



Natural Processes-Natural Selection

by Darrel Kautz

(September-October, 2004)

[editorial note: This is a reprint of a much older article. Darrel Kautz went home to the Lord in 1993.]

In the evolutionary scheme of things, the power to generate new types of organisms resides in natural processes, particularly in natural selection and mutations. These so-called mechanisms of macroevolution function as a kind of "god." Both the atheistic evolutionist and the Bible-believing creationist attribute the origin of organisms to a power source of some kind. To the evolutionist that source is an impersonal force; to the creationist it is a personal Being.

Natural Processes

A process is a series of coordinated actions or functions which produces a certain result. Among the many different kinds of processes in nature are these: 1. Chemical reactions in which a substance decomposes, combines with other substances, or interchanges constituents with other substances, 2. Physiological processes such as occur in the digestive, nervous, and cardiovascular systems, 3. The carbon and nitrogen cycles, and 4. Reproduction in plants and animals.

Processes such as these are highly complex operations. They involve an immense number of interdependent components all of which must function correctly, with utmost precision, and at the right moment in time. In addition, the operation of one process in nature is integrated with the operation of other processes, so that the whole of nature is one huge machine-like mechanism.

The very existence of natural processes leads a person to ask: How did nature come to have so many processes in the first place? How did they all become so integrated and coordinated? Do evolutionists have credible explanations for the origin of natural processes? In evolutionary thinking all of the marvelously integrated processes observed by man are the products of chance (the blind watchmaker), or else a combination of chance, mutations, and natural selection. In the absence of some intelligence outside of matter, matter itself is viewed as being inherently intelligent. Yet matter is not known to possess intelligence inherently. The only rational explanation, therefore, for the existence of the kinds of processes enumerated above is that there had to be a supernatural Being Who conceived the world's many complex operational systems, and Who had the power to translate His concepts into reality. In the last analysis the universe is ordered matter/ energy, a thought expressed in matter, intelligence rendered in material form.

In this connection it is important to understand that there is a vast difference between a creation process (bringing the universe and life into existence initially) and an operation process (maintaining that original creation). A description of how something functions is not an explanation of how that "something" came into existence. Description does not explain origin! The operation of an automobile, for instance, is something altogether different from the manufacturing of its parts and the assembling of those parts into a functional vehicle.

Natural Selection

Natural selection, as Charles Darwin understood it, can be summarized briefly as follows: Within every species there are more individuals born than can possibly survive. Due to the presence of disease, predation, limited food supply, etc., there is a constant struggle for existence; the weak die, the fit survive. "Fitness" arises from small variations from the average. Particular combinations of variations give some individuals an advantage over

others, allowing them to survive and form the next generation. Favored variations are well represented among the offspring of survivors, but unfavorable ones remain at a low level, decrease or die out. Variations are emergent species; and over the course of geological time new species arise from old ones.¹

Darwin's special theory of evolution is "relatively conservative and restricted in scope and merely proposes that new races and species arise in nature by the agency of natural selection."² "What he in fact meticulously and correctly documented in his work was what modern evolutionists call 'microevolution.' This occurs all the time. It is what creationists call 'variation' and is not support for evolution in the grand sense of the word."³

Darwin's general theory of evolution is far more radical than his special theory. "It makes the claim that the 'special theory' applies universally; and hence that the appearance of all the manifold diversity of life on Earth can be explained by a simple extrapolation of the processes which bring about relatively trivial changes such as those seen on the Galapagos Islands. This 'general theory' is what most people think of when they refer to evolution theory."⁴

"For Darwin, all evolution was merely an extension of microevolutionary processes. Yet, despite the success of his special theory, despite the reality of microevolution, not all biologists have shared Darwin's confidence and accepted that the major divisions in nature could have been crossed by the same simple sorts of processes. Scepticism as to the validity of the extrapolation has been generally more marked on the European continent than in the English speaking world. The German zoologist, Bernhard Rensch, was able to provide a long list of leading authorities who have been inclined to the view that macroevolution cannot be explained in terms of microevolutionary processes, or any other currently known mechanisms. These dissenters cannot be dismissed as cranks, creationists, or vitalists, for among their ranks are many first rate biologists."⁵

It is nothing less than astonishing that in the great amount of time since 1859, macroevolutionists are still without a scientifically credible explanation of how macroevolution occurred. This is even more amazing when one notices that this army of scholarly evolutionists has been working in universities and laboratories worldwide and operating on fantastic budgets financed, in part, by taxes and gifts from corporations and foundations.⁶ The failure of evolutionists to validate macroevolution scientifically tends to support the conclusion that macroevolution is a myth—something foreign to genuine science and not worthy of further pursuit.

