International Journal of Public Health and Medical Research
ISSN: 3006-7707 (Print), ISSN: 3006-3752 (Online) | Volume 4, Number 2, Year 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62051/ijphmr.v4n2.04
Journal homepage: https://wepub.org/index.php/IJPHMR/index

Comparison of the Core Concepts, Historical Context, and Modern Scientific Evaluation of Darwin's Theory of Natural Selection of Use and Disuse

Jiayi Shen *

University of Toronto 172 St. George Street Toronto, Ontario M5R 0A3, Canada
*Corresponding Author: admin@icyt.ac.cn

ABSTRACT

Charles Darwin's theory of natural selection stands as the cornerstone of modern biology. Yet, its formulation and reception occurred against the backdrop of pre-existing evolutionary ideas, most notably Jean-Baptiste Lamarck's theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, often summarized as "use and disuse." This paper provides a comprehensive comparison of these two pivotal theories, examining their core concepts, historical contexts, and crucially, their evaluation in light of modern science. We detail Lamarck's vision of organisms actively adapting through use and disuse of organs, passing these modifications directly to offspring. We contrast this with Darwin's mechanism of natural selection, where heritable variation within populations is acted upon by environmental pressures, leading to differential survival and reproduction. The historical analysis explores the intellectual climate of the 18th and 19th centuries, the influence of Lamarck on Darwin's thinking, and the fierce debates surrounding the publication of On the Origin of Species. Modern scientific evaluation, grounded in genetics, molecular biology, and rigorous experimentation, overwhelmingly supports the core tenets of natural selection as the primary driver of adaptation and evolutionary change. While Lamarckian inheritance, as originally conceived, has been falsified, the paper explores nuances such as epigenetic inheritance and phenotypic plasticity, demonstrating how they differ fundamentally from Lamarckism while enriching our understanding of organism-environment interactions. Ultimately, this comparison highlights the revolutionary nature of Darwin's theory, its enduring explanatory power, and why Lamarck's "use and disuse," despite its historical importance and intuitive appeal, remains relegated to the annals of superseded scientific ideas, save for very specific and limited modern reinterpretations.

KEYWORDS

Darwin's theory of natural selection; Lamarck's theory of inheritance of acquired characteristics; Use and disuse; Evolution; Natural selection; Inheritance of acquired characteristics; Historical context; Modern scientific evaluation; Genetics; Molecular biology

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of evolution – the idea that life on Earth has changed over vast stretches of time – predates both Charles Darwin and Jean-Baptiste Lamarck. However, the mechanism driving this change became the central battleground of 19th-century biology. Two contrasting visions emerged: Lamarck's theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, epitomized by the concepts of "use and disuse" and the "striving for perfection," and Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection. While Darwin's name is synonymous with evolution today, understanding the nature, context, and fate of Lamarck's competing theory is crucial for appreciating the depth and significance of the Darwinian revolution. This paper systematically compares the core concepts underpinning each theory, situates them within their respective historical and intellectual contexts, and subjects them to rigorous evaluation based on the overwhelming weight of modern scientific evidence [1]. The conclusion is unequivocal: natural selection provides the robust, evidence-based mechanism for adaptation and the diversity of life, while Lamarckian inheritance, despite persistent cultural echoes, lacks empirical support as a general evolutionary mechanism.

2. ORGANIZATION OF THE TEXT

2.1. Section Headings

2.1.1. Lamarck's Theory of Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics (Use and Disuse)

Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744-1829) presented the first coherent, naturalistic theory of evolution. His core mechanism, outlined in works like Philosophie Zoologique (1809), rested on two fundamental principles:

(1) Use and Disuse: Lamarck proposed that organs or structures develop and strengthen through repeated use. Conversely, organs that are not used weaken and diminish over time. This was presented as a direct physiological response to an organism's needs and activities within its environment [2].

