

NATURAL SELECTION INADEQUATE

C. H. MOSHER* AND WILLIAM J. TINKLE**

Shall we leave the question of creation versus evolution to the experts? Involving as it does, the true nature of man and other living things, also the power and activity of God, it is hard to find a person who is qualified to give an answer that will preclude all other answers. A person who has specialized in the structure of some animal or plant may have no more than a child's conception of the essential nature of man.

In such discussions an education is desirable, but many educated men have never gone to college. Thomas Henry Huxley spent very little time in school, and George McCready Price studied geology for himself. Education involves observation, reading, and that comparison of one idea with another which we call thought. A significant number of persons who are self-educated have ideas which are worthy of being heard.

Such men look at natural selection, the cornerstone of evolution, and see flaws in it. A paraphrase of natural selection, "the survival of the fittest," is no more than a truism. It is necessarily true that the animals which have survived were fit to survive. Thus the slogan is true but it adds nothing to our knowledge.

Charles Darwin observed farmers making improvements in plants and animals by repeated selection of types for breeding stock. It occurred to him that such selection might occur in the natural environment.

A plant or animal that happens to have a helpful new structure will thrive and produce many offspring. On the other hand, an organism that happens to have a structure which is not functional is thereby impeded and loses its life in the competition or is killed by predators. Darwin imagined that such a process is cumulative enough to change creatures into more complex categories.

More careful observation during the twentieth century has taught us that "natural selection," instead of developing higher forms of creatures, merely gets rid of diseased, crippled, and abnormal individuals. Thus the process maintains a standard by setting a lower limit.

When we try to visualize how a certain organ might have been developed through chance changes and natural selection we run into this difficulty: when the nascent organ appears and until it is well enough developed to be functional, it is an impediment to the animal. Presumably,

such an animal would lose its life in the struggle for existence and the new organ would cease to be.

Examples readily come to mind. Can you visualize a fish with lungs *almost* developed? Evolution would halt right there. As another example, the cow has a large complex stomach of four parts. When it swallows grass or hay, the food goes into the rumen or paunch. Later the hay is brought back to the mouth and chewed, then swallowed into the reticulum. From this organ it goes to the omasum, then to the true stomach, the abomasum. In contrast the hog has a simple, single stomach.

If a calf were born during the supposed development of cattle, with only the beginning of a complex four-part stomach, it would be handicapped. The new organs would not digest food and would get in the way of other organs. Logically, such a strain of cattle would have less vigor and fewer offspring than the former type, and would be crowded out before they became established.

It is postulated by evolutionists that frogs and other amphibia developed from fish; that fins somehow changed to legs. In modern fishes we do not see such changes taking place; and if we did, such nascent organs would be a detriment in the struggle for existence.

A fish swims rapidly by complex movements of the layers of muscle along its sides. Fins are used for slow motion and turning. The frog swims by powerful strokes of its hind legs and has no muscles on its sides that aid locomotion.

If a fish were changing to a frog there would be several stages in which it would have appendages that were neither good fins nor good legs. Many animals are predators of frogs, and it is only by means of rapid movement that enough frogs survive to escape extinction. An intermediate type certainly would be doomed!

There is a fish called a coelacanth, *Latimeria*, in which the pectoral fin is not attached directly to the body, but is at the end of a short stalk.¹ Some zoologists have interpreted this fin as the "beginning" of a jointed front limb. Yet, instead of the coelacanth becoming dominant and developing into a higher vertebrate, this genus almost was lost.

In fact, the coelacanth was considered extinct for a long time, and no fossils of it have been found in rocks "above" the Cretaceous series. But since 1938, a few have been caught in deep water off the east coast of Africa. (By the way,

(Continued on Page 184)

*C. H. Mosher lives in Westchester, Cumberland Co., Nova Scotia, Canada.

