

vol - 1

The Evolution Impasse

الله
رسول
محمد

HARUN YAHYA

The aim in compiling this anthology is to let readers easily obtain information on all matters concerning evolution and to have access to the most accurate facts. You can thus acquire the most practical, accurate and reliable information regarding all the terms and concepts you may encounter regarding the theory of evolution in the press, in magazines, books, TV programs and other media. The hypothetical claims made by those who advocate the theory of evolution—and how their assertions are invalidated by the scientific facts and recently discovered evidence—are set out in an encyclopedic format, under alphabetical headings.



About the Author

The author, who writes under the pen-name Harun Yahya, was born in Ankara in 1956. He studied arts at Istanbul's Mimar Sinan University, and philosophy at Istanbul University. Since the 1980s, the author has published many books on political, faith-related and scientific issues. Greatly appreciated all around the world, these works have been instrumental in helping many to return their faith in God, and, in many others, to gain a deeper insight into their faith. Harun Yahya's books appeal to all kinds of readers, regardless of their age, race, or nationality, for they focus on one objective: to broaden the reader's perspective by encouraging him or her to think about a number of critical issues, such as the existence of God and His unity, and to live by the values He prescribed for them.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

اللَّهُ
رَسُولُ
مُحَمَّدٍ

Published by
GLOBAL PUBLISHING

Talatpasa Mahallesi, Emirgazi Caddesi, İbrahim Elmas İş Merkezi A
Blok, Kat: 4
Okmeydani - Istanbul / Turkey
Tel: +90 212 222 00 88

Printed and bound by Secil Ofset in Istanbul
100 Yıl Mah. MAS-SIT Matbaacilar Sitesi 4. Cadde No: 77 Bağcılar-
Istanbul/Turkey
Phone: (+90 212) 629 06 15

All translations from the Qur'an are from *The Noble Qur'an: a New
Rendering of its Meaning in English* by Hajj Abdalhaqq and Aisha
Bewley, published by Bookwork, Norwich, UK. 1420 CE/1999 AH.

www.harunyahya.com - www.harunyahya.net

The book cover features a decorative border with a dark red background and intricate gold-colored scrollwork and floral patterns. The border frames a central white rectangular area where the title and author information are placed.

THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE -I

**HARUN YAHYA
(ADNAN OKTAR)**



ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Now writing under the pen-name of **HARUN YAHYA**, Adnan Oktar was born in Ankara in 1956. Having completed his primary and secondary education in Ankara, he studied arts at Istanbul's Mimar Sinan University and philosophy at Istanbul University. Since the 1980s, he has published many books on political, scientific, and faith-related issues. Harun Yahya is well-known as the author of important works disclosing the imposture of evolutionists, their invalid claims, and the dark liaisons between Darwinism and such bloody ideologies as fascism and communism.

Harun Yahya's works, translated into 57 different languages, constitute a collection for a total of more than 45,000 pages with 30,000 illustrations.

His pen-name is a composite of the names Harun (Aaron) and Yahya (John), in memory of the two esteemed Prophets who fought against their peoples' lack of faith. The Prophet's seal on his books' covers is symbolic and is linked to their contents. It represents the Qur'an (the Final Scripture) and Prophet Muhammad (may Allah bless him and grant him peace), last of the prophets. Under the guidance of the Qur'an and the Sunnah (teachings of the Prophet [may Allah bless him and grant him peace]), the author makes it his purpose to disprove each fundamental tenet of irreligious ideologies and to have the "last word," so as to completely silence the objections raised against religion. He uses the seal of the final Prophet (may Allah bless him and grant him peace), who attained ultimate wisdom and moral perfection, as a sign of his intention to offer the last word.

All of Harun Yahya's works share one single goal: to convey the Qur'an's message, encourage readers to consider basic faith-related issues such as Allah's existence

and unity and the Hereafter; and to expose irreligious systems' feeble foundations and perverted ideologies.

Harun Yahya enjoys a wide readership in many countries, from India to America, England to Indonesia, Poland to Bosnia, Spain to Brazil, Malaysia to Italy, France to Bulgaria and Russia. Some of his books are available in English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Urdu, Arabic, Albanian, Chinese, Swahili, Hausa, Dhivehi (spoken in Mauritius), Russian, Serbo-Croat (Bosnian), Polish, Malay, Uygur Turkish, Indonesian, Bengali, Danish and Swedish.

Greatly appreciated all around the world, these works have been instrumental in many people recovering faith in Allah and gaining deeper insights into their faith. His books' wisdom and sincerity, together with a distinct style that's easy to understand, directly affect anyone who reads them. Those who seriously consider these books, can no longer advocate atheism or any other perverted ideology or materialistic philosophy, since these books are characterized by rapid effectiveness, definite results, and irrefutability. Even if they continue to do so, it will be only a sentimental insistence, since these books refute such ideologies from their very foundations. All contemporary movements of denial are now ideologically defeated, thanks to the books written by Harun Yahya.

This is no doubt a result of the Qur'an's wisdom and lucidity. The author modestly intends to serve as a means in humanity's search for Allah's right path. No material gain is sought in the publication of these works.

Those who encourage others to read these books, to open their minds and hearts and guide them to become more devoted servants of Allah, render an invaluable service.

Meanwhile, it would only be a waste of time and energy to propagate other books that create confusion in people's minds, lead them into ideological chaos, and that clearly have no strong and precise effects in removing the doubts in people's hearts, as also verified from previous experience. It is impossible for books devised to emphasize the author's literary power rather than the noble goal of saving people from loss of faith, to have such a great effect. Those who doubt this can readily see that the sole aim of Harun Yahya's books is to overcome disbelief and to disseminate the Qur'an's moral values. The success and impact of this service are manifested in the readers' conviction.

One point should be kept in mind: The main reason for the continuing cruelty, conflict, and other ordeals endured by the vast majority of people is the ideological prevalence of disbelief. This can be ended only with the ideological defeat of disbelief and by conveying the wonders of creation and Qur'anic morality so that people can live by it. Considering the state of the world today, leading into a downward spiral of violence, corruption and conflict, clearly this service must be provided speedily and effectively, or it may be too late.

In this effort, the books of Harun Yahya assume a leading role. By the will of Allah, these books will be a means through which people in the twenty-first century will attain the peace, justice, and happiness promised in the Qur'an.

TO THE READER

- A special chapter is assigned to the collapse of the theory of evolution because this theory constitutes the basis of all anti-spiritual philosophies. Since Darwinism rejects the fact of creation—and therefore, Allah's Existence—over the last 140 years it has caused many people to abandon their faith or fall into doubt. It is therefore an imperative service, a very important duty to show everyone that this theory is a deception. Since some readers may find the chance to read only one of our book, we think it appropriate to devote a chapter to summarize this subject.
- All the author's books explain faith-related issues in light of Qur'anic verses, and invite readers to learn Allah's words and to live by them. All the subjects concerning Allah's verses are explained so as to leave no doubt or room for questions in the reader's mind. The books' sincere, plain, and fluent style ensure that everyone of every age and from every social group can easily understand them. Thanks to their effective, lucid narrative, they can be read at a one sitting. Even those who rigorously reject spirituality are influenced by the facts these books document and cannot refute the truthfulness of their contents.
- This and all the other books by the author can be read individually, or discussed in a group. Readers eager to profit from the books will find discussion very useful, letting them relate their reflections and experiences to one another.
- In addition, it will be a great service to Islam to contribute to the publication and reading of these books, written solely for the pleasure of Allah. The author's books are all extremely convincing. For this reason, to communicate true religion to others, one of the most effective methods is encouraging them to read these books.
- We hope the reader will look through the reviews of his other books at the back of this book. His rich source material on faith-related issues is very useful, and a pleasure to read.
- In these books, unlike some other books, you will not find the author's personal views, explanations based on dubious sources, styles that are unobservant of the respect and reverence due to sacred subjects, nor hopeless, pessimistic arguments that create doubts in the mind and deviations in the heart.

THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE I



Harun Yahya

CONTENTS

A

Abiogenesis	13
Aboriginal peoples	13
Adaptation	15
AL 288-1	15
AL 666-1	16
Algae	17
Altruism	18
Amino acids	21
Amphibians	23
Analogous organ	26
Analogy	28
Angiosperm	29
Inorganic evolution	30
Anthropic Principle, the	30
Anthropology	32
Antibiotic resistance	32
Ape-Human Genetic-Similarity	
Falsehood, the	35
Arboreal Theory	37
Archaeopteryx	37
Archaeoraptor	43
Atapuerca Skull, the	44
Australopithecus	45
Autotrophy Nonsense, the	47
Avian lungs	47

B

Bacteria flagellum	49
Bathybus haeckelii (Haeckel's mud)	50
Behe, Michael J.	51
Big Bang Theory, the	52
Biogenesis View, the	54
Bipedalism	54
Blind Watchmaker Deception, the	55
Boudreaux, Edward	56
Buffon, Comte de	57
Burgess Shal	57

C

Cambrian Explosion, the	61
Indeed, Darwin had written that	62
Cambrian Period, the	63

Carbon-14 testing	64
Carbon-based life	66
Carboniferous-Era Plant Fossils	68
Cell	69
Chemical Evolution Deception, the	73
Chromosomes	74
Coacervates	74
Coelacanth	75
Cloning	77
Cold Trap, the	78
Comedy of Life from Space, the	79
"Common Ancestor" Fallacy, the	79
Common creation	80
Communism and evolution	80
Confuciusornis	82
Conjugation	82
Creationism	83
Crick, Francis	84
Cro-Magnon Man	85
Crossing-over	85
Crossopterygian	86
Cultural Evolution Myth, the	88
Cursorial Theory, the	89
Cuvier, Georges	91
Cytochrome-C	91

D

Darwin, Charles Robert	93
Darwinism	95
Darwinism and Racism	95
Darwin, Erasmus	99
Dawkins, Richard	100
Dawson, Charles	100
DDT immunity	101
Denton, Michael	101
Descent of Man, the (Charles Darwin)	102
Devonian Period Fossilized Plants	103
Dino-Bird Fossil, the —See	
Archaeoraptor liaoningensis	103
Dipneuma	103
Dialectics	104
DNA	105
Dobzhansky, Theodosius	107
Drosophila—See Fruit flies	107

E

E. coli bacterium	109
Eldredge, Niles	110
Embryology	111
Embryological evolution	112
Embryological recapitulation	113
Eoalulavis	113
Endosymbiosis Theory, the	113
Law of Entropy, the —See, Second law of Thermodynamics, the.	115
Eohippus.....	117
Eukaryote—see Root of Plant Cell, the	117
Eugenic slaughter	117
Eukaryotic cells—see, Origin of the plant cell, the.	119
Eusthenopteron foordi	119
Evolutionary mechanisms	120
Evolutionary Family Tree	121
Evolution Theory, the	121
Evolutionary gaps	122
Evolutionary humanism	123
Evolutionary paganism	124

F

False god of chance, the	127
Feathered Dinosaur deception, the	128
Feduccia, Alan	130
Finch (Fringilla coelebs)	130
Five-digit homology	131
Fliermans, Carl	134
Flying reptiles	134
Fluoride testing.....	136
Fossil.....	136
Fossil records	139
Fox Experiment, the	142
Fox, Sydney	144
Fruit flies.....	144
Futuyama, Douglas	145

G

Galapagos Islands	147
Galton, Sir Francis.....	147
Genes	147
Gene frequency	149
Gene pool.....	149
Genetic information	150
Genetic homeostasis	150
Genome Project, the.....	151

Geographic Isolation theory, the.....	153
Gish, Duane T.	155
Gould, Stephen Jay	155
Gradual Evolution comedy, the —See, Punctuated Model of evolution myth, the Great Chain of Being, the	156

H

Haeckel, Ernst	159
Hallucigenia	159
Heterotrophic view, the	160
Hoatzin bird, the.....	160
Homo antecessor	161
Homo erectus	161
Homo ergaster	164
Homo habilis	164
Homo heidelbergensis	166
Homo rudolfensis	167
Homo sapiens.....	168
Homo sapiens archaic.....	169
Homology (Common origins).....	
Homologous organs	170
“Hopeful Monster” theory, the	172
Huxley, Julian	173
Hypothesis	173

I

Ichthyostega.....	175
Imaginary Human Family Tree, the	175
Impasse of Chaos Theory, the—See Second Law of Thermodynamics, the (The Law of Entropy).	177
Industrial Melanism.....	177
Peppered moths, the	180
Information theory	181
Irreducible complexity	184
Isolation	186

J

Java Man	189
Johnson, Phillip	190
“Junk” DNA	191

Notes.....	192
------------	-----

Introduction

The evolution theory claims that living things came into being spontaneously as the result of chance. This theory has been widely accepted for over a century and espoused by scientists with a vested interest in denying the existence of God and the fact of creation. However, far from supporting the theory of evolution, scientific evidence invalidates every aspect of this theory and points out the several impasses that confront it. Over the past 20 years especially, research in paleontology, biochemistry, population genetics, comparative anatomy, biophysics and many other branches of science have shown that the appearance of life and the multitude of different species cannot possibly be explained by the mechanism of natural processes and blind chance—as Charles Darwin originally proposed.

Darwin, the originator of this theory, was an amateur observer of nature. His idea was that all living things underwent changes and evolved from one another in a step-by-step process. But the fossil record disproves his claim: In the fossils of once-living things, there are no traces of the intermediate stages that Darwin imagined were necessary to prove his theory. So far, there has been no discovery of a reptile with vestigial wings or a fish with vestigial feet. On the contrary, every fossil that has been found shows that the living creature it once was had been created perfectly, all at once.

Moreover, it is clear that mutations—the supposed means by which evolution occurs—do not create the structural changes that enable natural selection. Finally, all branches of science have stopped trying to prove the theory of evolution. They can now demonstrate that life has an extraordinarily complex creation that could not possibly be the result of an infinite series of chances.

In spite of all this, evolution is still defended in certain quarters for the sole purpose of supporting an ideology. Proponents of atheism and materialism—and adherents of the distorted ideologies that arise from these currents of thought, such as communism, fascism, and rampant capitalism—claim, in so-called scientific support of their adopted ideologies, that life was not created, but came to through an



infinite series of chance occurrences. Naturally, supporters of these distorted ideologies are interested in defending at all costs every aspect of the theory of evolution.




Our previous books explain in detail how evolution is scientifically untenable; which groups disregard scientific facts to defend it and for what ideological purposes; and how evolutionists—with no basis in science or logic, no valid proof and no reliable evidence—try to disguise and pervert the facts.

Some of these books include *The Evolution Deceit*, *Darwinism Refuted*, *The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution in 20 Questions*, *New Research Demolishes Evolution*, *The Error of the Evolution of Species*, *A Definitive Reply To Evolutionist Propaganda*, *The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution in 50 Themes*, *The Disasters Darwinism Brought to Humanity*, and *The Dark Spell of Darwinism*. The present encyclopedia has been compiled from these books, to provide our readers with the most convenient way to access all information pertaining to evolution so that they will be able to assess the truth about these matters. This way, readers will have in a practical format the most up-to-date and reliable information about all the ideas and terms related to evolution as used in the press, magazines, books, television programs and other published sources.

The book has been prepared in encyclopedia format with topics listed alphabetically. Under each heading, the claims of evolutionists are laid out, followed by an explanation of the scientific evidence and discoveries that have invalidated these claims.

Ever-mounting scientific evidence and discoveries demonstrate this unchanging reality: Contrary to what evolutionists believe, life did not arise over time through a series of chance events. Today's science proves that every living species has been created according to a perfect plan. The theory of evolution cannot even explain how the first cell came into existence, let alone how a countless chain of living organisms evolved from one another. Every new discovery, every newly excavated fossil delivers another blow to the theory. Evolution as a hypothesis is dead and buried, and now science is free to examine the incomparable proofs in creation of God's perfect creation.

Harun Yahya (Adnan Oktar)





Abiogenesis

This is the theory that lifeless matter came together to form a living organism. Also known as the theory of Spontaneous Generation, this idea has persisted since the Middle Ages. (Also see **Spontaneous generation.**)



In Medieval times, it was widely accepted that maggots were generated from food scraps, clothe moths from wool and mice from wheat! Interesting experiments were devised to prove this belief. One 17th-century physicist by the name of J.B. Van Helmont thought that if he spread a few grains of wheat on a dirty cloth, mice would be generated. And when maggots appeared in rotting meat, they were regarded as proof that life could arise from lifeless matter.

Only later was it understood that maggots did not come about spontaneously, but from the nearly microscopic eggs that adult flies laid on the meat.

The theory of spontaneous generation was shown to be totally false by the famous 19th-century French scientist, Louis Pasteur, who summarized his findings in this triumphant sentence:

Never will the doctrine of spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow struck by this simple experiment. ²

Today the theory of abiogenesis has

been discarded in favor of the theory of biogenesis, which holds that life comes from only from life. (See: **Biogenesis.**)

But some evolutionist circles that still defend the idea that

life was formed long ago from some chance combination of lifeless matter. But they have been unable to prove their claims scientifically, and their attempts to do so

have been inconclusive.

(See **Miller Experiment, the** and **Fox Experiment, the.**)



Aboriginal peoples

Before Europeans discovered Australia, the only people there were Aboriginals, the descendents of groups who migrated to the north coast of Australia from Southeast Asia 50,000 years ago and who, in time, spread to all parts of the subcontinent.

Before the Europeans came to Australia in 1788, there were some 300,000 Aboriginals living there, divided into 500 tribes. The newly-arrived Europeans regarded them as “primitive” and undertook to exterminate them, employing extraordinarily savage means. By the end of the extermination, there were few Aboriginal survivors from the original 500 tribes. Of the Australian population today, only one in a hundred persons is of Aboriginal ancestry. ³

Native Aborigines



The Europeans' extermination of the Aborigines on the pretext that they were primitives gained momentum from the publication of Charles Darwin's *Descent of Man* (See, *Descent of Man*). In this book, he proposed that there was a "struggle for life" among the different races of humanity and that the "fittest" races were those that survived.

According to Darwin, the fittest were white Europeans. Asian and African races fell behind in this struggle. Darwin went further to suggest that they would soon lose their struggle for survival and be totally annihilated:

At some future period not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the

anthropomorphous apes . . . will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as the baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla. ⁴

As we see, Darwin placed Australian Aborigines on the same level as gorillas. He did not consider the Aborigines to be human beings and believed that those who were exterminating them were only killing gorilla-like animals.

After Darwin, some evolutionists stated that "if human beings and apes descended from a common ancestor, there must be somewhere in the world a transitional form (half-human and half-ape) that has still not totally evolved."

(See **Transitional form**). Because Aborigines have slightly larger eyebrow protrusions, a more downwardly slanted jaw and a smaller brain volume than Western peoples, they were thought to be living examples of transitional species. In order to produce proofs of evolution, evolutionist paleontologists together with fossil hunters who accepted the same theory dug up Aboriginal graves and took skulls back to evolutionist museums in the West. Then they offered these skulls to Western institutions and schools distributing them as the most solid proof of evolution.

Later, when there were no graves left, they started shooting Aborigines in the attempt to find proof for their theory. The skulls were taken, the bullet holes filled in and, after chemical processes were used to make the skulls look old, they were sold to museums.

This inhuman treatment was legitimated in the name of the theory of evolution. For example, in 1890, James Bernard, chairman of the Royal Society of Tasmania wrote: "*the process of extermination is an axiom of the law of evolution and survival of the fittest.*" Therefore, he concluded, there was no reason to suppose that "there had been any culpable neglect" in the murder and dispossession of the Aboriginal Australian.⁵

Today, Aborigines are regarded as full Australian citizens, but many still suffer social, economic and political discrimination.

Adaptation

This is the ability that allows a creature to survive and reproduce in its environment.

No two members of the same species resemble each other exactly. They will be of different sizes, colors and temperaments. Because of this distinction, one of them can adapt better to its environment, live longer and reproduce more successfully. This advantage is known as natural selection.

The theory of evolution gives an added significance to the process of adaptation, claiming that under conditions that favor continual adaptation, creatures undergo a change in species over time.

But this evolutionist claim—that changes in conditions lead to an evolution of species—is false. A species can adapt to change in its environment only to the extent that its genetic potential allows. If that genetic potential does not allow for ready adaptation, then the species cannot adapt to changing conditions and does not survive. No species ever changes into a new one by adapting to new conditions; it always remains a member of the same species. (See **Natural selection**.)

AL 288-1

(The fossil record of *Australopithecus afarensis*)

—See; **The Lucy Deceit**.

AL 666-1 (The fossil record of *Homo sapiens*)

This is the fossil of a jawbone found in 1994 in Hadar, Ethiopia, together with fossils of *Australopithecus afarensis*. The fossil was dated to 2.3 million years old and displayed characteristics belonging to *Homo sapiens*, the human species alive today.

The jaw structure of fossil AL 666-1 was quite different from that of *A. afarensis* and the 1.75-million-year-old *H. habilis* fossil with which it was found.

The jawbones of these two species are narrow and quadrangular, similar to those of modern-day apes. But the fossil AL 666-1 has a jaw structure similar to that of modern human beings.

In spite of the fact that fossil AL 666-1 has been determined to belong to the *Homo* (human) genus, evolutionists hesitate to interpret it as such. This is because the age of this fossil is calculated at 2.3 million years, much earlier than the age accepted for the *Homo* genus as a whole.



AL 666-1: A 2.3-million-year-old *Homo sapiens* jaw



Side view of AL 666-1


Algae

Algae are photosynthesizing organisms that live everywhere: in both fresh and salt water, desert sand, underground hot springs, and even under snow and ice. They vary in shape and size, from single-celled organisms to kelp up to 60 meters (196.85 feet) long. . By their photosynthesizing, they break down CO_2 and release a large amount of the oxygen into the atmosphere.

The origins of algae go back to very early times. Fossilized algae have been found that date from 3.1 to 3.4 billion years ago. How algae came to be is one of those questions that have left evolutionists at an impasse. They claim that the first cell evolved over time to form algae and for this reason, the algae are a primitive form of plant.



Algae floating freely in the ocean



Red algae fossils dating back to the Cambrian Period. These organisms are identical to present-day red algae.

But two factors show this explanation to be false: First, the theory of evolution has still been unable to explain how the first plant cell came into being. And, second, algae do not have the primitive structure one would expect. On the contrary, they are complex organisms whose living examples are indifferent from the earliest fossils known.

An article in Science News explains the similarity between the first algae and algae known today:

Both blue-green algae and bacteria fossils dating back 3.4 billion years have been found in rocks from S. Africa. Even more intriguing, the pleurocapsalean algae turned out to be almost identical to modern pleurocapsalean algae at the family and possibly even at the generic level.⁶

The German scientist, Professor Hoimar Von Ditfurth, makes the following comment on the structure of so-called "primitive" algae:

*The oldest fossils so far discovered are objects fossilized in minerals which belong to blue-green algae, more than 3 billion years old. No matter how primitive they are, they still represent rather complicated and expertly organized forms of life.*⁷

When we examine the structures that algae use to form their cell walls, we see that these organisms are by no means basic and primitive. The organic polyamine they use to produce their tissues is a complex chemical material, and to build their cell walls, algae use the longest polyamine chain found in nature.

As the algae go through the process of photosynthesis together with complex chlorophyll, they also produce a yellowish-gold colored pigment called *xanthophylls*. These single-celled organisms are fishes' major source of Vitamin D and have a complex structure designed for a special purpose.⁸

Just as evolutionists have been unable to account for the origins of the first cells, so they cannot explain how these first plant cells gave rise to the first algae cells, whose complex structure is no different from algae living today.

Altruism

The mechanism of natural selection that Darwin proposed foresees stronger living things and those best adapting to the natural conditions in their geographical location surviving and continuing

down the generations, and the unfit and weaker being eliminated. According to the mechanism of natural selection adopted by Darwinism, nature is an arena where living organisms fight to the death for a chance to survive and where the weak are eliminated by the strong.

Therefore, according to this claim, every living thing has to be strong and overcome others in all areas in order to survive. Such an environment has no place for such concepts as altruism, self-sacrifice or cooperation, because these can operate against the interests of each individual. For that reason, every living thing must be as self-oriented as possible and think only of its own food, its own home, and its own protection and security.

In fact, however, nature is not solely an environment consisting solely of selfish and savage individuals in which every living thing competes for survival, and strives to eliminate or neutralize all others. On the contrary, nature is full of examples of altruism and rational cooperation, even when individuals risk death, the loss of their own interests.

Despite being an evolutionist himself, Cemal Yildirim explains why Darwin and other evolutionists of his day imagined nature to be solely a battlefield:

Since the majority of scientists in the 19th century were confined to their work rooms, studies or laboratories and did not go to examine nature directly, they were easily taken in by the thesis that living things were solely at war. Even such a

prestigious scientist as Huxley was unable to escape this error.⁹

In his book *Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution*, dealing with cooperation among animals, the evolutionist Peter Kropotkin expresses the error into which Darwin and his followers fell:

*... the numberless followers of Darwin reduced the notion of struggle for existence to its narrowest limits. They came to conceive the animal world as a world of perpetual struggle among half-starved individuals, thirsting for one another's blood. ... In fact, if we take Huxley, ... were we not taught by him, in a paper on the "Struggle for Existence and its Bearing upon Man," that, "from the point of view of the moralist, the animal world is on about the same level as a gladiators' show. The creatures are fairly well treated, and set to, fight hereby the strongest, the swiftest, and the cunningest live to fight another day." ... But it may be remarked at once that Huxley's view of nature had ... little claim to be taken as a scientific deduction. ...*¹⁰

Evolutionist scientists interpreted certain features that could clearly be seen in nature in order to support the ideology to which they were devoted. The war that Darwin imagined to dominate all of nature is indeed a great error, because the natural world is not full of living things that fight for their own interests alone. Many species are helpful towards other species and, more importantly, are even altruistic and self-sacrificing toward members of their own.

Evolutionists are unable to account for the self-sacrificial behavior they encounter in nature. The authors of an article on the subject in one scientific journal reveal this helplessness:

*The question is why do living beings help one another? According to Darwin's theory, every animal is fighting for its own survival and the continuation of its species. Helping other creatures would decrease its own chances of surviving, and therefore, evolution should have eliminated this type of behavior, whereas it is observed that animals can indeed behave selflessly.*¹¹

Honeybees, for example, will sting to death any intruder that attacks their hive. By doing this they are actually committing suicide. Because since their stings lodge in the enemy during the stinging process, a number of their internal organs are torn out of their bodies. The honeybees give up their own lives to ensure the security of the hive as a whole.

Despite being a particularly ferocious reptile, the crocodile displays an astonishing gentleness towards its young. After they hatch from the eggs, it carries them in its mouth to the water. Subsequently, it carries them either in its mouth or on its back until they are old enough to look after themselves. Whenever the young crocodiles perceive any danger, they immediately retreat to in their mothers' mouth for shelter.

Yet the crocodile is both exceedingly ferocious and also devoid of conscience.

One would therefore expect it to eat its young as food without a moment's hesitation, rather than protecting them.

Among other species, some mothers have to leave the community in which they live until their young are weaned, and thus expose themselves to considerable risks. Some animal species care for their young for days, for months or even years after they are born or hatched. They provide them with food, shelter and warmth and protection from predators. Many birds feed their young between four and 20 times an hour throughout the day.

Among mammals, mothers face different problems. They have to eat better while suckling their young and must therefore hunt for more food. Yet as the young gain weight, the mother constantly loses it.

What one would expect an animal devoid of consciousness to do is to abandon its young after birth, because animals cannot even conceive of what these tiny creatures need. Yet they actually assume all the responsibility for their offspring.

Living things are altruistic not only when it comes to protecting their young from danger. They have also been observed to behave most considerately and helpfully towards others of their kind in the community they live in. One example can be seen when nearby food sources decline. In that event, one might expect stronger animals to rise to the top, neut-

ralize the weaker ones, and consume all the food resources for themselves. Yet events do not actually transpire as evolutionists imagine.

In his book, the well-known evolutionist Peter Kropotkin cites several examples of this: In the event of a food shortage, ants begin using the supplies they have stored. Birds migrate en masse in search of food, and when too many beavers start living in one pond, the younger ones head north and the older ones south.^{1 2}

As you can see, there is no ruthless fight to the death for food or shelter among these living things. On the contrary, even under the most difficult conditions, excellent harmony and solidarity are shown. It is as if these creatures work to ameliorate existing conditions.

However, one very important point needs to be borne in mind: These living things possess no rational mind with which to make decisions. There is therefore only one possible explanation for the way in which determine a particular objective and work together to attain it, even deciding on the soundest course for all members of the community—namely, God's creation.

Confronted by these facts throughout nature, evolutionists' claim to the effect that "Nature is a battleground, and the selfish and those who protect their own interests emerge victorious" is completely invalidated.

In the face of these features of living

things, one well-known evolutionist, John Maynard Smith, addressed the following question to evolutionists:

*Here one of the key questions has to do with altruism: How is it that natural selection can favor patterns of behavior that apparently do not favor the survival of the individual?*¹³

Amino acids

Amino acids are molecules, the building blocks of the proteins that make up living cells. More than 200 different amino acids are found in nature, but of these, only 20 kinds make up the protein in living creatures. Certain of these 20 amino acids combine with one another, forming a series of chemical bonds that create proteins with various functions and characteristics.

There are basic proteins, composed of about 50 amino acids, and other proteins are composed of thousands of amino acids. If a single amino acid is lacking in the structure of a protein—if it should alter its position, or if a single amino was added to the chain—that protein would be reduced to a useless series of molecules. For this reason, every amino acid must be in exactly the right place, in exactly the right order.

The theory of evolution claims that life came to be as a matter of chance—but it certainly cannot explain how this extraordinary order was formed by chance.

Although he's an evolutionist, the


American geologist William R. Stokes admits this fact in his book entitled, *Essentials of Earth-History*: “that it would not occur during billions of years on billions of planets each covered by a blanket of concentrated watery solution of the necessary amino acids.”¹⁴

An article in the January, 1999 edition of *Science News* explains that there is still no explanation as to how proteins are formed:


*... no one has ever satisfactorily explained how the widely distributed ingredients linked up into proteins. Presumed conditions of primordial Earth would have driven the amino acids toward lonely isolation.*¹⁵



The disappearance of a single amino acid in the structure of proteins, or a change of place or the addition of one extra amino acid to the chain, will turn that protein into a functionless molecular mass.





AMINO ACID STRUCTURE




Basic amino acid part

EXAMPLES



Proteins are made up of amino acids. Although amino acid molecules are much smaller than proteins, they have exceedingly complex structures.



The disappearance of a single amino acid in the structure of proteins, or a change of place or the addition of one extra amino acid to the chain, will turn that protein into a functionless molecular mass.

Deliberate manipulations performed under laboratory conditions have not been able to produce the amino acids required to form a protein. Experiments done in this area have either been unsuccessful or, as with the Miller Experiment, employed invalid methods.

The Miller Experiment used substances that did not exist in the primitive atmosphere and created an environment that was not to be found in that atmosphere. What was created as a result were *right-handed* amino acids, which are not found in the structure of living proteins (See **Miller Experiment, the.**) Evolutionists still cannot explain how amino acids could have formed by chance, yet they persist in their claim that just the right acids, in the proper number and arrangements, somehow brought proteins

into being. This is one of the greatest impediments faced by the theory of evolution. (See **Protein.**)

Amphibians

Frogs, toads, salamanders and caecilians are all amphibians, scale-less vertebrates able to live on both land and in the water. There are about 4,000 different species.

Because amphibians are able to live on land as well as in the water, evolutionists have claimed that they are a “transitional form” in the movement of vertebrate life from water to land.

According to the evolutionist scenario, fish first evolved into amphibians, which later developed into reptiles. But there is no proof for this. Not a single

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE EGGS OF AN AMPHIBIAN AND A REPTILE



One of the inconsistencies in the scenario of amphibian-reptile evolution lies in the structure of their eggs. Amphibian eggs develop in water, have a jelly-like structure and are covered in a porous membrane. Reptile eggs, on the other hand, have a hard structure that's impermeable to water, but appropriate to conditions on land—as you can see from the dinosaur egg reconstruction to the right. For an amphibian to turn into a reptile, its eggs need to become fully reptilian. Yet the slightest error in such a transition will lead to that particular species becoming extinct.

fossil has been found that proves that a half-fish or a half-amphibian ever lived.

In this book, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, the noted evolutionist writer Robert L. Carroll says that in fact, we have no fossils of any intermediate form between early amphibians and rhipidistian fish.¹⁶

Colbert and Morales, evolutionist paleontologists, make the following comment on the amphibians' three classes—

frogs, salamanders and caecilians.

There is no evidence of any Paleozoic amphibians combining the characteristics that would be expected in a single common ancestor. The oldest known frogs, salamanders, and caecilians are very similar to their living descendants.¹⁷

Up until about 60 years ago, an extinct fossilized fish called the *Coelacanth*, estimated to be 410 million years

old, was touted in evolutionist sources as the transitional form between fish and amphibians. But the fact that this fish, still alive and anatomically unchanged was caught in the Indian Ocean invalidated these evolutionist claims. (See **Coelacanth**.)

In the evolutionist scenario, the second stage is the evolution of amphibians to reptiles and their movement from the water to the land. But there is no solid fossil discovery to support this claim. On the contrary, there remain very great physiological and anatomical differences between amphibians and reptiles.

For example, take the structure of the eggs of the two different species. Amphibians lay their eggs in water. Their eggs have a very permeable, transparent membrane and a gelatin-like consistency that allows them to develop in water. But because reptiles lay their eggs on the ground, they are designed for a dry climate. Reptile eggs are amniotic with a strong rubbery shell that admits air, but keeps water out. For this reason, the fluid needed by the young is stored within until they hatch.

If amphibian eggs were laid on the ground, they would soon dry out, and the embryos inside would die. This poses a problem for any evolutionist explanation of how reptiles evolved in stages from amphibians: For the very first amphibians to begin living entirely on land, their eggs would have had to transform into amniotic eggs within a single generati-



A tropical salamander

on. How this switch could have suddenly occurred cannot be explained by the evolutionist mechanisms of natural selection and mutation.

Again, the fossil record leaves the origins of reptiles with no evolutionist explanation. The noted evolutionist paleontologist, Robert L. Carroll, admits this in an article entitled "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles":

Unfortunately not a single specimen of an appropriate reptilian ancestor is known prior to the appearance of true reptiles. The absence of such ancestral forms leaves many problems of the amphibian-reptilian transition unanswered.¹⁸

The same fact is admitted by the late evolutionist paleontologist, Stephen Jay Gould, of Harvard University: "*No fossil amphibian seems clearly ancestral to the lineage of fully terrestrial vertebrates (reptiles, birds, and mammals).*" (See **Movement from Water to land, the**.)¹⁹

Analogous organ

Some organs superficially appear to be similar and perform the same function. For example, their wings allow butterflies and birds to fly; and both cats and beetles use their legs to walk. But these creatures have completely different genetic and anatomical structures. This kind of similarity is only superficial.²⁰

Darwin stated that creatures with similar (so-called *homologous*) organs were related to one another by evolution, and that these organs must have been developed in some common ancestor. Ho-


wever, his assertion rests on no proof and was merely a supposition made on the basis of external similarities. From Darwin's time until now, no solid evidence has been discovered to substantiate these assertions.

In the light of this, evolutionists no longer call these organs homologous—that is, coming from some common ancestor—but *analogous*, or showing similarity without being related through evolution. (See **Morphological homology**.)

But many species among which evolutionists have been unable to establish an evolutionary connection do have similar (homologous) organs. The wing is the best known example. Bats, which are mammals, have wings and so do birds. Flies and many varieties of insects have wings, but evolutionists have not been able to establish any evolutionary connection or relationship among these various classes.

According to evolutionary theory, wings came to be by chance in four independent groups: in insects, flying reptiles, birds and bats. When evolutionists try to explain these four instances by the mechanisms of natural selection/mutation and assert a similarity of structure among them, biologists come up against a serious impasse.

Mammals are one of the most concrete examples that draw the evolutionary thesis into a blind alley. Modern biology accepts that all mammals are divided into two basic categories: tho-



The wings of a flying reptile, a bird, and a bat. There can be no evolutionary relationship among them, yet these wings all have similar structures.



THE TASMANIAN WOLF AND A SIMILAR ANIMAL FROM NORTH AMERICA

The existence of twin species between pouched and placental mammals is a serious blow to the homological claim. For example, the placental wolf from North America and the pouched Tasmanian wolf above bear an extraordinary resemblance to one another. To the side can be seen the two species' very similar skulls. Such a close similarity between these two, for which no evolutionary relationship can be claimed, leaves the homological claim totally unfounded.



se with placentas, and marsupials. Evolutionists suppose that this difference came into existence with the first mammals and that each category underwent a different evolutionary history, independently of the other. But it is interesting that in each of these two categories, there are almost two “identical pairs”. Wolves, cats, squirrels, anteaters, moles and mice with their similar features belong both to the category of mammals with placentas and marsupials.^{2 1} In other

words, according to the theory of evolution, totally independent mutations must have produced these two categories of creatures by chance! Of course, this is impossible.

One of the interesting similarities between placental mammals and marsupials is that between the North American wolf and the Tasmanian wolf. The first is classed as a mammal with a placenta; the second as a marsupial. (It is supposed that contact between marsupials and pla-

Harun Yahya (Adnan Oktar)

cental was severed when Australia and its costal islands separated from the continent of Antarctica—and that there were no species of wolves at that time.)

But structurally, that the skeletons of the North American wolf and the Tasmanian wolf are almost identical. As the above illustration shows, their skulls match almost exactly.

Such similarities, which evolutionist biologists cannot accept as examples of homology, demonstrate that similar organs do not prove the thesis of evolution from a common ancestor.

Analogy

Evolutionists try to establish an ancestor-descendent relationship between living creatures on the basis of certain perceived structural similarities between them. But some creatures have organs that perform a similar function, but no evolutionary link can be established between them. This similarity is known as *analogy*, and such organs are called *analogical*.

Analogical organs are different in structure and development, but the same in functions.²² For example, the wings of birds, bats, and insects are functionally the same, but there is no evolutionary connection among them.

Therefore, evolutionists have been unable to establish any common connection between these similar appendages and have been forced to admit that they are the products of separate developments. For example, the wings of birds and insects must have arisen through different chance events than those through which bats' wings evolved.

For those who want to establish an evolutionary connection solely on the basis of similarities, this is a major obstacle. They have never been able to explain how a structure as complex as a wing could have come into being by chance, and so must explain this separately for each creature. (See **Homology; Homologous organs**.) Many other such situations have led evolutionists into an impasse. (See **Analogous organ, above**.)



Angiosperm

This is a name given to the most common flowering plants, of which there are more than 230,000 species that grow in many environments, even on ocean and in deserts.

Fossils found of these plants clearly contradict the evolutionists' claims. The fossil record indicates that no primitive transitional form has been found for any one of 43 different families into which angiosperms have been classified. This fact was already known in the 19th century, and Darwin called the origin of angiosperms an "abominable mystery." All the research performed since Darwin's day has not been able to offer any evolutionist explanation for the origin of these plants.

In his book entitled, *Paleology of Angiosperm Origins*, the evolutionist paleontologist, N.F. Hughes, made this admission:

With few exceptions of detail, however, the failure to find a satisfactory explana-



This 140-million-year-old fossil belonging to the species *Archaeofructus* is the earliest known remains of an angiosperm (flowering plant). This plant is identical to its modern-day counterparts, and its flowers and fruit have similarly flawless structures.



tion has persisted, and many botanists have concluded that the problem is not capable of solution, by use of fossil evidence. ²³

And Daniel Isaac Axelrod's article, "The Evolution of Flowering Plants," had this to say:

The ancestral group that gave rise to angiosperms has not yet been identified in the fossil record, and no living angiosperm points to such an ancestral alliance. ²⁴

The fact that the fossil record of angiosperms reveals no evolutionary ancestor, and that such highly complex living things such as flowering plants came into being all at once is an indication that they were created.

Inorganic evolution

Inorganic evolution attempts to explain by chance processes the formation of the world and the universe before the appearance of living things.

Those who try to explain everything in terms of evolution espouse the materialist proposition that the universe has existed forever (that it was never created) and that it is a product of chance, with no plan, design or purpose. Evolutionists in the 19th century, with its primitive scientific level of achievement, actively supported this view, but its claims were invalidated in the 20th century.

The idea of an eternal universe was first to be abandoned. Information gat-

hered since the 1920s has proven that the universe came into being from nothing at a particular point in time called the Big Bang. That is, the universe is not eternal, but was created from nothing. (See **Big Bang Theory**.)

In the first half of the 20th century, Georges Politzer became a great supporter of materialism and Marxism. In his book, *Elementary Principles of Philosophy*, he came out in favor of the model of an eternal universe, as opposed to one that was created:

The universe was not a created object. If it were, then it would have to be created instantaneously by God and brought into existence from nothing. To admit creation, one has to admit, in the first place, the existence of a moment when the universe did not exist, and that something came out of nothingness. This is something to which science cannot accede. ²⁵

In supporting the idea of the eternal universe, he thought that science was on his side. But before long, science called Politzer's bluff: *To admit creation, one has to admit . . . that something came out of nothingness.* In other words, the universe *did* have a beginning.

Anthropic Principle, the

One of the several claims demolished by 20th-century science is that of chance. Research conducted since the 1960s has shown that all the physical balances in the solar system—indeed, in the entire universe—have been very fi-

nely regulated in order to support human life. The deeper research has penetrated, the more it has shown that the laws of physics, chemistry and biology; basic forces such as gravity and electromagnetism, and the structures of all atoms and elements are just as they need to be to support human life.

Western scientists today refer to this extraordinary creation as the Anthropic Principle. In other words, every detail in the universe has been created with the goal of supporting human life.

There are some 300 billion galaxies in the universe, each containing approximately as many stars. Eight major planets circle in great harmony around our Sun, which is one of those stars. Of these, only the Earth possesses conditions suited to life. Today, many scientists admit the impossibility of the universe being a collection of random clouds of hydrogen matter forming the stars that form galaxies, of matter thrown out randomly as the result of exploding stars, or of heavier elements coming together at specific points in such a way as to give rise to planets. In the face of this, Sir Fred Hoyle, who opposed the Big Bang theory for many years, expressed the astonishment he felt:

The Big Bang theory holds that the universe began with a single explosion. Yet as can be seen, an explosion merely throws matter apart, while the big bang has mysteriously produced the opposite effect—with matter clumping together in the form of galaxies.^{2 6}

An article in the well-known magazine Science refers to the wondrous equilibrium at the beginning of the universe:

If the density of the universe matter had been a little more, then the universe, according to Einstein's Theory of Relativity, would never expand due to the attraction forces of atomic particles, and would have recollapsed to turn into a point. If the density had initially been a little less, then the universe would have expanded at the highest speed, and the atomic particles would not have been able to attract and capture one another, and stars and galaxies would never have been formed. Naturally, we, too, would not have existed! According to the calculations made, the difference between the initial real density of the universe and the critical density beyond which there is no likelihood of its formation is less than a quadrillion of a hundredth. This is like placing a pen on its sharp end that it can stay so even after one billion years. Moreover, this balance gets more delicate as the universe expands.^{2 7}

Adherents of the theory of evolution try to account for this extraordinary order in the universe in terms of chance effects. Yet it is doubtless irrational and illogical to expect interconnected coincidences to give rise to such a complex order.

Since chance can be calculated mathematically, we can see the impossibility of such a thing happening. It has been calculated that the probability of an environment suited to life emerging through an explosion such as the Big Bang are 1 in 10×10^{123} .

This calculation was performed by the famous British mathematician Roger Penrose, a colleague of Stephen Hawking. In mathematics, Probabilities less than 1 in 10^{50} are regarded as essentially zero. The number in question is a trillion, trillion, trillion times larger than 1 in 10^{50} —a number that shows that the universe cannot be accounted for in terms of chance.

Roger Penrose comments on this inconceivably vast number:

This now tells how precise the Creator's aim must have been, namely to an accuracy of one part in 10×10^{123} . This is an extraordinary figure. One could not possibly even write the number down in full in the ordinary denary notation: it would be 1 followed by 10^{123} successive 0's. Even if we were to write a 0 on each separate proton and on each separate neutron in the entire universe—and we could throw in all the other particles for good measure—we should fall far short of writing down the figure needed. ²⁸

Anthropology

Anthropology is the science that investigates human origins together with its biological, social and cultural characteristics. This science began with the impetus to learn about human history; in fact, its Greek roots mean the *science of human beings*. After Charles Darwin established his evolutionary theory of the origins and development of living things in the 19th century, interested scientists

started to propose one new idea after another about the evolution of human beings.

Scientists wanted to learn about the development of human societies, how they changed and became politically organized, and how they developed art and music. As a result of all their efforts, the science of anthropology developed various branches of expertise in its study of the history of humanity: physical anthropology, cultural anthropology, and so forth.

But after Darwin proposed the theory of evolution, cultural anthropology began to study human beings as cultural animals, and physical anthropology investigated them as biological organisms. As a result of this distorted way of thinking, anthropology became the domain of evolutionist scientists, whose unrealistic and partisan views prevailed.

Antibiotic resistance

When any species of bacteria are constantly exposed to a given antibiotic, later generations of them begin to show resistance to it—and eventually that antibiotic has no further effect on them. Evolutionists assume that bacteria's developing resistance to antibiotics is proof for evolution. They say that this resistance develops as a result of mutations that occur in the bacteria.

However, this increasing resistance is not the result of bacterial mutations. Bacteria had resistance ability before be-



Bacteria acquire immunity in a very short time by passing their resistant genes on to one another.

ing exposed to antibiotics. Despite the fact that it is an evolutionist publication, *Scientific American* made the following statement in its March, 1998 issue:

Many bacteria possessed resistance genes even before commercial antibiotics came into use. Scientists do not know exactly why these genes evolved and were maintained. ²⁹

The fact that genetic information afforded bacterial resistance before the invention of antibiotics invalidates the claims of evolutionists.

Since bacterial ability of resistance existed years *before* the discovery of antibiotics, the respected scientific journal *Medical Tribune* related this interesting finding in its December 29, 1988 issue:

In 1845, sailors on an . . . Arctic expedition

were buried in the permafrost and remained deeply frozen until their bodies were exhumed in 1986. Preservation was so complete that six strains of nineteenth-century bacteria found dormant in the contents of the sailors' intestines were able to be revived! When tested, these bacteria were found to possess resistance to several modern-day antibiotics, including penicillin. ³⁰

Since the medical world now knows that this kind of resistance was present in some bacteria before the discovery of penicillin, it is definitely erroneous to claim that bacterial resistance is an evolutionary development.

In bacteria, the development of immunity occurs in this way:

In any one species of bacteria, there

are countless genetic variations. Some of them, as mentioned above, have genetic information that gives them resistance to some medicines. When bacteria are exposed to a certain medicine, the non-resistant variations are killed off. But the resistant variations survive and multiply even more. After a while, the rapidly multiplying resistant bacteria take the place of the non-resistant bacteria that had been destroyed. Then, since most bacteria in a colony are resistant to that particular antibiotic, it becomes ineffective against them.

But the bacteria are the exact same species of bacteria. There was no process of evolution.

Transmission of resistance among different species of bacteria

Not only can some bacteria inherit their resistance to antibiotics from previous immune generations; they can also have resistance genes from other bacteria transferred to them.


Genes are transmitted between bacteria by means of *plasmids*, tiny DNA circles in bacteria in which resistance genes are often found encoded. These genes allow the bacteria to become resistant to various toxic materials in their surroundings.

Resistance genes may also be found in the chromosomal DNA in bacteria. A chromosome is much larger than the plasmids in bacterial cells; it is a molecule that determines the cells' function and division.

A bacterium with genetic immunity to antibiotics can transfer its genetic information through plasmids to another bacterium. Resistance genes are sometimes transferred through viruses. In this case, a virus transfers the resistance gene it withdrew from one bacterium to another. And when a bacterium dies and disintegrates, another bacterium can absorb the resistance gene it releases into the immediate environment.

A non-resistant bacterium can easily add this gene to its own DNA molecules,

There were resistant bacteria before the discovery of antibiotics.
Bacteria did not develop resistance after being exposed to antibiotics.



because such resistance genes are usually in the form of tiny DNA particles called *transposons* that can easily be added to other DNA molecules.

In such ways, a whole colony of resistant bacteria can be formed in a short time from one resistant bacterium. This has nothing to do with evolution: The genes that make bacteria resistant did not develop through any process of mutation. Only *existing* genes are distributed among bacteria.

Ape-Human Genetic Similarity Falsehood, the

Drawing up the human gene map within the framework of the Human Genome project was a major scientific development. However, evolutionist publications have distorted a number of the project's results. It is claimed that the genes of chimpanzees and humans bear a 98% similarity and assumed that this shows their closeness, which is used as evidence for the theory of evolution.

However, this is in fact a false proof that evolutionists exploit by making use of society's lack of information on the subject.

First of all, the concept so frequently touted by evolutionists—that 98% similarity between human and chimpanzee DNA—is a deceptive one. In order to claim that the genetic structures of human beings and chimpanzees bear a 98% similarity, the entire chimpanzee genetic

code would have to be mapped, in the way the human one has. Then the two would have to be compared, to obtain the results. Yet no such results are yet available: While the human genetic map has been completed, the chimpanzee equivalent has not.

In fact, the “98% similarity between human and ape genes” slogan was deliberately produced for propaganda purposes many years ago. This “similarity” is a highly exaggerated generalization, based on a similarity in the amino acid sequences in between 30 and 40 of the basic proteins present in man and ape.

Sequence analysis of the DNA strings corresponding to these proteins was performed using a method known as “DNA hybridization.” and only these limited proteins were compared.

Yet there are around 30,000 genes in human beings and these genes encode some 200,000 proteins. There is thus no scientific justification for claiming, on the basis of a similarity in 40 proteins out of 200,000, any 98% resemblance between human and ape genetics.

The DNA comparison of those 40 proteins is also questionable. Two biologists named Charles Sibley and Jon Edward Ahlquist carried out the comparison in 1987 and published the results in the *Journal of Molecular Evolution*.³¹ However, another scientist by the name of Sarich examined their data and concluded that they'd used a method of questionable reliability and had exaggera-

tedly interpreted the data.³²

Basic proteins are essential molecules commonly found in many other living things. The structures of the proteins in all living things, not just of chimpanzees, bear a close similarity to those of proteins in human beings.

For example, genetic analyses reported in *New Scientist* revealed a 75% similarity between the DNA of nematodes (millimeter-long worms that dwell in the soil) and humans!³³ This, of course, does not imply that there is only a 25% difference between human beings and nematodes.

When the genes of the fruit fly species *Drosophila* were compared with human genes, a 60% similarity was determined.³⁴

Analyses of some proteins seem to show that man is actually closer to very different living things. In one study performed at Cambridge University, certain proteins in terrestrial organisms were compared. Astonishingly, in almost all the specimens involved, human beings and chickens were found to bear the closest relationship to one another. Our next closest relative is the lizard.³⁵

Another example used by evolutionists with regard to the so-called “genetic similarity between man and ape” is that there are 46 chromosomes in human beings and 48 in gorillas. Evolutionists assume that chromosome numbers are an indication of an evolutionary relationship. But in fact, if this logic emplo-

yed by evolutionists were valid, then man would have a much closer relative than the chimpanzee—the potato! Both human beings and potatoes have exactly the same number of chromosomes: 46.

These examples demonstrate that the concept of genetic similarity constitutes no evidence for the theory of evolution. Not only are the genetic similarities incompatible with the evolutionary family tree proposed, but they actually provide totally conflicting results.

In addition, the similarities discovered are actually evidence for creation rather than for evolution. It is perfectly natural for the bodies of humans and other living things to exhibit molecular similarities, because all living things are made up of the same molecules, use the same water and atmosphere, and consume foods made up of the same molecules. Naturally, their metabolisms—and thus, their genetic structures—will tend to resemble one another. However, this is no evidence that they evolved from a common ancestor.

Another example will help elucidate this: All the buildings in the world are constructed from similar materials—bricks, iron, cement, and so forth. But this does not imply that these buildings *evolved* from one another. They were built independently, using common materials. The same principle applies to living things.

