOT BEEN DONE?! Wow. How weird!

Let us consider the coming into being of new genes/ alleles.

*) Passive Gene-Evolution (PGE): This is where (as a hypothetical example) certain genes (perhaps erroneously double-copied; or whatever) are 'switched off'; and then undergo random mutations. Later such a gene could be turned 'back on', and if the Randomness of the Universe happened to create a new working gene/ allele, hooray! (This process might be somewhat invisible in the here and now, unless all genes are tracked over all generations.)

*) Active Gene-Evolution (AGE): This is where a brand new gene/ allele has come into being (likely via PGE), and now has a host of practical hurdles to overcome. (This sort of thing should be directly visible, via intermediate activity.)

-) For all that follows, keep in mind that Evolution MUST be probability busting; i.e. the number of breeding-generations MUST be limited (heck! insanely reduced!). If the busting-aspect fails, so does Evolution, DIRECTLY.

-) While some issues could be addressed at the same time, more factors would still take longer to address than fewer factors (set-intersections will lessen the valid probability spaces.)

-) There are no such thing as Evolution Fairies: they are not available to magically nullify the basic logics of the real-world. Keep that in mind.

Some basic AGE rate-hurdles that should, logically, exist.

*) From logic. Pre-Function: For every fully functional new gene/ allele, it is GALACTICALLY-CERTAIN that a very great many nearly-functional or badly-functional 'work-in-progress' genes would occur.

*) From logic. System Integration: Given a new gene/ allele, every other gene that is impacted by the new gene is likely to have to 'adapt' to it (via the Mechanism(s) of Evolution.) The living molecular machines of this world are quite flexible (based on alleles, of all things, after all. Incidentally, 'alleles' ratchet up general complexity MASSIVELY...) For everything involved to logically/ functionally get along with everything else, this sort of activity will have to occur. This would iterate: changes would beget more changes, etc. etc. etc.

*) From observation of the real world. Function enhancement/ optimization: As seen in all the living molecular machines in the world around us, genes/ alleles not only work well, they work very well: once a gene/ allele is working, Evolution must then expend more breeding-cycles on this aspect.

Then there are other, more general, more interesting, realities.

*) From observation of the real world. Entropy Resistance: DNA is known to be highly resistant to damage, a.k.a. mutation. This adds a MASSIVELY DRASTIC breeding-cycle burden to Evolution, MERELY AS A FIRST HURDLE BEFORE ALL OTHERS. (Increasing resistance to entropy DIRECTLY increases resistance to Evolution itself.)

One: Resistance cannot be so high as to make Evolution fall prey to the Knife Edges; Evolution -MUST- have access to changing the DNA, -AND- have that access be sufficiently high.

Two: ULTIMATELY maintenance of DNA is the DIRECT 'responsibility' of the Mechanism(s) of Evolution. Resistance in a sense might(!) smooth-out the need for intervention by Evolution, but no set of resistance-procedures exist that can oppose entropy indefinitely. Crux: At some point Evolution HAS to be able to step in as Mr. Fix-It (with all the associated problems that would entail.)

Incidentally, high-ish levels of resistance would counter-indicate the Hypothesis of Evolution. (The degree to which Evolution is ACTIVELY at work would balance against the allowable level of resistance: higher activity levels would imply lower resistance, and vice versa... which reminds me...)

Oh. And do not forget that Evolution has to CREATE, ADAPT/ EVOLVE and MAINTAIN this DNA-protective mechanism, all by ITSELF...

(Of course, these well known aspects of Evolution are taught in all schools, all over: the Honorable Scientists want everyone to UNDERSTAND just how obviously-true Evolution is...)

*) From logic. Rfeedback. First note that MNS cannot "demand" some specific new gene/ allele: it can only discriminate/ select between genes/ alleles that are already available. It can however create powerful pressures: an example would be "'become taller or die out". Under such a condition, ANYTHING that helps 'tallness' will be heavily favoured (including selection between new genes/ alleles). Let's call this Rfeedback: feedback that is dependant on the random-nature of randomness to generate a REQUIRED response.

Should some specie 'evolve' such that another specie is strongly impacted, the 2nd specie could then experience such a "Pressure-of-Doom!" NO NUMBER OF BREEDING-CYCLES CAN ADDRESS THIS! Either a solution happens to present itself, at which time it can be exploited, Or Else the specie ceases to exist: taking with it ALL the information it possesses, all it has ever "achieved." This REALITY is at play every single time something is 'demanded' from "Evolution." As a practical matter, it is one of the most powerful counter-arguments against Evolution, since it would logically arise often, and since there is ZERO conceivable counter to it except one: Massive Intelligence.

(Rfeedback has ENORMOUS practical import when considering the repair of genetic damage via Evolution... And this is just one instance. Just one.)

A lot more could be said about all the various kinds of expected molecular-level activity: but since ZERO activity is being observed (a few very-random gene-damages per generation), it would have little meaning save as an academic exercise. And the Sciences of Evolution provide far more than enough of that kind of 'exercise' already.

=- (3-4: Anti-Magic Chasm #4, DNA-ToL, STP)

This is the perhaps the most interesting of the Chasms. It is also the hardest to discuss: the Scientists use it with great effect to Show how true Evolution "looks." It is, unfortunately, hard to argue against something without a pretty alternative to present in its stead. But that is the state of it: Reason is not per 'demand'.

Note 1: The Scientists like to pretend there is a difference between "Evolution" and "Common Descent." Both demand ancestor/ descendent links. Both demand genetic change (vague.) Both demand natural random processes to drive them. As far as I am concerned, they are the selfsame thing. Period.

Note 2: Incompetent scientists are subjective: such do not look at (causation) what IS, but rather see (correlation) what they want to see, i.e. what MIGHT BE.

Note 3: Patterns are patterns - once identified their use is NOT dependent on an explanation for their coming into being. Obviously. The Theory of Evolution has contributed NOTHING to the practical sciences: that should be obvious.

This tale is told from the viewpoint of the Evolutionists: it would be more effective to start with the objective viewpoint, but this particular deception deserves to be faced head on. Re-read it afterwards by referring to the various comments.

*) Evolution demands that DNA changed over time. THEREFORE any changes in (X1) DNA are due to 'Evolution', and are to be explained by it. Specifically, there is the so-called Gene Clock.

*) The GClock states that as the aeons (i.e. time) tick by, a given gene picks up changes at a constant rate (N number of changes per M millennia.) (X2)

So. Where two genes have a common-ancestor-gene, the number of differences between them represents the time between them in a fairly direct manner: so half the number of changes represents the time to the common ancestor. Voila!

(Mixing GClock-type changes and normal Evolution is tricky: brainless GClock-type changes are supposedly complemented by the brained, and/or vice versa.)

**) (X3) In a burst of mindless genius, the Scientists realized they could use this 'truth' to build a great Tree of Life, the ultimate show-piece to maximize the 'obviousness' of Evolution.

So. How to achieve this most noble of all conceivable goals?

*) Statistical procedures that work with these-kinds of differences, require a high degree of basic similarity: that is just the way the mathematics crumble. So. Take some gene-TYPE, one that makes a specific sugar for example, and look for all other occurrences/ OPTIONS of it in other species. Then count the number of differences between that gene-type in a given specie and all the others; rinse and repeat. And the mathematics builds a section of the DNA-based Tree of Life. (X4)

*) The "FC-over-M" (see X2) value depends on the specific type of gene: some genes can be used to map larger areas of the Tree than others. Predictably, in perfect harmony with the Science of the GClock, the average of pretty much ANY five gene-types (selected from the available pool of FUNCTIONAL genes at random) would deliver the same Tree for that local area of it.

*) That last point is INCREDIBLE! This is the clearest PROOF of Evolution

anyone could imagine! A Grand Pattern, with Evolution as the "Sole Possible Explanation" in the very fabric of all living things, revealed by the Science of Evolution: the Single Tree Phenomenon/ Pattern (STP.) Hallelujah!

