

THE REFUTATION

EVOLUTIONARY THEORY:

NATURAL SELECTION

SHOWN TO BE WRONG

BY

COLIN LESLIE DEAN

***B.SC, B.A, B.LITT (HONS), M.A, B,LITT (HONS), M.A,
M.A (PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDIES), MASTER OF
PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDIES, GRAD CERT (LITERARY
STUDIES)***

THE REFUTATION

EVOLUTIONARY THEORY:

NATURAL SELECTION

SHOWN TO BE WRONG

BY

COLIN LESLIE DEAN

***B.SC, B.A, B.LITT (HONS), M.A, B,LITT (HONS), M.A,
M.A (PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDIES), MASTER OF
PSYCHOANALYTIC STUDIES, GRAD CERT (LITERARY
STUDIES)***

GAMAHUCHER PRESS WEST GEELONG, VICTORIA AUSTRALIA

2009

**There are four points which show natural selection [NS] is
invalid or wrong**

1) the cambrian explosion as darwin saw invalidates his theory.

<http://www.genesispark.com/genpark/explo/explo.htm>

“No real progress has been made by evolutionists since Darwin’s day and "The Cambrian evolutionary explosion is still shrouded in mystery." (Eldredge, N., *The Monkey Business*, 1982, p. 46.)”-at the present time nothing has changed

2) NS is invalidated by the fact of speciation as NS only deals with traits already present and cant deal with the generation of new species genetics might be able to account for the generation of new species [see below where it is shown genetics cannot account for the generation of new species] but NS cant as the generation of new species it not part of its remit

3) NS deals with the transmission of favorable traits and the eradication of unfavorable traits so the fact that unfavorable traits ie the gene for breast cancer are and can be transmitted and become common invalidates NS out right Some argue that harmful genes can be transmitted and become common when accompanied by good genes but this makes natural selection wrong ie

”natural selection, a process that causes helpful traits (those that increase the chance of survival and reproduction) to become more common in a population *and causes harmful traits to become more rare*”(Ref: Futuyma, Douglas Evolution 2005”

seeing bad genes can become common this thus makes natural selection wrong which says bad genes should be come rare or less common

4) genetics cannot account for the generation of new species-ie the cambrian explosion as it is claimed the generation of new genes is a random process due to radiation, viruses, chemicals etc and genetic cannot account for these process happening as they are out side the scope of genetics physics chaos theory etc may give some explanation but genetics cant

TO GIVE DETAIL

Natural selection

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_selection

“Natural selection is the process by which favorable [heritable traits](#) become more common in successive [generations](#) of a

population of reproducing organisms, and **unfavorable heritable traits become less common,**”

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution>

”natural selection, a process that causes helpful traits (those that increase the chance of survival and reproduction) to become more common in a population **and causes harmful traits to become more rare**” (Ref: Futuyma, Douglas Evolution 2005 Bowler, Peter. Evolution: the history of an idea)

(it should be noted that wiki altered its definition of NS in 2009 here is a link to a wiki page which has the original reference

http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Natural_selection&oldid=259585753) (again see

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk%3ANatural_selection#Dec_2008_to_Dec2007_revision_of_natural_selection_on_Wikipedia)

(here is a link to a book with the quote

<http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=BAaYNjlrJDcC&pg=PA289&lpg=PA289&dq=%22Natural+selection+is+the+process+by+which+favorable+heritable+traits+become+more+common+in+successive+generations+of+a+population+of+reproducing+organisms,+and+unfavorable+heritable+traits+become+less+common%22&source=bl&ots=zOoaYhJwHX>

<https://www.google.com/search?q=Natural%20selection%20is%20the%20process%20by%20which%20favorable%20heritable%20traits%20become%20more%20common%20in%20successive%20generations%20of%20a%20population%20of%20reproducing%20organisms%2C%20and%20unfavorable%20heritable%20traits%20become%20less%20common%22&f=false>)

Note the terms “favorable” “unfavorable” and “common” are subjective value laden theory laden and relative terms. All open to varying ideological interpretations

it is stated

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Objections_to_evolution#Evolution_is_controversial_or_contested