**William J. Tinkle is Professor Emeritus, Anderson College, Eaton, Indiana. He holds the Ph.D. degree.

Useful for Variety of Populations

This graph can be used for populations very different from human beings, e.g. bacteria in a culture. In such a case, it might be convenient to take as the "unit time" something other than a year; maybe a minute in dealing with the bacteria. The "time to double" and "time elapsed" must, of course, be expressed in the same units as the "unit time," e.g. in minutes as suggested for the bacteria.

The decay of radioactive isotopes can also be calculated with the graph. Then, instead of "increase," the change will be "decrease": decrease per unit time and decrease-fold. Thus, a hundred-fold decrease would mean that the amount of the isotope had decreased to $\frac{1}{100}$ the amount at the beginning of the period of time. The "time to double" would be considered the time to decrease to half—the familiar half-life. Again, the "unit time" need not be a year, provided only that all times are in the same units. In dealing with radioactive carbon, e.g., with a half-life of about 5500 years, it would be convenient to express time in centuries.

The reader might ask: "What is there creationistic about this graph?" In a sense, the answer must be—nothing. An evolutionist could use it just as well as a creationist.

Still, the creationist will be more interested in population statistics, especially of human beings. For the enormous time periods demanded by evolutionists do not allow any appreciable rate of increase; they can "fit in" only with fluctuation about some more or less constant number. But that is not what we see today; thus again the present would not be the correct key to the past.

(Continued from Page 182)

this paucity of fossils even casts doubt upon their usefulness in determining the relative ages of rocks.)

The difference between types of living things is not simply a matter of different degrees of complexity. They are constructed according to different patterns, and each pattern is well fitted to the life habits of that organism. Zoologists agreed a long time ago that animals cannot be listed in a single column to supposedly represent development from the lowest and simplest.² Since this is true, a chance addition is more often a detriment than an advantage. Also, most mutations known are destructive and deleterious, and further no new characteristics come about through gene mutations. Only undesirable

If, on the other hand, one postulates a human population that has been increasing for only a few thousand years, as most creationists do, it seems likely that the populations of man and of the larger animals have increased more or less uniformly. Moreover, it seems likely that, as well as the start at creation, there was a fresh start at the flood.

So it makes sense for the creationist to study population statistics. In theory, someone might believe in evolution followed by a fairly recent universal flood; but, in fact, probably no one does. And a creationist who believed in a fairly recent creation and a local flood (and some, it appears, have held such views), could still be interested in these statistics.

The reason that these remarks are restricted to man and the larger animals is that surely the smaller animals, rabbits for instance, have run into plagues, overpopulation, etc., many times in the past, and these things have affected their numbers greatly. But there is no evidence that such things have had any considerable effect on man; and it would seem likely that the same thing could be said (at least, until a century or so ago), about the larger animals, and especially about such kinds as elephants.

References

- ¹Enoch, H. 1966. Evolution or creation. Evangelical Press Fellowship House, 136 Rosendale Rd., London S.E. 21, pp. 132-137. (Also available from Puritan Publications, Inc., 25 W. High St., Carlisle, Pa. 17013.)
- ²Whitcomb, J. C., and Morris, H. M. 1961. The Genesis flood. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, pp. 396-398.
- ³Hand, J. R. 1959. Why I accept the Genesis record. Back to the Bible Publishers, Lincoln, Nebraska, pp. 76-81.

changes of existing characteristics occur through gene mutations.

We say again, observe, read, and think for yourself. It is impossible for a general permanent improvement to take place at the same time that the Second Law of Thermo-dynamics is leading to loss and disorder.³ See if a perfect creation followed by loss and decay does not fit the facts much better.

References

- ¹Moment, G. B. 1958. General zoology. Houghton, Mifflin, New York, p. 423.
- ²Hegner and Stiles. 1951. College zoology. Sixth Edition. Macmillan Company, New York, pp. 292 and 798.
- ³Williams, Emmett L., Jr. March, 1969. A simplified explanation of the laws of thermo-dynamics, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 5:138-147.