

# Smoky Mountain Bible Institute

## Biology, Natural Selection? 111

Welcome back to the lab. The subject matter at hand is biology. Let's touch on a couple more things on this topic and wrap up our study in this field of science. There are two thorns in the side of those in the macro-evolution camp: one is "Natural Selection" also known as "Survival of the Fittest", and the other is the pesky discovery of T-Rex red blood cells. Yes, you read correctly—we will get to the particulars of Dr. Mary Schweitzer's find after talking about natural selection.

**Natural Selection** on the surface seems to be a harmless mechanism built into the evolution-leaning mindset which claims the following: "Over time" all living things mutate into stronger, better, faster, smarter living things and because of this, the more fit new life forms will "over time" out think and out maneuver their less capable ancestors. This will, "over long periods of time", lead to stronger, better, faster, smarter living things. If a person holds that Natural Selection is evolution's tool for the improvement of all living things, they will find themselves running into two logical hard road blocks. One is scientific, and the other is philosophical.

First, the scientific problem is that genetic mutations are always, *always*, the result of a loss of genetic information, or a malfunction in that information, and this always, *always*, makes the organism less viable. Do some mutations cause beneficial side effects? Like sickle cell anemia and malaria, yes. However, it is still an anemic condition and has more bad side effects than good ones. This means that all mutations, *all mutations*, make an organism on the losing side of a "survival of the fittest" scenario. Therefore the mechanism does not work to advance evolution, even though it is still taught as fact in all of our schools today. Interesting side note, if you Google "beneficial mutation" you will find example after example of genetic adaptation which is not mutation at all, but genetic material doing what God designed it to do, allowing organisms to adapt to their environment as discussed in the last lesson. So, if anything, natural selection is an argument against macro-evolution because, "over time", it decreases the available amount of genetic material, causing less complexity and more harmful mutations. In essence—leading to devolution. For example the current decline in the human immune system in the west over the past decades.

The philosophical problem of holding this position is that all superior living things should rightly take hold of and manage, for their own benefit, all of the resources in any given ecosystem. You must then champion the cause of selfishness and condemn as misguided all unselfish acts. This means that natural selection culls out the weak, while favoring the strong. We can see this occurring in the animal kingdom, even though we do see occasional acts of kindness with one animal raising as their own the infants of another species. But for the most part, dog eat dog, strong devouring the weak, that is what a survival of the fittest position must logically hold to. This leads to an inconsistency between humanity and this philosophy. The acts of people like Hitler, Pol Pot, Mao Tse-tung, Mussolini, and any other acts of genocide can be justified under this philosophy as a culling out the weak. Abuse of the environment could also be justified under this philosophy. Selfless acts of kindness and mercy would be condemned as a violation of the precepts of this philosophy, not just because it is seen as a waste of valuable resources on the weak, but acts of kindness would also be seen as slowing progress toward the strongest, best and smartest any species has the potential to develop into. It is this mindset that led to eugenics, racism, and the holocaust in the late 1800's and early to mid-1900's, and is still with us today in the murder mills of Planned Parenthood.

**T-Rex blood cells:** So let's conclude our study of biology with the discovery of soft connective tissue and red blood cells in "68 million" year-old T-Rex bones. Dr. Mary H Schweitzer, a paleontologist at North Carolina State University, first published her findings in 1993. They discovered red blood cells in dinosaur fossils and later discovered soft tissue remains in a Tyrannosaurus Rex specimen. Dr. Schweitzer is the first researcher to identify and isolate soft tissues in fossil bone. Recent discoveries have been found in other fossils as well. Since Dr. Schweitzer's discovery, the scientific community has come up with many failed attempts to explain how this soft tissue could exist in "68 million" year-old fossils. The problem for them is that simple chemistry prohibits any soft tissue (no matter how it is preserved) from lasting more than tens of thousands of years. In most cases even under the best preservative conditions, in thousands of years the tissue would break

down to its base elements and no longer have any identifiable structure. Instead of questioning the age of the find, the current position of the scientific community is that they do not yet understand how this material could have been preserved for so long, but they are sure that science will eventually discover the process. Sounds like faith!

This concludes our tour of the biology wing of the Institute.