“evolutionary theory itself has been entirely uncontested in the field of biology and is commonly described as the "cornerstone of modern biology”

Evolution takes place via two process according to evolutionary theory

Natural Selection and genetic drift

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution>

Two major mechanisms determine which variants will become more common or rare in a population. The first is **natural selection**, a process that causes helpful traits (those that increase the chance of survival and reproduction) to become more common in a population and causes harmful traits to become more rare. This occurs because individuals with advantageous traits are more likely to reproduce, meaning that more individuals in the next generation will inherit these traits.^{[2][3]} Over many generations, **adaptations** occur through a combination of successive, small, random changes in traits, and **natural selection** of the variants best-suited for their environment.^[4] The second major mechanism driving evolution is **genetic drift**, an independent process that produces random changes in the frequency of traits in a population. Genetic drift results from the role that **chance** plays in whether a given trait will be passed on as individuals survive and reproduce. It will be pointed out that Natural selection/genetics does not generate new species/genes. Natural selection does not generate new genes/species Natural selection adds no new genetic information as it only deals with the passing on of genes/traits already present and it will be pointed out genetics cannot account for

the generation of new species/genes as it is claimed the generation of new genes [via mutation] is a random process due to radiation, viruses, chemicals etc and genetics cannot account for these process happening as they are out side the scope of genetics physics, chaos theory etc may give some explanation but genetics cant

points which disproves natural selection

1_punctuated equilibrium

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Punctuated_equilibrium

“Punctuated equilibrium is a theory in evolutionary biology which states that most sexually reproducing species experience little change for most of their geological history, showing stasis in the fossil record, and that when phenotypic evolution does occur, it is localized in rare, rapid events of branching speciation (called cladogenesis).”

Charles Darwin noted

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Punctuated_equilibrium

“The sudden appearance and lack of substantial gradual change of most species in the geologic record—from their initial appearance until their extinction—“

now the current thinking notes that speciation or punctuated equilibrium contradicts Darwin theory

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Punctuated_equilibrium

“Thus punctuated equilibrium contradicts some of Darwin's ideas regarding the specific mechanisms of evolution, but generally accords with Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection”

It is claimed that Goulds intention with PE was to be compatible with NS. Goulds intentions are irrelevant. As the consequence of PE is that it invalidates NS

Now NS is invalidated by the fact of speciation as NS only deals with traits/genes already present and cant deal with the generation of new species/genes

genetics might be able to account for the generation of new species [see below where it is shown genetics cannot account for the generation of new species] but NS cant as the generation of new species/genes is not part of its remit as it only deals with traits/genes already present Natural selection does not generate new genes/species. Natural selection adds no new genetic information as it only deals with the passing on of genes/traits already present . A new species has completely new traits/genes which were not in an antecedent so the antecedent species could not have passed them on NS is all about the transmission of already acquired traits/genes if evolution can take place by speciation i.e. a new species has new traits/genes that are not present in the antecedent species thus NS is invalid as it cannot account for speciation

Note Gould talks about speciation ie the appearance of new species And below Gould talks about phylum BUT scientists cannot tell us what a species or phylum is

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"However, the exact definition of the term "species" is still controversial, particularly in prokaryotes,[2] and this is called the species problem.[3"

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phylum>

"Although a phylum is often spoken of as if it were a hard and fast entity, no satisfactory definition of a phylum exists"

With out a definition of these terms then biologists are really talking nonsense for with out definitions to locate and identify the things they talk about they are really not talking about anything at all If the biologist talks about say speciation or this species proving natural selection but cant tell you what a species or phylum is then he is talking meaningless nonsense. He could as easily said certain gibbles prove natural selection but with out knowing what a gibble is the claim is meaningless

<http://conservativecolloquium.wordpress.com/2008/01/22/the-philosophical-and-theoretical-flaws-of-darwinian-evolution>

“British geneticist C. H. Waddington also recognized **natural selection** to be a tautology. Consider another example: “vertebrates evolved from invertebrates.” But invertebrate by definition means “not a vertebrate.” Evolve means to change, and **a changed thing is not what it once was**, by definition. Thus the example can be reduced to absurd and useless repetition: **something evolved from what it was not**. The end result of the phrase is merely an assumption, not a demonstration. **Evolution in this way assumes itself, cloaked in logical fallacy.**” **Natural selection adds no new genetic information as it only deals with the passing on of genes/traits already present**

