
Know Evolution –The Evolution Story is a Mixture of Reality and Fabrication

Natural Selection

Mark Bergemann

The evolution story is a mixture of reality and fabrication. Natural selection is a great example of this truth.

Reality: Natural selection produces new species of plants and animals.

Fabrication: The claim that natural selection produces new kinds of plants and animals.

There are many species in most Biblical kinds. Every kind of plant and animal which exists today, or which has gone extinct, was created by God thousands of years ago during the six days of creation. No new kinds ever develop. New species develop all the time, but always within their own kind. Birds did not descend from dinosaurs, they descended from birds. People did not descend from ape-like creatures, they descended from people.

What Is Natural Selection?

Natural selection is the natural process by which successive generations of plants and animals can eventually become different than their ancestors. To better understand natural selection, let's examine artificial selection. The National Academy of Science gives an example of artificial selection:

Early farmers began saving seeds from plants with particular favorable traits and planting those seeds the next growing season. Through this process of “artificial selection,” they created a variety of crops with characteristics particularly suited for agriculture. For example, farmers over many generations modified the traits of wild wheat so that the seeds remained on the plant when ripe and could easily be separated from their hulls.¹

Natural selection is the same as artificial selection, except the environment does the selecting instead of people.²

¹ National Academy of Sciences Institute of Medicine, *Science, Evolution, and Creationism*, (Washington: The National Academies Press, 2008), 6. Free pdf at <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/11876/science-evolution-and-creationism> (accessed Oct 24, 2016)

² "Artificial selection is a similar process [to natural selection], but in this case humans rather than the environment select for desirable traits by arranging for animals or plants with those traits to breed. Artificial selection is the process responsible for the development of varieties of domestic animals (e.g., breeds of dogs, cats, and horses) and plants (e.g., roses, tulips, corn)." National Academy, 5. Bill Nye also comments: "Artificial selection is the same as natural selection. ...Having characteristics that appeal to another species is the same whether it's an insect pollinating you or a human." Bill Nye, *Undeniable –Evolution and the Science of Creation*, (New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 2014), 74.

Bears

The bear kind on Noah's Ark must have had genetic diversity for a range of light to dark fur. The cubs of these two ark bears probably ranged from very light to very dark fur. Future generations of bears migrated throughout the globe. We can speculate how different bear species were produced by natural selection. Light colored fur would be beneficial for bears living in snow covered regions. Dark colored fur would be beneficial for bears living in forests. This is because bears whose fur blended in to the surroundings would have an advantage while hunting. Prey animals are less likely to notice bears with fur matching the landscape. Bears with a hunting advantage would be more likely to find sufficient food and grow to reproductive age. Animals which live long enough and then reproduce pass their traits to their offspring through their genes (DNA). In this way snow covered environments would "select" light colored bears and forests would "select" dark colored bears. Eventually separate species were produced: polar bears who lost the genes for dark fur,³ and grizzly bears⁴ who lost the genes for white fur.⁵ This is probably the way polar bears (*Ursus maritimus*) became a separate species from grizzly bears (*Ursus arctos*). We know that grizzly bears and polar bears are the same Biblical kind, because they can mate and produce a "grolar" bear (father is a grizzly and mother a polar) or "pizzly" bear (father a polar and mother is a grizzly).⁶

The National Academy of Science describes natural selection this way,

Natural selection: Differential survival and reproduction of organisms as a consequence of the characteristics of the environment. ...Evolution consists of changes in the heritable traits of a population of organisms as successive generations replace one another. *It is the population of organisms that evolve, not individual organisms.* The differential reproductive success of organisms with advantageous traits is known as natural selection, because nature "selects" traits that enhance the ability of organisms to survive and reproduce. Natural selection also can reduce the prevalence of traits that diminish organisms' abilities to survive and reproduce.⁷

Loss of DNA Information

In our bear example, genetic diversity which existed in the parent population was lost due to selective breeding, producing two separate species within the bear kind. The environment "selected" which bears would breed and which would not breed, resulting in a loss of some DNA information (a loss of genetic diversity). Each new species lost some ability that its ancestors possessed. This would never produce a new "kind" of animal. A new kind of animal would require that new genetic information be added. In our bear example genetic information was lost, and no new genetic information was gained. The decedents of bears would always be bears if this is the only way natural selection worked. Creationists and evolutionists can agree that natural selection produces new species in this way, where no new kinds ever develop.

