


The Endosymbiotic Theory Of Evolution

Yet Another Vain Attempt To Deny Intelligent Design

By Grasping At Straws To Try To Explain Away God And Scientific Creationism



Evolutionists continue to search for evidence of their ridiculous theories, looking under every rock possible, even when the evidence against their ever evolving theories is ever growing. One of their latest evolutionary theories is called the “endosymbiotic theory” of evolution. This latest theory claims that evidence exists for evolution in single celled organisms that have a symbiotic (i.e. interdependent) relationship with one another. However, a major flaw in their argument is an unfounded assumption that these symbiotic relationships DEVELOPED over time, rather than existed since the beginning of “creation”. The creationist (intelligent design) view is that these symbiotic relationships were DESIGNED INTO the organisms, versus magically appearing later on as these evolutionists want to believe.

Since evolutionists typically deny the possibility of a Creator and a corresponding Creation of that Creator, they have to MAKE ASSUMPTIONS, assumptions that SOMETHING HAPPENED, something changed, something mutated, something EVOLVED (meaning, the existence of the theory presupposes the truth of the theory). So... what is often referred to as proving the theory is really only an attempt to “justify” the theory in one particular case, with one particular organism or one particular set of organisms. We see that here in a quote from an article about this Endosymbiotic Theory:

*“Other species, not being able to photosynthesis sugars or break them down through oxidative phosphorylation, decreased in abundance **until they developed a novel adaptation** of their own.” [1]*

The problem with the Endosymbiotic Theory and with any theory of evolution is that there are NO evolutionary theories based upon changes or adaptations OBSERVED OVER TIME, simply because you would have had to observe the

entire evolutionary process prior to (and up to) what is ONLY observable today. Also, any similarities between living organisms - like bacteria AND chloroplasts reacting similarly or identically to antibiotics - is to be expected, since God, the Programmer, used interrelated materials and designs in His creation of all living things. For example, all mammals have red blood with many similar or even identical components.

Part of the explanation of the endosymbiotic theory of evolution relies on EVOLUTION... so it is a theory of the evolution of a specific organism being based upon the ASSUMPTION that prior living things EVOLVED into the current organisms whose origins are being explained. That cannot be called science. Its simply speculation built upon other speculations.

Not only that, these evolutionary theories (or sub-theories) tend to VASTLY OVERSIMPLIFY the organisms they are trying to explain the evolution of - overlooking MOUNTAINS of highly complex design features that no amount of "random chance" could ever hope to produce... THERE ARE NO INSTRUCTIONS FOR MAKING LEAPS OF CHANGE (of the kind that evolutionists are trying to explain) ENCODED WITHIN THE DNA OF LIVING CREATURES... Living organisms cannot and do not replicate into anything additionally complex, containing addition genetic material ... Therefore, the WHOLE CONCEPT of some mysterious "process" called evolution is based upon false premises, events that have NEVER been observed ANYWHERE on the entire planet, namely, some creature with such and such a DNA code reproducing into a creature with a more complex DNA code. So the entire field of evolutionary "science" is just dishonest. It's fraud science or non-science or NONSENSE.

The whole purpose of DNA is to PREVENT evolution... by that I mean, to prevent things from going haywire, and to ENSURE that living organisms replicate PROPERLY into what God designed them to REPLICATE into, NOTHING different. And by the way, damage to DNA during the replication process is not evolution. In mammals it is called BIRTH DEFECTS. In plants it is called mutations, typically harmful, often preventing further replication/germination/fertility. Even if a mutation is beneficial, the mutation never results in MORE COMPLEX DNA. "Parts is parts" as they say. You can't add 2 plus 2 and get 5, no matter how many different calculators you use. —
RM Kane

Creationist Ken Ham Destroys Theory Of Evolution In Debate With Bill Nye

REFERENCES:

1. <https://biologydictionary.net/endosymbiotic-theory/>