NOTE

“**Natural selection** is the process by which favorable heritable traits become more common in successive generations of a population of reproducing organisms, and unfavorable heritable traits become less common,”

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution>

”natural selection, a process that causes helpful traits (those that increase the chance of survival and reproduction) to become more common in a population **and causes harmful traits to become more rare**” (Ref: Futuyma, Douglas Evolution 2005
Bowler, Peter. Evolution: the history of an idea)

2_The Cambrian explosion disproves natural selection

“**Natural selection is the process by which favorable heritable traits become more common in successive generations of a population of reproducing organisms, and unfavorable heritable traits become less common,**”

but the cambrian explosion contradicts natural selection

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambrian_explosion

Cambrian explosion

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambrian_explosion

“The **Cambrian** explosion or Cambrian radiation was the seemingly rapid appearance of most major groups of complex **animals** around **530** million years ago, as evidenced by the **fossil record**.^{[1][2]} This was accompanied by a major diversification of other organisms, including **animals**, **phytoplankton**, and **calcimicrobes**.^[3] Before about **580** million years ago, most organisms were simple, composed of individual cells occasionally organized into **colonies**. Over the following 70 or 80 million years the rate of **evolution** accelerated by an **order of magnitude** (as defined in terms of the extinction and origination rate of species^[4]) and the diversity of life began to resemble today’s.^[5]

The Cambrian explosion has generated extensive scientific debate. The seemingly rapid appearance of fossils in the “Primordial Strata” was noted as early as the mid 19th century,^[6] and **Charles Darwin** saw it as one of the main objections that could be made against his theory of evolution by **natural selection**.^[7]

The long-running puzzlement about the appearance of the Cambrian **fauna**, *seemingly abruptly and from nowhere”*

species appeared from no where

“The long-running puzzlement about the appearance of the Cambrian fauna, seemingly *abruptly and from nowhere*,”

<http://www.genesispark.com/genpark/explo/explo.htm>

“No real progress has been made by evolutionists since Darwin’s day and “The Cambrian evolutionary explosion is still shrouded in mystery.” (Eldredge, N., *The Monkey Business*, 1982, p. 46.)”- nothing has changed in regard to this mystery

now even Darwin saw this as destroying his theory

“The Cambrian explosion has generated extensive scientific debate. The seemingly rapid appearance of fossils in the “Primordial Strata” was noted as early as the mid 19th century,[6] [b]and *Charles Darwin saw it as one of the main objections that could be made against his theory of evolution by natural selection.*[/b][7]”

<http://www.genesispark.com/genpark/explo/explo.htm>

“Some modern Darwinists have suggested that the absence of primitive lifeforms below the Cambrian is not a problem for evolution. However, this difficulty was fully appreciated by Darwin and it has only become more acute since his days. “Nevertheless, the difficulty of assigning any good reason for the absence of vast piles of strata rich in fossils beneath

the Cambrian system is very great. ...The case at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained." (Darwin, C., *The Origin of Species*, 1872, pp. 316-317.) Today, Gould writes, "The Cambrian Explosion occurred in a geological moment, and we have reason to think that all major anatomical designs may have made their evolutionary appearance at that time. ...not only the phylum Chordata itself, but also all its major divisions, arose within the Cambrian Explosion. So much for chordate uniqueness... Contrary to Darwin's expectation that new data would reveal gradualistic continuity with slow and steady expansion, all major discoveries of the past century have only heightened the massiveness and geological abruptness of this formative event..." (Gould, Stephen J., *Nature*, vol. 377, October 1995, p.682.) "The Cambrian explosion was the most remarkable and puzzling event in the history of life." (Gould, Stephen J., "The Evolution of Life," in Schopf, *Evolution: Facts and Fallacies*, 1999, p. 9.)"-nothing has changed

NOTE

Even the arch evolutionist Dawkins states the Cambrian explosion is a major problem and gives support for the creationists

