

Are you an evolutionist or a creationist?

The answer to that question determines whether or not you believe much of what is being told to the world's population... yes, the world's population... not the US population, neither the North American nor European nor African... but the world's. If you get nothing else out of this brief essay, get that.

When we were kids, cruel, and uncaring as kids are wont to be, we had myriad derogatory terms for people we didn't like... heck, frequently even for one another! One of the favorites *terms* in my circle was, "mutant". Most of us were "B" horror movie fans, and the presence of mutants was a regular and recurring theme in many of them in the 50's and 60's, the early years of the Space Age. In those days when science and scientific discovery was everything, that the "bad guy" or the "monster" in the movie was often a mutant was paradoxically, a "normal" thing! The mutant was a being that had mutated/morphed/changed from a normal, healthy example of some species – usually man but not necessarily – into something "other". But here was the thing about the movie mutant.

The film makers... simply folks like us but in another line of work, always had to balance and reconcile what they would take from "real" science, and what they would take from "theoretical" science. There was the story-teller's intuition among film makers that some semblance of credibility was necessary to keep the audience's interest and attention. Even though the Happy Days series hadn't even been conceived yet, they knew what it meant to "jump the shark".

For example, real science understood that mutations in any and every species were always harmful, negative, backward if you will. Mutations never benefit nor enhance any living species. At the same time, "modern man" was dealing with a growing adherence to something that not only disqualified "real science", but also mitigated and even eliminated dependence, need or even recognition of a deity; asserting that humans were the masters of their own destiny and could/would "chart their own course" through science and technology. The thinking is that there is no longer any need for an outside, transcendent or "superior" source for the things we know and experience, namely, God. This is where we get the idea of modernism and pre-modernism, by which we are able to define our current state of post-modernism. Modern man put away those quaint *deistic* ideas which we now label pre-modern.

One of those things to which *modern man* was adhering, and to which post-modern man is still clinging, is evolutionary theory.

In those days evolutionary theory was taking a front and center position on the world stage. Don't forget, even though it seems like a million years ago, when I was a kid in the 1950's the oil industry as we now know it was only a few decades old! It was still relatively new, and still being rolled out in the world. I remember when (and I had one until just a few years ago!) Sinclair Oil gas stations were giving out green, soap dinosaurs! These friendly little brontosaurus answered the question for the inquiring mind "Where did all this oil come from". In giving out these charming and friendly creatures, the industry had at once answered the other question about oil, "And how long will it last?". These same

little, soap dinosaurs answered it all; oil and its associated products were sold as finite commodities, the product of all those bygone “species”.

The oil industry, not in existence to be benevolent and provide for people, but to make profit for its owners, investors and stock holders and employees, found a way to combine ever-increasingly popular evolutionary theory, with a way to create scarcity *when necessary*. For any wondering why the creation of scarcity is important, one need only recall one's economics 101... scarcity of goods is what drives price; it's the “supply” side of the supply and demand equation. Automobiles, air travel, mass production, central heating in homes, advanced manufacturing, etc, all drove the demand side. Meanwhile the suppliers, the oil companies were not about to brag of any “endless” supplies. Between political wranglings over the “oil fields”, who owned them and had rights to them, and the need to be able to control supply from any and all sources regardless of ownership and access, the belief in “fossil fuels” was a perfect, and perfectly timely solution.

Millions and millions of generations of carbon based life forms had lived and died, and their final resting places had continually piled on top of each other and eventually broke down into... oil. That's where the idea of fossil fuels comes from, and it is that idea that is utterly dependent upon evolutionary theory, and vice versa.

Indeed, it is a fascinating study to look at the following things in conjunction with one another... the development of evolutionary theory, the development of the science and study of geology, theological “higher criticism”, the discovery and beginnings of mass production of oil, the development of uses and applications for oil... ALL happened within a few short decades toward the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. The thinking and beliefs about whence cometh the world's energy, for virtually ALL of it needs, rose out of those ideas, contemporary phenomena all, driven by oligarchs, captains of industry, academicians, theologians, politicians...

Rank and file humans had very little to do with any of it.

But back to the mutants...

ALL of the above is based on absolute adherence to the theory of evolution, which is based on the idea that mutations are positive, leading to the advancement and improvement of the fittest species. As the species “evolves”, it gets bigger, stronger, faster, more adaptive, more apt to survive adversity and the things that would threaten its existence. In addition to just being able to survive by being “the fittest”, the species would grow, morph, improve so significantly as to change into more and more advanced *and different* species, better *still* at being able to survive and ultimately becoming... us. This is the core underpinning of evolutionary theory, and it does not apply *merely* to the human species, nor to any other species in particular, but to *all living organisms whether plant or animal*. Remember, we all came from that single cell, which then (theoretically) differentiated into everything we now know in the world of living organisms... myriad generations of which have given us our fossil fuels. In order for evolution to work, and for us to have the opportunity to enjoy what it has left us, we must acknowledge positive mutation. That's how we all got here after all!