Apart from the superficial similarity between human beings and apes, there is no question of their being closer to each


other than to other animals. In terms of ability, a bee producing honeycombs that are geometrical miracles, or a spider weaving a web that is a marvel of engineering, are much closer to man than are apes. In some respects, one can even say that these invertebrates are superior.

Yet the huge gulf between human beings and apes is too vast to be bridged with evolutionist claims and myths. Apes are animals and, in terms of consciousness, are no different to horses or dogs. Human beings, on the other hand, are conscious, possess free will and are capable of thought, speech, reasoning, decision-making and judgment. All these attributes are processes of the soul they possess. It is this soul that gives rise to the major difference between human beings and animals. Man is the only entity in nature to possess a *soul*. No physical similarity can bridge this widest gulf between humans and other living things.

Arboreal Theory

This is one of two evolutionist theories regarding how reptiles—a terrestrial life form—began to fly. According to the arboreal theory, the ancestors of birds were tree-dwelling reptiles that gradually developed wings by leaping from branch to branch. (The other view is the cursorial theory, which maintains that birds took to the air directly from

One of the theories that evolutionists put forward to account for the origin of flight maintains that reptiles turned into birds by leaping from branch to branch. Yet there are no fossils of any living things that slowly developed wings, nor any natural process that could bring this about.



the ground.) But this first theory is utterly imaginary, and has no scientific evidence to support it.

John Ostrom, who first proposed the cursorial theory, admits that the proponents of both hypotheses can do nothing more than speculate. He wrote that his theory of “cursorial predator” was in fact speculative—but the arboreal theory was also speculative.^{3 6}

In addition, none of the transitional forms (See Transitional form) that should have existed on Earth in ages past has ever been discovered (See **Cursorial theory**; also **Origin of birds, the.**)

Archaeopteryx

This extinct species of bird lived 140 million years ago, during the Jurassic

period. The fact that *Archaeopteryx* had some characteristics that differ from those of modern birds led evolutionists to suppose that it was a transitional species between them and their dinosaur ancestors. According to the theory of evolution, small dinosaurs called Velociraptors or Dromesaur evolved wings and began to fly; *Archaeopteryx* is thought to be the ancestor of today's flying birds.

However, the latest research on *Archaeopteryx* fossils shows that this claim has no scientific basis. This species was not an awkwardly flying transitional species, merely an extinct bird with characteristics different from those of its modern counterparts. Here is the latest research data on *Archaeopteryx*:

- Originally, the fact that this creature had no sternum was cited as the most important proof that it could not fly. The muscles needed for flight are attached to the sternum located at the base of the rib cage. (Modern flying and flightless birds and bats—mammals which belong to a totally different family—all have a sternum.)

But the seventh *Archaeopteryx* fossil found in 1992 showed this argument to be false. This particular fossil had a sternum, which evolutionists had long discounted. The following words are from an article in *Nature* magazine:

The recently discovered seventh specimen of the *Archaeopteryx* preserves a partial, rectangular sternum, long suspected but never previously documented.

This attests to its strong flight muscles, but its capacity for long flights is questionable.³⁷

This discovery has removed the basic foundation for the claim that *Archaeopteryx* was a half-evolved flightless bird.

- There is no difference between the wings of modern birds and those of *Archaeopteryx*: Both have the same asymmetrical feather structure, which indicates that this creature was an excellent flyer. As the noted paleontologist Carl O. Dunbar pointed out, '*Because of its features, [Archaeopteryx is] distinctly to be classed as a bird.*'³⁸


- Another fact that emerges from the feathers of *Archaeopteryx* is that the creature was warm-blooded. As we know, reptiles and dinosaurs were cold-blooded—that is, their body temperature was determined by the external ambient temperature. One of the most important functions of birds' feathers is to stabilize keep their body temperature. The fact that *Archaeopteryx* had wings shows that unlike dinosaurs, it was warm-blooded. That is, it was a true bird that needed a covering of feathers to regulate its body temperature.

- The two most important points that evolutionist biologists consider as evidence that *Archaeopteryx* was a transitional form are its teeth and the claws on its wings.

But those claws on its wings and its teeth do not indicate that *Archaeopteryx* had any relation to reptiles. Two species

The best-known *Archaeopteryx*
fossil, on display in Berlin





Research into the anatomy of *Archaeopteryx* has revealed that the vertebrate had a perfect flying ability and was in fact a typical bird. The efforts to equate *Archaeopteryx* with reptiles are totally groundless.

of birds alive today, *Tauraco corythaix* and *Opisthocomus hoazin*, have claws that enable them to grip on to branches. Each of these species is wholly a bird, with no relation to reptiles. Therefore, the fact that *Archaeopteryx* had claws on its wings does not substantiate the claim that it was a transitional form.

Neither do its teeth. Evolutionists were wrong to claim that these teeth were a reptilian characteristic. In fact, teeth are not a typical characteristic of reptiles. Some living reptiles do not have teeth at all—turtles, for example. More

importantly, while no birds with teeth are alive today, when we look at the fossil record, we see that there was a species of bird with teeth that lived at the same time or later than *Archaeopteryx*. Until very recently in geologic history, there was a group of birds that could be called toothed.

In addition, the tooth structure of *Archaeopteryx* and other toothed birds is quite different from that of dinosaurs, their supposed ancestors. Noted ornithologists such as L. D. Martin, J. D. Stewart and K. N. Whetstone determined

that that the surface of the teeth of *Archaeopteryx* and other toothed birds were straight and had wide roots. However, the teeth of theropod dinosaurs—the supposed ancestors of birds—had serrated teeth and have straight roots.³⁹

-Some recently discovered fossils show in a different way that the evolutionist scenario invented for *Archaeopteryx* is untenable.

In 1995, Lianhai Hou and Zhonghe Zhou of the Vertebrate Paleontology Institute in China discovered a new fossil that they called *Confuciusornis*. It is the same age as *Archaeopteryx* (about 140 million years old) and has no teeth. Its beak and feathers and skeleton are the same as those of modern birds. And, like *Archaeopteryx*, it had claws on its wings, as well as a feature called a *pygostyle* that supported its tail feathers.

In short, this creature is the same age as *Archaeopteryx*, the supposed ancestor of all modern birds. But it was itself very much like modern birds. This contradicts the evolutionist thesis that *Archaeopteryx* is the primitive ancestor of all birds.⁴⁰


Another fossil found in China in 1996 caused even more of a stir. L. Hou, L. D. Martin and Alan Feduccia announ-

ced in *Science* magazine the discovery of a 130-million-year-old fossil called *Liaoningornis*. It had a breastbone to which the flying muscles were attached, as in modern birds. And in other ways too, this creature was no different from modern birds. The only difference was that it had teeth—which indicated, contrary to the evolutionist claims, that teeth in birds did not constitute a primitive characteristic.⁴¹


Accordingly, Alan Feduccia wrote in *Discovery* magazine that *Liaoningornis* invalidates the claim that birds evolved from dinosaurs.⁴² *Eoalulavis* is another fossil that has invalidated evolutionist claims about *Archaeopteryx*. At 120 million years old, it is 30 million years younger than *Archaeopteryx*,

but its wing structure is the same, and it still seen in some modern species of birds. This proves that 120 million years ago, creatures no different from present-day birds flew through the air.⁴³

One clear proof that *Archaeopteryx* is not a transitional form between reptiles and birds came from a fossil found in China in the year 2000. Named *Longisquama*, it was the fossil of a bird that lived in Central Asia 220 million years ago. The



An illustration of
Archaeopteryx



well-known magazines *Science* and *Nature*, as well as BBC television, reported about this fossil that the entire body of the fossil—estimated to have lived 220 million years ago—was covered in feathers, had a furcula like present-day birds (as well as *Archaeopteryx*), and that its feathers had hollow shafts.

This invalidates the claims that *Archaeopteryx* was the ancestor of present-day birds.

The fossil discovered is 75 million years older than *Archaeopteryx*—in other words, it existed with fully avian features 75 million years *before* the creature that evolutionists claimed to have been the forerunner of birds.⁴⁴

So it became clear that *Archaeopteryx* and other archaic birds were not transitional forms. Their fossils did not demonstrate that various bird species evolved from one another. On the contrary, they proved that modern-day birds and some species of birds like *Archaeopteryx* lived together.

In short, some characteristics of *Archaeopteryx* show that this creature was no transitional form. And now two noted proponents of the

A reconstruction
of *Archaeopteryx*



Some media organizations accept the theory of evolution unquestioningly and present every new fossil as if it were scientific evidence for the theory. In 1999 for example, newspapers interpreted the fossil known as Archaeopteryx as a winged dinosaur. Some two years later, however, it emerged that the fossil in question was an evolutionary fraud. Those same newspapers had to accept that all the talk of a “dino-bird” was mere nonsense.

theory of evolution—paleontologists Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge of Harvard University—have acknowledged that *Archaeopteryx* was never a transitional form but a so-called “mosaic” creature with several different characteristics.^{4 5}

Archaeopteryx

This fossil is said to have been discovered in China in 2001, but was actually a false construction. The hoax was detected through detailed analysis by re-

searchers, who published the results in *Nature* magazine:

The Archaeopteryx fossil was announced as a missing link and purported to be possibly the best evidence since Archaeopteryx that birds did, in fact, evolve from certain types of carnivorous dinosaur . . . But Archaeopteryx was revealed to be a forgery in which bones of a primitive bird and a non-flying dromaeosaurid dinosaur had been combined. . . . We conclude that Archaeopteryx represents two or more species and that it was assembled from at least two, and possibly five, separate specimens. . . Sadly, parts

of at least two significant new specimens were combined in favor of the higher commercial value of the forgery, and both were nearly lost to science. Paleontology was also badly damaged by the Piltdown forgery and the “lying stones” of Johann Beringer, and many fossils have been unwittingly or deliberately subjected to misleading reconstruction.^{4 6} (See **Piltdown Man**.)


Atapuerca Skull, the

In 1995, three Spanish paleontologists from the University of Madrid found a fossil in the Gran Dolina cave in Spain’s Atapuerca region. It was a section of the facial bones of an 11 year-old child that is identical to human children

living today. But the child died 800,000 years ago! This was a surprising discovery for evolutionists, who did not hope that *Homo sapiens* (modern-day human beings) lived so long ago. (See **Imaginary Human Family Tree, the**.)


The December 1996 issue of *Discovery* magazine gave it wide coverage. This fossil even shook the convictions about evolution of the head of the Gran Dolina research team, Arsuaga Ferreras, who said:

We expected something big, something large, something inflated—you know, something primitive. Our expectation of an 800,000-year-old boy was something like Turkana Boy. And what we found was a totally modern face. . . To me this is most spectacular—these are the kinds of



Facial bones discovered in Spain showed that human beings with the same facial structure as ourselves were living 800,000 years ago.





The reconstructed skull based on a fossil found in Atapuerca (*left*) bears an extraordinary resemblance to the skull of modern man (*right*).

things that shake you. Finding something totally unexpected like that. Not finding fossils; finding fossils is unexpected too, and it's okay. But the most spectacular thing is finding something you thought belonged to the present, in the past. It's like finding something like—like a tape recorder in Gran Dolina. That would be very surprising. We don't expect cassettes and tape recorders in the Lower Pleistocene. Finding a modern face 800,000 years ago—it's the same thing. We were very surprised when we saw it.^{4 7}

This fossil indicated that the history

of *Homo sapiens* had to be pushed 800,000 years into the past. But according to the human family tree fabricated by evolutionists, *H. sapiens* could not have lived 800,000 years earlier. Deciding that this fossil belonged to another species, they invented an imaginary species called *Homo antecessor* and assigned the Atapuerca skull to it.

Australopithecus

This is the first genus of human being in the imaginary evolutionist sche-



Australopithecines bear a very close resemblance, in terms of skull and skeletal structure, to modern apes.

ma; the name means “southern ape.” This creature is thought to have first appeared in Africa 4 million years ago and lived until one million years ago. All the species of *Australopithecus* [*A. africanus*, *A. africanus*, *A. boisei*, *A. robustus* (or *Zinjanthropus*)], comprise an extinct genus of apes that closely resembles apes we see today.

Their brain volume is the same or slightly smaller than that of a modern chimpanzee. Like modern apes, they had protrusions on their hands and feet to facilitate climbing trees, and their feet were shaped to allow them to grasp tree branches. They were short (130 centimeters, or 51 inches at the most), and like modern apes, males were much larger than the females. Many features of their skulls—the position of their eyes close together, their sharp molar teeth, jaw structure—long arms, and short legs

show that they were no different from modern apes.

Despite the fact that *Australopithecus* had the anatomy of an ape, evolutionists claim that unlike other apes, it walked upright like a human. But the skeletal structure of *Australopithecus* has been studied by many scientists who reject the validity of this claim. Two world-renowned anatomists, Lord Solly Zuckerman from England and Prof. Charles Oxnard of the U.S.A., did an extensive study of *Australopithecus* remains and determined that this creature didn’t walk on two feet and moved in a way quite different from that of humans.

Lord Zuckerman, with the support of the British government and a team of five experts, examined the bones of this creature for a period of 15 years. Even though he was an evolutionist, he concluded that *Australopithecus* was a speci-

es of ape and that certainly did not walk upright.⁴⁸

Studies done by another noted evolutionist anatomist, Charles E. Oxnard, showed that the skeleton of *Australopithecus* resembles that of a modern orangutan.⁴⁹

The fact that *Australopithecus* cannot be considered an ancestor of man is accepted even by evolutionist sources. The well-known French magazine *Science et Vie* made this the cover story of its May 1999 issue. The story dealt with Lucy, the best-known fossil specimen of *A. afarensis*, under the title "Adieu Lucy (Goodbye, Lucy)" and detailed the need to remove *Australopithecus* from the human family tree. The article was based on the discovery of a new *Australopithecus*, code number St W573:

*A new theory states that the genus Australopithecus is not the root of the human race. . . . The results arrived at by the only woman authorized to examine St W573 are different from the normal theories regarding mankind's ancestors: this destroys the hominid family tree. Large primates, considered the ancestors of man, have been removed from the equation of this family tree. . . . Australopithecus and Homo (human) species do not appear on the same branch. Man's direct ancestors are still waiting to be discovered.*⁵⁰

Australopithecus was nothing more than an extinct species of ape, with no

relation to human beings whatsoever.

Autotrophy Nonsense, the

Since all living organisms need food to survive, then the first living thing must have had to make its own food. According to this view, the first living thing capable of producing its own nourishment was an autotrophic one, and other living things then emerged from this organism.


However, it is impossible for autotrophs to emerge as in the hostile and simple conditions in early days of this Earth. Autotrophs would have to undergo millions of years of changes in order to acquire their first complex structure.

The autotrophic view maintains that the first living thing formed as a complex organism in a simple environment. Yet rather than account for the organism's appearance, it actually explains how this first living thing fed. Since the theory fails to account for how the first autotroph came into being, it received little support.⁵¹

Avian lungs

(See **Origin of Avian lungs, the**)

B



Bacteria flagellum

Flagella, allowing bacteria to move in a fluid environment, attached to the membrane covering the bacteria's cell surface, and their whiplike movement allows the bacteria to swim quickly from place to place.

These flagella have long been known about, but only in the last 10 years has their structure been observed carefully, to the surprise of the scientific world. Contrary to what had been supposed, the undulation of the flagellum is not the result of a simple mechanism, but of a very complex organic motor.


The bacterium's flagellum is mechanically similar to electric motors. There are two main movements: a moving rotor and a non-moving stator.

This organic motor is different from other systems that cause organic movement. The cell does not use the energy stored in it in the form of ATP molecules; it uses energy from acids in its membrane. The inner structure of the motor is highly complex: About 240 different proteins make up the flagellum, and the-

se have been put in place with a perfect mechanical design. Scientists have determined that these proteins send signals that start and stop the flagellum, that their articulations allow movement at the atomic level or set in motion the proteins that attach the flagellum to the cell membrane. Models constructed to make it simpler to understand the motor's functioning have not been sufficient to explain its complexity.


The flagellum possesses a structure that cannot be simply explained, and its complex structure of bacterium's flagellum is enough to show the invalidity of the theory of evolution. If there were any deficiency in the number or quality of any of the molecular particles in its makeup, the flagellum could not function and would be useless to the bacterium. The flagellum must have functioned perfectly from the moment it came into existence.

This proves once again that the evolutionist claims of stage-by-stage development in untenable. And so far, no evolutionist biologist has tried to explain the origins of these flagella, which also



This is an electric motor. Yet it is not located in a household appliance or transport vehicle, but in a bacterium. Thanks to this engine, which bacteria have possessed for millions of years, they operate their organ known as the flagellum (bacterial whip) and thus can swim through the water.

The bacterial whip motor was discovered in the 1970s and astonished the scientific world, because it is impossible to account for this irreducibly complex organ, consisting of 250 separate molecules, in terms of the random mechanisms proposed by Darwin.



Evolutionists maintain that life arose from a primitive bacterium that appeared by chance. However, the subsequent realization of the complex structure of bacteria definitively refuted this claim.

show the important fact that bacteria, thought by evolutionists to be the “most primitive of life forms”, have an extraordinarily complex structure.


Bathybus haeckelii **(Haeckel's mud)**

The complex structure of the cell was unknown in Charles Darwin's day. For that reason, evolutionists of his time imagined that chance and natural phenomena represented a satisfactory answer to the question of how life first came to be.


Darwin suggested that the first cell could come into existence in a small, warm waterhole. The German biologist Ernst Haeckel, one of Darwin's supporters, examined under the microscope the mud brought up from sea bed by a rese-

arch vessel and claimed that this was an inanimate substance that turned into living matter. This so-called life-assuming matter is known as *Bathybus haeckelii* (Haeckel's mud); and those who first proposed the theory of evolution imagined life to be just such a simple matter.

However, 20th-century technology investigated life down to the very finest



Although bacteria are very small and single-celled organisms they have a highly complex structure.



1.9 billion-year-old bacteria fossils discovered in Western Ontario in Canada. These fossils are identical to bacteria living today.

detail, revealing that the cell was the most complex system yet discovered. (See also *The Miracle in the Cell* http://www.harunyahya.com/books/science/miracle_in_cell/miracle_cell_01.php by Harun Yahya.)

Behe, Michael J.

The renowned biochemist Michael J. Behe of Lehigh University is one of the most important figures to advance the idea of irreducible complexity. In his 1996 book *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, Behe investigated the living cell and certain biochemical structures and stated that it was impossible to account for their complexity in terms of evolution.

As a scientist free from the influence of the materialist perspective and who thinks clearly, Professor Behe has no qualms about accepting the existen-

ce of a Creator. He describes scientists who refuse to admit the presence of design—in other words, of creation—in living things:

Over the past four decades, modern biochemistry has uncovered the secrets of the cell. . . . It has required tens of thousands of people to dedicate the better parts of their lives to the tedious work of the laboratory. . . . The result of these cumulative efforts to investigate the cell—to investigate life at the molecular le-



Prof. Michael J. Behe and his book *Darwin's Black Box*.



vel—is a loud, clear, piercing cry of “design!” The result is so unambiguous and so significant that it must be ranked as one of the greatest achievements in the history of science. This triumph of science should evoke cries of “Eureka” from ten thousand throats. . . . Instead, a curious, embarrassed silence surrounds the stark complexity of the cell. Why does the scientific community not greedily embrace its startling discovery? ⁵²

He goes on to define the dilemma: To acknowledge an intelligent design implies acknowledging God’s existence. In these words, Behe declares that the perfect design in living things reveals the existence of God.

Big Bang Theory, the

Given the primitive level of 19th-century science, materialists of the time strongly defended the idea that the universe had been in existence forever—in other words, that it was not created; that there was no design, plan or purpose in the universe and that everything in it was the result of chance. Eventually, however, these claims collapsed in the face of scientific discoveries made in the 20th century.

The fact of the expanding universe, revealed in 1929 by the American astronomer Edwin Hubble, gave birth to a new model of the universe. Since the universe was expanding, then the further back in time one went, the smaller the



universe must have been. And if one went back far enough, then the universe must have occupied a single point. Calculations showed that this single point, despite its containing all the matter in the universe, would have had zero volume because of its enormous gravitational pull.

The universe came into being when this single point with zero volume exploded. This explosion was given the nickname of the *Big Bang*, and the theory came to be known by that same name.

The Big Bang revealed one very important fact: Zero volume meant that the universe had come into being out of *nothing*. This in turn meant that the universe had a beginning, thus repudiating the materialist hypothesis that the universe had existed forever. Information about the structure of the universe obtained since the 1920s has proved that the universe came into being at a specific time through the Big Bang. In other words, the universe is not eternal, but was created from nothing by God.

But this fact was highly displeasing to many materialist scientists. For instance the British materialist physicist, H.S. Lipson, “reluctantly” admits that creation is a scientific fact:

I think, however, that we must ... admit that the only acceptable explanation is creation. I know that this is anathema to physicists, as indeed it is to me, but we must not reject a theory that we do not like if the experimental evidence supports it. ⁵³

Another important aspect of the Big

Bang stems from the order that emerged in the wake of the explosion. When we examine the universe, we see that everything in it—such as its density; its rate of expansion; its gravitational pull, orbits, movements, speed and matter contained by the galaxies; and countless other such details—is constructed with the finest calculations and most delicate balances. Similarly, the way that our Earth and the atmosphere that surrounds it have the ideal structure for supporting life, is another example of this extraordinary design. The slightest deviation in these calculations and balances would have an irrevocably destructive impact on the universe and the Earth.

We know that rather than producing order, explosions give rise to disorder, chaos and destruction. Since the Big Bang was an explosion, one would expect it to have distributed matter randomly throughout space. But following it, no such random distribution occurred. Matter accumulated at particular points in the universe to form galaxies, stars, constellations, the Sun, the Earth and later, all the plants, animals and human beings on it. There is only one explanation for this: Only a conscious intervention directing every moment of the event can give rise to such order in the wake of an explosion on the order of the Big Bang. That is the flawless creation of God, Who created the universe out of nothing and keeps it under His control and dominion at every moment.

Biogenesis View, the

When Darwin wrote his book *On the Origin of Species*, the scientific world widely accepted the belief that bacteria could form themselves out of inanimate matter. (See also **Abiogenesis View, the**.) But the fact is that five years after the publication of Darwin's book, the French biologist Louis Pasteur demolished this belief that represented the cornerstone of evolution.⁵⁴ Pasteur summarized the conclusions he arrived at as a result of lengthy research and observation: "*The claim that inanimate matter can originate life is buried in history for good.*"⁵⁵

Pasteur's opinion that "*life can emerge only from life*" is described as biogenesis.

For a long time, adherents of the theory of evolution held out against these findings of Pasteur's. However, as science progressed and increasingly revealed the living cell's complex structure, the idea that life could form itself spontaneously faced an ever-worsening impasse.

Bipedalism

In addition to the fossil record, the insuperable anatomical gulfs between human beings and apes also invalidate the fairy tale of evolution. One of these has to do with walking.

Human beings walk upright, on two legs, using a special movement not en-

countered in any other living thing. Some mammals may have a restricted ability to move on two legs, such as bears and apes, and stand upright on rare occasions for short periods of time, such as when they wish to reach a food source or scout for danger. But normally they possess a stooped skeleton and walk on four legs.

However, bipedalism (walking on two legs) did not evolve from the four-legged gait of apes, as evolutionists would have us believe.

First off, bipedalism establishes no evolutionary advantage. An ape's mode of walking is easier, faster and more efficient than a human's. Human beings cannot move by leaping from branch to branch like apes, nor run at 125 kilometers/hour (77 miles/hour) like cheetahs. Since they walk on two legs, humans actually move very slowly over the ground, making them one of the most defenseless creatures in nature. According to the logic of evolution, there is therefore no point in apes "evolving" to walking on two legs. On the contrary, according to the survival of the fittest, human beings should have begun walking on four.

Another dilemma facing the evolutionists is that bipedalism is wholly incompatible with Darwin's model of stage-by-stage development. This model suggested by evolution presupposes some "compound" form of walking, both on four and two legs. Yet in his 1996



The human skeleton was created to walk upright. With its stooped posture, short legs and long arms, however, the ape skeleton is suited to walking on four legs. It is impossible for any “intermediate form” between the two to arise, because such a transitional form would be totally inefficient.

computer-assisted research, the British paleoanthropologist Robin Crompton showed that such a compound walking style was impossible. (See **Compound walking**.) Crompton’s conclusion was that “a living being can either walk upright, or on all fours.” A walking style between these two would be impossible, as it would consume too much energy. Therefore, it is impossible for any semi-bipedal life form to have existed. (See, **Origin of walking upright, the**.)

Blind Watchmaker Deception, the


Richard Dawkins became a great proponent of Darwinism with the publi-

cation of his 1986 book *The Blind Watchmaker*, in which he tells his readers that: “*Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.*”⁵⁶ Despite this admission, Dawkins maintains that life evolved spontaneously through chance effects—a process he describes using the analogy of the “blind watchmaker.” According to Dawkins, the watchmaker is not only blind, but also unconscious. It is therefore impossible for the blind watchmaker to see ahead, make plans or harbor any objective in the formation of life.⁵⁷ Yet on the one hand, Dawkins sets out the complex order in living things, while on the other he seeks to

Harun Yahya (Adnan Oktar)



Even Richard Dawkins, one of the greatest advocates of evolution, has had to admit the complex order in living things. This order points to an evident fact: that living things are created by God.



Richard Dawkins' book *The Blind Watchmaker*

account for this in terms of blind chance.

In a later section of the book he says: *"If a marble statue of the Virgin Mary suddenly waved its hand at us we should treat it as a miracle,"* because according to Dawkins, *"all our experience and knowledge tells us that marble doesn't behave like that. . . . But if, by sheer coincidence, all the molecules just happened to move in the same direction at the same moment, the hand would move. If they then all reversed direction at the same moment the hand would move back. In this way it is possible for a marble statue to wave at us."* ⁵⁸

This difficulty in which evolutionists

find themselves—having to maintain the impossible and deny an evident fact—sometimes obliges them to propose such strained logic. Desperately striving to deny the evidence of creation that they so plainly observe, evolutionists reveal one important fact: The sole aim of all their efforts made on behalf of the theory of evolution is to deny the manifest existence of God.

As we have seen, such endeavors are always in vain. All scientific evidence reveals the truth of creation, once again proving that God has created living things.

Boudreaux, Edward


A professor of chemistry at University of New Orleans. Boudreaux regards the theory of evolution as an unscientific claim. On 5 July 1998, he participated in an international conference titled The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution: The Fact of Creation held by the Science and Research Foundation. At that conference, Boudreaux gave an address, Design in Chemistry, in which he referred to the chemical elements essential in order for life to emerge having been set out by way of creation. As he went on to say,

The world we live in, and its natural laws are very precisely set up by the Creator for the benefit of us, humans.^{5 9}

Buffon, Comte de

The Comte de Buffon was a French evolutionist and one of the best-known scientists of the 18th century. He served as director of the Royal Zoological gardens in Paris for more than 50 years. To a large extent Darwin based his theory on the works of de Buffon. One can see most of the teachings that Darwin employed in de Buffon's wide-ranging 44-volume study *Histoire Naturelle*.

"The Great Chain of Being," Aristotle's classification of living



Comte de Buffon

things from simple species to complex ones, also known as the Scala naturae, represented the starting point for the evolutionary systems of both de Buffon and Lamarck. The American historian of science D. R. Oldroyd describes this relationship:

In his Histoire Naturelle, Buffon reveals himself as an exponent of the doctrine of the Great Chain of Being, with man being placed at the top of the Chain. . . . Lamarck held a version of the ancient doctrine of the Great Chain of Being. Yet, it was not conceived as a rigid, static structure. By their struggle to meet the requirements of the environment, and with the help of the principle of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, organisms could supposedly work their way up the Chain—from microbe to man, so to speak. . . . Moreover, new creatures were constantly appearing at the bottom of the Chain, arising from inorganic matter through spontaneous generation. . . . Ascent of the Chain involved a continuous process of complexification.^{6 0}

From that point of view, the concept we refer to as the theory of evolution was actually born with the ancient Greek myth of the Great Chain. There were many evolutionists before Darwin, and the most of their original ideas and so-called proofs were already to be found in the Great Chain of Being. With de Buffon and Lamarck the Great Chain of Being was presented to the scientific world in a new guise, whereu-



Marrella: One of the interesting fossils discovered in the Burgess Shale beds

pon it came to influence Darwin.

Burgess Shale

The Burgess Shale region in the Canadian province of British Columbia contains a fossil bed now regarded as one of the most important paleontological discoveries of our time. The fossils in this region belong to very different species and appear suddenly, with no forerunners in earlier strata.

As we know, the theory of evolution maintains that all living species evolved in stages from other species that lived before them. The Burgess Shale fossils and similar paleontological discoveries, however, show that in contrast to this

claim, different species actually emerged suddenly on Earth, with no forerunners preceding them.

The February 1999 edition of the well-known scientific journal *Trends in Genetics* expressed this difficulty confronting Darwinism:

It might seem odd that fossils from one small locality, no matter how exciting, should lie at the center of a fierce debate about such broad issues in evolutionary biology. The reason is that animals burst into the fossil record in astonishing profusion during the Cambrian, seemingly from nowhere. Increasingly precise radiometric dating and new fossil discoveries have only sharpened the suddenness and scope of this biological revolution. The magnitude of this change in Earth's biota demands an explanation. Although many hypotheses have been proposed, the general consensus is that none is wholly convincing. ⁶¹

In this context, the journal refers to two famous evolutionist authorities Stephen Jay Gould and Simon Conway Morris. Both have written books



A fossil thorn discovered in Burgess Shale

THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE I



A Cambrian Period fossil

in order to account—according to evolutionary theory—for the sudden appearance of species in the Burgess Shale. Gould's book is titled *Wonderful Life*, and Morris's, *The Burgess Shale and the Rise of Animals*. However, as stressed in *Trends in Genetics*, neither of these authorities is able in any way to account for either the Burgess Shale fossils or other fossils dating back to the Cambrian Period.

The fact made clear by the fossil record is that living things appeared suddenly on Earth and in perfect forms.

The picture revealed by the Cambrian Period fossils refutes the assumptions of the theory of evolution, while also providing significant evidence that living things were brought into being through a supernatural creation. The evolutionist biologist Douglas Futuyma describes this fact:

Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence.^{6 2}

Therefore, the fossil records show that living things did not follow a path from the simple to the complex, as evolution maintains, but instead appeared suddenly and perfectly formed. This, in turn, is evidence that life came about not through unconscious natural phenomena, but through a sublime creation. In "The Big Bang of Animal Evolution," an article published in *Scientific American*, the evolutionist paleontologist Jeffrey S. Levinton admits as much, albeit reluctantly: "Therefore, something special and very mysterious—some highly "creative force"—existed then [at the Cam-



brian period].”⁶³

Cambrian Explosion, the

Fossils found in Cambrian rock strata belong to such complex invertebrates as snails, trilobites, sponges, worms, sea anemones, starfishes, shellfish and jellyfish. (See **Trilobites**.) The interesting thing is that all these very different species appear suddenly, with no forerunners. In the geological literature, this miraculous event is therefore known as the Cambrian Explosion.

Most of the organisms found in this stratum possess advanced physiological structures and complex systems, such as the eye, gills, and circulation system. These complex invertebrates appeared suddenly, fully formed, and with no links or transitional forms to the single-celled organisms that had previously been the only living things on Earth.


Richard Monastersky, editor of *Earth*

Sciences magazine, a popular evolutionist publication, provides the following information about the Cambrian Explosion, which baffles evolutionists:

*... remarkably complex forms of animals that we see today suddenly appeared. This moment, right at the start of the earth's Cambrian Period, some 550 million years ago, marks the evolutionary explosion that filled the seas with the earth's first complex creatures. ... The large animal phyla of today were present already in the early Cambrian and they were as distinct from each other as they are today.*⁶⁴

The question of how the world came to be suddenly filled with very different invertebrate species and how so many different species with no forerunners came into being is one that evolutionists are unable to answer.

The British biologist Richard Dawkins, one of the world's leading proponents of the idea of evolution, has this to




The way that many highly complex invertebrates such as the starfish and jellyfish appeared suddenly in the Cambrian Period, some 500 million years ago, invalidates Darwinist theory right from the outset.

Harun Yahya (Adnan Oktar)

say on the subject—which fundamentally invalidates the theses he maintains:

For example, the Cambrian strata of rocks. . . are the oldest ones in which we find most of the major invertebrate groups. And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needles to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists. ⁶⁵

As Dawkins admits, the Cambrian Explosion is clear evidence of creation, since that is the only explanation of how living things appeared with no evolution-




A fossil discovered in Cambrian rock beds

nary ancestors behind them. The evolutionist biologist Douglas Futuyma also admits this fact:

Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed, or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from preexisting species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence. ⁶⁶

Indeed, Darwin had written that

If numerous species, belonging to the sa-



THE CAMBRIAN EXPLOSION

*me genera or families, have really started into life all at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of descent with slow modification through natural selection.*⁶⁷


The Cambrian Period confirms the picture described by Darwin as a fatal. That is why the Swedish evolutionist Stefan Bengtson admits the absence of intermediate forms in discussing the Cambrian Period and says, “*Baffling (and embarrassing) to Darwin, this event still dazzles us.*”⁶⁸

As we have seen, the fossil record shows that living things emerged suddenly and perfectly formed, and did not—as the theory of evolution maintains—follow a process from the primitive to the developed. Living things did not

come into being through evolution, but were all separately created.

Cambrian Period, the

The Cambrian Period is a geological age that began some 520 million years ago and is estimated to have lasted 10 million years. Apart from single-celled organisms and a few simple multi-celled organisms, no traces of living things from before that period are to be found in the fossil record. But in the exceedingly short Cambrian Period (10 million years being a very brief space of time in geological terms), all the animal phyla emerged simultaneously, with not a single deficiency among them. In the geologic periods that followed. Basic classifications such as fish, insects, amphibians,





Living things from the Cambrian Period

reptiles and birds, and subgroups thereof, also appeared suddenly, and with no forerunners preceding them.

This totally demolished the theory of evolution's fundamental claim, that of gradual development over a long period of time by way of chance. Moreover, this also represents major evidence for the fact of creation.

Mark Czarnecki, and evolutionist and paleontologist, in effect admits as much:

A major problem in proving the theory has been the fossil record. . . This record has never revealed traces of Darwin's

*hypothetical intermediate variants—in-
stead, species appear and disappear ab-
ruptly, and this anomaly has fueled the
creationist argument that each species
was created by God.^{6 9}*

Carbon-14 testing

Carbon-14 is one form of radiometric test, but one very important feature distinguishes it from the others. Other radiometric tests can be used only in determining the ages of volcanic rocks. Carbon-14 dating, however, can be used

to determine the ages of once-living things. That is because Carbon-14 is the only radioactive substance found in the bodies of living organisms.

The Earth is constantly being bombarded by cosmic rays from outer space. These rays strike nitrogen-14, found in high levels in the atmosphere, and transform this into carbon-14, a radioactive substance. Radioactive carbon-14, a newly produced element, combines with oxygen in the atmosphere, forming another radioactive compound, C-14 O₂. As we know, plants use CO₂ (carbon dioxide), H₂O (water) and solar rays in order to produce their nutrients. Some of these carbon dioxide molecules the plant absorbs into its body are molecules formed from radioactive carbon-14. The plant accumulates this radioactive substance in its tissues.


Some animals feed on plants; other living things feed on the creatures that feed on plants. Via this food chain, the radioactive carbon that plants have absorbed from the air is transferred to other living things. In this way, every living thing on Earth absorbs an equal level of carbon-14 into its body.

When that plant or an animal dies, it is of course no longer able to feed and absorb any more carbon-14. Since carbon-14 is a radioactive substance, it has a half-life, and gradually begins losing electron. Thus the age of a once-living thing can be calculated by measuring the amount of carbon-14 left in its tissues.

The half-life of carbon-14 is around 5,570 years. In other words, the amount of carbon-14 in the dead tissue declines by half once every 5,570 years. For example, if there were 10 grams of carbon-14 in a living thing's body 5,570 years ago, then there will now be only 5 grams. This test, like other radiometric tests, cannot be used to determine the age of specimens which are thought to be very old, since carbon-14 has only a short half-life. Carbon-14 dating is regarded as giving accurate results for specimens between 10,000 and 60,000 years old.

Carbon-14 testing is one of the dating tests most frequently employed. Evolutionists use this method in order to determine age when examining the fossil record. However, as with other radiometric tests, there are serious doubts concerning the reliability of carbon-14 dating. The most important of these is the high likelihood of gas exchange between the specimen to be dated and the outside environment. This exchange mostly comes about by means of waters containing carbonate or bicarbonate. If these natural waters—which contain carbon-14—come into contact with the specimen, then some of the carbon-14 atoms they contain will pass into the specimen. In that event, the specimen will test younger than it really is.

The exact opposite of this situation may also arise. Under certain conditions, the amount of carbon-14 in the spe-



Plants use CO_2 (carbon dioxide), H_2O (water), and sunlight to produce food. Part of these carbon dioxide molecules absorbed into the body of the plant are molecules consisting of radioactive Carbon-14. The plant collects this radioactive substance in its tissues and, by way of the food chain, the radioactive carbon that plants absorb from the air is transferred to other living things.

cimen to be dated can be released into the external environment in the form of carbonate and/or bicarbonate. In that event, the specimen will appear to be older than it actually is.

Indeed, various concrete findings have revealed that carbon-14 dating is not all that reliable. Carbon-14 dating tests on specimens whose age is known for certain have often given false results. For instance, the skin of a newly dead seal was depicted as being 1.300 years old.⁷⁰ A living shell was dated as 2.300 years old.⁷¹ A deer antler was variously dated

as 5.340, 9.310 and 10.320 years old.⁷²

A piece of tree bark was dated as 1.168 and 2.200 years old.⁷³ Carbon-14 dating gave an age of 6.000 years for the city of Jarmo in northern Iraq, where people have been living for 500 years.⁷⁴

For all these reasons, carbon-14 dating, like other radiometric tests, cannot be regarded as wholly reliable.

Carbon-based life

The theory of evolution, maintaining that all living things evolved by chance

from a common ancestor, makes frequent use of the concept of adaptation. Evolutionists claim that by adapting to their environments, living things develop into entirely new species. In fact, the concept of evolution through adaptation is a hangover from the primitive scientific understanding of Lamarck's day and has long since been refuted by scientific findings. (See **Adaptation**)

However, despite having no scientific basis, the idea of adaptation still influences most people. When told that the Earth is a special planet for life, they immediately assume that since life emerged under the conditions on such a planet, so other forms of life could develop on other planets. Science-fiction writers imagine, for example, that while human beings live on Earth, there could be living things on the planet Pluto that perspire at -238°C degrees, that breathe helium instead of oxygen, or that drink sulphuric acid instead of water.

Yet such imaginative ideas are actually based on ignorance. Evolutionists with knowledge of biology and biochemistry do not actually support such fantasies, since they are well aware that life can exist only with specific elements and when specific conditions are established.

The adaptation error in question is also the result of such ignorance. The only model of life with any scientific validity is that of carbon-based life, and scientists have concluded that there cannot be any other physical life in the uni-

verse based on other elements.

Carbon is the sixth element in the periodic table. Its atoms are the basis of life on Earth because all basic organic molecules (such as amino acids, proteins and nucleic acids) form as the result of carbon atoms combining with certain other atoms in particular ways. Carbon forms the various types of protein in our bodies by combining with hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and other elements. No other element can replace carbon, because no other element has the ability to make so many unlimited types of chemical bonds.

Therefore, if there is to be life on any other planet in the universe, it will inevitably have to be carbon-based life.⁷⁵

In addition, carbon-based life has a number of immutable laws. For example, carbon-based organic compounds (proteins) can only exist in a specific temperature range. Above 120 degrees Celsius, they begin to break down, and at temperatures below -20 degrees they begin to freeze. Other factors such as light, gravity, atmospheric make-up and magnetic forces must all fall within narrow and specific ranges in order to permit carbon-based life.

The Earth possesses just those narrow and specific ranges. If any one of these is exceeded—if the Earth's surface temperature exceeds 120 degrees, for example—then life on this planet will be impossible.

Life can exist only when very special

and specific conditions are met. To put it another way, living things can only exist in an environment specially created for them. The Earth is an environment specially created by our Lord, and all its details reveal God's mercy on us.

Carboniferous-Era Plant Fossils

(Between 360 and 286 Million Years Old)

The most important characteristic of the Carboniferous Period is the enormous variety of plant fossils belonging to it. There is no difference between fossils belonging to this period and plant species alive today. This variety, which appears suddenly in the fossil record, represents a major dilemma for evolutionists, because each of these plant species appeared suddenly on Earth, each with its

own perfect systems.

Evolutionists sought to avoid this dilemma by giving it a name suggestive of evolution, describing it as the "evolutionary explosion." But of course, that description only shows that evolutionists have no explanation to offer on this subject.


Plants were performing photosynthesis millions of years ago, just as they do today. Even then, they possessed hydraulic systems powerful enough to crack stone, pumps capable of raising water absorbed from the soil to many meters in height, and chemical factories producing foodstuffs for living things. This shows that plants were created millions of years ago. Their creator, God, Lord of the Worlds, continues to create them today. It is impossible for human beings seeking to understand the miracles of creation in plants, even using the most advanced means provided by present-day technology, to create a single plant from not-



hing—or even a single leaf.

Cell

The complex structure of the cell was unknown in Darwin's time. For that reason, evolutionists of the day believed that it was perfectly reasonable to answer the question of "How did life emerge?" by saying "Through coincidences and natural events." Darwin suggested that the first cell would have had no trouble forming in a small, warm drop of water. (See *The Abiogenesis View*, *the*) But the fact is that 20th-century technology, which made visible even to the tiniest microscopic details, revealed that the cell was actually the most complex structure yet encountered. Today we know that the cell contains energy-producing plants, factories that produce the enzymes and hormones essential to life, a data bank containing all the information about the products to be manufactured, a complex transportation system that carries raw materials and products from one region to another, pipelines, advanced laboratories and refineries that break down raw




materials brought in from the outside, and cell-membrane proteins that regulate the entry and departure of various materials from the cell. And this is only a part of the cell's complex structure.

The evolutionist scientist W. H. Thorpe writes, "*The most elementary type of cell constitutes a 'mechanism' unimaginably more complex than any machine yet thought up, let alone constructed, by man.*" ⁷⁶

So complex is the cell that even today's advanced technology cannot duplicate one. All the research aimed at making an artificial cell has ended in failure. The theory of evolution, on the other hand, maintains that this system—which man has been unable to replicate with all the knowledge and technology at his disposal—once formed by chance on the primeval Earth. This is far less likely, for instance, than even an explosion in a publishing house resulting in the coincidental printing of an encyclopedia.

The British mathematician and astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle offered a similar analogy in the 12 November 1981 edition of *Nature* magazine. Despite being a



materialist, Hoyle stated that there was no difference between a living cell coming into being by chance and a Boeing 747 jet spontaneously assembling itself when a whirlwind hit a scrap yard.⁷⁷ In short, it is not possible for a cell to form spontaneously, as the result of coincidence.

One of the main reasons why the theory of evolution cannot explain how the cell came into being is the irreducible complexity it possesses. (See **Irreducible Complexity**.) A cell thrives through its large number of organelles all working together in harmony. It cannot survive in the absence of any one of these. The cell cannot wait for such unconscious mechanisms as mutation and natural selection to develop it. Therefore, the first cell to appear on Earth must have been fully formed, together with all the organelles and biochemical functions essential for its survival.

In the human body, there are more than 100 trillion cells, some of them so small that a million of them would cover only the tip of a needle. However, biologists unanimously agree that, despite its minute size, the cell is the most complex structure that science has yet confronted. The cell, continuing to harbor a great many unresolved mysteries, represents one of the major dilemmas facing the theory of evolution. The well-known Russian evolutionist A. I. Oparin says:

Unfortunately, however, the problem of the origin of cell is perhaps the most obs-

*cure point in the whole study of the evolution of organisms.*⁷⁸

The cell is the building block of any living organism. Therefore, it is impossible for a theory—which cannot even explain the emergence of the proteins and amino acids that comprise the cell—to account for the appearance of living things on Earth. On the contrary, the cell constitutes one of the clearest pieces of evidence that all organisms, including human beings, are created.

Yet evolutionists still manage that living things emerged by chance in the most uncontrolled environment possible—that existed on the primeval Earth. This claim can never agree with the scientific facts. In addition, even the simplest mathematical calculations have proven that chance cannot give rise to even one of the millions of proteins in cells, let alone to a cell in its entirety. This shows that the theory of evolution, far from being rational and logical, is a collection of scenarios based on imagination, fantasy and implication.

Despite holding evolutionist views, the zoologist David E. Green and the biochemist Prof. Robert F. Goldberger have this to say in a paper in a scientific journal:

The popular conception of primitive cells as the starting point for the origin of the species is really erroneous. There was nothing functionally primitive about such cells. They contained basically the same biochemical equipment as do their mo-



In Darwin's day, no one knew that the cell has an exceedingly complex structure and system. As technology progressed, however, it became clear that these complex structures could not possibly have formed by chance, placing evolutionists in an impossible position.

dern counterparts. How, then, did the precursor cell arise? The only unequivocal rejoinder to this question is that we do not know.^{7 9}

The perfect harmony and cooperation between cells is just as astonishing as the existence of a single cell. All the cells in a human being come

into existence through the division and multiplication of a single embryonic cell. And all the information regarding the present structure of our bodies—their shape, design and all their features—is present in the chromosomes in the nucleus of that first cell, from the very beginning.

THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE I

The continuity of any human's life depends on the harmonious functioning of the components of the cells and of those cells with one another. Even while the cell works together with other cells in great order, it also maintains its own life in a state of and a delicate equilibrium. The cell identifies and produces a great many substances, including the energy necessary for its survival and to maintain that order and equilibrium. Those of its needs it cannot meet by itself, it selects very carefully from the outside—so selectively that none of the random substances in the external environment can enter by chance without the cell's permission to do so. There are no aimless, unnecessary molecules in the cell. Their controlled exit from the cell also takes place as the result of strict monitoring.

In addition, the cell possesses a defense system to protect it from all external threats and attack. Despite all the structures and systems it contains and the countless activities that take place in it, an average cell is not the size of a small city, but just 1/100 millimeters in diameter. Each of the cell's functions listed above is a miracle in its own right. (See **DNA**.)

Chemical Evolution Deception, the

Evolutionists refer to all the claims

regarding the synthesis of the amino acids that gave rise to life in the supposedly primitive atmospheric conditions are as *chemical evolution*. (See **Primordial soup fantasy, the**) Before they move on to scenarios about the evolution of living things, evolutionists must first account for the formation of DNA nucleotides and amino acids, the building blocks of life. According to their claims, which are based on no evidence whatsoever, simple compounds containing carbon, oxygen, nitrogen and phosphorus were dissolved in water and then exposed to a constant bombardment of ultraviolet rays and lightning, thus giving rise to different compounds. These small molecules, supposedly produced by chance, subsequently bonded chemically, thus increasingly enriching their complex combinations. Eventually, it is suggested that the water turned into a thick soup containing new forms of molecules in copious amounts. If one waits long enough, it was said, even the most unlikely reactions will take place.⁸⁰

Yet none of these hypotheses are supported by any scientific findings. Indeed, evolutionists themselves admitted that their account is actually a hypothesis which can never be proven. To suggest that these claims, which cannot be verified or duplicated even under present-day conditions, , actually came about spontaneously as the

work of chance, is therefore incompatible with logic and reason. (See **Primordial soup fantasy**, *the*.)

Chromosomes

The DNA molecule in the cell nucleus is wrapped up in special coverings known as chromosomes (See, DNA). The total length of the DNA molecule packaged in the chromosomes in a single cell reaches 1 meter (3.3 feet). The total thickness of the chromosome is 1 nanometer, or 1 billionth of a meter. The one-meter-long (3 feet, 3 inches long) DNA molecule is twisted and folded into this tiny volume.


Inside the nucleus of every human cell (except for reproduction, or germ cells) there are 46 chromosomes. If we compare every chromosome to a book made up of pages of genes, then we can compare the cell to a six-volume encyclopedia containing all a person's cha-

racteristics. The information in this "encyclopedia" is equivalent to that found in a 32-volume edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

The chromosomes containing the DNA molecule actually consist of much smaller special packaging systems. This DNA molecule is first tightly surrounded by special proteins known as *histones*, just like cotton wound round a spool. Those parts of the DNA attached to the histone spools are known as the *nucleosomes*, which have been designed to protect the DNA from any harm. When nucleosomes are combined end to end, they constitute *chromatins*, which cling tightly to one another and fold over, forming dense coils. Thus it is that the DNA molecule is able to be squeezed so perfectly into an area just 1 millionth of its actual length.

Coacervates

Alexander I. Oparin, a leading pro-



DNA molecules, roughly 1 meter long, are squeezed into chromosomes just 1 billionth of a meter thick.

ponent of evolution, describes coacervates as blobs of organic matter (mostly containing sugars and short polypeptides), supposedly the precursors of modern cells.⁸¹ At one time evolutionists maintained that coacervates were the forerunners of the cell, and that proteins emerged as a result of the evolution of coacervates. However, this claim, devoid of any scientific evidence—was later abandoned as invalid by even the evolutionists themselves.

Even the simplest looking organism has energy producing and transforming mechanisms for its own survival, as well as complex genetic mechanisms to ensure the survival of the species concerned. Coacervates, however, are simple collections of molecules lacking any such systems and mechanisms. Their structures are prone to be broken down by even the slightest natural effects. It is totally unscientific to claim that they gradually and spontaneously came to life by developing such complex systems.

One evolutionist reference describes how coacervates cannot represent the basis of life:

*Droplets with metabolism such as coacervate cannot of course be regarded as living. Because they lack two fundamental characteristics as inheritance and mutation. In addition, the primitive cell, in other words the protobiont, cannot be regarded as a pre-formative stage. Because the substances used in these droplets are formed from present-day organisms.*⁸²

However, some circles who have turned evolution into an ideological slogan continue to portray coacervates as major evidence for evolution in their publications, without admitting the slightest scientific doubt on the matter. As always, their aim is to portray the theory of evolution as backed by extensive scientific evidence and to deceive those who lack detailed information about the subject about and the means to investigate it.

Coelacanth

The *Coelacanth* is a species of fish that used to be put forward as evidence for vertebrates' "transition from water to land" thesis. Fossil *Coelacanths* were once regarded as evidence of an intermediate form between fish and amphibians. Based on fossil remains of the creature, evolutionist biologists suggested it contained a primitive (and not yet fully functional) lung in its body.

This organ was described in a great many scientific sources. Drawings were even published showing the *Coelacanth* moving from the sea onto dry land.

On 22 December 1938, however, a most significant discovery was made in the Indian Ocean. A living member of the species *Latimeria*, a member of the *Coelacanth* species that had been portrayed as having become extinct 70 million years ago, was caught in the open sea! The discovery of a living *Coelacanth* definitely came as a major shock to evolu-

tionists. The evolutionist paleontologist J. L. B. Smith said that he could not have been more astonished if he had met a dinosaur in the street.⁸³ In the years that followed, more than 200 *Coelacanth*s have been caught in various regions of the sea.

When the first few of these fish were examined, it was realized that the speculation concerning them had been groundless. Contrary to what had been claimed, the *Coelacanth* had no primitive lung or a large brain. The structure that evolutionist researchers had thought to be the fish's a primitive lung was actually nothing more than an oil sac in its body.⁸⁴ Moreover, it was also realized that the *Coelacanth*, which had been depicted as a amphibian-to-be preparing to emerge from the water, actually lived in deep ocean waters and hardly ever rose to above 180 meters (590 feet).⁸⁵

At this news, the popularity of the *Coelacanth* among evolutionist publications suddenly waned. An evolutionist paleontologist by the name of Peter L. Forey made this admission in an article



After examining *Coelacanth* fossils, evolutionists used to say that it was an intermediate form in the transition of vertebrates from sea to dry land. However, the capture of living *Coelacanth* specimens, beginning in 1938, showed just how far evolutionist speculation could be carried.

in *Nature* magazine:

*The discovery of [living specimen of] Latimeria raised hopes of gathering direct information on the transition of fish to amphibians, for there was then a long-held belief that coelacanths were close to the ancestry of tetrapods. . . . But studies of the anatomy and physiology of Latimeria have found this theory of relationship to be wanting and the living coelacanth's reputation as a missing link seems unjustified.*⁸⁶


As his admission shows, no interme-



diate form between fish and amphibians ever existed. The Coelacanth, the only serious intermediate form proposed by evolutionists, is nothing more than a living species of fish with nothing whatsoever to do with evolution.