<http://www.genesispark.org/genpark/explo/explo.htm>

“Eldredge and Gould certainly would agree that some very important gaps really are due to imperfections in the fossil record. Very big gaps, too. For example the Cambrian strata of rocks, vintage about 600 million years, are

the oldest ones in which we find most of the major invertebrate groups. **And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear.** It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. **Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists.**" (Dawkins, Richard, *The Blind Watchmaker*," 1986, p.229).-nothing has changed to the present

NOTE

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cambrian_explosion

“Charles Darwin considered this sudden appearance of many animal groups with few or no antecedents to be the greatest single objection to his theory of evolution:”

note there is little or no evidence in the preceding geological strata of transitional fossils

thus

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Objections_to_evolution

“Darwin himself found the paucity of transitional species to be *one of the greatest weaknesses of his theory:*”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Punctuated_equilibrium#Relation_to_Darwin.27s_theories

“who appealed to the imperfection of the record as the favored explanation.”

As it stands right now *the evidence* of cambrian explosion invalidates NS if there is no evidence to prove NS that is just to bad and you cant live in hope the evidence will show up
As it stand right now *the evidence* of cambrian explosion invalidates NS

darwin saw

if you have an abrupt explosion of species out of now where ,that invalidates NS-the geological evidence cannot be found to support NS so empirically it is not supported -thus invalidated -up to the present time

This sudden appearance of new species has been explained as speciation but as we saw speciation mean NS is wrong

<http://www.fossilmuseum.net/Paleobiology/CambrianExplosion.htm>

“some scientists believe there was indeed an explosion of diversity [cambrian explosion] (the so-called punctuated equilibrium theory elaborated by Nils

Eldredge the late Stephen J. Gould - Models In Paleobiology, 1972

note that at the time of Darwin the cambrian explosion was evidence that refuted his theory all the religious people had to do at the times was refer to science itself for refutation of evolutionism ie the cambrian explosion and lack of **EVIDENCE** for natural selection

3)

NOW NS is invalidated by the fact that unfavorable traits are transmitted and can become common – THERE ARE MANY GENETIC DISORDERS WHICH ARE COMMON ie the gene for breast cancer

“**Natural selection** is the process by which favorable heritable traits become more common in successive generations of a population of reproducing organisms, and **unfavorable heritable traits become less common,**

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution>

”natural selection, a process that causes helpful traits (those that increase the chance of

survival and reproduction) to become more common in a population **and causes harmful traits to become more rare**” (Ref: Futuyma, Douglas Evolution 2005 Bowler, Peter. Evolution: the history of an idea)

(it should be noted that wiki altered its definition of NS in 2009 here is a link to a wiki page which has the original reference

http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Natural_selection&oldid=259585753) (again see

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk%3ANatural_selection#Dec_2008_to_Dec2007_revision_of_natural_selection_on_Wikipedia

Note some say that harmful genes can be transmitted so long as they accompany good genes or have beneficial results. But this is not what NS says –

”natural selection, a process that causes helpful traits (those that increase the chance of survival and reproduction) to become more common in a population *and causes harmful traits to become more rare*”(Ref: Futuyma, Douglas Evolution 2005)”

(here is a link to a book with the quote

<http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=BAaYNjlrJDcC&pg=PA289&lpg=PA289&dq=%22Natural+selection+is+the+process+by+which+favorable+heritable+traits+become+more+common+in+successive+generations+>

[of+a+population+of+reproducing+organisms,+and+unfavorable+heritable+traits+become+less+common%22&source=bl&ots=zOoaYhJwHX&sig=kqQFaabdIRtuwysfo83Ax2A0PUY&hl=en&ei=giaXTsnoGIGt8QO-yenoBQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=10&ved=0CGAQ6AEwCQ#v=onepage&q=%22Natural%20selection%20is%20the%20process%20by%20which%20favorable%20heritable%20traits%20become%20more%20common%20in%20successive%20generations%20of%20a%20population%20of%20reproducing%20organisms%2C%20and%20unfavorable%20heritable%20traits%20become%20less%20common%22&f=false](https://www.google.com/search?q=of+a+population+of+reproducing+organisms,+and+unfavorable+heritable+traits+become+less+common%22&source=bl&ots=zOoaYhJwHX&sig=kqQFaabdIRtuwysfo83Ax2A0PUY&hl=en&ei=giaXTsnoGIGt8QO-yenoBQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=10&ved=0CGAQ6AEwCQ#v=onepage&q=%22Natural%20selection%20is%20the%20process%20by%20which%20favorable%20heritable%20traits%20become%20more%20common%20in%20successive%20generations%20of%20a%20population%20of%20reproducing%20organisms%2C%20and%20unfavorable%20heritable%20traits%20become%20less%20common%22&f=false))