(X1) "Changes in" are actually "differences between". The one ASSUMES Evolutionary DESCENT, the other objectively works with the raw data.

(X2) There is a RADICAL difference between a gene/ allele picking up random damages of N over M, AND picking up FUNCTIONAL Changes over Millennia (FC over M). Functional Changes REQUIRE the workings of Evolution, which are RANDOM in turn (involving Rfeedback among other things.) Also a very great many factors (interaction with other genes, closeness of viable gene-options, etc. etc.) would determine the (relatively fractional) rate of FC over M. In terms of statistics, the FC over M distribution would not only have a massive variance: it might even be white... EITHER case massively counter-indicates the STP.

(X3) The order of progression here is highly dubious.

-) There is a rule in statistics that you must NEVER, EVER, look at the end-result/ outcome when compiling your problem-statement/ mathematics: you end up with a SELECTED outcome.

-) Since new Science is based on correlations, something highly surprising is not only possible, but occurs frequently: Given that an actual correlation is not specific, it is therefore not "attached" to a specific hypothesis/ theory! This means that as the need arises, the 'theory' can 'evolve' using the same "outcome"! WTF! This is another reason why the falsifiability criterion exists: to disallow this kind of 'reverse-engineering'-always-correct "Science."

In old school science the driving idea was increasing understanding the universe. In the new Science, the driving idea is dreaming up ideologically-compatible explain-aways as to why one thing correlates with another.

(X4) At this point note the distinction between a raw Difference Tree, and a Time-Difference Tree: DT vs TDT. (Data vs (Data + Assumptions).)

--> Note that the Tree SHAPE is SPECIFICALLY generated by the Algorithm!

-) The links placed between the nodes serve to indicate the ancestor/ descendant relationships. I.e. Evolution is directly ASSUMED. (Who needs proof anyway.)

-) The Markovian Nested-Hierarchy is a 'prediction' made by Evolution.

'Markovian' indicates a one-directionality (i.e. downstream and upstream), while the 'Nested-Hierarchy' indicates a branching, TREE-SHAPED, pattern... get it? There is no real reason why Evolution would disallow backwards-breeding, (who cares about the practicalities of mixing-up gene-options anyway) but since the Grand Pattern does not 'show' this happening... get X3 a bit better now?

Q: What -IS- a gene?

A: A gene -IS- its function. What -IS- a water pump? It -IS- a thing that pumps water. So. What is the CRUX problem with the GClock? Well. Two given

functional genes are different from each other... which means that they have different functions. SO there are base-pair differences between them. SO WHAT! This has the effect of breaking the rationality of the GClock: as does taking the conceptual-jump the GClock makes from 'differences' to 'changes' (+1, +1).

So. What the DNA-'ToL' of the Scientists really IS, is:

- *) a DNA-Difference-Data-derived,
- *) Tree-Shape--FORCED (via 'minimized' difference-'distance'-links (which AGAIN assumes Evolution)),
- *) GENE-FUNCTION-based P-I-C-T-U-R-E.

So. The GClock 'Theory' serves as a stand-in "fix" for the STP problem: (when a given hypothesis fails, simply invent a 'special-exception' sub-"Theory"! Yay!)

*) The "practical" (ha ha!) Evolution of the GClock is considered as an advanced aspect of Genetic Drift (EGD)... IF granted the Fairy Magic REQUIREMENT that past gene/ allele selections somehow become (via unspecified means) INVALID for future use: which breaks its rationality yet again (+1).

Put another way: the "practical" GClock has endless "different-than-before"-steps as EXPLICITLY REQUIRED Effect... yet more magically invisible mechanism(s) required for the Greatest Obviously True Scientific Fact on Earth.

*) For "theoretical" Evolution to be probability-busting, Evolution must be "INTELLIGENT", i.e. it must 'look' for the QUICKEST & best way of achieving the ultimate goal of 'enhancement of a specie via changes (to DNA)'... it must HUNT the probability-spaces for available gene-options... (WHICH MEANS that going BACKWARDS is a VERY valid proposition! As time passes ever onwards, gene-function should, just maybe?, 'drift' randomly (or a bit non-randomly?) among the nearest gene-options; hey, why not? Oh, right: Fairy Magic.)

Fact: the Grand Pattern of STP is massively indicative of un-quickness.

-) MNS is expected to generate very random patterns in gene-FUNCTION-differences. Also visible should be "bridging"-genes when new species are split-off (via specific alleles.) STP shows NONE of this.

-) Understand: the STP does NOT support the Evolution Algorithm: it ACTIVELY counter-indicates it... which the Scientists bypass (read: ignore) with the "IF given A, there is a possibility that B..." trickery of an unspecified GD-variant.

But. The existence of the Grand Pattern really is AMAZING!

A Plus for the new Science of the GClock is that it provides a (very bad) explanation for the Grand Pattern... which is not really a plus.

A Plus for the old science: it makes no assumptions; it just states what exists.

A Minus for the new Science is that it ignores all counter-indications.

A Minus for the old science is that it cannot provide an explanation... (Chasm 8?)

There are exactly three explanations for the Grand Pattern: The Irrational GClock; That most classical of all indicators of Intelligence At Work -- a design-pattern; Or "necessity" as per Chasm 8 (which demands molecular ACTIVITY.)

=- (3-5: Anti-Magic Chasm #5, Bad Fossils 1)

Ah, fossils. That great reservoir of Evolutionary Truth via Crystal Clear Evidence.

The Fossil-Tree (FT) is constructed in a manner practically equivalent to that of the DNA-ToL. The strange methodology the Scientists followed in the STP section is eerily similar to their treatment of fossils. There they also ASSUME ancestor-descendant links between different-looking fossils. There also, they ignore the implications of the concept of FUNCTION, and instead look solely at "changes" (X1 in Chasm #4).

However, unlike with the DNA-ToL, the error of ignoring proper conceptualization has SEVERE repercussions in the case of the FT: I think the word is "scandal."

It is a fact that the Fossil-Tree (FT) consists of periods of stasis, and sudden splitting-events. (Unless the Scientists are motivated to dream up new "Science" to explain-away problems with their correlations.) There is no exception to this.

Questions: How are the FT-nodes ordered; How are the FT-links determined.

*) Nodes: Cladistics is an organization-method. It creates super-groups (example all entries have teeth), with sub-groups (sharp teeth, blunt teeth, etc.) All the various fossils are taken, plugged into the cladistics sausage-machine, and out pops all the nodes on the FT.

(It is one of the Great Secrets of Evolution Science, but MNS can & DOES create cladistic changes... something to keep in mind when reading their nonsense.)

Again, 'function' is NOT 'changes': "Repeat it enough, and they shall believe!"

*) Links between the nodes: Just ASSUME that Evolution is true (i.e. that there ARE descendent-ancestor links), then you just LINK all the nodes together. Pop!

The DNA-'ToL' is built using differences in gene-FUNCTIONS. The differences are detected via counting base-pair differences between selected genes.

The FT is built using differences in physical FUNCTIONS (VERY strongly related to the molecular-machine-building-DNA, of course.) The differences are detected via the methodology of cladistics applied to bones-in-rocks.

Occam says that what patterns you see in the present, you could also expect to find in the past. And so it is. The same overall generalities of the Grand Pattern are in both the DNA-ToL as well as the FT.

There are some nasty problems with the FT:

*) To make the FT correlate better with the modern-day DNA organization-methods (DNA-ToL), the FT was... edited... to better match the DNA-ToL.

*) The FT is hand-crafted. o_o. And there is a STRICT -RULE- that Evolution IS true. So. The various cladistics were carefully hand-selected, over the passing of decades, so as to "correctly PLACE" a given fossil in the Evolutionary-FT (EFT).

*) In the pre-Darwin days, basic "human-eye correlation" was used to create the various fossil-organizing trees that existed then. They were often not all that much different from the modern ones. Which makes sense, if you think about it.