Example: A giraffe stretching its neck to reach higher leaves would, over its lifetime, experience a slight elongation of its neck. Blacksmiths developing strong arms through their work was a common human analogy used.

(2) Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics: This is the crucial and controversial step. Lamarck argued that these modifications acquired during an organism's lifetime – the longer neck, the stronger arms – could be passed on directly to its offspring. The offspring would then be born with a slightly longer neck or predisposition for stronger arms, starting from this new baseline. Over generations, this cumulative process could lead to significant evolutionary change [3].

(3) The "Striving for Perfection" (Le pouvoir de la vie): Underpinning Lamarck's view was an inherent, almost teleological, drive within organisms towards greater complexity and "perfection." Use and disuse was the mechanism by which organisms actively adapted themselves to their environments in service of this inherent progressive tendency. Evolution was thus portrayed as linear and purposeful [4].

In essence, Lamarckian evolution is instructionist : the environment directly instructs the organism on how to change, and these learned changes become innate in the next generation. The individual organism's lifetime experience is paramount.

2.1.2. Darwin's Theory of Evolution by Natural Selection

Charles Darwin (1809-1882), independently of Alfred Russel Wallace, proposed a radically different mechanism in On the Origin of Species (1859). Natural selection relies on several key observations and inferences:

(1) Overproduction and Struggle for Existence: Organisms produce more offspring than can possibly survive given limited environmental resources (food, space, mates, escape from predators/disease). This leads to a perpetual "struggle for existence" [5].

(2) Variation: Individuals within a population exhibit heritable variations in their traits (morphology, physiology, behavior). Crucially, Darwin recognized this variation but lacked a complete understanding of its genetic basis (Mendel's work was unknown to him).

(3) Differential Survival and Reproduction (Natural Selection): In the struggle for existence, individuals possessing variations that confer an advantage (better camouflage, faster speed, greater efficiency in resource use, increased attractiveness to mates) in a specific environment are more likely

to survive and reproduce successfully. Those with less advantageous variations are less likely to survive and reproduce [6].

(4) Descent with Modification: Over generations, the advantageous variations become more common in the population as the individuals possessing them contribute disproportionately to the next generation's gene pool. The population gradually changes, or "descends with modification," becoming better adapted to its local environment. This process is non-random with respect to fitness but random in the origin of variation [7].

Darwinian evolution is selectionist . Variation arises randomly (relative to need). The environment does not instruct change; it selects from the existing pool of variation. The unit of change is the population over generations , not the individual within its lifetime. There is no inherent drive towards complexity or "higher" forms; adaptation is local and relative, leading to branching diversity (descent from a common ancestor) rather than linear progress.

2.2. Key Conceptual Contrasts

Direction of Change: Lamarck: Environment -> Individual Change -> Inheritance. Darwin: Random Variation -> Environment Selects -> Inheritance.

Role of the Organism: Lamarck: Active agent, responding physiologically to need. Darwin: Passive recipient of selection pressures acting on pre-existing variation.

Origin of Variation: Lamarck: Generated in response to need during life. Darwin: Pre-existing and random (relative to need) [8].

Speed of Change: Lamarck: Could theoretically be rapid (within few generations). Darwin: Generally gradual, accumulating over many generations (though punctuated equilibrium later offered a nuance) [9].

Teleology: Lamarck: Inherent drive towards complexity/perfection. Darwin: No goal, only adaptation to local conditions; complexity can arise but is not inevitable.

2.3. Historical Context: Intellectual Crucibles

2.3.1. Lamarck's Theory of Inheritance of Acquired Characteristics (Use and Disuse)

Pre-Darwinian Evolutionism: Ideas of transformation existed (e.g., Erasmus Darwin, Charles's grandfather), but were often vague or mystical. Lamarck provided the first systematic naturalistic framework.

The Great Chain of Being: A dominant concept viewing nature as a static, hierarchical ladder from simplest to most complex (humans at the top). Lamarck dynamized this chain, seeing life ascending it over time via his mechanisms.

