Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 34

Can "Natural Selection" Explain Evolution?

Let us talk about whether "natural selection" can help create new DNA.

Suppose a pair of animals had ten offspring and each of them had a different set of mutations to their DNA and each had a new DNA structure. This means each of them became a new "child species."

Suppose predators (i.e. natural selection) killed the nine "weakest" of the ten offspring (i.e. the weakest of the ten new "child species"), leaving only one of the offspring, which supposedly would be the strongest of the "child species."

"Natural selection" has essentially "preserved" the best DNA (i.e. it preserved the best set of mutations to the DNA of the ten offspring) according to the theory of evolution.

Have we solved the problems with the theory of evolution?

First of all, the death of members of offspring usually has more to do with pure chance than superior DNA. It has to do with luckily being in the "right place at the right time" more than with better fighting skills.

But more importantly, it is totally ludicrous to think that in one generation a superior set of fighting skills, which could significantly increase survival chances, could result from random mutations of DNA!!

But the biggest absurdity with this theory is that it first assumes that evolution can create ten new and improved sets of DNA and that each of these "new and improved" species will survive until natural selection eliminates nine of the ten species!!

In other words, the above story **assumes macro**evolution **is true** as part of the "evidence" that macroevolution is true!!

It may be remembered from above that evolution cannot create a SINGLE new species - ever; so how is evolution going to create TEN new "child species" **in the same generation**, so "natural selection" can choose from among the best of the ten new "child species"??

Natural selection must assume that the theory of evolution is true, in order to have two or more animals to choose from.

What does it mean that natural selection will "preserve" the most superior DNA from among the ten "child species?" There are no "child species" to "select" from unless you assume the theory of evolution is true!!!

Evolution must be **FIRST**, then and only then can Natural Selection eliminate the inferior DNA of the weak species!!

Natural Selection cannot "work" on animals that don't exist!! **Evolution must create the animals first**, then and only then can natural selection eliminate the weak species!!

Evolutionist claim that natural selection created the animals. This is nonsense. Natural Selection doesn't create anything; **natural selection only destroys species that already exis**t.

How can you destroy something that doesn't exist??!!

And there certainly aren't ten new species created by evolution in the same generation!!

The point is that the entire concept of "natural selection" first assumes the theory of evolution is true!!

Or to put it another way, you cannot have a "first" or "second," etc. new species (to choose from) unless you first assume evolution is true.

The evolutionists, as always, use very clever logic. You avoid and ignore the mathematical problems with evolution by assuming that evolution is true and that evolution can create ten viable new child species, in roughly the same time period, so that natural selection can preserve the DNA of one of the ten new species!!

How can you use an assumption that evolution is true (which is the only way to obtain any of the "child species" to select from) as part of the "evidence" for natural selection and evolution!!

The ten viable species come from the vivid imaginations of evolutionists.

While "natural selection" may be a viable theory when considering examples of microevolution, it must be remembered that microevolution has nothing to do with creating new DNA. **"Natural selection" combined with microevolution will never generate macroevolution.**

Try writing a vastly superior computer program using "natural selection" and see if it will lead to a superior computer program. It won't work because none of the

randomly created programs, created from the original program, will ever function, much less add value to the original program!! Thus, there will never be anything viable to "select" from among.