-) One of the great 'achievements' attributed to the Idea of Evolution, is that it allowed the ORGANIZATION of fossils into the FT. (Which at this point is funny.)
-) All these points, each, add to the classical Circular Logic fallacy. (In terms of the FT itself; and also in terms of comparing the Two Trees.)

Another problem is this: we have no idea how much the Scientists involved in the FT have been cooking the data. Fossil-'Science' goes hand in hand with dating methods. The various Scientists involved in the pre-Isochron dating methods, it is now known as a fact, LIED about the severe problems involved with them. (Which is why the isochron methods had to be introduced in the first place.) Via Magic and Mystery, the isochron-methods' results somehow match, essentially exactly, their previous sets of lies. What a coincidence! Oh, and there are some severe problems with isochron dating as well... but THIS time, the Scientists will not be lying, no sir! You can trust them this time!

... and then there is that HUGE problem with the EFT.

***) The EFT was constructed with the idea of ever-evolving life, with new DNA being "observed" in the fossil-'record'. The same strange Great Pattern (ASSUMED to be the "fingerprint" of EVOLUTION) also seems to be present in fossils (multiple cladistic lines produce same Tree, and that Tree has some resemblance to the DNA-ToL - even though only a tiny part of the ToL covers those species that could be fossilized.)

*) Assumption Zero: fossils are a record of Evolution happening. Er, No. Fossils ARE a record of stone-dead examples/ members of various species.

*) Assumption 1: Cladistics "observe" Evolutionary CHANGES. Er, No. What cladistics ARE based on, is Differences in Physical Function. THAT is what they detect. The practical detecting of differences, is NOT the same as the practical detection of the CAUSE/ MECHANISM of the differences. (Typically, the Scientists refuse to acknowledge this distinction, which is patently insane.)

*) Assumption 2: Splitting events are driven by Evolution. Er, Highly unlikely. MNS (via ALLELES), i.e. wolf-2-Pekinese, is almost certainly the driver here.

--> It is a FACT that CLADISTICS cannot be used to detect Evolutionary activity. Sure, you might take a long overview of the FOSSILS, and say that somewhere along the way Evolution MIGHT have taken place. But cladistics can ONLY be expected to detect major MNS-type events over time: IF EVOLUTION IS GIVEN. So. The FT CANNOT be an EFT: i.e. the FT CANNOT show Evolution.

The FT IS a MNS-T... at best: a record of essentially random MNS events: occurring in an essentially random environments (climate, plants, other animals), at random places, at random times, in random ways using what alleles are available... (Hey, who paid for all this? How much individual-TIME has this cost?)

The crux problem with the FT is now this: fossils are found in sediment-rock, which cannot be dated. So nearby lava-rocks are dated: using many magical assumptions... In PRACTICE, the fossils are used to date the sedimentary rocks; a practice that exists because the FT has been incorrectly conceptualized. This-all has a VERY high impact: it is a systematically applied, endemic, error.

=- (3-6: Anti-Magic Chasm #6, Bad Fossils 2)

Correlations, when stacked one on top of the other, and then interlocked with yet more correlations, have a powerful 'visual' impact. (There is perhaps no better example of this than the 'science' of Evolution.) That impact is however purely imaginary: Dreams of flights of winged fluffy bunnies are but dreams. Such correlation-'arguments' are, essentially, not based on reason, and therefore cannot be reasoned against. (Which is why this essay was written as it was.)

Assuming Evolution: The fossil-record shows that some specie (node) remains locked, unchanged, in Stasis. Then 'poof!', and the specie Splits into a few more species; the original usually rapturing off to Darwin-topia during the process.

Of course, there are some really serious problems with this:

a1) Should, as per Evolution, new genes/ alleles arise, the randomness-of-the-universe WILL manifest those new genes/ alleles (be it via NS or GD.) Genes/ alleles CANNOT come into existence and not, somehow, exist! Genes/ alleles exist to be USED (i.e. genes exist to exist; or: genes exist.)

This is the classical objection to Evolution, which predicts ever changing, incrementally different nodes, over time. Certainly NOT Stasis; AND certainly NOT sudden Splitting events. The Scientists have no proper explanation for this, so they simply cite 'all the other overwhelming evidence', proclaim that Evolution is 'true', insult the Stupids for being Science-blind religious maniacs for a while, and then go on about their day. (It is actually all quite funny: like a big circus! :-)

The new Scientists claim that the Stasis-Splits are a perfectly acceptable example of an 'Unknown'. But that is not correct: what it is, is a massive counter-indication against the Theory of Evolution.

a2) But it gets worse. Consider the practical effect of the presence of alleles. Question: Were there alleles way-back-then? If there WERE, then the Stasis-periods are ABSOLUTELY impossible. Consider how rapidly climate changes. Consider how rapidly MNS 'uses' alleles. Remember the Pekinese? See the problem? NOTHING is as fast, as responsive, as MNS running on alleles. Be it via lizards, or birds: NS 'creating' new species has been FULLY DOCUMENTED in the modern world.

And to say that there were NOT alleles present, that they only came into being relatively recently... PROVE it. At some point, surely, one can ask for actual 'proof', in the place of yet another inane 'possibility'? (It is a very nasty habit that Scientists have: to equate 'Idea'/ 'Possibility' directly with 'Reality'.)

-) Oddly enough, even though I lean towards the old-earth idea, the 2nd allele-argument makes the fossil-record positively SCREAM Young-LIFE. Go figure!

What about 'transitional' fossils? First off, what Evolution predicts is an ENDLESS number of 'transitional' fossils: curves consisting of multitudes of nodes on the FT. Adding a bare few more nodes into the FT changes nothing. Also: what is more likely to explain the odd transitional-fossil: the KNOWN phenomenon of birth-defects, the KNOWN phenomenon of ENS, or the perfectly

invisible phenomenon of Evolution. Mmmm?

Some related ideas that are tossed out by the Scientists:

Vestigial Organs: example the wings on an Ostrich. Some of the counters are:

- *) Prove that MNS is not to blame. Cannot? Too bad.
- *) Are the wings completely useless? For every practical situation it will ever find, AND has ever found, itself in? No? Then go fly a kite.

Atavisms: example whales with leg-bones.

- *) MNS NOT to blame?
- *) Are they completely useless?
- *) Lastly, so what. There are flipper-like things attached to those bones, yes? So, in the OPINION of a bunch of the Scientists, they have no 'real' use? The Scientists have reached a 'consensus' on that? And why should anyone care about "CONSENSUS" in SCIENCE?!?! Since when is -OPINION- 'scientific'?!?! (Yet more correlation-based flim-flammetry.)

*) It is an unfortunate reality that humans often have difficulty in distinguishing between 'correlation' and 'causation', between 'mind-picture' and reason.

*) It is a fact that the Scientists have spent very many decades in shaping the 'dialogue'/ 'landscape' of the Sciences to conform with their desires: any sensible adult taking a look at their activities, their work, their outputs, will see this clearly.

*) There certainly are many different patterns in nature: and the very nature of the new Science lends itself to free-flowing 'interpretations' of those patterns. THAT is the 'strength' of Evolution: a horde of non-reality-based maniacal radicals on a Mission from Darwin, are its Protectors.

*) Of course, it is indeed possible that Evolution did occur. But there is no way to PROVE it, AND there are a LOT of very serious counter indications. While a bit late to do so, here follows a short quote on when a "hypothesis" has failed: http://www.knowledgerush.com/kr/encyclopedia/Scientific_method/: "Failure to see the predicted results from a well designed and implemented experiment is clear indication that the hypothesis is defective."

(A 'Theory' is a 'Hypothesis' that has been PROVEN... Really! Where?!?!)

So at which point will it finally be acknowledged that the 'Theory' of Evolution is a failure? Silly question.

Something to keep in mind. Ever encountered those probability calculations that are supposed to indicate how unlikely life is? You know, made by those Stupid religious maniacs? The Scientists heap so much contempt on such things, that it is painful to watch. But those SAME Scientists, the very people who SCREAM that the Science of Evolution is unassailable, REFUSE to work out the calculations themselves, EVEN ROUGHLY, and then defend them in public.

