Practical model and evidence of Darwin's theory opposite to Darwin's theory natural selection and sexual selection (human evolution)

Md. Abdul Ahad

Department of Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur, Bangladesh.

Abstract- *Hybridization (breeding) is a practical evidence and model of Darwin's theory. But it would be true, if hybridization between two plants or animal species is possible and a fertile and reproductively isolated offspring is produced. However, in this article all the possible crosses both plants and animals are presented, which indicated that hybridization (breeding/cross) between two plants or animal species is not possible due to structural and behavioural differences, and seasonal isolations; if imposed, the fertilization fails, if the fertilization is successful, the embryo may abort, or the young may die. If the hybrid survives up to maturity, it must become sterile and Darwin himself admit it. However, a very rare case the hybrids become fertile but those produce so-called varieties /races only, which lost their new characteristics just after a few generations and return back to their parental types by random mating, and by non-random mating produce homozygous organisms (which are least fit to survive). The artificial selection is also a skilled sexual selection, as the breeders choose the fittest, most vigour, and most fertile/productive organism. Thus, sexual selection is opposite to the evolution of humans from chimpanzee. Furthermore, breeders also failed to develop reproductively isolated species/varieties/races by cloning, genetic engineering and mutation breeding too. Even, a new species is not evolving through the spontaneous (natural) hybridization. So, there is no evidence of evolution of a new species either artificially or naturally. It is assumed that macroevolution occur through hybridization; so, such assumption is not valid.*

Keywords-*Darwin, hybridization, sterile hybrid, reproductive isolated variety, pure line selection, variety/race*

1. INTRODUCTION

Of all the theories of biology, the theory of evolution is most important. It is so fundamental theory of biology that science cannot be understood without its concepts (Alter,1996). Evolution suggests that all the species of living organisms have evolved from simpler organisms over a long period of time. Human beings, like all other plants and animals, have evolved from simpler organisms (Bufallo, 1963). Darwin defines evolution as the descent with modification through natural selection from a few common ancestors (Darwin, 1859). Darwin was a pigeon breeder, from which he derived the most important evidence and a model for his natural selection (Purves and Orians, 1987). However, the power of natural selection is compared with artificial selection that is done by man (Darwin, 1859). It is the main driving force of evolution (Wilson, 1977; Laetsch, 1979). So, the importance and parallelism between artificial selection and natural selection have also been emphasized by many Darwinists (Young, 1985; Lull, 1976; Evans, 1984; Wallace, 1990).

In contrast, there are many criticisms against the artificial selections/ hybridization/ polyploidization as the evidence of Darwin's theory of natural selection and sexual selection e.g. i) Due to breeding, there are plenty of evidences of changes within kinds, such as. the various races of dogs, cats, horses, cows, etc., whereas there has never been observed any changes across kinds. All the different breeds of dogs are simply variations and changes within the genetic limits of the dog kind. Through breeding, a dog is not becoming a cat, or a horse is not becoming a cow; such changes are not possible, as a dog lacks the information in its genes to become a cat (Ranganathan, 1988).ii) Though by hybridization, a number of new varieties/breeds that is established from an original kind. But it is not speciation and has no true evolutionary significance, as it backs to the parental form within a short span of time (Morris, 1988). iii) Through the artificial selection breeders develop many animal and plant breeds/varieties. It is not an evolution of the species. It is also within the kind, not the crossing kind.

Also, almost all the changes brought through the artificial selection are lost just after a few generations (Graham, 1986; Lewin, 1988). Those criticisms claim that there is a great doubt whether the artificial selection/ hybridization produce new species and it provides a model of Darwin's theory or not. So, it is essential to remove the doubt for the benefit of modern biological science. Furthermore, literature indicated that there are many works against the evidence of Darwin's theory such as: the direct evidence (paleontology/fossils) of evolution is opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2015); Darwinian classification of plant and animal opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2018), embryological evidences opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2018a). But literatures claim that there is no work on the title: *The practical model and evidence of Darwin's theory opposite to Darwin's theory natural selection and sexual selection (human evolution) or not.."* As "Science searches, which is the truth (Ahad, 2017, Ahad, 2018 Ahad, 2019 and Ahad,2022)." So, to work on the title is essential. This article provide an over view of modern breeding and would be helpful for Darwinists, geneticists, breeders, botanists, zoologists, agriculturists, and also others those who dealing with evolution.

2. **Impossible of hybridization between two animal/plant species, which is a great challenge of artificial selection act at model of Darwin's theory of natural selection, sexual selection (human evolution)**

Hybridization between two animal species or genera is quite impossible**,** and the causes ere:

i) The structural changes, behavioral and seasonal isolation of two different animal species may render the organism making physically impossible to copulate. In many cases, gametes may be incapable of fusion, or the female reproductive tract may not allow for the survival of sperm cells. Even successful fertilization of an egg does not ensure successful reproduction; as the embryo may abort, or the young animal may be ill suited to the environment. Finally, even if the hybrid survives up to maturity it may not produce viable gametes, or it must be sterile (Mayer, 1963; Ritchie and Carola, 1983; Starr and Taggart, 1989). ii) The eggs of many species produce chemical substances, which attract or direct the swimming movements of sperms to eggs. This chemical substances, which help fertilization are species–specific. Consequently, the sperm of one species are not attracted to the egg cells of different species. Thus, the isolating mechanism of different animal species prevents the formation of embryo of new species (Ward and Hetzel, 1980). The similar phenomenon also occur in plant also.

