

Many what he had  
seen at the galapagos



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Many scientists have different understandings and uses of bioengineering. Darwin's Theory on natural selection has stirred up some controversies on whether or not to remain studying and researching for information on the theory. Jeremy Rifkin, a philosopher and environmental activist, portrays in his article the world will be coming to an end if we remain to use bioengineering the way that we have been. He feels it is a waste of time and money to keep researching on Darwin's Theory.

Where as Stephen Jay Gould, biology and geology professor at Harvard University, feels that bioengineering is a complex yet useful item in science. He believes if one can understand the history behind the theory, then it would be a useful item for future use. Both authors main view is to create a better environment for humans to live in, but have different thoughts on how to reach the better side. Gould believes " Rifkin does not understand science, therefore hemisuses science for political and social purposes- or scientific racism." (Gould, 1985, pg 676)Rifkins outlook on bioengineering is not being totally against it, but as a method that is not useful. He feels that science may be misused andpointless, therefore why have scientists work day and night over projects which are pointless. He doesn't want society to spend so much money on a cause that is what he thinks is worthless.

In one case, he says that evolution is a false science. The whole theory of Darwin is fake because it was created due to scientists experimenting over and over again until they came up with some conclusions. He believes scientists should not waste time on trying to find an answer, whenit isn't exact. He believes that no one knows the truthful answers unless one has lived through theera.

Gould along with many other scientist disagree to that piece of information Rifkin gives. Gould believes that Rifkin doesn't understand science to the full extent. He has no knowledge or experience behind the field, therefore leading him to the wrong answers about science. Most scientists agree because research and experimentation is the way to learn about the past and future. There was also a statement that Rifkin wrote in *Algeny*, a book about alchemy of genes, that Gould found hilarious. Rifkin wrote about what he had seen at the Galapagos islands: " vultures, condors, vampire bats, jaguars, and snakes.

" Rifkin also wrote, " it was a savage, primeval bloodletting and ferocious, unremitting battle for survival. The air was dank and foul and the thick stench of volcanoes ash veiled the islands with a kind of goulash drape." (Gould, 1985, 682) He gave a very harsh, scary description of the islands. Gould laughs and believes Rifkin has never set foot on the islands. Gould says the total opposite of the environment and physical description of the Galapagos.

He says it is a beautiful and there are no harmful animals at the location. Rifkin doesn't totally disagree on science, but is making many false accusations. He loves science, but critics believe some of his view points against evolution and Darwin's theory do not have enough understanding behind them. Gould believes that Rifkin doesn't comprehend or have enough facts and information on the subject to make a honest opinion. He feels that Rifkin just looks straight and won't look to the side, where he could find deeper information. Many scientists and critics do not appreciate Rifkin's rambling on about science and saying things he doesn't know. Rifkin feels he has a say in anything, and these are his opinions on the matter at hand.

<https://assignbuster.com/many-what-he-had-seen-at-thegalapagos/>