

Patterns of Intelligence

CHAPTER 35

ANOTHER VIEW OF NATURAL SELECTION

Even after the discovery of DNA, scientists have continued to use the concepts of randomness and "natural selection" as being the engine which drove evolution.

Scientists (i.e. the scientific establishment) do not want evolution to depend exclusively on "randomness" to DNA to create new species; thus scientists claim that "natural selection" weeded out inferior DNA and this allowed superior DNA to slowly "evolve" into higher and higher intelligence.

In other words, modern evolution claims that randomness created the DNA, and that some of the DNA was better than other DNA. Then "natural selection" eliminated the inferior DNA (i.e. it eliminated the inferior species which in turn eliminated its inferior DNA).

Note that if two species fight it out to the death (i.e. "species versus species"), both species must exist prior to natural selection eliminating one of the species, as mentioned above!!

Natural selection is all about fighting and killing. **Natural selection can only eliminate species, meaning eliminate genetic intelligence on DNA, it cannot create new DNA.**

It is hard to imagine that fighting and killing could lead to new and improved genetic information on DNA (i.e. to a new and improved species). In fact it can't.

Natural selection can only reduce the planets overall gene pool!!

It is hard enough for "evolution" to create any new DNA, so eliminating DNA would not be a good thing. It would be counter-productive. Mother Nature would want to salvage any viable DNA it could produce.

While natural selection supposedly eliminates inferior DNA in the planet's overall gene pool, this still does not lead to any new DNA and it is certainly not a proof that the slightly improved overall or average gene pool leads to any new species, much less new and improved species.

All natural selection can do is eliminate "new species" from being made from "inferior species" (because the "inferior species" are killed off by natural

selection). This is nice, but it does not overcome the problems with creating new species.

In other words, "natural selection" can only destroy **already existing** "inferior species," by definition, from "evolving." It has nothing to do with creating superior species.

So who cares? "Inferior species" are not going to "evolve" into new species (because evolution is nonsense) so who cares whether these species survive or not!!

Evolutionists talk as if "natural selection" was critical in **creating** new species. This claim is based on pre-DNA concepts and is nonsense in the age of knowing about DNA. **Natural selection doesn't create anything; it only destroys things** after they are created and it only reduces the gene pool.

For example, suppose there were 10,000 species on the earth. Suppose "natural selection" destroyed 600 of these species. Has the overall gene pool increased? No, it has decreased.

While the "average" species intelligence may have increased, how is this going to lead to superior species?

Neither stupid nor smart species are going to evolve into new species.

Natural selection distracts attention away from the key issue: creating new and improved species in the age of DNA.

Has anything happened in the destruction of these 600 species that has improved any DNA on the planet? No, it hasn't. The overall gene pool has decreased, not increased.

As mentioned, perhaps the "average" "genetic intelligence" increased by eliminating inferior genetic intelligence, but so what? Nothing new has been created. No new and superior species has been created. Only the possible evolution of "inferior species" has been stopped by natural selection. But the supposed evolution of "superior species" has not been improved one iota. **Macro**evolution is nonsense.

But again, all of this assumes the theory of evolution is true and that it is better for superior species to "evolve" rather than inferior species to "evolve." While that may be true, the overriding truth is that **nothing evolves** so "natural selection" is a purely academic issue!! "Natural selection" sounds nice, but it is totally irrelevant because the theory of evolution itself is not true!!

Natural selection doesn't prove anything because natural selection depends on evolution to be true and evolution itself is false!!!!

For example, suppose someone wrote a computer program called "The Purger" that did nothing but evaluate the "intelligence" in other computer programs.

Suppose "The Purger" could then eliminate, at its whim, any computer program it felt was "inferior."

How can "The Purger" be claimed to create new computer programs? "The Purger" can only destroy computer programs after they are already written, it cannot create them.

Nor does "The Purger" suddenly imply that new computer programs can be created from superior computer programs by randomly mutating "bits."

What natural selection can do is irrelevant because it does not overcome the underlying mathematical problems with [macro](#)evolution.

Natural selection is nothing but "The Purger."

Could corporations fire their computer programs if someone wrote "The Purger?"

Don't be absurd.