=- (3-7: Anti-Magic Chasm #7, IRC)

Irreducible Complexity is, like the falsifiability criterion, a favourite spit-target of the Scientists. (Coverage is general: specifics like Hopping are not discussed.)

Two types of counter-'argument' are presented by the Scientists:

- *) firstly misstating what it is REALLY about; in one of very, very many ways;
- *) and secondly with cute little "thought experiments"...

So here is what IRC is about: Note that there are TWO main concepts involved:

*1.1.1): A molecular-MACHINE (i.e. some living thing) is made up of PARTS (i.e. a gene/ allele). A given machine-part could be sliced up into SUB-PARTS/ chunks/ sections -- BUT should ANY sub-part be removed/ altered (damaged), the machine-part stops working. (Generally 'a very bad thing' for molecular-machines.) (The finer the slice-&-splice, the easier it could be to get the requisite sub-parts, but the more improbable the assembling process becomes...)

I.e. IRC is, in essence, a sensitivity-to-damage argument.

*1.1.2): In practice, ANY gene/ allele that reacts VERY negatively to ANY minimal 'mutation' (i.e. damage), is most likely IRC (via the nature of complex devices.) (Which is ASTOUNDING, especially if you consider the Mullerian counter-spiel section a bit further on: i.e. doubly-lucky.)

*1.2): The (complex) machine-part has a 'primary function/ work', which is NOT related (in terms of functionality) to any of the sub-parts/ sections of sub-parts. (I.e. the whole-part-Function is NOT duplicated by any of the sub-part-Functions.)

*1.3): The effect of all this is that in order to get to the desired Function for the PART, Evolution has to play at RANDOMLY assembling the tiny pieces into the required gene. And this is the CRUX of the IRC argument: 'randomness' implies that ever-more generations of time is required - which DIRECTLY counter-indicates the probability-busting Requirement of Evolution. (Recall that entropy is ceaselessly hammering away at the DNA of every living thing... all the time.)

The resulting IRC argument itself has three parts:

*2.1): IF it is GIVEN that the various sub-parts are present in the environment, & ready for assembly to take place (which is all bloody unlikely);

*2.2): THEN MNS cannot SELECT for the primary function of the machine-part; since any removal-or-alteration type-of-change FROM the present gene WILL require a non-functional predecessor. (Which is counter to Evolution.) So the sub-parts have to assemble via a PURE random process (however way the Scientists want), and then '!poof!', the functional part comes into being.

*2.3.1): There are literally thousands upon thousands (millions? billions? all the alleles for all the species on earth...) of different instances of this 'type' of machine-part: which then changes the problem the Mechanism(s) of Evolution (MoE) has to overcome to one where all these 'random' events become very, very, very unlikely.

*2.3.2) Sure, there are bound to be a few pathways-to-existence for SOME of the IRC genes... but for ALL of them?

Is this how the Honest Scientists portrayed IRC to you? Mmmm? Still think that it is a stupid lie told by evil religious people?

Note that Removal- or Alteration-type changes can be analysed for a KNOWN gene. For Insertion, which uses the unknown, this is not possible. I.e. the trusty "IF given A, there is a possibility that B..." trickery is called on. So, next consider one of the 'obviously-true' little 'thought experiments' the Scientists have used so EFFECTIVELY to discredit the logic of IRC.

(TalkOrigins.Org): "The Mullerian two-step:
With Behe's error now in hand, we immediately have the following embarrassingly facile solution to Behe's "irreducible" conundrum. Only two basic steps are needed to GRADUALLY evolve an irreducibly complex system from a FUNCTIONING precursor:
1 - ADD a part.
2 - Make it necessary.
It's that simple. After these two steps, removing the part will kill the function, yet the system was produced directly and GRADUALLY from a simpler, FUNCTIONAL precursor."

They even thoughtfully provide us all an example of the application of the above:
Paraphrased: "Imagine three cubic stones in a line - a bridge. Place a slab on top of them - STILL a bridge! Remove the middle stone. Voila, an IRC bridge!"

Very well, let us extend their example to genes/ alleles.

- 1) Some gene/ allele evolves incrementally over the eons, as per the requirement of Evolution. Prime Function Exists CONTINUOUSLY. (This is the IRC-A gene.)
 - 2) Another change is made to the gene: the INSERTION of a sub-part. (The definition of IRC specifically ONLY talks about REMOVAL/ ALTERATION.) As per Evolution, the Prime Function STILL remains. (This is the IRC-B gene.)
 - 3) Next some or other part gets removed. The Prime Function STILL Remains. (This is the IRC gene.)
-) WOW! Their example destroys the IRC argument! Me am SO, like, AWED!

At this point I would like to remind you of the whole sugar-OPTION spiel. Then: Their 'argument' may indeed be valid...:

- *) IF the IRC-A gene is MASSIVELY LUCKY enough to be such that addition of another part is possible, AND TO STILL retain Prime Function!
- *) IF the IRC-B gene is MASSIVELY LUCKY enough to be such that removal of some part is possible, AFTER THE LUCK OF THE PREVIOUS STEP, AND TO STILL retain Prime Function!! Far out, dude!!!

WTF?!: So instead of Evolution creating & using lots of non-IRC genes (even IRC-A are too limited), it hunts for these Lucky Genes. Might I ask why? Mmmm? It may be obvious, but note that IRC-genes will not easily 'evolve' further; both Removal- and Alteration-types of damage will BREAK their function. So... why?

=- (3-8: Anti-Magic Chasm #8, The Dirt-Eating Goo & The Balanced Bio-Sphere)

Evolution is blind. Give any specie the ability to breed & displace/ destroy every other specie on the planet, except for its food, and it WOULD. Happily.

Then its food (the Dirt-Eating Goo) would ask Sociopathic Big Brother Evolution: "Hey, WHY must I be edible?"

Rinse & Repeat.

This is an undeniable FACT.

So. Given that Evolution WILL happen faster, the shorter the breeding-cycles are, where is the other non-magical alternative type of Goo: the Hungry Goo that Ate the World? Mmmm?

Again, this is a massively obvious TYPE of flaw in the 'obvious truth' of Evolution, and again, it just gets ignored: and there are MANY possible incarnations of it... (Recall how even simple diseases can completely destroy native populations that are not used to it? Same thing, just more lethal.)

So let us test it. Take a Rat. Pick a single enzyme, protein, whatever and change it in the lab so that the pRat becomes poisonous to its predator species. Let it take TWO base-pair changes in its predator species to adapt/ Evolve to this.

Set the pRats free.

And watch EVERY predator species die out. Why? Because the kind of molecular activity required to react to this situation has NEVER been observed.

Not once. Not EVER.

THAT is how much Evolution SUCKS in practice: we KNOW what some of its limits ARE HERE AND NOW; we can PREDICT that it will fail.

Now, given how fast bacteria can spread, if for example a 4 base-pair change is required by EVERY animal (for example) to survive, THEY WILL ALL DIE.

So. Why has this not happened? Surely it SHOULD have happened? Surely it could happen tomorrow?

So you think that the Evolution 'debate' does not matter? Really? What will happen if the work of some happy Scientist, some nifty gene, is absorbed by some bacteria? Mmmm? The whole f@cking world will die, you spineless twit! (You want evidence that there is a God? Well, you are still alive, despite YOU allowing some incredibly foolish people to bumble around, oblivious to reality.)

Anyway.

If the ecological 'niche' of a given specie is taken to mean its functioning in the climate, weather, plant-life, animal-life, insect life, bacteria & viruses, etc. etc. that comprises its environment, then it follows DIRECTLY that its DNA reflects this niche (at least as a lower bound: there might be more 'written', but all these MUST be addressed: or it would already be dead.)