Cloning

With advances in the science of genetics, the possibility of genetically duplicating living things—and therefore human beings came to the agenda as well. Such a copying process is feasible, tho-



The issue of cloning recently became an important item on the scientific agenda. Although cloning is a process that occurs according to known laws, evolutionists sought to use it to support their own theories, in the same way they do with every new scientific development. A number of media organizations that give evolution their ideological support raised the subject to the headlines with pro-evolution slogans. The subject of cloning was portrayed as if it were proof of evolution. Yet it was actually obvious that it had nothing to do with evolution at all. The scientific world did not take these ridiculous evolutionist endeavors seriously at all.

To the side: A scientific publication describing how cloning is carried out. A pregnant white sheep



Cloning consists of the duplication of genetic information that already exists. No new mechanisms or new genetic information are added during the process.

ugh evolutionist scientists in particular refer to this process as “creating living things.” This most striking logic is far removed from the true facts, because “creation” means making something from nothing—and that verb belongs exclusively to God.

If genetic science can produce an identical copy of a living thing, that does not imply the creation of an organism from nothing. Because in copying a human being or any other organism, a living thing’s cells are extracted, and then induced to replicate themselves. Not one single cell can ever be brought into existence from nothing. This important distinction shows that creation belongs to God alone. (See **DNA; Fox Ex-**

periment, the; and also Miller Experiment, the.)

Cold Trap, the

When analyzed realistically, the Miller experiment—first performed to prove that life could have emerged by chance in the primitive atmosphere—can be seen to be riddled with various inconsistencies.

One factor that invalidates the Miller experiment is the mechanism known as the cold trap, a mechanism that isolates amino acids the moment they form. Otherwise, the conditions giving rise to amino acids would immediately destroy these same molecules. Yet it is absurd even to consider the possibility that any such protective arrangement came about under in primeval conditions that included ultraviolet rays, lightning, various chemicals and high levels of oxygen. In the absence of any mechanism like a cold trap, any amino acids that were obtained would be immediately broken down again.



In the absence of a cold trap mechanism, even if some kind of amino acid were obtained, these molecules would immediately be broken down by conditions in the same environment that created them.

The chemist Richard Bliss describes this contradiction:

“Cold trap”, being the crucial part of Miller’s tools, has the duty to collect the products as

they were formed out of chemical reacti-

ons. Actually, without this cold trap, the chemical products would be destroyed by the energy source (electrical sparking).⁸⁷

In Miller's previous experiments, in fact, he had used the same materials, but had failed to obtain even a single amino acid without setting up a cold trap mechanism.

Miller's aim was to obtain amino acids, and the methods and equipment he employed were specially arranged in order to achieve that objective. Above all, however, even if we postulate the existence of intelligence capable of ensuring such a method, order and arrangement in the primitive atmosphere, this conflicts with the theory of evolution's own logic.

Comedy of Life from Space, the

See *Inconsequence of Panspermia hypothesis*.

"Common Ancestor" Fallacy, the

This interpretation was put forward by Darwin and repeated by all the evolutionists who followed him. According to this claim, living things have similar organs because they evolved from one common ancestor. For example, the fact that all vertebrate land dwellers have five digits at the end of their four limbs is

the result—according to evolutionists—that they all evolved from a common forerunner, namely the first fish assumed to have survived on land.

The theory of evolution has dominated the world of science since the late 19th century, and its interpretation of similarities has also been widely accepted. Every similarity in living things is interpreted as evidence of some "ancestral" evolutionary relationship between them.

Yet findings obtained over the last 20 to 30 years show that this is not at all the case. To summarize:

1) Homologous (similar) organs are found in living things belonging to totally different classes, among which evolutionists can construct no evolutionary link.

2) The genetic codes of these animals' similar organs are entirely different.

3) The stages of embryological development of these organs are very different.

These facts alone show that homology constitutes no evidence for evolution.

Indeed, it has been realized that living things with similar organs are so far apart from one another genetically that no evolutionary links can be found between them.

In order for Darwin's "common ancestor" explanation to be true, these similarities in living things would have to be genetically very close to one another.

Conversely, if such similarities are genetically far apart, then the possibility of any common ancestor is not tenable. On the contrary, it can be seen that the fact of creation is the true explanation. (See **Common creation**, below.) No evolutionary relationship can be claimed between living things that are genetically so very different from one another. (See **Homology**.)

Common creation

Similar organs or similar molecular structures in living things provide no support for the theory that they are evolved from any common forerunner. (See **Homologous organs**.) On the contrary, these similarities refute the possibility of conjecturing any hierarchical evolutionary family trees among living things. If one comparison of proteins suggests that human beings are similar to chickens; and another comparison, similar to the nematode worms; in, and a third analysis to crocodiles, then it cannot be proposed that these living things evolved from one another—or from any other common ancestor.

Scientists such as Carolus Linnaeus or Richard Owen, who both first raised the subject of similar organs in living things, regarded such organs as examples of common creation. (See **Linnaeus, Carolus**) In other words, similar organs did not evolve by chance from any shared forerunner. Quite the contrary; they were created to perform similar functions,

which is why they resemble one another.

Today's scientific findings demonstrate that the claim of common ancestry regarding similar organs is invalid, and that the only possible explanation is common creation.

Communism and evolution

Communism, elevated to its highest point in the 19th century by the two German philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, led to such bloodshed as to dwarf even the state massacres of the Nazis and Imperialist nations. (See **Marx, Karl**.) Even though communism is generally agreed to have collapsed in 1991, this dark ideology still continues to influence people, and its materialist philosophy turns them away from religion.

This ideology caused a wave of global terror in the 20th century, but actually represents a stream of thought that's been around since ancient times. Materialism was a philosophy that regarded matter as all that exists. Communism was base in turn constructed upon that philosophy, and first made its appearance in the 19th century.

Marx and Engels, communism's intellectual founders, sought to describe materialist philosophy in terms of a method known as **Dialectics** (which see) Marx maintained that the entire history of humanity was one of conflict, that ongoing struggle of his time was between



The aim of communism is to take the theory of evolution that Darwin applied in the field of biology and apply it to human societies as well—and for human beings to be in a state of war and conflict as wild animals supposedly do in nature.

workers and capitalists, and that soon the workers would rise up and organize out a communist revolution. Both dyed-in-the-wool atheists, Marx and Engels regarded the elimination of religion as essential for communism to succeed. However, the actions and struggle to be waged had to be placed on a legitimate philosophical footing.

The theory of evolution, proposed by Darwin in his book the *Origin of Species*, became the scientific guise their ideology had been waiting for. Darwin claimed that living things emerged and developed as the result of a “struggle for

survival”, in other words, through dialectical conflict. In addition, he rejected religious beliefs by denying creation. In those terms, Darwinism provided an intellectual support for the assertions of communism.

Hostility towards religion formed the basis of the alliance between Darwinism and communism. The most important reason for the communists’ devotion to Darwinism was the support it gave to atheism. In his book *Soviet Marxism and Natural History*, David Jorafsky describes this relationship:

In spite of its scientific deficiencies, evo-

Harun Yahya (Adnan Oktar)

*lution's alleged scientific character has been used to justify all kinds of ungodly systems and practices. The most successful of these, thus far, seems to be communism, and its adherents all over the world have been deluded into thinking that communism must be true because it is based on the science of evolution.*⁸⁸

Communism's objective was to apply the theory of evolution, which Darwin had applied to biology, to human societies, advocating that for human beings, like wild animals, are in an inevitable state of conflict and war.

Confuciusornis

In 1995, Lianhai Hou and Zhonghe Zhou, two paleontologists from the Ver-



Confuciusornis, which lived at around the same time as *Archaeopteryx*, bears a close resemblance to modern birds.

tebrate Paleontology Institute in China, discovered a new fossil bird they named *Confuciusornis*. This winged vertebrate—the same age as *Archaeopteryx*, approximately 140 million years old and long considered to be the earliest ancestor of all birds and regarded as semi-reptilian. Yet *Confuciusornis* bore a very close similarity to birds living today. It had no teeth, and its beak and feathers have exactly the same characteristics as those of birds alive today. This bird's skeletal structure is identical to that of today's birds, but as with *Archaeopteryx*, its wings had claws.

Also apparent was a structure known as the pygostyle, which supports the tail feathers. Naturally, its presence undermined the evolutionist thesis that *Archaeopteryx* was the primitive ancestor of all birds.⁸⁹

Confuciusornis, so similar to modern-day birds, has conclusively disqualified *Archaeopteryx*, which evolutionists for decades pointed to as the prime evidence for their scenario of evolution.

Conjugation

This is one means by which organisms such as bacteria transmit genes between themselves. In conjugation, two bacteria from the same species come alongside one another and form a temporary cytoplasmic bridge, over which a mutual exchange of DNA takes place.⁹⁰

Genetic variety in bacteria is increa-

sed by means of conjugation. However, since no separate bacterial cell emerges as a result, this mechanism cannot be regarded as sexual reproduction.⁹¹ (Bacterial reproduction by way of mutual contact is known as sexual reproduction with conjugation.)

Evolutionists, however, do regard these newly emerging genetic variations as a universal feature of sexual reproduction. Since the initial bacteria have different characteristics from those that emerge subsequently, evolutionists take this as evidence for evolution. In fact, what is happening here is actually variation. The genes from the two bacteria do give rise to further variety, but no new genes or genetic data are added to the genetic pool. As a result, the bacteria remain the same species of bacteria, and no new subspecies emerges.

Creationism

The question of the origin of life—of how the first living things came into existence on Earth—was one of the greatest dilemmas confronting materialism for the last 150 years. That is because the cell, once regarded as the simplest component of any organism, actually possesses a complexity incomparably greater than any technology produced by humans. Probability calculations prove that not even proteins, the building blocks of the cell, could ever have come into being by chance. This, of course,

is proof of creation.

One such calculation was performed by Robert Shapiro, a professor of chemistry and DNA expert from the University of New York. An evolutionist, Shapiro calculated the probability of the 2,000 varieties of protein in a simple bacterium having emerged by chance. (There are some 200,000 varieties of protein in the human body.) The result he obtained was 1 in $10^{40,000}$.⁹² This figure, 1 followed by 40,000 zeroes, has no equivalent in the entire universe.

The fact revealed by this figure is that materialism, and Darwinism, its counterpart in the natural sciences—both of which seek to account for life in terms of chance, are equally invalid. Chandra Wickramasinghe, Professor of Applied Mathematics and Astronomy at Cardiff University, says this about Shapiro's calculations:

*The likelihood of the spontaneous formation of life from inanimate matter is one to a number with 40,000 noughts after it. . . . It is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution. There was no primeval soup, neither on this planet nor on any other, and if the beginnings of life were not random, they must therefore have been the product of purposeful intelligence.*⁹³

On the same subject, the famous astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle made this comment:

. . . such a theory [that life was assembled by an intelligence] is so obvious that


one wonders why it is not widely accepted as being self-evident. The reasons are psychological rather than scientific.^{9 4}

Both Hoyle and Wickramasinghe are people that have long engaged in science and adopted materialism. Yet the truth that confronted each of them is that life was created, and they have been forced to admit it. Today, a great many biologists and biochemists have also abandoned the myth that life was born as a result of chance.

The fact of creation conflicts with no scientific facts. On the contrary, all scientific findings tend to support it. The Big Bang Theory, for instance, confirms that the universe had a beginning, confirming creation while refuting materialism. In the fossil record, living species appear suddenly and in their present forms with no trace of any forerunners behind them. Not a single intermediate-form fossil has ever been found of the kind that evolutionists hypothesize must have existed.

This proves the fact of creation while refuting evolution, revealing that the exceeding-

ly complex structure of life cannot be the work of coincidences; and that intelligence, consciousness, knowledge and ability are all essential for life to emerge. This demolishes the theory of evolution while revealing proof of the existence of God. However, the adherents of evolution ignore the scientific facts and produ-



Francis Crick


ce a dogma in the defense of their theory.

Crick, Francis

Advances in genetic science and the discovery of nucleic acids—DNA and RNA, in other words—posed new problems for the theory of evolution, which seeks to account for the origin of life in terms of chance and which was already unable to offer any consistent explanation for the cell's most basic molecules.

In 1955, two scientists, James Watson and Francis Crick, revealed the

Francis Crick's discovery of DNA shed light on its extraordinarily complex structure.



unbelievably complex structure and design in the DNA molecule. (See **DNA**.)

DNA is found in the nucleus of each of the 100 trillion cells in the body, containing the flawless blueprint for the human body.

Francis Crick had spent years defending the theory of molecular evolution. But after his discovery of DNA, even he admitted that it was impossible for such a complex molecules to come into being by chance, spontaneously, as the result of a process of evolution:

An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that, in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle.⁹⁵

Cro-Magnon Man

The *Cro-Magnon* classification was given to a European race of humans estimated to have lived around 30,000 years ago. They had a dome-shaped skull and a broad forehead. Their skull volume of 1,600-cubic centimeters is actually greater than the average skull volume of modern humans. On account of the thick eyebrow protrusions on its skull and another bony protrusion on the back of the head, Cro-Magnon Man was proposed as an intermediate form.

However, the volume and structure of the Cro-Magnon skull are very similar to those of certain human races living today in Africa and in tropical climes. Ba-



A Cro-Magnon skull

sed on this resemblance, Cro-Magnon is estimated to be an ancient race that originated in Africa. Certain other paleontological findings show that Cro-Magnon and Neanderthal men interbred and formed the basis of certain races alive today. In addition, it is agreed that ethnic groups resembling Cro-Magnon Man are still alive today in various regions of Africa and in the Salute and Dordogne regions of France. Humans with the same characteristics have also been encountered in Poland and Hungary.

All this goes to show that Cro-Magnon man is not, claim, the evolutionary ancestor of human beings living today, as evolutionists suppose. The differences between the fossils and modern Europeans are no greater than that between an Eskimo and an African or between a pigmy and a European. In conclusion, Cro-Magnons rep-

resent a distinct human race that either became extinct or was assimilated by interbreeding with other races.

Crossing-over

This is the term for the exchange of genes during cell division among similar (homologous) chromosomes from the mother and father. Homologous chromosomes make non-sibling chromatids spiral. Gene exchange takes place where the two chromosomes touch one another. Crossing-over leads to a change in the chromosome gene sequence. Thanks to this phenomenon, genetic variations arise in living things, which in turn lead to intra-species variation. However, there is no question of one species changing into another.

Crossing-over makes for variation within a given species. Exchange of single or paired components takes place between similar chromosomes during crossing-over. Since this will give the chromosomes new combinations of genes, offspring can possibly display characteristics that do not exist in either of their parents.

This is an example of a typical variation. Genes already present in the mother and father are brought together, and new combinations formed. But contrary to what evolutionists would have us believe, there can be no question, of a new species emerging. Therefore, the examples of variation proposed by evolutionists actually constitute no evidence at all for evolution.

(See **Invalidity of Micro-evolution the; Macro-evolution Myth, the.**)

The biologist Edward S. Deevey Jr. describes how crossing-over takes place within specific genetic bounds:


Some remarkable things have been done by cross-breeding . . . but wheat is still wheat, and not, for instance, grapefruit. We can no more grow wings on pigs than hens can make cylindrical eggs. A more contemporary example is the average increase in male height that has occurred the past century. Through better health care, males have reached a record adult height during the last century, but the increase is rapidly disappearing, indicating that we have reached our limit.^{9 6}

In short, such research into plants and animals merely gives rise to certain changes within the genetic information of a species. No new genetic information is ever added. No matter how much you interbreed different types of dogs, cows or horses, the result will still be dogs, cows or horses. No new species will emerge.

Crossopterygian

The theory of evolution hypothesizes that quadrupeds (four-footed life forms) evolved from fish. But in fact, this claim is inconsistent, both physiologically and anatomically, and has no basis in the fossil record. If water-dwelling creatures acquired characteristics appropriate to dry land, which evolutionists supposed happened by chance, it would give no advantage to

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FINS AND FEET



These fishes' bony fins are the main reason why evolutionists imagined that the *Coelacanth* and similar fish are the ancestors of terrestrial animals. They assumed that these bones slowly turned into feet. However, there is a fundamental difference between the bones of these fish and the feet of such land animals as *Ichthyostega*. As shown in Diagram 1, the bones in the *Coelacanth* are not connected to its backbone. The bones in *Ichthyostega*, however, as shown in Diagram 2, are directly attached to the backbone.

Therefore, the claim that these fins slowly turned into feet is totally groundless. Furthermore, as can be seen from Diagrams 3 and 4, the structure of the bones in the *Coelacanth* fin and in the feet of *Ichthyostega* is completely different.

these marine animals. There is thus no logical basis for suggesting that legs came about by way of natural selection.

On the contrary, any living thing undergoing "pre-adaptation" should be eliminated by way of natural selection, because the more characteristics it develops that are appropriate to dry land, the more disadvantaged it will be in water. In short, the scenario of transition from sea to land is totally self-contradictory.

Evolutionist biologists have no consistent fossil records they can point to on this matter.

Evolutionists generally regard fish belonging to the class *Rhipidistian* or *Cœlacanth* as the ancestors of quadrupeds. These fish belong to the group *Crossopterygian*. Their only features that inspire hope in evolutionists are their fins, being fleshier than those of other fish. However, these fish are not inter-

mediate forms at all, and between them and amphibians there exist enormous fundamental anatomical and physiological differences. Despite all the research that has been conducted, not a single fossil has ever been found to fill this gap.⁹⁷ (See **Transition from water to land thesis, the.**)

Cultural Evolution Myth, the

Paralleling their hypothesized biological evolution, evolutionists also suggest that mankind has undergone a cultural progression from the primitive to the more advanced. They relate a great many narratives of no scientific validity in line with human evolution, which consists of no more than an imaginary family tree, and conjectures about the lives of people in the Paleolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic ages.

The idea of human evolution is totally fictional: In order for such a family tree to exist, apes must have gradually evolved into human beings, and the relevant fossils should have been found. But in fact, there is a clear gulf between apes and man. Features such as their skeletal structures, skull sizes, and walking on two legs or four, clearly distinguish apes from human beings. It is now recognized that the supposedly intermediate forms between ape and man proposed by evolutionists (*Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, *H. erectus*, etc.) are simply biased interpretations, distortions and outright

fraud. (See **Pittdown Man Fraud, the; Nebraska Man Fraud, the** and **Neanderthal: A Human Race.**)

For example, the Neanderthals (*Homo neanderthalis*), which evolutionists suggest were a transitional species between apes and human beings, were actually human, as their genus name implies. They emerged suddenly in Europe 100,000 years ago, and disappeared, quickly and silently, some 35,000 years ago, or else were assimilated into other human races. The only difference between them and modern human beings is that their skeletons were rather more massive and their average skull volumes were slightly larger.

Today, almost everyone agrees that the Neanderthals were a human race. For a long time, some evolutionist paleoanthropologists regarded these human beings as a primitive species, although scientific findings have shown that Neanderthal Man was no different from the stockier humans who can be seen walking the streets today.

The University of New Mexico paleoanthropologist Erik Trinkhaus, regarded as an eminent authority on the subject, writes:

Detailed comparisons of Neanderthal skeletal remains with those of modern humans have shown that there is nothing in Neanderthal anatomy that conclusively indicates locomotor, manipulative, intellectual, or linguistic abilities inferior to those of modern humans.⁹⁸

Nonetheless, evolutionists still des-

cribe Neanderthals as a subspecies of modern man, suggesting that they possessed a more primitive cultural level.

Fossil findings, however, show that contrary to what evolutionists claim, Neanderthal Man actually had an advanced culture. One of the most interesting examples of this is a fossilized whistle made by Neanderthals from the thigh bone of a bear, and found in a cave in northern Yugoslavia in July 1995 by the archaeologist Ivan Turk.

Later on, the musicologist Bob Fink analyzed this whistle, whose age of which is thought to be between 43,000 and 67,000 years according to carbon-14 dating results. He determined that this instrument produced four different notes, with both full and semi-tones.

This discovery shows that Neanderthals used the seven-note scale, which now represents the basis of Western music. Fink stated that the distance between the first and third holes was twice that between the third and fourth. *“These three notes . . . are inescapably diatonic and will sound like a near-perfect fit within any kind of standard diatonic scale,”*⁹⁹ wrote Fink, adding that Neanderthals had a musical ear and musical knowledge.

Other fossil findings show that the Neanderthals buried their dead, cared for the sick, and wore necklaces and similar adornments.¹⁰⁰

During the course of excavations, a 26,000-year-old needle made out of bone by Neanderthal Man was discovered. This

needle, is exceedingly straight and has a hole for a thread to be passed through.¹⁰¹ People who possess clothing of such a kind as to require sewing needles cannot, of course, be regarded as primitive.

Steven L. Kuhn, a professor of anthropology and archaeology at University of New Mexico, and Mary C. Stiner—despite being proponents of evolution—said that their research and analysis revealed that Neanderthals who lived thousands of years ago in caves on the southeast coast of Italy engaged in activities requiring complex thought like that of modern human beings.¹⁰²

Margaret Conkey of the University of California describes how implements belonging to periods before the Neanderthals were made by conscious, intelligent communities:

*If you look at the things archaic humans made with their hands, Levallois cores and so on, that's not a bumbling kind of thing. They had an appreciation of the material they were working with, an understanding of their world.*¹⁰³

All this proves that the cultural “evolution” proposed by evolutionists is utterly groundless.

Cursorial Theory, the

This is one of the two main explanations proposed by evolutionists as to how terrestrial reptiles began to fly. According to this theory, reptiles took to the air vertically, by hopping from the



The idea that dinosaurs turned into birds by growing wings as they hunted flies is not a comic story, but in fact, evolutionist theoreticians' most serious thesis regarding the origin of birds.

ground. The basic concept is that certain reptiles flapped their forearms very rapidly and for long periods as they chased insects, and that over the course of time, these forelegs developed into wings. Not the slightest explanation is offered, however, for how such a complex structure as a wing could have come into existence from forearms being beaten against one another in order to trap flies.

John Ostrom, a prominent adherent of the cursorial theory, admits that the proponents of both hypotheses can do no more than speculate: "*My cursorial predator theory is in fact speculative. But the arboreal theory is also similarly speculative.*"¹⁰⁴ (See **Arboreal Theory**, *the*.)

Even if we assume that mutations did cause undirected changes in a reptile's

forearms, it is still irrational to expect that any wing could emerge *by chance* through the addition of cumulative mutations. Any incremental mutation taking place in its forearms would not endow the reptile with functional wings, but would leave it deprived of functioning forearms. This would leave the animal disadvantaged (in other words, defective) compared to other members of its species. According to the rules of the theory of evolution, that deformed creature would be eliminated through natural selection.

Furthermore, according to biophysical research, mutations take place only very rarely. Therefore, it is impossible for these deformed creatures to wait millions of years for their deficient, in-

complete wings to be completed through minute mutations.

Cuvier, Georges

The French scientist Georges Cuvier (1769-1832), now regarded as the founder of paleontology, was at the same time a geologist and comparative anatomist. He conducted wide-ranging research into the zoology and paleontology of vertebrates and invertebrates and wrote about the history of science. At the same time, Cuvier definitively revealed that some organisms that had existed in the past had become extinct and accounted for this in a way diametrically opposed to the theory of evolution.¹⁰⁵

Moreover, Cuvier grouped relevant classes into phyla and thus broadened Linnaeus's classification. (See **Linnaeus, Carolus**.) He also applied this system to

fossils and thus identified the remains of extinct life forms. Since Cuvier believed that animals possessed certain fixed and natural characteristics, he thus opposed both the theory of evolution and Lamarck's theory that "*species could pass on to their offspring characteristics that they had acquired during their lives.*"
106

Cytochrome-C

Professor Ali Demirsoy, a leading proponent of evolution in Turkey, has this to say about cytochrome-C, one of the proteins which must be present in the body and which is essential for respiration, and the chances of its coming into being by chance: "*as low as those of a monkey sitting at a typewriter and writing the history of mankind.*"¹⁰⁷


Yet it is extremely interesting that Professor Demirsoy, an evolutionist scientist, should admit the impossibility of this:

*The probability of forming a cytochrome-C string is so low as to be zero. In other words, we may say that if life requires a specific sequence there is a very low probability of this occurring once in the whole universe. Or else supernatural forces that we cannot define played a role in this formation. It is incompatible with science to admit the latter possibility, which means we need to investigate the first hypothesis.*¹⁰⁸

Many evolutionists prefer the impossibility in the above example over accepting supernatural forces—in other words, creation by God.



Georges Cuvier



Darwin, Charles Robert

The first person to propose the theory of evolution in the form it's accepted today was Charles Robert Darwin, an amateur British naturalist.


Darwin never received any genuine training in biology and possessed only an amateur knowledge of nature and living things. As a result of his interest he took his place as a volunteer on the discovery vessel HMS Beagle, which sailed from Britain in 1832 and traveled through various regions of the world over the next five years.

Darwin was highly influenced by the different species he saw during the course of this voyage, and especially by the different species of finches he observed on the Galapagos Islands. He concluded that the differences in these birds' beaks stemmed from their adaptation to their surroundings. As a consequence of this idea, he assumed that the concept of environmental adaptation lay at the heart of all the variety among living things.

Yet in making that assumption, Darwin ignored the scientific facts, opposed the evidence that God created all living species, and suggested that living things were all descended from some common ancestor and became differentiated from another due over time, due to environmental conditions.

This hypothesis of Darwin's was based on no scientific facts or experiments. However, with the support and encouragement that he received from eminent materialist biologists of the time, Darwin gradually worked up these hypotheses into a coherent theory, according to which all living things were descended from a single primitive ancestor, but had been subjected to minute changes over very lengthy periods of time, and thus diverged anatomically from one another.

The ones that best adapted to their surroundings passed their characteristics on to subsequent generations, and these beneficial changes thus accumulated in such a way as to turn these in-



Charles Darwin, founder of the theory of evolution that has been refuted by modern scientific findings.

dividuals' offspring into life forms that were very different from their forerunner. (How these beneficial changes came about unclear, however.) According to Darwin, human beings were the most advanced product of this hypothetical mechanism.

Darwin called this product of his own imagination "evolution by way of natural selection." He now imagined that he had discovered the origin of species. The origin of any one species was another, less developed species. He eventually announced these ideas in his book *The Origin of Species*, published in 1859.

Darwin constructed his theory on the concept of natural selection, which meant the survival of the strongest individuals or those best able to adapt to environmental conditions in the struggle for survival in their environment. That is the claim emphasized in the subtitle of Darwin's book: *The Origin of Species: By Means of Natural Selection*.

Darwin's groundless logic followed this reasoning:

There are natural and random differences within any living species. Some cattle are larger than others, for example, and others are darker in color. Those characteristics that are most advantageous will be favored through natural selection, and the beneficial characteristic in question will thus come to predominate in that animal population. Through an accumulation of these features over a

long period of time, a new species will emerge.

However, this theory of evolution by way of natural selection, as by Darwin proposed it, left unanswered the most fundamental questions right from the outset. If living things had evolved in stages, as Darwin claimed, then a great many transitional forms must have existed as well. Yet the fossil record revealed no trace of these theoretical transitional life forms. Darwin puzzled over this problem for a long time and eventually had to conclude that hopefully, such fossils would be unearthed in the future. Despite the passage of the intervening 150 years, however, the expected fossils have still not been found.

Darwin was in an equally hopeless position when it came to accounting for such complex organs as the eye, ear and wing in terms of natural selection. It was impossible to maintain that these organs developed in stages, since the absence of even a single component would render them totally functionless.. (See **Irreducible Complexity**.) Indeed, Darwin was forced to state the difficulties he experienced regarding his theory in his book. (See **Origin of Species, the**)

Before all, the question of how the organism that by Darwin referred to as the ancestor of all living things came into being remained a complete mystery—because it is impossible for inanimate matter to come alive by means of natural processes. Eventually, advances in sci-

ence and technology were to fundamentally undermine his theory, which was the product of Darwin's primitive knowledge of science.

Darwinism

— See **Evolution Theory**, *the*.

Darwinism and Racism

Most present-day Darwinists claim that Charles Darwin was not actually a racist, but that racists have interpreted his ideas in a biased manner in order to support their own views. They maintain that the expression “by means of *The Preservation of Favored Races*” in the subtitle of his book *The Origin of Species* is meant solely for animals. However, those who make such claims ignore what Darwin actually said about human races in his book *The Descent of Man*.

According to the views that by Darwin set out in that book, the different human races represented different stages of evolution, and some races were more highly “evolved” and thus advanced than others. Some, in fact, were pretty much at the same level as apes.

Darwin suggested that the struggle for survival also applied to human races, (See **Struggle for Survival**, *the*.) In the course of that struggle, favored races would be victorious. According to Darwin, these favored were European whites. Asians and Africans, on the other

hand, had lagged behind in the fight for survival going on in the world. Darwin went even further and suggested that these races would soon lose the struggle entirely and be eliminated altogether:

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes. . . will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.¹⁰⁹

In another chapter of *The Descent of Man*, Darwin claimed that inferior races should disappear, and that there was no need for advanced human beings to protect them and seek to keep them alive. He compared this situation to livestock breeders:




Enslaved African natives

With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilised men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment. . . . Thus the weak members of civilised societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man.¹¹⁰

In line with these statements, Darwin regarded native Australians and blacks as being at the same level as gorillas and maintained that these races would eventually become extinct. He also advocated the need to prevent other races whom he regarded as inferior from multiplying, and that these races should therefore be eradicated. Darwin thus approved of and justified racist and discriminatory practices, the remains of which can still be seen today.

According to Darwin's racist ideas, the duty of any civilized human being

Slavery was the starting point for racism. Whites captured native peoples by force and shackled them to work like animals. Darwinism served as the ideological basis for this barbarism.



was to speed up this evolutionary process. That meant that there was no scientific reason why these backward races should not be eliminated right away!

Darwin's racist side revealed itself in several of his writings and analyses. For example, in 1871, in describing the native people of Tierra del Fuego that he had seen during the course of his long voyage on the Beagle, he made his racist preconceptions perfectly clear. He depicted them as "*wholly nude, submerged in dyes, eating what they find just like wild animals, uncontrolled, cruel to everybody out of their tribe, taking pleasure in torturing their enemies, offering bloody sacrifices, killing their children, ill-treating their wives, full of awkward superstitions.*"¹¹¹

Yet the researcher W. P. Snow, who had visited the same region ten years earlier, described those same people as;

*... powerful looking, strong, fond of their children, having inventive handicrafts, bearing the notion of private ownership for some goods and accepting the authority of the elder women in the community.*¹¹²

From these examples, it is clear that Darwin was a full-fledged racist. Indeed, as Benjamin Farrington, author of the book *What Darwin Really Said*, puts it, Darwin made many comments about "*the evident nature of the inequality among human races*" in *The Descent of Man*.¹¹³

Moreover, Darwin's theory denied the existence of God, leading to his ig-

noring fact that man is an entity created by God and that all human beings are created equal.

This was another factor that accelerated the rise of racism and its worldwide acceptance. The American scientist James Ferguson states that there is a direct relation between the rejection of creation and the rise of racism:

*The new anthropology soon became a theoretical background between two opposed schools of thought on the origin of humans. The older and more established of these was 'monogenism,' the belief that all humankind, irrespective of colour and other characteristics, was directly descended from Adam and from the single and original act of God's creation. . . . [In the 18th century] opposition to theological authority began to fuel the rival theory of 'polygenism,' (theory of evolution) which held that different racial communities had different origins.*¹¹⁴

The Indian anthropologist Lalita Vid-yarthi describes how Darwin's theory of evolution imposed racism on the social sciences:

*His (Darwin's) theory of the survival of the fittest was warmly welcomed by the social scientists of the day, and they believed humanity had achieved various levels of evolution culminating in the white man's civilization. By the second half of the nineteenth century, racism was accepted as fact by the vast majority of Western scientists.*¹¹⁵

Many Darwinists after Darwin set about trying to prove his racist opinions.

For that purpose, they had no qualms about perpetrating scientific distortions and fraud. They imagined that if they managed to prove their own superiority, they would also have scientifically demonstrated their own superiority and their right to oppress, exploit, and if necessary, even eradicate other races.

Stephen Jay Gould also stated that some anthropologists twisted the facts in order to demonstrate the superiority of the white race. According to Gould they most frequently resorted to engaging in distortions regarding the brain sizes of skulls they discovered. In one book Gould describes how many anthropologists suggested there was a direct relation between brain volume and intelligence and how, despite having no true criteria, they exaggerated the brain volumes of Caucasians in particular and portrayed these as greater than those of blacks and Native Americans.¹¹⁶

Gould sets out some of the unbelievable claims that Darwinists made to depict certain races as inferior:

Haeckel and his colleagues also invoked recapitulation [the theory of the repetition of the so-called evolutionary process during individual growth] to affirm the racial superiority of northern European whites. They scoured the evidence of human anatomy and behaviour, using everything they could find from brains to belly buttons. Herbert Spencer wrote that "the intellectual traits of the uncivilized are traits recurring in the children of the civilized." Carl Vogt said it more strongly in 1864: "The grown up Negro partakes, as regards his intellectual faculties, of the nature of the child" . . . Some tribes have founded states, possessing a peculiar organization, but, as to the rest, we may boldly assert that the whole race has, neither in the past nor in the present, performed anything tending to the progress of humanity or worthy of preservation.¹¹⁷

In his work *Race et Milieu Social Essais d'Anthroposociologie*, the French Darwinist anthropologist Vacher de La-

pouge advanced the view that non-white races were the representatives of wild children who had been unable to adapt to civilization, or classes whose blood had been corrupted. He drew his conclusions



Stephen Jay Gould in his book explains the Darwinists' racism.

from measuring the skulls from the upper and lower classes in Parisian graveyards. According to these results, people's skulls determined whether they would be wealthy, self-confident and in favor of freedom, while others would be conservative, content with very little and make excellent servants. Classes were the product of social divisions. Higher classes equated with higher races, and degree of wealth was directly proportionate to skull volume.

In summary, the racist aspect of Darwin's theory found very fertile ground in the second half of the 19th century, when European whites were hoping for just such a theory to legitimize their own crimes.

Darwin, Erasmus

Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of Charles Darwin, was one of those who put forward the first fundamental proposals for what we now refer to as the theory of evolution. According to him, living things were not created as individually distinct species. On the contrary, they were all descended from a common ancestor and were shaped, altered and varied according to their subsequent needs.

His ideas were subsequently adopted

by Charles Darwin and set out in greater detail. The theory that living things had descended from one another in a haphazard manner took its place in his grandson's book, *The Origin of Species*.

Charles Darwin had received a lengthy religious education. But a year before setting out on his voyage on the Beagle, he definitively abandoned certain fundamental Christian beliefs. By that time, he had developed a passionate interest in biology and the paradigm he observed was incompatible with his religious belief. The most important influence in making the young Charles Darwin non-religious, and even actively hostile to it, was his grandfather Erasmus.¹¹⁸

Erasmus Darwin was actually the first person in Britain to put forward the idea of evolution. A physicist, psychologist and poet, he was someone whose words were listened to with respect. Indeed, according to his biographer, Desmond King-Hele, he was the greatest Briton of the 18th century.¹¹⁹

Erasmus Darwin was also one of Britain's leading naturalists. (Naturalism is an intellectual movement that believes the essence of the universe lies in nature, that rejects the existence of a Creator, and even regards nature itself as a creator.) Erasmus Darwin's naturalist outlook gave Char-



Erasmus Darwin

les both an ideological and an organizational direction. Erasmus developed arguments that would later form the basis of Darwinism from his research in his eight-hectare botanical garden and collected these in his books, *The Temple of Nature and Zoonomia*. In 1784, he also set up a society that would play a leading role in the dissemination of these ideas. In fact, the Philosophical Society would be one of the greatest and most passionate adherents of the concept put forward decades later by Charles Darwin.¹²⁰

In short, despite the theology that Charles Darwin learned, the most important factor in his turning to materialist-naturalist philosophy—and rapidly rejecting religious beliefs, and subsequently publishing his book *The Origin of Species*—was his grandfather, Erasmus Darwin.

Dawkins, Richard

The British biologist Richard Dawkins is one of the world's most prominent proponents of Darwinism. However, Professor Dawkins also admits the impossibility of the very theory of evolution that he espouses so passionately:

So the sort of lucky event we are looking at could be so wildly improbable that the chances of its happening, somewhere in the universe, could be as low as one in a billion billion billion in any one year. If it



Richard Dawkins

*did happen on only one planet, anywhere in the universe, that planet has to be our planet—because here we are talking about it.*¹²¹

This attitude, on the part of one of the best-known authorities on evolution, clearly reflects the imperfect logic

on which the theory is constructed. The above statements, taken from Dawkins' book *Climbing Mount Improbable*, boil down to the argument that "If we are here, that means evolution must have happened"—a striking example of a logical paradox that actually explains nothing at all.

Dawson, Charles

Charles Dawson was a well-known doctor and amateur paleontologist who claimed to have discovered a jawbone and skull fragment in a pit near Piltdown in England in 1912. Although the jawbone resembled that of an ape, the teeth and skull resembled those of a human being. This fossil, known as Piltdown Man and estimated to be roughly 500,000 years old, was depicted as incontrovertible evidence of the evolution of man.

However, carbon-dating tests carried out from 1949 to 1953 revealed that the skull was indeed human, but only 500 years old, and that the jaw belonged to a

recently dead orangutan. In addition, the teeth had been deliberately added to the jawbone afterwards, arranged and filed in order to give the impression they belonged to a human. All the fragments had been later dyed with potassium dichromate in order to give them an aged appearance. Thereafter, Piltdown Man went down as the greatest scandal in the history of science. (See **Piltdown Man**.)

DDT immunity

Evolutionists attempt to portray insects' growing immunity to DDT as evidence for evolution. In reality, DDT immunity develops in much the same way as bacterial immunity to antibiotics. (See **Antibiotic Resistance**.) There is no question of a subsequently acquired immunity to DDT, since some insects already possess it.

Following the invention of DDT, those insects that were exposed to the pesticide—and had no immunity to it—died out. However, those individuals with such immunity were initially very low in number, but survived and gradually multiplied in number. As a result, the same insect species came to consist of individuals that all possessed genetic immunity.

Naturally, as most of the population of insects came to be made up of immune individuals, DDT began to have little effect on that species. This process is popularly referred to as “insects becoming immune to DDT.”

The evolutionist biologist Francisco Ayala admits this:

... the genetic variants required for resistance to the most diverse kinds of pesticides were apparently present in every one of the populations exposed to these man-made compounds. ^{1 2 2}

Evolutionist sources are clearly misleading on this subject. From time to time, certain popular science magazines in particular portray it as major evidence for evolution. In fact, however, there is no scientific ground for claiming that insects' DDT immunity is the result of evolution.

Denton, Michael

Michael Denton, a molecular biologist from the University of Otago in Australia, examined the theory of evolution in the light of various different branches of science in his 1985 book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, and concluded that Darwinism was very far from accounting for life.

In addition, he compared the theory of evolution with scientific findings in his book and stated that a major contradiction emerged: The theory of evolution is in a state of *crisis* in a great many areas, including the origin of life, population genetics, comparative anatomy,



paleontology and biochemical systems.¹²³

Descent of Man, the (Charles Darwin)

In this book, published in 1871, Charles Darwin suggested that apes and human beings shared a common ancestor and that the two species had gradually diverged under the effect of environmental conditions. At the same time, Darwin also made a number of inferences regarding “the evident inequality between human races”.¹²⁴

According to the views that Darwin stated in his book, human races represented different stages of evolution, and some races had evolved and progressed further than others. Some were still more or less at the level of apes. In his book Darwin maintain that these inferior races should be eliminated. And that there was no need for developed human beings to strive to maintain them and protect them. He compared this situation with that of livestock breeders:

With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilised men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment. . . . Thus the weak members of civilised societies

*propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man.*¹²⁵

In his book, Darwin ascribed the same status to Negroes, native Australians, and gorillas after which he predicted that these would gradually be eliminated by “civilised races”:

*At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes . . . will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.*¹²⁶

Ever since Darwinism was first put forward, it has represented the main supposedly scientific basis for racism. Darwinism, which assumes that living things evolve through a fight for survival, was applied to entire societies, the result being the scientific movement known as Social Darwinism. (See **Social Darwinism**.) According to Darwin, the duty of “civilised” individuals was to accelerate this evolutionary process and to ensure the elimination of backward races that were, in any case, condemned to disappear. (See **Darwinism and Racism**.)

Indeed, the racist and discriminatory

practices we still encounter today draw support from ideas supposedly legitimized in this way by Darwinism.

Devonian Period Fossilized Plants (408 to 306 Million Years Old)

Fossil plants from this period have many features in common with present-day species. The stoma, cuticle, rhizoid and sporangia, for example, are some of the structures evident today.¹²⁷ In order for a land plant to survive, it needs to protect itself against the danger of its tissues drying out. Cuticles are waxy layers that cover the stem, branch and leaves and protect the plant against desiccation. If a plant had no cuticles to protect it, then it would have no time to wait for them to form, as evolutionists maintain must have happened. If a plant has a cuticle, it thrives; if not, it shrivels up and dies. The distinction is as sharp as that.

Like the cuticle, all the structures possessed by plants are of vital importance to their survival. In order for a plant to be able to live and multiply, it

needs to have *all* its structures present and fully functional. Therefore, these structures cannot have developed in stages. All the plant fossils discovered so far confirm that plants have displayed the same flawless structures ever since they first appeared on Earth.

Dino-Bird Fossil, the

—See *Archaeoraptor liaoningensis*.

Dipneuma

With the discovery of living things that refuted the thesis regarding the transition from water to land, evolutionists clutched at other theories on the subject. (See *Coelacanth*.) Some evolutionists regarded lunged fish as the ancestors of all terrestrial animals. The general name given to these fish that are able to use their lungs as well as gills is *Dipneuma*. There are three different species of these fish living in the seas around America, Africa and Australia.

Since the 1850s, it was actually thought that these fish had evolved into primitive amphibians. By the 1950s, howe-



Lungfish do not represent an "intermediate stage" that later then disappeared, but are an original species that has been living since very early times.

ver, they ceased being regarded as transitional forms because they were very exceptional specimens. By that time no one any longer supported the idea that they were the ancestors of terrestrial life forms.¹²⁸

As the evolutionist Maria G. Lavant describes it,

*Since 1930's, the Dipneuma assumption has been put aside gradually. When the final years of 1950's were reached, organisms with double respiratory features was characterized as very exceptional by a paleontology publication known to be a classic.*¹²⁹

In addition, the fact that the fossil remains of these fish are regarded as being 350 million years old, and have undergone no change at all in that time, also removed their candidacy as transitional forms. These animals are not transitional links between two species that subsequently disappeared, but distinct species that have been alive since very early times.

Dialectics

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the intellectual founding fathers of communism, tried to describe their materialist philosophy in terms of a new method known as dialectics—the hypothesis that all progress in the universe is obtained as the result of conflict. Based on this assumption, Marx and Engels sought to interpret the entire history of the world.

Marx claimed that the history of humanity was one of conflict, that the existing 19th-century conflict was between workers and capitalists, and that the workers would soon rise up and carry out a communist revolution. (See **Communism**.)

In order to influence large masses of people, however, Marx and Engels needed to give their ideology a scientific appearance. The basic claims made in Darwin's *The Origin of Species* published in the 19th century represented just such a supposed scientific basis for Marx and Engels' ideas. Darwin maintained that living things emerged as the result of a struggle for survival—in other words, through dialectical conflict. (See **Struggle for Survival**, *the*.) Furthermore, Darwin rejected religious beliefs by denying creation; and for Marx and Engels, this was an opportunity not to be missed.

Marx and Engels rejoiced to imagine that Darwin's concept of evolution represented a scientific backing for their




Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the intellectual fathers of communism, were delighted to imagine that Darwin's theory of evolution gave scientific backing for their own atheistic views.

own atheistic world view. However, the theory of evolution received widespread acceptance mainly thanks to the primitive level of science in the 19th century when it was first put forward. Actually, it is devoid of any scientific evidence and is full of errors. Scientific advances in the second half of the 20th century revealed the invalidity of the theory of evolution. This spelled the collapse of materialist and communist thinking, and did the same for Darwinism. Yet scientists with a materialist world view resorted to all kinds of methods to conceal the collapse of Darwinism, since they knew that it would also spell the end of their own ideologies.

DNA

The theory of evolution, which accounts for the origin of life in terms of chance, cannot provide a coherent explanation for even

If just one of the codes that make up a gene contains an error, that gene will serve no purpose at all. It is impossible for the millions of nucleotides making up the 40,000 genes in the human body to assume the correct sequences by chance.



the existence of the most basic molecules in the cell.

Advances in genetic science and the discovery of the nucleic acids, DNA and RNA, represented still further impasses for the theory. In 1955, research by two scientists, James Watson and Francis Crick, brought to light the DNA's unbelievably complex structure and design.

The molecule known as DNA, found in every one of the 100 trillion cells in the human body, contains a flawless structural blueprint for the body as a whole. Information regarding all a person's characteristics, from external appearance to the structures of the internal organs, is recorded in the DNA through a special coding system, via the arrangement of four special molecules that constitute the DNA spiral. These molecules, known as nucleotides, are referred to by their initial letters: A, T, G and C.

All the structural differences between



en human beings stem from these letters being arranged differently from one another. The arrangement of these molecules in DNA determines a person's structure, down to the minutest detail. In addition to features such as height and the color of the eyes, hair and skin, the blueprints concerning the body's 206 bones, 600 muscles, 100 billion nerve cells and 100 trillion cells are all contained in the DNA in any single cell. If you were to put down all the information in DNA on paper, you would need to a library of 900 volumes of 500 pages each. Yet this unimaginable amount of information is coded in the components of the DNA known as genes.

Any error arising in the arrangement of the nucleotides making up a gene will make that gene totally functionless. Bear in mind that there are 40,000 genes in the human body, and it seems absolutely impossible for the millions of nucleotides comprising these genes to have assumed their correct order by chance.

Frank Salisbury, an evolutionist biologist, expresses this impossibility in the following terms:

A medium protein might include about 300 amino acids. The DNA gene controlling this would have about 1,000 nucleotidase in its chain. Since there are four kinds of nucleotidase in a DNA chain, one consisting of 1,000 links could exist in 41000 or 10600. Ten multiplied by itself 600 times gives the figure 1 followed

*by 600 zeros! Imagine how many universes it would take to accommodate 10600 DNA chains!*¹³⁰

Following a small logarithmic calculation, in 4^{1000} is equivalent to a probability of 1 in 10^{600} . That number is 1 followed by 600 zeros. Since 1 followed by 11 zeros equals 1 trillion, it is absolutely impossible to conceive of the number represented by 1 and 600 zeros. The impossibility of nucleotides coming together by chance to constitute DNA and RNA is expressed by the French evolutionist scientist Paul Auger:

*We have to sharply distinguish the two stages in the chance formation of complex molecules such as nucleotides by chemical events. The production of nucleotides one by one—which is possible—and the combination of these within very special sequences. The second is absolutely impossible.*¹³¹

Regarding the formation of DNA, the Turkish evolutionist Professor Ali Demirsoy makes the following admission:

*The chances of a protein and nucleic acid (DNA-RNA) forming are far beyond what is estimated. In fact, the odds of a specific protein chain coming about are astronomically small.*¹³²

The theory of evolution has not proven any of the evolutionary formations alleged to have taken place at the molecular level. As science progresses, far from producing answers to these questi-

ons, it actually makes those questions more complex and unanswerable, and thus confirms creation by default.

However, evolutionists have conditioned themselves to deny creation and are thus left with no alternative than to believe in the impossible. In his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, the well-known Australian molecular biologist Michael Denton describes the situation:

To the skeptic, the proposition that the genetic programmes of higher organisms, consisting of something close to a thousand million bits of information, equivalent to the sequence of letters in a small library of 1,000 volumes, containing in encoded form countless thousands of intricate algorithms controlling, specifying, and ordering the growth and development of billions and billions of cells into the form of a complex organism, were composed by a purely random process is simply an affront to reason. But to the Darwinist, the idea is accepted without a ripple of doubt—the paradigm takes precedence!¹³³

Dobzhansky, Theodosius

The Russian scientist Theodosius Dobzhansky, one of the feverish proponents of evolution theory, agrees that the idea of "natural selection," the foundation of Darwinism, gives rise to a morally degenerate society:

Natural selection can favor egotism, he-

donism, cowardice instead of bravery, cheating and exploitation, while group ethics in virtually all societies tend to counteract or forbid such 'natural' behavior, and to glorify their opposites: kindness, generosity, and even self-sacrifice for the good of others of one's tribe or nation and finally of mankind.¹³⁴





Dobzhansky Theodosius

Even as the theory of evolution found itself facing a literal dead end in the face of genetic laws discovered in the first half of the 20th century, Dobzhansky took his place among the founders of neo-Darwinism, which was put forth as a new "patch" to Darwinism itself.

Drosophila

— See **Fruit flies**.





Contrary to their expectations, the *E. coli* bacterium selected by evolutionists to prove evolution and discover its supposed mechanisms has remained unchanged for a billion years.

E. coli bacterium


No living thing has ever undergone evolution through the mechanisms of natural selection and mutation. Yet evolutionist biologists sometimes maintain that we cannot observe the evolutionary effect of the mechanisms of natural selection and mutation because these mechanisms work over very lengthy periods of time.

This is no more than a distraction with no scientific foundation, because has never been observed in such organisms as fruit flies or bacteria, whose very short life spans make it possible for scientists to study them through thousands of generations.

Pierre Paul Grassé comments on the stasis that makes bacterial evolution impossible:

Bacteria . . . are the organisms which, because of their huge numbers, produce the most mutants. [B]acteria . . . exhibit a great fidelity to their species. The bacillus Escherichia coli, whose mutants have been studied very carefully, is the best example. The reader will agree that it is surprising, to say the least, to want to prove evolution and to discover its mechanisms and then to choose as a material for this study a being which practically stabilized a billion years ago!

What is the use of their unceasing mutations, if they do not [produce evolutionary] change?



E. coli bacterium

*In sum, the mutations of bacteria and viruses are merely hereditary fluctuations around a median position; a swing to the right, a swing to the left, but no final evolutionary effect. Cockroaches, which are one of the most venerable living insect groups, have remained more or less unchanged since the Permian, yet they have undergone as many mutations as *Drosophila*, a Tertiary insect.*¹³⁵

In short, it is impossible for living things to have undergone evolution, because there is no evolutionary mechanism in nature. Indeed, when we look at the fossil record, we see no evolutionary process at all, but rather a picture that represents the exact opposite of evolution.

Eldredge, Niles

The well-known evolutionist paleontologist Niles Eldredge is one of the most prominent adherents of the neo-Darwinist model known as punctuated equilibrium—in other words, the punctuated model of evolution, first put forward in the 1970s. (See **Punctuated equilibrium**.) According to this theory, evolution takes place not gradually, through small changes, but through very large and sudden ones.

The reason behind such a scenario (which actually contradicts the most basic claim of evolution) is that living species appear suddenly in the layers of the

Earth in the same perfect forms they possess today.

For that reason, Eldredge—who shares the same views—claimed that evolution happened by way of large sudden changes, a claim that was entirely the product of the imagination.

Actually, this theory was a different version of the “Hopeful Monster” theory proposed by the German paleontologist Otto Schindewolf back in the 1930s. According to that theory, the first bird emerged from a reptile egg through an enormous change caused by a random mutation. Certain land-dwelling animals might also have turned into giant whales through a similarly sudden and wide-ranging change. But this theory was swiftly abandoned.