So, it is documented that hybridization between two animal species is quite impossible**,** and if possible it must produce sterile hybrid.

3. If hybridization between two animal/plant species is possible, then sterile hybrid is result, but if fertile and reproductively isolated hybrids are produced, then hybridization serve as an excellent model and the evidence of Darwin's theory. it is a second great challenge

Breeders have failed to cross between the two closely related plant and animal species. But, they rarely successful to cross between the two closely related plant and animal species**;** but unfortunately all the cross produced sterile hybrids; if fertile and reproductively isolated hybrids produce, then hybridization serves as an important model and evidence of Darwin's theory and macroevolution also occur. There are many documents about the production of sterile hybrid but a few are placed here under various sub-headings:

3.1. Documents about production of sterile hybrids by the hybridization among the different animal species

Breeders have failed to cross between two closely related animal genera. But if they rarely become successful but all the hybrids (offspring) became sterile and a few classical examples are placed here:

a) Hybrids of different *Eqqus* species is sterile

i) Female ass *Equus asinus* × male domestic horse *E. caballus* → (Mule) sterile

ii) Female domestic horse *E. caballus* × male ass *E. asinus* → (Hinny) sterile

iii) Female horse *E. caballus* × male zebra *Equus zebra* → (Zebroid) sterile

iv) Grevy zebra *E. grevyi* × domestic horse *E. caballus* → sterile

v) African zebra *E. bruchelli* × ass *E. asinus* → (Zebronky) sterile

vi) Ass *E. asinus* × mountain zebra *E. zebra* → sterile (Banerjee, 2003).

b) Hybrids of cattle and buffalo are sterile

European cattle *Bos taurus* × American bison *Bison bison* → sterile

ii) European cattle *Bos taurus* × buffalo *Bos bubillus* → sterile (Banarjee, 2003).

c) Hybrids of goat and sheep died before birth

i) Domestic goat *Capra hircus* × sheep *Ovis aries* → Embryos are terminated at the six weeks of pregnancy (Rastogi, 1994).

ii) Domestic goat *C. hircus* × Barberry sheep *Ammotragus lovia* → Results full-term embryo, but none survive (Rastogi, 1994).

d) Hybrids of different species of birds are sterile

Crosses of bird (or poultry) also produce sterile offspring, which are given here-

i) Female domestic duck *Anas platyrhyncos* × male muscovy duck *Cairina moschata* → Resulted mule duck/mallard but those are sterile (Abplanalp, 1990; Craford, 1990s

ii) Muscovy duck *C. moschata* × Pekin mule duck *A. platyrhyncos* → sterile (Painter and Cole, 1943).

iii) Male pigeon *Columba livia* × female dove *Streptoplia risoria*→ male sterile, female embryos died during embryonic development (Painter and Cole, 1943).

iv) Male chicken *Gallus domesticus* × female Turkey *Meleagris gallapavo* → male sterile (Harada and Buss, 1981).

v) Ross geese *Chen rossii*× Emperor geese *Anser canagicus*→ partial fertile but F_2 progeny suffers from trisomy (Shoffner et al., 1979).

vi) Chicken *Gallus domesticus* × Japanese quail *Coturnix japonica* → male sterile, female embryos died during embryonic development (Bammi et al., 1966).

vii) Grey geese *Anser* spp. × Black geese *Branta* spp. → Sterile (Gray, 1958).

viii) Mallard *Anser platyrhnchos* × Spot billed duck *A. poecilorhyncha* → sterile (Gray, 1958).

ix) American black duck *Anser rubripes* × Spot billed duck *A. poecilorhyncha* → sterile (Gray, 1958).

e) Hybrids of fishes are absent

Sperms of different species of fishes may be inseminate with the eggs of different species of fishes. But further development does not ensue normally (Rastogi, 1994).

f) Hybrids of different toad species are sterile

Hybridization among the different toad species produces sterile hybrid. A few traditional examples are: i) Female toad *Bufo fowleri* × male *B. vatticeps*s → sterile (Vermal and Agarwal, 1999).

ii) Races of leopard frogs of the northern United States *Rana pipiens* × races of leopard frogs *R. pipiens* of Florida or the races of the Texas→ the hybrid die before completing their development (Dobzhansky, 1955).

iii) Bullfrog *Rana catesbiana* × common frog *Rana temporaria*→the embryo dies within a very short time (Krisnaswamy, 1971).

g) Sterility of hybrid of different species of insects

i) Drosophila *Drosophila pseudoobcura* × *D. persimilis* → the hybrid male are sterile (Dobzhansky, 1955; Strickberger, 1996).

ii) Tobacco budworm (non-pest) *Heliothis subleflexa* × tobacco budworm (pest) *H. virescens* → sterile male (Laster, 1972).

h) Hybrid of hominid is absent.

h) Hybrids of hominids are absent

There is no evidence of formation of hybrid among the homonid (Novotskii, 1977).