Hollywood, in the making of the pictures I and my friends loved so much, had a problem in reconciling these two ideas... the one scientific, that mutations are negative and detrimental to a species, and the other theoretical but immensely popular and “essential” to all that we know about our contemporary lives, that mutations are positive and beneficial to a species.

While we learned in science class that mutations are detrimental to any species, that second, theoretical idea posits that mutation is what is making us great and capable of all the technological advancement we're experiencing! It asserts that all the technological advancement we're experiencing is being fueled by all those fossils on whose shoulders we are standing... not just academically as we advance in our understanding and smarts, but in actuality in the means by which we fuel all of this *stuff*, including heating this movie theater, keeping the projector and lights on, and the plastic from which the film is made!

Mutants in the movies were usually an odd combination of damaged, disfigured, inferior things with some *extraordinary* ability that makes them in some respects superior to normal humans, but was unfortunately out of control and thus creating a threat to *ordinary* humans. We struggled with their humanity as, we created them either by some negligence or some experiment or other, and yet they threatened our continued existence and advancement. Troublesome things, they.

Nevertheless, we acknowledged them as things from which we could learn, advance and evolve. They were in that respect OK. We became accustomed to the mutant, and were glad to hear that in “reality”, mutations were actually good things. Just ask anyone and they'll tell you... we come here by evolutionary processes... read that, *positive mutations*. Oh, there are some who claim to believe that we came here by the Divine act of Creation, but even in the most religious circles, as many as 62% believe that humans arrived “here” by some evolutionary process¹. As many as half of them believe that that evolutionary process was superintended by God in a process frequently referred to as “theistic evolution”.

I find it quite fascinating, and perhaps telling, that a huge support for the idea of theistic evolution comes from the director of America's National Institute of Health, Dr. Frances Collins.

Collins, a professing evangelical, authored “The Language of God”, a book in which, Collins, the head of the human genome project which ultimately completed that mapping of the human genome, claims that while God did in fact “create” what we know, the means whereby He managed to arrive finally at this thing we now call *homo sapiens* or sentient man, was evolution. Collins believes he can substantiate this thinking with his genetic discoveries, thereby melding God with evolutionary theory and thinking.

Let me summarize the above paragraph... positive mutation, and scientific non-reality, is at the head of the National Institute of Health and its related entities.

In this environment, the world is now being told that the novel corona virus identified as Covid-19 or Sars-CoV2, has mutated into something that is more virulent and more contagious. So let's examine that

1 <https://www.christianpost.com/news/how-many-christians-believe-in-evolution-depends-on-how-you-ask.html>

in the light of evolutionary theory, an idea bought hook, line and sinker by the United States National Institute of Health.

A living organism wants to survive: any: all. Virus, over which science argues might or might not be a living thing, does in fact replicate as though it wants to survive. As a matter of fact, humans only survive when our immune systems are able to kill an invading virus, which is replicating itself, as if in order to survive. In order for the virus to stay “alive” or at least in existence, it must replicate in the human host in which it wants to live, reproduce and thrive. Eventually the virus will kill the host, or spread to another host, infecting it until some intervening force, be it a strong immune system or as is supposed an effective vaccine or drug, stops it: kills it. We can debate whether or not virus is a living thing, but in the meantime, we try to kill it. yeah...

These viruses, mutate: all of them: categorically. It is thought that virus, in an effort to survive immune systems and/or medical interventions, mutates into something more contagious, more virulent, and more resistant to being killed by immune systems and/or medical interventions, more able to survive attempts to kill it. This is not science. It is evolutionary theory and no mistake.

In science, actual, verifiable, virological science, virus, just like any other thing becomes damaged, weaker, less virulent when it mutates². Even if one believes virus to be something other than a living organism, if it exists, it is subject to the second Law of Thermodynamics which governs all that is, alive or not, that all things tend toward disorder. Consider rust and age in all of your possessions. Count how many automobiles you've owned, sold and/or scrapped, and how many pets you've buried. Consider the maintenance that needs to be done in the home in which you live. Look in the mirror, loved ones.

Bigger, faster, stronger, better as a result of mutation, is a fake story, including in the world of virus. That this line of thinking is consensus, means nothing to me, and should mean nothing to you. Truth is not arrived at by consensus.

Let's just let mutants be their charming, damaged big-screen presence, and leave it at that.

Pastor

2 “Gain of Function” virological study which was ostensibly outlawed in this country, but continued in American and Chinese labs through “back door” funding from the National Institute of Allergies and Infections Diseases, endeavors deliberately to “strengthen” virus and increase its “functionality”, attempting to counter the natural progression of this and all other things toward disorder.