In order to impart a scientific character to their theory, Eldredge and Gould sought to develop a mechanism for these sudden evolutionary leaps. But the inconsistencies in this claim soon gave its authors reason for concern. Niles Eldredge stated, by way of a question, that the idea of living things progressing through evolution was logically flawed: Do plant and animal species really improve and develop into the more complex? If so, then should we consider the simple and unchanged life forms, such as the sponge, as evolutionary failures? He then added that the evolutionary motto “Progress is inevitable” should be replaced with “Why apes succeeded.”¹³⁶


Embryology

This branch of science studies the developmental stages between the zygote phase that results from the fertilization of a living thing right through to birth. However, the concept of embryology is mostly used to describe a branch of biology that studies the development of animal embryos.

Until the 18th century, embryology was based more on speculation than on facts. The reason was that genetics had not yet been discovered, and the cell had not as yet been described. In general terms, the theory at that time was that initially, all of an animal's organs were in a miniaturized state and only needed to open up and develop, like the petals of a flower. Many naturalists maintained that this initial state existed in the repro-

ductive cells of a woman's, ovary. This theory, proposed long before by Aristotle, maintained that the individual's specialized structures developed gradually from non-specialized ones previously in the egg.¹³⁷ But following the discovery under the microscope of sperm, the male reproductive cell, some scientists developed the hypothesis in 1677 that sperm carried the fertilizing agent.

Subsequent research in the field of embryology was largely put forwards as evidence for evolution. But with the realization, that drawings and interpretations produced were fake, the situation was reversed, and embryological studies demonstrated that living things are created with a perfect system with mutually compatible components. (See **Embryological evolution** below, also **Recapitulation**.)



Above is an illustration drawn by Ernst Haeckel in order to prove a resemblance between the embryos of a human and a fish. When Haeckel's drawing is compared with a genuine human embryo, it can be seen that he has deliberately removed a large number of the organs.



Observations in recent years have revealed that the embryos of different life forms do not resemble each other at all in the manner suggested by Haeckel. The differences between the mammal, reptile and bat embryo shown above are a clear example of this.

Embryological evolution

Any mammal undergoes a developmental process in its mother's womb. The claim that embryological development in living things is evidence for evolution, however, is known as the Recapitulation theory in evolutionist literature. (See **Recapitulation theory**.) A number of evolutionist publications and textbooks today seek to portray this theory of recapitulation which had previously been removed from the scientific literature, as a scientific fact.

The term "recapitulation" is an abbreviated version of the "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" axiom proposed by the evolutionist biologist Ernst Haeckel in the 19th century. Haeckel, the father of the recapitulation theory, resorted to fabricated drawings to back up his fictitious thesis. (See **Haeckel, Ernst**.) Cer-

tain circles who have conditioned themselves to support the theory of evolution still seek to portray his falsified drawings as evidence of embryological evolution.

According to Haeckel's theory embryos repeat the evolutionary process during their developmental stages. The human embryo, for instance, first exhibits fish-like features and then reptilian ones during its development in the womb before finally resembling a human being.

In later years, however, it emerged that this scenario was wholly imaginary. The supposed gills that appeared during an embryo's earliest stages were determined in fact to be the middle ear canal and the beginning of the parathyroid and thymus glands. That part of the embryo formerly compared to the yolk sac was revealed to be a sac producing blood for the baby. That part that Haeckel and his

followers described as the tail is actually the backbone, which resembles a tail only because it develops before the legs.

These facts are known to everyone in the world of science. Evolutionists also accept them. As George Gaylord Simpson, one of the founders of neo-Darwinism, writes, "*Haeckel misstated the evolutionary principle involved. It is now firmly established that ontogeny does not repeat phylogeny.*"¹³⁸

That Haeckel's theory is mere forgery is also accepted by the leading authorities of evolution. The world famous *Science* magazine announces this fact in its September 1997 issue under the title, "Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered."

*Not only did Haeckel add or omit features, Richardson and his colleagues report, but he also fudged the scale to exaggerate similarities among species, even when there were 10-fold differences in size. Haeckel further blurred differences by neglecting to name the species in most cases, as if one representative was accurate for an entire group of animals. In reality, Richardson and his colleagues note, even closely related embryos such as those of fish vary quite a bit in their appearance and developmental pathway. "It looks like it's turning out to be one of the most famous fakes in biology," Richardson concludes.*¹³⁹

Embryological recapitulation

— See "Ontology recapitulates

phylogeny" theory, the.

Eoalulavis

This is one of the fossils that demolishes evolutionist claims regarding *Archaeopteryx*, showing that no evolutionary link can be established between birds and dinosaurs. The wing structure in *Eoalulavis*, approximately 30 million years older than *Archaeopteryx*, is exactly the same as that in slow-flying birds alive today. This feature considerably increases the bird's maneuvering ability and provides extra control during landing and take-off.

The point is that a bird 30 million years older than *Archaeopteryx* was able to fly in a very effective manner.¹⁴⁰

This proves that neither *Archaeopteryx* nor any other birds like it were transitional forms.

Endosymbiosis Theory, the

This thesis was put forward in 1970 by Lynn Margulis, who claimed that bacterial cells turned into plant and animal cells as the result of symbiotic and parasitical activity. According to this thesis, plant cells emerged after a bacterium swallowed another photosynthetic bacterium cell. The photosynthetic bacterium supposedly evolved inside the devouring cell and turned into a chloroplast. Finally, organelles with very complex structures—such as the Golgi appa-

ratus, endoplasmic reticulum and ribosome—somehow evolved inside the main cell. And thus plant cells came into being.

This thesis is nothing more than a figment of the imagination. Indeed, it has been criticized in many respects by many scientists regarded as authorities on the subject—D. Lloyd¹⁴¹, Gray and Doolittle¹⁴² and Raff and Mahler, for example.

The fact on which the endosymbiosis thesis is based is that the chloroplasts inside the cell have their own DNA separate from that of the main cell. Based on that distinction, it is claimed that mitochondria and chloroplasts were once independent cells. Yet when chloroplasts are examined in detail, the invalidity of this claim becomes apparent.

The points that invalidate the endosymbiosis thesis are as follows:

1. If chloroplasts had really once been swallowed by a larger cell when they were living independently, as is claimed, then the only one result would have been their digestion and use as food by the main cell. Even if we assume that the main cell did mistakenly absorb these cells instead of food, its enzymes would have digested them. Naturally, evolutionists may try to gloss over this point by claiming that the digestive enzymes had disappeared. But this is a manifest contradiction. If the digestive enzymes had vanished, then the main cell would have died for lack of nourishment.

2. Again, assume that all these impossible events actually took place and that the cells claimed to be the forerunners of chloroplasts were swallowed by the main cell. We now face another problem: the blueprint for all the organelles in the cell is encoded in DNA. If the main cell is to use as organelles other cells it has engulfed, then it needs to have the information concerning them coded in its DNA beforehand. Indeed, the DNA of the swallowed cells would have to possess information regarding the main cell. Such a thing is of course impossible. No living thing carries genetic information for an organ it does not possess. It is impossible for the DNA of the main cell and that of the engulfed cells to have later adapted to one another.

3. Within the cell, there is enormous harmony. Chloroplasts do not act independently of the cell to which they belong. In addition to being dependent on the main DNA in protein synthesis, the chloroplasts do not make the decision to multiply themselves. In any one cell, there are more than one chloroplast and mitochondrion. Just as with other organelles, their numbers rise or fall in line with cell activity.

The fact that these organelles contain their own separate DNA is of particular benefit when it comes to replication. As the cell divides, the chloroplasts also separate in two, thus doubling their numbers, so that cell division takes place more quickly and orderly.

4. Chloroplasts are vitally important generators of energy for the plant cell. If these organelles are unable to do so, many of the cell's functions cannot take place, and the organism will be unable to survive. These vitally important functions take place with proteins synthesized in the chloroplasts. However, the chloroplasts' own DNA is not sufficient for them to synthesize these proteins. The great majority of proteins are synthesized using the cell's main DNA.¹⁴³

It is absolutely impossible for such harmony to have developed through trial and error. Any change in a DNA molecule will not gain the organism any new characteristic, but will definitely harm it.

Mahlon B. Hoagland describes the position in his book *The Roots of Life*:

*You'll recall we learned that almost always a change in an organism's DNA is detrimental to it; that is, it leads to a reduced capacity to survive. By way of analogy, random additions of sentences to the plays of Shakespeare are not likely to improve them! . . . The principle that DNA changes are harmful by virtue of reducing survival chances applies whether a change in DNA is caused by a mutation or by some foreign genes we deliberately add to it.*¹⁴⁴

Evolutionists did not produce their claims on the basis of any scientific experiments. No such phenomenon as one bacterium swallowing another has ever been observed. The molecular biologist Whitfield describes the situation:


*Prokaryotic endocytosis [the taking in of matter by a living cell] is the cellular mechanism on which the whole of S.E.T. (Serial Endosymbiotic Theory) presumably rests. If one prokaryote could not engulf another, it is difficult to imagine how endosymbiosis could be set up. Unfortunately for Margulis and S.E.T., no modern examples of prokaryotic endocytosis or endosymbiosis exist . . .*¹⁴⁵

There is no example of a bacteria that is left intact, without being digested, after being engulfed by another and which 'contributes' to the initiation of an even more complex cell in nature. Such a relationship between two bacteria is not definitely demonstrated in any laboratory experiments. That means such organisms are not alive in nature or in test tubes, but only in the minds of evolutionists. In reality, genes of eukaryotic cells are much different than the ones in prokaryotic ones and no evolutionary relationship exists in between them. D.F. Doolittle has a confession in an article in the *Scientific American* magazine:

*... many eukaryote genes are totally unlike those seen in the prokaryotes and archaea. They seem to come from nowhere.*¹⁴⁶

Law of Entropy, the

—See, **Second law of Thermodynamics, the.**



Fossils of *Eohippus*, the supposed ancestor of the horse, and breeds of horse still alive today have all been found in the same strata.

Eohippus

Evolutionists have set out horse fossils out in a series, from small to larger. Yet evolutionists do not agree on regarding these family trees concerning the horse's supposed evolution. The only point they agree upon is their belief that a dog-like mammal known as *Eohippus* (*Hyracotherium*) that lived in the Eocene period 55 million years ago is the first forerunner of the horse. Yet *Eohippus*, portrayed as an equine ancestor that became extinct millions of years ago, is almost identical to the mammal known as *Hyrax* that still lives in Africa, but has not the slightest connection with horses.¹⁴⁷

The invalidity of the claim regarding the evolution of the horse is becoming clearer every day with the discovery of new fossils. *Eohippus* has been identified in strata containing some fossilized breeds of horse—*Equus nevadensis* and *E. occidentalis*—that are still alive today—*Equus nevadensis*.¹⁴⁸ This shows that the modern horse lived at the same time as its supposed forebear, proving that the horse never underwent the process known as evolution.

In his book *The Great Evolution Mystery*, the evolutionist writer Gordon Rattray Taylor describes the horse series myth:

But perhaps the most serious weakness of Darwinism is the failure of paleontologists to find convincing phylogenies or

*sequences of organisms demonstrating major evolutionary change. . . The horse is often cited as the only fully worked-out example. But the fact is that the line from Eohippus to Equus is very erratic. It is alleged to show a continual increase in size, but the truth is that some variants were smaller than Eohippus [the first in the sequence], not larger. Specimens from different sources can be brought together in a convincing-looking sequence, but there is no evidence that they were actually ranged in this order in time.*¹⁴⁹

All these facts reveal that the horse evolution-trees, portrayed as one of the strongest pieces of evidences for evolution, are imaginary and worthless. Like other species, horses were brought into being with no evolutionary forebears. (See **Origin of the Horse**, *the*.)

Eukaryote

— See **Root of Plant Cell**, *the*.


Eugenic slaughter

The theory of eugenics, which attracted many adherents in the first half of the 20th century, called for the eradication of deformed and sick people and the improvement of a human race by means of the multiplication of healthy individuals. According to the theory of eugenics, humanity can be improved in the same way that breeds of animals can—by mating strong, healthy animals together.

The people who first proposed the theory of eugenics were Darwinists. Charles Darwin's nephew, Francis Galton, and his son Leonard Darwin led the eugenics movement in Britain. From that point of view, the concept of eugenics emerged as a natural consequence of Darwinism. That fact was specially emphasized in publications supporting eugenics – "Eugenics is mankind directing its own evolution," they stated.

According to K. Ludmerer, the idea of eugenics was as old as Plato's famous work *The Republic*. However, Ludmerer states that Darwinism was the reason why interest in the idea increased:

*... modern eugenics thought arose only in the nineteenth century. The emergence of interest in eugenics during that century had multiple roots. The most important was the theory of evolution, for Francis Galton's ideas on eugenics—and it was he who created the term "eugenics"—were a direct logical outgrowth of the scientific doctrine elaborated by his cousin, Charles Darwin.*¹⁵⁰



Following the development of Darwinism and the idea of eugenics, racist scientists in Germany began openly advocating the killing of unwanted individuals. One of these scientists, Adolf Jost, called for unwanted people to be medically put down in his 1895 book *Das Recht auf den Todt* ("The Right to Die"). Jost claimed that "*the state needs to assume the responsibility for killing individuals for the health of the social organism.*"

Jost was the intellectual inspiration behind Adolf Hitler, who would emerge onto the world stage 30 years later. Along the same lines, Hitler said, "*The state must ensure that only healthy children exist. The visibly sick and those carrying infectious diseases must be declared to be unfit.*"¹⁵¹

Shortly after coming to power, Hitler initiated an official policy of eugenics, which he summarized in these words:

Mental and physical education occupy an important place for the state, but human selection is just as important. The state has a responsibility to declare that the genetically sick or individuals with infectious diseases are unfit to breed . . . And that responsibility must be ruthlessly

The current effects of the concept of eugenics are reflected in the way the handicapped are treated. To the right can be seen a handicapped child excluded from society, and whose hands have even been tied.

*enforced, showing no compassion and without expecting others to understand. . . To stop the crippled or physically sick from reproducing over a period of 600 years. . . will lead to improvement in human health that cannot be obtained today. If the healthiest members of the race breed in a planned manner. . . then a race will emerge that bears no mentally or physically defective seeds of the kind we still carry today.*¹⁵²

As a requirement of this policy of Hitler's, the mentally ill, crippled, those born blind and the genetically sick in German society were regarded as parasites who damaged the purity and universal progress of the German race. These people were rounded up and sterilized. Not long after, these people who had been removed from society began being killed, following a secret directive issued by Hitler.

Under a law passed in 1933; 350,000 mental patients, 30,000 gypsies and hundreds of black children were sterilized by such methods as x-rays, injection or electric shocks to the genitals. One Nazi officer said, "*National Socialism is nothing more than applied biology.*"¹⁵³

Hitler sought to accelerate the supposed evolution of the German race with these killings and ruthless measures aimed at innocent people, and also brought in eugenics. Blond, blue-eyed young men and women whom he regarded as representatives of the German race were encouraged to have

children together. In 1935, special breeding farms were established for this purpose. Young girls who met racial criteria were sent to these farms, which, were constantly visited by SS units. The illegitimate children born on these farms were to be raised as the citizens of the 1000-year Reich.

Eukaryotic cells

—See, *Origin of the plant cell*, the

Eusthenopteron foordi

After the capture of a living *Coelacanth*, evolutionists realized that this was not a transitional form. So they next settled on depicting the fish *E. foordi* as a transitional "missing link."

Evolutionists maintained that that the tailed water frog was descended from *E. foordi*. However, anatomical comparisons of tailed water frog and *Eusthenopteron* revealed profound differences between the two. This meant that evolution



A *Eusthenopteron foordi* fossil dating to the late Devonian Period, found in Canada

nists had to suppose another transitional form between them. However, no skeleton belonging to this theoretical transition between *Eusthenopteron foordi* and the tailed water frog *Ichthyostega* has ever been found.

Now, the two favorite subjects for most of the contemporary evolutionary scenarios regarding tetrapod origins are *Eusthenopteron* (an extinct fish) and *Acanthostega* (an extinct amphibian). Robert Carroll, in his *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, makes comments on these allegedly related forms:

*Eusthenopteron and Acanthostega may be taken as the end points in the transition between fish and amphibians. Of 145 anatomical features that could be compared between these two genera, 91 showed changes associated with adaptation to life on land . . . This is far more than the number of changes that occurred in any one of the transitions involving the origin of the fifteen major groups of Paleozoic tetrapods.*¹⁵⁴

Evolutionary mechanisms

The neo-Darwinist model we refer to today as the theory of evolution proposes two basic evolutionary mechanisms; *natural selection* and *mutation*. According to the theory's basic proposition, these two mechanisms are mutually complementary. The source of evolutionary changes is random mutations in the genetic structure of living things. Again according to the theory, natural selection favors the most advantageous characteristics caused by mutations, and thus living things evolve.

However, these proposed mechanisms actually have no evolutionary force at all. And there is no question of them giving rise to new species, as evolutionists claim. (See **Natural selection and Mutation.**)

There is no process of evolution behind the origin of frogs. The earliest known frogs emerged totally different from fish and with their own unique structures. There is no difference between this frog fossil preserved in amber, discovered in the Dominican Republic, and living specimens.



Evolutionary Family Tree

— See **Tree of Life and Imaginary family tree of Man, the.**)

Evolution Theory, the

Many people imagine the theory of evolution to have been formulated by Charles Darwin and to be based on scientific evidence, observations and experiments. However, the source of the theory is not its intellectual founding father, Darwin, nor any scientific evidence.

At a time when pagan religions dominated Mesopotamia, many beliefs and myths abounded regarding the origin of life and the universe. One of these, surprisingly, was a belief in *evolution*! According to an inscription from Sumerian times, known as the *Enuma-Elish*, there was initially watery chaos, out of which two gods, Lahmu and Lahamu, suddenly emerged. According to this myth, these deities first brought themselves into being and then gave rise to other substances and living things. In other words, according to the Sumerian legend, life emerged suddenly out of watery chaos and developed by way of evolution.

The evolution myth later flourished in another pagan civilization—ancient Greece. Athenian philosophers regarded matter as the only absolute entity. They turned to the myth of evolution, inherited from the Sumerians, to explain how life arose. Materialist philosophy and the

myth of evolution thus came together in ancient Greece, whence they were transplanted to Roman culture.

The idea that all living things had one common ancestor, maintained by the theory of evolution, was put forward by the French biologist the Comte de Buffon in the mid-18th century. (See **Buffon, Comte de.**) Charles Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus Darwin, developed de Buffon's idea and came up with the first basic propositions representing the concept we today know as the theory of evolution. (See **Darwin, Erasmus.**)

After Erasmus Darwin, the French natural historian Jean Baptiste Lamarck proposed the first wide-ranging theory of evolution at the beginning of the 19th century. (See **Lamarck, Jean Baptiste.**) According to him, evolution operated through "*acquired characteristics being passed on from generation to generation.*" In his view, the changes that living things underwent during the course of their lives were permanent and could be passed on genetically to their offspring.

Lamarck's theory enjoyed enormous success at the time it was launched. But afterwards, that popularity declined rapidly. People with justified doubts regarding Lamarck's theories began carrying out their own research.

In 1870, the British biologist Weismann proved that acquired characteristics could not be passed on to subsequent generations and therefore, Lamarck's theory was wrong. Therefore, the teach-



Like modern-day materialists, the ancient Greek materialist philosopher Democritus made the error of thinking that matter was eternal and nothing existed apart from matter.

hing today imposed on us and the entire world as the theory of evolution is not actually based on Lamarck. The birth of Darwinism, known as the theory of evolution the world around, came with the 1859 publication of Charles Darwin's book *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*.

Darwin removed certain obvious logical errors from Lamarck's theory and produced the *natural selection* thesis rather than a genetic explanation for the evolution of living things.

His theory of evolution denies that li-

ving things were created and maintains that they are the product of natural processes and random influences. According to this theory, all living things are descended from one another. A previously existing living species gradually developed turned into another, and eventually, all species emerged in this way. The transition took hundreds of millions of years and was carried forward in stages. Though the theory was been widely accepted for around a century and a half, today it finds itself in conflict with findings from a great many branches of science such as paleontology, biochemistry, anatomy, biophysics and genetics.

Evolutionary gaps

Though the theory of evolution has no scientific foundation, most people around the world regard it as scientific fact. The most important reason for this error is systematic indoctrination and propaganda from the media.

In their reports, the media giants employ an assumption that the theory of evolution is as certain as any mathematical law. The most classic example of this comes with regard to fossil remains.

Sentences such as “According to a Time magazine report, a very significant fossil filling a gap in the chain of evolution has been discovered,” or “According to a report in Nature, scientists have clarified the final missing parts in the evolutionary puzzle” are printed in large, bold face. However, nothing has actually been proven at all for the *final missing link in the evolutionary chain* to have been found. All the evidence put forward is false.

On the other hand, despite there being millions of fossils of living things in perfectly formed states, no transitional form fossil that might confirm an evolutionary development has ever been found. In his 1991 book *Beyond Natural Selection*, the American paleontologist R. Wesson describes the significance of the real and concrete gaps in the fossil record:

*The absence of a record of any important branching is quite phenomenal. Species are usually static, or nearly so, for long periods, species seldom and genera never show evolution into new species or genera but replacement of one by another, and change is more or less abrupt.*¹⁵⁵

This shows that the argument that “Transitional-form fossils have not been found yet, but may be in the future,” put forward by evolutionist for the last century and a half, no longer has any validity. The fossil record is sufficiently rich for us to understand the origin of life,

and from it a very concrete picture emerges: different living species appeared suddenly and separately on Earth, with all their different structures, and with no transitional forms between them.

Evolutionary humanism

Julian Huxley, one of Darwin’s leading supporters, sought to place the latter’s biological argument onto a philosophical footing and constructed a new religion under the name of evolutionary humanism.

The aim of this religion was to “ensure that the evolutionary process on Earth reached its maximum conclusion.” This was not restricted to strong organisms living longer and trying to reproduce more offspring. In addition, “it was foreseen that man would develop his own abilities to the highest level.” To put it another way, efforts were to be made to enable mankind to proceed to stages more advanced than the one that human beings are in today. Huxley offered a full definition of the term Humanism:

*I use the word ‘Humanist’ to mean someone who believes that man is just as much a natural phenomenon as an animal or a plant, that his body, his mind, and his soul were not supernaturally created but are all products of evolution, and that he is not under the control or guidance of any supernatural Being or beings, but has to rely on himself and his own powers.*¹⁵⁶

Huxley's suggestion that human beings' sacred aim was to accelerate their own evolution had a profound effect on the American philosopher John Dewey. He developed this line and founded the movement known as Religious Humanism in 1933, publishing the famous *Humanist Manifesto*. The main idea he emphasized was that the time had come for the traditional Theistic (God-oriented) religions to be done away with and replaced by a new system based on scientific progress and social cooperation.

The deaths of 50 million people in World War II as a result of "scientific progress" rocked the optimism exhibited in the *Humanist Manifesto*. In the wake of similar blows, Dewey's followers were forced to partially revise their views, and they published the second *Humanist Manifesto* in 1973. This one admitted that science may sometimes harm mankind, but preserved the basic idea: Man should now direct his own evolution and could do so through science. As the *Manifesto* said:

*Using technology wisely, we can control our environment, conquer poverty, markedly reduce disease, extend our life-span, significantly modify our behavior, alter the course of human evolution and cultural development, unlock vast new powers, and provide humankind with unparalleled opportunity for achieving an abundant and meaningful life.*¹⁵⁷

In fact these ideas, adopted consciously or subconsciously by all Darwi-

nists, make crystal clear the fundamental beliefs of the *Religion of Evolution*. An imaginary process of species evolution is first dreamed up, and it is then assumed that this process is the creator of everything. The further, it is thought that this process can represent salvation for humanity, and it is believed that humanity's sacred destiny is to serve that process. In short, evolution is both a Creator, and a savior, and a sacred purpose. To short, it is worshipped as a deity.

Evolutionary paganism

Some people believe in Divine religions revealed to them by God. Others, are devoted to religions they have made up for themselves or that have been produced by the society they live in. Some worship totems, others the Sun, while others beseech beings from outer space.

These second groups ascribe partners to God and are commonly defined as pagans in Western literature.

Evolutionists also adopt the theory of evolution, and indeed use science as a general religion. These people say they place their faith in scientific fact proven by means of concrete evidence. They also regard themselves as representatives of a concrete reality, superior to religion. These deceptive claims of evolutionist pagans place them in an imaginary position above other religious believers. For them, accordingly, other religions are subjective beliefs, whereas evolution is

an objective reality. Using the false authority bestowed by this deception, they call on other religious believers to follow them. According to the evolutionist's argument, if other religions accept evolution and the concepts that follow from it, then all socio-political measures based on evolution will be perceived as a moral teaching.

George Gaylord Simpson, one of the most important figures in the neo-Darwinist movement, makes this clear:

Of course there are some beliefs still current, labeled as religious and involved in religious emotions that are flatly incompatible with evolution and therefore are intellectually untenable in spite of their emotional appeal. Nevertheless, I take it as now self-evident, requiring no further special discussion, that evolution and true religion are compatible.¹⁵⁸


This implies that evolution and the scientific teachings developed on the basis of it have the authority to judge other religions. It will be up to evolutionist science to decide which religions or which interpretation will be regarded as the "true" one. The teaching referred to as true religion makes no claims regarding the observable universe and that makes do solely with setting out moral criteria for human beings. Everything to do with the observable universe—science, economics, politics, law, etc—is to be determined in the light of an evolutionary conception.

While this totalitarian approach imposes the theory of evolution on society as a scientific fact, it also keeps a tight reign on scientific circles. Most present-day biologists worship the pagan religion in question, and any who do not share that belief are silenced. In this system, the theory of evolution becomes a sacred cow. Scientists who reject evolution lose any chance of rising in their careers.

The well-known professor of anatomy Thomas Dwight describes this as an intellectual dictatorship:

The tyranny of the zeitgeist in the matter of evolution is overwhelming to

a degree of which outsiders have no idea. Not only does it influence (as I admit it does in my own case) our manners of thinking, but there is oppression as in the days of the Terror. How very few of the leaders of science dare tell the truth concerning their own state of mind.¹⁵⁹



False god of chance, the

One evolutionist claim demolished by 20th-century science is that of chance. Research conducted since the 1960s has revealed that all the physical balances in the universe have been delicately regulated for human life. All the physical, chemical and biological laws in the universe, basic forces such as electromagnetism, and the structures of the atom and the elements have all been regulated in such a way as to make human life possible. Western scientists today call this extraordinary creation the **Anthropic Principle**. In other words, every detail in the universe possesses a special creation that enables human life. (See **Anthropic Principle, the.**)

The sudden emergence of a complex structure is very definitely not anything that can be explained in terms of chance. For example, if you see a brand-new make of car among the trees in a forest, you will not imagine that various elements combined to produce it over the course of millions of years. All the raw materials in a car, such as iron, plastic and rubber, either come directly from the Earth or are products of it. Yet this does not imply that these substances were randomly synthesized and then combined to produce a car.

Any rational, logical person will naturally realize that the car was designed by intelligent humans and constructed in a factory, and will wonder what it is do-

ing in a forest. Because the sudden emergence of a fully-formed complex structure shows that it was brought into existence by a conscious will. A system as complex as the cell is of course the product of a sublime knowledge and will—in other words, it was created by our Almighty Lord, God.

Evolutionists believe that coincidences can give rise to flawless structures, though here they part ways with reason and logic. The famous French zoologist Pierre Grassé, formerly president of the French Academy of Sciences, is also a materialist, but maintains that Darwinist theory cannot account for life. He says this about the logic of coincidence that represents the foundation of Darwinism:

The opportune appearance of mutations permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding: a single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with an infinitesimal probability could not fail to occur. . . . There is no law against day dreaming, but science must not indulge in it.¹⁶⁰

Grassé goes on to summarize what the concept of coincidence means for evolutionists:

. . . chance becomes a sort of providence, which, under the cover of atheism, is not named but which is secretly worshipped.¹⁶¹

Feathered Dinosaur deception, the

With every new fossil discovery, evolutionists engage in speculation on the link between birds and dinosaurs. However, detailed analyses constantly refute the conjecture that these fossils constitute evidence for reptile-to-bird evolution.

A report titled “Feathered Dinosaur Fossils Unearthed in China” in *National Geographic* magazine in 1996 was thought to represent definitive proof of evolution. But there was an error and a lack of knowledge here. Since there is no evidence that feathered dinosaurs evolved, the report concerning them later proved fictitious.

The article dealt with three theropod dinosaur fossils discovered in China. Great media propaganda sought to portray these as important evidence for evolution. Even in Turkey, certain media organizations devoted wide space to those specious claims.

The fossils described in the *National Geographic* article are:


1. *Archæoraptor*
2. *Sinornithosaurus*
3. *Beipiaosaurus*

According to the information provided in *National Geographic*, all three fossils are around 120 million years old, and members of the theropod dinosaur class. (A theropod is the name given to such carnivorous dinosaur species as *Tyrannosaurus rex* and *Velociraptor*.) However, *National Geographic* also maintained that these dinosaurs had bird-like characteristics. These fossil dinosaurs were covered in feathers, similar to those in birds.

Over the months that followed, however, detailed analysis of the fossil known as *Sinosauropteryx* showed that the structures evolutionists had described as bird feathers were in fact nothing of the sort. An article in *Science* magazine called “Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur” stated that the structures evolutionist paleontologists portrayed as feathers



Sinornithosaurus



Evolutionist paleontologists claimed this fossil was a feathered dinosaur, but later it was determined that the creature did not possess such a characteristic.

actually had nothing to do with feathers at all:

Exactly 1 year ago, paleontologists were abuzz about photos of a so-called "feathered dinosaur." . . . The Sinosauropteryx specimen from the Yixian Formation in China made the front page of The New York Times, and was viewed by some as confirming the dinosaurian origins of birds. But at this year's vertebrate paleontology meeting in Chicago late last month, the verdict was a bit different: The structures are not modern feathers, say the roughly half-dozen Western paleontologists who have seen the specimens. . . . Paleontologist Larry Martin of Kansas University, Lawrence, thinks the structures are frayed collagenous fibers beneath the skin—and so have nothing to do with birds.¹⁶²

Following the failure of their speculation with regard to *Sinosauropteryx*, evolutionists moved their attention to new fossil discoveries known as *Archaeoraptor*, *Sinornithosaurus* and *Beipiaosaurus*. (See **Archaeoraptor**). A dogmatic approach to evolution, a lack of thought and belief in a preconception lead to such errors and erroneous interpretations. The fossils in question establish no connection between birds and dinosaurs, but rather raise a number of inconsistencies and contradictions, some of which may be summed up as follows:

The fossils discovered in China and known as *Archaeoraptor*, *Sinornithosaurus* and *Beipiaosaurus* are depicted as

part birds and part dinosaurs. The evolutionist paleontologist Chris Sloan who interpreted the fossils suggests that these creatures were unable to fly, but used their wings for balance when running. In other words, they need to be regarded as the forerunners of birds and were as yet incapable of flight.

There is an enormous inconsistency here, because these fossils are only 120 million years old. Yet *Archaeopteryx*, the oldest known bird, is already 150 million years old. *Archaeopteryx* had exactly the same flying ability as modern-day birds. It possessed the requisite broad wings, asymmetric and complex feather structure and sternum (breast) bone for flight. Evolutionists have for long attempted to portray *Archaeopteryx* as the primitive forerunner of birds. Yet the greatest problem they face is that this vertebrate already possessed all bird-like features and was fully capable of flight.

In short, *Archaeopteryx* proves that ancient birds were flying through the air 150 million years ago. This naturally makes it impossible for fossil dinosaurs that are younger by 30 million years to be regarded as the primitive forerunners of birds that were as yet incapable of flight. This shows an evident contradiction in evolutionist claims regarding *Archaeoraptor*, *Sinornithosaurus* and *Beipiaosaurus*.

Feduccia, Alan

The evolutionist claim seeking to depict *Archaeopteryx* as a transitional form is based on the supposition that birds evolved from dinosaurs. However, Professor Alan Feduccia of the University of North Carolina, one of the world's leading ornithologists—despite being an evolutionist himself—absolutely opposes the theory that birds are related to dinosaurs:



Alan Feduccia

Well, I've studied bird skulls for 25 years and I don't see any similarities whatsoever. I just don't see it. . . . The theropod origins of birds, in my opinion, will be the greatest embarrassment of paleontology of the 20th century.¹⁶³

Finch (*Fringilla coelebs*)

The finches that some evolutionists claim to represent evidence of micro-evolution are actually an example of speciation. It is true that initially, the ancestors of the finches on the Galapagos Islands were rather few in number. However, some finches that arrived on the islands from the

South American continent spread over the islands, and as a result of geographic isolation, variations began to predominate between the two groups. (See **Geographic isolation**.)

The speciation among these birds emerged at exactly this point. It has been seen that when birds belonging to different variations are brought back together again in any way, they lose the instinct to mate with one another. This stems not from any biological difference, but from completely different behavior patterns.

One bird does not regard as a potential mate another variation it has not previously lived together. As a result, these variations failure to interbreed stems not from their turning into biologically different species, but because their living in different geographical regions leaves





The finches with varying beaks that Darwin saw on the Galapagos Islands—and which he thought constituted evidence for his theory—are in fact examples of variation and represent no evidence for the claim of the evolution of species.

them feeling no impulse to do so.

In an effort to use this observation to support their own theories, evolutionists propose a groundless, unscientific distortion along the lines of “Finches speciate among themselves thanks to geographic isolation. This means that if they are exposed to greater natural selection they will soon turn into totally different species.”

But this variation in finches has nothing to do with the formation of new species, as evolutionists maintain. The phenomenon consists of new variations within a species emerging through different gene combinations within the entire finch gene pool. The species is still the same species, and there is no question of any new genes—in other words, any

new information—being added to the species’ gene pool.


To give an analogy of how evolutionists distort this evident truth on the genetic variation in finches for their own advantage, pick up a pack of playing cards and shuffle it a few times. No new or different cards will ever emerge. All that happens is that the order of the cards changes.

The variation within finches is exactly the same. No new gene is added to the these birds’ gene pool, and the finches never turn into another species of bird. They merely exhibit variation within themselves. Many living things in nature display even extensive variations, but none of them is evidence for evolution.

Five-digit homology

Just about every book about evolution points to the hand and foot structure of tetrapods—that is, land-dwelling vertebrates—as an example of homology. Tetrapods have five digits on their front and rear feet. Even if these do not always fully resemble fingers or toes, these creatures are still regarded as *pentadactyl* (having five digits) because of their bone structure.

The hands and feet of a frog, a lizard, a squirrel or a monkey are all of this kind. Even the bone structures of birds and bats agree with this basic design. Therefore, evolutionists claim that all these life forms are evolved from a single common ancestor and for long, they regarded the phenomenon of pentadactylism as evidence of this. In our own time, however, it was realized that this claim actually lacked any scientific validity.



The fact that almost all terrestrial vertebrates have five digits on their hands and feet was for years portrayed by evolutionists as great evidence for Darwinism. However, the latest research has revealed that these bone structures are controlled by very different genes. Thus the five-digit homology hypothesis has now collapsed.

Even evolutionists admit that pentadactylism is a characteristic found in different living groups among which they cannot construct any evolutionary relationship. For example, in two separate articles published in 1991 and 1996, the evolutionist biologist M. Coates states that the phenomenon of pentadactylism emerged on two separate occasions, independently of one another. According to Coates, a pentadactyl structure emerged in both *Anthracosaurus* and in amphibians, quite independently of each other.¹⁶⁴ This finding indicates that pentadactylism cannot represent any evidence for the hypothesis of a common ancestor. (See **Common ancestor**.)

Another difficulty for the evolutionists is that these vertebrates have five digits on *both* their front and hind feet. Yet nowhere in the evolutionist literature is it suggested that front and back feet developed from a common *ancestor* and it is not hypothesized that they then developed independently. Therefore, we would expect front and back feet to have different structures as a result of different random mutations.

Michael Denton has this to say on the subject:

[T]he forelimbs of all terrestrial vertebrates are constructed according to the same pentadactyl design, and this is attributed by evolutionary biologists as showing that all have been derived from a common ancestral source. But the hind limbs of all vertebrates also conform to the pentadactyl pattern and are strikingly

similar to the forelimbs in bone structure and in their detailed embryological development. Yet no evolutionist claims that the hind limb evolved from the forelimb, or that hind limbs and forelimbs evolved from a common source. . . . Invariably, as biological knowledge has grown, common genealogy as an explanation for similarity has tended to grow ever more tenuous. . . . Like so much of the other circumstantial "evidence" for evolution, that drawn from homology is not convincing because it entails too many anomalies, too many counter-instances, far too many phenomena which simply do not fit easily into the orthodox picture.¹⁶⁵

The real blow to the claim of five-digit homology, so long propagated in evolutionist publications, was dealt by molecular biology. The hypothesis collapsed when it was realized that finger structure was controlled by different genes in different species with a pentadactyl digit structure.

The biologist John Randall describes the collapse of the evolutionist thesis regarding pentadactylism:

The older textbooks on evolution make much of the idea of homology, pointing out the obvious resemblances between the skeletons of the limbs of different animals. Thus the 'pentadactyl' [five bone] limb pattern is found in the arm of a man, the wing of a bird, and flipper of a whale, and this is held to indicate their common origin. Now, if these various structures were transmitted by the same gene couples, varied from time to time by mutations and acted upon by environmental selecti-

on, the theory would make good sense. Unfortunately this is not the case. Homologous organs are now known to be produced by totally different gene complexes in the different species. The concept of homology in terms of similar genes handed on from a common ancestor has broken down.¹⁶⁶

Fliermans, Carl

Indiana University Professor of Microbiology Carl Fliermans, a renowned scientist, carried out research supported by the U.S. Department of Defense on “the neutralization of chemical wastes

by bacteria.” At a conference on “The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution: The Fact of Creation” held by the Science Research Foundation on 5 July 1998, he responded to evolutionist claims at the biochemical level:

Modern biochemistry proves that organisms are marvelously designed, and this fact alone proves the existence of the Creator.¹⁶⁷

Flying reptiles

This interesting subclass of reptiles first emerged some 200 million years ago in the Upper Triassic Period and later became extinct. All are reptiles, be-



Eudimorphodon, one of the oldest species of flying reptile. This fossilized specimen, found in northern Italy, is around 220 million years old.



The wing membranes of flying reptiles are attached to a fourth finger some 20 times longer than the other digits. The important feature is that this unique wing structure appears suddenly in the fossil records. There are no intermediate forms to show how the fourth finger developed gradually—in other words, that it extended through evolution.

cause they bear fundamental reptilian features: cold-blooded metabolisms (unable to produce their own heat), and bodies covered in scales. However, thanks to their powerful wings, they were able to fly.

Various popular evolutionist publications portray flying reptiles as a paleontological discovery that supports Darwinism—or at least, give such an impression. In fact, however, their origin constitutes a major dilemma for the theory of evolution: The flying reptiles emerge in the fossil record suddenly and fully formed, with no intermediate form between them and terrestrial reptiles. They have perfectly created powerful wings, which no land reptiles possess. Yet no fossil of a half-winged creature has ever been discovered.

In fact, it is impossible for half-winged creatures ever to have existed. Had such fictitious animals ever lived, they would have been at a disadvantage compared to other species, having lost the use of their front legs, but still being unable

to fly. In that case, according to the logic of evolution itself, they would have swiftly gone extinct.

When examined, the wing structure of flying reptiles is seen that as too flawless and sophisticated to be explained in terms of evolution. Flying reptiles have five fingers on their wings, as do other reptiles do on their front limbs. However, the fourth finger is some 20 times longer than the others, and the wing stretches out from it as a membrane. Had terrestrial reptiles actually evolved into flying reptiles, then the fourth finger in question could only have lengthened gradually—and in stages. Not just the fourth finger but *all* structural wing changes must have come about through mutations, and the entire process must have constituted an advantage for these animals.

Professor Duane T. Gish, a foremost critic of the theory of evolution on the paleontological level, makes this comment:

The very notion that a land reptile could have gradually been converted into a flying reptile is absurd. The incipient, part-

*way evolved structures, rather than conferring advantages to the intermediate stages, would have been a great disadvantage. For example, evolutionists suppose that, strange as it may seem, mutations occurred that affected only the fourth fingers a little bit at a time. Of course, other random mutations occurring concurrently, incredible as it may seem, were responsible for the gradual origin of the wing membrane, flight muscles, tendons, nerves, blood vessels, and other structures necessary to form the wings. At some stage, the developing flying reptile would have had about 25 percent wings. This strange creature would never survive, however. What good are 25 percent wings? Obviously the creature could not fly, and he could no longer run.*¹⁶⁸

It is impossible to account for the origin of flying reptiles in terms of Darwinist evolutionary mechanisms. Indeed, the fossils make it clear that no such evolution ever took place. All that exists in the fossil record are perfect, flying reptiles, along with land-dwelling reptiles of the kind we are familiar with today.

Robert L. Carroll, an evolutionist himself and one of the most eminent figures in the world of vertebrate paleontology, makes this confession:

*... all the Triassic pterosaurs were highly specialized for flight ... They provide ... no evidence of earlier stages in the origin of flight.*¹⁶⁹

None of the flying reptiles provides any evidence for evolution. However,

since for most people the word *reptile* implies a land-dwelling vertebrate, evolutionist publications seek to lump the pterodactyls in with dinosaurs and write about “reptiles opening and closing their wings.” But in fact, land reptiles and flying reptiles emerged with no evolutionary links between them.

Fluoride testing

One method used to determine the age of fossils is fluoride testing, first tried on a number of ancient fossils in 1949 by Kenneth Oakley of the British Museum’s Paleontology Department. Using this technique, an experiment was performed on the Piltdown Man fossil and showed that the “fossil” jawbone contained no fluoride—thus revealing that it had been in the earth for no more than a few years.

The skull, which contained a small amount of fluoride, however, could have been only a few thousand years old.

Subsequent research conducted on the basis of fluoride testing revealed that the skull was indeed only a few thousand years old. It was also determined that the teeth in the jawbone were those of an orangutan and had been artificially abraded, and that the primitive tools found near the fossil were replicas that had been created using steel tools.¹⁷⁰ Detailed analysis by Joseph Weiner definitively revealed the fossil’s fraudulent nature in 1953. The skull was human, but

only 500 years old, whereas the jawbone belonged to a newly deceased orangutan! (See **Pittdown Man**.)

Fossil

This is the name given to the remains or traces of a plant or animal preserved in the Earth's strata. The word itself is of Latin origin, signifying to dig. Fossils collected from all over the world provide detailed information about the organisms that have lived on Earth since life began.

Under normal conditions, when an animal dies, all traces of it quickly disappear. The body may be removed by scavengers or broken down by micro-organisms, after which no trace of the animal is left. Remains are only preserved under exceptional circumstances.¹⁷¹ For that reason, only a very few organisms are preserved as fossils after they die. The fossilization of any organism generally depends on two conditions being met:

1. *Swift burial*, so that it is protected against attacks by scavengers,
2. *The presence of hard body parts*, capable of being fossilized.

The most efficient environment for fossilization is a muddy, clay-rich one. After any organism that falls—or is dragged—into such an environment, the elements around harden, forming a mould. Later, the soft tissues of the organism itself generally disappear, due to

decay, but the mould or cast remains. If minerals subsequently fill the hollow, the result is an exact copy of the organism's outline. If the body parts are replaced with different minerals, this is known as *petrification*. So perfect can this petrification sometimes be that anatomical studies can even be carried out on fossilized specimens.¹⁷²

Fossils may include not only the hard parts of living things such as bones, teeth, and shells, but can even preserve moulds of various organs and even suggest lifestyles. The shape of bones and how muscles were attached to them can tell us an animal's posture and how it moved.¹⁷³

Fossil research also enables us to obtain information about extinct animals and plants, and when these particular species lived. However, evolutionists also regard fossils as vital in terms of constructing genetic relationships between living things and indicating similarities in their development. They use fossil remains to prove their claim that living things supposedly developed from one another in stages. However, although some 80% of the fossil records have today been uncovered, they have no evidence to offer, apart from a few fossils that subsequently proved to be fakes or the product of distortion. In fact, the fossils in the layers of the Earth confirm that living things have existed in their perfect forms ever since they were first created. (See **Fossil records**, below.)



Ever since Darwin's theory came to dominate the world of science, paleontology has been based upon that theory. Yet despite this, excavations in many regions of the world have provided results that have refuted the theory rather than supporting it. Fossils show that the different living groups on Earth emerged suddenly with all their particular characteristics—in other words, that they were created.

In his 1991 book *Beyond Natural Selection*, the American paleontologist Robert Wesson describes how the gaps in the fossil records are real and objective:

*The gaps in the fossil record are real, however. The absence of a record of any important branching is quite phenomenal. Species are usually static, or nearly so, for long periods, species seldom and genera never show evolution into new species or genera but replacement of one by another, and change is more or less abrupt.*¹⁷⁴

Fossil records

Observational biological findings do not support the claim that different living things are descended from a common forebear, and it is paleontology, the study of fossils, which clarifies this fact. Evolution, they say, is a process that took place in the past, and our only scientific source of information about the history of life is fossil findings.

The famous French zoologist Pierre Paul Grassé has this to say:

*Naturalists must remember that the process of evolution is revealed only through fossil forms. . . Only paleontology can provide them with the evidence of evolution and reveal its course or mechanisms.*¹⁷⁵

According to the theory of evolution, living things are descended from one another. One living species already in existence gradually turned into another,


with all species eventually coming into being in this way. According to the theory, this transition took place over hundreds of millions of years and proceeded in stages. That being the case, countless transitional forms should have appeared and persisted over a fairly lengthy time frame. (See **Transitional Forms.**)

Indeed, the number of these transitional forms should be even greater than that of the species we know of today. Darwin admitted that this represented an enormous difficulty for his theory in the chapter “Difficulties on Theory” of his book *The Origin of Species*:

*Why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined. . . . But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth? . . . Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.*¹⁷⁶

The argument that Darwin proposed 140 years ago in the face of the absence of transitional form fossils—that there may be no transitional forms now, but these may be discovered through later research—is no longer valid. Today’s

THE FOSSIL RECORD ARGUES AGAINST THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION



The theory of evolution maintains that the different basic living groups (phyla) arose from a single common ancestor and diverged by developing and becoming more complex over the course of eons. The above diagram illustrates this claim: According to Darwinism, life forms must have diverged like the branches of a tree.

The fossil record, however, reveals the

exact opposite of this. As can be seen in the diagram below, the different living groups on Earth appeared suddenly and with all their different structures completely developed.

Some 100 basic living classes (phyla) appeared suddenly in the Cambrian Period. There was no subsequent rise in their number, but actually a decrease, because some phyla became extinct.

paleontological data show exceedingly rich fossil records. On the basis of the billions of fossils discovered in various regions of the world, some 250,000 different species have been described. They bear an extraordinary resemblance to the 1.5 million or so species alive today.¹⁷⁷ It seems impossible that any transitional forms will be unearthed by new excavations, given the absence of any transitional forms so far in such a rich array of fossil specimens.

T. Neville George, a Glasgow University professor of paleontology, admitted as much years ago:

*There is no need to apologize any longer for the poverty of the fossil record. In some ways it has become almost unmanageably rich, and discovery is outpacing integration. . . . The fossil record nevertheless continues to be composed mainly of gaps.*¹⁷⁸

Niles Eldredge, the well-known Harvard University paleontologist, refutes Darwin's claim that the fossil records are inadequate, which is why we are unable to find any transitional forms:

*The record jumps, and all the evidence shows that the record is real: The gaps we see [in the fossil record] reflect real events in life's history—not the artifact of a poor fossil record.*¹⁷⁹

Darwinists no longer claim the fossil record is not adequate on the account that fossil findings have almost provided all the samples. Main part of the earth is already examined and paleontology has

put forward the truth that not “even one intermediary form” exists and living beings which existed for millions of years have “not changed” at all. Evolutionist writer Gordon R. Taylor describes this as follows:

*One of the most astonishing features in the fossil record is the way in which new phyla have quietly appeared and carried on without making much impact for a while, and then have suddenly diversified into numerous life forms. This is called by paleontologists “explosive radiation”. (The word is used merely in its basic sense of lines radiating from a point.)*¹⁸⁰

George Gaylord Simpson, evolutionist paleontologist at the American Museum of Natural History makes the confession:

*This is true of all the thirty-two orders of mammals. . . . The earliest and most primitive known members of every order already have the basic ordinal characters, and in no case is an approximately continuous sequence from one order to another known. In most cases the break is so sharp and the gap so large that the origin of the order is speculative and much disputed.... This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by paleontologists. It is true of almost all classes of animals, both vertebrate and invertebrate . . . it is true of the classes, and of the major animal phyla, and it is apparently also true of analogous categories of plants.*¹⁸¹

In the journal *Science*, D.S. Woodroff of California University sets out this grave disappointment suffered by evolutionists:

*But fossil species remain unchanged throughout most of their history and the record fails to contain a single example of a significant transition.*¹⁸²

Fox Experiment, the

Amino acids release water molecules as they combine chemically to form proteins. According to this behavior, known as the Le Chatelier's principle, it is not

possible for a reaction that gives off water (a so-called condensation reaction) to take place in an environment containing water. (See **Le Chatelier's Principle, the.**) Therefore, the oceans—where evolutionists say that life began—are definitely unlikely, unsuitable places for amino acids to combine and produce proteins.

Given this “water problem” that so demolished all their theories, evolutionists began to construct new scenarios. Sydney Fox, the best-known of these researchers, came up with an interesting theory to resolve the difficulty. He theorized that immediately after the first amino acids had formed in the primitive ocean,



FOX'S “PROTEINOIDS”

Under the influence of Miller's scenario, Stanley Fox combined certain amino acids to form the molecules above, which he called proteinoids. However, these useless amino acid chains had nothing to do with the real proteins that make up living organisms. In fact, all his endeavors confirmed that life cannot be created in the laboratory, let alone come into being by chance.

they must have been splashed onto the rocks by the side of a volcano. The water in the mixture containing the amino acids must then have evaporated due to the high temperature in the rocks. In this way, amino acids could have distilled and combined—to give rise to proteins.

But his complicated account pleased nobody. Amino acids could not have exhibited a resistance to heat of the kind that Fox proposed. Research clearly showed that amino acids were destroyed at higher temperatures. Even so, Fox refused to abandon his claim.

He combined purified amino acids by heating them in a dry environment in the laboratory under very special conditions. The amino acids were duly combined, but he still obtained no proteins. . . What he did obtain were simple, disordered amino-acid sequences, bound to one another in a random manner, that were far from resembling the proteins of any living thing. Moreover, had Fox kept the amino acids at the same temperature, the useless links that did emerge would have immediately broken down again.¹⁸³

Another point that makes his experiment meaningless is that Fox used pure amino acids from living organisms, rather than those obtained in the Miller Experiment. In fact, however, the experiment, claimed to be an extension of the Miller Experiment, should have continued from the conclusion of that experiment. Yet neither Fox nor any other re-

archer used the useless amino acids that Miller produced.¹⁸⁴

This experiment of Fox's was not received all that positively by evolutionist circles because it was obvious that the amino acid chains (proteinoids) he obtained were not only meaningless, but could not have emerged under natural conditions. In addition, proteins—the building blocks of life—had still not been obtained. The problem of proteins had still not been solved.

An article published in *Chemical Engineering News*, a science magazine in the 1970s, said this about the experiment conducted by Fox:

*Sydney Fox and the other researchers managed to unite the amino acids in the shape of "proteinoids" by using very special heating techniques under conditions which in fact did not exist at all in the primordial stages of Earth. Also, they are not at all similar to the very regular proteins present in living things. They are nothing but useless, irregular chemical stains. It was explained that even if such molecules had formed in the early ages, they would definitely be destroyed.*¹⁸⁵

The proteinoids that Fox obtained were certainly far from being true proteins in terms of structure and function. There were as different from proteins as a complex technological device is from a heap of scrap metal.

Furthermore, these irregular collections of amino acids had no chance of surviving in the primitive atmosphere. Un-

der the conditions of that time, destructive chemical and physical effects produced by the intense ultraviolet rays reaching the Earth and by uncontrolled natural conditions would have broken down these proteinoids and made it impossible for them to survive. Because of the Le Chatelier's principle, there can be no question of these amino acids being underwater where ultraviolet rays could not reach them. In the light of all these facts, the idea that proteinoid molecules represented the beginning of life increasingly lost all credibility among scientists.