3.2/ Causes of Sterility of hybrid of different species of animal and plant

When two different species are crossed, the F_1 offspring are usually sterile, as their non-homologous chromosome cannot pair properly (cannot undergo the process of synapses) during meiosis and it is the cause of sterility hybrid (Raven et al., 1980; Mader, 2003).

Finally, it is documented that if hybridization between two animal/plant species is possible, then sterile hybrid is result, but if fertile and reproductively isolated hybrids are produced, then hybridization serve as an excellent model and the evidence of Darwin's theory and macroevolution also occur.

3.3. Documents about sterile hybrids are produced by the hybridization among all the plant species

Breeders have failed to cross between closely related two plant species within the same genus; if rarely successful but all the hybrids (offspring) are sterile and such a few examples are given here:

i) Commercial tobacco *Nicotiana tabacum* × wild tobacco *N. glutinosam*→ sterile (Dodson, 1960; Brewbraker, 1964)

ii) Goat grass Ageilops *squarrosa* ×*Triticum spelta* → Sterile,

iii) Goat grass A. *squarrosa* × *Triticum dicoccoides* → Sterile,

iv) Goat grass A. *squarrosa* × *Triticum dicocum* → sterile (Sambamurty, 1999).

v) Grass species *Agropyron trachycaulum* × *Hordium jubtum* → sterile (Gardner et al., 2001).

vi) Old world cotton *Gossipium herbaceum* × American upland cotton, *G. raimondi* → sterile,

vii) American cotton *G. hirsutum* × African cotton, *G. anomalum*→ sterile (Brewbacker, 1964).

viii) Wild tobacco *N. glutinosa* × *N. sylvestres* → Sterile → Fertile (Dodson, 1960).

ix) British salt marsh grass *Spertina maritima* × North American salt marsh grass, *S. alternariflora* → sterile,

x) North American horsetail *Equisctum laeviigatum* × *E. hyemale* (variety affine) → Sterile (Raven et al., 1980).

xi) Maize *Zea mays* × Gama grass *Tripsicum* → sterile (Allard, 1960).

xii) The red tubular flowered *Gilia genus*, found in Mojave Desert of California, contains 5 species namely *G. transmontana, G. minor, G. clokeyi, G. malior* and *G. aliquanta*. Nonetheless, these five species are sterile in all combinations of crosses (Purves and Orians, 1987).

xiii) The species in herbaceous and short-lived groups are generally crossed, but all the individual populations within such species are also sterile (Raven et. al, 1980).

So, it is documented that all the possible hybridization among the various plants species produce a sterile hybrid.

4. Documents about fertile hybrids of different animal species are not reproductively isolated and produce temporary variety only and ii is another great challenge

Breeders fail to cross between to animal genera. However, rarely get success to cross between two animal species but a few crosses produce fertile offspring and produce a so-called varieties, which are not reproductively isolated. A number of classical examples are shown here:

i) The red wolf *Canis rufus* ×coyote *C. latrans*→ hybrids are fertile and it is common in nature (Enger and Ross, 1997).

ii) The gray wolf *C. lupus* × coyote *C. latrans* → hybrids are fertile are common in nature (Enger and Ross, 1997).

ii) Mallard duck *Anas platyrynchos* × Pain tail duck A. *acuta* (in custody) → fertile (Gupta, 1997).

iii) Polar bear × Kodiak bear. → fertile (Case, 1979).

iv) The black moth *Biston carbonaria* × white moth B. *betularia* → fertile, but not new species yet variety (Makean, 1976;Ahad, 2011; Ahad, 2014, Ahad, 2019; Ahad, 2022)

v) American bison *Bison bison* × beef cattle *Bos indicus*→ male sterile. Backcrossed hybrids are fertile and produce the variety named 'Beefloes' (Ward and Hetzel, 1980; Banarjee, 2003).

vi) American bison *Bison bison* × European cattle *Bos taurus*→ sterile male. Backcrossed hybrids are fertile and produce the variety named 'Beefloes' (Ward and Hetzel, 1980; Banarjee, 2003).

vii) European cattle *Bos taurrus* × American bison *Bison bison* → sterile males and fertile females. By back crossing the female bison with the European cattle, a new variety of cattle called 'cattalo' is produce but it is not a new species (Banarjee, 2003).

4.2, Documents about fertile hybrids of different plant species are not reproductively isolated and produce so-called variety only

Breeders fail to cross between two plant genera. However, rarely success to cross between two animal species but those cross produce fertile offspring and do not produce new species but produce new varieties. A

number of such examples are shown here:

i) Avena sativa × *Avena byzantina* → Clinton oat variety,
ii) *Oryza indica* × wild rice, *Oryza perenensis* → CO31 rice variety,
iii) *Saccharum officinarum* × wild sugarcane, *S. spontaneum* → sugarcane variety,
iv) S. officinarum × *S. barbari* → sugarcane variety,
v) American cotton, *G. hirsutum*×x *G. barbadense* → Vara lakshmi variety,
vi) Indian lemon grass, *Cymbopogon khansianus* × *C. pendulus* → CKP-25 variety,
vii) *C. confertiflorus* × *C. jwarancusa* → Jamrosa/RRL-82 variety,
viii) *Oryza japonica* × *O. indica* → Adt. 27 rice variety,
The above crossing) is mentioned from the Singh (2000).

