



# Mutations

by Darrel Kautz

(January-February, 2002)

*This is a reprint of a much older article. Darrel Kautz went home to the Lord in 1993.*

The idea of evolution by means of *mutations*, along with natural selection, entered the mainstream of evolutionary thinking during the early twentieth century. Since that time Darwinism is customarily spoken of as *neo-Darwinism* or "new" Darwinism.

Neo-Darwinism rejects the view that acquired characteristics can be inherited. It is acknowledged by neo-Darwinists that the rate of mutations is very slow. Thus evolution by natural selection could not be faster than the mutation rate. To neo-Darwinists the only way in which variation enters a species is by mutation; all that natural selection does is to accept or reject those variations. Although mutations are random, the cumulative change over many generations, according to neo-Darwinists, is not a random process.

A mutation is a sudden variation in the hereditary code, a mistake in the transmission of genetic information, an error in the precise machinery of DNA replication. M. Pitman writes,

*"Most mutations are changes of individual genes; that is, they involve loss, gain, substitution or rearrangement of bases in the DNA nucleotide sequence. Some, however, are gross structural alterations in chromosomes or changes in numbers of whole chromosomes per nucleus.*

*Whereas recombination and reassortment are built into the system, mutations are rare and discordant events. Clearly, only mutation in a sex cell has any value as far as evolutionary theory is concerned, because here it produces a source of variation that remains intact, as a heritable unit, from generation to generation.*

*Because they seem to be the only way in which novelty can occur in a gene-pool, neo-Darwinian theory places great emphasis on random mutations. They constitute the raw material of evolution, the chance upon which the necessary force of natural selection acts. They are the rope, or the thread, upon which the theory of evolution hangs." 1*

Mutations are not known to produce any new genetic information or message which leads to the production of a new organ or organism.

Mutations in the sex cells are known to produce hereditary defects such as sickle cell anemia. In that disease distorted sickle cells get stuck in the tiny blood vessels of a person, starving him of oxygen. About 25% of the children carrying this mutation die. **2 3** Mutations have the effect of degrading an organism making it less perfect than what it once was. Through mutations organisms devolve rather than evolve. In point of fact, mutations point back to perfect organisms — to the kind God created in Genesis 1.

When mutations take root in an organism, they constitute what is known as "genetic burden. **4** "When genetic burden gets too great, offspring are so likely to have serious hereditary defects that the ability of the species to survive is threatened. And time only makes this evolutionary problem worse. Thanks to our accumulated genetic burden, serious hereditary defects are present in 1% of all human births." **5**

Pierre Grasse, who for twenty years held the Chair of Evolution at the Sorbonne in Paris, said that the “opportune appearance of mutations permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding: a single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule . . . There is no law against daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it.”

Note what Michael Pitman says about mutations:

*“If the genetic blueprint for an organism is initially optimal — like, say, the design for a new TV set — then mutations appear as damage incurred by wear and tear or misuse. Kicking a damaged TV set might improve its performance but the treatment is not generally recommended. In no way could random — or even well-directed — kicking have been responsible for the origin of the TV set in the first place. But the neo-Darwinian, who asserts that mutations are the raw material of evolution, and the only source of novelty for natural selection to work on, is both denying the existence of an optimal genetic blueprint (or archetype) for a life-form, and accepting ‘kicking’ as a rational means of improving it out of recognition. Mutations are pathological aberrations: who would risk exposure to radioactivity to generate a superhuman child? . . . The probability of simultaneous good mutations in all the genes which control a given character must lie very close to zero. For evolution to occur through mutation, countless sequential good mutations would be required; at each step all would have to cooperate harmoniously and each mutation would have to be selected for. This simply could not happen. As Arthur Koestler has put it: ‘Each mutation occurring alone would be wiped out before it could be combined with the others. They are all interdependent. The doctrine that their coming together was due to a series of blind coincidences is an affront not only to common sense but to the basic principles of scientific explanation.’ ” 6*

With the elimination of both natural selection and mutations as viable mechanisms of evolution, and the absence of any mechanism whatever, and with the new insights about the extremely complex structure of a cell as it is known through molecular biology, the theory of evolution is losing its credibility more and more. Witness the title of this book by Michael Denton, a molecular biologist and also an evolutionist, *Evolution, a Theory in Crisis*. *LSI*

### References

1. Pitman, Michael. *Adam and Evolution*. Rider, 1984, p. 59.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
3. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, July, 1983, p. 10.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
5. Morris, H. *Evolution in Turmoil*, Creation-Life, 1982, p. 50.
6. Pitman, M., *Op. cit.*, p. 66-67.