Lack of Deep Time: While geological ideas were changing (Hutton), the immense age of the Earth necessary for gradual evolution was not yet fully grasped or accepted.

Biology's State: Physiology was poorly understood; the nature of inheritance was a complete mystery (pre-Mendel); cell theory was nascent. Lamarck's ideas, particularly the inheritance of acquired characteristics, were not seen as biologically implausible in this context. His work was largely ignored or rejected during his lifetime, partly due to the dominance of Cuvier's anti-evolutionary catastrophism.

2.3.2. Darwin's World (Mid 19th Century)

Rising Evidence for Evolution: Fossil discoveries increasingly revealed extinct species and sequences suggesting change. Comparative anatomy (homologies) pointed to common descent. Biogeography (distribution of species, especially on islands like the Galapagos) strongly suggested adaptation and divergence from common ancestors.

Uniformitarianism (Lyell): Charles Lyell's Principles of Geology profoundly influenced Darwin. Lyell argued that geological features resulted from slow, gradual processes observable today (erosion, sedimentation, vulcanism) acting over immense timescales. This provided the crucial framework of "deep time" necessary for natural selection's gradual action.

Malthusian Economics: Thomas Malthus's essay on population, highlighting geometric population growth versus arithmetic resource growth, provided Darwin with the key insight of overproduction and the consequent "struggle for existence."

Scientific Temperament: A growing emphasis on naturalistic explanations, empirical evidence, and mechanistic processes characterized the era.

Lamarck's Shadow: Darwin was aware of Lamarck's ideas. While he rejected the inheritance of acquired characteristics as the primary mechanism, he never entirely ruled it out as a possible minor contributor (a stance later dropped by Neo-Darwinists). His notebooks show he grappled with Lamarckian concepts early on before formulating natural selection.

The Reception and Conflict: On the Origin of Species ignited immediate controversy. While many found the evidence for evolution compelling, the mechanism of natural selection faced significant hurdles:

Lack of Genetics: Without an understanding of inheritance, critics argued variations would "blend away" over generations. How could discrete variations persist?

Perceived Gradualism: Critics argued the fossil record showed jumps, not gradualism (though gaps were a major issue).

Teleology and Design: Natural selection's apparent randomness and lack of purpose offended religious and philosophical sensibilities accustomed to seeing design in nature. Lamarck's "striving" felt more purposeful to some.

The Lamarckian Alternative: For many biologists uncomfortable with natural selection's materialism and randomness, Lamarckism offered a more palatable, seemingly more "direct" mechanism. Figures like Herbert Spencer were influential proponents. This led to decades of debate where Lamarckism remained a serious contender well into the late 19th and even early 20th centuries, particularly in some scientific communities.

2.4. Modern Scientific Evaluation: The Weight of Evidence

The 20th century witnessed a scientific revolution that decisively resolved the debate in favor of Darwinian natural selection, while simultaneously falsifying Lamarckian inheritance as a general mechanism.

2.4.1. The Triumph of Natural Selection: The Modern Synthesis (Neo-Darwinism)

Rediscovery of Mendel (1900): Provided the mechanism of inheritance – discrete, particulate units (genes) passed unchanged (except by mutation) from parents to offspring. This solved the "blending inheritance" problem and showed how variation could be maintained.

Population Genetics (Fisher, Haldane, Wright): Mathematically integrated Mendelian genetics with natural selection, demonstrating how allele frequencies change in populations over time due to selection, drift, mutation, and migration.

Mutation as the Source of Variation: Established that new genetic variation arises primarily through random mutations in DNA. Mutations are not directed by the environment or the organism's needs.

