

Presentation by BW Cartman to Disprove Evolution

34,100 views 528 4 SHARE ⋮



Clovis Star

Published on Dec 5, 2017

[EDIT VIDEO](#)

Presentation by BW Cartman to Disprove Evolution

This is a presentation given by B.W. Cartman that I found while browsing youtube. This BLEW MY MIND! He makes a fantastic point, by saying basically that anyone who doesn't know anything about science will likely have faith in God instead.

For instance in this video Cartman shows this leaf, and the leaf has turned yellow, but it used to be green. A person of faith would say "the leaf turned yellow because the Creator turned it yellow".

OF COURSE!

Now I finally understand the inner workings of the universe.

I was also startled to find that this chap has a whole playlist dedicated to my brand "Clovis Star" and "Clovis Tribe".

In the past I have actually made a presentation in



Reference: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a51P1...>

And to see the original video that I found on youtube, that I am responding to, check this;

Reference: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e4Pex...>

More of my opinions can be found at:

<https://opinions.clovisstar.com>

<https://clovistribe.com>

More on this here:

<https://opinions.clovisstar.com/always...>

In its most general sense, a fair use is any copying of copyrighted material done for a limited and “transformative” purpose, such as to comment upon, criticize, or parody a copyrighted work. Such uses can be done without permission from the copyright owner


<https://fairuse.stanford.edu/overview...>

Category	Science & Technology
License	Standard YouTube License
Suggested by Fox	It's Always Sunny in Philadelphia

SHOW LESS

Up next

AUTOPLAY



My experiences with Bitcoin investing over eight years

Clovis Star
685 views




Clovis Star is Gonzo Journalism more about our style

Clovis Star
1.6K views
New



Food rationing and lines San Juan Puerto Rico 10/7




What is the definition of religion and how is atheISM a religion?

Clovis Star
61 views
New



Ireland worried that Trump's tax plan will reduce foreign investment

Clovis Star
2.2K views




Live Exclusive: Ben Shapiro with Dr. Jordan Peterson

The Daily Wire
Recommended for you
New




Answering AronRa's stupid questions while waiting for our

Clovis Star
55 views
New




More about "What Is Religion"

Clovis Star
17 views
New




Atheist makes data about the origin of life, and contradicts himself with

Clovis Star
18 views
New



Response to Infinity730 about how magic created life

Clovis Star
1.1K views
New



Intelligent Design? Watch it get schooled.

Rational Response Squad
1.5M views



Clovis Star Vs. AronRa will we ever have a productive debate?

Clovis Star
37 views
New



Clovis Star
3.2K views



Systematic Classification of Life - ep22
Prozostrodontia

AronRa ✓
3.1K views
New



This is what happens when you reply to spam email | James Veitch

TED
19M views




Tammy Bruce How the Left builds on narcissism

Clovis Star
13 views
New



Bret Weinstein - Is the left eating itself?

Clovis Star
43 views
New



Richard Dawkins Proves Intelligent Design in 5 Min

Verdant Servant
27K views



Neil de Grasse Tyson on the afterlife. Very moving.

moeman1984
3.9M views



"The Apostles" David Taylor Full Deposition: Day 1 Part 1

I Hate Liars
Recommended for you

SHOW MORE

42 Comments

≡ SORT BY



Add a public comment...



If evolution is true, what observation, discovery, or experiment could reveal that?
If evolution is not true, what observation, discovery, or experiment do you predict would disprove it

REPLY 3   

Hide replies ^



Clovis Star 2 months ago

In the description of the video I did post a follow up, to something that I made in response to Richard Dawkins., This was several years back, and since then I have found even greater evidence along the same lines. However this is what I have compiled so far;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a51P15Keld4>

Show less

REPLY   



AronRa  2 months ago

Can you answer those four questions?

REPLY 1   



Clovis Star 2 months ago

Proving evolution untrue has never been my point. People can play on words and they will have different meanings to different people. Most creationist that I know do not doubt adaptation. Humans are great at adapting. But I see no proof of evolution being the origins of species, as Darwin predicted. Nor has this theory been proven in a lab, or observed in real time. So proving or disproving a theory, that has very little consequence to me or my path, is not what I have set out to do.

However, the proof that I offer for creation, I have posted in that link.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a51P15Keld4>

Show less



I think we should start with those four questions. Can you answer them?

REPLY 1   



Clovis Star 2 months ago (edited)

If evolution is true, what observation, discovery, or experiment could reveal that?

