

An Exam for Evolutionary Knowledge

Introduction: This exam will test what you have learned about the real origins of the whole universe including all galactic entities, the sun, the moon and the stars, the laws of science, gravity, all animal life, all microbial life, all substances including water, all life cycles, fire, heat, light, trees, flowers, bumble bees, spiders, birds, whales, food crops, all geologic features, mountains, valleys, streams, weather, clouds, snow, tornadoes, hurricanes, rain, sleet and mankind. In no instance are you to invoke the Christian God or his book of fables and fairytales or anything or anybody associated with that collective idiocy known as Biblical Christianity. This would be a direct violation of Church and State and will result in swift and severe legal action. Besides as the New York Slimes um Times so eloquently stated in the past, god is dead.

This exam will be broken down into two sections:

The three justifications of evolutionary theory (fact)

Evolution's Contributions to Mankind Past and Present

The three justifications of evolutionary theory (fact)

The first section consists of three parts corresponding to the three belief systems, (really established scientific proofs) of evolution. (We realize that having three different ideas for one theory that really isn't a theory because it's true is a real bummer... uh we mean on the surface we realize it is an apparent contradiction that there are three divergent hypothesis on the unquestioned reality of the theory (fact) of evolution because if it was a fact it wouldn't have three such disparate explanations. We are confident this seemingly insurmountable contradiction will be overcome as soon as non-biased, non-religious science gives us a definitive answer since the theory (fact) of evolution is true. You only need to choose one part and validly support your answer. The three theories (proofs of evolutionary reality) are:

1. The universe has been in existence for infinity
2. The Big Bang theory
3. Intelligent Design

1. The universe has been in existence for infinity.

Question: The most established scientific laws are the first and second laws of thermodynamics. According the first law, energy cannot be created or destroyed. According to the second law the energy of the universe is being used up in useable form and changing to non-useable states. Just about every credible secular scientist (there are Christian scientists but they're idiots) agrees with these laws. Actually, the second law transcends all science and explains many things including the natural process of decay that befalls all biological life and inanimate objects and just about everything on Mother Earth, uh we mean this planet. Evolution, which is true, states that life formed by synthesizing various chemicals, substances and pools of goop or who knows what therefore doing just the exact opposite. This could be a problem. Hmmm. Well don't worry about that now. Yes but of course if useful energy is decreasing this implies a beginning of the universe since the energy had to be at a maximum beginning state to decrease from. **Based on these two laws even a complete moron could simply know that of course something had to be responsible for this beginning state of maximum energy and the creation of energy itself.** But this would imply a godlike entity and

would violate separation of Church and State. Trying to address this therefore would be unacceptable and could even result in legal action. Therefore DO NOT attempt to address the First Law of Thermodynamics. Therefore the problem is this: Since evolution is true you must disprove the second law of thermodynamics. And since this option involves a belief in the infinite existence of the universe you have infinity to prove its validity.

If you're successful before the time constraint of infinity explain that if you come up with a solution how every scientific principle and law is not affected. In other words, if one of the two most known, universal and established laws of science can be discredited how does this not make every other scientific fact and law based on it collapse like a house of cards? How then can the theory of evolution, which is scientific and true, be reconciled in this situation? When you come up with an answer that explains this apparent shortcoming explain how your mechanism/theory of work mysteriously umm scientifically applied to inanimate objects for their improvement can be applied. For example, you might explain that if you park a Ford Festiva in the woods for 13.7 billion years (or less) years it will evolve into a Space Shuttle. Or you might try to explain how a jar of Smucker's Jelly can evolve into the animal of your choice with the application of your mysterious umm scientific pathway. Any similar scenario can be applied as needed to prove your theory (fact).

Alternative solution: If the universe has existed for infinity and the decay principal (Second Law of Thermodynamics) cannot be disproved explain how it is that you're taking this test right now. In other words, if infinity past exists as per evolutionary theory (fact) shouldn't you (and the entire universe for that matter) have decayed by now? Since evolution is true prove that you and the universe don't exist.