The Synthesis Itself (Dobzhansky, Mayr, Simpson, Huxley, Stebbins): Forged in the 1930s-1950s, it unified genetics, paleontology, systematics, and ecology under the framework of evolution by natural selection acting on genetic variation. It provided a robust, testable, and predictive theory explaining adaptation, speciation, and the diversity of life across all biological scales. Countless studies in fields like antibiotic resistance in bacteria, pesticide resistance in insects, industrial melanism in peppered moths, and adaptive radiation in Darwin's finches provide overwhelming empirical validation. Modern techniques like DNA sequencing allow direct observation of genetic changes driven by selection.

2.4.2. The Falsification of Lamarckian Inheritance

Modern biology provides fundamental reasons why Lamarck's core mechanism fails:

(1) The Central Dogma of Molecular Biology (Crick): Information flows from DNA -> RNA -> Protein. Proteins (the molecules built through "use") do not alter the DNA sequence in a way that is transmitted to gametes. Muscle built by a blacksmith does not alter the sperm or egg cells' DNA coding for muscle development. Environmental modifications generally affect the phenotype (the expressed characteristics), not the genotype (the genetic code).

(2) Weismann's Barrier: August Weismann's concept (later confirmed by cell biology) states that the "germ line" (cells producing sperm and eggs) is isolated early in development from the "somatic line" (body cells). Changes to somatic cells (like a longer neck from stretching) cannot be communicated to the germ line cells. Only mutations occurring in the germ line can be inherited.

(3) Experimental Evidence: Numerous rigorous experiments have failed to demonstrate the inheritance of acquired characteristics. The most famous is August Weismann's experiment cutting off the tails of mice for many generations; offspring were always born with normal tails. Similar negative results exist for countless other traits. While some historical "evidence" for Lamarckism existed (e.g., Paul Kammerer's midwife toad experiments), it was later shown to be fraudulent or misinterpreted.

(4) Genomic Implausibility: There is no known molecular mechanism by which specific, environmentally-induced phenotypic changes could be translated into precise, corresponding changes in the DNA sequence of germ cells across the entire genome in a heritable way.

2.4.3. Nuances and Caveats: Beyond Strict Dichotomies

While Lamarckism as a general theory is falsified, modern biology reveals complexities that, while not Lamarckian, show the relationship between environment, phenotype, and inheritance is more intricate than the simplest Neo-Darwinian models sometimes implied:

(1) Phenotypic Plasticity: A single genotype can produce different phenotypes in different environments (e.g., changes in size, color, behavior, physiology). This looks like direct environmental induction but is not inheritance. The capacity for plasticity is itself genetically controlled and evolved by natural selection. The induced changes are not passed on genetically (e.g., a well-fed, large mother bear gives birth to genetically normal-sized cubs who will grow large only if they are well-fed).

(2) Epigenetic Inheritance: This involves changes in gene expression (whether a gene is turned on/off, up/down) without changes in the underlying DNA sequence. Mechanisms include DNA methylation, histone modification, and RNA interference. Crucially:

Some epigenetic marks can be passed from parent to offspring (transgenerational epigenetic inheritance).

Environment can influence these marks (e.g., diet, stress).

However, this is NOT Lamarckian Inheritance: The changes are usually not adaptive in a Lamarckian sense (direct response to need); they are often stochastic or stress-induced side-effects. The effects are typically short-lived, fading over a few generations. Crucially, the epigenetic marks themselves are established and maintained by molecular machinery encoded in the DNA , meaning they operate within the framework of genetic inheritance and natural selection. Epigenetics adds a layer of complexity to inheritance and development but does not revive the core Lamarckian mechanism of directed inheritance of somatic adaptations.

(3) Cultural Evolution (Humans): Humans transmit vast amounts of information (knowledge, skills, behaviors) culturally (language, teaching, imitation). This can resemble Lamarckian inheritance ("acquired" knowledge is passed on) and drives rapid change. However, this operates via a completely different mechanism (learning, not genetics) and is unique in scale to humans (though rudimentary forms exist in other animals). It supplements, but does not replace, biological evolution by natural selection.