seeing bad genes can become common in the population this thus makes natural selection wrong which says bad genes should be come rare or less common in the population

NS. Also concepts of “good” and harmful/bad “rare” “common” are subjective value laden ideological terms which can mean different things to different people.

Now NS is about favorable genes being transmitted and becoming common and unfavorable genes becoming less common

Now unfavorable killer genes ie breast cancer genes can and are transmitted and are common in the population-thus invalidating NS

Young women mums and grandmother are killed by it ie breast cancer genes It occurs in women of childbearing age and they transmit it to their daughters. Some say a gene that kills after child bearing age does not invalidate NS. The fact is the gene for breast cancer kills Young women mums and grandmother. It is an abuse of language to say such a deleterious gene which kills all ages of women is not bad or unfavorable

Some argue that NS or survival only matters up to the point where you survive long enough to reproduce These people seem to think humans are a species of octopus or salmon If all human women died after giving birth to children the kids would die as well-thus humans would not survive Kids need living parents to survive if the mothers died after birthing the kids would die Take mammals if the mammal mother died after giving birth the off spring would die and mammals become extinct

Also kids can only survive if there are adults around to look after them now adults can be mum and dad and also grandparents Note In africa with the adults dieing of aids it is the grandparents bringing up the kids. All members of the human population play their part in the survival of the species- humans are not a species of octopus or bacteria or amoeba or salmon

Now some people argue that a disease or genetic disorder that does not affect reproduction is not considered harmful or unfavorable in terms of natural selection

Now some claim that if a woman at reproduction age- from puberty to menopause - has a genetic disorder ie breast cancer has a child then the genetic disorder was not harmful or unfavorable in terms of natural selection because it did not hinder her from reproducing, but the women might have had another 20 years of reproducing left if she had not died so **then it could be argued that those genes were harmful or unfavorable as they stopped her from reproducing up to menopause ie her full reproductive term** And again if a woman at reproduction age- from puberty to menopause- dies before reproducing **then it could be argued that those genes were harmful or unfavorable as they stopped her from reproducing**

EVIDENCE FOR COMMON HARMFUL GENES IN THE POPULATION

Research has shown the breast cancer genes are common and may lead to other cancers – all of which invalidates NS

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution>

”natural selection, a process that causes helpful traits (those that increase the chance of survival and reproduction) to become more common in a population **and causes harmful**

traits to become more rare” (Ref: Futuyma, Douglas Evolution 2005
Bowler, Peter. Evolution: the history of an idea)

<http://www.abc.net.au/science/articles/2009/03/30/2529713.htm>

Researchers find new **breast cancer** genes

“Associate Professor Jennifer Byrne, at the [University of Sydney](#)'s Faculty of Medicine, says the two studies suggest there are more of these "weak alleles" that affect **breast cancer** risk yet to be found.

Byrne, an oncology researcher, says **these genes play a tiny role in increasing risk, but may be quite common in the general population.**

"Individually they are probably not major factors, but cumulatively they could be helpful in working out who is at greater risk," she says.

"They are all small pieces of the puzzle."

She also suggests they may play an important role in what is termed sporadic **breast cancer**, which is **cancer** without an obvious genetic basis.

"These are the genes that might underlie this form of **cancer**," she says.

Regardless of their role in **breast cancer**, Byrne says the findings may have side benefits for **cancer** research in general.

Genes involved in breast cancer predisposition can also play roles in cancers such as ovarian and prostate, she says.