2. The Big Bang Theory

Question: This theory (fact) states that the entire universe started from an egg sized or smaller entity of dense and lifeless matter. This matter suddenly exploded and voila the universe and all its wonders. Uh we mean at some unknown point in the past, a super-dense chemically complex elliptical confine of random matter somewhere "out there" acquired an impulse of immeasurable force in an instantaneous immeasurably minute amount of time and the universe and every orderly life cycle emerged unscathed over the course of billions of years of self correcting, life producing, life supporting, life regenerating evolution. (You are not allowed to ask who created the super-dense elliptical confine of random matter or provided the energy for the "explosion" as this would imply a god like character and therefore be a violation of the separation of Church and State. Legal consequences may be realized.)

The first question has multiple parts:

Explain how a very large and disorderly outward burst of energy (ie, the Big Bang explosion) created isolated areas of counter-force such as gravity and concentrations of energy such as the sun.

Explain how this explosion accounts for the random stoppage of entities in space such as the sun and planets and how the latter rotate around the former in orderly fashion.

Explain how all organized life evolved on earth from such a random explosion. Prove how this does not contradict the Second Law of Thermodynamics that states existing order is becoming increasingly chaotic. Alternatively, disprove the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

The hydrologic cycle involves the evaporation of water into the atmosphere and return to the earth in the form of rain. Explain how this orderly cycle emerged from the random explosion.

Explain the origin of the universal solvent and most important substance on earth, water, from a random explosion.

Explain how all biological life figured how to be created, develop parallel sexes in many cases, grow, die, decay and fertilize the earth and be reborn or replanted from a random explosion.

Explain why evolution suddenly stopped at some point in the past. In other words, if evolution has always improved on itself why are people still getting diseases? Shouldn't we still be evolving to rid ourselves of imperfections such as disease? If evolution is ongoing, shouldn't we be forming new organs, limbs, eyes, brains, etc.? Explain.

Bumblebees can find their way back to their nests from a distance of several miles. Explain how this ability might have evolved over billions of years from a large random explosion.

The ozone layer is a self-correcting portion of the atmosphere that regenerates as needed based on the concept of chemical equilibrium. Explain how this layer and the entire atmosphere for that matter and the process of chemical equilibrium all emerged from a random explosion over the course of billions of years.

(When discussing the regenerative capacity of the ozone layer be careful not to offend those lunatic crackpots in the radical environmental movement...Uh we mean account for the feelings of our friends in that well intentioned yet boisterous conglomeration of groups who are ecological stewards of our beloved Mother Earth um planet who may be offended that one of their watershed "concerns" may be less than veracious. Therefore, they themselves would turn out to be complete idiots or worse have ulterior motives)

Proteins are made up mostly of RNA. Without it they essentially don't exist. However, proteins themselves are responsible for producing RNA. In other words, one of them had to be first. Explain how a random explosion via the initially lifeless theory (fact) of evolution overcomes this biological "chicken and egg" scenario.

Science has never been able to produce life from non-life nor by all accounts can it ever. Explain how the initially lifeless theory (fact) of evolution overcomes this problem while at the same time remaining "scientific".

This selection requires a laboratory test as well. Place an M80 firecracker inside an egg. Ignite and produce a Western omelet. If you are not successful on the first attempt repeat until an edible omelet is produced. Green peppers are not required in the final omelet and will count as extra credit. You have 13.7 billion years to complete the lab portion. If there is a cataclysmic massive meteor strike or Ice Age in the meantime you *cannot* re-start.

3. Intelligent Design

Congratulations! This is the simplest option in this exam. You have decided that the first two approaches to the theory (fact) of evolution cannot be reconciled with science in any way, shape or form which is kind of funny since the theory (fact) of evolution is not to be questioned as sound science. Sucks for them. Anyway, you have concluded that a powerful creator or intelligent designer must be responsible for the orderly universe. Contrary to popular belief, this **DOES NOT** necessitate a belief in those idiotic Christians, their stupid book of fairy tales or their dead god. In fact if you dare invoke their god you will be in direct violation of the separation of Church and State and will be legally prosecuted. This option involves only one multiple-choice question. As such this choice is the simplest of the three sections in part I.