3. CONCLUSION

The comparison between Darwin's natural selection and Lamarck's use and disuse reveals a profound shift in scientific understanding. Lamarck deserves immense credit as a pioneer who boldly proposed a naturalistic theory of evolution in an era dominated by static views. His emphasis on adaptation to the environment was crucial. However, his proposed mechanism-the inheritance of characteristics acquired through use and disuse-was fundamentally incorrect.

Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection, forged in a context enriched by geology, biogeography, and Malthusian insights, provided the correct mechanistic framework. Its core strength lies in its grounding in observable variation and differential reproduction. The subsequent Modern Synthesis, integrating genetics, provided the missing mechanism of inheritance and cemented natural selection as the overwhelmingly dominant force shaping adaptation and evolutionary change. Modern molecular biology definitively falsified the core tenet of Lamarckian inheritance: the direct transmission of environmentally-modified somatic characteristics to the germ line.

While phenomena like phenotypic plasticity and epigenetic inheritance demonstrate sophisticated ways organisms respond to their environments within their lifetimes and sometimes transmit non-genetic information briefly, they operate within the genetic framework established by natural selection. They do not constitute a return to Lamarckism. Lamarck's theory remains a historically significant stepping stone, a testament to early evolutionary thought, and a persistent cultural meme due to its intuitive appeal. However, as a scientific explanation for the diversity and adaptation of life, it has been conclusively superseded by the powerful, evidence-based, and continually validated theory of evolution by natural selection. The "shadow" of use and disuse lingers only as a reminder of a path not taken by nature, a hypothesis that could not withstand the rigorous scrutiny of modern science. Darwin's insight into the power of selection acting on random variation endures as biology's central unifying principle.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, whose insightful guidance and unwavering support have been instrumental in shaping this paper. Their profound knowledge of evolutionary biology and meticulous feedback have greatly improved the quality of this work.

I am also thankful to the faculty and peers at the University of Toronto for engaging in stimulating discussions that broadened my perspectives on the historical and scientific nuances of Darwinian and Lamarckian theories.

Additionally, I appreciate the valuable resources provided by the university library, which facilitated access to key literature and research materials essential for this comparative analysis.

Finally, I extend my deepest thanks to my family and friends for their constant encouragement and understanding throughout the research and writing process.

REFERENCES

[1] Bowler, P. J. (2009). Darwin's originality. Science, 323 (5911), 223–226.

[2] Jablonka, E., Lamb, M. J. (2005). Evolution in four dimensions: Genetic, epigenetic, behavioral, and symbolic variation in the history of life. MIT Press.

[3] Haig, D. (2007). Weismann rules! OK? Epigenetics and the Lamarckian temptation. Biology & Philosophy, 22 (3), 415–428.

[4] Gissis, S. B., Jablonka, E. (Eds.). (2011). Transformations of Lamarckism: From subtle fluids to molecular biology. MIT Press.

[5] West-Eberhard, M. J. (2005). Phenotypic accommodation: adaptive innovation due to developmental plasticity. Journal of Experimental Zoology Part B: Molecular and Developmental Evolution, 304B (6), 610–618.

[6] Danchin, É., Charmantier, A., Champagne, F. A., et al. (2011). Beyond DNA: integrating inclusive inheritance into an extended theory of evolution. Nature Reviews Genetics, 12 (7), 475–486.

[7] Laland, K. N., Uller, T., Feldman, M. W., et al. (2015). The extended evolutionary synthesis: its structure, assumptions and predictions. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 282 (1813), 20151019.

[8] Wray, G. A., Hoekstra, H. E., Futuyma, D. J., et al. (2014). Does evolutionary theory need a rethink? Nature, 514 (7521), 161–164.

[9] Skinner, M. K. (2015). Environmental epigenetics and a unified theory of the molecular aspects of evolution: a neo-Lamarckian concept that facilitates neo-Darwinian evolution. Genome Biology and Evolution, 7 (5), 1296–1302.