"They [the variants] may predispose to more than breast cancer in the end," she says"

MORE EVIDENCE

these genes are harmful as they can lead to the death of the person –even child bearing women

<http://www.cancerhelp.org.uk/help/default.asp?page=5689>

"But it is possible to be born with a gene fault that may cause cancer. This doesn't mean you will definitely get cancer. But it means that you are more likely to develop cancer than the average person"

“The first breast cancer gene faults to be found were BRCA1 and BRCA2. These faults don't mean you have cancer, or you definitely will get cancer **but women with these genes have a 50 to 80% chance of getting breast cancer in their lifetime.** We now know of other genes that significantly increase a woman's risk of breast cancer. They are called TP53 and PTEN. Genetic tests are available to women with a high risk of having changes in their BRCA1, BRCA2, TP53 or PTEN genes.

“Researchers have found other common genes that can slightly increase a woman's risk of developing breast cancer. These are called CASP8, FGFR2, TNRC18, MAP3K1 and LSP1. No tests are available to find these genes yet.”

“Rare genes that can also increase breast cancer risk slightly include CHEK2, ATM (ataxia telangiectasia mutated), BRIP1 and PALB2. No tests are available for these genes yet”

“With particular groups of women, **there are very common specific gene faults.** Ashkenazi Jewish women tend to have one of 3 very particular gene mutations”

<http://ghr.nlm.nih.gov/condition=breastcancer>

“Hereditary cancers are those associated with inherited gene mutations. **Hereditary breast cancers tend to occur earlier in life** than noninherited (sporadic) cases and are more likely to involve both breasts”

“BRCA1 and BRCA2 are major genes related to hereditary breast cancer. Women who have inherited certain mutations in these genes have a high risk of developing breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and several other types of cancer during their lifetimes”

“Additionally, BRCA1 mutations are associated with an increased risk of pancreatic cancer. Mutations in the BRCA2 gene are associated with an increased chance of developing male breast cancer and cancers of the prostate and pancreas. An aggressive form of skin cancer called melanoma is also more common among people who have BRCA2 mutations.”

“Inherited changes in several other genes, including CDH1, PTEN, STK11, and TP53, have been found to increase the risk of developing breast cancer”

“Some research suggests that inherited variants of the ATM, BARD1, BRIP1, CHEK2, NBN, PALB2, RAD50, and RAD51 genes, as well as certain versions of the AR gene, may also be associated with breast cancer risk. Not all studies have shown these connections, however. Of these genes, ATM and CHEK2 have the strongest evidence of being related to the risk of developing breast cancer”

Now some people argue that a disease or genetic disorder that does not affect reproduction is not considered harmful or unfavorable in terms of natural selection

Now some claim that if a woman at reproduction age- from puberty to menopause - has a genetic disorder ie breast cancer dies after having a child **then the genetic disorder was not harmful or unfavorable** in terms of natural selection because it did not hinder her from reproducing, but the women might have had another 20 years of reproducing left if she had not died so **then it could be argued that those genes were harmful or unfavorable as they stopped her from reproducing up to menopause ie her full reproductive term** And again if a woman at reproduction age- from puberty to menopause- dies before reproducing **then it could be argued that those genes were harmful or unfavorable as they stopped her from reproducing**

Thus it is seen that **inherited genetic disorders can decrease the probability of reproduction**- thus such genetics disorder according to NS are harmful or unfavorable ,but NS says such harmful genes should become less common when in fact as we have seen they are in fact common Thus NS is wrong

As a note this is where it can be seen that the notion of **harmful or unfavorable genes** becomes a subjective human value judgment and in effect is ridiculous . Namely in one case a person dies before reproducing because of inherited genes ie breast cancer gene then it is claimed that the genes were of **harmful or unfavorable** – because they stopped reproduction - but in another case a person with the **same genes** does reproduce then it is claimed the same genes were not harmful or unfavorable to reproduction thus the notion of NS and **harmful or unfavorable ends in absurdity or is ridiculous**

Likewise a male can reproduce from puberty into old age so even though he has already reproduced any genetic disorder that stops a man from reproducing into old age **it could be argued that those genes were harmful or unfavorable as they stopped him from reproducing for his full reproductive term** but if he has a child then dies **it is argued those genes were not harmful or unfavorable as the did not stop him from reproducing** thus the notion of NS and **harmful or unfavorable ends in absurdity or is ridiculous**

MORE EVIDENCE – THAT HARMFUL GENES ARE COMMON

http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-738782_ITM

“2001 MAY 25 - (NewsRx Network) -- New research indicates that a vast majority of children admitted to hospitals have a genetically determined underlying disorder.