Sydney Fox

Fox, Sydney

Sydney Fox maintained that proteins, the building blocks of life, had formed by chance from amino acids and carried out an experiment in an attempt to demonstrate this. (See **Fox Experiment**, *the*.)

Under the influence of Miller's scenario, Fox combined various amino acids and produced molecules he named "proteinoids". However, these functionless amino acid chains had nothing to do with the actual proteins that compose living things. In fact, all of Fox's endeavors documented that life could not be produced in the la-



Ever since the beginning of the last century, evolutionist biologists have exposed flies to mutations and looked for examples of beneficial ones. However, all that has ever been obtained are sick, deformed and imperfect flies. The picture shows a normal fly's head and another, belonging to a fruit fly subjected to mutation, with legs emerging from it.

boratory, let alone come into being by chance.

Fruit flies

All evolutionist efforts to establish beneficial mutations have ended in failure. In order to reverse this pattern, evolutionists have for decades been carrying out experiments on fruit flies, which reproduce very quickly and which can easily be subjected to mutations. Scientists have encouraged these insects to undergo all kinds of mutations, a great many times. However, not one single useful mutation has ever been observed.

The evolutionist geneticist Gordon R. Taylor describes these evolutionists' pointless persistence:

*It is a striking, but not much mentioned fact that, though geneticists have been breeding fruit flies for sixty years or more in labs all round the world—flies which produce a new generation every eleven days—they have never yet seen the emergence of a new species or even a new enzyme.*¹⁸⁶

Another researcher, Michael Pitman, expresses the failure of the experiments on fruit flies:

... geneticists have subjected generations of fruit flies to extreme conditions of heat, cold, light, dark, and treatment by chemicals and radiation. All sorts of mu-

tations, practically all trivial or positively deleterious, have been produced.

*Man-made evolution? Not really: Few of the geneticists' monsters could have survived outside the bottles they were bred in. In practice mutants die, are sterile, or tend to revert to the wild type.*¹⁸⁷



Douglas
Futuyma

In short, like all other living things, fruit flies possess specially created genetic information. The slightest alteration in that information only leads to harm.

Futuyma, Douglas

In his 1986 book *Evolutionary Biology*, Douglas Futuyma maintained that natural selection was an evolutionary mechanism. The example Futuyma's book cited was that of the color of a moth population turning darker in Britain during the Industrial Revolution—one of the best known such examples. (See **Industrial-Revolution moths, the.**) However, he admitted, “Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed, or they did not. If not, then they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by



*some omnipotent intelligence.”*¹⁸⁸

In addition, Futuyma—one of the best-known exponents of the theory of evolution in our time—indicates the true reason for the importance of the theory: *“Together with Marx’s materialist theory of history and society. . . Darwin heaved the final planks of the platform of mechanism and materialism.”*¹⁸⁹

Galapagos Islands

This group of islands in the Pacific Ocean off the coast of Ecuador contain a great many living species, particularly birds and reptiles. The miraculous diversity that Darwin observed here led him to conclude, in contrast to many others at the time, that all living things had come into existence as the result of chance. He was unable to appreciate the infinite might of God, the Creator of them all. He should have been influenced by the artistry in the universe and as a researcher, have immediately comprehended this fact. But he actually followed a logic that was diametrically opposed.

Although he collected thousands of specimen and preserved them in alcohol, he was interested only in finch species and when he investigated them, made very narrow-minded deductions. Naturally, the thinness, length or shortness of finch beaks can be examined. Yet nobody who thinks along rational and scientific lines should make a deduction solely on the basis of such an investigation about the origin of all living things—for instance how giant whales, different kinds of elephant, flies with their wondrous acrobatic ability, the butterflies with marvelous symmetry on their wings, different fish living under the sea, shellfish, birds, reptiles and, most important of all human beings possessed of reason and consciousness.

Galton, Sir Francis

Like his cousin, Charles Darwin, Sir Francis Galton was interested in biology. In contrast to Darwin, he investigated fields about which little was known: heredity and intelligence. Galton supported the idea of eugenics (which sought to improve the human race by way of heredity) for the development of inherent characteristics an individual possessed since birth. Galton's genetic concept was adopted by Hitler, Churchill and many people who sought to eliminate "unfit" races.

K. Ludmerer states that Darwinism was the reason for the 19th century's increased interest in eugenics:

... modern eugenics thought arose only in the nineteenth century. The emergence of interest in eugenics during that century had multiple roots. The most important was the theory of evolution, for Francis Galton's ideas on eugenics—and it was he who created the term "eugenics"—were a direct logical outgrowth of the scientific doctrine elaborated by his cousin, Charles Darwin.¹⁹⁰

Genes

The DNA data bank found in the cell

nucleus is made up of nucleic acids expressed in shorthand form by the letters A, T, G and C. The molecules represented by these letters combine together in pairs, with each pair forming a rung in the DNA. Genes emerge through these rungs, one on top of the other. Every gene, part of the DNA molecule, controls a particular characteristic in the human body.

All the physical information regarding a living thing—from height to eye color, from the shape of the nose to blood group—is encoded in its genes. There are some 30,000 genes in the human DNA. Every gene consists of between 1,000 and 186,000 nucleotides, depending on the kind of protein it corresponds to, set out in a specific sequence. These genes contain some 30,000 codes controlling the production of these proteins. The information contained in these 30,000 genes represents just 3% of the total information in the DNA. The remaining 97% is still a mystery.

Genes are found inside chromosomes. The nucleus of every human cell (with the exception of reproductive cells) has 46 chromosomes. If each chromosome were compared to a volume and each gene to a page, there is enough information in one cell—which contains all the features of a human being—to fill



a 46-volume encyclopedia. That encyclopedia is equivalent to 920 *Encyclopedia Britannica* volumes.

The letters in the DNA of every human being are arranged differently. That is why all the billions of people who have ever lived on Earth have been different from one another. The basic structure and functions of organs and limbs are the same in everyone. But everyone is specially created with such finely detailed differences. Even though each human being is the product of a single cell dividing, nobody looks exactly the same as anyone else.

All the organs in your body are constructed within the framework of a blueprint describes by the genes. For example, according to scientists, the skin is controlled by 2,559 genes, the brain by 29,930, the eye by 1,794, the salivary glands by 186, the heart by 6,216, the breast by 4,001, the lung by 11,581, the liver by 2,309, the intestines by 3,838, the skeletal muscle by 1,911 and blood cells by 22,092.

The secret behind your survival as a normal human being lies in the fact that the billions of letters in your cells' 46-volume encyclopedia are all arranged flawlessly. It is of course impossible for these letters to organize and arrange themselves through their own consciousness and will. The genes we have compared to the pages of an encyclopedia, and their flawless arrangement that rules out the concept of chance, are proof of



creation.

Gene frequency

Every population—every community consisting of living members of the same species, spread over a specific area—has its own particular genetic structure. This genetic structure is determined by the population's genotype (or individual genetic structure) and gene frequency.

Gene frequency means the percentage of the gene concerned with a specific feature of a living thing in the gene pool (a population's genetic structure) in the total genes. In pea populations, for example, there are two genes for straight and for bent pod characters. The percentage of straight-pod genes in the overall total number gives the straight-pod gene frequency. (See **Gene Pool**.)

One gene frequency being higher than another means that the gene in question is found more frequently in the gene pool and therefore plays a more dominant role in any genetic variation.

Evolutionists, however, seek to depict greater variation within a species as evidence for their theories. But in fact, that variation constitutes no evidence for evolution, because variation is only the product of different combinations of existing genetic information. Variation cannot endow genetic information with any new characteristic. (See **Variation**.)

Populations do not exhibit homogeneous distribution with regard to gene frequency. Within them, there will be small groups whose members resemble one another more closely than others. Such groups may be separated from one another for a time through geographic isolation, but gene transmission between them is not interrupted. (See **Geographic Isolation theory, the**.)

Gene pool

Evolutionists attempt to depict variations within a species as evidence for their theories. However, variation is no evidence for evolution, because variation consists of only the emergence of different combinations of already existing genetic information. It does not endow new genetic information with its apparently new characteristic.

Variation provides a restricted diversity within any one species. These changes are limited because they only diversify already-existing genetic information within a population. It cannot add any genetic information. All that occurs is

that the genetic information that already exists rearranges itself, but the boundaries of that change remain fixed. In genetics, this limit is described as the *gene pool*.

All the features in the gene pool of a given species may emerge in various forms thanks to variation. For example, as a result of variation breeds with slightly longer or shorter legs may emerge in a species of reptile, because the information for leg length already exists in the reptiles' gene pool. But variation can never attach wings to reptiles, add feathers and change their metabolisms, thus turning them into birds. Any such a transformation would require an increase in genetic information, and there is no question of any such thing in variation.

Many breeds of chicken have been bred from wild forest cocks. Yet in our day, the formation of new breeds has come to an end because the limits of change possible in the wild birds' genetic information have been reached, and no new breeds can be produced. This kind of variation represents no evidence for evolution in any way.

The same applies in plant technology. Sugar beet is an excellent example. Starting in the 1800s, farmers began producing new strains of sugar beets by cross-pollination. Following 75 years of research, it became possible to increase the beets' sugar level from 6% to 15%. Shortly afterwards, however, improvement came to a stop. The sugar level co-



Celera Genomics, the company that carried out the Human Genome project

uld not be raised any further, because the limits of change permitted by the sugar beet's genetic information had been reached, and it was not possible to enhance it any further by cross-pollination. This is one of the main examples of the limits to change in genetic data.

Genetic information

The genetic system does not consist of DNA alone. Enzymes must read the DNA code; mRNA will be produced from that reading. The mRNA will take that code to ribosomes and bond to them for production. Carrier RNA will transport the amino acids to be used in production to the ribosome. And countless other highly complex enzymes that will permit intermediate processes to be carried out must all be present.

In addition, such an environment can


only be one like the cell, in which all the raw materials and energy sources are present, and which is completely isolated and controlled. (See **DNA, Ribosomes; RNA World Thesis, the.**)

Genetic homeostasis

Twentieth-century science revealed this principle as a result of various experiments on living things. All their efforts to produce a new species through cross-breeding were pointless, revealing that there are insuperable walls between living species. It was definitely impossible to livestock breeders breeding new variations of cows to turn cows into another species altogether, as Darwin had claimed was possible.

Norman MacBeth revealed the invalidity of Darwinism in his book *Darwin Retried*:

Harun Yahya (Adnan Oktar)



The heart of the problem is whether living things do indeed vary to an unlimited extent. . . . The species look stable. We have all heard of disappointed breeders who carried their work to a certain point only to see the animals or plants revert to where they had started. Despite strenuous efforts for two or three centuries, it has never been possible to produce a blue rose or a black tulip.¹⁹¹

Genome Project, the

Evolutionist circles claim that the Genome Project has proven their theory, but there is no scientific basis to this. Evolutionists engage in hollow claims that the Genome Project has definitively proven the theory of evolution, because they actually have no concrete evidence, and there is no connection at all between the Genome Project's findings and the claims of the theory of evolution.

It is a grave error to think that causing physical changes by tampering with genes constitutes evidence for the theory of evolution. True, within the Human Genome Project defective genes in living things may be able to be put right. Certain inherited diseases may be cured, and a species may be perfected even further through altering its genes. So long as all such interventions take place at the hands of rational human beings possessed of abilities and technology, they will continue to give cures and improvements.

But the most important criticism of

the theory of evolution actually arises at this exact point. The theory claims that genes, proteins, all the building blocks of life—and therefore, life itself—came into being spontaneously as the result of chance, with no consciousness involved at all.

Neither science nor logic can accept such a claim of chance. With the Genome Project, it was yet again realized that life consists of exceedingly complex structures, all interrelated to one another, and that any one cannot exist without all the others. Each one of these structures has a flawless blueprint and design, and it is therefore impossible for such perfect and complex structures to come into existence spontaneously and—again by chance—to further develop themselves into even more complex structures. This shows us one certain fact: God, the Omniscient and Almighty, created life.

Another error in this regard is that some scientists think that since they can effect changes by altering genes, it is actually man who is a creator. This claim is linked to the groundless, atheistic propaganda that evolutionists bring up at every available opportunity because of their denial of God. Tempering with a living organism's genes to produce changes is not the same as creating it. To take cloning, for example, to place a living thing's stem cell in a womb and produce an exact copy of the life form in question is not the same as creating it in the first place.

Creating means bringing into existence from nothing. And evolutionists are perfectly aware that they are quite unable even to produce a single cell from nothing. All their endeavors in this area have ended in failure. (See **Fox Experiment, the and Miller Experiment, the.**)

Far from proving evolution, the findings of the Genome Project have once again revealed the fact of creation.

Geographic Isolation theory, the (Allopathic isolation)

Living things that reproduce sexually may be subjected to geographic isolation when a land bridge collapses or continents drift apart one another. In that event, the same species in two separate regions may display different genetic characteristics. To put it another way, geographic obstacles may divide populations from one another. For example, land-dwelling animals may become separated from one another by deserts, waters, or high mountain ranges.¹⁹² If a population is divided into two or more regions, the genetic differences between them will increasingly broaden and eventually, the life forms in these different regions will develop into different breeds or races.¹⁹³

When this separation reaches such a level as to prevent gene transfer between populations, then the similarity of cha-



The different races on Earth came to have different features due to geographic isolation. The feature of black skin came to predominate in one group, and since these people lived on the same continent and reproduced among themselves, a black-skinned race developed.

racteristics between the different variations of a species is diminished.

Evolutionists erroneously maintain that living things on different continents or in different environments develop into different species. However, the different characteristics arising in different regions are nothing more than population differences. The genetic combination of those life forms obliged to reproduce in any one region is restricted, and speci-

fic characteristics in their genes come to the fore. Yet there is no question of any new species emerging.

The same applies to human beings. The different races on Earth have acquired different characteristics because of geographic isolation. The feature of dark skin came to predominate in one human group, and since these people lived in Africa and reproduced among themselves, a dark-skinned race was the result. The same thing applies to Far Eastern races with their almond-shaped eyes. Were it not for geographic isolation—in other words if human races had inter-married for hundreds of years—then everyone would now be a crossbreed. No one would appear to be black, white, or oriental; everyone would be an average of all racial characteristics.

Sometimes, when variations once divided from each other due to geographic reasons are reunited, they are unable to reproduce with one another. Since they are unable to reproduce, they cease being sub-species, according to modern biology's definition, and become separate species. This is known as *speciation*.

Evolutionists, however, take this concept and infer that since there is speciation in nature, and new species form through natural mechanisms, that impli-

es that all species formed in this way. Yet that inference actually conceals a grave deception.

There are two significant points to be made:

1. Variations A and B, which have been isolated from one another, may be unable to reproduce when reunited again. But this generally stems from mating behavior. In other words, individuals belonging to variation A are regarded as foreign by variation B, and therefore fail to mate, even though there is no genetic incompatibility to prevent mating. In terms of genetic information, therefore, they are still members of the same *species*. (Indeed, for that very reason the concept of “species” continues to be debated in biology.)



2. The really important point is that speciation represents a loss of genetic information, rather than an increase. The reason for the division is not that either or both variations have acquired new genetic information. There is no such genetic acquisition here. Neither variation has acquired any new protein, enzyme or organ. No development has gone on. On the contrary, instead of a population that previously contained genetic data for different characteristics (for example, for both long and short fur, or dark and light coloring), there are now two populations, both been impove-



Duane T. Gish's books criticizing the theory of evolution

rished in terms of genetic information.

Therefore, nothing about speciation supports the theory of evolution. Because the theory of evolution maintains that all living species developed from the simple to the complex through chance. In order for that theory to be taken seriously, therefore, it needs to be able to point to mechanisms that enhance genetic information. It must explain how life forms lacking eyes, ears, a heart, lungs, wings, feet or other organs and systems came to acquire them—and where the genetic data for these features arose. A species being divided into two through a loss of genetic information has nothing to do with evolution.

Gish, Duane T.

In his address titled “The Origin of Man,” presented to the Collapse of the Theory of Evolution: The Fact of Crea-

on conference, held by the Science Research Foundation on 5 July 1998, the world-famous expert on evolution Professor Duane Gish described why the thesis that man evolved from apes is groundless:

*The fossil record refutes the evolutionary theory and it demonstrates that species appeared on Earth fully-formed and well-designed. This is a concrete evidence for that they were created by God.*¹⁹⁴

With his books—mainly on the subject of paleontology—and the more than 500 conferences he has held, Professor Gish is one of the founders of the Institu-



Stephen Jay Gould

te for Creation Research (ICR), and one of the world's most eminent critics of the theory of evolution. The ICR was founded in San Diego, California in the early 1970s, and has since become one of the most important

organizations in the world to criticize the theory of evolution. The ICR has more than 20 scientists, laboratories, a large number of researchers, a faculty that offers postgraduate training, a Museum of Creation that attracts thousands of visitors every year, a team that carries out scientific research in various countries, and also publishes books and magazines and broadcasts radio programs.

Gould, Stephen Jay

Although the late Harvard University paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould is one of the leading proponents of evolution theory, he criticizes evolutionary biologists in stuffing scientific literature with non-evident tales. Gould describes such stories in his following words:

*Evolutionary biology has been severely hampered by a speculative style of argument that records anatomy and ecology and then tries to construct historical or adaptive explanations for why this bone looked like that or why this creature lived here... Scientists know that these tales are stories; unfortunately, they are presented in the professional literature where they are taken too seriously and literally. Then they become [scientific] "facts" and enter the popular literature...*¹⁹⁵

Gould, an evolutionist paleontologist, was also one of the leading theoreticians of the punctuated model of evolution. (See **Punctuated evolution.**) Phillip Johnson, one of the world's leading critics of the theory of evolution, describes Gould as the "Gorbachev of Darwinism." Mikhail Gorbachev sought to revise the system in the former Soviet Union out of a belief that it was imperfect. But in fact, the problems he regarded as imperfections actually stemmed from the nature of the system itself, and Com-

munism finally collapsed entirely.

Gradual Evolution comedy, the

—See, **Punctuated Model of evolution myth, the Great Chain of Being, the**

According to the Greek philosopher Aristotle, there is a hierarchy among species, from the simple to the complex, and these are set out in a linear manner, just like the rungs of a ladder. Aristotle gave this thesis the name *Scala naturae*. This idea would have a profound effect on Western thought up until the 18th century, and belief in the Great Chain of Being, would later develop into the theory of evolution.

The belief that all living things evolved from inanimate matter constitutes the basis of Darwinism, but it can first be encountered in Aristotle's accounts. Belief in the Great Chain of Being was enthusiastically adopted by philosophers who denied the existence of God.

According to this view, life came into being spontaneously and everything evolved—minerals into organic matter, and the first living primitive organisms into animals, plants and human beings, and from there to so-called deities, or gods. According to this irrational belief, new organs arise spontaneously accor-


ding to a living thing's requirements.

This belief has no scientific basis, but rather conflicts with all the scientific facts and is based solely on abstract logic. But it was most recently proposed under the name of the theory of evolution.


Initially, the Great Chain of Being was advanced as an entirely philosophical view and made no scientific claims. However, for those seeking to answer the question of how life came to be, aside from the fact of creation, the Great Chain of Being was literally a lifesaver, and was given a scientific air for that purpose.

How these organisms actually turned into one another, however, is a great mystery. Because this chain is based on an abstract and superficial logic rather than on any scientific observation. In other words, it consists of a hypothesis dreamed up by early philosophers, without engaging in any scientific research.

There is a strong parallel between the theory of evolution, which represents the basis of materialist and atheist philosophies, and the *Scala naturae* and Great Chain of Being that form the vital source of ancient pagan materialist philosophies. (See **Evolutionary Paganism**.) Today, materialism draws strength through the theory of evolution, as in the past, materialist thinking was based on the Great Chain of Being.



Darwin was strongly influenced by this concept and even constructed his theory on its principal logic. In several places in his book *Darwin's Century*, Loren Eiseley emphasizes that the logic of this “ladder” was used in the 18th century and that this, in particular, was where the idea of organic substances moving inevitably towards perfection was born.¹⁹⁶



Ernst Haeckel

finally emerged as the greatest deception in the history of science.

Therefore, Darwin did not propose any new scientific theory. He merely restated a superstition whose roots lay in ancient Sumerian pagan myths and which developed fully within ancient Greek pagan beliefs. He employed contemporary scientific terminology and a few distorted observations, and further enriched it with a number of additions made by some scientists who lived in the 17th and 18th centuries—after which it acquired a scientific appearance in Darwin's book *The Origin of Species*, and



This *Hallucigenia* fossil, one of the life forms that suddenly emerged in the Cambrian Period, has spines for protection.

Haeckel, Ernst

The famous evolutionist biologist Ernst Haeckel was a close friend and supporter of Darwin. To support the theory of evolution, he put forward the theory of recapitulation, which maintained that the embryos of different life forms resembled one another in their initial stages. It was later realized that in putting forward that claim, Haeckel had produced forged drawings. (See **Embryological evolution**.)

While perpetrating such scientific frauds, Haeckel also engaged in propaganda in favor of eugenics. He was the first to adopt and disseminate the idea of eugenics in Germany. (See **Eugenic slaughter**.) He recommended that deformed newborns babies should be killed without delay and that the evolution of society would thus be accelerated. He went even further, maintaining that lepers, patients with cancer and the mentally ill should be ruthlessly done away with, lest such people prove to be a burden on society and slow its evolution.

George Stein summarized Haeckel's blind devotion to the theory of evolution:

*... [Haeckel] argued that Darwin was correct ... humankind had unquestionably evolved from the animal kingdom. . . humankind's social and political existence is governed by the laws of evolution, natural selection, and biology, as clearly shown by Darwin. To argue otherwise was backward superstition.*¹⁹⁷

Hallucigenia

This is one of the life forms that emerged suddenly in the Cambrian Period in its perfect form. (See **Cambrian Period**.) This Cambrian fossil has sharp spines to protect it against attack—and evolutionists are unable to explain how this creature came to have such excellent protection at a time when there were no predators around. The absence of predators makes it impossible to account for this in terms of natural selection.

Heterotrophic view, the

The heterotrophic view is one of the most researched theses regarding the emergence of the first life. According to this view, a consuming life form absorbs from its outside environment the organic molecules it needs for the formation of structures and to meet its energy requirements. This theory maintains that the first life form fed on organic compounds that formed spontaneously within a highly complex framework. It had no need for a gene system to enable it to synthesize the simple organic molecules it absorbed from the environment. In other words, this hypothetical first living thing was able to maintain its vital functions as a simple-structured feeder in a complex environment.

According to this view, chemical evolution took place before life formed. As



The wings of the modern bird *Opisthocomus hoatzin* have claw-like talons, just like *Archaeopteryx*.

the result of the lengthy evolution of inanimate substances, heterotrophic life forms emerged. Again according to this view, there was no free oxygen in the primeval atmosphere. The gasses assumed to have existed then—ammonia (NH_3), methane (CH_4), hydrogen (H_2) and water vapor (H_2O)—underwent chemical reactions with high-energy ultraviolet rays and gave rise to more complex compounds. At the end of these reactions, the substances that emerged by chance first combined in tiny droplets of water and

were gradually transported to the seas and oceans where, it's assumed, they gave rise to simple organic compounds.

All the research conducted to confirm this hypothesis has ended in failure. This has not even been possible in controlled laboratory experiments, let alone as the work of chance. (See **Fox Experiment, the and Miller Experiment, the.**)

Hoatzin bird, the

The points on which evolutionist base their portrayal of *Archaeopteryx* as a transitional form are its skeleton, which resembles that of dinosaurs, the claws on its wings, and the teeth in its mouth. (See *Archaeopteryx*.) They therefore claim that *Archaeopteryx* was a transitional form that still had many reptilian features, but had newly acquired some bird-like ones.

However, the “reptilian” features in question do not actually make *Archaeopteryx* a reptile at all. The claims put forward pointing to its claws are particularly invalid, because there are birds with clawed wings alive today. Just like *Archaeopteryx*, the Australian Hoatzin has clawed wings.¹⁹⁸ Again like *Archaeopteryx*, it flies with a small breastbone. However, for that reason alone, evolutionists claim that *Archaeopteryx* was unable to fly, or could not fly very well. This demonstrates that such features as claws,



HOMO ERECTUS' MARITIME CULTURE

According to "Ancient Mariners: Early humans were much smarter than we suspected" an article published in *New Scientist* magazine on 14 March 1998, the human beings whom evolutionists refer to as *Homo erectus* were building boats some 700,000 years ago. It is of course out of the question to regard people possessed of boat-building knowledge as primitive.



THIS WEEK

Ancient mariners

Early humans were much smarter than we suspected

Older ancestors made organized sea journeys more than 700,000 years earlier than previously thought—and they probably used language to coordinate their efforts.

Then surprising new theory comes from paleoanthropologist Mike Morwood and his colleagues at the University of New England in northern New South Wales. It is the result of an intriguing find during their exploration of an ancient lake bed at Santa Monica in Australia in 1997.

ask surrounding the tools were between 800,000 and 400,000 years old. Fossil plants and animals found near the tools dated from the same period.

The researchers believe the tools were used by the ancestral human species *Homo erectus*.



HOMO ERECTUS' MARITIME CULTURE

According to "Ancient Mariners: Early humans were much smarter than we suspected" an article published in *New Scientist* magazine on 14 March 1998, the human beings whom evolutionists refer to as *Homo erectus* were building boats some 700,000 years ago. It is of course out of the question to regard people possessed of boat-building knowledge as primitive.

teeth and skeletal structure like those in *Archaeopteryx* make it a unique species of bird, not a reptile.

However, all kinds of biased interpretations can be made from the evolutionist perspective. Were a fossil Hoatzin discovered today in the appropriate geological strata, very likely it would be proposed as a transitional form, in the same way as *Archaeopteryx* was. But the fact that this creature is still alive and manifestly a bird does not let evolutionists make any such claim.

Homo antecessor

The most astonishing fact to tear up the imaginary tree of life by its very roots is the way that *Homo sapiens* dates back to unexpectedly early times. Paleontological findings show that human

beings identical to the *H. sapiens* were living nearly a million years ago.

The findings on this subject¹⁹⁹ were rejected by some evolutionist paleoanthropologists, because of their damaging implications for the evolutionary family tree. One fossil discovered in Atapuerca in Spain in 1995 revealed in a most striking manner that *H. sapiens* was far older than had been thought. (See **Atapuerca**.) This fossil indicated that the history of *H. sapiens* needed to be put back to at least 800,000 years ago. However, once they had got over their initial shock, evolutionists decided that the fossil belonged to a different species, because—according to the evolutionary family tree—*H. sapiens* could not have been alive 800,000 years ago. They therefore came up with an imaginary speci-

es known as *Homo antecessor*, to which they ascribed the Atapuerca skull.

Homo erectus

Evolutionists regard the classification on *Homo erectus*, meaning “upright-walking human,” as the most primitive species on the fictitious human family tree. They have had to separate these humans from other, earlier classes by means of the title *upright*, because all the *H. erectus* fossils we have are erect in a manner not seen in specimens of *Australopithecus* or *Homo habilis*. There is no difference between *H. erectus* skeletons and those of modern human beings.

Evolutionists’ most important grounds for regarding *H. erectus* as “primitive” are the fact that its brain volume (900 to 1100 cubic centimeters) is smaller than the modern human average, and also its thick protruding eyebrow ridges. The fact is, however, that a great many human beings today have a brain size identical to that of *H. erectus* (pygmies, for example), and eyebrow protrusions can also be seen in various contemporary human races, such as native Australians. It is known that there is no correlation between brain size and intelligence and ability. Intelligence varies not according to brain size, but according to its internal organization.²⁰⁰

The fossils that introduced *H. erectus* to the world were Peking Man and Java Man fossils, both discovered in Asia.

However, it was gradually realized that these two remains were not reliable. (See **Java Man, Peking Man.**) For that reason, more and more importance began to be attached to the *H. erectus* fossils discovered in Africa. (Also, some evolutionists included some of the fossils described as *H. erectus* in a second class, *Homo ergaster*, by. The matter is still a subject of debate.)

The best-known of the *H. erectus* specimens discovered in Africa is *Nariokotome homo erectus* or the so-called Turkana Boy. The fossil’s upright skeleton is identical to that of modern man.²⁰¹ Therefore, *H. erectus* is a human race that is still in existence today. (See **Turkana Boy, the.**)

Professor William Laughlin of the University of Connecticut carried out lengthy anatomical research into Inuit and the inhabitants of the Aleut Islands and noted that these people bore an astonishingly close resemblance to *H. erectus*. Laughlin’s conclusion was that all these races are actually different races all belonging to *H. sapiens*, or today’s man:

*When we consider the vast differences that exist between remote groups such as Eskimos and Bushmen, who are known to belong to the single species of Homo sapiens, it seems justifiable to conclude that Sinanthropus [an erectus specimen] belongs within this same diverse species [H. sapiens].*²⁰²

There is an enormous gulf between *Homo erectus*, a human race, and the

apes that precede it (*Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, *H. rudolfensis*) in the scenario of human evolution. In other words, the first humans to appear in the fossil records emerged suddenly, all at the same time, and in the absence of any process of evolution. There could be no clearer indication that they were created.

However, acceptance of this fact would constitute a violation of evolutionists' dogmatic philosophies and ideologies. Therefore, they seek to depict *H. erectus*, a human race, as a semi-ape.



That is why they insist on giving *H. erectus* an ape-like appearance in the reconstructions they produce. (For detailed information, see *The Evolution Deceit* by Harun Yahya.)

Homo ergaster

Some of the fossils described as *Homo erectus* ("upright-walking human") are classified as *Homo ergaster* by certain evolutionists. There is no agreement among evolutionists regarding this second classification. (See **Homo erectus**.)



Analyses of the teeth of the species *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis* (at side) shows that these belong to the same category as African apes.

Homo habilis

The fact that *Australopithecus* is nearly identical to chimpanzees in terms of their skull and skeletal structures, plus the emergence of concrete evidence that demolished the claim that these creatures walked upright, left evolutionist paleoanthropologists in a rather difficult position. Because *Australopithecus* is followed by *Homo erectus* in the imaginary course of evolution.

As can be seen from the use of the term *Homo* in its Latin name, *Homo habilis* is a human group and has a completely upright skeleton. Its skull volume is up to double that of *Australopithecus*. According to the imaginary family tree, *H. erectus* with a skeleton identical to that of modern man, coming immediately after *Australopithecus*, a species of ape similar to chimpanzees, cannot be explained in terms of the theory of evolution. Therefore, links or transitional forms are necessary. It is this difficulty that gave rise to the concept of *Homo habilis*.

In the 1960s, the Leakeys, the fossil hunter family, proposed the classification *Homo habilis*. According to the Leakeys, this new species classified as *H. habilis* possessed the ability to walk upright, had a relatively large brain, and was able to use tools made of stone and wood. It may therefore have been an ancestor of modern man.

New fossils belonging to the same species discovered after the mid-1980s

totally altered that view. Researchers such as Bernard Wood and Loring Brace said that the term *Australopithecus habilis* or “tool-using South African ape” should be employed instead of *Homo habilis*, which means “tool-using human,” because *H. habilis* shared a great many characteristics with the apes known as *Australopithecus*.

Just like *Australopithecus*, it had a long-armed, short-legged and ape-like skeletal structure. Its fingers and toes were suited to climbing. Its jaw structure completely resembles that of modern apes. Its 500-cubic-centimeter brain size was the best indication that it was in fact an ape. In short, *H. habilis*, portrayed as a separate species by some evolutionists, was actually an ape just like all other *Australopithecus*.

Detailed analyses conducted by the



Homo heidelbergensis fossils show that human beings bearing a close resemblance to modern Europeans were living in Britain and Spain some 740,000 years ago.

American anthropologist Holly Smith in 1994 again showed that *H. habilis* was not *homo* at all, but rather a monkey. Smith said this about these analyses of the teeth of *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, *H. erectus* and *H. neandertalensis*:

*Restricting analysis of fossils to specimens satisfying these criteria, patterns of dental development of gracile australopithecines and Homo habilis remain classified with African apes. Those of Homo erectus and Neanderthals are classified with humans.*²⁰³

That same year, three experts in anatomy—Fred Spoor, Bernard Wood, and Frans Zonneveld—arrived at the same conclusion using another method. This was based on a comparative analysis of the semi-spherical canals that serve to establish balance in the inner ears of human beings and monkeys. The inner ear canals of all the *Australopithecus* and *H. habilis* specimens that Spoor, Wood, and Zonneveld examined by were identical to those of modern apes. That of *H. erectus*, on the other hand, was the same as that of modern human beings.²⁰⁴

This finding led to two conclusions:

1. The fossils known as *Homo habilis* actually belong to the classification *Australopithecus*, not to *Homo*, or modern man.

2. Both *H. habilis* and *Australopithecus* walked with a stoop, and had monkey-like skeletons. They have nothing to do with human beings.

Homo heidelbergensis

The classification referred to as *H. heidelbergensis* in evolutionist literature is actually the same as *Homo sapiens* archaic. The reason why these two separate names are used to describe the same human race is the differences of opinion among evolutionists. All the fossils included under the classification *Homo heidelbergensis* show that human beings very anatomically similar to modern Europeans were living in Britain and Spain 500,000 and even 740,000 years ago.

Homo rudolfensis

This is the Latin name given to a few fossil fragments discovered in 1972. Since these were unearthed near the River Rudolf in Kenya, the species they were assumed to represent was given the name *Homo rudolfensis*. The majority of paleoanthropologists, however, regard these fossils not as a new species but as *H. habilis*—in other words, a species of monkey.

Richard Leakey, who discovered the fossils, presented the skull—which he estimated to be 2.8 million years old and which was given the official designation of *KNM-ER 1470*, as the greatest discovery in the history of anthropology—and thus aroused an immense reaction. According to Leakey, this creature, with a small skull volume like that of *Australopithecus* and with a human-type face, was the missing link between *Australo-*

pithecus and man.

However, it was later realized that the human facial features of KNM-ER 1470, which had appeared on the covers of various scientific journals, were errors, made perhaps even deliberately in assembling the skull fragments. Professor Tim Bromage, who conducted research into the anatomy of the human face, summarized his findings produced with the aid of computer simulations in 1992:

*When it [KNM-ER 1470] was first reconstructed, the face was fitted to the cranium in an almost vertical position, much like the flat faces of modern humans. But recent studies of anatomical relationships show that in life the face must have jutted out considerably, creating an ape-like aspect, rather like the faces of Australopithecus.*²⁰⁵

On the same subject, the evolutionist paleoanthropologist J. E. Cronin says this:

*... its relatively robustly constructed face, flattish naso-alveolar clivus, (recalling australopithecine dished faces), low maximum cranial width (on the temporals), strong canine juga and large molars (as indicated by remaining roots) are all relatively primitive traits which ally the specimen with members of the taxon A. africanus..... KNM-ER 1470, like other early Homo specimens, shows many morphological characteristics in common with gracile australopithecines that are not shared with later specimens of the genus Homo.*²⁰⁶

C. Loring Brace from Michigan University arrived at the following conclusion

on regarding the KNM-ER 1470 skull, based on analyses of its jaw and teeth structure:

*... from the size of the palate and the expansion of the area allotted to molar roots, it would appear that ER 1470 retained a fully Australopithecus -sized face and dentition.*²⁰⁷

John Hopkins University Professor of paleoanthropology Alan Walker, who has examined the KNM-ER 1470 skull at least as much as Leakey, maintains that like *Homo habilis* or *H. rudolfensis*, the creature should not be classified as *Homo* but should be included in the classification *Australopithecus*.²⁰⁸

Classifications such as *Homo habilis* or *H. rudolfensis*, which evolutionists depict as transitional forms between *Australopithecus* and *Homo erectus*, are completely fictitious. Most present-day researchers accept the fact that these are members of the series *Australopithecus*. All their anatomical characteristics point to the fact that they were monkeys.

Homo sapiens

The history of *Homo sapiens*, which represents modern man on the imaginary evolutionary family tree, goes back much further than evolutionists expected. Paleontological findings indicate that human beings identical to us were alive nearly a million years ago.

One of the discoveries in this regard is a fossil found in the Atapuerca region

of Spain. The fact that this fossil has the same characteristics to those of modern man rocked evolutionist beliefs regarding the evolution of man. Because according to the evolutionary family tree, no *Homo sapiens* should have lived 800,000 years ago.

Indeed, many findings showed that *H. sapiens* goes back even further than 800,000 years. One of these was the discoveries made in Olduvai Gorge by Louis Leakey in the early 1970s. Leakey determined in the Bed II stratum that *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis* and *H. erectus* had all lived there together and at the same time.

However, the really interesting thing was a structure—the remains of a stone hut—found by Leakey in that same stratum (Bed II). Its most interesting aspect was that such a structure, which is still in use in some African regions today, could have been made only by *Homo sapiens*! According to Leakey's findings, *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, *H. erectus* and modern man must all have been living together around 1.7 million years ago.²⁰⁹ This fact of course invalidates the theory of evolution that maintains that modern human beings evolved from the monkeys described as *Australopithecus*.

Moreover, there are findings of traces of modern human beings that go back even further than 1.7 million years. The most important of these is the footprints found in the Laetoli region. (See **Laetoli footprints**, *the*.) These prints,

identical to those of modern human beings, have been calculated to date back some 3.6 million years.

These footprints discovered by Mary Leakey were later examined by such well-known paleoanthropologists as Don Johanson and Tim White.

Examinations of the morphological structure of the footprints again showed that they had to be regarded as belonging to a human and, what is more, to modern man, *Homo sapiens*. Russell Tuttle investigated the prints and later wrote:

*A small barefoot Homo sapiens could have made them. . . In all discernible morphological features, the feet of the individuals that made the trails are indistinguishable from those of modern humans.*²¹⁰

Unbiased investigations described the owners of these two sets of footprints: There was a total of 20 fossilized footprints belonging to a human being aged around 10, and 27 fossilized footprints belonging to someone slightly younger. They were very definitely normal human beings just like ourselves.

The fact that evolutionists persist in their theory that clearly conflicts with the scientific findings, and the way that they distort or ignore every discovery that works against it, clearly reveals that theory's unscientific nature.

Homo sapiens archaic

Homo sapiens archaic represents the



At the molecular level, no organism is the ancestor of any other, nor more primitive or advanced than any other.

rung before modern man on the illusory evolutionary ladder. In fact, evolutionists have nothing to say about these people because they are distinguished from modern man only by very minute differences. Some researchers even suggest that representatives of this race are still alive today, citing native Australians as an example. Just like this race, native Australians have heavy eyebrow ridges, a retracted jaw structure and a rather smaller brain volume. And native Australians are a normal human race. (See **Aborigines.**)

Homology (Common origins)

In biology, structural similarities among different living species are referred to as *homologous*. Evolutionists attempt to use these similarities as evidence for evolution. Pointing to homologous organs in different life forms, they maintain that these species are descended from a common forebear. (See **Homologous organs.**) Yet in order for evo-

lutionist claims regarding homologous organs to be taken seriously, these organs would have to be coded by similar DNA codes. Yet these homologous organs are generally determined by different genetic (DNA) codes.

In addition, similar genetic codes in *different* life forms also correspond to very different organs! In his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, the Australian professor of biochemistry Michael Denton describes the predicament represented by the evolutionist interpretation of homology:

Homologous structures are often specified by non-homologous genetic systems, and the concept of homology can seldom be extended back into embryology.²¹¹

In order for that same claim to be taken seriously, the embryological development process of these similar structures—in other words, the phases of development in the embryo in the mother's womb—have to be parallel to one another. Yet the embryological stages for similar organs are different in all living things.

Genetic and embryological research

has shown that the concept of homology, which Darwin took as proof that living things are descended from a common ancestor, does not in fact provide any backing for such a definition. Thus it is that science has revealed the unrealistic nature of yet another Darwinist thesis.

The evolutionist claim regarding homology is not only invalid at the level of organs, but also at the molecular level. (See **Molecular homology thesis, the**.) There are enormous molecular differences between living things that outwardly appear very similar and closely related to one another. Professor Michael Denton comments:

Each class at a molecular level is unique, isolated and unlinked by intermediates. Thus, molecules, like fossils, have failed to provide the elusive intermediates so long sought by evolutionary biology . . . At a molecular level, no organism is “an-

*cestral” or “primitive” or “advanced” compared with its relatives . . . There is little doubt that if this molecular evidence had been available a century ago. . . the idea of organic evolution might never have been accepted.*²¹²

Homologous organs

Anyone examining the different living species on Earth will observe that there are certain similar organs and characteristics among species. This phenomenon has attracted the notice of biologists ever since the 18th century, but the first to link it to the theory of evolution was Darwin, who maintained that there was an evolutionary link between living things with similar (i.e. homologous) organs, and that such organs were a legacy from their common ancestor.

Accordingly, since pigeons and eag-



TWO UNRELATED MAMMALS WITH GIANT TEETH

The existence of extraordinarily similar species, one a placental and the other a pouched mammal, deals a severe blow to the claim of homology. For example, *Smilodon* (right) and *Thylacosmilus* (left) both have very large front teeth. The fact that the skull and tooth structures of these two life forms, between which no evolutionary relationship can be established, are exceedingly similar refutes the claim of homology—that similar structures represent evidence for evolution.

les have wings, that means that pigeons, eagles and other such winged birds all evolved from a common forebear.

Homology is a superficial hypothesis put forward solely on the basis of external appearances. The hypothesis has not been confirmed by any concrete finding since Darwin's time. In particular, no trace has ever been found of the imaginary common ancestors of life forms with homologous structures as proposed by evolutionists. And there are additional hurdles:

1. The existence of homologous organs in life forms belonging to totally different classes, among which evolutionists also cannot establish any evolutionary link

2. The fact that such homologous organs have very different genetic codes, and

3. The fact that the stages of the embryological development of these organs all show that homology represents no basis for evolution.

Among the examples of species between which evolutionists cannot establish any evolutionary link but which possess homologous structures are those with wings. The bat—a mammal—has wings, and so do birds, and there were once species of dinosaurs that also had wings. However, not even evolutionists can construct any evolutionary relationship among these three different classes.

Another striking example in this context is the astonishing similarity and structural resemblance between the eyes of different living things. For example,

the octopus and man are two very different life forms—mollusk and mammal—between which no evolutionary link can be construed. In terms of their structure and function, however, their eyes are actually very similar. Not even evolutionists will claim that human beings and octopi had a common ancestor with a similar eye. These and countless other similar examples make it clear that there is no scientific basis to the evolutionist claim that homologous organs prove that living things are descended from a common evolutionary ancestor. In fact, these organs represent a major impasse for them.

“Hopeful Monster” theory, the

The “Hopeful Monster” theory claims that one day, a reptile laid an egg and that quite by chance, a creature with brown fur hatched out of it. According to evolutionists, when this mammal grew up, it found a mate that had also suddenly emerged from a reptile egg—and a new species resulted.

The reaction from scientists with any common sense ran along the lines of “Is this a scientific account, or a Greek myth, or a Hans Christian Anderson fairy tale?” Yet for some reason, a number of scientists still imagine that it represents a solution to an evolutionary problem. What it actually represents, however, is total despair. One paleontologist, Otto Schindewolf, proposed that all ma-

jor evolutionary transformations must have occurred in single large steps, like a reptile laying an egg from which a bird hatched.²¹³ As you see, some evolutionists believe that a perfectly formed but totally different species can hatch out of any viable egg!

Of course, the sudden emergence of different living groups in the fossil record showed that living species did come into being with no evolutionary process behind them.²¹⁴ Naturally, this was a source of major concern for evolutionists.

The “Hopeful Monster” theory was put forward in the 1930s by the European paleontologist Otto Schindewolf, who proposed that living things evolved not with the accumulation of small mutations over time, as neo-Darwinism maintained, but by sudden and very large ones. (See **Macro-Mutation deception**, *the*.) In citing examples for his theory, Schindewolf claimed that the first bird had emerged from a reptile egg by way of a gross mutation—by some enormous, random change in its genetic structure.²¹⁵

According to his theory, some land animals may have turned into giant whales through sudden and wide-ranging changes. Schindewolf’s fantastical theory was adopted and supported in the 1940s by the Berkeley University geneticist Richard Goldschmidt, although it

was so inconsistent that it was swiftly abandoned.

But due to the lack of any transitional forms in the fossil record, the Harvard University paleontologists Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge were again obliged to resuscitate the idea to account for that situation. Gould’s famous article “Return of the Hopeful Monsters” was an expression of this obligatory about-face.²¹⁶

Although they did not repeat Schindewolf’s theory to the letter, Gould and Eldredge sought to come up with a mechanism for sudden evolutionary leaps in order to endow the theory with a scientific gloss. (See **Punctuated evolution myth**, *the*.) In the years that followed, Gould and Eldredge’s theory was adopted by some other paleontologists, who duly fleshed out its bones.

In fact, however, that the theory of punctuated evolution was based on even greater inconsistencies and contradictions than the neo-Darwinist theory of evolution.



Julian Huxley

Huxley, Julian

In his 1958 book *Religion without Revelation*, the zoologist Julian Huxley, one of the architects of neo-Darwinism, described it not as a scientific theory, but as a ideological dogma. (See **Neo-Darwinism**.)



Hypothesis

A *hypothesis* is a temporary solution or explanation proposed for a problem raised by various facts or phenomena. In order for a good hypothesis to be confirmed, it needs to be open to experiment and observation, besides conforming to the available facts. At the same time, it must be open to new facts and estimates, and partial changes must be made if required.²¹⁷

Scientists first generalize from the observations they carry out or describe a possible cause-and-effect relationship between a chain of events in order to give a temporary explanation for those observations. The first step towards research is taken by means of a hypothesis. Assumptions made in forming that hypothesis must be capable of being tested through controlled experiments. If a hypothesis cannot be based on experimental testing that may confirm it, it remains mere speculation.²¹⁸

A theory is constructed with a hypothesis, supported by a great many observations and experiments (See **Theory**.) and includes hypothesis and observation in various different disciplines. For example, the theory of evolution includes hypotheses and observations from paleontology, anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, genetics and other sciences. When a scientist makes an observation that is not compatible with the hypothesis, he must conclude that either the

hypothesis or his experiment is flawed. If the observation is correct, he rejects the hypothesis, or else refashions it.

The most important thing in science is for every new observation to conform to the hypothesis.

When it comes to the theory of evolution, however, it appears not to be supported by any hypothesis in any branch of science. Nonetheless, this is wholly ignored for the sake of keeping the theory viable. (See, **Evolution theory**, *the*.)

Ichthyostega

Evolutionists claim that water-dwelling organisms gradually turned into land-dwelling ones. In order to verify these claims, they depict all terrestrial living things and those living in water with similar characteristics as transitional forms. *Ichthyostega* is a marine creature that lived in the Devonian Period and which, in the evolutionists' view, represents a transitional form. These creatures were specially created to live in water, and the only reason why evolutionists regard them as transitional forms between fish and amphibians is that they compare a structure on their fins to a foot capable of walking on dry land.

However, there is no scientific validity to this unfounded claim. Living mammals such as the bat are capable of flight, mammals such as the **Platypus** that lay eggs, and mammals such as whales and dolphins live in the sea.

Such life forms also existed in the past. *Ichthyostega* lived in the sea, like dolphins, but that does not indicate that it was a transitional forms. On the contrary, it shows that they were an original and stable species. Indeed, according to the theory of evolution, there is no rational basis to proposing them as transitional forms at all.


All the supposedly transitional forms referred to today are the result of such distortions. According to evolutionists, the first movement made using the feet was made by life forms resembling amphibians that walked on the floors of shallow waters. These fish, which include the Coelacanth, were for long described as transitional forms that moved in such a way. Evolutionists claimed that the Coelacanth evolved over the course of time and turned into *Ichthyostega*, an amphibian. However, this was a comple-

tely groundless scenario.

Despite being an evolutionist, even Henry Gee, editor of the well-known magazine *Nature*, admitted the mistaken and biased attitudes adopted towards *Ichthyostega*:

*A statement that Ichthyostega is a missing link between fishes and later tetrapods reveals far more about our prejudices than about the creature we are supposed to be studying. It shows how much we are imposing a restricted view on reality based on our own limited experience, when reality may be larger, stranger, and more different than we can imagine.*²¹⁹

As his admission shows, there is not a single piece of concrete evidence for any transition from water to land. This came to light with the discovery of a living Coelacanth and once again demonstrated that all the scenarios dreamed up by evolutionists were a fantasy.



One of the reconstructions frequently employed by evolutionists, despite their having no scientific foundation

Imaginary Human Family Tree, the

The Darwinist claim assumes that modern humans evolved from various ape-like creatures. The assertion is that various transitional forms between modern man and his supposed forbears must have lived during this period, which is assumed to have begun 4 to 5 million years ago. This totally fictitious scenario consists of four basic species:

1. *Australopithecus*
2. *Homo habilis*
3. *Homo erectus*
4. *Homo sapiens*

Evolutionists attach the name *Australopithecus*, meaning “southern ape,” to the first supposed ape-like ancestors of man. These creatures are in fact an extinct species of ape. There are various types of *Australopithecines*, some of which are large apes and others of which are smaller and more delicate. (See ***Australopithecus, the***)

The subsequent stage—and genus—in human evolution is classified as *Homo*, in other words “man.” According to the claim, living things in the *Homo* genus are more developed than *Australopithecus*. It is then claimed that *H. sapiens*, or modern man, emerged in the final phase of this genus’ evolution.

In coming up with the series *Australopithecines* > *Homo habilis* > *Homo erectus* > *Homo sapiens*, evolutionists

give the impression that each one is the ancestor of the one succeeding it. Yet the latest paleoanthropological findings show that *Australopithecines*, *Homo habilis* and *H. erectus* all lived in the same period in different regions of the world. Moreover, some humans belonging to the species *Homo erectus* were living until very modern times and were present in the same surroundings as *Homo sapiens neandertalensis* and *Homo sapiens sapiens* (modern man). This, of course, clearly invalidates the claim that these forms are one another’s ancestors.

Impasse of Chaos Theory, the

— See **Second Law of Thermodynamics, the (The Law of Entropy)**.

Aware that the Second Law of Thermodynamics makes evolution impossible, various evolutionist scientists have recently engaged in speculation in order to bridge the gulf between the Second Law and the theory of evolution and to clear away this obstacle.

Of these advocates, the Belgian scientist Ilya Prigogine is the best-known with his claims made in the hope of reconciling Thermodynamics and evolution. Starting from the concept of Chaos Theory, Prigogine put forward a number of hypotheses to the effect that order could emerge from chaos. Yet despite all his endeavors, Prigogine failed to reconcile

thermodynamics and evolution. This can clearly be seen in his following words:


*There is another question, which has plagued us for more than a century: What significance does the evolution of a living being have in the world described by thermodynamics, a world of ever-increasing disorder?*²²⁰

Prigogine was aware that at the molecular level, the theories he had produced did not apply to living systems—a living cell, for instance. He set out the problem in these terms:

The problem of biological order involves the transition from the molecular activity to the super molecular order of the cell.

*This problem is far from being solved.*²²¹

The final point reached by the concept of Chaos Theory and the conjecture based on it is that no concrete result supporting and confirming evolution and eliminating the dichotomy between thermodynamics and evolution has ever been obtained. As in all other spheres, science once again reveals that with regard to thermodynamics, evolution is impossible and that there cannot be other explanation for the emergence of life than creation.



A species that does not already exist in nature cannot emerge through natural selection. Only handicapped or weak individuals can be eliminated from a species. The peppered moths are an excellent example of this. Trees became darker with the advent of the Industrial Revolution. In consequence, the lighter-colored moths that alighted on these trees became more visible to birds, and their numbers declined. There was also an increase in the numbers of surviving, darker moths. This is not, of course, evolution. No new species formed, and all that happened was the ratios changed of differently colored moths of the same species.

Industrial Melanism

In the 18th and 19th centuries, enormous changes took place in the industrial sphere first in Britain and then in other West European countries and America. Particularly in Great Britain, color changes were observed in some populations of animals due to the air pollution that increased with the Industrial Revolution. Industrial melanism is an expression of color changes allowed animals to camouflage themselves better.