Who is the intelligent designer of the universe (remember no god can be invoked here):

- Buddha (the human Siddhatta Gotma)
- DK (New Age heroine Ma Bailey's Tibetan "spiritual" guide, Djwahl Khul)
- Tenzin Gyatso (the fourteenth dalai-lama)
- E.T. (The Extra Terrestrial)
- The prophet Mohammed
- John Lennon
- Bozo the Clown
- Someone else

If you have chosen 'someone else' explain who this designer is. If you choose to state that it is a mystery then explain why such a powerful and intelligent creator would want to keep him/her/itself hidden and show no interest, love or compassion in his/her/its creation and its living beings.

II. Evolution's Contributions to Mankind

All three camps that prove the theory (fact) of evolution are to take this part of the exam. It will consist of more qualitative and non-scientific questions. Again, no reference whatsoever is to be made to those dumb Christians, their comic book of fairy tales and male dominance or their dead god. Such reference will result in expulsion and possible legal action as a violation of separation of church and state.

1. Besides directly contradicting the most established laws of science what has evolutionary theory contributed to the betterment of science or society in general?

(Actually if you answer that it is a great intellectual club to beat down those archaic and anachronistic christians, associated idiots and related morons you are allowed to mention their dead god and the bible since this is the best and for now only answer)

2. How did humans develop their apparent sense of morality? How did something like respect for other life develop from a lifeless source of goop, or an egg or from an intelligent designer who has no interest in his/her/its creation?

3. Based on 2. it is apparent that thought and therefore morality had to evolve in some kind of parallel fashion to life as it exists today. If this is in fact the case, where did it evolve from? Where is it evolving to?

4. If human thought and morality are evolving to the “betterment” of mankind shouldn’t “evil” have worked its way out by the twentieth century? In other words it’s okay that empires killed thousands in centuries past but how is it possible that someone like Adolf Hitler still existed in the 20th Century? Why are there still wars and cruelty today with our ever evolving human spirit and desire for “good” as per the Lucis Trust over at the UN?

(Don’t even think of basing this answer on that idiotic christian bible where it emphatically and simple mindedly states that some humans are just evil only because they themselves choose to be. This implies the principle of good and evil and in turn implies religion and in turn violates separation of Church and State subjecting you to legal action.)

5. But wait didn’t evolution suddenly stop biologically thousands of years ago? How is it that thought and morality are still evolving today? Have we achieved maximum morality without achieving biological perfection? Or vice versa? Explain.

6. If evolution is responsible for “morality” how would then would you define morality? It has evolved from somewhere and going to somewhere. Where is this somewhere of the past? Where is it going today? Speaking of floating morality is what Adolf Hitler did so “bad”? In other words he killed millions of fellow humans but they evolved from Mother Earth umm we mean the earth just like all the other animals and many of them kill each other every day. True the “lower” animals do it for survival but today thanks to those moronic jerkoffs in the radical environmental movement uh we mean that grouping of ecologically concerned friendly citizens along with their equally environmentally concerned human animals at the UN we know that mankind is too plentiful and is therefore destroying Mother Earth umm the earth from which we all emerged. Therefore, our own survival is at stake. By the way, we thought the UN was supposed to be about world peace. Who the hell put it in charge of the world’s environment? Never mind. Anyway maybe Hitler could have used better methods but he wasn’t all “bad”, right? After all by killing millions of human animals he helped preserve Mother Earth umm the earth, right? Expand on this reasoning and pick your own “evil” despot from recent or ancient history and explain that maybe he or she wasn’t so “evil” after all.

(Don’t even try to rationalize that this could be the reason that before he died god distinguished mankind by granting it domain over the animals and a soul and accountability to all of us for our actions as per that non-scientific book of half truths and racism known as the christian bible. Don’t be stupid and jeopardize yourself with a lawsuit as you look to un-separate Church and State).