It would have to be more than a theory, there would have to be observable science of this being the origins of species.

If evolution is not true, what observation, discovery, or experiment do you predict would disprove it forever?

Refer to question/answer one.

If creationism is true, what observation, discovery, or experiment could reveal that?

It has already been done. DNA has the signature of intelligent design. And there is no other creation that we know of that was created out of chaos, without a designer. The code in the DNA is the key here.

If creationism is not true, what observation, discovery, or experiment do you predict would disprove it forever?

I would suspect if question/answer one were proven, that as Darwin and other scientists predicted, that life came out of chaos, and that random elements came together randomly,

and eventually a single cell organism popped up, and then evolved.

Show less

REPLY   



Clovis Star 2 months ago

Anyway, it's 4:25am. Thanks for the participation.



AronRa ✓ 2 months ago

So if evolution were shown to be "more than a theory", that would disprove creationism? How?

REPLY 1



Clovis Star 2 months ago

I answered the questions. Now your turn.

Im on my way to bed.

REPLY



AronRa ✓ 2 months ago

Maybe I should have started with definitions.

Evolution is the biological theory of biodiversity explaining every level of taxonomy as a population-level change over time, summarily defined as "descent with inherent genetic modification".

Creationism is a rejection of evolution specifically and of scientific methodology in general; positing instead that life was magically/miraculously created by a god according to one of many competing religious fables.

1. If evolution is true, what observation, discovery, or experiment could reveal that? In science, before we can even say that something is possible, there must be a precedent or parallel or verified phenomenon indicating that such possibility exists. Once we have that, then we'd have to have a mechanism for HOW that happens. We don't always get that. We don't have it for the theory of gravity for example. But gravity is at least demonstrable as a fact, even if the theory isn't. So we'd have to have some means to verify that evolution can and does happen. Once we know that it could happen, then we'd need further indications (be it in paleontology, embryology or phylogenetics) to show that it



2. If evolution is not true, what observation, discovery, or experiment do you predict would disprove it forever? Evolution has to adhere to a series of specific biological laws that can't be broken. Virtually everything that creationists ask for to prove evolution would actually break on or more of those laws.

- a) a fish deciding to grow legs
- b) cats giving birth to dogs
- c) a crocoduck
- d) any individual turning into a different "kind" of anything.

What would disprove evolution for me is if an organism violates taxonomy. Defiance of taxonomy is the nature of created things because that's how it's been with absolutely everything we've ever "created". Look at every single animal we've ever invented for mythology or movies. All of them defy taxonomic classification. They all have traits that don't belong. Godzilla, for example, has differentiated teeth, eternal ears and an actual nose. These are all mammalian traits that don't belong on a Diapsid reptile.

I can accept that Godzilla has four toes instead of the typical five. I could even see how evolution could produce something like a jackalope, because hares aren't that far from deer on the phylogenetic tree, and novel mutations can occur in any lineage. We can have atavisms or turn on genes that were dormant, like causing chickens to grow teeth for example, since they still have those genes. But something we can't have would be six-limbs on a tetrapod or feathers on a mammal, because both of those things defy taxonomy. The discovery of a pegasus would reduce evolution to horse feathers, because that would be something evolution cannot account for.

3. If creationism is true, what observation, discovery, or experiment could reveal that? Well, as I said, we first have to know that it is



something supernatural, gods, ghosts, magic of any kind. Can anyone create anything? Can anyone conjure anything? Can anyone heal anything in such a way that is not better explained by medicine or remission or simple trickery? If faith-healers worked in hospitals and healed amputees, that would convince me that someone out there at least some sort of supernatural powers. If parapsychologists actually got ectoplasm and verifiable kirlian imagery of spiritual life-force, that would be something too. If people could do things like Spock, Obiwan or Gandalf could do on-demand whenever they need to do it, then they can do it under laboratory conditions. Then, even if we can't explain the supernatural, we'd at least be sure it actually exists, and thus "anything is possible" after that.

Scripture actually has nothing to do with that. I mean, if the Qur'an actually did accurately describe the stages of fetal development as many Muslims say it does, that might imply special intuitive knowledge perhaps, but it doesn't speak to how or if anything could be magically created. The fact that the Bhagavad Gita described the radiometric age of the earth with alarming accuracy for the oldest scripture in history could come down to simple coincidence.

Again, the issue for me is taxonomy. Instead of a hierarchical phylogenetic tree of life, biologists would have to identify "created kinds" or baramins, things that were evidently magically-created unrelated to anything else. Remember those three monsters that Anakin Skywalker had to fight in Star Wars Episode II? All of them are obviously created as they clearly defy evolutionary explanation.