Evolutionists attempt to account for these observed differences in color as natural selection under the pressure of environmental conditions. In fact, however, the situation stems from a complete misinterpretation of observed phenomena.

One evolutionist source sets out the position as follows:

The most striking contemporary example of this directed selection is the evolution of protective colouring demonstrated by two Oxford University researchers called Ford and Kettlewell. They discovered that one kind of moth living in regions of Britain with a large number of factory chimneys were darker than moths living in other regions. It is known from collections that specimens previously collected (before industrialisation) were lighter in colour. Since the lighter-coloured moths lived on white and light coloured lichens found around tree trunks outside industrial regions, they adapted well to their environment and were able to avoid attracting the notice of predator birds. In industrial



The peppered moths in Britain are portrayed as one of the contemporary proofs of evolution by way of natural selection. Yet there is no evolution at work here, because no new species of moth emerged. The picture at top left shows pre-Industrial Revolution moths, and the one on at right shows trees and the moths on them following the Industrial Revolution.

areas, since the soot from the chimneys darkened these lichens, white moths began to become more visible. In contrast, dark-coloured moths were better adapted. Since birds hunted the white moths, darker moths began to predominate and the genotype possessed by these began increasing in the population. White forms have today again begun to predominate in those regions of Britain in which air pollution has been eradicated.²²²

The point to be noted here is the presence of *black* moths caught prior to the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in


Britain. In fact, this type of moth existed in Britain years before the Industrial Revolution. The change brought about by air pollution increased the likelihood of the white form, which had previously existed in large numbers, being seen by predators. As a result, there was a reduction in the numbers of this type and an increase in the numbers of darker moths. (See **Peppered moths, the.**)

It is clear that this change was in the numbers of the moths, not in their colors. This event can never be put forward as evidence of evolution. Proponents of the original creation of species accept this. In addition, even if there were a change in color as a result of mutation, this would still constitute no evidence for evolution, because the species of

moth would still be the same species and would not have turned into any other. Evolution needs to scientifically prove that one species can evolve into another

What is happening here is not evolution, but only normal variation. Natural selection is only a mechanism that prevents members of a given species from disappearing as a result of environmental changes. (See **Variation.**)

The phenomena of variation and natural selection do not account for evolution in the way that by Darwin imagined. On the contrary, they're excellent examples of a method of protection foreseen by creation. To put it another way, God has created all kinds of living things with systems to ensure their survival. An organism's genetic system may be able



Since tree trunks became darker with soot in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, light-colored peppered moths were easier prey for birds and their numbers declined. This is not an example of evolution by natural selection, however, because no new species emerged. All that happened was that the characteristics of an existing species changed.

to regulate its characteristics within certain bounds, according to changes in the surroundings. Otherwise, even minor changes in climate or food sources would spell the species' death.

Many living things such as mammoths, dinosaurs, and flying reptiles have become extinct due to sudden environmental or climatic changes). These life forms disappeared when they were unable to adapt to environmental conditions exceeding the limits of the genetic potential they possessed when they were created. However, there is no scientific evidence that these turned into other species.

Peppered moths, the

Douglas Futuyma's 1986 book *Evolutionary Biology*, is regarded as a reference that most clearly explains the theory of natural selection. The best-known of the examples cited by Futuyma is the darkening of the color of a moth population in Great Britain during the Industrial Revolution.

Before the Industrial Revolution began, the bark of trees in the Manchester area was light in color. Therefore, any dark-colored melanic moths landing on these trees were easily detected by birds and thus had little chance of survival. Fifty years of pollution later, however, the bark grew darker, after the death of the light-colored lichens on the trees, and now the lighter-colored moths fell prey to birds more often. As a result, as

the number of light-colored moths declined, the dark-colored ones increased because they were less visible.

Evolutionists resort to the misleading claim that this process represents major evidence for evolution and that those lighter-colored moths gradually "evolved" into darker ones.

The fact is, though, this example cannot stand as evidence for evolution. The natural selection that took place did not give rise to the emergence of any new species that did not exist before. Black individuals already existed in the pre-Industrial Revolution population. All that changed was the characteristics of a species that already existed. Moths acquired no new organs or characteristics that would lead to species change. Whereas in order for a moth to turn into another distinct species, countless changes, additions and subtractions would have to occur in its genes. To put it another way, a whole new genetic program containing the physical characteristics of a new species would have to be loaded onto the moth.

Contrary to the impression evolutionists seek to give, it is impossible for natural selection to add or remove any organ from a living thing, and for that species to turn into another one. The strongest evidence on this subject since Darwin's time is the tale of the peppered moths in Britain.

Yet there is an even more noteworthy aspect to the evolutionist "example" of



It is impossible for the
information in DNA to
have emerged through
coincidences and natural
processes.

the peppered moths. Not only is the interpretation of the story wrong, but so is the story itself. As the molecular biologist Jonathan Wells described in his 2000 book, *Icons of Evolution*, the reported tale of the Industrial-Revolution Moths does not reflect the true facts at all. (For detailed information, see *The Evolution Deceit* by Harun Yahya.)

Information theory

This discipline investigates the structure and origin of the information in the universe. As a result of lengthy research, the conclusion reached by information theoreticians is that information is distinct from matter. It can never be reduced to matter. The sources of information and matter must be investigated separately.

For example, a book consists of paper, ink and the information within it. However, ink and paper are material elements. Their origin again lies in matter: Paper is composed of cellulose, and ink from various chemicals and dyes.

The information in a book, however, is not material and cannot have any material origin. The source of the information in every book is the mind of the author who wrote it.

Furthermore, this author also determines how this paper and ink are to be used. A book first takes shape in its author's mind. The writer constructs a pattern and sets out sentences. He gives these a material form—turning the words in

his mind into letters by way of a typewriter or computer. These letters later go to the printer and are turned into that book consisting of paper and ink.

From this, we may draw the general conclusion that if something contains information, then it must have been set out by a mind possessed of information. First, that mind translated the information it possessed into matter, and thus produced a design.

In their DNA, living things possess exceedingly wide-ranging information. A literal data bank describes all the physical details of an organism's body in a space just 1/100,000th of a meter in size. In addition, there is also a system that reads this information in the living body, analyzes it, and sets about production accordingly. The information in the DNA in all of a living thing's cells is read by various enzymes, and proteins are produced in the light of that information. Millions of proteins are produced every second in line with your body's requirements. Thanks to this system, dead blood cells are replaced with living ones.

All the scientific research conducted in the 20th century, the results of all the experiments and all the observations, revealed that the information in DNA cannot be reduced to matter alone, as materialists would have us believe. To put it another way, it definitively rejects the idea that DNA is merely a collection of organic compounds and that all the information it contains came about as the result of chance interactions.

Professor Werner Gitt, director of the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology, says:

A code system is always the result of a mental process (it requires an intelligent origin or inventor) . . . It should be emphasized that matter as such is unable to generate any code. All experiences indicate that a thinking being voluntarily exercising his own free will, cognition, and creativity, is required. There is no known law of nature, no known process and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter. . . . There is no known natural law through which matter can give rise to information, neither is any physical process or material phenomenon known that can do this.²²³

Gitt's words reflect the same conclusions arrived at from the Information Theory developed over the last 20 to 30 years and which is regarded as a component of thermodynamics. George C. Williams, one of the most prominent adherents of the theory of evolution alive today, accepts this fact, which most materialists and evolutions are reluctant to admit. Despite having vigorously espoused materialism for many years, Williams in a 1995 article stated the error of the materialist (reductionistic) approach that assumes that everything consists of matter alone:

Evolutionary biologists have failed to realize that they work with two more or less incommensurable domains: that of information and that of matter. . . . These two


domains will never be brought together in any kind of the sense usually implied by the term "reductionism." . . . The gene is a package of information, not an object. . . . In biology, when you're talking about things like genes and genotypes and gene pools, you're talking about information, not physical objective reality. . . . This dearth of shared descriptors makes matter and information two separate domains of existence, which have to be discussed separately, in their own terms.²²⁴

Evolutionists occasionally admit their despair. One frankly spoken authority on this subject is the famous French zoologist Pierre Grassé, according to whom the most important fact to invalidate the Darwinist account is the information that constitutes life:

Any living being possesses an enormous amount of "intelligence," very much more than is necessary to build the most magnificent of cathedrals. Today, this "'intelligence" is called information, but it is still the same thing. It is not programmed as in a computer, but rather it is condensed on a molecular scale in the chromosomal DNA or in that of every other organelle in each cell. This "intelligence" is the sine qua non of life. Where does it come from? . . . This is a problem that concerns both biologists and philosophers, and, at present, science seems incapable of solving it. . . .²²⁵

Contrary to Grassé's statement that science can never resolve this problem, all the scientific research that has been carried out invalidates the hypotheses of

The human eye functions through its 40 or so components all working in harmoniously together. If one of these is absent, the eye will serve no purpose. Each of these 40 components has its own very complex structure and must have been created simultaneously. The theory of evolution has no answer to the question of how such a complex organ came into being.



materialist philosophy and clearly proves the existence of a Creator—in other words, of God.

Irreducible complexity

One of the most important resources to question Darwinist theory in the face of scientific findings is the criteria put forward by Darwin himself!

In proposing his theory, Darwin also set out a number of concrete measures about how his theory might be disproved. There are passages beginning with the words “*If my theory is true . . .*” in many chapters of *The Origin of Species*, and in those passages, Darwin describes the findings needed to prove his theory. One of them reads:

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous,

successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find out no such case.^{22 6}

Darwinism accounts for the origin of living things in terms of two unconscious natural mechanisms: natural selection and random changes, caused by mutations. According to Darwinist theory, these two mechanisms gave rise to the complex structure of the living cell, the complex body systems of living things, eyes, ears, wings, lungs, bat sonar and millions of other complex and sophisticated designs.

However, it is unscientific and illogical to claim that all these systems with their exceptionally complex structures are the product of two unconscious natural phenomena. At this point, Darwinism resorts to the concept of *reducibility*. It is maintained that all the systems in question were once far simpler states, and that they then developed in stages. Each stage pro-

vided the living species in question with a slightly greater advantage, and it will thus be favored by way of natural selection. Yet another small, accidental change will later take place, and that will also constitute an advantage and improve the individual's chances, and the whole process will continue running along those lines.

Thanks to this process, according to the Darwinist claim, a species that initially had no eyes at all would come to possess a flawless pair, and another species previously unable to fly would develop wings and take to the air.

These evolutionist scenarios are related in a very convincing and reasonable-seeming style. Examined in slightly greater detail, however, it appears that there is a major error in place. The first misconception is that mutations are destructive occurrences, rather than beneficial ones. In other words, the idea that random mutations affecting a species can endow it with some advantage—and continue to do so, thousands of times in succession—is a violation of all scientific observations.

However, there is a still more important error at work. Note that Darwinist theory requires every stage in the progression (for instance, from a wingless animal to a winged one) to be advantageous. Thus in any evolutionary process from *A* to *Z*, all the intermediate stages—*B*, *C*, *D* ... through to *W*, *X* and *Y*—must all bestow separate advantages on the species that evolves. Since it is impossible for natural selection and mutation to

consciously determine an objective beforehand, the whole theory depends on living systems being capable of “being reduced” to small, advantageous changes.

That is why Darwin said, “*If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed. . . .*”

Given the primitive level of science in the 19th century, Darwin may well have thought that living things did have a reducible structure. However, 20th century scientific findings revealed that many systems and organs in living things were actually irreducible. This phenomenon, known as *irreducible complexity*, *definitively* demolished Darwinism in exactly the way that Darwin feared.

The human eye's structure cannot be reduced to a more simple form, and is a clear example of such a system. The eye cannot function at all unless all its components exist together and function properly. The consciousness that produces such a complex structure needs to calculate beforehand the benefits to be obtained at the very final stage. It is absolutely impossible, however, for the mechanisms of evolution to produce complex organs through consciousness and will.

Isolation

When populations are divided by some geographic obstacle, the gene pools (representing the populations' genetic structure) of populations living in the

two different environments may be found to change. The further apart populations move from one another, the greater the potential increase in the differences between them. Isolation giving rise to population changes may be geographic, economic, cultural or climatic.²²⁷ (See **Geographic Isolation theory, the.**)

These two populations separated from one another for whatever reason—generally geographic isolation—may lose the ability to interbreed with each other. As a natural consequence of this, the genetic combination of each population remains restricted. Evolutionists refer to every effect that prevents mating and effective fertilization between populations as *isolation* or as an *isolation mechanism*. According to evolutionists, isolation that restricts reproduction is essential for species formation.²²⁸ One evolutionist source describes this essential requirement:

No species can separate from another in the absence of this; and if ever it did, it could never survive independently. What if all animals mated freely with one another and were able to reproduce among themselves? The result would be a convergence leading to the disappearance of all zoological units. In other words, no dog, horse, cat or cow would have a separate existence; they would be just combinations of all animals. Because the distinction between animals and human beings would be lost, there would be many human-like animals and animal-like humans. Eventually a most fascinating mongrel would emerge from the combination of all these. Since reproduction is unrestricted on the streets we see various

*mongrel breeds among dogs. Since dogs all belong to separate breeds they produce mongrels among themselves. That is why dog breeders take care to use only pedigree breeds in order to maintain specific characteristics. If this were not done, then peculiar mongrel breeds from a mixture of all dogs.*²²⁹

Evolutionists try to account for the origin of species in terms of isolation. But the question of how so many thousands of species emerged on Earth is exceedingly hard for evolutionists to answer. Therefore, they deliberately use the concept of isolation as the mechanism that brings new species into being. However, no new species comes into being through isolation.





or. That merely masks the emergence of different variants stemming from a narrowing of the gene pool. At the basis of speciation, there is no genetic incompatibility stemming from division into two groups. These life forms will still belong to the same species, in terms of their overall genetic information.

Therefore, there is nothing about the speciation that supports the theory of evolution, which claims that all living species evolved from the simple to the complex in a random manner. This means that if evolution is to be taken seriously, it must be able to point to mechanisms that *increase* genetic information. It must be able to explain how life forms originally lacking eyes, ears, a heart, lungs, wings, feet or other organs and systems managed to acquire them, and where the genetic information describing these organs and systems came from.

No doubt that the division of an already existing species into two, suffering a loss of genetic diversity, has absolutely nothing to do with this.

The fact that subspecies are not evolving into new species is actually admitted even by evolutionists. For that reason, evolutionists describe examples of variations within a species and of speciation by division as *micro-evolution*. (See **Micro-evolution**.) Micro-evolution is used in the sense of variants emerging within an already existing species. However, the use of the term *evolution* here is deliberately intended to mislead, be-

cause there is no such process going on.

What is happening consists of different combinations of genetic information that already exists in that species' gene pool being distribution in different populations of individuals.

Evolutionists need to answer such questions as, "How did the first species come into existence?" and "How did the categories above species, the classes, orders, families etc. initially come into existence?" that.

Java Man

In 1891, Eugene Dubois, who had dedicated himself to searching for the theory of evolution's so-called missing link, discovered a skull fragment on the shores of the River Solo on the island of Java in Indonesia. Dubois believed that this skull possessed both human and simian (ape-like) properties. A year later, he discovered a thigh bone some 15 meters from where he had found the top of the cranium and concluded that this thigh bone—which was very similar to those of human beings—and the skull might have belonged to the same body.

Based on these two pieces of bone, he adopted the idea that this fossil might be a transitional form and gave it an impressive scientific name: *Pithecanthropus erectus*, or “upright-walking ape-man.” Popularly referred to as Java Man, the fossil had a skull volume of around 900 cubic centimeters and was suggested to be around 500,000 years old.

Dubois thought that the Trinil stratum in which the fossil was found was underneath the border between the Pleistocene and Pliocene (Tertiary) periods; and was certain that human beings had evolved during the Middle Pleistocene. For that reason, according to Dubois, the age of Java Man was entirely compatible with its being the missing link. However, Dubois had prepared a study of the Javanese fossil fauna before he discovered that fossil—which study totally contradicted the information was to provide

about Java Man. But following his discovery of Java Man, his comments regarding the fauna study made an abrupt about-face.

Marvin L. Lubenow spent some 20 years researching Java Man. In his book *Bones of Contention*, he states that Dubois did not possess sufficient geological knowledge when he discovered the fossil:

*When Dubois issued his first description of the fossil Javanese fauna he designated it Pleistocene. But no sooner had he discovered his Pithecanthropus than the fauna had suddenly to become Tertiary. He did everything in his power to diminish the Pleistocene character of the fauna.*²³⁰

Dubois said that the thigh bone and the skull belonged to the same creature. Yet eminent scientists of the time came to the opposite conclusion. The famous Cambridge University anatomist Sir Arthur Keith clearly stated that a skull with such a volume could not belong to an ape and revealed the absence of structural features permitting powerful mastication and particular to apes. Keith said that the skull was very definitely human.

Dubois' claims on the basis of these two bones approached the fantastic. A directed perspective underlay his claims. Since Dubois was an evolutionist, he acted in the light of certain preconceptions and was unwilling to consider any alternative possibility. He also harbored obvious hostility towards those who criticized his opinions.

Another discovery that totally refuted Dubois' ape-man nonsense came from Dr. Walkhoff, an anthropologist, who found the upper part of a human molar tooth in a dried-up region of the River Solo, no more than three kilometers (two miles) from where Dubois had discovered Java Man. This fossilized molar was human and dated back to a period as old as that to which Java Man supposedly belonged. A team of experts who were all evolutionists carried out this project, with the aim of finding fossils to verify evolution. Nonetheless, the head of the team, Professor Selenka, concluded that modern man and Java Man had lived at the same time, and that there could therefore be no evolutionary relationship between Java Man and modern human beings.

In the final chapter of the report, Dr. Max Blanckenhorn, who acted as project secretary, apologized to readers for having demolished Dubois' thesis with their discovery instead of confirming it!

All this goes to show that there is no difference between Java Man, depicted as an ape-man, and modern humans. The only thing that can be suggested with regard to Java Man is the small size of the skull volume, although there are races with small skulls living today. In addition, among these races are native Australians, who live not so very far from the



island of Java. Thus the fact that Java Man is a genuine human becomes even clearer.

Johnson, Phillip

Phillip Johnson, has been a professor of law at Berkeley University for 26 years, and is one of the world's most important critics of Darwinism. In Darwin on Trial, Johnson states that the philosophy behind the theory of evolution was based on naturalism, and that evolution is supported for ideological reasons:

*... the leaders of science see themselves as locked in a desperate battle against religious fundamentalists, a label which they tend to apply broadly to anyone who believes in a Creator who plays an active role in worldly affairs. These fundamentalists are seen as a threat to liberal freedom, and especially as a threat to public support for scientific research. As the creation myth of scientific naturalism, Darwinism plays an indispensable ideological role in the war against fundamentalism. For that reason, the scientific organizations are devoted to protecting Darwinism rather than testing it, and the rules of scientific investigation have been shaped to help them succeed.*²³¹

In his following words, Johnson clarifies why the origin of mind cannot be explained with theory of evolution:

*A theory that is the product of a mind can never adequately explain the mind that produced the theory. The story of the great scientific mind that discovers absolute truth is satisfying only so long as we accept the mind itself as a given. Once we try to explain the mind as a product of its own discoveries, we are in a hall of mirrors with no exit.*²³²

“Junk” DNA

Until several years ago, this term was given to collections of DNA whose functions were unknown to scientists. For the time being, they referred to these long sequences that they were unable to describe as genes as “junk DNA.” They also suggested that these long sections of DNA, which served no purpose according to their understanding at the time, were evidence of evolution.

According to this thesis, junk DNA was composed of segments that had accumulated during the evolutionary process, but which now had no use.



This claim, based on no scientific grounds, consisted solely of unfounded speculation. The reason why it was so easily able to find a place in the literature was that in those days, very little was known about DNA. The functions of those parts of DNA known as “junk” had not yet been brought discovered.

However, with the Human Genome Project and other similar genetic research, it emerged that genes were constantly interacting with one another during the protein-production process. (See **Genome Project**, *the*.) During the course of this production, It was realized that no one gene works independently of other DNA segments. The point we are at today shows that while one gene works, especially during the initial protein codification phase, parts of the DNA that do

not constitute genes help regulate it. For that reason, any scientist interested in genetics or who closely monitors developments no longer attaches any worth to the concept of junk DNA.

The fact that these DNA segments are in a constant state of activity has actually been known for a considerable time, whether evolutionists like it or not. Molecular biologists from the Harvard University Medical Faculty and physicists from Boston University shed light on this matter in a report titled “Does nonsense DNA speak its own dialect?” published in Science magazine in 1994.²³³ As a result of their research into 37 DNA strands containing 50,000 base pairs, taken from various living things, they reported that the “empty” DNA that makes up 90% of human DNA



They said, “Glory be to You!

We have no knowledge except

what You have taught us.

You are the All-Knowing,

the All-Wise.”

(Surat al-Baqara, 32)

is actually written in a special language.

Evan Eichler, an evolutionist scientist from Cleveland University, made the following admission:

The term “junk DNA” is a reflection of our ignorance.^{2 3 4}

In fact, this concept is simply the latest example of the “vestigial organs” that evolutionists have been proposing since the beginning of the 20th century. (See **Vestigial Organs thesis, the.**) At that time, many evolutionists suggested that many organs whose functions had not yet been discovered (for example, the appendix and the coccyx) were useless, vestigial organs and left behind in the course of evolution. Later medical research, however, revealed that these organs imagined to be useless actually performed important functions. The appendix, for instance, was shown to be part of the body’s immune system, and the coccyx to be an attachment point for important muscles.

In the words of the evolutionist author Steven R. Scadding, “As our knowledge has increased, the list of vestigial structures has decreased,”^{2 3 5} and eventually disappeared altogether.

Today the same thing applies to those parts of the chromosome that some would like to consider vestigial DNA. Yet as our biological knowledge increases, so this claim is increasingly unfounded.

NOTES

1 Ozer Bulut, Davut Sagdic, Selim Korkmaz, *Biyoloji Lise 3*, (“Biology High School 3”) MEB Publishing, Istanbul, 2000, p. 182.

2 From Rene Vallery-Radot, *The Life of Pasteur*, 1920, Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Company, Inc., p.109. <http://www.founder-sofscience.net/interest1.htm>

3 *Grolier International Americana Encyclopedia*, Vol 2, Danbury: Grolier Incorporated, 1993, pp. 345-346.

4 Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, 2nd Edition, New York: A L. Burt Co., 1874, p.178.

5 Jani Roberts, “How neo-Darwinism justified taking land from Aborigines and murdering them in Australia”, <http://www.gn.apc.org/inquirer/ausrace.html>.

6 “Ancient Alga Fossil Most Complex Yet”, *Science News*, Vol. 108, 20 September 1975, p. 181.

7 Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs*, Istanbul: Alan Publishing, November 1996, Trans: Veysel Atayman, p.199.

8 N. Kroger, R. Deutzmann, M. Sumper, “Polycationic Peptides from Diatom Biosilica That Direct Silica Nanosphere Formation”, *Science*, 286, pp. 1129, 1999.

9 Cemal Yildirim, *Evrin Kurami ve Bagnazlik* (“The Theory of Evolution and Bigotry”), p.49.

10 Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, 1902, Chapter I, <http://www.calresco.org/texts/mutaid1.htm>

11 *Bilim ve Teknik* magazine, No.190, p. 4.

12 Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, 1902, Part II.

13 John Maynard Smith, “The Evolution of Behavior”, *Scientific American*, December 1978, Vol. 239, No.3, p. 176.

14 William R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 305.

15 Sarah Simpson, “Life’s First Scalding Steps,” *Science News*, 155(2), 9 January 1999, p.

25.
 - 16 Robert L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1988, p. 304.
 - 17 Edwin H. Colbert, M. Morales, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1991, p. 99.
 - 18 Robert L. Carroll, "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 44. p. 393.
 - 19 Stephen Jay Gould, "Eight (or Fewer) Little Piggies," *Natural History*, No. 1, Jan 1991, Vol. 100, p. 25.
 - 20 Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, Biyoloji 1 ("Biology I"), Istanbul: Surat Publishing, 1998, p. 129.
 - 21 Dean Kenyon, Davis Percival, *Of Pandas and People: The Central Question of Biological Origins*, Dallas: Haughton Publishing, 1993, p. 33.
 - 22 Prof. Dr. Eşref Deniz, *Tıbbi Biyoloji* ("Medical Biology"), 4th Edition, Ankara, 1992, p. 369.
 - 23 N.F. Hughes, *Paleology of Angiosperm Origins: Problems of Mesozoic Seed-Plant Evolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, pp.1-2.
 - 24 Daniel Isaac Axelrod, "The Evolution of Flowering Plants," in *Evolution After Darwin: Vol. 1: The Evolution of Life*, Ed. by S. Tax, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960, pp. 264-274.
 - 25 Georges Politzer, *Principes Fondamentaux de Philosophie*, Paris: Editions Sociales, 1954, p. 84.
 - 26 Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, London, 1984, p. 184.
 - 27 *Bilim ve Teknik* ["Science and Technique"] magazine, Vol. 201, p. 16.
 - 28 Michael Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, New York: The Free Press, 1998, p. 9.
 - 28 Stuart B. Levy, "The Challenge of Antibiotic Resistance", *Scientific American*, March 1998, p. 35.
 - 30 *Medical Tribune*, 29 December 1988, pp.1,
23.
 - 31 *Hubert Journal of Molecular Evolution*, Vol. 26, pp. 99-121.
 - 32 Sarich *et al.*, *Cladistics*, Vol: 5, 1989, pp. 3-32.
 - 33 Karen Hopkin, "The Greatest Apes," *New Scientist*, May 15, 1999, p. 27.
 - 34 "Fruit Fly Gene Success," *BBC News*, 18 February, 2000.
 - 35 Mike Benton, "Is a Dog More Like Lizard or a Chicken?" *New Scientist*, Vol. 103, August 16, 1984, p. 19.
 - 36 John Ostrom, "Bird Flight: How Did It Begin?," *American Scientist*, January-February 1979, Vol. 67.
 - 37 Kevin Padian, "Early Bird in Slow Motion," *Nature*, 1 August 1996, p. 401.
 - 38 Carl O. Dunbar, *Historical Geology*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1961, p. 310.
 - 39 L.D. Martin, J.D. Stewart, K.N. Whetstone, "The Origin of birds: Structure of the tarsus and teeth," *The Auk*, Vol. 97, 1980, p. 86.
 - 40 Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It . . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, 1 February 1997, p. 31.
 - 41 "Old Bird," *Discover*, Vol. 18, No. 3, 21 March 1997.
 - 42 *Ibid.*
 - 43 Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It . . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, p. 31.
 - 44 Terry D. Jones, John A. Ruben, Larry D. Martin, Evgeny N. Kurochkin, Alan Feduccia, Paul F. A. Maderson, Willem J. Hillenius, Nicholas R. Geist, Vladamir Alifanov, "Nonavian Feathers in a Late Triassic Archosaur." *Science*, 23 June 2000, pp. 2202-2205; "Earliest feathers fan controversy," 22 June 2000, *BBC News*, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/802009.stm>.
 - 45 S.J. Gould & N. Eldredge, *Paleobiology*, Vol. 3, 1977, p. 147.
 - 46 Timothy Rowe, Richard A. Ketcham, Cambria Denison, Matthew Colbert, Xing Xu, and Philip J. Currie, "Forensic palaeontology: The Arc-

haeoraptor forgery," *Nature*, 29 March 2001, Vo.: 410, pp. 539-540.

47 Robert Kunzig, "The Face of an Ancestral Child," *Discover*, December 1996, pp. 97-100.

48 Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, New York: Taplinger Publications, 1970, pp. 75-94.

49 Charles E. Oxnard, "The Place of Australopithecines in Human Evolution: Grounds for Doubt," *Nature*, Vol. 258, p. 389.

50 Isabelle Bourdial, "Adieu Lucy," *Science et Vie*, May 1999, No. 980, pp. 52-62.

51 Ozer Bulut, Davut Sagdic, Selim Korkmaz, *Lise Biyoloji 3* ("High School Biology 3"), Istanbul: MEB Press, 2000, p. 183.

52 Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*. New York: Free Press, 1996, pp. 232-233.

53 H. S. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution", *Physics Bulletin*, vol. 138, 1980, p. 138.

54 Özer Bulut, Davut Sağdıç, Selim Korkmaz, *Biyoloji Lise 3*, p.182.

55 Sidney Fox, Klaus Dose, *Molecular Evolution and The Origin of Life*, New York: Marcel Dekker, 1977, p. 2.

56 <http://www.apologetics.org/articles/founder2.html>; Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, Longman, England, 1986, p. 1.

57 *Ibid*.

58 Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, London: W.W. Norton, 1986, p. 159.

59 <http://www.evolutiondeceit.com/conferences.php>.

60 D.R. Oldroyd, *Darwinian Impacts*, Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1983, pp. 23, 32.

61 *Trends in Genetics*, February 1999.

62 Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1983, p. 197.

63 Levinton, Jeffrey S., "The Big Bang of Animal Evolution," *Scientific American*, 267:84, November 1992.

64 Richard Monastersky, "Mysteries of the Orient," *Discover*, April 1993, p. 40.

65 Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 229.

66 Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, p. 197.

67 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 302.

68 Stefan Bengtson, "The Solution to a Jigsaw Puzzle" *Nature*, Vol. 345, 1990, p. 765.

69 Mark Czarnecki, "The Revival of the Creationist Crusade," *MacLean's*, January 19, 1981, p. 56.

70 W. Dort, *Antarctic Journal of the US*, 1971, p. 210.

71 M. S. Kieth, G. M. Anderson, "Radiocarbon Dating: Fictitious Results with Mollusk Shells," *Science*, August 16, 1963, p. 634.

72 G. W. Barendsen, E. S. Deevey, L. J. Gralenski, "Yale Natural Radiocarbon Measurements," *Science*, Vol. 126, p. 911.

73 H. R. Crane, "University of Michigan Radiocarbon Dates I," *Science*, Vol. 124, p. 666, specimen M-19.

74 Charles Reed, "Animal Domestication in the Prehistoric Near East," *Science*, Vol. 130, p. 1630.

75 Michael Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, p. 106.

76 W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, pp. 298-299.

77 "Hoyle on Evolution," *Nature*, Vol. 294, November 12, 1981, p. 105.

78 A. I. Oparin, *Origin of Life*, p. 196.

79 David E. Green, Robert F. Goldberger, *Molecular Insights into the Living Process*, Academic Press, New York, 1967, s. 403.

80 Mahlon B. Hoagland, *Hayatın Kökeni* ("The Roots of Life"), Ankara: Tubitak, 1998, p. 40.

81 www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-55683967.html.

82 M. Yılmaz Öner, *Canlıların Diyalektiği ve Yeni Evrim Teorisi*, Belge Publishing, 2000, p. 165.

83 Jean-Jacques Hublin, *The Hamlyn Ency-*

clopaedia of Prehistoric Animals, New York : The Hamlyn Publishing Group Ltd., 1984, p. 120.

84 Jacques Millot, "The Coelacanth," *Scientific American*, December 1955, No. 193, p. 39.

85

<http://www.cnn.com/TECH/science/9809/23/living.fossil/index.html>.

86 Peter L. Forey, "Golden jubilee for the coelacanth *Latimeria chalumnae*," *Nature*, Vol. 336, 1988, p. 729.

87 Richard B. Bliss and Gray A. Parker, *Origin of Life*, California, 1979, p. 14.

88 David Jorafsky, *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961, p. 4.

89 Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It . . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, p. 31.

90 Ozer Bulut, Davut Sagdic, Elim Korkmaz, *Lise Biyoloji 3* ("High School Biology 3"), p. 135.

91 Musa Ozet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biology I*, Istanbul: Surat Publishing, 1998, p. 138.

92 Robert Shapiro, *Origins: A Sceptics Guide to the Creation of Life on Earth*, New York: Summit Books, 1986, p. 127.

93 Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984, p. 148.

94 *Ibid*, p. 130.

95 Francis Crick, *Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 88.

96 Edward S. Deevey, Jr. 1967, "The Reply: Letter from Birnam Wood," *Yale Review*, 61, pp. 631-640.

97 Maria Genevieve Lavanant, *Bilim ve Teknik* magazine, April 1984, No. 197, p. 22.

98 Erik Trinkaus, "Hard Times Among the Neanderthals," *Natural History*, Vol. 87, December 1978, p. 10.

99 "Neandertals Lived Harmoniously," *The AAAS Science News Service*, 3 April 1997.

100 Ralph Solecki, *Shanidar: The First Flower People*, New York: Knopf, 1971, p. 196.

101 D. Johanson, B. Edgar, *From Lucy to Language*, pp. 99, 107.

102 Mary C. Stiner, Steven L. Kuhn, "Subsistence, Technology, and Adaptive Variation in Middle Paleolithic Italy," *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 94, No. 2, 1992, pp.309-310.

103 Roger Lewin, *The Origin of Modern Humans*, New York: Scientific American Library, , 1993, p. 131.

104 John Ostrom, "Bird Flight: How Did It Begin?," *American Scientist*, p. 47.

105

<http://www.strangescience.net/cuvier.htm>.

106 *Ibid*.

107 Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim* ("Heredity and Evolution"), Ankara: Meteksan Publishing, 1995, p. 61.

108 *Ibid*.

109 Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, 2nd Edition, New York: A L. Burt Co., 1874, p. 178.

110 *Ibid*., p. 171.

111 *Ibid*.

112 W. Parker Snow, "A Few Remarks on the Wild Tribes of Tierra del Fuego from Personal Observation," *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, Vol. 1, 1861 (1861), pp. 261-267.

113 Benjamin Farrington, *What Darwin Really Said*, London: Sphere Books, 1971, pp. 54-56.

114 James Ferguson, "The Laboratory of Racism," *New Scientist*, Vol. 103, September 27, 1984, p. 18.

115 Lalita Prasad Vidyarthi, *Racism, Science and Pseudo-Science*, Unesco, France, Vendôme, 198, p. 54.

116 Rebekah E. Sutherland, "Social Darwinism," <http://www.rebsutherland.com/SocialDarwinism.htm>.

117 Stephen Jay Gould, *Ever Since Darwin*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992, pp. 217-218.

118 Glen McLean, Roger Oakland, Larry McLean, *The Evidence for Creation: Examining The Origin of Planet Earth*, Pittsburgh: Full Gospel Bible Institute, Whitaker House, 1989, p. 94.

119 Desmond King-Hele, *Doctor of Revoluti-*

on: *The Life and Times of Erasmus Darwin*, London: Faber & Faber, 1977, p. 361.

120 William R. Denslow, *10,000 Famous Freemasons*, Vol. I. Richmond: Macoy Publishing & Masonic Supply Co., 1957, p. 285.

121 Richard, Dawkins, *Climbing Mount Improbable*, New York: W.W. Norton, 1996, p. 283.

122 Francisco J. Ayala, "The Mechanisms of Evolution." *Scientific American*, Vol. 239, September 1978, p. 64.

123 Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, London: Burnett Books, 1985.

124 Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981, p. 72.

125 Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, p. 171.

126 *Ibid.*, p. 178.

127 Malcolm Wilkins, *Plantwatching*, New York: Facts on File Publications, 1988, pp. 25-26.

128 Jacques Millot, "The Cœlacanth." *Scientific American*, December 1955, Vol. 193, p. 39.

129 Maria Genevieve Lavanant, *Bilim ve Teknik*, April 1984, No. 197, p. 22.

130 Frank B. Salisbury, "Doubts about the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution." *American Biology Teacher*, September 1971, p. 336.

131 Paul Auger, *De La Physique Theorique a la Biologie*, 1970, p. 118.

132 Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim*, Ankara: Meteksan Yayınları, 1984, p. 39.

133 Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. London: Burnett Books, 1985, p. 351.

134 Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Ethics and Values in Biological and Cultural Evolution", *Zygon, The Journal of Religion and Science, as reported in Los Angeles Times*, part IV (June 16, 1974), p. 6

135 Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, , 1977, p. 87.

136 Niles Eldredge, "Is Evolution Progress?" *Science Digest*, September 1983, pp. 40, 160.

137 http://www.repromed.org.uk/history/history_1500.htm.

tory_1500.htm.

138 G.G. Simpson, W. Beck, *An Introduction to Biology*, New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1965, p. 241.

139 Elizabeth Pennisi, "Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered", *Science*, 5 September 1997: Vol. 277. no. 5331, p. 1435.

140 Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It. . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, p. 28.

141 D. Loyd, *The Mitochondria of Microorganisms*, 1974, p. 476.

142 Gray & Doolittle, "Has the Endosymbiont Hypothesis Been Proven?," *Microbiological Review*, Vol. 30, 1982, p. 46.

143 Wallace-Sanders-Ferl, *Biology: The Science of Life*, 4th Edition, Harper Collins College Publishers, p. 94.

144 Mahlon B. Hoagland, *The Roots of Life*, p. 145.

145 Whitfield, "Book Review of Symbiosis in Cell Evolution", *Biological Journal of Linnean Society*, Vol. 77-79 1982, p. 18.

146 W. Ford Doolittle, "Uprooting the Tree of Life," *Scientific American*, 282:90, February 2000.

147 Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, pp. 16-17, 19

148 *Ibid.*

149 Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Sphere Books, 1984, p. 230.

150 K. Ludmerer, *Eugenics*, In: *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, edited by Mark Lappe, New York: The Free Press, 1978, p. 457.

151 <http://www.trufax.org/avoid/nazi.html>; Theodore D. Hall, Ph. D., *Scientific Background of Nazi 'Race Purification' Program*, Leading Edge International Research Group.

152 A. E. Wilder Smith, *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny, A Critical Survey of the Principles of Evolution and Christianity*, The Word For Today Publishing 1993, pp.163, 16.

153 Henry Morris, *The Long War Against God*, p. 78; Francis Schaeffer, *How Shall We Then Live?*, Old Tappan, NJ: Revell Books, , 1976, p.

151.

154 Maria Genevieve Lavanant, *Bilim ve Teknik* magazine, April 1984, No. 197, p. 22.

155 R. Wesson, *Beyond Natural Selection*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991, p. 45.

156 Huxley, J. as cited in *The Best of Humanism*, ed. Roger E. Greeley. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1988. pp. 194-5.

157 <http://www.jcn.com/manifestos.html>.

158 Phillip E. Johnson, "Evolution as Dogma: The Establishment of Naturalism," <http://www.arn.org/docs/johnson/pjdogma1.htm>.

159 Thomas Dwight, *Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*. London: Longmans Green & Co, 1927, pp. 20-21.

160 Pierre P. Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, p. 103.

161 *Ibid.*, p. 107.

162 Ann Gibbons, "Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur," *Science*, Vol. 278, no. 5341, 14. November 1997, pp.1229-1230.

163 Pat Shipman, "'Birds Do It. . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, p. 28.

164 Coates M. 1991. New palaeontological contributions to limb ontogeny and phylogeny. In: J. R. Hinchcliffe (ed.) *Developmental Patterning of the Vertebrate Limb* 325-337. New York: Plenum Press; Coates M. I. 1996. "The Devonian tetrapod *Acanthostega gunnari* Jarvik: postcranial anatomy, basal tetrapod interrelationships and patterns of skeletal evolution," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 87, pp. 363-421.

165 Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp. 151, 154.

166 John Randall, quoted in William Fix's *The Bone Peddlers: Selling Evolution*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1984, p. 189.

167

<http://www.evolutiondeceit.com/conferences.php>.

168 Duane T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No*, ICR, San Diego, 1998, p. 103.

169 Robert L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology*

and *Evolution*. p. 336.

170 "Piltdown," *Meydan Larousse*, Vol. 10, p. 133.

171 *Bilim ve Yaşam Ansiklopedisi*, Istanbul: Gelişim Publishing, 1976, p. 4.

172 Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları, Genel Biyoloji/Genel Zooloji*, Vol.I, Chapter 10, Ankara, 1993, pp. 629-630.

173 *Ibid*, p. 629.

174 Robert Wesson, *Beyond Natural Selection*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991, p. 45.

175 Pierre Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 82.

176 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, pp. 172, 280.

177 David Day, *Vanished Species*, New York: Gallery Books, , 1989.

178 T. N. George, "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *Science Progress*, Vol. 48, January 1960, pp. 1, 3.

179 N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1982, p. 59.

180 Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, Abacus, Sphere Books, London, 1984, p. 82.

181 George G. Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1944, pp. 105, 107.

182 D.S. Woodroff, *Science*, Vol. 208, 1980, p. 716.

183 Richard B. Bliss and Gary E. Parker, *Origin of Life*, California, 1979, p. 25.

184 *Ibid*.

185 S. W. Fox, K. Harada, G. Kramptz, G. Mueller, "Chemical Origin of Cells," *Chemical Engineering News*, June 22, 1970, p. 80.

186 Gordon R. Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, p. 48.

187 Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, London: River Publishing, 1984, p. 70.

188 Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1983, p. 197.

- 189 Douglas Futuyma, *Evolutionary Biology*, 2. b., MA: Sinauer, Sunderland, 1986, p. 4.
- 190 K. Ludmerer, "Eugenics" in *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, Edited by Mark Lappe, New York: The Free Press, , 1978, p. 457.
- 191 Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, New York: Harvard Common Press, 1971, p. 33.
- 192 *Ibid.*
- 193 Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları, Genel Biyoloji/Genel Zooloji*, Vol. I, Part I, Ankara, 1993, p. 606.
- 194 <http://www.evolutiondeceit.com/conferences.php>.
- 195 Stephen Jay Gould, "Introduction," in Björn Kurtén, *Dance of the Tiger: A Novel of the Ice Age* (New York: Random House, 1980), xvii-xviii)
- 196 Loren Eiseley, *Darwin's Century*, p. 283.
- 197 George Stein, "Biological science and the roots of Nazism," *American Scientist*, Vol. 76(1), 1988, p. 54.
- 198 J. Lear Grimmer, *National Geographic*, August 1962, p. 391.
- 199 L.S. B. Leakey, *The Origin of Homo sapiens*, ed. F. Borde, Paris: UNESCO, 1972, pp. 25-29; L.S.B. Leakey, *By the Evidence*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.
- 200 Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992, p. 83.
- 201 Boyce Rensberger, *The Washington Post*, November 19, 1984.
- 202 Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 136.
- 203 Holly Smith, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Vol. 94, 1994, pp. 307-325.
- 204 Fred Spoor, Bernard Wood, Frans Zonneveld, "Implication of Early Hominid Labryntine Morphology for Evolution of Human Bipedal Locomotion," *Nature*, Vol. 369, June 23, 1994, pp. 645-648.
- 205 Tim Bromage, *New Scientist*, Vol. 133, 1992, pp. 38-41.
- 206 J. E. Cronin, N. T. Boaz, C. B. Stringer, Y. Rak, "Tempo and Mode in Hominid Evolution," *Nature*, vol. 292, 1981, pp. 117.
- 207 C. L. Brace, H. Nelson, N. Korn, M. L. Brace, *Atlas of Human Evolution*, 2nd Edition, New York: Rinehart and Wilson, 1979.
- 208 Alan Walker, *Scientific American*, Vol. 239 (2), 1978, p. 54.
- 209 A. J. Kelso, *Physical Anthropology*, 1st Edition, 1970, p. 221; M. D. Leakey, *Olduvai Gorge*, Vol. 3, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, p. 272.
- 210 I. Anderson, "Who made the Laetoli Footprints?" *New Scientist*, Vol. 98, 1983, p. 373.
- 211 Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, p. 145.
- 212 *Ibid.*, pp. 290-291.
- 213 Dr. David N. Menton, "The Hopeful Monsters of Evolution," <http://www.genenet.org/facts/metro12.html>.
- 214 *Ibid.*
- 215 Stephen M. Stanley, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process*, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1979, pp. 35, 159.
- 216 S. J. Gould, "Return of the Hopeful Monster," *The Panda's Thumb*, New York: W. W. Norton Co., , 1980, pp. 186-193.
- 217 Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Bi-yoloji 1* ("Biology 1") Istanbul: Sürat Publishing, 1998, p. 7.
- 218 Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları, Genel Biyoloji/Genel Zooloji*, Vol. I, Part I, Ankara, 1993, pp. 12-13.
- 219 Henry Gee, *In Search Of Deep Time: Beyond The Fossil Record To A New History Of Life*, New York: The Free Press, A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1999, p. 54.
- 220 Ilya Prigogine, Isabelle Stengers, *Order Out of Chaos*, New York: Bantam Books, 1984, p. 129.
- 221 *Ibid.* p. 175.
- 222 Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*,

Ankara: Meteksan Yayınları, 1984, p. 644.

223 Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning Was Information*, CLV, Bielefeld, Germany, p. 80.

224 George C. Williams, *The Third Culture: Beyond the Scientific Revolution*, ed. John Brockman, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995, p. 43.

225 Pierre P. Grassé, *The Evolution of Living Organisms*, 1977, p. 168.

226 Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 189.

227 Özer Bulut, Davut Sağdıç, *Elim Korkmaz*, Biyoloji Lise 3, p. 152.

228 Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları, Genel Biyoloji/Genel Zooloji*, Vol. I, Part I, Ankara, 1993, p. 605.

230 Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, p. 689.


231 Marvin L. Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 88.

232 Phillip E. Johnson, Darwin on Trial, p. 155. Phillip E. Johnson, Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law & Education, Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1995, p. 62.

233 "Does nonsense DNA speak its own dialect?," *Science News*, Vol. 164, December 24, 1994.

234 Service, R.F., Vogel, G, *Science*, February 16, 2001.

235 S. R. Scadding, "Do 'Vestigial Organs' Provide Evidence for Evolution?" *Evolutionary Theory*, Vol. 5, May 1981, p. 173.



THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE II



**HARUN YAHYA
(ADNAN OKTAR)**

This book is based on other works by the same author dealing with the collapse of the theory of evolution.

The aim in compiling this anthology is to let readers easily obtain information on all matters concerning evolution and to have access to the most accurate facts. You can thus acquire the most practical, accurate and reliable information regarding all the terms and concepts you may encounter regarding the theory of evolution in the press, in magazines, books, TV programs and other media.

The hypothetical claims made by those who advocate the theory of evolution—and how their assertions are invalidated by the scientific facts and recently discovered evidence—are set out in an encyclopedic format, under alphabetical headings.



About the Author

Adnan Oktar, who writes under the pen-name Harun Yahya, was born in Ankara in 1956. Since the 1980s, the author has published many books on faith-related, scientific and political issues. He is well-known as the author of important works disclosing the imposture of evolutionists, their invalid claims, and the dark liaisons between Darwinism and such bloody ideologies as fascism

and communism.

All of the author's works share one single goal: to convey the Qur'an's message, encourage readers to consider basic faith-related issues such as Allah's existence and unity and the Hereafter; and to expose irreligious systems' feeble foundations and perverted ideologies. His more than 300 works, translated into 63 different languages, enjoy a wide readership across the world.

By the will of Allah, the books of Harun Yahya will be a means through which people in the twenty-first century will attain the peace, justice, and happiness promised in the Qur'an.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

اللَّهُ
رَسُولُ
مُحَمَّدٍ

TO THE READER

A special chapter is assigned to the collapse of the theory of evolution because this theory constitutes the basis of all anti-spiritual philosophies. Since Darwinism rejects the fact of creation—and therefore, Allah's existence—over the last 150 years it has caused many people to abandon their faith or fall into doubt. It is therefore an imperative service, a very important duty to show everyone that this theory is a deception. Since some readers may find the opportunity to read only one of our books, we think it appropriate to devote a chapter to summarize this subject.

All the author's books explain faith-related issues in light of Qur'anic verses, and invite readers to learn Allah's words and to live by them. All the subjects concerning Allah's verses are explained so as to leave no doubt or room for questions in the reader's mind. The books' sincere, plain, and fluent style ensures that everyone of every age and from every social group can easily understand them. Thanks to their effective, lucid narrative, they can be read at one sitting. Even those who rigorously reject spirituality are influenced by the facts these books document and cannot refute the truthfulness of their contents.

This and all the other books by the author can be read individually, or discussed in a group. Readers eager to profit from the books will find discussion very useful, letting them relate their reflections and experiences to one another.

In addition, it will be a great service to Islam to contribute to the publication and reading of these books, written solely for the pleasure of Allah. The author's books are all extremely convincing. For this reason, to communicate true religion to others, one of the most effective methods is encouraging them to read these books.

We hope the reader will look through the reviews of his other books at the back of this book. His rich source material on faith-related issues is very useful, and a pleasure to read.

In these books, unlike some other books, you will not find the author's personal views, explanations based on dubious sources, styles that are unobservant of the respect and reverence due to sacred subjects, nor hopeless, pessimistic arguments that create doubts in the mind and deviations in the heart.

Translated by Carl Nino Rossini
Edited by Timothy Mossman

Published by
GLOBAL PUBLISHING

Talatpasa Mahallesi, Emirgazi Caddesi, İbrahim Elmas İş Merkezi A Blok, Kat: 4
Okmeydani - Istanbul / Turkey
Tel: +90 212 222 00 88

Printed and bound by Secil Ofset in Istanbul
100 Yıl Mah. MAS-SIT Matbaacilar Sitesi 4. Cadde No: 77 Bağcılar-Istanbul/Turkey
Phone: (+90 212) 629 06 15

All translations from the Qur'an are from *The Noble Qur'an: a New Rendering of its Meaning in English* by Hajj Abdalhaqq and Aisha Bewley, published by Bookwork, Norwich, UK. 1420 CE/1999 AH.

www.harunyahya.com - www.harunyahya.net



THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE II



K-Z

ABOUT THE AUTHOR


Now writing under the pen-name of HARUN YAHYA, Adnan Oktar was born in Ankara in 1956. Having completed his primary and secondary education in Ankara, he studied fine arts at Istanbul's Mimar Sinan University and philosophy at Istanbul University. Since the 1980s, he has published many books on political, scientific, and faith-related issues. Harun Yahya is well-known as the author of important works disclosing the imposture of evolutionists, their invalid claims, and the dark liaisons between Darwinism and such bloody ideologies as fascism and communism.

Harun Yahya's works, translated into 63 different languages, constitute a collection for a total of more than 55,000 pages with 40,000 illustrations.

His pen-name is a composite of the names Harun (Aaron) and Yahya (John), in memory of the two esteemed Prophets who fought against their peoples' lack of faith. The Prophet's seal on his books' covers is symbolic and is linked to their contents. It represents the Qur'an (the Final Scripture) and Prophet Muhammad (saas), last of the prophets. Under the guidance of the Qur'an and the Sunnah (teachings of the Prophet [saas]), the author makes it his purpose to disprove each fundamental tenet of irreligious ideologies and to have the "last word," so as to completely silence the objections raised against religion. He uses the seal of the final Prophet (saas), who attained ultimate wisdom and moral perfection, as a sign of his intention to offer the last word.

All of Harun Yahya's works share one single goal: to convey the Qur'an's message, encourage readers to consider basic faith-related issues such as Allah's existence and unity and the Hereafter; and to expose irreligious systems' feeble foundations and perverted ideologies.

Harun Yahya enjoys a wide readership in many coun-



tries, from India to America, England to Indonesia, Poland to Bosnia, Spain to Brazil, Malaysia to Italy, France to Bulgaria and Russia. Some of his books are available in English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Urdu, Arabic, Albanian, Chinese, Swahili, Hausa, Dhivehi (spoken in Maldives), Russian, Serbo-Croat (Bosnian), Polish, Malay, Uygur Turkish, Indonesian, Bengali, Danish and Swedish.

Greatly appreciated all around the world, these works have been instrumental in many people recovering faith in Allah and gaining deeper insights into their faith. His books' wisdom and sincerity, together with a distinct style that's easy to understand, directly affect anyone who reads them. Those who seriously consider these books, can no longer advocate atheism or any other perverted ideology or materialistic philosophy, since these books are characterized by rapid effectiveness, definite results, and irrefutability. Even if they continue to do so, it will be only a sentimental insistence, since these books refute such ideologies from their very foundations. All contemporary movements of denial are now ideologically defeated, thanks to the books written by Harun Yahya.


This is no doubt a result of the Qur'an's wisdom and lucidity. The author modestly intends to serve as a means in humanity's search for Allah's right path. No material gain is sought in the publication of these works.

Those who encourage others to read these books, to open their minds and hearts and guide them to become more devoted servants of Allah, render an invaluable service.