The Bio-Sphere is all about PRACTICAL Balance. The question is a simple one:

why would Evolution 'create' such a Balance? Mmmm? Why bother? Balanced complexity is not a nice place to be at: for the simple reason that maintaining STABILITY becomes a nightmarishly difficult endeavour. Obviously. Yet the Scientists want everyone to "just believe in Evolution!" (Talk about irony.)

The REASON for existence of the Grand Pattern, the STP, WHATEVER its cause may ultimately be, is almost certainly chained to the BALANCE/ STABILITY of the Bio-Sphere. The Bio-Sphere would not be Balanced/ Stable without every specie "fitting-in" with every other specie. Such a system, left to run by itself, would REQUIRE that every specie be 'adapted' to all others: otherwise random contact would result in fatal instability. The STP would be the manifestation of this reality on the genetic level. In other words, the STP would be NECESSARY. (In fact, if it could be shown that STP exists between species that are near-certain to have had no contact with each other, Evolution would be counter-indicated: the ADDITIONAL cycle-burden for such 'sequentially-chained'/ 'indirect' specie-'fitting' would be completely insane.)

The general level of FEEDBACK required for this PERVASIVE Balance (even ignoring all additional complications) would be... off the charts. Unimaginable. The cycle-burden for achieving it all would be horrific: truly impossible to achieve. But when it comes to their faith, the Scientists would never be moved by mere facts and logic and reason.

Keep in mind that EVERY time some specie 'evolved' in the past, those in direct contact with it would also be pressured to 'counter-evolve'. And this effect would have spread out like ripples in a pond... and back again... and out again... etc. etc. Where each and every change would OPPOSE the Balance/ Stability.

*) Again, it would take little work on the side of Evolution to completely destroy the Balance, but you MUST completely ignore that: you MUST surrender your little Mind to Science! Remember that Science Loves You! Beware the evil God-religions! Science is SO much better! Science alone has Ultimate Truth! Honest!

*) It is VERY unclear how 'nature' can have such extreme variations in breeding-cycles among different species and STILL remain stable in the face of Evolution: that it does so would rather seem to counter-indicate Evolution, directly.

*) An interesting question arises: does a given specie fit into a niche, or do the niches determine the DNA of the species? Given the pervasiveness of the Balance, the second factor seems to be the dominant. But that hardly makes sense in terms of Evolution, now does it. But then, what does.

Yawn. So the problem the average Stupid has with Scientists, early in the morning, in the afternoon, and even late in the evening, is this:

Question : "Where is the Presented Proof? Of ANYTHING."

Answer: "Well, nowhere. But we are Scientists, you MUST BeLiEvE in us! WE are the Pure Angels, the Perfected Paragons, of this, our New Earth-Home!"

Response: "Er... How about I DON'T do that. Um. I have to run away now."

And the Scientists call me a Stupid FANATIC.

=- (3-9: Anti-Magic Chasm #9, Time and Time Again)

There are two parts to this section: I'm not too confident on the math of the second one, so take care when reading it. The issue at hand here is the never-ending duplicity of the Scientists.

So, to kick it off:

(TalkOrigins:)

"... Observed RATES of evolutionary change in modern populations must be greater than or equal to RATES observed in the fossil record.

... In 1983, Phillip Gingerich published a famous study analyzing 512 different observed RATES of evolution (Gingerich 1983). The study centered on RATES observed from three classes of data: (1) LAB EXPERIMENTS, (2) HISTORICAL COLONIZATION EVENTS, and (3) the FOSSIL RECORD.

... A useful measure of evolutionary RATE is the darwin, which is defined as a change in an organism's character by a factor of e per million years (where e is the base of natural log). The average RATE observed in the FOSSIL RECORD was 0.6 darwins; the fastest RATE was 32 darwins. The latter is the most important number for comparison; RATES of evolution observed in modern populations should be equal to or greater than this RATE.

... The average RATE of evolution observed in HISTORICAL COLONIZATION EVENTS in the wild was 370 darwins—over 10 times the required minimum RATE. In fact, the fastest RATE found in colonization events was 80,000 darwins, or 2500 times the required RATE. Observed RATES of evolution in LAB EXPERIMENTS are even more impressive, averaging 60,000 darwins and as high as 200,000 darwins (or over 6000 times the required RATE).

... .. This "unique and staggering" acceleration in evolutionary RATE was only 7 darwins (Williams 1992, p. 132). This RATE converts to a minuscule 0.02% increase per generation, at most. For comparison, the fastest RATE observed in the fossil record in the Gingerich study was 37 darwins over one thousand years, and this corresponds to, at most, a 0.06% change per generation."

1983... why that is like equivalent to a million years ago, only not. First of all, the Science above runs off of cladistics... which is actually running off ENS... all the while PRETENDING to be the Stupid version of Evolution. Oh, and a small army of Evolution-is-true assumptions are also employed. Secondly, take note of the 0.02% and 0.06% "changes" PER GENERATION.

There is a website, www.evolutionfairytale.com, that has a spiel on how DNA is decaying over time. I severely dislike the people there, but feel free to go there and experience being falsely accused by a TRUE religious idiot: one thing that is NOT forgivable in a self-declared 'Christian' site is compromise with the truth. But that is something those bastards will have to learn the hard way.

Anyway. In short, there are much better examples of similar-type to what follows. Ok, I've called enough attention to the shortcomings, so let's party on.

Note that trying to compare the results of the garbage-Science Fossil-record with the empirical genetic mutation rates (which follows next), makes no sense whatsoever. It's like comparing strawberries with moon-rocks. Nevertheless, the Scientists hold that somewhere inside that ocean of MNS activity, Stupid Evolution also lurks...

(TalkOrigins:) Space restraints keep me from properly quoting, so instead I'll try and summarize:

*) Cancer research has determined the rate of genetic mutation at about 1.8×10^{-9} per site per generation. Human DNA has about 6.34×10^9 base pairs. So there are about ~ 3.5 DNA changes per generation. Actually the number should be a bit higher to allow for other processes. Let's pick 5 DNA changes per generation out of the air.

*) The percentage value is therefore about: $5 / (6.34 \times 10^9) = 0.8 \times 10^{-9} = 0.000,000,000,8 = 0.000,000,08 \%$ per generation for humans beings.

*) Recall the difference between: "N over M", and "FC over M" in Chasm #4? The teensy-tiny-sized value given above is "N over M", while the 0.02% and 0.06% values are of the type of "FC over M." So the real situation is much, much, much worse... ALSO: FC requires the MegaBrain -- i.e. -multiple- breeding-CYCLES...)

*) Lots of, shall we say, "hurdles" stand between these two types of values: as mentioned in various places throughout this essay. Which makes it all worse.

-) So! This is like having your boat hit by a capital-ship-killing torpedo, and having a Scientist insist that a band-aid can plug the hole. Probably not exactly to scale, but who knows... it would also depend if you look at the area, or the individual dimensions, of a band-aid. (Serious concerns for a serious problem!)

-) One could put in a whole lot more detail here, but why bother. What can be more clear than trying to do work on a 0.02% roof, using a $0.08 \times (10^{-6})\%$ scaffolding. IF these values are correct, and I mean even vaguely (i.e. ignoring EVERY hurdle) correct; then Evolution HAS BEEN PROVEN TO BE COMPLETELY COUNTER-INDICATED. Period.

Why is this argument so hard to make? Surely the Honest Scientists do a better job somewhere?

Well, the REAL problem is that Stupid Evolution has NEVER been observed, either in the lab or outside. Which makes it IMPOSSIBLE to compare the rate values empirically... well, that is not really correct: the observed rate of Stupid Evolution occurring is ZERO, while the activity rate of entropy is (roughly) at about $0.08 \times (10^{-6})\%$ per generation in humans... remember: Y - X ?

On the one hand I would dearly like to see the Scientists try and explain-away the above. But on the other hand, I have had enough of their ceaseless bullsh@tting to last me several lifetimes. If just one more God-damned nerd starts in on me with a condescending little smile, words with extra helpings of syllables, lies and yet more omissions, I might not be able to help myself.

