

# PRE-SCIENTIFIC THEORY & COMMON SENSE

## A Tiny Glimpse at Vij Soderas's *One Small Speck to Man*

This critical—but courteous - examination of the theory of evolution is obtainable from  
vijsodera@onesmallspeck.com

### Darwin's Mistake

On page 127 Vij Soderas quotes a passage from *Origin of Species* (Penguin 1985 p178, 451):

As difficult as it is to imagine that eyes, though useless, could be in any way injurious to animals living in darkness, I attribute their loss wholly to **disuse**... Disuse, aided sometimes by natural selection, will often tend to reduce an organ, **when it becomes useless** by change in habits or under changed conditions of life... (Bold added).

Here Darwin has made a pig's ear! A muscle (say) may become wasted, but this fact does not affect the individual's *genes*. People are now generally less muscular than they used to be, but their genes are still capable of bulking up the muscles with proper exercise. You may squint or even go blind but your children will not be born either squinting or blind! Cows in Madeira used to become blind through being shut up in sheds (no pasture available), but their progeny were not born blind. Of course, Darwin knew nothing of DNA and the genetic code, but the fallacy in his thinking lay just here. An animal's progeny can only be born with a degenerate organ or structure if there is genetic, deleterious mutation. Possibly the progeny will survive despite the disadvantage and perpetuate it in its offspring. Possibly it will die before doing so. *But at all events the mere disuse of an organ will not have such effects.*

### Superfluities?

On page 128 Soderas turns to certain cave-dwelling fish (*Astyanax fasciatus mexicanus*), which have 'almost unrecognizable eye remnants'. However in the early stages of development they are quite normal. Only the adults have degenerate eyes and a degenerate visual cortex. The Dorling Kindersley book on *Aquarium Fish* (Mills, 1993 p87) says,

The eyes of this species **have become superfluous** as it navigates underground waters using its lateral line system (Bold added).

Soderas points out that neither normal nor blind fish would possess any selective advantage since *both* would use their 'lateral line system' to detect objects in the water, and their sense of smell to locate food. Moreover 'simply living in darkness can have no effect on the genetics of the eye. So why are blind cave-fish blind?

### Bairdiellas

When *bairdiellas* (small marine fish native to the Gulf of California) were transplanted to the Salton Sea, a significant number of progeny were born blind. Clearly blind fish are at a disadvantage in the open sea, and more likely to be killed by predators.

If the Mexican fish similarly produced a percentage of blind progeny, both blind and seeing individuals might find their way into underground streams, clear of predators. The seeing fish would be able to find their way out, but the blind fish would have to stay put - enabled by their 'lateral line system' to survive.

### Conclusion

So the mutation is not the result of living in a cave, nor have the eyes of these fish become degenerate because they are unnecessary, nor have blind fish arisen to fill an environmental slot. It's simply that *blind fish can survive in caves, when they would stand little chance in the open sea.*

### Still evolving?

On page 129 Soderas looks at the Galapagos cormorants, whose wing bones are small and whose flight feathers are unusually short and 'don't zip properly'. Evolutionists think that they are evolving into something like a penguin! But Galapagos cormorants paddle with their feet (like other cormorants). Evolutionists think that these birds originally flew to the Galapagos, but flight lost its selective advantage, their wings atrophied, and they evolved a more efficient way of life.

### Common Sense!

But why should the genes that produce healthy cormorants become a disadvantage? Any one knows that birds kept in cages produce young with normal wings and feathers. The lack of use of a structure does not itself result in young with faulty structures. The most plausible explanation is that a deleterious mutation was inbred, causing the original birds to become flightless. The lack of predators allows these otherwise disadvantaged birds to survive. *They 'simply manage to survive despite their congenital abnormalities'*. How much simpler common sense is than Darwinism!