7. Based on the answer to 6. maybe murder on a large or any scale for that matter isn’t so “bad”? If this is the case why would it not be okay if people (aka “highly evolved animals”) just started shooting each other dead on the streets? Maybe we could confiscate all their guns and knives and baseball bats and axes and chainsaws and

Chlorox bleach for that matter to avoid this? But couldn't this action be regarded as not helping Mother Earth umm the earth by fostering "overpopulation? Perhaps our friends in the gun control lobby could be mistaken? Anyway, if it's okay to kill each other why wouldn't it be okay to steal and plunder each other? Is rape so bad as this is a stronger animal overpowering a weaker one? Wouldn't all this fit perfectly with our god's uh we mean respected intellectual Charles Darwin's "survival of the fittest" scenario?

8. If you believe 7. would result in anarchy and mayhem and the only way to regain control is for a despotic leader promising law and order to emerge with laws against everything how is this different from a so called "police" state? Explain how evolution and its related "freeing of the human spirit" co-exists with this societal slavery. By ridding ourselves of moral restraint via religious "values" didn't we get rid of rules and "free" ourselves?

(Don't even try to rationalize that maybe it's better that people govern themselves to the maximum extent possible via a more powerful creator to whom we, including our leaders, are all accountable and has written numerous laws on "morality" in that silly stupid word of a dead god. This was the system of our white racist forefathers and their intellectual trash christian fundamentalism. Any invocation of such theoretical tripe will be considered a violation of the separation of Church and State and will expose you to legal litigation.)

Bonus Credit

As we all know the theory (fact) of evolution categorically states that mankind as it exists now evolved from lower life forms that have become extinct over time hence "survival of the fittest". In fact our god's uh we mean intellectual maverick's other famous book was the "Descent of Species". Based on this many people in the nineteenth century believed in the superiority of the white race. It was assumed that since blacks lived in Africa home to our closest descendant, the monkey, that they were somehow inferior. This also extended to other peoples such as Australian pygmies and aborigines. This belief was also based on physical similarities. In fact, in the late nineteenth century one pygmy man was imprisoned at the Bronx Zoo to prove this fact. In light of this can we now blame the whites for owning slaves in the nineteenth century? Blacks were (are) not fully evolved humans, right? Maybe they weren't total animals but the superior (white) people were not as enlightened as we are today, right? Have these inferior races caught up in the last century and a half? Were all these superior (white) people sadly mistaken? Of course if they were not mistaken then slavery could kind of be justified, as blacks could be considered some kind of unevolved worker mules, right? Of course if they were mistaken that kind of deflates the theory (fact) of evolution, or no? Of course, this whole dilemma may open a can of worms with our brethren in the national educational establishment who want to blame every ill of minorities in America on the white man. Figure out how to answer this logical checkmate in the theory (fact) of evolution while remaining "politically correct" and you will receive a 100 regardless of all your other answers, no matter how stupid... umm we mean educated.

End of the exam.

If you have successfully completed it congratulations you are in great company with a plethora of highly educated evolutionists/atheists from history including Karl Marx the “known” forefather of global Communism, Soviet leaders of greatness such as Lenin and Nikita Khrushchev and Adolf Hitler. Yes these men are “great” aren’t they? They achieved the ultimate science rules/atheistic/religion hating/mankind is the ruler of himself societies and should be highly revered and commended, right?

Hopefully I have made my point. I will restate one of the overall points of this book. The people that know science and “believe” and espouse this accumulation of intellectual garbage and blatant lies logically cannot be that dumb. Therefore there are only two alternatives:

1. They have concluded that God doesn’t make any sense or doesn’t exist. So they’ve concocted a theory that eliminates a powerful Creator, assigned it an aura of scientific validity and convinced themselves of its truth. And they try to get everyone to do likewise via the media and public schools, no questions allowed. This makes it 100% about religion and not science.
2. Even much more sinister, they know God exists and has a moral law that supersedes mankind and governments. (Do the founding fathers ring a bell?) They have become irreversibly corruptible and drunken with the desire for their own power to rule. Christianity and its ability for self-governance must be eviscerated. Do you think it’s a mere coincidence that Marx, Stalin, Hitler among others were big evolution/atheism/mankind can rule himself without God fans? Again, 100% about religion and not science.