=====

===== (A Question Of Magic, Part 4)

= (4.1: Miscellaneous)

Part 4 is all about those damned nerd-hippies, and other assorted murderers. It is hoped that you will understand them all better after reading it through.

=- (4-1.1: Why Simulations Are Magical)

This point is best explained directly: do evil wizards, dragons and magical fairies exist? Well, simulations for them exist, so I guess they DO exist! Wow!

If you are a Scientist, then there is a 'possibility' that Evolution is real: and as any Scientist worth the 666 on his forehead knows, calling something 'possible' is only a little bit different from calling it 'probable'. Why the two words sound almost identical! So they MUST mean almost the exact same thing! Tada! Isn't the practice of Real Science like SO COOL!

Just because somebody is fanatical about World of Warcraft does NOT make it all real... well, unless you have the finely trained mind of a Scientist...

How can a given Scientist not KNOW that they are creating Virtual Worlds when writing/ creating Evolution simulations? Good point! They DO know...

=- (4-1.2: Parallel Evolution)

A nifty sounding-idea is 'Parallel Evolution'. It is used as an anti-complexity concept in discussions on how improbable Evolution is.

In a nutshell it says that: After each minor-ish 'good' change to a gene/ allele, its gene-frequency first goes up; once there are many copies of it around, it can now 'process' many different kinds of new changes all at once. Rinse and repeat.

First. This is just an idea: if this process is even feasible in Reality is unknown.

Secondly. What is the difference between conventional Evolution and Parallel Evolution? NONE... in fact, it is a pretty good explanation of Evolution!

Q: Since this is such a good 'explanation', why is this concept not in general use?

A: For one very simple reason: it logically enhances the strength of the following: (Fossil Tree - Stasis & Jumps): "... the classical objection to Evolution, which predicts ever changing, incrementally different nodes..."

The Scientists are VERY careful with what propaganda they use, and when, and how often, and against whom... they have to be.

=- (4-1.3: The Core-Dialectic - i.e. How To Lie In An Extremely Effective Manner)

The Hegellian Dialectic is a well-known methodology. It forms the heart of the Chinese brainwashing-programs. It is quite interesting to read up on - there are some very good articles on "Crossroad.to": I really recommend reading them.

Central to the Dialectic is a certain sub-process - which is to be discussed here.

Simply, the core-dialectic (CD) is a specific way to tell lies. What makes it different, is that it works off the way the human brain tends to process information, in order to bypass/ fool the truth/correctness-checking aspects. (The

CD is not new: politicians and other con-men throughout the ages have all naturally, instinctively, used the dialectic. This entire essay is a testament to it!

So. How do you short-circuit the lie-detection functions of a human mind?

*) It takes concentration, REAL concentration, (and lot of thinking-work), to examine a SINGLE given fact for 'correctness.'

*) It takes concentration, REAL concentration, (and lot of thinking-work), to examine a SINGLE given logic/reason-step for 'correctness.'

*) So. Combine several facts, and several logic/reason steps. (The more of each, the better.) So a whole lot of rather hard thinking-work lies before you... or not. Now. If your IQ is high enough, (AND/OR if you have a natural knack/ skill for doing it), you can tweak one or more of the facts. And/Or tweak one or more of the logic-steps. And COMPLETELY alter the "-rational-" outcome!

*) ...AND the rapid-checking mechanisms of the mind doesn't see it. MAGIC!

--> Example 1: Perhaps the most common dialectic in the Western world is the pro-abortion 'argument.' SIMPLY have the Scientists call an unborn baby a 'fetus.' WHICH turns 'killing' into 'removal.' WHICH makes partial-birth abortion or live-birth abortion Ok. Snap! Just like that. (Very impressive!)

--> Example 2: As noted before, re-naming 'genetic damage' as 'genetic mutation.' Damage has to be addressed (via replacement or repair), while Mutation makes Awesome Magical Super-Heroes. (Again, very impressive!)

-- (4-1.4: Some humour from TalkOrigins)

*) "In fact, evolution can be PRECISELY defined as any change in the frequency of alleles within a gene pool from one generation to the next." (That's SO nice!)

"These definitions are simply wrong (all the dictionaries). Unfortunately it is common for non-scientists to enter into a discussion about evolution with such a definition in mind." (Aw, 'dem 'ol dumb hicks is a-talkin' 'bout complexy-like stuff.)

*) "What is the scientific method? This is a complex and contentious question, and the field of inquiry known as the philosophy of science is committed to illuminating the nature of the scientific method." (Consider it ILLUMINATED!)

"Though science formally cannot establish absolute truth, it can provide overwhelming evidence in favor of certain ideas. OFTEN these ideas are quite unobvious, and USUALLY they clash with common sense." (Sir! Mind... OFF!)

"The PRIMARY function of science is to demonstrate THE EXISTENCE of phenomena that cannot be OBSERVED directly." (How perfectly convenient!)

*) "No alternate explanations compete SCIENTIFICALLY with common descent, primarily for four main reasons: (1) so many of the predictions of common descent have been confirmed from independent areas of science, (2) no significant contradictory evidence has yet been found, (3) competing possibilities have been contradicted by enormous amounts of scientific data, and (4) many other explanations are untestable, though they may be trivially consistent with biological data." (Especially funny are (2) and (3). But (4) is the REAL kicker.)

*) And then the funniest of them all: "Many people have asked how to cite this work in formal research papers and academic articles." (Ow! Ow! My tummy!)

- =- (4-2: The Evil That Men Do)
- =- (4-2.1: The Rationality of Evil)

By itself this topic has NOTHING to do with God, the KJV Bible, or anything like that. However, let's start there anyway; since it certainly ends there.

- ***) What discriminates a soul-filthy hippie-Scientist from a converted trailer-trash whore? Truth. Reason. Specifically, giving a damn about both.
- *) Choosing reason is (it turns out) the second most significant choice a human being can make.
- *) Choose it, pursue, seek to perfect it ceaselessly, and the result WILL be the KJV Biblical Lord. (Or rather, the other way around... He cometh a knockin'.)
- *) Otherwise you messed-up somewhere.

Here is what exists, what is real:

- *) God is accessible as a kind of omnipresent telepath.
- *) In a fuzzy kind of way.
- *) BUT. Go looking for God, and devils will ALSO start playing in the sandbox.
- *) ...and devils REALLY screw up playing in the sandbox.
- *) You yourself are also a negative element in this: not fooling yourself becomes a cottage industry.
-) Dealing with all this requires that you be as rational as possible. The more you practice rationality, the more "rationality will practice YOU." What this means is that you no longer 'act' from the same 'core' as before.

- *) The above is empirically verifiable. But is rarely followed. For this reason, most who consider themselves 'Christian', are quite mistaken. Following the above road is not optional... otherwise you WILL mess up somewhere: devils have a remarkably wide scope of influence, and they will make you fail, if they can.
- *) It is not enough to simply go forth and blindly check if -SOME- kind of supernatural 'God' exists. EXACTLY as with the classical scientific method, you have to: Alpha: Positively Test; Beta: Destructively Test; and Gamma: Re-Examine. In other words, you have to error-check; correct; Rinse and Repeat...

- ***) Call them the Lawless, or Hedonists, or Atheists, or liberals, or hippies, or whatever. They are all the same thing: Irrational.
- *) Psychology exists to refute all the above; on an individual level. Sociology exists to manage that refutation; on a societal level. That which demands the refutation is Lawlessness.
- *) "Are religious people truly so weak, so blind, so stupid, that they cannot grasp that they are victims of their own minds?" This is the single, core, psychological crux-'truth' of Atheism - without it, Atheism cannot be PRACTICED. It is the Wall of Moronic Denial. (WMD;)
- *) As documented throughout this essay, Atheists are remarkably dishonest. Manipulative. Liars. Most people would call their actions 'evil.' Their condition is an inevitable result of their profound surrender to a perceived, but non-existent,

weakness. Atheists refuse to accept that their minds might actually work: this single point explains a great deal about them.

