

**Natural Selection is More Consistent with Creation than with the General Theory of
Evolution**

Kenneth J. Coughlan

March 15, 2020

Despite common use to the contrary, natural selection and evolution are not synonymous. It is possible to accept natural selection as an accurate biological mechanism and still adhere to a creation model for the universe. Claims to the contrary are typically based on a misrepresentation of natural selection, evolution, or both. In fact, an accurate appreciation of the information-rich nature of the genetic code demonstrates that natural selection is far from the only alleged evidence for evolutionary theory that fails to hit its mark.

As Donald Batten explains, natural selection is merely the commonsense notion that “[c]reatures with features (traits) suited to survival in a given environment tend to survive better than those that do not have those features.”¹ It is a purposeless process by which creatures that both survive and reproduce will be those which carry on in a particular environment. This process, as far as it goes, is not controversial. However, there is a large intellectual leap between conceding the reality of natural selection and embracing the General Theory of Evolution.

Batten outlines two varieties of evolution that sometime get improperly conflated. The Special Theory of Evolution (STE) refers to “simple changes in species.” The General Theory of Evolution (GTE), however, attempts to extrapolate these simple changes into an explanation of the “origin of the diversity of all living things.”² Proponents of GTE often speak as if natural selection and GTE were one and the same, such that evidence of natural selection is *per se* evidence of GTE. However, this is founded upon a misrepresentation of natural selection.

¹ Donald Batten, “Natural Selection,” in *Evolution’s Achilles Heel*, ed. Robert Carter (Powder Springs, GA: Creation Book Publishers, 2015), 15.

² *Ibid.*, 18.

Natural selection requires something already in existence on which it can operate. For example, at the genetic level, natural selection may be able to favor one gene over another. However, that gene must already exist before it can be favored. GTE requires the infusion of new genetic information into an organism in order to account for new body structures. While natural selection can “select” a gene, it cannot create one. Evolutionists propose other explanations for the creation of new genetic information such as gene duplication and mutation. But these are not natural selection. Thus, natural selection in and of itself does not lead to the conclusion that GTE is true.

In fact, Batten argues that natural selection is consistent with a creation model. In the first chapter of Genesis, “[t]he formula, ‘according to their kinds’ or ‘after their kinds’ is used repeatedly (10 times) in reference to the creation of different types of living things.”³ Thus, the creation model is not based upon specific creatures, but rather “kinds” of creatures. Batten states that speciation, meaning changes within a created kind, is completely consistent with the Genesis description. God created broad “kinds” with the genetic information already contained within them to permit variation within that kind over time. This stands in contrast to GTE, however, which contends that organisms undergo radical alterations, eventually becoming something completely different. While speciation is often cited as evidence in favor of GTE, it fails on the most significant point. Speciation only demonstrates change within a “kind.” Those changes may come about through natural selection without violating any of the parameters of the creation model. However, in order for evidence to support GTE, it must demonstrate the ability for one kind to evolve into another, and speciation simply does not show any such process.

³ Ibid., 28.

Faced with the need to articulate evidence of a mechanism capable of producing new genetic information (in order to account for the development from the simplest organisms to the most complex), evolutionists have resorted to mutations as a possible explanation. When a gene mutates, so the argument goes, it can sometimes create a new gene that turns out to be advantageous to the organism. Thus, this new gene is favored by natural selection and works its way into the evolutionary history of the creature. Unfortunately, which some useful mutations have come about, the overwhelming majority are deleterious. Further, Batten observes that even those that are advantageous are the result of something being broken at the molecular level, not the creation of something new.⁴

Other examples sometimes cited to support GTE's claims actually turn out to be the result of gene switches turning on or off certain genetic activity. For example, according to Batten, saltwater stickleback fish have spines and armor plates around their bodies. The freshwater variety, however, lack such spines and plates in their pelvic region. According to the evolutionary story, a number of factors in freshwater lakes made those pelvic spines and plates disadvantageous, so changes in the genetic code occurred resulting in an alteration of the fish's body structure. In reality, though, both forms of stickleback possess the genetic information to form the pelvic features. In the freshwater fish, a corrupted genetic switch prevents the organism from forming the spines. The information did not change. Rather the information was "deactivated." The stickleback did not experience any mutations in its genetic code. The code was merely turned "off" (and has been shown to be capable of being turned back "on" again as

⁴ Ibid., 35.

well). The actions of a genetic switch are not the same as an advantageous mutation and do nothing to help support the evolutionist's burden of proof.

Even if evolutionists could point to sufficient advantageous mutations in genomes, that still would be far from proving GTE. The information-rich complexity of DNA speaks loudly against any such evolutionary explanation. Robert W. Carter identifies numerous characteristics of DNA which defy evolutionary odds. For example, he cites the way in which DNA is folded in upon itself. While genes that are used together may be far apart on the chromosomes, once folded they are quite near in three-dimensional space. Further, this folded shape changes over time in order to accommodate the changing genetic needs of the cell. Codon degeneracy minimizes the impact of potential mutations by permitting a codon to produce the same amino acid regardless of the final letter in its sequence. It also turns out to be ideal in allowing overlapping codes, in which each section of the genome can be responsible for multiple things simultaneously, allowing for significant data compression.⁵ Such an information-rich system is easily recognizable in any other context as having been the result of an intelligent mind, but GTE advocates have failed to come up with an alternative and viable naturalistic mechanism.

Thus, rather than supporting GTE, natural selection ends up being more consistent with creation. After all, it gives evidence of changes within kinds, not alterations from one kind to another. Other commonly cited evidence, such as gene switches, do not involve the creation of new genetic information at all. Finally, a thorough appreciation of the nature of DNA shows that it is a repository of information that, while it could be inserted by an intelligent mind, is inconsistent with the type of blind, naturalistic processes that GTE advances.

⁵ Robert W. Carter, "Genetics and DNA," in *Evolution's Achilles Heel*, ed. Robert Carter (Powder Springs, GA: Creation Book Publishers, 2015), 60 - 65.