4. If creationism is not true, what observation, discovery, or experiment do you predict would disprove it forever?

a) If you have to have faith to believe it, then you have no reason to believe it at all. if there is no evidence of it, that's as good as proving it



entire claim has no more validity than one that has already been disproved.

b) Since religious scriptures are the only source ever provided for creationism, then if all those sacred texts were full of factual absurdities inconsistencies and contradictions, or if we otherwise had substantial reason to believe they were all written by men pretending to speak for their gods, then we'd know it was all a fraud.

c) If the arguments from every religion from Sikh to Hindu to Mormon or what-have-you all turn out to be nothing but frauds, falsehoods and fallacies with no demonstrable truth to any of them, then we'd know it's a massive hoax.

Now, what would you need to learn in order to accept evolution as "more than a theory"? Can you name something--anything--in science that is "more than a theory"? What does that even mean?

Show less

REPLY 2   



Clovis Star 2 months ago

Yes of course, as I said before we got into to the whole "you answer my questions, but I won't answer my question thing. (btw- thank you for finally answering, and then deleting your rejection of my request to answer them).

This was the beginning and really the ending of this for me:

"Proving evolution untrue has never been my point. People can play on words and they will have different meanings to different people. Most creationist that I know do not doubt adaptation. Humans are great at adapting. But I see no proof of evolution being the origins of species, as Darwin predicted. Nor has this theory been proven in a lab, or observed in real time.

So proving or disproving a theory, that has very little consequence to me or my path, is not what I have set out to do



have posted in that link.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a51P15Keld4>

"

However, why would solid evidence of evolution disprove creation? Well on the

merits of how many believe, regarding the proposed solution that Darwin came up with, that evolution is the origins of life, and that chaos created order. (I think there is some Masonic rule about this concept)

But if evolution could be proven correct, that there was no intelligence behind creation, and that creation came out of chaos (random elements came together randomly and made a single celled organism, etc etc etc), then it would prove to many that no intelligence is needed for life.

However, that has not been proven, or duplicated yet. So I am still waiting.

If we could establish for certain that no intelligence was needed to plan or create life. Well that would be substantial.

Show less

REPLY   



AronRa  2 months ago (edited)

Evolution has been proven in the sense that it has been reproduced and demonstrated, but I want to make sure of what we're talking about.

Read more

REPLY 1   



Clovis Star 2 months ago

AronRa no evolution being the origin of life has not been proven, not even in the slightest. Present your evidence if that is the case.

And as for "theories", scientific theories are



Facts are different than theories

Show less

REPLY   



AronRa  2 months ago

Only a very few scientific theories have ever been disproved, all of them in the 18th and 19th centuries. No scientific theory has been disproved in more than a hundred years. That, as I said, is why nowadays a hypothesis must be effectively proven before it can be elevated to the level of theory. It must endure an extensive battery of tests for a long time, have great parsimonious explanative power and have substantial evidentiary backing.

Most physicists hate the notion of "string theory" as popular tripe, because it doesn't meet the criteria. Like Intelligent Design theory, it is a theory in name only.

Evolution also is not the origin of life. As I said before, evolution is a theory of biodiversity, "descent with inherent genetic modification". That has indeed been proved every way that it possibly can be. You're asking for abiogenesis, which is a whole different set of processes.

Here's an explanation of abiogenesis, intended to teach middle school students.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bdozVq81gog>

Show less

REPLY 1   



Clovis Star 2 months ago

Actually with Quantum Physics being so new and unexplored, it's hard to say how many scientific theories have been disproven in the last 100 years. However MANY have, as a result of Quantum Physics/Mechanics.

Regardless, if you have proof that evolution is the origin of life, I would be happy to view that evidence.



Show less

REPLY



AronRa 2 months ago

Once again, I repeat, evolution is not the origin of life. That's abiogenesis. Very few scientific theories have ever been disproved, and all those were from the early days. Quantum

REPLY 1



Clovis Star 2 months ago

What I am saying, and have said, is that chaos is not known to create anything. Without a designer, or a source of the information, structures (such as cells) can not be formed. Or at least there is no proof of this happening to this point.

I laid my case out in this video;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a51P15Keld4>

What you have shown is a theory, not a proven experiment. It is interesting, as is your video. I love learning about these things. But it does not prove your case.