5. According to the universally accepted definition of species; animals and plants those producing fertile offspring. must belong to the same species

The most modern and universally accepted definition of a species is that a group of individual or natural population actually interbreeds among themselves and produces fertile offspring or at least produce sterile or partially sterile offspring, when crossed to other such a group (Mayer, 1969; Dodson, 1960). As a result, coyote *Canis latrans* × Alaskan husky dog *Canis familaris* produce fertile offspring (Pawnee). Since coyote and dog interbreed, even while differing greatly in behaviour and appearance. Therefore, scientists treated them as a single species (Wallace, 1990).

Consequently, in this way, those animals and plants producing fertile offspring; would belong to the same species.

6. Johansen's pure line selection (experiments) fails to developed a new reproductively isolated variety/breeds

Johansen's pure line selections/experiments (1909, 1920) indicates that natural selection is ineffective in a pure line, because genotype is not altered by environmental factors. He showed that selection never produce new species (Dobzhansky, 1955; Strickberger, 1996**).** Thus his selection does not serve as an important model and evidence of Darwin's theory.

7. World renowned biologists agreed that breeders are still and never able to produce a new animal or plant species through hybridization/artificial selection, which strongly oppose Darwin's theory

Artificial selection was practiced by Americans and Indians from about 2500 B.C. (Allard, 1960). So, this selection has been practiced for 4500 years. But, during this vast period, breeders have failed to develop a single new species of plants or animals. They may have developed some varieties or races of plant or animal, which lost their originality due to segregation in space and time. There are a large number of literature but a few are placed here:

i) Breeders rarely or never been able to produce a group of individuals by artificial selection, which could clearly be regarded as a new species; new and distinct strains or races of corn, apple, or other plants, which have been developed by breeders, are not regarded as new specie (Sinnott and Wilson, 1963).

ii) Darwin proposed 'artificial selection' for improving of race of domestic animals but it could never lead to create permanent specific variations (Rastogi,1994).

iv) Hybridization has been employed for the development of new varieties, but such examples are limited to a few crop species. The most distant hybrids are of no agricultural values. Those suffer from high sterility; poor seed set and produced a wide range of segregates. The segregated plants are much weaker and less adapted than the parent crops (Singh, 2000).

v) Polyploids plants comes from hybridization of two species. But polyploids in animals are rare as well as sterile (Stickberger, 1996; Gardner et al., 2001).

Those above literature indicated that breeders failed to develop a single new species. This literature support the result of the present study.Consequently, Darwin stated that varieties which he had called incipient species, become ultimately converted into good and distinct species (Darwin, 1859); such assumption is misleading for the whole biological world.

8. There is no document that a new species evolve by the spontaneous/natural hybridization

If existing plants and animals are resulted by the spontaneous/natural hybridization, still one could observe arising of new plant and animal species through spontaneous hybridization suddenly in every year. But not so happen. As a result, it is poited out that: (i) occasionally natural hybrid is found in nature. This hybrid represents a breakdown of the isolating barriers but usually temporary, and does not alter the taxonomic status of the two groups of organisms (Gerking, 1969).(ii) Cockrum and McCauley (1965) drew attention that even Darwin could not point out a single example of evolution in progress. (iii) Bucaille (1989) stated that Darwin himself agreed that he could not prove in a single case that a species has changed into another species. v) Starr and Taggart (1989) and Vuletic (2003) declared that no one had ever proved that one species changing into another one i.e. a species arises from another species.

9. **No new species evolve through plant biotechnology/ genetic engineering (GE) /genetic modification (GM)/ transgenic crops (but produce variety), which powerfully oppose Darwin's theory**

In biology a set of laboratory-based methods used to change the genetic makeup of cells by removing, moving or transferring genes within and between plants in order to produce the desired effect since 1988. GM crop variety produce about ninety (90) species of crop In spite of increase in global area under transgenic crops, there are potential risks associated with large scale adoption of this technology. So, transgenic crops and threat to non-target organisms in the environment (Atwal and Dhaliwal, 2005).Therefore, no new species evolve through plant biotechnology/ genetic engineering (GE) /genetic modification (GM)/ transgenic crops but produce variety, which oppose artificial selection/hybridization serve as an important model and evidence of Darwin's theory.