Meanwhile, it would only be a waste of time and energy to propagate other books that create confusion in people's minds, lead them into ideological confusion, and that clearly have no strong and precise effects in removing the doubts in people's hearts, as also verified from previous experience. It is impossible for books devised to emphasize the author's literary power rather than the noble goal of saving people from loss of faith, to have such a great effect. Those who doubt this can readily see that the sole aim of Harun Yahya's books is to overcome disbelief and to disseminate the Qur'an's moral values. The success and impact of this service are manifested in the readers' conviction.

One point should be kept in mind: The main reason for the continuing cruelty, conflict, and other ordeals endured by the vast majority of people is the ideological prevalence of disbelief. This can be ended only with the ideological defeat of disbelief and by conveying the wonders of creation and Qur'anic morality so that people can live by it. Considering the state of the world today, leading into a downward spiral of violence, corruption and conflict, clearly this service must be provided speedily and effectively, or it may be too late.

In this effort, the books of Harun Yahya assume a leading role. By the will of Allah, these books will be a means through which people in the twenty-first century will attain the peace, justice, and happiness promised in the Qur'an.



THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE II

Harun Yahya // Adnan Oktar



CONTENTS

K

Kanapoi Elbow Fossil Fraud, The	11
Kenyanthropus platyops	12
KNM-ER 1470 Fraud, The	13
KNM-ER 1472 Lie, The	15
KNM-WT 15000 (The oldest known human fossil)	15
Knuckle Walking	16

L

Laetoli Human Footprints, The	19
Lamarck, Jean B.	21
Lamarckism	22
Law of Biogenetics, The	22
Laws of Inheritance, The	22
Le Chatelier's Principle	23
Leakey, Richard	24
Left-Handed Amino Acids (Levo-Amino Acids)	25
Lewontin, Richard	27
Liaoningornis	28
"Life Comes from Life" Thesis, The	28
Linnaeus, Carolus	29
Lucy Deceit (Australopithecus afarensis), The	29

M

Macro-Evolution Myth, The	33
Macro-Mutation Myth, The	33
Malthus, Thomas Robert	35
Marx, Karl	36
Materialism	38
Mayr, Ernst	41
Mendel, Gregor	42
Menton, David	42
Metamorphosis	43
Micro-Evolution Myth, The	44
Miller Experiment, The	46
Miller, Stanley	51
Missing Link in the Evolutionary Chain, The	51
"Mitochondrial Eve" Thesis's Inconsistencies, The	51
Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution Myth, The	54
Modifications	55
Molecular Evolution Impasse, The	56
Nonsensical Nature of the Molecular Homology Thesis, The	57
Morphology	61

The Morphological Homology Myth	61
Morris, John	61
Mosaic Creatures	62
Mother Nature; An Irrational Concept	62
Mutagenic Factors	63
Mutant	63
Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism	64

N

Narrow Population	69
Naturalism	70
Natural Selection	70
Neanderthals: A Human Race	72
"Nebraska Man" Fraud, The	74
Neo-Darwinism Comedy, The	76

O

Octopus's Eye, The	79
OH 62: A Species of Ape	80
Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny Theory, The	80
Oparin, Alexander I.	81
Open System	81
Ordered System	83
Organized Systems	85
Orgel, Leslie	85
Origin of the Avian Lung	85
Origin of the Bacteria	90
Origin of the Bats	93
Origin of Behavior	95
Origin of the Birds	96
Origin of the Bird Feathers	98
Origin of the Fish	101
Origin of the Flies	103
Origin of Flight	104
Origin of the Horses	104
Origin of the Insects	107
Origin of Instinct	108
Origin of the Language	113
Origin of the Mammals	113
Origin of the Marine Mammals	115
Origin of the Marine Reptiles	119
Origin of the Quadrupeds	120
Origin of Photosynthesis	121
Origin of the Plant Cells	124
Origin of Reptiles	127
Origin of Species, The	130
Origin of Turtles	131
Origin of Vertebrates	132
Origin of Viruses	134
Origins of Bipedalism (Walking Upright)	136

Origin of Whales	137
Origin of the Wings	141
Orthogenesis Muddle, The (Directed Selection)	142
Ota Benga	142

P

Paleontology	147
Paleoanthropology	149
"Panda's Thumb" Error, The	150
Pangensis Theory, The	152
Panspermia Theory, The	152
Parallel Evolution Impasse, The	154
Pasteur, Louis	154
Peking Man Fraud, The	155
Pentadactyl Homology	157
Peptide Bond	157
Phylogeny	159
Phylum (Plural: Phyla)	160
Pitldown Man Fraud, The	160
Pithecanthropus erectus	162
Plasmid Transfer	162
Platypus	163
Pleiotropic Effect, The	163
Population	165
Pre-Adaptation Myth, The	165
Primeval Atmosphere, The	166
Primeval Earth, The	168
Primeval Soup, The	168
Theory of Favored Races, The	169
Primordial Soup Fantasy, The	169
Protein	170
Prokaryotic Cells	172
Protoavis	172
Punctuated Equilibrium	173
Punctuated Model of Evolution Myth, The	173

R

Ramapithecus Error, The	177
Recapitulation Theory	178
Recombination	178
Reconstruction (Imaginary Pictures)	178
Reductionism	180
Regulatory Gene	181
Ribosome	182
Right-Handed (Dextro) Amino Acids	182
RNA World Scenario, The	182

S-Ş

Schindewolf, Otto	187
Second Law of Thermodynamic, The (The Law of Entropy)	187

"Selfish Gene" Theory, The	191
Self-Ordering Error, The	193
"Self-Organization" Nonsense, The	194
Seymouria	196
Shapiro, Robert	196
Sickle Cell Anemia	197
Single Cell to Multi-Cell Transition Myth, The	198
Social Darwinism	200
Speciation	203
Spencer, Herbert	203
Spontaneous Generation	204
Stasis	204
Struggle For Survival, The	204
Synthetic Evolution Theory, The	205
Systematic	205

T

Taung Child Fossil, The	207
Taxonomy	209
Tetrapod Finger Structure, The	210
Theory	210
Theropod Dinosaurs	212
Transition From Jungle to Open Savanna Myth, The	214
Transition from Land to Air Myth, The	215
Transition from Sea to Land Thesis, The	216
Transition from Water to Land Dilemma, The	216
Transitional Forms, The (The Transitional Species)	220
Tree of Life	223
Trilobites	224
Turkana Boy Fossil, The	227

U


Urey, Harold	229
Urey-Miller Experiment, The	229

V-W

Variation	231
Vestigial Organs Thesis, The	233
Wallace, Alfred Russell	235
Watson, James	236

Y-Z

Zinjanthropus	239
---------------	-----



K

KANAPOI ELBOW FOSSIL FRAUD, THE

The best example of how evolutionists interpret fossils according to their own preconceptions is a fossilized elbow bone found in the Kenyan region of Knapoi. This fossil, displayed in the Kenya National Museum – East Rudolf under the number KP 271, consists of a part of the upper arm bone near the elbow. Unearthed in 1965 by Bryan Patterson of Harvard University, it has been exceedingly well preserved. The latest tests carried out by evolutionists have shown it to be around 4.5 million years old.¹ The fossil is therefore known as the oldest hominid fossil discovered to date.

In 1967, the researchers Bryan Patterson and W.W. Howells joined forces to describe KP 271. They suggested that the fossil's anatomy was similar to that of human beings and that it belonged to *Australopithecus*. Howells and his assistant Patterson announced the report regarding their research in the 7 April, 1967 edition of *Science* magazine, in which they stated:

In these diagnostic measurements, Knapoi Hominoid 1 [the original name given to the fossil] is strikingly

*close to the means of the human sample.*²

Though admitting the close resemblance to the bone of a present-day human, Howells and Patterson still maintained that the fossil belonged to *Australopithecus*, because to them, it was unacceptable that such an old fossil could belong to *Homo sapiens*.

But subsequently, studies performed by other researchers using computers again revealed that the fossil KP271 was identical to a human bone. As the result of his computer-assisted research, Henry M. McHenry of the University of California published an article in 1975:

*The results show that the Knapoi specimen, which is 4 to 4.5 million years old, is indistinguishable from modern Homo sapiens...*³

After this, various other researchers (including David Pilbeam and Brigitte Senut) have also performed experiments and comparative studies proving that the bone is identical to *H. sapiens*. Yet despite all the evidence, even the evolutionists who carried out all this research were unable to admit, on account of their own preconceptions, that this fossil could belong to *H. sapiens*.

KENYANTHROPUS PLATYOPS

In Kenya, a team led by Meave Leakey discovered a fossilized skull that was referred to as "Flat-faced Man" because of the shape of its facial bones. The fossil was given the scientific name of *Kenyanthropus platyops*. This 3.5 million-year-old fossil overturned evolutionists' imaginary evolutionary scenarios because some extinct ape species (such as "Lucy") that lived after *Kenyanthropus platyops* were more primitive than it according to evolutionist criteria.⁴ (See **Lucy Deceit, The.**)

In fact, when one looks at all of the fossils discovered to date, it becomes clear that there is no evolutionary progression, beginning from a common ancestor and slowly turning into apes and present day man.

Daniel E. Lieberman of Harvard University's Anthropology



The 3.5-million-year-old *Kenyanthropus platyops* fossil skull overturned evolutionists' imaginary evolutionary tree.

Department commented on *Kenyanthropus platyops* in an article in *Nature* magazine:

*The evolutionary history of humans is complex and unresolved. It now looks set to be thrown into further confusion by the discovery of another species and genus, dated to 3.5 million years ago. . . The nature of *Kenyanthropus platyops* raises all kinds of questions, about human evolution in general and the behaviour of this species in particular. Why, for example, does it have the unusual combination of small cheek teeth and a big flat face with an anteriorly positioned arch of the cheekbone? All other known hominin species with big faces and similarly positioned cheekbones have big teeth. I suspect the chief role of *K. platyops* in the next few years will be to act as a sort of party spoiler, highlighting the confusion that confronts research into evolutionary relationships among hominins.*⁵

The BBC reported the story under such headlines as "Flat-Faced Man a Puzzle," "A Confusing Picture" and "A Scientific Contradiction" and went on to say that:

*The discovery by Meave Leakey, of the National Museums of Kenya, and colleagues threatens to blur still further the already murky picture of man's evolution.*⁶

Fred Spoor, the famous evolu-

tionist in University College London said that "the fossil raises a lot of questions."⁷

As can be seen from these statements and admissions, the theory of evolution is facing a major dilemma. In particular, every new discovery in the field of paleontology presents a new contradiction for the theory of evolution to explain. Evolutionists who produce diagrams of the supposed evolution of mankind seek to incorporate new discoveries by setting the fossils out among extinct species of ape and to human races.

However, no fossil fits in with their diagrams, simply because human beings and apes did not evolve from any common ancestor. Human beings have always been human beings, and apes have always been apes. For that reason, the theory of evolution faces an ever greater dilemma with every new scientific discovery.

KNM-ER 1470 FRAUD, THE

In 1972, a fossil was discovered in East Rudolf that would lead to debates in paleoanthropology. This was a complete skull, lacking only the lower jaw, but broken into some 300 parts, which were assembled by Richard Leakey and his wife, Meave.

It was later sent to the Kenya National Museum – East Rudolf and classified as *Homo habilis*. (See *Homo habilis*.)

Homo habilis shares many features with the apes known as *Australopithecus*. Like them, *H. habilis* has a long-armed, short-legged and ape-like skeletal structure. Its hands and feet are well suited to climbing. These characteristics show that *H. habilis* spent most of its time in the trees.

The volume of the majority of skulls classified as *H. habilis* does not exceed 650 cubic centimeters. This brain size is very close to that of present-day gorillas. On the other hand, its jaw structure closely resembles that of present-day apes, definitely proving that it was an ape.

In terms of general skull features, it bears a closer resemblance to *Australopithecus africanus*. Like *A. africanus*, *H. habilis* has no eyebrow protrusions. Previously, this feature led to its being misinterpreted and depicted as a human-like creature.

KNM-ER 1470's long, broad forehead, its less obvious eyebrow protrusions, the lack of the structure in the gorilla skull known as the sagittal crest, and its 750 cubic centimeter brain volume show that it did not resemble human beings. J. E. Cronin

describes why:

*However its relatively robustly constructed face, flattish naso-alveolar clivus (recalling australopithecine dished faces), low maximum cranial width (on the temporals), strong canine juga and large molars (as indicated by remaining roots) are all relatively primitive traits which ally the specimen with members of the taxon A. africanus . . . KNM-ER 1470, like other early Homo specimens, shows many morphological characteristics in common with gracile australopithecines that are not shared with later specimens of the genus Homo.*⁸

C. Loring Brace of the Museum of Anthropology, Michigan University says this on the same subject:

*. . . from the size of the palate and the expansion of the area allotted to molar roots, it would appear that ER 1470 retained a fully Australopithecus -sized face and dentition.*⁹

Another well known paleontologist, Bernard Wood, makes this comment:

*There is no evidence that this cranium particularly resembles H. sapiens or H. erectus according to either phenetic or cladistic evidence. Phenetically, KNM-ER 1470 is closest to the remains from Olduvai [considered apes by creationists] referred to as H. habilis.*¹⁰

The reason why the fossil KNM-

ER 1470 was interpreted as human for a while lies in the biased and leading interpretation of its discoverer, Richard Leakey. He sought to give the impression that although the fossil had ape-like features, the skull was too large to be that of an ape. The aim was to describe the creature as an intermediate form.

Professor Tim G. Bromage, a researcher into the anatomy of the human face, summarizes the facts he revealed with computer-aided simulations in 1992:

*When it [KNM-ER 1470] was first reconstructed, the face was fitted to the cranium in an almost vertical position, much like the flat faces of modern humans. But recent studies of anatomical relationships show that in life, the face must have jutted out considerably, creating an ape-like aspect, rather like the faces of Australopithecus.*¹¹


KNM-ER 1470's 750-cubic centimeter skull does not in any way make it a hominid and prevent it from being an ape species, because there are apes with just such a skull volume. In referring to ape skulls, evolutionists generally point to chimpanzees, with a smaller-sized brain, but never mention gorillas. Chimpanzees have an average brain volume of 400 cubic centimeters. Gorillas have an average brain size

of 500 cubic centimeters, although in larger individuals, this may rise to 700 and even 750 cc centimeters.

Therefore, KNM-ER 1470's large brain size shows that it was a large ape (estimated to be a male), rather than a hominid. Indeed, the fact that KNM-ER 1470 has large teeth and a broad skull volume indicates that its body was correspondingly large.

From all this, it appears that structurally, KNM-ER 1470 was an ape resembling *Australopithecus*. Many features, such as its forward-looking face, abnormally large molars and brain volume too small to belong to a human being, reveal this clearly. In addition, KNM-ER 1470's teeth are identical to those of *Australopithecus*.¹²

This indicates that there is no significant difference between fossils of the *Homo habilis* class and those of the *Australopithecus* class. These all consist of different species of ape that were unable to walk on two feet and had smaller brains compared with those of man. All evolutionists do is to pick out certain features of these and use them as anatomical links in the myth of evolution from ape to man.



KNM-ER 1472 LIE, THE

KNM-ER 1472 is the identifying "serial number" given to a thigh bone that is identical to one of modern man. That this bone was found in the same stratum as *Homo habilis* fossils, but a few kilometers away from them, led to the false interpretation that *H. habilis* was a two-legged creature. The fossil OH 62, discovered in 1987, showed that contrary to what had been thought *H. habilis* did not walk on two legs. KNM-ER 1472 was thus included under the classification *Homo erectus*. (See **Homo erectus**.)

KNM-WT 15000 (THE OLDEST KNOWN HUMAN FOSSIL)

KNM-WT 15000, otherwise known as the Turkana Boy skeleton, is perhaps the oldest and most fully preserved human remain found to date. (See **The Turkana Boy**.) Research into the fossil, said to be



Turkana Boy skeleton is the most complete example of Homo Erectus up till now. It is interesting that this 1.6 year-old skeleton and that of present day humans has no distinct difference.

Knuckle Walking

some 1.6 million years old, has shown that it belonged to an individual aged around 12, who would have been some 1.80 meters (5'11) tall on reaching adulthood. This fossil, which exhibits close similarities to the Neanderthal skeletons, is one of the most striking proofs to undermine the myth of human evolution. (See **Neanderthal Man: A Human Race.**)

KNUCKLE WALKING

—See Bipedalism

KP 271 (Kanapoi Hominid or Kanapoi Elbow Fossil) — See Kanapoi Elbow Bone Fossil Fraud, *The*





LAETOLI HUMAN FOOTPRINTS, THE

In 1978, Mary Leakey discovered a number of footprints in a layer of volcanic ash in Laetoli in Kenya. These prints were employed as an important part of the evolutionist propaganda regarding the well-known fossil "Lucy" (See *The Lucy Deceit*). Evolutionists portrayed the Laetoli footprints as concrete proof that Lucy—which they regarded as the common ancestor of man and ape—walked on two legs. It was announced that the prints were the same age as Lucy, approximately 3.6 millions years, and that they represented evidence of bipedalism.

The footprints were indeed of the same age as Lucy, they had clearly been left by a creature that walked upright. Yet there was no evidence to show that the prints belonged to *Australopithecus afarensis*, a supposed intermediate-form classification, like Lucy. They had evidently been left by a true human being.



A Laetoli footprint

The famous paleoanthropologist Tim White, who worked with Mary Leakey, said this on the subject:


*Make no mistake about it . . . They are like modern human footprints. If one were left in the sand of a California beach today, and a four-year-old were asked what it was, he would instantly say that somebody had walked there. He wouldn't be able to tell it from a hundred other prints on the beach, nor would you.*¹³

After examining the prints, Louis Robins from University of California said:

*The arch is raised—the smaller individual had a higher arch than I do . . . The toes grip the ground like human toes. You do not see this in other animal forms.*¹⁴

In short, it was impossible for these 3.6-million-year-old prints to belong to Lucy. Lucy had curved hands and feet and used her forearms when walking. She could not have left behind such prints, which can only belong to a human being. The only reason why they were thought to have been left by *Australopithecus afarensis* was the vol-

Human footprints 3.6 million
years old, found in Laetoli,
Tanzania



canic layer in which they were found, estimated as being 3.6 million years old. They were ascribed to *A. afarensis* from the idea that human beings could not have lived so far back in the past.

Independent examinations defined that 20 of the fossilized prints belonged to a 10-year-old human being, and 27 prints belonging to a younger human. These were definitely normal human beings, just like us. In other words, modern humans were living at a time in which evolutionists claim that our oldest ancestors were alive. In other words, man's ancestor is man!

LAMARCK, JEAN B.

Though the theory of evolution's philosophical roots go back as far as Ancient Greece, it entered the agenda of the scientific world in the 19th century. In his book *Zoological Philosophy*, the French biologist Jean B. Lamarck hypothesized that living species had evolved from one another.

According to him, living things pass along the features they acquire during their lives, and evolve in this way. Giraffes, for example, had descended from

antelope-like creatures; their necks had grown longer and longer over the generations as they sought to reach leaves from tall trees. Darwin also made use of Lamarck's thesis of the transmission of acquired characteristics as a factor that impelled evolution.

This "transmission of acquired traits" model lost all validity with the discovery of the laws of inheritance. (See ***The Laws of Inheritance.***) With the discovery of DNA in the mid-20th century, science realized that living things possess very special genetic information encoded in the cell's nucleus, and that this information cannot be altered by behavior or striving. (See ***DNA.***) Therefore, even if a living animal's neck did elongate by a few centimeters (an inch or two) as a result of constantly stretching up into the trees, it would still give birth to young with the standard neck measurements for its species.

The theory proposed by Lamarck was refuted by the scientific findings, and went down in history as an incorrect hypothesis.



Jean B. Lamarck

LAMARCKISM

Charles Darwin made use of Lamarck's thesis of the "transmission of acquired traits" as a factor giving rise to evolution. (See **Lamarck, Jean B.**)

Gordon Rattray Taylor, a researcher and proponent of evolution, described Lamarckism in his book *The Great Evolution Mystery*, and explained why Darwin was so heavily influenced by it:

Lamarckism is known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics . . . Darwin himself, as a matter of fact, was inclined to believe that such inheritance occurred and cited the reported case of a man who had lost his fingers and bred sons without fingers . . . [Darwin] had not, he said, gained a single idea from Lamarck. This was doubly ironical, for Darwin repeatedly toyed with the idea of the inheritance of acquired characteristics and, if it is so dreadful, it is Darwin who should be denigrated rather than Lamarck. . . In the 1859 edition of his work, Darwin refers to 'changes of ex-

*ternal conditions' causing variation but subsequently these conditions are described as directing variation and cooperating with natural selection in directing it. . . Every year he attributed more and more to the agency of use or disuse. . . By 1868, when he published *Varieties of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, he gave a whole series of examples of supposed Lamarckian inheritance: such as a man losing part of his little finger and all his sons being born with deformed little fingers and boys born with fore-skins much reduced in length as a result of generations of circumcision.*¹⁵

LAW OF BIOGENETICS, THE

—See Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny

LAWS OF INHERITANCE, THE

In the period during which Darwin developed the theory of evolution, the question of how living things transmitted their characteristics to later generations was unknown. Therefore, primitive conjectures such as traits being transmitted by way of the blood were widely accepted. This uncertainty about the mechanisms of heredity led Darwin

to predicate his theory on a range of completely erroneous assumptions.

He pointed to natural selection as the basis of the evolutionary mechanism. Yet if beneficial attributes were chosen by means of natural selection (the survival of the fittest"), how could they be transmitted from one generation to another? At this point, Darwin embraced the thesis, which Lamarck had proposed, of "the transmission of acquired characteristics."

However, Lamarck's thesis was refuted when the laws of inheritance discovered by the Austrian botanist and also a priest Gregor Mendel. This meant that beneficial traits could not be passed along. Genetic laws demonstrated that acquired features were not handed on, and that inheritance took place according to immutable rules—which by implication supported the idea of the immutability of species.

The laws of inheritance, determined by Gregor Mendel after lengthy experiments and observations, were published in 1865. However, these laws attracted the interest of the scientific world only towards the end of the century. Scientists accepted the validity of these laws in the early 20th century. This represented a serious impasse

for Darwin's theory, which he had based on Lamarck's "beneficial traits."

For that reason, scientific adherents of Darwinism in the first quarter of the 20th century sought to develop a new model of evolution. Thus neo-Darwinism was born. (See ***The Neo-Darwinism Comedy***.)

LE CHATELIER'S PRINCIPLE

As amino acids chemically combine to form a protein, they build what is known as the *peptide bond*. In building this bond, a water molecule is released. This totally invalidates the evolutionist account of primitive life emerging in the sea. According to the law known as Le Chatelier's Principle, it is impossible for a so-called condensation reaction—a reaction that gives off water—to take place in an environment that contains water. The probability of a chemical reaction taking place in a watery environment is described as the lowest possible.

Therefore, the oceans—where evolutionists say life began and where amino acids had to form—are totally unsuited to the formation of proteins. The chemist Richard E. Dickerson explains why:


*If polymeric chains of proteins and nucleic acids are to be forged out of their precursor monomers, a molecule of water must be removed at each link in the chain. It is therefore hard to see how polymerization could have proceeded in the aqueous environment of the primitive ocean, since the presence of water favors depolymerization rather than polymerization.*¹⁶

But in the face of this, it is also impossible for evolutionists to alter their claim and to maintain that life began on land, because the seas were supposedly the only environment capable of protecting the amino acids from harmful ultraviolet rays. Amino acids formed in the primitive atmosphere on land would be broken down by ultraviolet rays.

Yet Le Chatelier's principle makes it impossible for amino acids to have emerged in the sea! This is yet another insoluble dilemma facing the theory of evolution.

LEAKEY, RICHARD

As well as being an anthropologist and paleontologist, Richard Leakey is also a well known evolutionist writer. He is best known for his fossil-hunting activities, having discovered a great many fossils, par-



Richard Leakey's claims regarding the fossils he found by the shores of Lake Turkana in northern Kenya misled the world of paleoanthropology several times.

ticularly along the shores of Lake Turkana in Northern Kenya. Yet more than once, his suggestions regarding these fossils have misled the world of paleoanthropology.

For example, he described a fossil skull he dated at 2.8 million years old as the greatest discovery in the history of anthropology, though it was later realized that this skull's human-like face was the result of a deliberately falsified reconstruction. (See *Homo rudolfensis*.)

Leakey was strongly biased in favor of the theory of evolution, and

never changed his attitude in the face of the evidence against it. One example of this was his statements regarding the Turkana Boy. In evolutionists' imaginary family tree, they advanced the concept of *Homo erectus*, meaning "upright-walking human," in order to suggest a transition from ape to man, though the skeleton of *Homo erectus* is identical to that of any modern man.

The best known fossil included under that classification is the Turkana Boy. Later it was determined that, contrary to evolutionist claims, the fossil belonged to a 12-year-old boy, who would have reached a height of some 1.83 meters when fully grown. In addition, shortly after the fossil was discovered, it was determined that its upright skeleton was identical to that of modern human beings.

In an article titled "Modern and Tall," Leakey described the inconsistencies between the Turkana Boy fossil and evolutionary theories:

*... the boy from Turkana was surprisingly large compared with modern boys his age; ... he would probably go unnoticed in a crowd today. This find combines with previous discoveries of Homo erectus to contradict a long-held idea that humans have grown larger over the millennia.*¹⁷


Despite being an evolutionist, Leakey goes on to state that the differences between *Homo erectus* and modern man are not all that significant:

*One would also see differences: in the shape of the skull, in the degree of protrusion of the face, the robustness of the brows and so on. These differences are probably no more pronounced than we see today between the separate geographical races of modern humans. Such biological variation arises when populations are geographically separated from each other for significant lengths of time.*¹⁸

LEFT-HANDED AMINO ACIDS (LEVO-AMINO ACIDS)

The appropriate amino acids being arranged in the correct sequence is not sufficient to form a protein molecule in a living organism. In addition, each one of the 20 varieties of amino acid in a protein's structure must be *left-handed*.

In chemical terms, there are two different forms of any one amino acid; right-handed and left-handed. They differ in that their three-dimensional structures are mirror images of each another, just like the right and left hands on human beings.



L- Left handed amino acid

D- Right-handed amino acid

The question of how proteins distinguish left-handed amino acids, and how no right-handed amino acids ever become mixed up in them, are ones that evolutionists cannot answer. They can never account for such unique and rational selectivity.

Amino acids from either group can easily bind together with one another. However, research has revealed a most astonishing fact: The proteins in all living things, from the simplest to the most complex, are made up solely of left-handed amino acids. Even if just one right-handed amino acid is added to a protein's structure, that protein will become functionless.

In some experiments, bacteria have been given right-handed amino acids, but the bacteria have immediately broken down these amino acids—and in some cases, have reconstructed from these fragments left-handed amino acids that they can use.

Assume for a moment that life did come into existence by chance, as evolutionists maintain. If so, there should be equal amounts of right- and left-handed amino acids in nature, both being the results of chance. Therefore, there should be varying levels of right- and left-handed amino acids in the bodies of all living things, because chemically amino acids from either group can easily combine with one another.

The fact remains, however, that the proteins in living organisms consist solely of left-handed amino acids.

How do proteins select only left-handed amino acids? And why do no right-handed ones ever creep in?

This is a question that evolutionists are unable to explain away, and cannot account for such a specialized, conscious selectivity.

The amino acids of all living organisms on Earth, and the building blocks of complex polymers such as proteins, all have the same left-handed asymmetry. This is tantamount to tossing a coin a million times and having it always come up heads. It is impossible to understand why molecules become left-handed or right-handed, and that this choice is fascinatingly related to the origin of life on Earth.

In conclusion, it is totally impossible to account for the origin of life in terms of coincidences: If we calculate the probability of an average-sized protein consisting of 400 amino acids being made up only of left-handed amino acids, we obtain a figure of 1 in 2400, or 1 in 10^{120} .

In order to grasp some idea about this astronomical figure, we can say that the total number of electrons in the universe is very much smaller than this, having been calculated at around 1079. The chances of amino acids forming in the requisite sequence and functional form, give rise to a far larger number.

If we then add these probabilities and extend them to the formation of

many more, and more varied proteins, then the calculations become truly unfathomable.

LEWONTIN, RICHARD

Richard Lewontin, a well known geneticist and evolutionist from Harvard University, admits that he is "a materialist first, a scientist second":

It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, so we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door. ¹⁹

The term *a priori* that Lewontin uses is particularly significant. This philosophical term expresses a given assumption, based on no experimental data. In the absence of any information regarding the truth of an idea, that idea is assumed to be true, "from the beginning." As openly stated by the evolutionist Lewontin, materialism is an *a priori* assumption for evolutionists, one into which they attempt to make science fit.

Since materialism necessitates the rejection of a Creator, they cling to the theory of evolution as the only remaining alternative. It makes no difference how much the scientific findings refute evolution, since the scientists in question already regard evolution as a fact, *a priori*. This biased attitude leads to the belief that "unconscious substances can regulate themselves," which is a violation of both science and reason.



A 130-million-year-old *Liaoningornis* bird fossil, identical to modern birds.

LIAONINGORNIS

The best-known of the claims regarding intermediate forms in the context of reptile-bird evolution is the fossil known as *Archaeopteryx*. However, it is now known that *Archaeopteryx* is not an intermediate form at all, but that it was a flying bird, not much different from birds alive today. (See *Archaeopteryx*.)

Archaeopteryx, which has been proposed as "the forerunner of modern birds," lived approximately 150 million years ago. However, the discovery in China in November 1996 of a fossil known as *Liaoningornis* demolished evolutionists' claims concerning *Archaeopteryx*.

This bird, *Liaoningornis*, is around 130 million years old, possessed a


breastbone to which the flight muscles are attached—a structure also found in present-day birds. The only difference is that it had teeth in its beak. This showed that, in contrast to evolutionist claims, that toothed birds did not have a primitive structure.²⁰ Indeed, in a text published in *Discover* magazine, Alan Feduccia says that this fossil invalidates the claim that the origin of birds can be found in dinosaurs.²¹

"LIFE COMES FROM LIFE" THESIS, THE

—See Biogenesis.

LINNAEUS, CAROLUS

In 1735, the Swedish natural historian Carolus Linnaeus published his *Systema Naturae* ("System of Nature"), in which he classified all living species. He believed that species did not change, that the species he had classified possessed characteristics that they would preserve down through future generations. Linnaeus was a pathfinder in botany and zoology, and the classifications he made for plants and animals are still used by biologists today and constitute the basis of their nomenclature.²²



Carolus Linnaeus

for flight, and therefore, this ideal structure must have been created separately for every species of bird. This view is clearly predicated on the assumption that Allah creates every living thing. (See *Creationism*.)

In fact, modern scientific findings show that with regard to similar organs, the claim of a common ancestor is not valid, and that the only possible explanation is one of common creation. (See *The "Common Ancestor" Lie*.)

LUCY DECEIT **(AUSTRALOPITHECUS AFA-** **RENSIS), THE**

"Lucy" is a fossil that Donald Johanson discovered in 1973. Its scientific name, *Australopithecus afarensis*, derives from the Afar region of Ethiopia, where it was discovered. For years, Lucy was portrayed as the missing link in the human evolution sequence. However, it no longer enjoys that earlier esteem in evolutionist sources, thanks to the latest scientific findings.

The fact *Australopithecus* can no longer be regarded as the ancestor of



"ADIEU, LUCY"

Scientific findings have shown that evolutionist hypotheses regarding "Lucy," the best-known specimen of the class *Australopithecus*, are quite groundless. In its February 1999 issue, the famous French magazine *Science et Vie* admitted this under the headline "Adieu, Lucy" and agreed that *Australopithecus* could not be regarded as an ancestor of man.

human beings was the cover story for the May 1999 edition of the well-known French scientific journal *Science et Vie*. Under the heading "Adieu Lucy [Goodbye to Lucy]," the text described why, based on a new *Australopithecus* finding known as St W573, *Australopithecus* apes




The "Lucy" skull

needed to be removed from the human family tree:

*A new theory states that the genus *Australopithecus* is not the root of the human race. . . The results arrived at by the only woman authorized to examine St W573 are different from the normal theories regarding mankind's ancestors: this destroys the hominid family tree. Large primates, considered the ancestors of man, have been removed from the equation of this family tree . . . *Australopithecus* and *Homo* (human) species do not appear on the same branch. Man's direct ancestors are still waiting to be discovered.*²³





MACRO-EVOLUTION MYTH, THE

Evolutionists refer to the variety or variation within species as "micro-evolution" and to the hypothesis of the formation of new species as "macro-evolution." Evolutionists seek to give the impression that micro-evolution is a scientific fact that which everyone agrees on, and that macro-evolution is a result of micro-evolution spread out over a longer time frame. Above all, the point that needs to be emphasized is that there is no such process as micro-evolution.

As we've already seen, evolutionists try to create the impression that variation within species is an evolutionary process by giving it the name of "micro-evolution." In fact, however, that this is an attempt to validate the concept of evolution by using an expression containing the word. Variation consists of the emergence of various dominant genetic combinations as a result of geographic isolation of individuals in a given species. But even with extreme variation, no new information is added to that species' gene pool. Therefore, no such process as evolution has taken place. (See *The Micro-evolution Myth*.)

The second distortion is the claim that macro-evolution—in other words, development of one species into another—comes about as the accumulation of micro-evolutions over a long time. Yet when one realizes that there is no such thing as micro-evolution, the supposed basis for macro-evolution disappears. If no such process as micro-evolution ever takes place, macro-evolution must logically be eliminated too.

Many evolutionist biologists have admitted that such various hypotheses based on these fictitious concepts provide no explanation of the origin of species. The well-known evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin described his conclusions at a four-day symposium attended by 150 evolutionists held at the Chicago Natural History Museum in 1980:

The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution . . . the answer can be given as a clear, No. ²⁴

MACRO-MUTATION MYTH, THE

Evolutionists' inability to find

any of the intermediate forms that they claim must once have existed led them to come up with new theses. One of these is the theory of punctuated evolution, which hypothesizes that the mutations necessary to form a new species took place, or that some individuals were exposed to intense, consecutive mutations.

One law revealed by Fisher, one of the century's best known geneticists, on the basis of experiment and observation clearly invalidates that hypothesis. In his book, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Fisher states that "the likelihood that a particular mutation will become fixed in a population is inversely proportional to its effect on the phenotype."²⁵ In other words, the greater the effect of a mutation, the less chance it has of becoming permanent in a population.

In addition, mutations cause random changes in living things' genetic data, and do not *improve* it. On the contrary, individuals exposed to mutations typically suffer serious diseases and deformities. Therefore, the more an individual is affected by a mutation, the less that individual's chances of survival.

Professor Walter L. Starkey of Ohio University writes about these

damaging effects of mutation:

Being bombarded by mutation-causing radiation, would be like shooting a new car with a 30-caliber rifle . . . Similarly, it would be highly unlikely that mutations would do anything other than damage you or an animal. Mutations caused by DNA copying errors would have a similar result . . . Mutations are harmful by a ratio of at least 10,000 to one. Radiation and copying errors do not produce new features that are beneficial. ²⁶

Clearly, mutations establish no evolutionary progress, and this fact represents a major dilemma for both neo-Darwinism and for the theory of punctuated evolution. Since mutation is a destructive mechanism, the macro-mutations that are the proponents of punctuated evolution must have a macro-destructive effect on living individuals.

The geneticist Lane Lester and the population geneticist Raymond Bohlin describe the mutation impasse as follows:

The overall factor that has come up again and again is that mutation remains the ultimate source of all genetic variation in any evolutionary model. Being unsatisfied with the prospects of accumulating small point mutations, many are turning to macromutations to explain the origin of evolutionary

*novelties. Goldschmidt's hopeful monsters have indeed returned. However, though macromutations of many varieties produce drastic changes, the vast majority will be incapable of survival, let alone show the marks of increasing complexity. If structural gene mutations are inadequate because of their inability to produce significant enough changes, then regulatory and developmental mutations appear even less useful because of the greater likelihood of nonadaptive or even destructive consequences. . . . But one thing seems certain: at present, the thesis that mutations, whether great or small, are capable of producing limitless biological change is more an article of faith than fact.*²⁷

Experiment and observation show that mutations do not improve on genetic data but rather, damage living things. So it is clearly inconsistent for the proponents of punctuated evolution to expect great successes from mutations.

MALTHUS, THOMAS ROBERT

The theories of the British statistician Thomas Robert Malthus were influential in shaping Darwin's ideas that in nature, there is a deadly struggle for survival and that every living thing strives only for itself.

Malthus suggested that food resources increased arithmetically and the human population geometrically—for which reason, he maintained, human beings were necessarily in a fight for survival. Darwin adapted this concept of the struggle for survival to nature as a whole.

In the 19th century, Malthus' ideas were adopted by a fairly wide audience. Upper-class European intellectuals in particular supported his ideas. An article titled "The Scientific Background to the Nazi Racial Improvement Program" describes the importance that 19th-century Europe attached to Malthus' theories:

*In the opening half of the nineteenth century, throughout Europe, members of the ruling classes gathered to discuss the newly discovered "Population problem" and to devise ways of implementing the Malthusian mandate, to increase the mortality rate of the poor: "Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settlements in all marshy and unwholesome situations," and so forth and so on.*²⁸


Under the "oppression of the poor" program implemented in Britain in the 19th century, the strong crushed the weak in the struggle for survival, and the rapidly rising population would thus be kept in balance. The struggle for survival that Malthus regarded as theoretically necessary led to millions of poor people in Britain living wretched lives.

MARX, KARL

Karl Marx, the founder of Communism, described Charles Darwin's book *The Origin of Species*, which set forth the basis of the theory of evolution, as "a book which contains the basis of natural history for our views."²⁹

Marx demonstrated his regard for Darwin by dedicating his own most important work, *Das Kapital*, to him. His own handwriting in the German edition of the book read, "Mr. Charles Darwin / On the part of his sincere admirer / Karl Marx."³⁰

The American researcher Conway Zirkle explains why Marx and Engels, the founders of Communism, so readily accepted the idea of evolution after Darwin published *The Origin of Species*:



Karl Marx, the founder of communism

*Evolution, of course, was just what the founders of communism needed to explain how mankind could have come into being without the intervention of any supernatural force, and consequently it could be used to bolster the foundations of their materialistic philosophy. In addition, Darwin's interpretation of evolution—that evolution had come about through the operation of natural selection—gave them an alternative hypothesis to the prevailing teleological explanation of the observed fact that all forms of life are adapted to their conditions.*³¹

The social scientist Tom Bethell, who works at the Hoover Institute in America, explains the fundamental reasons for the link between the two theories:

*Marx admired Darwin's book not for economic reasons but for the more fundamental one that Darwin's universe was purely materialistic, and the explanation of it no longer involved any reference to unobservable, nonmaterial causes outside or 'beyond' it. In that important respect, Darwin and Marx were truly comrades.*³²

The bond between Marxism and Darwinism is an evident fact on which everyone agrees. This link is set out in biographies of Marx, and is described in a biography of Marx brought out by a publishing house specializing in books with Marxist views:

*Darwinism featured a series of facts that supported, proved the reality of and developed Marxist philosophy. The spread of Darwinist, evolutionist ideas created a suitable groundwork for Marxist thought to be understood by the working class in society as a whole. . . Marx, Engels and Lenin attached great value to Darwin's ideas and indicated the scientific importance of these, thus accelerating the spread of those ideas.*³³

On the other hand, Marx based historical progress on economics. In his view, society went through various historical phases, and the factor determining them was changes in the relationship between means of

production and production itself. The economy determined everything else. This ideology described religion as a fairy tale invented for coercive economic purposes. In the eyes of this superstitious conception, religion was developed by the ruling classes to pacify those they ruled, and was "the opium of the masses."

In addition, Marx thought that societies followed a process of development. A slave-based society developed into a feudal society, and a feudal society turned into a capitalist one. Finally, thanks to a revolution, a socialist society would be constructed, whereupon the most advanced social stage in history would be attained.

Marx's views were evolutionist even before the publication of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*. However, Marx and Engels experienced difficulties in accounting for how living things came into being. That was because in the absence of a thesis accounting for living things on the basis of *non-creation*, it was impossible to maintain that religion was an invented falsehood and to base all of history on matter. For that reason, Marx immediately adopted Darwin's theory.

Today, all forms of materialist thinking—and Marx's ideas in par-

ticular— have been totally discredited, because in the face of scientific findings, the theory of evolution on which materialism based itself has been completely invalidated. Science refutes the materialist assumption that denies the existence of anything apart from matter, and shows that all living things are the work of a sublime creation.

MATERIALISM

Materialist philosophy is one of the oldest ideas in history, whose essence is based on the existence of matter, and nothing else. According to this creed, matter has existed for ever, and everything that exists is composed of physical matter. This definition of course makes belief in a Creator impossible. As a requirement of this logic, materialist philosophy has opposed all forms of belief in Allah and the revealed religions.

The supposed "scientific" foundation of materialist philosophy, which maintains that nothing exists apart from matter, is the theory of evolution.

Since materialism seeks to explain nature in terms of material factors alone and rejects creation right from the outset, it maintains that everything—living or inanimate—

emerged without creation but by chance and then later assumed order. Yet when the human mind perceives order, it immediately realizes that there must have been an entity that performed the ordering. Materialist philosophy is a violation of this most fundamental principle of human intelligence, and produced the evolution theory in the 19th century. (See *The Evolution Theory*.)

We may also question the truth of materialism's claim of using scientific methods. We can investigate whether or not matter has existed for ever, whether matter is capable of ordering itself in the absence of a Creator, and whether or not it can give rise to life. When we do so, we see that materialism is actually in a state of collapse.

The idea that matter has always existed collapsed with the Big Bang theory, which proved that the universe had come into being from nothing. (See *The Big Bang Theory*.) Therefore, the evolution theory—in other words, the claim that matter organized itself and gave rise to life—has also collapsed.

However, materialist scientists refuse to abandon their position, even though they clearly see that science has refuted the theory of evolution, since their devotion to this phi-

losophy is so important to them. On the contrary, they seek to keep materialism alive by supporting the theory of evolution in whatever way possible.


Arthur Ernest Wilder-Smith, a professor of chemistry, sets out these facts in one of his books:

... however, [since] materialistic philosophy does not permit us to see concepts such as "mind" or nonmaterial intelligence behind the origin of material life, it automatically became necessary to search for the source of language, code, mind, and information in biological cells exclusively within matter and the laws of chance.

However, it is just this task which has turned up so many major difficulties .

... it exhibits in its raw primeval forms neither intelligence nor "mind." Yet the living cell is really just a bag full of projects, of teleonomy, and of concepts, and, therefore, of mind. The materialist is forced to seek the origins of this programming and of these concepts of life in "nonmind," i.e., in matter and chance, because he believes that matter and time represent the total reality of the universe. A considerable amount of "mental acrobatics" is required to obtain programs magically, to conjure up projects and concepts out of "nonmind," "nonprojects," and "nonprograms," i.e., out of matter and chance. It is just these mental acrobatics which are carried out support materialism that we need to consider more closely, for they are the basis of much that is of-

The Big Bang, in which the universe began, is a phenomenon that refutes the claims of materialists and evolutionists and which confirms creation by showing that the universe had a finite beginning.



ferred to our youngsters in our secondary and high schools and taught in universities as the sole scientific explanation of life and its codes.

If a reasonable materialistic view of biogenesis is to be taught as a fact, the problem of programming, simulation, language, code and translation of a code-obtained spontaneously from noncode-must be squarely faced. For matter, which is known to possess neither plans, intelligence, nor programming, alleged by the materialists to have conjured them all up like a rabbit out of a hat.³⁴

The eminent biologist Hubert Yockey agrees:

*Faith in the infallible and comprehensive doctrines of dialectic materialism plays a crucial role in origin of life scenarios. . . . That life must exist somewhere in the solar system on 'suitable planets elsewhere' is widely and tenaciously believed in spite of lack of evidence or even abundant evidence to the contrary.*³⁵

Stanley Sobottka, a professor of physics from Virginia University, describes the distorted nature of materialism:

The widespread belief in materialism has profound effects in our lives and in our society. If we believe this way, we must conclude that everything, including ourselves and all of life, is gov-

erned completely by physical law. Physical law is the only law governing our desires, our hopes, our ethics, our goals, and our destinies. Matter and energy must be our primary focus, the object of all of our desires and ambitions. Specifically, this means that our lives must be focused on acquiring material goods (including bodies), or at least rearranging or exchanging them, in order to produce the maximum material satisfaction and pleasure. We must expend all of our energy in this quest, for there can be no other goal. And in all of this, we have no choice, because we are totally governed by physical law. We may feel trapped by these beliefs and desires, but we cannot shake them. They totally dominate us.

*A succinct, personalized, summary statement of materialist philosophy is, "I am a body."*³⁶

This materialist dogma underlies the evolutionist propaganda that one constantly encounters in some of the prominent media organizations and well-known journals, as a result of such ideological and philosophical requirements. Since evolution is crucial in ideological terms, it is accepted without any debate by the materialist circles that determine the standards of science.

Evolution is actually not a theory that emerged as a result of scientific research. On the contrary, the theory

was produced in line with the requirements of materialist philosophy, and was then made into a sacred taboo that sought to impose itself despite the scientific facts. As is apparent from evolutionist writings, the clear objective behind all these endeavors is to deny the fact that living things were brought into being by a Creator.

Evolutionists refer to this aim as being "scientifically objective." Yet they are referring not to science, but to materialist philosophy. Materialism rejects the non-material, or supernatural. Science, on the other hand, is not obliged to accept any such a dogma. Science has a duty to study nature, perform experiments, and duplicate results. If the results reveal the fact that nature was created, then science must accept that fact. A true scientist must not defend untenable scenarios by restricting himself to 19th century dogmas.

MAYR, ERNST

Ernst Mayr, a well-known evolutionist biologist, is also the founder of the Modern Synthetic Theory of evolution, which—proposed by adding concept of mutation to Darwin's natural-selection thesis—was given the name of neo-



Ernst Mayr

Darwinism. Therefore, Ernst Mayr and the other founders of the theory (Theodosius Dobzhansky and Julian Huxley) began being referred to as neo-Darwinists.

Ernst Mayr was one of the most significant adherents of the theory of evolution in the 20th century. He based his theory on mutation, and yet at the same time admitted the impossibility of this:

The occurrence of genetic monstrosities by mutation . . . is well substantiated, but they are such evident freaks that these monsters can be designated only as 'hopeless.' They are so utterly unbalanced that they would not have the slightest chance of escaping elimination through stabilizing selection . . . the more drastically a mutation affects the phenotype, the more likely it is to reduce fitness. To believe that such a drastic mutation would produce a viable new type, capable of occupying a new adaptive zone, is equivalent to be-

lieving in miracles . . . The finding of a suitable mate for the 'hopeless monster' and the establishment of reproductive isolation from the normal members of the parental population seem to me insurmountable difficulties.³⁷

Mayr made another admission on the subject:

. . . it is a considerable strain on one's credulity to assume that finely balanced systems such as certain sense organs (the eye of vertebrates, or the bird's feather) could be improved by random mutations.³⁸

Mayr, an adherent of Darwinism, sought to cover up the gaps that Darwinism never could by means of claiming mutation. Yet the scientific impossibility of this can still be seen in his own admissions.

MENDEL, GREGOR

In 1865, following the publication of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, the Austrian botanist and monk Gregor Mendel published his laws of inheritance, the result of long experiments and observations. (See *The Laws of Inheritance*.) However, these laws attracted the attention of the scientific world only toward the end of the century. Not until the early 20th century did the entire scientific world



Gregor Mendel

accept the accuracy of these laws.

This represented a major dilemma for Darwin's theory,

which sought to account for the

concept of beneficial characteristics, based on Lamarck.

But Mendel opposed not only Lamarck's model of evolution, but also Darwin's model. As stated in an article titled "Mendel's Opposition to Evolution and to Darwin," published in the *Journal of Heredity*, Mendel was against the theory of evolution. Darwin suggested that all life had evolved from a common ancestor, while Mendel believed in creation.³⁹

MENTON, DAVID

David Menton, a professor of anatomy from Washington University, gave a lecture at the 2nd international conference titled "The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution: The Fact of Creation," held by the Science Research Foundation on 5 July, 1998, in which he discussed the anatomical differences between bird feathers and reptile scales. He re-

vealed the invalidity of the thesis that birds evolved from reptiles, and summarized the facts:

*I have been investigating the anatomies of the living creatures since 30 years. The only fact I met during my researches is the flawless creation of God.*⁴⁰

METAMORPHOSIS

Frogs are hatched in water, where they live for a while as tadpoles. They then emerge onto land, after growing limbs and losing their tails, in a process known as metamorphosis. Some people regard metamorphosis as evidence of evolution, but the fact is that metamorphosis has nothing whatsoever to do with evolution.

The only developmental mechanism that the theory of evolution proposes is mutations. Metamorphosis, however, does not take place through such chance events, but these changes are already programmed in the frog's genetic data. In other words, when a tadpole is first hatched, it is already determined that it will eventually undergo a process of change and come into possession of a frog's body suited to life on land.

Harun Yahya - Adnan Oktar



Eggs




Tadpole



Young frog



Abult frog



The evolutionist biologists looked for an example of a useful mutation since the beginning of the century. Yet only crippled, diseased and faulty flies were existing at the end of their efforts. In the picture, a normal fruitfly's head and a mutated one that has its legs coming out of its head are seen.

Recent research has shown that metamorphosis is a very complex process controlled by different genes. In this process, for example, during the disappearance of the tail alone, "more than a dozen genes increase their activity," according to the journal *Science News*.⁴¹

Evolutionist claims of a "transition from water to land run along the lines that fish with the genetic data for total life in water evolved by chance into terrestrial amphibians as a result of random mutations. For that reason, metamorphosis represents evidence that actually *undermines* evolution, rather than supporting it. The slightest error in the process of metamorphosis will leave

an animal crippled or dead, so there can be no question of a random change. Metamorphosis must be completed in a flawless manner.

It is impossible to maintain that such a complex process, one that allows no margin of error, emerged through random mutations, as the evolution theory claims.

MICRO-EVOLUTION MYTH, THE

Evolutionists seek to account for differentiation within species—in other words, the emergence of variations—by means of an imaginary mechanism they refer to as micro-

evolution. By accumulating over a long period of time, they maintain that small changes can give rise to macro-evolution, in other words the emergence of an entirely new species. (See **The Macro-Evolution Myth**) In fact, however, there is nothing to do with evolution here. Variation within species occurs with the emergence of individuals with new and different physical characteristics as a result of different combinations of existing genes, through cross-breeding of individuals. However, no new gene is ever added to the gene pool here. All that happens is that genes combine in offspring in new combinations. Since the number and variety of genes in a given species is fixed, there is a limit to the number of combinations that these can give rise to. In addition, variation within a species never produces any new species. For example, no matter how many dogs of different breeds mate together in different combinations, the results will always be dogs, never horses or ferrets. This fixed biological law has been proven through experiment and observation.

Interestingly, Darwin constructed the backbone of his theory on variations he imagined to be micro-evolution. But the advances in biology that gradually undermined Darwin's

Harun Yahya - Adnan Oktar

claims also revealed that the variations he thought accounted for the origin of new species actually bore no such meaning.

For that reason, evolutionist biologists needed to distinguish between variations within a species and the formation of a whole new species, and present these as two distinct concepts.

By using the concept of micro-evolution, evolutionists seek to give the deceptive impression that variations can eventually, gradually give rise to brand new species, families, and orders. Indeed, many people with not much knowledge of the subject become taken in by the superficial idea that when micro-evolution occurs over a long period of time, the result is macro-evolution.

One often encounters examples of this thinking. Some amateur evolutionists suggest that since human beings' average height has increased by 2 centimeters (0.78 of an inch) over a century, so all kinds of major evolutionary changes may take place over millions of years.

The fact is, though, that all variations such as a change in average height take place within specific genetic limits, and these biological variations entirely unrelated to evolution.