None of this is particularly difficult to understand.

Ok. So why is it Rational to be Evil? Simply: Why not?

You can be weak, and chose not to control (for example) your own empathy: then the pain of others will 'hurt' you as well. Otherwise their pain might be amusing, irrelevant, pleasurable, or just annoying.

You can be weak, and chose to be irrationally afraid of situations where you are fairly confident the various possible outcomes: not committing rape when you both want to, and could get away with it, is a good example of this.

Why could normal, 'good' Germans work in the death-camps? They were never 'good.' Similarly, even 'good person' soldiers will steal, and rape children.

If you chose to be rational, properly, then ultimately Evil follows directly. This is undeniable. This is why devils are DEVILS. And though they DENY it, THIS is WHY Scientists/ Atheists/ whatever are such foul liars, deceivers, manipulators.

Individuals differ in regards to wants, desires, feelings, thoughts, etc. etc.

Because of that, people are 'naturally' evil in different ways.

Of course, the concept of evil does exist: what is 'bad' for you is evil. Similar with 'good.' Selflessness is irrational. So is kindness, generosity, etc. etc. etc.

Aside from CHOOSING to be irrational, there are ZERO exceptions to this fact.

But TWO types of modifiers exist. One is externally applied 'policing.' Joining a group has many benefits, and for such groups to exist in practice, there are rules in place that limit acceptable behaviors. It can be a 'nice' group like a hippie-orgy-club, or a 'nasty' group like a prison gang. You are externally dominated.

The other is internally applied 'policing': should you become convinced that a God does exist, desire-to-avoid-negative-consequence(s) would dictate that you avoid ticking Him off. Hence you adopt, without any actually existent external supervision, limits on your behavior and even thoughts. You are self-controlled.

Atheists make a big deal out of following God out of 'fear.' Oh the horror! Why do MOST people not run around murdering and raping? Fear of the police...

One cannot really call the Atheists stupid, because purposefully suspending the use of your mind is something else. The Bible names it thus: Foolishness.

What one CAN however say is this: Atheists are quite aware of their acts - they ARE liars. They ARE deceivers. What they are not, in general, is stupid.

Last item: Q: What is Biblical 'good'?

A: Righteousness = Do & Be what is RIGHT. (Perhaps, sometimes: 'honor.')

These are types of issue that being an adult does not help you with all that much. People do not reason like this, in general, and as such you are no better off than an inexperienced child. Deal with it.

=- (4-2: The Evil That Men Do - Continued)

Christians face TWO great mortal-enemies in this world; in MORTAL combat:

*) The Lawless (Atheists, communists, whatever) are proceeding in their attacks on Christianity via the destruction of its core theologies. Evolution is only one battle in this war. Eventually they shall seek to murder all KJV-type Christians.

*) In times past, no other group has murdered, raped, enslaved & robbed Christians more than the Muslims. This is a CLEAR FACT. There can NEVER be anything but full-blown war between Islam and all Christians: as per the orders given by THEIR Prophet Mohammad - carved in stone in THEIR Koran.

=- (4-2.2: The Larger Context - Know thy enemy - Capitalism vs Communism)

Only a complete FOOL holds hands with his mortal enemies.

I recommend reading "The Irrational Atheist" by Vox Day. (Free online!)

In the ideal, Capitalism is to be a Meritocracy (work & ability): minimal government - with greatly limited powers; an independent judicial-justice system - with a focus on the individual, NOT the group. Etc. Etc.

Politics is for the birds: there is NOT supposed to be much of a focus on it.

Innovations (sci-tech/ engineering), which do cause disruptions, are welcomed.

Old-school science is the norm - politics especially must have NO part of it.

Capitalism can ONLY work if the population trying to practice it is KJV-Christian.

Nothing else is really compatible with it. Why? In the main, because such

Christians are controlled via internal constraints: some of which are unique.

In the Ideal, Communism/ Socialism grants all equal access to everything: a

maximum government in every way; the judicial system serves as an arm of the government, and will have its focus on the group - actual justice does not exist.

Political/ ideological activity is rewarded: working harder/ better is not rewarded.

Disruptions to the System are the height of 'badness,' and WILL be punished.

Correlation-type Science is the norm: Why? Politics can, and does, easily involve

itself. There is no better example of this than the garbage-Science of Evolution,

which exists to serve as an Ideological foundation stone for Atheism. Second to it is Psychology and Sociology: all these are utilized to CONTROL the masses.

Most 'religions' are incompatible with Communism: only Atheism is TRULY

compatible with it. Why? Because under Communism control is via

EXTERNALLY imposed constraints: THAT is the difference.

The irony here is deep: Which option has maximal Freedom? Ideal Communism CANNOT function: in practice the levels of anarchy become too great. Under the Chinese model, which DOES function, INTERNAL CONSTRAINTS are imposed via massive propaganda- & brainwashing-programs; and BRUTAL oversight.

So? Why is America dead? Give KJV-Bible Churches the power to name a

person (married 15+ years; employed in Private sector), via something like the

Westminster Confession of Faith, 'Accepted as a Christian.' Let such a person

have a vote. Voting must be secret. But this is all academic: it's too late.

=- (4-2: The Evil That Men Do)
=- (4-2.3: The Larger Context - Know thy enemy - Islam)
Only a complete FOOL holds hands with his mortal enemies.

As a start I would recommend reading Winston Churchill's famous quote on Islam (WWW.) JihadWatch and BareNakedIslam are good next stops (& more links.)
To understand Islam theologically, slog through The Prophet of Doom. (Free!)

The Official Opposition, to both Evolution & Islam, make the terrible mistake of "playing nice." ('Good manners', when leading to INSANITY, MUST be cast off.)
*) Evolutionists are LIARS. Without facing that FACT, it is NOT possible to understand them, it is NOT possible to formulate actions addressing them.
*) To understand Islam, to PROPERLY grasp the genius of Muhammad The Desert PIRATE-King, it must be realized that Islam captures, like flies in amber, CRIMINALS. Almost the ENTIRE criminal element of an Islam-infected society, is turned towards the self-policing/ maintenance/ rule of Islam, AND its expansion.

Why become a Muslim (a.k.a. Mohammad's Land Pirates)? (Type A):

*) Money: In Civil- and Criminal-Courts, facing non-Muslims, your WORD is enough to exonerate you of ANY accusations of theft, violence, rape, etc. Wow!
*) Sex 1. You are allowed 4 'wives'; of ANY age. Their entire lives are in your hands... so enjoy! Rape is so difficult to prove, that it is a cottage industry. Yeah!!
*) Sex 2: Female Genital Mutilation. Something like 32 of the top 35 FGM countries in the world are Islamic. The other 3 have strong Muslim populations. Nothing is so much fun as sticking it to a submissive woman/ little girl, and watching her moan in pain. Every. Single. Time. If THAT doesn't make you hard:
*) Violence. Same as with Money. BUT with the "infidels": you get to slit people's throats, cut off their heads, burn them alive, rip/ blow them to pieces, cut off limbs, hang queers... men, women, children: ALL is FULLY justified under Islam.
*) The Religion of the God of CRIME: Die while doing the above, and you go to Heaven where you will be Master of 72 female slaves FOREVER! Awesome!!!
A Religion Suitable for MORONS: It is EASY to be a Muslim! Islam is essentially a set of mechanical exercises. In fact, using your mind is EVIL! SUPER-COOL!!!!

Why NOT become a Muslim? (Type A):

*) No alcohol or drugs. (To atone give alms to the poor: drinking is so expensive!)
*) NO raping boy-children! Aw damn!! Girl babies are just fine however (just more alms!) Raping a male prisoner-of-The-war is Ok, as long as neither of you enjoy it... Female prisoners-of-The-war of course EXIST to be enjoyed, so don't worry.

Why become a Muslim? (Type B):

*) You are a man, and are deeply terrified of the Type A Muslims. A live coward.
*) You are woman, and have ZERO say in the matter: such is the life of a slave.