10. Neither animal cloning produces a new species nor produces a new variety as it regenerates the individual, even cloned animal fail to live, which powerfully oppose Darwin's theory

In the process of somatic cell nuclear transfer, biologists collect a cell from the targeted animal that is to be cloned "genetic donor". The somatic cell contains the DNA of genetic donor animal. The scientist collects an egg from its female animal the "egg donor" and discards the nucleus of the egg cell, which is the part of the cell containing the egg donor's genes. The scientist then inserts the somatic cell into the egg. The resulting fused egg contains the genetic donor's DNA. The fused egg is transferred into a surrogate mother where it continues to develop as a fetus. After a full-term pregnancy, the recipient gives birth as normal to the animal that is essentially the identical twin of the genetic donor. So, cloning (Biotechnology) neither produce a new species nor produce a new variety. But it is sorrowful that the first clone sheep "Dolly" died before giving an offspring.

11. No new species evolve through mutations breeding either artificially or naturally, which oppose artificial selection/hybridization serve as an important model and evidence of Darwin's theory

It drew attention that over hundreds of chicken mutant have lethal effects e.g. blindness, wingless, missing maxillae, missing mandible, missing upper beak, nervous disorder etc. (Crawford, 1990 and Somes, 1990). Therefore, the improvement of domestic animals through mutation breeding is hopeless from the very beginning; it has almost no practical significance (Banerjee, 2000). Moreover, all mutations arise by the errors of DNA replication and damage of DNA as well. Hence, mutated organisms suffer from various diseases and about 3,500 diseases (including cancer) are found in humans by a gene mutation (Starr and Taggart, 1989). Moreover, mutations express its phenotype only in recessive and homozygous conditions, which is the least fitted to survive and may extinct suddenly (its best example is Ancon breed of sheep). Therefore, both the natural and

artificial mutated organisms are least fitted for survival and reproduction. If accidentally possible (either naturally or artificially), this change might be within the species and form variety (or race or strain). But acquiring of status of this variety to a species is not possible due to segregation and failure to gain reproductive isolation, as by random mating, it return to original type/parental type (its best example is albino baby return to normal man) by non-random mating and non-random mating become a homozygous organism and extinct (its best example is Ancon breed of sheep) over time (Ahad, 2011; Ahad, 2014; Ahad, 2022).

12. Claiming of new species of animal/plant, which is developed by hybridization is not a valid species at all

i) It is claimed that *Raphano brassica* is a new species, which arise through hybridization of radish *Brassica sativus* and cabbage *B. oleracea* (McNaughton, 1973). However, it breeds with their parents' radish and cabbage. So, it is not reproductively isolated. Therefore, it is not a new species (Tamarin, 1996).

ii) It is argued that *Tirticale* is a new species, which arise through hybridization of wheat *Triticum turgidium* and rye *Secale cereale.* But the F_1 hybrid is highly sterile. However, using colchicine, it becomes fertile. Moreover, about 50 years of intensive research, the characteristics of *Triticales* have been considerably improved as a crop (Zillinnsky, 1974 and Singh, 2000). But *Triticale* backcrosses with both the parents *Triticum turgidium* and *Scale cereale*. So, it is not reproductively isolated; therefore, it is not a species at all. As a result, Raven et al. (1980) declared that *Triticale* is not a species; it is just a variety only.

13. Artificial selection/hybridization is a skill sexual selection but it fails to developed a new reproductive isolated species/variety/race, which powerfully oppose evolution of human from the lower animal-like chimpanzee through sexual selection of Darwin's theory

Sexual selection is primarily proposed by observing that female birds select the most melodious and most beautiful males (Darwin, 1858; Darwin, 1859). Sexual selection is a mechanism of evolution in which the female is said to choose among various possible mates (Case, 1979). Darwin noted that many details of structure in man could not be explained through natural selection, so, he proposed the theory of sexual selection. This subject of sexual selection was treated at full length in the 'Descent of Man' (Darwin, 1882).

Oppositely, breeders select the best beautiful, healthy, vigorous, strong male animal, which is quite impossible by a female animal itself. So, artificial selection/hybridization is a skill sexual selection. But it is experienced from the whole text of this article due to the artificial selection breeders have failed to develop a single new species of plants or animals. So, it is quite impossible evolution of humans by a selection of a female animal. Thus, human was not evolved from the lower animal-like chimpanzee, which is questionable. Again, the artificial selection/hybridization is practiced by Americans and Indians from about 2500 B.C. (Allard, 1960). Hence, artificial selection is practicing by breeders from the last 4500 years. Yet human unable to produce a new species. So, how human evolve by natural selection/natural hybridizations?

14. Darwin himself admit that evolution of new species through artificial selection/hybridization is not possible

Darwin himself admit that evolution of new species through artificial selection/hybridization is not possible. In his words "The fourth difficulty on the theory of descend with modification, how can it account for species, when crossed, being sterile and produced sterile offspring, whereas when varieties are crossed, their fertility is unimpaired (Darwin, 1859).

15. Macroevolution remains unproven

Hybridization/ polyploidization provides a mechanism by which new species may arise suddenly (macroevolution) in nature by doubling of chromosome (Gardner 1972,Brewer and Sing, 1983; Strickberger, 1996). It is assumed that all vascular plant both for wild and cultivate plants or angiosperms come from natural hybridization/polyploidization (Soltis *et al.*, 2010 and Madlung, 2012). So, polyploidization is a major route and driving force of plant evolution (Blanc and Wolfe, 2004; Soltis and Soltis, 2009).

