

CREATION AND THE ORIGIN OF SEX

WILLIAM STROUD*

The origin of sex from the standpoint of evolution is extremely unlikely while at the same time the existence of sex is a strong evidence favoring special creationism.

The general picture of how evolution works is now clear. The basic raw material is the mutant gene. Among these mutations most will be deleterious, but a minority will be beneficial. These few will be retained by what Muller has called the sieve of natural selection. As the British statistician R. A. Fischer has said, natural selection is a "mechanism for generating an exceedingly high level of improbability." It is Maxwell's famous demon superimposed on the random process of mutation. Despite the clarity and simplicity of the general idea, the details are difficult and obscure.¹

The foregoing statement is representative of the mechanism currently postulated by which all life forms supposedly arrived at their present configurations.

It is the writer's contention that this hypothesis contains a tacit assumption about sex, a system essential to the theory. It will be shown, that under present physical laws, the observed nature of mutations, and population genetics, the gradual evolution of present life forms according to the currently proposed Neo-Darwinian framework is not possible. Existence of a system of sexual reproduction is gratuitously assumed.

Specific Case Discussed

As a specific case, consider the proposed common mammalian ancestor and the changes in the reproductive organs necessary to give rise to such extremes in size as mouse and moose. Random mutations would indeed produce an array of deformations in the genitalia of such a progenitor. The point of interest in this case is that the organs of each sex function as environmental selectors on the mutant organs randomly occurring in the other sex.

The situation, then, is not one of environmental selection operating on a randomly fluctuating gene pool, but two independently variable parameters that must, however, be at all times compatible with each other in order to propagate and maintain the species in question.

Yet, even if the progeny of some aberrant type did survive, there would be *no* selection advantage, since each mutant organ would be "selected" only with respect to random mutations occurring in the opposite sex, not with respect to an environment external to the whole species. Es-

tablishment of this mutant form would seem to be ruled out in any length of time.

To further compound the problem, the limited, recurrent, nature of these genetic mutations is best seen in the often quoted statement of Goldschmidt:

It is true that nobody thus far has produced a new species or genus, etc., by macromutation. It is equally true that nobody has produced even a species by the selection of micromutations. In the best-known organisms, like *Drosophila*, innumerable mutants are known. If we were able to combine a thousand or more of such mutants in a single individual, this would have no resemblance whatsoever to any type known as a species in nature.²

It would seem that the strictures cited previously bear even more stringently upon the chromosomal rearrangements favored by Goldschmidt as an evolutionary mechanism.

The Ultimate Objection

The ultimate objection, however, is the origin of the sex difference itself, demanding simultaneous introduction of mutually compatible organs of both male and female, at whatever primitive level of life one wishes to introduce sexual reproduction. In essence, based on present observable processes, unless these two independent systems (male and female), both mutually compatible, and otherwise functional, arose simultaneously from a population that heretofore was reproducing asexually, then there was no copulation, no progeny, no evolution.

It is true that one can postulate multiple simultaneous mutations occurring in past history that are not now observed. One could go so far as to postulate a saltational origin of the two sexes. But such multiple mutation or jump evolution concepts are unlikely and are rejected by a majority of biologists, including evolutionists.

And certain aspects of human sexual reproduction have not been considered in this short paper. While the forementioned objections are germane to human reproduction, the remarkable matter of secondary sex characteristics, and divergent but complimentary psychological and hormonal responses would further complicate any evolutionary "explanation" of the origin of sex.

Conclusion

For some time, the origin of the sexes has been to this writer an evidence of a Creator (or in the strictest sense, an obstacle to acceptance

(Continued on page 116)

*William Stroud is chemistry lecturer at Jefferson County Technical College, Steubenville, Ohio. He holds the M.S. degree in physical chemistry.