In reality natural selection is a conserving mechanism, not a creating one; it is a passive process, not an active one. In natural selection there is no intelligence at work in the selecting process. Furthermore, mutations degrade an organism; they do not produce new genetic information which leads to the production of more complex organisms. In natural selection existing genes are recombined to form variations within the originally created kinds. Recall the variety of colors of roses and the many breeds of dogs. Species possess a compulsion to reproduce their own kind.

In England the melanic or dark form of a certain moth (*Biston betularia*) is prevalent in areas in which the trees are devoid of lichens because of industrial pollution. The peppered or light form persists in areas where the lichens remain. "Each group of organisms possesses a unique set of capabilities that allows it to live harmoniously within its particular environment. These capabilities are called adaptations."⁷ Adaptations are relatively trivial changes; they fall into the category of what earlier was spoken of as "microevolution."

Natural selection is supposed to be a kind of "try it and see" mechanism for progress in which each chance reaction and mutation compete for survival. The method is wasteful of material, immensely time consuming, and very cruel to the majority of organisms. In addition, it is recognized in biology that natural selection works on the end products produced by the genetic code. That being the case, how can natural selection reach "the germinal code mechanisms" to effect a genetic change leading to more complex organs and organisms?⁸

The British evolutionist, Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, pointed out that, "No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever gotten near it and most of the current argument in neoDarwinism is about this question."⁹

Norman Macbeth (a lawyer), author of *Darwin Retried*, says that the expression “natural selection” is “utterly empty. It doesn’t describe anything.”¹⁰ Michael Pitman of Cambridge University writes that “natural selection can only reduce rather than increase genetic variability. It operates in nature solely as a conservative mechanism, a sieve to weed out the weak, malformed or sick and maintain a healthy stock. It is indeed a force counteracting the tendency for mutation to cause a degeneration in the quality of living organisms—but it cannot be creative.”¹¹ “Natural selection working on chance (nonteleonomy) is the modern magic wand!” says Prof. Wilder-Smith.¹²

At a meeting of the world’s leading evolutionists in Chicago in October of 1980, the central question, according to *Science* (Nov. 21, 1980), “was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macro-evolution.” The response of a reporter in his article is, “At the risk of doing violence to the positions of some of the people at the meeting, the answer can be given as a clear, No.”¹³

Natural selection, then, is acknowledged even by certain well-known scientists to be useless as a mechanism for macroevolution. Its scientific validity for explaining macroevolution is zero. In point of fact, natural selection is one of the Creator’s processes for maintaining the stability and the quality of the categories of life He created.
LSI

References

1. Pitman, Michael, *Adam and Evolution* (Rider, 1984), pp. 16-17.
2. Denton, Michael, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Adler & Adler, 1985), p. 44.
3. Pitman, M., *Op. cit.*, p. 17
4. Denton, M., *Op. cit.*, p. 44.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
6. Pitman, M., *Op. cit.*, p. 50.
7. Lester, L. and Bohlin, R. *The Natural Limits to Biological Change* (Zondervan, 1984), pp. 21, 74-75.
8. Wilder-Smith, A. E., *God: To Be Or Not To Be?* (Telos-International, Stuttgart, 1975), p. 51.
9. Morris, Henry, *Evolution in Turmoil* (Creation-Life, 1982), p. 39.
10. Sunderland, Luther, *Darwin’s Enigma* (Master Books, 1984), p. 25.
11. Pitman, M., *Op. cit.*, p. 76.
12. Wilder-Smith, A. *The Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution* (Master Books, 1981), p. 61.
13. Morris, H. and Parker, G. *What is Creation Science?* (Creation-Life, 1982), p. 74-75;