But it is experienced from the whole text of this article due to the hybridization, if hybridization between two animal/plant species is possible, then sterile hybrid is result, but if fertile and reproductively isolated hybrids are

produced, then hybridization serve as an excellent model of macroevolution of a new species. So, breeders have failed to develop a single new species of plants or animals. Hence, macroevolution remains unproved because no one has observed it (Vuletic 2003). In fact, macroevolution is a principle only but unobservable and consequently non-scientific. It has also been reported that there is no evidence for macroevolution (Denton, 1985). In addition, macro mutations normally do not contribute any evolution (Gould, 2002). Macroevolution is not possible. So, it is not take place (Isaak, 2003).

CONCLUSIONS

It is experienced from the whole text of this article due to the artificial selection breeders have failed to develop a single new species of plants or animals but successful to develop some variety/breeds/race/strain. But the both naturally and artificially develop variety/breeds/race/strain fail to gain reproductive isolation, as by random mating it return to original type/parental type and by non-random mating become homozygous organisms and extinct over time. There is no known reference that a species is develop either naturally and artificially. So, important model and evidence (artificial selection and hybridization) of Darwin's theory oppose both the gradual evolution and macroevolution

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is thankful to Professor T. M. Iqbal, Department of Horticulture, Faculty of Agriculture Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur, Bangladesh. The authour is also thankful to the great help of Google and ResearchGate for the data use in this paper. The author is also very thankful to the writers and publishers that mention in the references for using their information in this article.

Ethical Approval: No ethical approval is required.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/signin

REFERENCES

REFERENCE IS NOT FORMATTED ACCORDING TO JOURNAL GUIDELINE. It would done when it is accepted.

[1] Abplanalp, H.1990. Inbreeding. In R.D. Crawford (ed.). Elsivier, Asterdam.

[2] Ahad, M. A. (2011). Molecular evolution of new species without modern synthetic theory (neo-Darwinism). Int. J. Bio. Stress Manag., 2 (2):131-136.

[3] Ahad, M. A. (2014). Sociobiology is not a theory of evolution but a branch of entomology, which deals with social insects. Acad. J. Psych. Stud., 3: (7) 380-393[ajps.worldofresearches.com/archive12.html]

[4] Ahad, M.A. 2015. The direct evidences (paleontology/ fossils) of evolution opposite to Darwin's theory and even opposite to human evolution (descent of man) from the lower animal like chimpanzee. Am. J. L. Sci. Res., 3(1):56-76.

[5] Ahad, M.A. 2017. Punctuated equilibrium theory represents shifting balance theory (of macro and quantum evolution) and invalid Darwin's theory. J. Ent. Zool. Stud.5 (3):06-12

[6] Ahad, M.A. 2018. Darwinian classification of plant and animal (taxonomical evidences) opposite to Darwin's theory. J. Ent. and Zool. Studies 2018; 6(1): 111-115.

[7] Ahad, M.A. 2018a. Embryological evidences opposite to Darwin's theory: Biogenetic law (Recapitulation theory) and Haeckel's evolutionary tree is valid or not J. Ent. and Zool. Studies 2018; 6(5): 2492-2499.

[8] Ahad, M.A. 2020. Seven non-Darwinian theories opposite to evolution. Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies 2020; 8(5): 1212-1220

[9] Ahad, MA. 2019. Punctuated equilibrium theory, shifting balance theory, allopatric speciation theory and species selection theory for macroevolution valid or not. International J. Bot. Studies; 4:2)92-99.

[10] Allard, R. W. 1960. Principles of Plant Breeding. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.

[11] Anonymous. 2010. All About Animal Cloning- Biotechnology Industry…Animal Biotechnology updateSeptember.2010

[www.bio.org/…/Cloning_onepa]. Last visited-29.08.14

[12] Antonovics, J.; Bradshaw, A. D. and Turner, R. G. 1971. Heavy metal tolerance in plants. Adv. Ecol. Res. 7: 1-85.

[13] Atwal, A.S. 2005. Agricultural pests of India,5th edn and South East of Asia. Kalayni publishers, New Delhi. P. 90.

[14] Bammi, R. K. Shoffner, R. N. and Haldane, G. J. 1966. Sex ratio and karyotype in the chicken-coturnix quality quail hybrid. Can. J. Genet. Cytol. 8: 533-536.

[15] Banerjee, G. C. 2002. A Text Book of Animal Husbandry (8th Ed.). Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi.

[16] Banerjee, G. C. 2003. A Text Book of Animal Husbandry, 8th edn. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi.

[17] Brewbaker, J. L. 1964. Agricultural Genetics. Prentice-Hall Foundations of Modern Science, Englewood, Cliffs, New Jersey.

[18] Brewer, G. J. and. Sing C. F. (1983). Genetics. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., London.

[19] Brewer, G. J., and C. F. Sing. 1983. Genetics. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., London.