- ⁹Harland, W. B. and Others (Editors). 1967. The fossil record. London: Geological Society.
- ¹⁰Simpson, G. G. 1960. The history of life (in) Sol Tax (Editor). The evolution of life, Volume 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, p. 149. See also Simpson, G. G. 1953. The major features of evolution. New York: Columbia University Press, p. 361.
- ¹¹Romer, Alfred S. 1949. Time series and trends in animal evolution (in) Jepson, G. L., E. Mayr, and G. G. Simpson (Editors). Genetics, paleontology and evolution. Princeton: Princeton University Press. p. 114.
- ¹²Goldschmidt, R. B. 1952. Evolution as viewed by one geneticist, *American Scientist*, Volume 40, No. 1, January: 97.
- ¹³Conner, Frederick W. 1949. Cosmic optimism (A study of the interpretation of evolution by American poets from Emerson to Robinson). Gainesville, Florida: University of Florida Press.
- ¹⁴Henkin, Leo J. 1940. Darwinism in the English novel. New York: Corporate Press, Inc.
- ¹⁵Loewenberg, Bert J. 1964. Darwinism: reaction or reform? New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- ¹⁶Parsons, Stow (Editor). 1956. Evolutionary thought in America. New York: George Braziller, Inc.
- ¹⁷Roppen, Georg. 1956. Evolution and poetic belief. Oslo, Norway: Oslo University Press.
- ¹⁸Selsam, H. 1959. Charles Darwin and Karl Marx, *Mainstream*, Volume 12, No. 6, June: 28 and 36.
- ¹⁹Stevenson, Lionel. 1963 Darwin among the poets. New York: Russell and Russell,
- ²⁰Zirkle, Conway. 1958. Evolution, Marxian biology, and the social scene. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- ²¹Dowdeswell, W. H. 1960. The mechanism of evolution. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Torchbook Edition.
- ²²Boyle, W. S. 1960 Studies in experimental evolution. *Faculty Honor Lecture Series*, Utah State University.
- ²³Ehrlich, Paul R. and Richard W. Helm. 1963. The process of evolution. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- ²⁴Thompson, W. R. 1956. Introduction (in) Charles Darwin. Origin of species. New York: Dutton Everyman's Library Edition, p. xxii.
- ²⁵Thompson, W. R. 1965. Science and common sense. Albany, N.Y.: Magi Books, Inc., p. 229.
- ²⁶Harris, Errol E. 1965. The foundations of metaphysics in science. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.
- ²⁷Chein, Isidor. 1966. Some sources of divisiveness among psychologists, *American Psychologist*, Volume 21, No. 4, April: 337.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Evolutionists claim that the second law is bypassed by the importation of energy from the sun. Regardless of the amount of energy imported from an outside source into an open system, there could be no consistent ordering effect in the open system if the effect of the energy is perfectly random (as the sun's energy is).

There may be random momentary fluctuations toward order, but there would be no consistent long range development of order such as required for the origin of life. The only way in which such an ordering effect could possibly be imagined would be if the incoming energy were directed to have a specific organizing effect.

Such an argument may appear to be in agreement with the position of theistic evolutionists, but when we consider that theistic evolution exists largely to salve the conscience of Christians who believe that they must keep their feet in both ideological worlds at once, we are aware that theistic evolutionism would disappear if atheistic evolution should disappear.

W. H. KERSEY, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Chemistry
East Texas Baptist College
Marshall, Texas

EVOLUTION IS LOGICAL BUT NOT BIOLOGICAL

I hope it will be understood by the student that the evolutionary series presented throughout this book are not to be regarded as demonstrated facts. These series are, instead, logical conclusions held by many botanists based on observation and interpretation of the facts available to us. Additional information about plant structure, together with a re-interpretation of known facts, could lead to different hypotheses in the future.

from Preface of *Plant Diversification* (p. vi) by Theodore Delevoryas, Yale University.
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1966.

(Continued from page 104)

of the currently postulated evolutionary mechanism). A greater understanding of this matter which is so personal and so vital will come with the realization that an Originator and Designer of sex and sexual attraction exists—that a man

and a woman were, after all, made for each other.

References

- ¹Crow, James. 1959. Ionizing radiation and evolution, *Scientific American*, 201 (3):142, September.
- ²Goldschmidt, Richard. 1952. Evolution as viewed by one geneticist, *American Scientist*, 40 (1):94, January.