The study, led by a pediatrician and medical geneticist at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, found **such disorders accounting for more than two-thirds of all children admitted to a large full-service pediatric hospital over a one-year period.**

Moreover, regardless of reason for admission, children whose underlying disorder had a strong **genetic** basis tended to be hospitalized longer, with charges for their care accounting for 80% of total costs.”

<http://www.libraryindex.com/pages/270/Genetic-Disorders.html>

“There are more than 6,000 known single-gene **disorders, which occur in about one in every 200 births.** Examples are cystic fibrosis, sickle-cell anemia, Huntington's disease, and hereditary hemochromatosis”

Now some people argue that a disease or genetic disorder that does not affect reproduction is not considered harmful or unfavorable in terms of natural selection

So if some of those kids admitted to hospital with an underlying genetic disorder died before reproducing, then from the above claim that would mean those genes were harmful or unfavorable in terms of natural

selection because the kids did not survive to reproduce, but if some of the kids [and others did not] survive to reproduce then it would be claimed those genes were not harmful or unfavorable in terms of natural selection

Thus it is seen that inherited genetic disorders can decrease the probability of reproduction- thus such genetics disorder according to NS are harmful or unfavorable ,but NS says such harmful genes should become less common when in fact as we have seen they are in fact common Thus NS is wrong

As a note this is where it can be seen that the notion of **harmful or unfavorable genes** becomes a subjective human value judgment and in effect is ridiculous . Namely in one case a kid dies before reproducing because of inherited genes then it is claimed that the genes were **harmful or unfavorable**-because they stopped reproduction- but in another case a different kid with the **same genes** does reproduce then it is claimed the same genes were not harmful or not unfavorable to reproduction thus the notion of NS and **harmful or unfavorable ends in absurdity or is ridiculous**

4)

Now some people seem to think that Genetics can account for the generation of new species/genes

lets be logical

there are only two possibilities

1)the generation of new species is random process

or

2) there is some purpose or design programmed into the genes/DNA such that the generation of a new species takes place in a certain manner

when you think about these alternatives

logically then genetics cant account for the generation of new species

1) if the process is random then genetics cannot account for why a species appears for being random there can be no deterministic reason why it happens in a particular why- once the generation process has started genetics can account for how it unfolds-but genetics cannot account for its random starting point chaos theory might but genetics cant In other words it is claimed the generation of new genes is a random process due to radiation, viruses, chemicals etc and genetic cannot account for these process happening as they are out side the scope of genetics physics chaos theory etc may give some explanation but genetics cant

2)if there is some plan programmed into the genes/DNA such that species unfold according to the plan

then

genetics cant account for the generation of new species- it can account for how the process might unfold

but

it cant account why the genes have been programmed that way- the idea of god might but genetics cant

THUS IN SUMMARY

1)the cambrian explosion as darwin saw invalidates his theory

2)NS is invalidated by the fact of speciation as NS only deals with traits already present and cant deal with the generation of new species

genetics might be able to account for the generation of new species [see above where it is shown genetics cannot account for the generation of new species] but NS cant as the generation of new species it not part of its remit

3) NS deals with the transmission of favorable traits and the eradication of unfavorable traits so the fact that unfavorable

traits ie the gene for breast cancer are and can be transmitted and become common invalidates NS out right

4) genetics cannot account for the generation of new species-ie the cambrian explosion and speciation as it is claimed the generation of new genes is a random process due to radiation, viruses, chemicals etc and genetic cannot account for these process happening as they are out side the scope of genetics physics chaos theory etc may give some explanation but genetics cant