[20] Case, J. F. 1979. Biology, 2nd edn. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York and Collier Macmillan Publishers, London.

[21] Cockrum, E. L. and W. J. McCauley1965. *Zoology*, Saunders Student edn. W.B. Saunders Co., London.

[22] Coyne, J., Orr, H. (2004). Speciation. Sinauer Associates, Inc: Sunderland, MA.

[23] Crawford, W. C. 1990. Breeding and selection by poultry fanciers. In R.D. Crawford. (ed.) Poultry Genetics. Elsivier, Astadarm.

[24] Crawford, W. C. 1990. Crawford (ed.), R.D. Poultry Genetics. Elsivier, Astadarm.

[25] Darwin, C. 1859. On The Origin of Species . Oxford University Press, London.

[26] Darwin, C. R. 1882. *The Descent of Man, And Selection in Relation to Sex (*2nd edition). John Murray, London.p.165 [*Darwin online: The Descent of man (www.* **darwin-online**.org.uk/.../Free**man**_The**DescentofMan**.html*]*

[27] Denton, M. (1985). Evolution: A theory Crisis. Bethestda: Adler & Adler. [www.talkorigin.org/faqs/denton.html]

[28] Dobzhanskey, T. 1955. Evolution, Genetics and Man. Wiley Eastern Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.

[29] Dodson, E. O. 1960. Evolution: Process and Product, east-west student edn. Affiliated East West Press Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

[30] Eldredge, N.and Gould, S.J., 1972. Punctuated equilibria: an alternative to phylotic gradualism. In: Schopf, I.M. (Ed.), Model in Paleobiology. Freeman Cooper, San Francisco, 82-115.

[31] Enger, E. D., and Ross, F. C. 1997. Concept in Biology, 8th edn. McGraw Hill, New York.

[32] Evans, L.T. 1984. Darwin's use of the analogy between artificial and natural selection. J. Hist. Biol. 17: 130-140.

[33] Gardner, E. J., M. J. Simons, and D. P. Snustad. 2001. Principles of Genetics, 8th edn. John & Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.

[34] Gardner, E.J. 1972. Principle of Genetics, 2nd edn. Wiley Eastern Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

[35] Gerking, S.D. (1974). Biological Systems, 2nd edn. W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia.

[36] Gerking, S.D. 1969. Biological Systems, 1st & 2nd edn. W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia.

[37] Gould, F. (1980). Is a new & general theory emerging? Paleobiology, 6,1, 119-130.

[38] Gould, S.J. and Eldredge, N., 1977. Punctuated equilibria: the tempo and mode of evolution reconsidered. Paleobiology 3(2), 115-151.

[39] Graham, K. 1986. Biology Pensacola. A Beka Book Publication, FL.

[40] Grant, V. (1975). Genetics of flowering plants. Columbia University Press: New York.

[41] Gray, A. P. 1958. Bird Hybrids. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau, Barham Royal, Bakingham-Shire.

[42] Gupta, P. K. 1997. Cytology, Genetics and Evolution, 5th edn. Rastogi Publications, Meerut, India.

[43] Hardada, K., and Buss, E.G. 1981. Turkey-chicken hybrid: A cytological study of early development. J. Hered. 72: 264-266.

[44] Isaak, M. (2003). The talk origin archives, Index to creationist claim. [www.talkorigin.org/faq-misconception].Last visited18.04.14.

[45] Jiao, Y, Wickett, N.J., Ayyampalayam, S., Chanderbali, A.S., Landherr, L., Ralph, P.E. (2011] Ancestral polyploidy in seed plants and angiosperms. Nature 473: 97–100.

[46] Johnson, G. B. (2003). The Living World (3rd Edn.) McGraw Hill New York.

[47] Khanna, S. S. 1989. Genetics and Evolution, 4th edn. Central Book Depot, Allahabad, India.

[48] Kuckuc, H., Kobabe, G and Wenzel, G. I. 1991. Fundamentals of Plant Breeding. Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi.

[49] Laetsch, W. M. 1979. Plants: Basic Concepts in Botany. Little Brown and Co., Boston, Toronto.

[50] Laster, M. L. 1972. Interspecific hybridization of Heliothis virescens and H. subflexa. Env. Entomol. 1: 682-687.

[51] Levin, D. (2002). The Role of Chromosomal Change in Plant Evolution. Oxford University Press: New York.

[52] Lewis, W. (1980). Polyploidy in species populations. In: Lewis W (ed.). Polyploidy: Biological Relevance. Plenum: New York. pp 103–144.

[53] Lull, R. S. 1976. Orgnanic Evolution, Indian edn. Seema Publications, New Delhi.

M.A. (2019). Living organisms (even human) evolve to match with the climate or not and geographical distribution (biogeography) opposite to Darwin's theory or not. International J. Bot. Studies, 4 (2); 28-34.

[54] Mackean, D. G. 1976. Introduction to Biology, new trop. edn. John Murray, London.

[55] Mackean, D. G. 1976. Introduction to Biology, new trop. edn. John Murray, London, 205, 206.

[56] Mader, S. (2003). Biology, 3rd edn. McGrow-Hill Higher Education, New York.

