SPECIES PARADOX

By

Colin leslie dean

B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA,

MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies,

Grad Cert (Literary studies)

Gamahucher press West Geelong
Australia

2010

CASE STUDY IN THE MEANINGLESSNESS OF ALL VIEWS
ALL PRODUCTS OF HUMAN THINKING END IN MEANINGLESSNESS ABSURDITY OR CONTRADICTION

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 toa 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 beyound 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 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

FROM ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE

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 dromardary 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 nonsence as you cant tell us what a species is

or

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

thus

ie The notion of species leads into meaningless nonsense

APPENDIX

The abyss the notion of species throws biology

locked into an untenable taxonomy based on the notion that species breed amongst themselves-which is contradicted by species hybridization - biologists
have in fact created new animals

Genetics entering into biology has turn biology into a joke once biologist where looking for the missing link know biologist are looking for the ur camel and the ur elephant why
because genetics and biology have know created these two new species take the discovery that

http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2001/08/0824_twoelephants.html

DNA Tests Show African Elephants Are Two Species

Genetic fingerprinting shows that Africa's forest and savanna elephants are as different from one another as lions and tigers and should be considered as two genetically distinct species, an international group of researchers reports.

Up until now, elephants have been divided into two species—Asian and African. However, there has been considerable debate among experts as to whether the differences between Africa's forest and savanna elephants were significant enough to identify them as separate species. The DNA evidence, reported in the August 24 issue of the journal Science, provides a definitive answer to the long-debated controversy.

this means there must have been an original elephant from which these two new elephants evolved

thus we have the ur elephant
also

genetics has shown the wild camel and the domestic camel are 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. “

thus we now have the ur camel
what next
the ur cat
ur dog
it never ends
rather than just say they are totally different animals biologists who are locked into an untenable taxonomy based on the notion that species breed amongst themselves
have in fact created new animals of the ur type
happy hunting biologists sorta like looking for a unicorn perhaps

what a complete joke rather than have a complete new think about anomalies and contradiction in their definition of species due to species hybridization biologist just close there minds and what do we get
new animals being created -something out of frankenstiens laboratory

TAKE BIOLOGIES NOTION OF SPECIES AND SEES WHERE IT LEADS US-INTO AN ABYSS OF NONSENSE

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

"A usable definition of the word "species" and reliable methods of identifying particular species are essential for stating and testing biological theories "

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. While in many cases this definition is adequate, more precise or differing measures are often used, such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche"

the uasble definition of species vie "A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring."
ends in contradiction due to species hybridization
so then biologists fudge the definition when it dont work by taging on secondary elaborations ie dna etc
they tag on extra definitions to save what is in facta contradictory definition

when applying the DNA test they in fact use the usable definition
ie
A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring
to make the first indentication
then they apply other tests
ie
such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche. Presence of specific locally adapted traits may further subdivide species

take the bactrian and dromardary camels
they say they are "camels"
then thy apply the DNA test and then decide they are different species of camels
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."

you could have said they where totally different animals instead
but because the uasble definition is used the biologist where stuck with calling them camels

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 nonsence as you cant tell us what a species is
or
when you do ie different species cant interbreed you end in contradiction

AGAIN

fact is
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Species

"A usable definition of the word "species" and reliable methods of identifying particular species are essential for stating and testing biological theories "

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. While in many cases this definition is adequate, more precise or differing measures are often used, such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche"

as wiki says a definition must be made for the testing of theories
fact is definition of species ie wiki
A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring.

leads to contradiction due to species hybridization thus biology cant even begin to test its theories
also
you are taking the effect for the cause
DNA is not used to find species
the usable definition of species is used then biologists use DNA for any fudging required in the definition due to anomalies contradictions

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

"A species is often defined as a group of organisms capable of interbreeding and producing fertile offspring. While in many cases this definition is adequate, more precise or differing measures are often used, such as similarity of DNA, morphology or ecological niche"

the sharing of similar DNA is said to determine what is a species

similarity is a subjective thing
on this criteria we are a species of banana
http://wiki.answers.com/Q/How_much_dna_do_humans_share_with_a_banana