³ Or their population mostly lost genes for dark fur.

⁴ Grizzly bears are a subspecies of brown bears.

⁵ Or their population mostly lost genes for white fur.

⁶ Ed Mazza, *Rare 'Pizzly' Or 'Grolar' Bear Shot And Killed By Hunter In Canada*, The Huffington Post, May 25, 2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/pizzly-grolar-bear-shot-killed_us_57453eeae4b055bb1170b094 (accessed Oct 20, 2016)

⁷ National Academy, 5.

Errors in Reproduction

While not needed in the bear example, an additional factor can come into play in some cases of natural selection. When living things reproduce there are often small errors in that reproduction. Some of the DNA information passed onto the offspring is changed (mutated). A famous mutation example is the antibiotic resistant version of a bacteria called *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*). These antibiotic resistant bacteria are often used as examples of evolution in action. Molecular geneticist Dr. Purdom explains,

Antibiotic-resistant *H. pylori* have a mutation that results in the loss of information to produce an enzyme. This enzyme normally converts an antibiotic to a poison, which causes death. But when the antibiotics are applied to the mutant *H. pylori*, these bacteria can live while the normal bacteria are killed. So by natural selection the ones that lost information survive and pass this trait along to their offspring. ... Although the [mutant] bacteria can survive well in an environment with antibiotics, it has come at a cost. If the antibiotic-resistant bacteria are grown with the non-mutant bacteria in an environment without antibiotics, the non-mutant bacteria will live and the mutant bacteria will die. This is because the mutant bacteria produce a mutant protein that does not allow them to compete with other bacteria for necessary nutrients.⁸

Loss of DNA Information (again)

In our *H. pylori* example, a mutation caused a loss of genetic (DNA) information. The bacteria could no longer produce a normally needed enzyme, but in an antibiotic environment that damaged mutant bacteria could still survive. Environments with antibiotics “selected” the mutant bacteria by killing the non-mutated bacteria. The resulting “superbug” is super only when antibiotics are present. In a normal environment that superbug is “selected” for death due to its inability to compete with normal bacteria. Again, this would never produce a new “kind” of animal. A new kind of animal would require that new genetic information be added. Creationists and evolutionists can agree that natural selection works in this way, where no new kinds ever develop.

Enter Fabrication

Because evolutionists reject the possibility of a creator god, they need a way for new kinds of creatures to develop. The two examples of natural selection we examined so far do not meet this need. Enter fabrication. Even though it has never been seen to happen, evolutionists claim natural selection can produce new kinds of creatures (like birds descending from dinosaurs, or humans descending from ape-like creatures). Being capable scientists, evolutionists know that this requires the repeated creation of new genetic (DNA) information. The creation of new information has never been observed, but evolutionists still claim evidence for new information.

⁸ Georgia Purdom, “Is Natural Selection the Same Thing as Evolution?” in *The New Answers Book 1*, ed. Ken Ham (Green Forest: Master Books, 2006), 279. <https://answersingenesis.org/natural-selection/is-natural-selection-the-same-thing-as-evolution/> (accessed Oct 20, 2016)

