Mitochondria and chloroplasts completely refute evolution and billions of years

How can evolution explain how mitochondria and chloroplasts came into being? There are several theories for their origin. But why is there not one definitive answer? The reason is that all proposed theories are preposterous. This is the state of evolution for the origin of anything. So, this post will just concentrate on the least preposterous theory.

Each supposedly came into being when a bacterium was engulfed by a eukaryote cell over 1 billion years ago. What does it mean engulfed? Wouldn't the eukaryote cell have repelled it or digested it? The theory is that a eukaryote ingested but did not digest it. The eukaryote just partially digested a bacterium. Kind of like indigestion.

But why did the bacterium stop replicating once engulfed? And how did the eukaryote cell take over making copies of the engulfed bacteria when it needed energy? How did the eukaryote cell learn to use the bacteria's ATP when it did not have the ability to use it before? And how did the engulfed partially digested bacteria become dependent on proteins manufactured from the host eukaryote cell's DNA?

But it gets way stranger yet. Bacteria have genomes that are over 1 million base pairs and some millions of base pairs long. Yet the engulfed bacteria when supposedly converted to mitochondria have only about 15,000 base pairs. Where did the other over 1 million base pairs go?

After this, the engulfed bacterium had to change from having a cell wall produced by enzymes in its cytoplasm to the double membrane for mitochondria enclosed in the cytoplasm of the eukaryote that enclosed it. This is an inside out change. Also, this would mean that the enclosed bacterium would have had all its internals spill out. Furthermore, there is a significant difference in the functionality of a bacteria's cell wall and the double membrane of mitochondrial. The cell wall is the outer part of the cell protecting it from the outside world whereas the double membrane is an internal structure which requires less protection. Therefore, the cell wall is tougher and less permeable than the mitochondria's double membrane. There is a difference in what can be transported through them. The cell wall in permeable to small molecules and the double membrane of mitochondria is selectively permeable. And there is a difference in what allows that transport and their makeup. The cell wall is also thicker. The cell wall is metabolically inactive, and the double membrane of mitochondria are metabolically active.

What is also puzzling is that eukaryotes are supposedly descended from prokaryotes. Yet eukaryotes do not have circular DNA like most prokaryotes. Some prokaryotes do but then how did prokaryotes end up with some with linear DNA organized as chromosomes and most with circular DNA?

From the following site, it is known that there is a big difference in how prokaryotes and eukaryotes carry out transcription and translation. This is described in the paragraph following the link.

https://bio.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Microbiology/Microbiology_(Boundless)/07%3A_Microbial_Genetics/7.06%3A_Translation-_Protein_Synthesis/7.6C%3A_Prokaryotic_Transcription_and_Translation_Are_Coupled

“Prokaryotic transcription occurs in the cytoplasm alongside translation. Prokaryotic transcription and translation can occur simultaneously. This is impossible in eukaryotes, where transcription occurs in a membrane-bound nucleus while translation occurs outside the nucleus in the cytoplasm.”

Furthermore, there is a difference in how bacteria and mitochondria carry out transcription and translation. This is described in the paragraph following the below link.

https://elifesciences.org/articles/58362#:~:text=In%20bacteria%2C%20ribosomes%20are%20directly,translation%20are%20most%20likely%20compartmented.

“In bacteria, ribosomes are directly associated with RNA polymerase, thus regulating the rate of gene expression (Kohler et al., 2017; Demo et al., 2017). In mitochondria, such coupling does not occur because transcription and translation are most likely compartmented”

There is also a difference in the transcription/translation codon table between bacteria and mitochondria. This is shown in the following article.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DNA_and_RNA_codon_tables#Translation_table_1

So, to recap, here is what happened that fateful day over 1 billion years ago. A eukaryotic cell, which no one can explain how it evolved from a prokaryote, engulfed and partially digested a bacterium. It then had to get rid of its cell wall and surround it with a double membrane. It had to do this without the bacterium spilling out its insides. The engulfing eukaryote took control of the bacterium’s replication, discarded over 1 million base pairs of the bacteria, and kept just 15,000 base pairs. The bacterium turned off its own replication and had to have some of its proteins made by the engulfing eukaryote. The eukaryote somehow changed how it used energy to using ATP. The bacterium’s codon transcription and translation table were changed, and its DNA selectively edited. Also, how the bacterium did transcription and translation were also changed. And all these super miracles of miracles happened simultaneously in these 2 individual organisms that one fateful moment. Each of these super miracles of miracles had to have least dozens or hundreds of super miracles of miracles happen simultaneously in that moment. And this did not happen just once but twice as a similar preposterous theory is used to explain the origin of chloroplasts.

More information on the differences between bacteria and mitochondria are found at the following 2 sites.

https://febs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/febs.14692

https://us.ukessays.com/essays/biology/similarities-between-mitochondria-and-bacteria-biology-essay.php