

Darwin was very Wrong

Jan Wade Gilbert*

WIAN Industries, Wilmington, North Carolina, USA

***Corresponding Author:** Jan Wade Gilbert, WIAN Industries, Wilmington, North Carolina, USA.

Received: May 14, 2019; **Published:** May 30, 2019

There just is no way Darwin's major thesis can be right. It has to be wrong. Let's take one of the famous examples of Darwinism: random genetic mutations causing faster running big cats like lions and leopards. Ostensibly, the faster a predator can run, the more likely it will survive because of the ability to run down prey and to escape more quickly when itself is in danger.

No one mutation can make an animal run faster. The combination of changes necessary - from different musculature to differing biochemistry to bone structure alterations and to the balancing of those changes with the rest of the body - is not a random mutation. One random mutation cannot possibly control such a plethora of changes to such a wide variety of tolerances. Such would deny all that we have uncovered about genetics.

However, for arguments sake, let's say there is one gene that can mutate and so cause the development of that animal into a faster runner. And let's say, for argument sake, that the mutation happened in a gamete, a single - one - gamete when there was the possibility of the mutation happening so many elsewhere; of all the other possible DNA strands present in this specimen. And, that mutation happened to occur in a cat instead of a paramecium. And that gamete became a zygote. And that zygote developed into an embryo and ultimately entered the world as a healthy but helpless baby. And let's further think that this single cat survived, stayed healthy and grew up to be a parent that passed on that mutation and the resulting second generation zygote also went through the dangers of development and growth and also survived its birth and it, too, lived safely and without harm or death to also become a parent.

Do you not see the extraordinary, unbelievable and outright impossible sets of events that must take place for such a thing to be true? One such event is way out of the range of favorable odds but to string together the multitude of such dramatic changes can't be accepted by a reasonable person.

The same thing goes for giraffes that developed long necks enabling them to better survive because they can reach higher on the plant to eat what others with short necks cannot access. The entire circulatory structure would require a change as well as the fluid dynamics of the new situation.

Ah, you say. It would have been a series of mutations, not just one.

Do you mean that a random, beneficial mutation would occur in the same animal that had the first random mutation; and then the third coordinated random and helpful mutation in the same animal lineage and so on until all of the necessary mutations will have occurred and, miraculously, all in the entities that had the previous mutations befall them? Is that what you think?

And do you not know that current scientific thinking is that: seemingly random mutations, as a rule, are harmful and do not persist?

Darwin cannot be correct in that aspect of his theory.

There are few names in scientific history that conjure one-side-or-the-other as does Charles Darwin. He evokes the battle between Creationism (The Bible) and Evolution (Origin of The Species). Can we have both? Yes - to a small degree and No - to a huge degree.

If one believes in Creationism, it's BOOM! - all done in one act of God. Like magic... and we all know there is no such thing as magic; only events for which we do not now have a reason for it to happen.

If, however, we believe in Darwinism, you could be considered as foolish or uneducated because there is no way evolution makes sense on a large scale. Darwin's ideas could never work; not in 10 billion years and the world (so says science by some estimates) is only 5 billion years old. Biblically, it's dramatically younger by so much in comparison it causes one to think someone is woefully errant.

For the moment, let's forget about all of the inconsistencies, details that bang into each other (well-known details about which people never think) and realities that cross one's eyes in the light of Darwin's theories.

And let us not forget that Darwin's ideas are still only theories. That means they are unproven.

They will never be proved because they are stunningly wrong, make no scientific sense and anyone with an understanding of embryology and genetics would laugh at Darwin's concepts about evolution.

Where does one begin when debunking Darwin? How about: most mutations are destructive to the organism? But let's say that a mutation occurs that is a positive. That means that somewhere along the genetic landscape a gene has altered. How, why and exactly when are questions we'll just put aside for now. That one change, let's say, made the protein actin different and when muscles contracted, the sliding mechanism of actin and myosin was now different. Since it's that sliding mechanism of actin and myosin that allows the muscles to perform as they do and it is now different, let's grant that the muscles can now contract more quickly and more strongly. Of all the possible places for such a mutation to happen, having it happen to a human is unlikely (by dint of odds alone) - though possible. That's possible but what if the mutation happened not to a human but to a bunny.

And the bunny with that trait survived and bred and the trait was passed on to the offspring. Knowing how many offspring a single bunny can have in a year, it could happen that that one mutated bunny survived and passed along that gene to the next generation. What luck against the odds of survival?

We now have a bunny whose muscles perform differently from the others and we give in to the possibility that the muscles are stronger (though they could be weakened and not cause demise); or require different nutritional components to make contraction happen.

Having that one mutation can likely be worthless unless other mutations happen that give the muscle mutation an advanced phenotype. For example, stronger muscles with better oxygenation; longer muscles and longer bones with correspondingly stronger and longer ligaments and tendons; and correspondingly longer vessels (blood, lymphatics) and it all has to coordinate with growth in every other related area.

In any case, that one bunny's genetic line has been altered, possibly for a long time to come but possibly not at all if the bunny carrying that altered gene does not survive (is eaten by a predator or gets sick and can't reproduce or for some other reason does not procreate).

Having that one random mutation might be worthless unless other mutations also happen at the same time to the same bunny that gives the muscle mutation an advantaged phenotype. For example, stronger muscles with better oxygenation; longer muscles with longer bones and correspondingly longer blood vessels and the entire biomechanical apparatus mutating in coordination to enhance this bunny, etc.

Let's say those needed mutations do occur based on the quintillions of genetic reproductions that occur. But who's to say they all occur in that one bunny line? What if the needed, random additional mutations occurred in a horse; or another bunny; or bat; and not in the chosen bunny?

It's unthinkable to believe that all of the mutations would happen in that one genetic bunny line and the bunnies all survive and procreate and without mishap pass along all of the mutations.

Never! - unless there was a sophisticated, super intelligent force making that happen.

Evolution as Darwin suggests could never happen; not in a million years and not in a trillion years.

Creationism is that superior intelligent being coordinating all of the biochemical necessities*.

Darwin says the giraffe with the longest neck will get to eat more food from the taller trees and so have an advantage over the shorter-necked giraffes.

In order to have a longer neck, one must also have longer bones and the entire structure of the neck and associated muscles, blood and lymph vessels, nerve structure, connective tissue, etc. must also be changed (mutated) to accommodate the increased length.

Do you have any idea of the fortuitous and coordinated mutations and successes in life that would have to occur; spontaneously, no less?

Volume 18 Issue 6 June 2019

©All rights reserved by Jan Wade Gilbert.