As for disproven and/or superceded and or obsolete scientific theories. There are so many it's hard to really have a reasonable discussion about it, without taken my time for the next 3 weeks.

However here is a list here:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superseded_scientific_theories

Show less

REPLY 1



Clovis Star 2 months ago

One more follow up, as I have watched a few of your videos.



we still don't know .

<https://youtu.be/AP12uHdcS74?t=9m40s>

Incorrect. Life had a designer, and the origin of life has been written down and explained for a very long time.

Show less

REPLY



AronRa ✓ 2 months ago

Knowledge differs from mere belief in that knowledge is demonstrable and can be tested with measurable accuracy. We know that evolution is an inescapable fact of population

Read more

REPLY 1



AronRa ✓ 2 months ago

I have to add that abiogenesis is a list of catalytic chemical processes, which is not remotely like chaos.

REPLY 1



Clovis Star 2 months ago

This is where these conversations sort of take lengthy tangents off in other directions. Usually I am happy to hash those definitions of things out for awhile. But I feel I will leave you

Read more

REPLY



AronRa ✓ 2 months ago (edited)

Let's see,

cha·os

/kā, äs/noun

"complete disorder and confusion".

No, that's not remotely like an overlapping sequence of natural catalytic chemical processes with cumulative results.

Thus far, intelligence has never yet come from intelligence, but there is a process whereby intelligence may be derived as a property of



what you

Remember I'm not talking about what we "sorta know about what probably happened", although that would already be better than the creationists' position of assuming impossible absurdities for no good reason and pretending to know what no one knows. I'm talking about what we actually DO know and can prove beyond reasonable doubt.

To demonstrate that, I asked you another question you didn't answer. How does creationism explain all the species of dogs and cats, for example? Not just domestic breeds but genetically distinct and separate

species of wild variants too? To clarify, I'm presenting a challenge that will already effectively prove evolution before I even show you any of the actual proof of it, which there is a lot of from many different fields of study. But first I have to know how you as a creationist would answer these.

Are domestic cats related to each other and all other feral felines? Are all felines related to each other as well as panthers and scimitar cats? Are all felids related to nimravids or viverrids? And how could we tell? Are all of Feloidea related to any or all other members of the order Carnivora?

Similarly, are domestic dogs related to each other as well as wolves and all other feral canines? Are all canines related to each other as well as the African wild dogs and Asian wild dogs? Are all types of living dogs related to each other as well as foxes and extinct forms like the giant "bone-crusher" dogs from the fossil record? Are canids related to modern bears as well as fossil bear-dogs? Are caniformes related to feliformes?

This subject matter is explained in the following videos.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bJ->



These simple yes-or-no questions are extremely important, because they illustrate the most significant out of all the failures of creationism. If you need me to explain why that is, I'll be happy to.

Show less

REPLY 1   



Clovis Star 2 months ago

AronRa when you say on one hand "we do not know how life began" and then follow up with "intelligence doesn't come from intelligence" those are two extreme opposite statements.

And if you watched my video in response to Richard Dawkins you will learn a lot about intelligence and ID. In that there is no process that we know of on earth that currently produces intelligence without a designer. And it is mathematically impossible for these "natural processes" that you speak of to occur on their own

Show less

REPLY   



Clovis Star 2 months ago

This is why humans have not and can not recreate Abiogenesis. It's mathematically impossible and will never happen.

REPLY   



AronRa  2 months ago (edited)

So you think the origin of life equals intelligence? You realize that most organisms don't have brains or even nerves, right? I mean, slime moulds have been shown to have a sort of non-neurological intelligence, but not what you're talking about at all.

I watched a moment of your video about Dawkins. I clicked to the middle where you said that Christian writing is older than Hinduism. Whoa! No. I studied comparative



to get an A. The earliest Christian writing is very late 2nd century. Christianity is based on Judaism, and Judaism was initially polytheist and largely influenced by Zoroastrianism, which dates back to Zarathustra around 600 BCE. The Bhagavad Gita was contextually dated to roughly 600 BCE also, (though it was reputed to be much older) and that's one of the more recent works of the Hindu religion. Vedic scripture is a thousand years older than that! Hinduism is the oldest and consequently most detailed and diverse religion in continuous practice. Christian writings are definitely NOT older than, or even anywhere near as old as Hindu writings.