Claims of New DNA Information

I recently ran across a short article in *New Scientist* magazine where evolutionist Michael Le Page lists half a dozen examples of mutations adding new information to the genome (new DNA information). Le Page's opening sentence is, "Biologists are uncovering thousands of examples of how mutations lead to new traits and even new species."⁹ Just before his last example he writes, "The list of examples could go on and on."¹⁰ I agree that Le Page's list could go on indefinitely, since he uses a very wide and loose definition for new information. His definition seems to allow most any DNA change to be considered new information. The examples he gives (such as duplicated information) are not the new information needed to begin a journey to a new kind of creature. His examples seem to be as good as any I have seen advanced by evolutionists. In my opinion, these arguments are so extremely weak, they are not worth making. I'll list two of his arguments for you to judge. His opening example of new genetic information is,

Most people lose the ability to digest milk by their teens. A few thousand years ago, however, after the domestication of cattle, several groups of people in Europe and Africa independently acquired mutations that allow them to continue digesting milk into adulthood. Genetic studies show there has been very strong selection for these mutations, so they were clearly very beneficial. Most biologists would see this as a gain in information: a change in environment (the availability of cow's milk as food) is reflected by a genetic mutation that lets people exploit that change (gaining the ability to digest milk as an adult). Creationists, however, dismiss this as a malfunction, as the loss of the ability to switch off the production of the milk-digesting enzyme after childhood.¹¹

Now our DNA is filled with switches that turn sections of our DNA code on and off. How does damage to one of these switches count as new information? Damaging any or even all of these switches does not even start down a path toward a new kind of creature. A new kind of creature requires a tremendous amount of new information. While the above was Le Page's opening example, now let's look at his closing argument.

The list of examples could go on and on, but consider this. Most mutations can be reversed by subsequent mutations – a DNA base can be turned from an A to a G and then back to an A again, for instance. In fact, reverse mutation or "reversion" is common. For any mutation that results in a loss of information, logically, the reverse mutation must result in its gain. So the claim that mutations destroy information but cannot create it not only defies the evidence, it also defies logic.¹²

Let's go back to our *H. pylori* example. A mutation damages a bacteria's genes. A descendent of that mutated bacteria benefits from another mutation which reverses the damage. How is this an example of gaining new information? The information was there at the start. We started with an *H. pylori* bacteria having normal genes and ended with an *H. pylori* bacteria having the same genes. No new information was added. That was zero progress toward producing a new kind of creature.

⁹ Michael Le Page, *Evolution myths: Mutations can only destroy information*, *New Scientist*, April 16, 2008.

<https://www.newscientist.com/article/dn13673-evolution-myths-mutations-can-only-destroy-information/> (accessed Oct 20, 2016)

¹⁰ Le Page

¹¹ Le Page

¹² Le Page

A Significant Scientific Discovery

Natural selection is a significant scientific discovery. It helps us better understand how the Biblical kinds of plants and animals diversified into so many species. It helps us better understand how the estimated 40,500 species¹³ of amphibians, birds, mammals, and reptiles alive today could have descended from an estimated 627 kinds of those animals on Noah's Ark. [One estimate is that 1,373 kinds were on the ark, 627 for animals alive today, 746 for extinct animals in the fossil record.¹⁴ This estimate is based on a 2011 published study¹⁵ and recent updates.]

God built rich genetic diversity into living things allowing their offspring to change in size and color, to adapt to new environments, and to significantly modify their diets, behavior, temperament, and so much more, all "according to their kinds" (Genesis chapter 1).



Full Size Noah's Ark in Kentucky¹⁶

¹³ Liz Osborn, *Total Number of Species Estimated in the World*, Current Results, <https://www.currentresults.com/Environment-Facts/Plants-Animals/estimate-of-worlds-total-number-of-species.php> (accessed Oct 20, 2016)

¹⁴ Craig Froman, ed., *How Many Animals Were On The Ark?* (Green Forest: Master Books, 2016), 47.

¹⁵ Lightner et al., "Determining the Ark Kinds," *Answers Research Journal* 4 (2011): 195–201. <https://answersingenesis.org/noahs-ark/determining-the-ark-kinds/> (accessed Oct 21, 2016)

¹⁶ photo credit, <https://www.facebook.com/arkencounter/photos/>