According to evolutionary biologist Robert May, President of Britain's Royal Society, "We share half our genes with the banana" (2001), but genes only make up 2% of human DNA - the answer depends on what proportion of the remaining 98% is the same. Humans have 23 pairs of chromosomes and bananas 11 pairs - even if the 11 banana chromosomes were identical to human ones (they're not) it would still mean that less than half of human DNA would be found in a banana.

or perhaps species of mice fruit flys or yeast
http://www.mindfully.org/GE/GE4/Humans-Over-Primates-NOT12apr02.htm

Once nature figures out how to accomplish something, it doesn't reinvent the wheel. As a result, mice share around 85% of their genes with humans. Yeast shares 46%. Those tiny annoying fruit flies that descend on overripe bananas share 60%. Oh, and the banana itself shares about 50%.

based on similar DNA we are a species of banana

http://www.makingthemodernworld.org.uk/stories/defiant_modernism/01.ST.02/?scene=6&tv=true

Even the DNA of plants is similar to that of humans. We share 60% of our DNA with a banana. DNA is generally to be found in chromosomes usually coiled up very tightly, like the tape in a cassette.
Images with the text:

http://www.ornl.gov/sci/techresources/Human_Genome/publicat/primer2001/4.shtml

Over 40% of the predicted human proteins share similarity with fruit-fly or worm proteins.

http://www.dnalc.org/view/555-Model-Organisms.html

Organisms share similar genes because they have inherited them from common ancestors. Even humans and yeast share many genes! ... If we look at a portion of the amino acids derived from the Ras gene, we can see similarities between humans and yeast.

http://www.koshland-science-museum.org/exhibitdna/intro03.jsp

What percent of their genes match yours?
Another human? 100% - All humans have the same genes, but some of

these genes contain sequence differences that make each person unique.
A chimpanzee? 98% - Chimpanzees are the closest living species to humans.
A mouse? 92% - All mammals are quite similar genetically.
A fruit fly? 44% - Studies of fruit flies have shown how shared genes govern the growth and structure of both insects and mammals.
Yeast? 26% - Yeasts are single-celled organisms, but they have many housekeeping genes that are the same as the genes in humans, such as those that enable energy to be derived from the breakdown of sugars.
A weed (thale cress)? 18% - Plants have many metabolic differences from humans. For example, they use sunlight to convert carbon dioxide gas to sugars. But they also have similarities in their housekeeping genes

. DNA identication has its pit falls

http://www.suite101.com/content/dna-barcode-of-life-a205480

but DNA being used to identify new species may lead to revision the classic taxonomy
ie showing it is untenable ie based on species breeding together

DNA identification just assists the classic already know taxonomy ie it is used once the species has been identified by the usable definition of species breeding

but the criteria used to identify new species is not agreed upon the whole thing is a dogs dinner over what criteria to use
again DNA identification is a subjective thing used on known species and

no agreed criteria for identifying new species-but what appears any criteria will show the current taxonomy based on inbreeding with species to be untenable

and you call biology a science nothging but a discipline where truth is a manner of consensus and a show of hands

http://www.suite101.com/content/dna-barcode-of-life-a205480

"there is nothing conceptually new in DNA barcoding except the standardisation of the technique and the use of a single gene. Apart from molecular diagnostics, the other major application is discovery of new species. Mitochondrial DNA divergence has been proposed as a primary criterion for recognizing species boundaries which would probably lead to a revision of the classic taxonomy. This marker has already been proven useful to assess taxonomic diversity and to identify new or cryptic species. DNA barcoding is also a powerful tool to study species diversity.

Pitfalls of DNA Barcoding

The DNA barcoding system relies on greater COI sequence divergence between species than within species. However, some groups such as plants have a much slower rate of cytochrome c oxidase I gene evolution than animals. Therefore, a more suitable marker is needed for use in DNA barcoding these groups. Choloroplast genes such as rbcl have been proposed as a barcode candidate for plants.

In addition, new or rapidly diverged species arising from divergent selection or polyploidy might be overlooked. Controversy has also arisen

from using a single molecular marker rather than multiple taxonomic characters and ecology. Nevertheless, genetic barcoding will assist classic taxonomy and greatly improve our current knowledge of the biodiversity and phylogeny of biological species."

Thus we see the notion of species ends in an abyss of nonsense where biological truth comes done to consensus and a show of hands –and they call biology a science what a joke