And the "moderates" in the West? Simply, there are 'degrees' of Type A...
Do not Wonder-Why Islam spreads in prisons & primitive tribes in Africa: Know.

=- (4-2: The Evil That Men Do)

=- (4-2.4.1: The Larger Context - Face-To-Face - Confrontation)

FIRST OF ALL: You should NOT be face-to-face with the Scientists. If you are, you must have somehow been forced into the situation: so leave. If you cannot leave, then leave anyway. I am NOT kidding.

SECOND: You are going to lose. (Muslims are different - much easier to oppose their nonsense (just keep on hammering at the given IMPORTANT issue: do NOT deviate... and they fall), BUT they will gladly beat you up or kill you.)

Consider devils. They attack you as much as they -CAN-; at some given moment (as constrained by the Living God.) As per Rebecca Brown (first two books are really good), devils will cast their whisper-thoughts & force-nets: all sorts of nonsense as to WHY their level of attack, then, is what it is. Lies & Misdirection. Their whispers are COMPLETE nonsense. The level of attack is MOSTLY based on what you are doing with the Lord in that time, and what He wants to occur, and therefore LETS them do: secondary are whether CLEAN Christians are helping/ praying for you or not, AND also importantly how much prayer-type stuff you are doing ON YOUR OWN. Thirdly how CLEAN (simply: how correct) you are. ('Clean' Christians are VERY rare: (the new bibles, and the consequent new "Holy Spirit", has obliterated the Protestant 'Christian' church. Then there are lots of unknowns. And several other problems as well. And the mistakes made here.) IN A SIMILAR MANNER, Scientists care NOTHING about a given argument in a 'debate': THEY HAVE THEIR PURPOSES, and -INDIVIDUAL- 'arguments' ARE USED -solely- AS 'CHANNELS'/ 'CARRIER-MEDIUMS' TO CONVEY/ EXECUTE THOSE PURPOSES. So ask yourself why you are arguing something with someone who is NOT ever going to move beyond pretend-response?! So leave!

Rationally, it makes no sense to talk to Scientists, since they do not WANT to reason: their SOLE intent is to mind-rape you into having approved thought(s). If you can, pretty please, understand this ONE point, and ALWAYS keep in DIRECTLY foremost in your mind when dealing with them; you should drastically limit the amount of damage they can inflict on you (i.e. lies they have successfully planted into your head.)

MAKE NO MISTAKE: They WILL win: talk with one of them long enough, and you WILL be corrupted in SOME way. Victory. They have decades upon decades (if not more) of accumulated experience/ specific crafted 'arguments'/ techniques/ to draw on: ALL of it crafted by some of the most intelligent people in the world. Oh. And DEVILS will sit outside of such encounters and work to destroy your mind, and simultaneously uplift theirs. (Some of the most nifty moments ever are when prayer kicks in (see Daniel), and suddenly the little Scientists' "mind" just shuts down - no devils, no "creativity": the idiot becomes, in an instant, an idiot.)

Point: You try and play with the Well-Trained Children of devils, and their parents WILL be around to join in the fun. Unless you are SPECIFICALLY told to, DON'T.

=- (4-2.4.2: The Larger Context - Face-To-Face - Debate)

This section can be completely nullified by a given Scientist: all he/she has to do is read through it, and use the techniques that remain... and there are MANY... However. ALL the techniques run off ONE single thing: the Core Dialectic. But that does not help all that much: it takes, in my opinion, intervention from the Holy Spirit to SEE through CD's. My empirical justification for this position is that there are very many highly intelligent proper-scientists who CANNOT see through the OBVIOUS garbage that is Evolution: Ask: WHY? And: See my point?

So here is a rough-and-ready summary of some techniques the Scientists use:

--> The ultimate goal of debate is to hijack the cognitive abilities of the audience. I.e. DO THEIR THINKING FOR THEM. (Secondly, be ABSTRACT: avoid reality.)

*) Every rule is subject to creative change or reversal - the debater has no limits to what he may choose to do, or how, or anything. Debate is ART.

*) Infect literally EVERYTHING with CD's: barring genius-level IQ, this makes it impossible to PRACTICALLY counter (takes an essay!) -EACH- 'argument.'

*) To lie/ deceive convincingly is the greatest ability in the art of debating.

*) Get the audience to look past the irrefutable rationality of an opponents arguments, get them to disregard it: get them to NOT reason... and YOU WIN.

*) Never, ever, concede the slightest point of reason. (Important for next point.)

*) Win the debate, not the actual arguments, which are meaningless. Preventing the audience from EVER reasoning (EFFECTIVELY/ correctly/ logically/ rationally) is the single most important & practical goal to strive for in a debate.

*) Pre-crafted & well-designed 'arguments' are extremely effective tools.

*) Confusion upon the enemy! (dream up logical-SOUNDING 'arguments', but which are very hard to 'unpack' to the level of step-by-step rationality: i.e. CD's.)

*) Confuse the issue enough, and then insist on a specific (apparently 'clear') interpretation(s): people will strongly tend to follow/ 'absorb' such. I.e. "Trust me."

*) Overload reasoning: weave together several multi-syllable arguments at once. Combined with flair & pizzazz, a competent debater can create 'mental pictures'/ correlations that are quite intractable to fact-based reason and logic: fact-based logic and reason can ONLY be applied to facts, logic and reason...

*) Overload responses: ask a whole bunch of questions all at once (during your turn of the debate.) The practical limits on debates make replying to this sort of thing impractical. If the audience is unaware of this, the opponent looks stupid.

*) Overload opponent: try to force the opponent to have to constantly 'define' the DETAIL of things, and the like, on BOTH sides. In essence, the opponent carries the core burden of reason for BOTH sides: this is a very hard (& silly) thing to do.

=====

A Question Of Magic

=====

===== (Conclusion To An Anti-Evolution Essay)

At the beginning of this essay the following was said:

Nothing so typifies the typical 'Defender' of Evolution as this: "liar."

Evolutionists are self-knowing liars. EVERYTHING noted in this essay, they already know. Everything. Each of the slightly bigger fish: they have been confronted by it all. When you reach the end, or as you read, remember, and consider just how very selectively you have been 'educated', and by whom.

Something else typifies the 'Defenders' of Evolutionist, namely this: "mindless."

In the time of Darwin, it was thought that cell-walls were somewhat like very small oil-droplets. Relatively easy to bring into existence. Since then we have learned that cell-walls are extremely complex: built-up using an array of very complex, very SPECIFIC, organic molecules, in a VERY complex, multi-functional structure.

Yet. In the face of this MASSIVE increase in the KNOWN Complexity Of Life, the response of the Scientists has been to paste a superior little smile onto their faces, and "stand in awe" of the "hereto unimagined achievements of Evolution."

Oh, and "Science is providing new and exiting proofs of Evolution every single day! Hooray!" (Paraphrased times-2.)

The new Scientists are Mindless Liars.

Evolution's "awesome victories" over "practical complexities" exist only as a massive Public Relations program. You may ask how this can be. The answer is simply that most University-/ College-brainwashed people have a VERY heavy personal emotional investment in the Truth of Evolution. Without "Evolution", their atheist-based world-views would crack, and then self-destruct. OuchY.

It is nothing more than that. They are cowards. Small, tiny, pretend-people.

I hope this essay was sufficient to bring THIS point across:

*) 'Science' was never something that you were supposed to 'believe' in: it is simply a TOOL, nothing more. Humans ARE Reasoners, NOT Science-ers.

*) The suspension of The Unspoken Purpose of science has, in practice, had the effect that a 'belief' in 'Science' has REPLACED the PRACTICE of Reason. It seems that, in practice, either science is a tool used to aid reason; or else 'Science'-'opinions' is used to supersede reason - which is literal insanity.

=====

G.K. Chesterton: "The first effect of not believing in God is to BELIEVE in anything."

Well, hot damn! That sure does ring true, now, does it not?

=====