You shared that link with me saying it was proof of creation, but of course it was no such

thing. Proof (in the context you're using) is an overwhelming preponderance of evidence. Evidence is a body of facts which are positively indicative of, or exclusively concordant with one available position over any other, and facts are objectively verifiable data. You didn't provide anything like any of that; just your own subjective assertions which happen to be misinformed and misleading misinformation. It's not factual, it isn't evidence, and it certainly isn't proof of anything more than you don't know what you're talking about.

Show less

REPLY 1   



AronRa ✓ 2 months ago

Craig Venter has already replicated living cells by artificial assembly, but that's not what abiogenesis is, and abiogenesis is not what evolution is.

I asked you to answer with a simple yes or no whether creationists accept each of those biological relationships. I told you this important. If evolution from common ancestry is not true and some flavor of special creation of as yet unidentified "kinds" is true, then there



ancestry, but there must also be subsequent levels in that twin-nested hierarchy where life-forms would no longer be the same "kind" and wouldn't be biologically related anymore. At that point, they would be magically created separate "kinds", and distinctly unique from those listed around it as well as those apparently ancestral to it.

So...are domestic cats related to each other and all other feral felines? Are all felines related to each other as well as panthers and scimitar cats? Are all felids related to nimravids or viverrids? And how could we tell? Are all of Feloidea related to any or all other members of the order Carnivora?

Similarly, are domestic dogs related to each other as well as wolves and all other feral canines? Are all canines related to each other as well as the African wild dogs and Asian wild dogs? Are all types of living dogs related to each other as well as foxes and extinct forms like the giant "bone-crusher" dogs from the fossil record? Are canids related to modern bears as well as fossil bear-dogs? Are caniformes related to feliformes?

Those who promote creationism's bewildering inanity should be able to show exactly where and why uniquely created kinds could not be grouped together with any parent clades which would otherwise only imply an evolutionary ancestry. Throw away any other argument you might be thinking about; none of them compare to this! If creationism is true of anything more than a single ancestor of all animal forms (if not the entire eukaryote collective), or if the concept of common ancestry is fundamentally mistaken, then there must be a point in the tree where taxonomy falls apart—where what we thought was related to everything is really unrelated to anything else; and unless you're a scientologist or a Raelian, that criteria must apply to other animals besides ourselves



validity of this inquiry to your position?

Show less

REPLY   



AronRa  2 months ago

in·tel·li·gence

/in'teləjəns/noun: "the ability to acquire and apply knowledge and skills."

REPLY 1   



AronRa  2 months ago

I just watched your video. The speaker used the logical fallacy of argument from improbability. I'll explain that if you need me to. But for the moment, remember that the ENTIRE global scientific community, including 99.87% of all earth & life scientists accept evolution. Less than one percent abstain and always only ever as a result of religious conditioning in early childhood. Yet you think that willfully ignorant religious zealots have discovered something all that all the brightest minds from every nation in the world for the last century or so couldn't figure out?

I've heard and refuted the fallacy of improbability argument many times, and a number of scientific luminaries have also.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NCbjXDol1Lw>

Show less

REPLY 1   



AronRa  2 months ago (edited)

Imagine that you're monitoring security cameras for a department store. At some point you see a woman entering a little-used ladies' room. She is immediately followed by a man. He comes out of the restroom carrying that woman's purse and hurries away. Hours later, it's closing time, and that door hasn't opened again. That woman still hasn't come out of the ladies' room. So you take a look yourself and find her dead. Would you know



Clovis Star 1 month ago

Really though consensus does not define the Scientific Method. Like I said, if the cycle can be replicated and observed, then it is proven. Your proposal is that "this is what is likely" and as you pointed out in your video "we don't know how life began" (your words).

So if your theory is not proven, and my theory is not proven, then we are both working on the same playing field.

Yet the mathematical equation is a reality, it would literally be the most impossible thing ever thought up, for life to be a random occurrence without a designer. Intelligence comes from intelligence this is real as it gets.

Now if you are proposing that "evolution is proven by consensus" but at the same time you claim that "evolution is not the theory of how life began, that is Abiogenesis". Then in reality, what we should be talking about is "abiogenesis" using your terms.

And the mathematical improbability of this occurring, and the fact it has never been replicated, brings us back to square one.

Show less

REPLY   



AronRa  1 month ago

I never said we don't know how life began. We know it happened and we've already confirmed a few of equally viable ways that it could have happened, most of which could be true at the same time. You're saying that if we don't know which processes occurred in which order, then we don't that it happened at all. That's wrong.

This is literally a contest between fact and fantasy. Let me lay this out for you. You posit a magical creation by a djinni-like character from your favorite mythology. You don't know that happened, nor could you know that, though