Appendix

THE COLIN LESLIE DEAN SPECIES PARADOX

The first humans Adam and Eve gave birth to Cain and Able so who did Cain mate with

similarly

who did the first bird mate with who did the first dog mate with

an individual of species A gives birth to a individual of the new species B so who did this new individual of new species B mate

with to continue the new species

either

1)there was no one to mate with- so how did the new species B become common

or

2)a whole lot of species A gave birth to a whole lot of new individuals of species B at the same time so that these new individual members of species B could mate together

if this 2) was the way it happened

we have a major problem

it would mean something made a whole lot of members of species A give birth to a whole lot new members of species B at the same time

we are told species form due to random mutations

so

it is beyond possibility that the same random mutation took place in a whole lot of different members of species A at the same time

the other alternative is that some intelligence was at work

NOW

There is a dilemma

1) in order to resolve the dean paradox

the dean paradox makes you abandon the word species

in which case biology is destroyed

or

2) biology uses the word bird

signifying it is different from its parent organism

science uses the word species

as such

you have the dean paraodox

in order to resolve the dean paradox

the dean paradox makes you abandon the word species

in which case biology is destroyed

and all this talk in biology about speciation species this species that

is meaningless nonsense

Many think biologists know what species are

some **define species to be those animals that breed with each other**

yet this definition is shown to end in meaningless nonsense as

many so called species interbreed with each other ie hybridization
take the Bactrian and dromadary camelss

Wild camels have three more genes than domestic camels and so
they have concluded that they are a completely different species.

http://www.camelphotos.com/camel_breeds.html

“Wild camels have three more genes than domestic camels and so they have concluded
that they are a completely different species. “

yet these two different species can interbreed and have fertile off
spring

<http://www.geocities.com/plin9k/limiting-species.htm>

thus we have the contradiction

ie bactrian and dromadry camels are different species thus they
cant bread together

but

they can breed which means they must be the same species

thus a contradiction

so the notions of species and speciation leads into meaningless
nonsense as you cant tell us what a species is

or

when you do ie different species cant interbreed you end in
contradiction

thus

ie all this is meaningless nonsense

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

Total number of species (estimated):

7 - 100 millions (identified and unidentified), including:

* 5-10 million bacteria[13];

Bacteria belong to the kingdom Protocista. Typical features include; Circular DNA, Plasmids, Meurin Cell walls, Mesosomes, and 70S Ribosomes. Bacteria have many feeding behaviours - Saprophytes, Parasites, Patogens, Mutualites, Autotrops and Heterotrophs. Bacteria reproduce by binary fission, a form of asexual reproduction - this uses the process of mitosis only.

* 74,000-120,000 fungi[14];

Typical features of the Fungi kingdom include; A true nucleus, Chitin Cell walls, many feeding behaviours - Saprophytic, parasitic, but all are heterotrophs.

Fungi can reproduce both Asexually (by mitosis) and sexually (by meiosis). This offers a selective advantage in changing environments

Of the identified eukaryote species we have:

* 1.6 million, including:

- o 297,326 plants, including:
 - + 15,000 mosses,
 - + 13,025 Ferns and horsetails,
 - + 980 gymnosperms,
 - + 258,650 angiosperms,
 - # 199,350 dicotyledons,
 - # 59,300 monocotyledons,
- o 28,849 fungi & other non-animals, including:
 - + 10,000 lichens,
 - + 16,000 mushrooms -Kingdom Fungi,
 - + 2,849 brown algae - Kingdom Protocista,
 - + 9,671 Red and green algae - Kingdom Protocista
- o 1,250,000 animals, including (Kingdom Animalia):
 - + 1,203,375 invertebrates:
 - # 950,000 insects,
 - # 81,000 mollusks,
 - # 40,000 crustaceans,
 - # 2,175 corals,
 - # 130,200 others;
 - + 59,811 vertebrates (Phylum Chordata):
 - # 29,300 fish,
 - # 6,199 amphibians,
 - # 8,240 reptiles,
 - # 9,956 birds,
 - # 5,416 mammals.

Now bear in mind biology does not know what species phylum are

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species>

"However, the exact definition of the term "species" is still controversial, particularly in prokaryotes,[2] and this is called the species problem.[3"

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phylum>

"Although a phylum is often spoken of as if it were a hard and fast entity, no satisfactory definition of a phylum exists"

Thus biology is destroyed as it is not a science since without knowing what the term species or phylum means biologies classificatory system cannot locate or identify the objects of its investigation

ISBN 1876347783