[57] Mader, S. 2003. Biology, 3rd edn. McGrow-Hill Higher Education, New York.

[58] Matzke, N.J., Gross, P.R., 2006. Analyzing Critical Analysis: The Fallback Antievolutionist Strategy (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/macroevolution).

[59] Mayer, E. 1963. Animal Species and Evolution. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

[60] Mayr, E.1969. Principles of Systematic Zoology. McGraw-Hill, New York.

[61] McNaughton, I. M. 1973. Synthesis and Sterility of Raphanobrassica. Euphytica 22: 70-88.

[62] Morris, H. M. 1988. Evolution and the Modern Christians. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Phillipsburg, New Jersey.

[63] Novitski, E. 1977. Human Genetics. Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc. New York and Collier Macmillan Publishers, London.

[64] Oparin, A. I.1924. Proiskhozhozhdenie zhizny, Moscow (Translated by Ann Synge in Bernal (1967)), The Origin of Life, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 199–234.

[65] Painter, T. S., and Cole, L. J. 1943. The genetics and sex of pigeon-ring dove hybrids as determined by their sex chromosome. J. Morph. 72: 411-439.

[66] Purves, W. K. and Orians, G. H. 1987. The Science of Biology, 2nd edn. Sinauer Associates Inc. Publishers, Snderland, Massachuetts.

[67] Ramsey, J, Schemske, D.W. (1998). Pathways, mechanisms, and rates of polyploid formation in flowering plants. Annu Rev Ecol Syst 29: 467–501 Mader, S. (2003). Biology, 3rd edn. McGrow-Hill Higher Education, New York.

[68] Ranganathan, B. G. 1988. Origins?. The Banner of Truth Trust. Carlisle, PA.

[69] Rastogi, V. B. 1994. Organic Evolution. Kedernath Ramnath, India.

[70] Rause, M. 1975. Neo-Darwinism, Theoria to Theory 14: 17-25.

[71] Raven, P.H., Evert, R.F., and Curtis, H. 1980. Biology of Plants, 2nd edn. Worth Publishers Inc., New York.

[72] Ritche, D. D. and Carola, R. G. 1983. Biology. Addison-Wiley Publishing Co., Inc., Califonia.

[73] Sambamurty, A. V. S. S. 1999. Genetics. Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi,.

[74] Shoffner, R. N., Wang, N. Lee, F. King., R. and Otis, J. S. 1979. Chromosome homology between the Ross's and the emperor goose. J. Hered. 70: 395-400.

[75] Singh, B. D. 1990, 2000. Plant Breeding, 5th & 6th edn. Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi.

[76] Sinha, U. and Sinha, S. 1997. Cytogenetics, Plant Breeding and Evolution. Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

[77] Sinnott, E. D., Dunn, L. C. and Dobzhanskey, T. 1998. Principles of Genetics, 5th edn. Tata-McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., New Delhi.

[78] Sinnott, E. D., Dunn, L. C. and Dobzhanskey, T. 1998. Principles of Genetics (5th Ed.). Tata-McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Ltd., New Delhi.

[79] Sinnott, W. E., and Wilson, K. S.1963. Botany: Principle and Problems, 6th edn. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.

[80] Starr, C., Taggart, R., 1989. Biology: the Unity and Diversity of Life (5th Edn.). Wardsworth Publishing Co. Belmont, California,675.

[81] Stebbins G. L. (1966). Process of Organic Evolution. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

[82] Strickberger, W.M. 1996. Genetics, 3rd edn. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi

[83] Tamarin, R. 1996. Principle of Genetics, 5th edn. Wm. C. Brown Publishers, Oxford, England.

[84] Verma, P. S, and Agarwal, V. K. 1999. Cell biology, Genetics, Molecular Biology, Evolution and Ecology, 13th edn. S. Chand and Co. Ltd., New Delhi.

[85] Vuletic, M.I. (2003). Frequently encountered criticisms in evolution vs. creation. (www. vuletic. com/hume/cefec/).

[86] Wallace, R. A. 1990. Biology, the world of life, 5th edn. Harper Collins Publishers Inc., New York.

[87] Wallace, R. A. 1990. Biology, the world of life, 5th edn. Harper Collins Publishers Inc., New York.

[88] Ward, J. A., and H. W. Hetzel. 1980. Biology Today and Tomorrow. West Publishing Co., New York.

[89] WBES. 1994. The World Book of Encyclopedia of Science. Vol. 6 (The animal world). World Book, Inc., Chicago.

[90] Weaver, R. F. and Hedrick, P. W. 1997. Genetics (3rd Ed.). Wm. C. Brown Publishers, England.

[91] Wilson E. O. 1977. Life. Sinaur Associates, Inc. Publishers, Sunderland, Mass.

[92] Young, R. M. 1971. Darwin's Metaphor: Does nature selects? Monist. 55: 442-503.

[93] Young, R. M. 1985. Darwin's Metaphor. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.

[94] Zillinnsky, F.J. 1974. The development of Triticale. Adv. Agron. 26: 315-348.