

GPRA Project: Evolution 2.0 - The Hypothesis

Copyright © 2010 Robert L. DeMelo, www.gpofr.com

It is my personal belief that all theories are flawed, but I also equally think most are partial correct. Darwin's evolution is one of those theories I believe to be partially correct yet flawed or incomplete. Evolution by natural selection is obvious in the animal kingdom and in human society such as in business. The strong survive and the weak die which then the surviving strong obviously pass on their genes and the dead, well they're just dead.

The Problem

The problem with Darwin's evolution is the "random" in random mutation which gives an animal an advantage over others. Randomness is also defined as ordered chaos as described in the context of Chaos Theory. A single random mutation might not make sense in a limited perceived scope by the observer but make total sense in a larger scope. Chaotic random mutations imply that there is an ordered design which favours the argument for intelligent design which is violently opposed by advocates of Darwin's theory. This goes to show you that perhaps intelligent design theory is also partially correct, and that Darwin's theory along with intelligent design make a more complete evolution theory.

Willed Mutations

Random mutations are probably not random at all, and I'm not talking about a divine influence. What I'm saying is that an animal's need and will to survive leads to "spontaneous" mutation, or a series of mutations, to occur in favour of that need or will. Essentially, the mutations may be related to the animal's learning and learned experience and knowledge derived from its need and will – to survive. In a more relative and understandable example, people in order to survive learn new skills and adapt to environmental situations (society, business, physical environment). These skills are then passed onto their children and subsequently these children will learn new skills due to environmental changes they experience and in turn they will pass all these skills to their own children and so on. As a result, after many generations, these people will become more efficient in relation to survival and live better lives than their forefathers in perspective. Does learning, which derives from willing or needing, by animals of any sort (humans included) manifest physically as mutations in DNA and in other physiological and psychological changes? It is postulated here that it does.

Compounded Effect

Willed mutations do not alone describe evolution entirely without the obvious compounding effect of natural selection; survival of the fittest.