In fact, present-day evolutionist authorities admit that the variations they refer to as micro-evolution cannot create new genetic information and thus, cannot give rise to macro-evolution. The evolutionist biologists Scott Gilbert, John Opitz and Rudolf Raff describe this position in a 1996 article published in the journal *Developmental Biology*:

*The Modern Synthesis [the neo-Darwinist theory] is a remarkable achievement. However, starting in the 1970s, many biologists began questioning its adequacy in explaining evolution. Genetics might be adequate for explaining microevolution, but microevolutionary changes in gene frequency were not seen as able to turn a reptile into a mammal or to convert a fish into an amphibian. Microevolution looks at adaptations that concern only the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fittest. As Goodwin (1995) points out, "the origin of species—Darwin's problem—remains unsolved."*⁴²

The variations that Darwinism has regarded for a century or so as proof of evolution actually have nothing to do with the origin of species. Horses may be crossbred in different combinations for millions of years and different strains of horse may be obtained. Yet horses will

never turn into another species of mammal, such as giraffes or elephants. The different chaffinches that Darwin saw on the Galapagos Islands are, in the same way, examples of the variation that constitutes no evidence for evolution. Therefore, the origin of species will remain a question that can never be answered in terms of evolution.

MILLER EXPERIMENT, THE

Research into the origin of life to which evolutionists attach the greatest esteem is the Miller experiment, carried out by the American researcher Stanley Miller in 1953. (The experiment is also known as the **Urey-Miller Experiment**, due to the contribution made by Miller's Chicago University supervisor Harold Urey.)

Miller's aim was to establish an experimental environment to show that amino acids, the building blocks of proteins, could have formed by chance in the lifeless world of billions of years ago.

In his experiment, Miller used a combination of gasses that he assumed had existed in the Earth's primordial atmosphere (but which were later determined not to have existed in it), such as ammonia,



Stanley Miller's experimental setup.

methane, hydrogen and water vapor. Since under normal conditions, these gasses would not enter into reactions with one another, he added energy from the outside. The energy—which he thought might have stemmed from lightning in the primitive atmosphere—he provided by means of an artificial electrical charge.

Miller heated this mixture of gasses at 100°C for a week, while also providing an electrical current. At the end of the week, Miller measured the chemicals in the mixture at

the bottom of the jar and observed that he had synthesized three of the 20 amino acids constituting the building blocks of proteins.

The result of the experiment caused great joy among evolutionists and was announced as a great success. Indeed, some publications went so far as to produce headlines reading "Miller Creates Life." Yet all that he had actually synthesized was a few inanimate molecules.

With the courage they took from this experiment, evolutionists immediately produced new scenarios. There was immediate speculation about the stages that must have taken place after the amino acids' formation. According to the scenario, these came together in the appropriate order as the result of chance, and gave rise to proteins. Some of these proteins, the work of still more random coincidences, installed themselves inside structures resembling cell membranes—which also came into being in some way, and thus gave rise to the cell. Cells gradually lined up alongside one another and gave rise to living organisms.

The Miller experiment—the basis for this scenario, not one single stage of which is backed up by any evidence at all—was nothing more than

a deception, whose invalidity in all regards was subsequently proven.


The experiment performed by Miller to prove that amino acids could give rise to living organisms under the conditions of the primordial Earth is invalid in several regards:

1. Miller used a mechanism known as the cold trap to isolate amino acids at the moment they formed. Otherwise, the very conditions in which the amino acids formed would have immediately destroyed them.

However, there was no such conscious arrangement in the primordial world atmosphere. Even if any

amino acid had formed in the absence of any mechanism, that molecule would have been broken down under the conditions at the time. As the chemist Richard Bliss has stated, "Without this cold trap, the chemical products would be destroyed by the [experiment's] energy source (electrical sparking)." ⁴³

In fact, Miller had failed to obtain even a single amino acid in earlier experiments in which he did not use a cold trap.



The artificial atmosphere created by Miller in his experiment bore no resemblance to that of the primordial Earth. For that reason, the experiment was regarded as invalid by the scientific world.

2. The primordial atmosphere that Miller attempted to replicate in his experiment was not realistic. In 1982, scientists agreed that instead of methane and ammonia in the primitive atmosphere, there must have been nitrogen and carbon dioxide. Indeed, after a long silence, Miller himself admitted that the primitive atmosphere model he'd used was not realistic.⁴⁴

The American scientists J.P. Ferris and C.T. Chen repeated Miller's experiment, using a mixture of carbon dioxide, hydrogen, nitrogen and water vapor, but failed to obtain even a single amino acid molecule.⁴⁵

3. Another important point invalidates the Miller experiment: At the time when the amino acids were suggested to have formed, there was so much oxygen in the atmosphere that it would have destroyed any amino acids present. This important fact that Miller ignored was determined by means of uranium and oxidized iron deposits in rocks estimated to be around 3 billion years old.⁴⁶

Other findings later emerged to show that the level of oxygen in that period was far higher than that claimed by evolutionists. And research showed that the level of ultra-violet rays reaching the Earth's sur-

face was 10,000 times higher than evolutionists' estimates. That intense level would inevitably have given rise to oxygen by breaking down atmospheric water vapor and carbon dioxide.

This completely discredited the Miller experiment, which was carried out without considering oxygen. Had oxygen been used in the experiment, then the methane would have transformed into carbon dioxide and water, and the ammonia into nitrogen and water. On the other hand, in an atmosphere with no oxygen—since no ozone layer had yet formed—the amino acids would have been directly exposed to ultra-violet rays and been immediately broken down. At the end of the day, the presence or absence of oxygen in the primordial atmosphere would still make for an environment deadly for amino acids.

4. At the end of the Miller experiment, a large quantity of organic acids also formed whose characteristics were damaging to the structures and functions of living things. In the event that amino acids are not isolated but are left together in the same environment as these chemical substances, they will inevitably react with them and form new compounds.

In addition, at the end of the experiment, a high level of right-handed amino acids also emerged.⁴⁷ (See **Right-Handed Amino Acids**.) The presence of these amino acids totally undermined the premise of evolution by means of its own logic. Right-handed amino acids are not used in living structures. Finally, the environment in which amino acids emerged in the experiment was not suited to life; but on the contrary, was a mixture that would have broken down and oxidized useful molecules.

All this points to the concrete fact that Miller's experiment—a conscious, controlled laboratory study aimed at synthesizing amino acids—does not prove that life could have emerged by chance under primordial world conditions. The types and levels of the gasses he used were determined at the ideal levels for amino acids to be able to form. The level of energy supplied was carefully regulated, neither too much nor too little, to ensure that the desired reactions would take place.

The experimental apparatus isolated so as not to harbor any element that might be harmful, or prevent the emergence of amino acids. No element, mineral or compound present in the primeval world that

might have altered the course of the reactions was included in the experimental apparatus. Oxygen that would hinder the formation of amino acids is just one of these elements. Therefore, in the absence of the cold trap mechanism, even under those ideal laboratory conditions, amino acids could not have survived without being broken down.

With the Miller experiment, evolutionists actually invalidated evolution by their own efforts. Because the experiment demonstrated that amino acids could be obtained only in specially arranged laboratory conditions and with conscious intervention. In other words, the force giving rise to life is *creation*, not random coincidences.

The reason why evolutionists refuse to accept this stems from their preconceptions. Harold Urey, who organized the experiment together with his student Stanley Miller, made this admission:

*All of us who study the origin of life find that the more we look into it, the more we feel it is too complex to have evolved anywhere. We all believe as an article of faith that life evolved from dead matter on this planet. It is just that its complexity is so great, it is hard for us to imagine that it did.*⁴⁸

This experiment is the sole proof

that supposedly verifies the molecular evolution suggested as the first stage of the evolutionary process. Although half a century has gone by since, and great technological advances have been made, no new progress has been made on the subject. The Miller experiment is still taught in schoolbooks as an explanation of the first emergence of life. Evolutionists, aware that such endeavors will refute their claims rather than supporting them, carefully avoid embarking on any other such experiments.

MILLER, STANLEY

An American researcher, who attempted to synthesize amino acids—the fundamental building blocks of life—in a laboratory environment together with his supervisor, Harold Urey, at Chicago University in 1953. However, during the experiment, he distorted the primitive atmosphere hypothesized by evolutionists. This experiment, known as the Urey-Miller experiment, proved, contrary to what had been hoped, that life could not possibly come into existence spontaneously. (See *The Miller Experiment*.)



Stanley Miller with his experimental apparatus

MISSING LINK IN THE EVOLUTIONARY CHAIN, THE

—See Evolutionary Gaps

"MITOCHONDRIAL EVE" THESIS'S INCONSISTENCIES, THE

Popular scientific terminology is often used to apply an authoritative veneer to evolution. Evolutionists make use of "DNA" in just this way.

In addition to being present in the nucleus, DNA is also found in mitochondria, energy-production

organelles in the cell. The DNA in the nucleus forms as a result of the combination of DNA from the mother and father, but the mother is the sole source of the mitochondrial DNA. Every human being's mitochondrial DNA is therefore identical to his or her mother's, and therefore, the origin of man can be researched by following this trail.


The "mitochondrial Eve" thesis distorts this fact by interpreting it according to the dogmas of the theory of evolution. A few evolutionist scientists have regarded the mitochondrial DNA of the first humanoid as the DNA of chimpanzees, by viewing as indisputable scientific fact the claim that

the chimpanzee is man's ancestor. Over hundreds of thousands of years, according to this claim, random mutations turned chimpanzee DNA into our present mitochondrial DNA. Starting from that preconception, they then attempted to determine where and when the present evolutionary family tree began.

The Berkeley University biochemists Wilson, Cann and Stoneking, who first proposed the theory, set out with fundamental assumptions that were impossible to prove:

1. The origin of mitochondrial DNA lies in hominids, in other words ape-like creatures.
2. Mutations must have caused regular changes in mitochondrial DNA.
3. These mutations must have taken place constantly and at a fixed rate.

Taking these assumptions as their basis, the researchers believed that they could obtain a molecular clock to show how quickly a species changed within the alleged process of evolu-



tion. In fact, the writers of the computer program to calculate that clock directed their research towards the result they wished to achieve.

The assumptions they worked on were claims whose existence could not be proven, of which no examples had ever been obtained by experiment or observation. Mutations, caused by degeneration of DNA, have only been observed to cause deformity and death in living structures. Mutations can never impart progress by raising a living thing to a higher level. (See **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism.**)

The evolutionist researchers developed a computer program that they hoped would camouflage their prejudices. They created their program on the basis of evolution, following the most direct and effective path. This, however, is an imaginary picture that conflicts with even the basic assumptions of the theory of evolution.

Many scientists who supported the theory of evolution agreed that this thesis had no scientific value. Henry Gee, a member of *Nature* magazine's editorial board, described the results of the MtDNA

(mitochondrial DNA) study as garbage⁴⁹ in an article titled "Statistical Cloud over African Eden." In his article, Gee stated that when the current 136 MtDNA series were considered, the number of family trees exceeded 1 billion! In other words, in this study, these 1 billion chance family trees were ignored, and only that one tree compatible with the hypothesis of evolution between chimpanzees and human beings was selected.

Alan Templeton, the well-known Washington University biologist, stated that it was impossible to set out any date for the origin of man based on DNA series, because DNA was highly mixed up, even in present human societies.⁵⁰

Considered in mathematical terms, it means that it is impossible to determine mtDNA as belonging to a single human being in the family tree.

The most significant admission came from the authors of the thesis themselves. Mark Stoneking, from the team that repeated the study in 1992, said in a letter to *Science* magazine that the "African Eve" thesis was untenable,⁵¹ because it was



clear that in all respects, the study had been aimed towards the desired result.

The mitochondrial DNA thesis was developed on the basis of mutations in DNA. But when the evolutionists looked at human DNA, it was unclear how they decided which DNA rungs had formed as the result of mutation, and which were original and unchanged. They had to start work from the original human DNA they claim must have existed. Yet the evolutionist deception here is crystal-clear: They assumed chimpanzee DNA as their basis.⁵²

To put it another way, in a study looking for evidence that chimpanzee DNA turned into human DNA, the chimpanzee is taken as the starting point as the original prehistoric human. Right from the outset, the study is carried out on the assumption that evolution took place, and the result obtained is then depicted as proof of evolution. In these circumstances, the study is far from being scientific.

In addition, if an evolutionist researcher is to employ regular, useful mutations that he claims occurred in DNA in calculating the molecular clock, then he must also calculate the speed of these mutations. Yet there

is not the slightest indication, in either the nucleus of the mitochondria, to show the frequency with which DNA was subjected to mutation.

In terms of its own logic, this thesis actually shows that once again, there has been an attempt to use evolution as evidence for evolution. Seeking evidence for evolution in DNA is biased research, based on the assumption that evolution took place in any case.

Why do evolutionists feel the need to pull the wool over people's eyes in this way? The answer is clear: Because there is no scientific evidence to support evolution.

MODERN SYNTHETIC THEORY OF EVOLUTION MYTH, THE

To the question of "What is the source of the beneficial changes that cause living things to develop?" scientists meeting at the American Geological Association gave the answer, "Random mutations." Darwin had given the same answer by adopting the concept of mutation, based on Lamarck. But with adding the concept of mutation to Darwin's natural selection, the new theory

that emerged was given the name of the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution.

This new theory soon became known as neo-Darwinism and its proponents as neo-Darwinists. (See *Neo-Darwinism Comedy, The.*)

MODIFICATIONS

Modifications are differences in living things that are not inherited, but occur within limited bounds under the influence of external factors. Reproduction between members of the same animal or plant species will not give rise to other identical individuals. The differences between them that are not hereditary are known as *modifications*—differences that all biological entities exhibit due to external factors, but which still remain within specific boundaries.

Though identical twins have exactly the same hereditary material, they never resemble one another completely, because it is impossible for environmental conditions to affect them both to exactly the same degree. The external factors leading to modification in living things include food, temperature, moisture and mechanical effects. But since any impact exists in the body only and not the DNA, it remains limited

to the individual in question and cannot be transmitted to offspring.

Darwin had claimed that living things could turn into other living things under the effect of environmental conditions, but Mendel proved experimentally that environmental influences could not change living species and showed that heredity took place only within specific bounds. Darwin's ideas remained a theory based on speculation, rather than on experimental evidence. But Mendel's laws of heredity which is the result of a long and patient study and based on experiment and observation, went down in the history of science. Although they were roughly contemporaries, Mendel's genetic studies were accepted by the scientific world only 35 years after Darwin. That was because the science of genetics, for which Mendel laid the groundwork, totally undermined the assumptions of Darwinism, but for a long time evolutionists refused to admit this.

However, scientific progress, obliged them to accept Mendel's findings, and they came to see making minor modifications to their theories as the only way of overcoming this. (See *The Neo-Darwinism Comedy.*)

MOLECULAR EVOLUTION IMPASSE, THE

According to the theory of evolution, gas molecules such as water vapor, hydrogen, methane and ammonia that represented the atmosphere on the primordial world were combined out by ultraviolet rays from the Sun, electricity from lightning, radiation from radioactive rocks and thermal energy from volcanoes. According to this non scientific scenario, the atoms that then emerged in new sequences combined together and produced the building blocks that would form the first cell.

These compounds were later transported to lakes and seas by rain. Organic compounds thus combined together and the waters of the Earth gradually grew richer in terms of these substances. The amino acids and other organic substances in this mixture then combined to produce proteins, carbohydrate chains and other increasingly complex organic substances. Because of their tendency to grow, the first large bodies that developed tried to absorb new molecules from around them. Thus bodies with more complex structures and organization, and capable of growing and multiplying, gradually emerged.

Although there is no consensus among evolutionists at this point, according to what most of them maintain, nucleic acids that also came into being outside, by chance, settled inside these bodies, known as *coacervates*. And when the coacervates' organizational level had risen sufficiently, they turned into the first living cells.

In the above scenario, evolutionists admit of no conscious intervention in the formation of life from inanimate substances, and claim that everything happened as the result of blind coincidences. They point to the Miller experiment as the first step in the chance emergence of life from inorganic materials. Today, however, it is recognized that the Miller experiment's assumptions regarding the chemical make-up of the early atmosphere were incorrect, and Miller himself admitted as much. Despite all evolutionist efforts, it is clear that the theory of evolution has no scientific support, neither on the molecular level nor in any other area.

Dr. Stephen C. Meyer, from Cambridge University, says that no credibility can be attached to any explanations of the origin of life that are based on chance:

While many outside origin-of-life biology may still invoke "chance" as a

causal explanation for the origin of biological information, few serious researchers still do. Since molecular biologists began to appreciate the sequence specificity of proteins and nucleic acids in the 1950s and '60s, many calculations have been made to determine the probability of formulating functional proteins and nucleic acids at random. Even assuming extremely favorable prebiotic conditions (whether realistic or not) and theoretically maximal reaction rates, such calculations have invariably shown that the probability of obtaining functionally sequenced biomacromolecules at random is, in Prigogine's words, "vanishingly small . . . even on the scale of . . . billions of years."⁵³

Thus the theory of evolution, which seeks to account for the origin of life in terms of chance, collapses at the very outset. Science clearly reveals that since chance cannot represent the origin of life, life must have been flawlessly created. Not only the first life form, but all the different life forms on Earth have been created separately. Indeed, the fossil record confirms this, showing that all the life forms on Earth emerged suddenly and with their own particular characteristics, and that they never underwent evolution.

Comparisons carried out at the molecular level show that living

things did not evolve from one another, but were created independently. A great many other scientific facts besides the fossil record, the complex structures and systems in living things, and the lack of any evolutionary mechanism have in any case long since demolished the theory of evolution's claims.

NONSENSICAL NATURE OF THE MOLECULAR HOMLOGY THESIS, THE

Evolutionists point to different living things having similar DNA codes or protein structures and interpret this as evidence that these species evolved from some common ancestor. For instance, evolutionist sources often say that there is a great similarity between the DNA of humans and apes, which they offer as evidence of an evolutionary link between the two. (See *The Ape-Human Genetic Similarity Lie*.)

First off, it's only to be expected that living things on Earth should have DNA structures similar to one another. Their basic vital functions are the same, and since they all—humans included—have physical bodies, one cannot expect human beings to have a DNA structure totally different from other living things. Like



Comparisons based on chromosome numbers and DNA structures show that no evolutionary relationship can be established between different species..

other organisms, our bodies develop by consuming proteins, blood flows through their bodies, and we produce energy at every moment by using of oxygen.

Therefore, the fact that living things are genetically similar cannot be used to argue that they evolved from a common ancestor. If evolutionists wish to verify the theory of evolution from a common ancestor, they have to demonstrate a line of descent on the molecular level. Yet evolutionists have no such concrete finding.

In fact, when the data obtained as a result of the analysis of DNA and chromosomes belonging to various

species and classes are compared, it clearly emerges that any similarities or differences are incompatible with any evolutionary logic or link. According to the evolutionist thesis, there must be a gradual increase in species' complexity, and so is also to be expected that the number of chromosomes establishing this genetic information will gradually increase. However, the data actually obtained show that this is a mere fantasy.

For example, although a tomato has 24 chromosomes, the copepod crab—an organism with far more complex systems—has only six. The single-celled creature *Euglena* has 45 chromosomes, compared to the alligator, which has only 32. In addition, *Radiolaria*, microscopic organisms, have more than 800 chromosomes.

Theodosius Dobzhansky, a famous evolutionary theoretician, says that this unregulated relationship between living things and their DNAs is a major problem that evolution cannot explain:

*More complex organisms generally have more DNA per cell than do simpler ones, but this rule has conspicuous exceptions. Man is nowhere near the top of the list, being exceeded by *Amphiuma* (an amphibian),*

*Protopterus (a lungfish), and even ordinary frogs and toads. Why this should be so has long been a puzzle.*⁵⁴

Again according to the evolutionist homology thesis, the number of chromosomes should be expected to increase as living things grow—and to decrease as the organism becomes smaller. The fact is, however, that living things of very different sizes and with very different structures, between which no evolutionary relationship can possibly be claimed, having the same number of chromosomes totally undermines the superficial evolutionist logic built on chromosome similarities between organisms.

To give some examples: both oak trees and Macaques monkeys have 42 chromosomes. The deer mouse has 48 chromosomes, the same number as the gorilla, which is many times larger. Another interesting example is that of the gypsy moth and the donkey, both of which have 62

chromosomes.

Other comparisons at the molecular level also offer examples that make evolutionist interpretations quite meaningless. The more protein strings are analyzed in laboratories, the more unexpected and even astonishing results emerge. For instance, while the human cytochrome-C protein differs from that of a horse by 14 amino acids, it differs from that of a kangaroo by only eight. Analysis of cytochrome-C has shown that tortoises are much closer to human beings than they are to rattlesnakes, even though both are members of the reptile family.

Interpreted from the evolutionist perspective, this produces utterly meaningless results that not even evolutionists can accept, such as tortoises being more closely related to human beings than to snakes.

The difference of 21 amino acids between tortoises and rattlesnakes, which are both members of the rep-



According to findings from molecular biology, each living class is unique at the molecular level, different from and independent of all others. No organism is the ancestor of any other.

tile class, is significantly greater than that between representatives of very different classes. The above difference, for example, is greater than the difference of 17 amino acids between chickens and eels, the difference of 16 amino acids between horses and sharks, or even the difference of 15 amino acid between dogs and worm flies, which are members of two totally different phyla.

A similar state of affairs also applies to hemoglobin. The sequence of this protein in human beings differs from that in lemurs by 20 amino acids and from that in pigs by only 14. The position is more or less the same for other proteins.⁵⁵

Evolutionists should therefore conclude that in evolutionary terms, a human being is closer to the kangaroo than the horse or to the pig than the lemur.

Dr. Christian Schwabe is a professor at department of biochemistry at Medical University of South Carolina and a scientist who has devoted many years to seeking evidence of evolution in the molecular sphere. In particular, he has carried out studies on the proteins insulin and relaxin in an attempt to construct evolutionary relationships between living things. Several times, however, he has been forced to ad-

mit that he hasn't been able to obtain any evidence for evolution at any point. In one article in Science magazine, he writes:

*Molecular evolution is about to be accepted as a method superior to paleontology for the discovery of evolutionary relationships. As a molecular evolutionist, I should be elated. Instead, it seems disconcerting that many exceptions exist to the orderly progression of species as determined by molecular homologies: so many in fact, that I think the exception, the quirks, may carry the more important message.*⁵⁶

Schwabe's research into relaxin produced most interesting results:

*Against this background of high variability between relaxins from purportedly closely related species, the relaxins of pig and whale are all but identical. The molecules derived from rats, guinea-pigs, man and pigs are as distant from each other (approximately 55%) . . . Insulin, however, brings man and pig phylogenetically closer together than chimpanzee and man.*⁵⁷

Schwabe states that his comparison of lysozymes, cytochromes and many hormones and amino acid strings revealed unexpected results and abnormalities from the evolutionary point of view. Based on all this evidence, Schwabe maintains that all proteins possess their same,

initial structures, without having undergone any evolution—and that, just as with fossils, no intermediate form among molecules has ever been found.

Michael Denton bases this comment on results obtained from the field of molecular biology:

*Each class at a molecular level is unique, isolated and unlinked by intermediates. Thus molecules, like fossils have failed to provide the elusive intermediates so long sought by evolutionary biology.*⁵⁸

In short, the homological hypothesis that looks for anatomical or chemical similarities in living things and attempts to portray them as evidence for evolution has been invalidated by the scientific facts.

MORPHOLOGY

This is the branch of science that studies the shape and structure of organisms as a whole. With plants, it investigates the structures and common organization of the root, stem, leaves and fruits; and with animals and human beings, compares and analyzes their physical structure.⁵⁹

Sub-branches of morphology include *anatomy*, the study of the visible internal and external structures of organisms; *histology*, the study of the microscopic structure of the tis-

sues that make up organs; *cytology*, the study of the microscopic structure of the cells that make up tissues; and *embryology*, the study of all the phases between the fertilized egg (zygote) and the emergence of an independent organism.⁶⁰

Comparisons between the homologous or analogous organs of living things are performed on the basis of findings obtained from morphology. (See **Homologous Organs; Analogous Organs**.) All living things with similar morphologies are regarded as homologous in order to construct a supposed evolutionary relationship between them. However, there is no scientific basis for this. Indeed, there are many examples of species that resemble each other very closely, but between which no so-called evolutionary relationship can be constructed—and this represents a major inconsistency from the point of view of evolutionist claims.

THE MORPHOLOGICAL HOMOLOGY MYTH

—See Homology

MORRIS, JOHN

Professor John Morris is the director of the Institute for Creation



John Morris

Research and a well-known geologist. At the second international conference held by the Science Research

Foundation on 5 July 1998, titled "The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution: The Fact of Creation," he described the ideological and philosophical conditions behind evolution, the way this theory became a dogma, and how its proponents believe in Darwinism as if it were a religion.⁶¹

MOSAIC CREATURES

Using one-sided interpretations, evolutionists sometimes present living things as actually constituting intermediate forms. However, the fact that a species has features belonging to another living group does not make it an intermediate form.

For example, the Australian duck-billed platypus is a mammal, but lays eggs, just like reptiles. In addition, it has a beak just like a bird. However, its fur, milk glands and inner ear structure define it as a mammal. Scientists therefore refer to the platypus as a mosaic creature.

Such prominent evolutionist paleontologists as Stephen J. Gould and Niles Eldredge admit that mosaic creatures cannot be regarded as intermediate forms.⁶²

With its exceedingly specialized structures, the platypus also refutes this claim. (See *Platypus, The.*)

MOTHER NATURE; AN IRRATIONAL CONCEPT

The intellectual movement that influenced Darwin—and encouraged him to look for an explanation for the living things he encountered other than one based on creation—was naturalism, one of the main philosophies of the 19th century's atheistic climate. Naturalism was a movement that recognized no other reality than nature and the world perceived by the five senses. According to this perverted view, nature was its own creator and ruler. Concepts such as *Mother Nature* or clichéd expressions such as "Nature gave humans this ability," or "Nature created this creature in this way" result from preconceptions placed in the mind of society by naturalism.

Evolutionists say that Mother Nature gave living things the features they possess. But nature consists of such familiar components as

stone, soil, trees, and plants. It is impossible for these natural elements to perform conscious, intelligent actions or to program living things, because everything we see in nature has been created and therefore, cannot be their creator.

Since living things do not create the superior characteristics they possess through their own intelligence. Since they are born with these attributes, then there must be a creator who endows them with these features and who impels them to display such behavior. Almighty Allah is our Creator.

MUTAGENIC FACTORS

Breaks and shifts in the genetic data in living things are described as mutation. These affect and damage the DNA in the cell nucleus. Every cause giving rise to mutation—generally, some form of chemical effects or particle emissions—is known as a *mutagenic factor*.

Substances such as mustard gas and nitric acid may be given as examples of chemical mutagenic factors. X-rays or the radiation leaking from a nuclear power station are examples of radioactive mutagenic effects. Particles emitted from a radioactive element can cause damage to

DNA. When high-energy particles strike DNA bases, they alter their structure, and usually cause changes of such dimensions that the cell cannot repair them. (See **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism.**)

MUTANT

Mutant is the name given to any living thing, cell or gene that has undergone obvious changes in its DNA. Mutations are breaks and shifts that occur as a result of physical (for example, radiation) or chemical effects in the DNA molecule, found in the cell nucleus that carries genetic data. Mutations damage the nucleotides that make up DNA. The components making up genetic information are either detached from their locations, damaged or else transported to different sites in the DNA. They cause damage and other



A physically defective mutant lamb.

changes that are usually too severe for the cell to repair. Cells or living things subjected to such mutations—99% of which are harmful and the other 1% neutral or silent— are known as mutants. (See **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism**)

Although mutations have clearly destructive effects, evolutionists regard random mutations occurring in living things' genetic structures as the source of the positive evolutionary changes that they assume took place. Yet mutations can never bestow a new organ or new characteristic on a living thing by adding new information to its DNA. They merely cause abnormalities, such as (on a fruit fly) a leg emerging from the back of the insect.

Can new information emerge as the result of mutations? Professor Werner Gitt responds to the question:

*This idea is central in representations of evolution, but mutations can only cause changes in existing information. There can be no increase in information, and in general the results are injurious. New blueprints for new functions or new organs cannot arise; mutations cannot be the source of new (creative) information.*⁶³

MUTATION: AN IMAGINARY MECHANISM

Mutations are breaks and shifts that occur as a result of radioactive or chemical damage to the DNA molecule that carries genetic data. Mutations damage the nucleotides that make up DNA, or else cause them to change places, causing changes that are usually too severe for the cell to repair.

Therefore, contrary to what many people imagine, the mutations that evolutionists depend on are not, magic wands that lead living things to progress and perfection. Mutations' net effects are harmful. The only changes brought about by mutations are of the kind suffered by the offspring born to inhabitants of Hiroshima, Nagasaki or Chernobyl; in other words, death or deformity.

The reason for this is elementary: Any random impact on the very complex structure of the DNA molecule can only harm it.

The American geneticist B.G. Ranganathan explains:

First, genuine mutations are very rare in nature. Secondly, most mutations are harmful since they are random, rather than orderly changes in the structure of genes; any random change in a highly ordered system will be for the worse, not for the better. For exam-



These photographs show some of the damaging effects of mutation on the human body.

A process that cripples individuals or leaves them ill cannot, of course, give rise to any progress.

*ple, if an earthquake were to shake a highly ordered structure such as a building, there would be a random change in the framework of the building, which, in all probability, would not be an improvement.*⁶⁴

No examples of beneficial mutations have ever been observed. The evolutionist scientist Warren Weaver said the following about a report prepared by the Committee on Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation, set up to examine the mutations arising as a result of nuclear weapons in the wake of the Second World War:

Many will be puzzled about the statement that practically all known mutant genes are harmful. For mutations are a necessary part of the process of evolution. How can a good effect — evolution to higher forms of life — result

*from mutations, practically all of which are harmful?*⁶⁵

All the mutations observed in human beings are harmful. Medical textbooks describe physical or mental defects such as mongolism, Down Syndrome, albinism, dwarfism and sickle cell anemia, or diseases such as cancer as examples of mutation. A process that cripples or sickens cannot, of course, be any evolutionary mechanism.

In a scientific paper, David Demick, an American pathologist, wrote this to say about mutations:

Literally thousands of human diseases associated with genetic mutations have been catalogued in recent years, with more being described continually. A recent reference book of medical genetics listed some 4,500 different genetic diseases. Some of the inherited syn-

dromes characterized clinically in the days before molecular genetic analysis (such as Marfan's syndrome) are now being shown to be heterogeneous; that is, associated with many different mutations.

With this array of human diseases that are caused by mutations, what of positive effects? With thousands of examples of harmful mutations readily available, surely it should be possible to describe some positive mutations if macroevolution is true. These would be needed not only for evolution to greater complexity, but also to offset the downward pull of the many harmful mutations. But, when it comes to identifying positive mutations, evolutionary scientists are strangely silent.⁶⁶

The reasons why mutations cannot support evolutionist claims may be summarized under three main headings:

1. *Mutations are always harmful.* Since they occur at random, they always damage living things. Logically, any unconscious intervention in a perfect and complex structure will damage it, rather than causing it to develop. Indeed, no useful mutations have ever been observed.


2. *No information can be added to DNA as a result of mutation.* The components of the genetic information are removed and dismantled, dam-

aged or carried to other locations in the DNA. Yet mutations can never cause a living thing to acquire a new organ or attribute.

3. *For a mutation to be transmitted to a subsequent generation, it must take place in the reproductive germ cells.* No change arising in any other cell of the body can be passed along to later generations. For example, an embryo's eye may depart from its original form by being subjected to radiation and other similar effects, but this mutation will not manifest itself in subsequent generations.



Harun Yahya - Adnan Oktar



NARROW POPULATION

One of the views held by the proponents of punctuated evolution is the concept of *narrow populations*. This postulates that new species form in communities consisting of very small numbers of animals or plants. According to this claim, populations containing large numbers of animals exhibit no evolutionary development, but remain in a state of *stasis*. However, small groups that separate from this population and become isolated (generally because of geographical conditions), will reproduce solely among themselves. Macro-mutations then occur in these groups and rapid *speciation* takes place.

Proponents of punctuated equilibrium insist on the concept of narrow populations simply because they cannot account for the lack of any evidence in the fossil records. That is why they imagine that evolutionary changes took place very rapidly and in narrow populations, for which reason no fossil traces have been left behind.

In recent years, however, scientific experiments and observations have revealed that narrow populations are a disadvantage rather than an advantage. Rather than develop-

ing and giving rise to new species, narrow populations actually cause severe genetic impairments, since individuals must constantly reproduce within a restricted gene pool. As result, normally *heterozygotic* individuals become increasingly *homozygotic*. Impaired or defective genes, normally recessive become dominant, and the population suffers increasing genetic diseases.⁶⁷

In order to investigate this, one study on chickens was conducted over 35 years. Chickens kept in a narrow population were seen to become genetically weakened. Egg production fell from 100% to 80%, and reproduction levels from 93% to 74%.

However, this genetic regression was halted through conscious human intervention. When chickens were brought in from other regions and the augmented chicken population reassumed normal trends.⁶⁸

This and similar findings show that the claim of punctuated evolution—that narrow populations are the source of evolutionary development—has no scientific validity. (See The Punctuated Evolution Model.)

NATURALISM

In general terms, naturalism is a philosophy that recognizes no other reality aside from nature and the world perceived by the five senses. Naturalism, one of the most significant products of the 19th century atheistic atmosphere, influenced Darwin and drove him to offer an atheistic explanation for life. According to this way of thinking, nature itself was regarded as its own creator and arbiter. Concepts such as Mother Nature or clichés such as "Nature gave some people superior abilities; nature made humans what they are," are still widely employed today, but are the result of preconceptions imposed by naturalism.

Naturalists were great admirers of the perfection in the physical world, yet found it difficult to give a satisfactory answer to how this came into being. Since they adopted positivist dogma, and believed only in concepts whose existence could be established by means of experiment and observation, they fiercely rejected the fact that nature was created by Allah. In their view, nature created itself.

Darwin's theory served naturalist/materialist philosophy, or to be more accurate, the atheism that un-

derlay it. It therefore received support and was imposed on society as if it were a major scientific truth. Otherwise, it would have been regarded as the speculation of an amateur biologist and quickly forgotten.

NATURAL SELECTION

Natural selection is based on the hypothesis that there is a constant struggle for survival among species and those living things that are strongest and best adapted to natural conditions survive that struggle and live to propagate themselves. For example, in a herd of deer, those animals that are naturally able to run fast will escape predators and survive. Naturally, this herd will soon consist of deer that are all able to run quickly.

But note that no matter how long



Fossilized deer

this predator pressure lasts, the deer will never turn into any other species. Weak deer are eliminated and the fittest survive; but no "evolution" of species takes place, because there is no change in the deer's genetic information. No matter how much herds of deer are subjected to natural selection, they will still remain deer.


This example applies to all other species. Deformed or weak individuals in a population, or those unfitted to environmental conditions are eliminated by way of natural selection. But no new species, genetic information or organs will emerge as a result. In other words, living things

cannot evolve by way of natural selection.

Darwin admitted as much when he wrote, "Natural selection can do nothing until favourable individual differences or variations occur." ⁶⁹

Natural selection was a natural phenomenon known to biologists before Darwin, but described as a mechanism that enables species to remain stable without being impaired. It was Darwin who first claimed that this process was an evolutionary force and thus constructed his whole theory on that basis. The name he gave his book—*The Origin of Species, By Way of Natural Selection*—shows that natural selec-

No matter how much deers are subjected to natural selection, they will always give birth to more deer.



tion represented the foundation of Darwin's theory.

Stephen Jay Gould, one of the best-known contemporary evolutionists, says this about Darwinism's grave error:

*The essence of Darwinism lies in a single phrase: natural selection is the creative force of evolutionary change. No one denies that selection will play a negative role in eliminating the unfit. Darwinian theories require that it create the fit as well.*⁷⁰

In an article published in *American Scientist* magazine, the evolutionist C. Loring Brace describes how Darwinism has been refuted by scientific discoveries and states that we cannot regard natural selection as an evolutionary mechanism:

*Readers of American Scientist may not realize the extent to which a major part of the field of biology and almost all of paleontology has rejected Darwin's insights concerning organic evolution. Natural selection is dismissed as contributing nothing more than "fine-tuning," and adaptation is largely ignored in practice.*⁷¹

NEANDERTHALS: A HUMAN RACE

The Neanderthals emerged suddenly in Europe around 300,000

years ago, and disappeared, or else were assimilated by mixing with other human races, silently and just as quickly about 35,000 years ago. The only difference between them and present-day humans is that their skeletons are rather sturdier and their brain volumes slightly larger. Neanderthals were a well-built human race, as is now agreed by just about everyone.

Evolutionists, on the other hand,



A fossil belonging to a Neanderthal

have made great efforts to portray these people as a "primitive" species, although all the facts show Neanderthal Man to be no different to a fairly stocky human walking around today. The New Mexico University paleoanthropologist Erik Trinkaus, regarded as an eminent authority on the subject, writes:

Detailed comparisons of Neanderthal

*skeletal remains with those of modern humans have shown that there is nothing in Neanderthal anatomy that conclusively indicates locomotor, manipulative, intellectual, or linguistic abilities inferior to those of modern humans.*⁷²

Therefore, many modern researchers describe Neanderthal Man as a sub-group of modern man and

Although the fossil findings show that Neanderthal Man was a human, with nothing primitive about him compared to ourselves, evolutionists still portray Neanderthals as ape-men. This is just one of the many indications that Darwinism is based not on scientific findings, but on prejudice and propaganda.



FALSE

refer to him as *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*. Recent discoveries show that the Neanderthals buried their dead, made various musical instruments and shared a culture as developed as that of modern man, *Homo sapiens sapiens*.

"NEBRASKA MAN" FRAUD, THE

In 1922, Henry Fairfield Osborn, director of the American Museum of Natural History, announced that

near Snake Valley in Nebraska, he had found a molar tooth that bore common human and ape features, dating back to the Pliocene Period. Before long, a profound scientific debate on the subject had begun. Some people regarded this tooth as belonging to *Pithecanthropus erectus*, while others said it was closer to being fully human. This fossil was given the popular name of Nebraska Man and the scientific name of: *Hesperopithecus haroldcookii*.

Based on this single tooth,



The Neanderthals: A Human Race

To the above can be seen the *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis* Amud 1 skull, discovered in Israel. It is estimated that the owner of this skull would have stood 1.80 meters (5 feet, 11 inches) tall. Its brain volume is the largest so far encountered for Neanderthals, at 1,740 cubic centimeters.



The reconstruction above, produced on the basis of a single tooth, was published in the 24 June 1922 edition of the *Illustrated London News*. Shortly afterwards, however, it was realized that the tooth actually belonged to an extinct species of wild boar, and not to an ape-like creature or human being at all. This inflicted a major disappointment on evolutionists.

Nebraska Man's skull and body were reconstructed in artists' conceptions. Pictures were even published of Nebraska Man in his natural habitat, together with his wife and children. This whole scenario was spun out from a single tooth. Evolutionists so believed in this hominid made from whole cloth that when a researcher by the name of William Bryan cast doubt upon all these firmly held opinions based on

a single tooth, he attracted the most terrible fury.

However, other parts of the skeleton were discovered in 1927. In the light of these remains, this tooth was found to belong neither to an ape nor to a human being, but to an extinct species of American wild boar known as *prosthennops*. *Science* magazine covered the story under the title "*Hesperopithecus* Apparently Not an Ape Nor a Man." ⁷³

As a result, all pictures of *Hesperopithecus haroldcookii* were swiftly removed from the literature.

NEO-DARWINISM COMEDY, THE

With the genetic laws discovered in the first quarter of the 20th century, Darwin's theory reached a complete impasse. At this, a group of scientists determined to remain loyal to evolution theory came together at a meeting held by the American Geology Association in 1941. After lengthy discussions by geneticists such as G. Ledyard Stebbins and Theodosius Dobzhansky, zoologists such as Ernst Mayr and Julian Huxley, and paleontologists such as George Gaylord Gibson and Glen L. Jepsen, the decision was reached to patch up Darwinism.

To the question of "What is the source of beneficial changes that

cause living things to develop?"—which Darwin had been unable to answer, but had sought to resolve based on Lamarck—these people replied, "Random mutations." They advanced a new theory by adding the concept of mutation to Darwin's thesis of natural selection; which new theory began to be known as neo-Darwinism (or the **Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution**, which see).

The decades that followed saw hopeless attempts to prove neo-Darwinism. Mutations were well known to be breaks, shifts and defects occurring in living organisms' genes as the result of external factors, which give rise to serious damage on practically every occasion. Nevertheless, neo-Darwinists carried out thousands of experiments to try to establish an example of a *useful* mutation—endeavors that invariably ended in fiascos. (See **Mutation:**


An Imaginary Mechanism.)

At the same time, neo-Darwinists also sought to prove that the first living organisms could have emerged by chance under the conditions of the primeval Earth—as required by the theory. The same fiascos were experienced in that field, too. All the experiments intended to prove that life emerged by chance ended in failures. Probability calculations showed that not a single protein, the basic building blocks of the cell, could form by chance. As for the cell itself, the smallest living unit, not a single one could be formed even in laboratories with the most highly advanced 20th century technology. Then how could a cell have come about as the result of chance in the primitive, uncontrolled conditions of the primeval world, as evolutionists claimed?

Neo-Darwinist theory was also dealt a fatal blow by the fossil

record. In long years of excavations, no intermediate forms—that should, according to neo-Darwinist theory, have demonstrated that primitive species gradually evolved into more advanced ones—were found anywhere. Comparative anatomical studies showed that living things once assumed to have evolved from one another in fact possessed very different anatomical features and could never be one another's fore-runners or later descendants.

Neo-Darwinism was not a scientific theory, but rather an ideological dogma. For that reason, evolution's adherents still continue to support the theory in the face of all the evidence against it. In their view, evolution is a belief that can never be abandoned.





OCTOPUS'S EYE, THE

Evolutionists maintain that all living things with similar structures and organs share an evolutionary relationship. One of the perfectly clear examples that invalidate this claim, known as homology, is the octopus eye. (See **Homology**.) According to evolutionists' imaginary tree of life, octopi—being mollusks—are one of the life forms furthest removed from human beings. Although the octopus and man are very different life forms, between which no so called evolutionary relationship can exist, their eyes have exactly the same structure! This is a clear sign that similar structures do not constitute proof of evolution.

Confronted by this situation, evolutionists say that these organs are not homologous (that is, descended from a common ancestor) but rather *analogous*—similar, despite the absence of any evolutionary relationship. See **Homologous Organs** and **Analogous Organs**.) In their view, for instance, the human eye and the octopus eye are analogous organs.

However, the question of whether a particular organ should be included in the homologous or the analogous category is answered solely according to the preconcep-

tions of the theory of evolution. This in turn shows that there is nothing scientific about the evolutionist claim based on similarities.

All evolutionists seek to do is to interpret the findings they discover against the terms of evolution dogma, which they assume to be true right from the outset. Yet the interpretations they come up with are highly inconsistent. Because sometimes organs they are forced to regard as analogous resemble one another so closely, despite their extraordinarily complex structures, that it is utterly illogical to suggest that such resemblances came about as the result of random mutations. If, as evolutionists claim, the octopus's eye emerged as the result of chance, then the vertebrate eye should have emerged by repeating those exact same coincidences.

The well-known evolutionist Frank Salisbury writes:

*Even something as complex as the eye has appeared several times; for example, in the squid, the vertebrates, and the arthropods. It's bad enough accounting for the origin of such things once, but the thought of producing them several times according to the modern synthetic theory makes my head swim.*⁷⁴

According to the theory of evolu-

tion, completely independent mutations must have produced these life forms twice, by chance! This fact places evolutionists in an even worse dilemma. Extraordinary similarities like these, which conflict with the evolutionist thesis of homology, show that similar organs represent no evidence for having evolved from a common ancestor. Indeed, the exact opposite can be observed in some life forms: Some living things, despite being regarded by evolutionists as very closely related, have some organs that are completely different from one another.

OH 62: A SPECIES OF APE

Evolutionists long suggested that the fossil creature to which they gave the name *Homo habilis* was capable of walking upright. They thus thought that they had found a link between ape and man. However, the new *H. habilis* fossils discovered by Tim White in 1986 and given the name OH 62 demolished that claim. These fossil parts showed that, just like present-day apes, *H. habilis* had long arms and short legs. This fossil put an end to the claim that *H. habilis* was capable of walking upright. It was nothing more than a species of ape.

ONTOGENY RECAPITULATES PHYLOGENY THEORY, THE

(See also **The, Biogenetic Law and Theory of Recapitulation,**)

The evolutionist biologist Ernst Haeckel proposed this theory toward the end of the 19th century. The term *recapitulation* is used to summarize the theory.

Haeckel claimed that during their developmental phases, embryos repeated the evolutionary process that their alleged ancestors had undergone. For example, he maintained that during its development in the mother's womb the human embryo exhibited first fish-like gills and then reptile characteristics before finally "evolving" into a human baby. However, as time passed, it emerged that this scenario was totally imaginary.

Evolutionists also admit this. One article in *American Scientist* read:

*Surely the biogenetic law [the recapitulation theory] is as dead as a doornail. It was finally exorcised from biology textbooks in the fifties. As a topic of serious theoretical inquiry it was extinct in the twenties.*⁷⁵

To support his theory of recapitulation, Ernst Haeckel produced faked drawings, attempting to portray fish and human embryos as re-

sembling one another. When these frauds were exposed, he had no other defense other than to say that other evolutionists did exactly the same thing:

After this compromising confession of 'forgery' I should be obliged to consider myself condemned and annihilated if I had not the consolation of seeing side by side with me in the prisoner's dock hundreds of fellow-culprits, among them many of the most trusted observers and most esteemed biologists. The great majority of all the diagrams in the best biological textbooks, treatises and journals would incur in the same degree the charge of 'forgery,' for all of them are inexact, and are more or less doctored, schematised and constructed.

76

OPARIN, ALEXANDER I.

The Russian biologist Alexander I. Oparin, founder of the concept of "chemical evolution," could not obtain any findings to shed light on the origins of life, despite all his theoretical research. In his 1936 book *The Origin of Life*, he wrote, "Unfortunately . . . the problem of the origin of the cell is perhaps the most obscure point in the whole

study of the evolution of organisms."

77



Alexander I. Oparin

Ever since Oparin, evolutionists have carried out countless experiments, studies and observations to prove that the cell could have come into existence by chance. However, every study has undermined evolutionists' assumptions by revealing in ever-greater detail the complex creation in the cell.

OPEN SYSTEM

The term "open system" refers to a thermodynamic system with an external energy source, into which matter enters and departs. Since the theory of evolution conflicts with the Second Law of Thermodynamics (the Law of Entropy), evolutionists maintain that this entropy applies only to *closed systems*. They resort to a deception, maintaining that open systems lie outside this law. They suggest, further, that the Earth's biosphere is an open system, being exposed to a constant flow of energy

from the Sun; and that therefore, the Law of Entropy does not apply to the Earth, and that ordered, complex living things can indeed emerge from disordered, simple and inanimate structures.

Yet there is a very clear distortion of the facts here, because energy entering a system from outside is not sufficient to make that system into an ordered one. To make that energy capable of being used, special mechanisms are needed. For example, control mechanisms, an engine and transmission systems are needed to harness the energy generated from the fuel in an internal combustion engine. In the absence of such transformation systems, it will be impossible to use that fuel's energy.

The same applies to living things, which receive their energy from the Sun. This solar energy is turned into chemical energy thanks to extraordinarily complex energy-conversion systems such as photosynthesis in plants and the digestive systems in animals and human beings. In the absence of any of these conversion systems, no organism can survive. For a living thing with no energy-conversion system, the Sun will be simply a source of destructive heat and UV radiation.

Therefore, any system without an

energy-conversion system be it open or closed, will offer no advantage for evolution. No one claims that any such complex and conscious mechanism existed in the conditions of the primeval Earth. At this point, evolutionists cannot account for how complex energy conversion systems, such as photosynthesis, which even modern technology cannot reproduce — emerged in the first place.

Whatever solar energy reached the primeval Earth had no way of giving rise to order. For one thing, the higher the temperature rises, the more amino acids—the building blocks of life—resist forming bonds in regular sequences. Energy alone is not sufficient for amino acids to form the far more complex molecules of proteins, and for proteins to give rise to cell organelles, which are more complex still. This manifest order is only possible through our omniscient Lord's creation.

In fact, many evolutionists openly admit that the claim about open systems is invalid and that it conflicts with thermodynamics. Although Professor John Ross of Harvard University holds evolutionist views, he writes in a paper in *Chemical and Engineering News* that this claim is unrealistic and unscientific:

... there are no known violations of the

*second law of thermodynamics. Ordinarily, the second law is stated for isolated systems, but the second law applies equally well to open systems. . . there is somehow associated with the field of far-from-equilibrium phenomena the notion that the second law of thermodynamics fails for such systems. It is important to make sure that this error does not perpetuate itself.*⁷⁸

ORDERED SYSTEM

The theory of evolution clearly conflicts with the second law of thermodynamics (the law of entropy), one of the most basic laws of physics. (See **The Second Law of Thermodynamics**)

According to this experimentally proven theory, all systems in the universe, left to their own devices, will suffer disorder, disruption and impairment in direct relation to the passage of time.

In order not to violate this scientific law, evolutionists use various concepts in a misleading manner. They maintain that specific order can arise in systems undergoing constant exchanges of matter and energy.

For example, when wind enters a dusty room, it may move all the dust that has settled and deposit it in one corner of the room. However, these

dust particles can never order themselves by using the energy of the wind to produce a recognizable image of, say, a human being.

Similarly, when the A key on a keyboard is pressed repeatedly (with a corresponding flow of energy entering the system), the result is dozens of repetitions of the letter, as in *aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa* . . . However, this constant repetition contains no information, no complexity. For a sequence of letters to contain information in the form of a meaningful sentence, paragraph or book, an intelligent, ordering mind is absolutely essential.

As a result, no complex, organized system can ever arise through natural processes, although simple combinations of the kind described above may occur from time to time. These arrangements never go beyond specific limits, however.

Yet evolutionists depict examples of self-ordering that arise spontaneously in this way as significant evidence for evolution, portraying them as supposed examples of self-organization. As a result of this misconception, they suggest that living systems can emerge spontaneously as a result of natural chemical reactions.

However, ordered systems and organized systems have totally dis-

tinct structures. *Ordered* systems include simple arrangements and repetitions, while *organized* systems contain very complex and interconnected structures and functions. Knowledge and conscious design are essential if they are to emerge.

Ilya Prigogine resorted to this deliberate conceptual confusion and referred to molecules that arranged themselves as energy passed through them as "spontaneously self-organizing." In their book *The Mystery of Life's Origin*, the American scientists Thaxton, Bradley and Olsen describe the position in these terms:

*In each case random movements of molecules in a fluid are spontaneously replaced by a highly ordered behaviour. Prigogine, Eigen, and others have suggested that a similar sort of self-organization may be intrinsic in organic chemistry and can potentially account for the highly complex macromolecules essential for living systems. But such analogies have scant relevance to the origin-of-life question. A major reason is that they fail to distinguish between order and complexity. . . .*⁷⁹

Those same scientists also describe the logical superficiality and distortion of some evolutionists' claim that water turning into ice is an analogy of biological ordering

taking place spontaneously.

*It has often been argued by analogy to water crystallizing to ice that simple monomers may polymerize into complex molecules such as protein and DNA. The analogy is clearly inappropriate, however . . . The atomic bonding forces draw water molecules into an orderly crystalline array when the thermal agitation (or entropy driving force) is made sufficiently small by lowering the temperature. Organic monomers such as amino acids resist combining at all at any temperature, however, much less [forming] some orderly arrangement.*⁸⁰

Prigogine devoted his whole career to trying to square thermodynamics with the theory of evolution. But even he admitted that there was no resemblance between the crystallization of water and the emergence of complex biological structures:

*The point is that in a non-isolated system there exists a possibility for formation of ordered, low-entropy structures at sufficiently low temperatures. This ordering principle is responsible for the appearance of ordered structures such as crystals, as well as for the phenomena of phase transitions. Unfortunately, this principle cannot explain the formation of biological structures.*⁸¹

ORGANIZED SYSTEMS

—See Ordered System

ORGEL, LESLIE


Probability calculations show that complex molecules such as proteins and nucleic acid (RNA and DNA) cannot possibly come in to being separately and by chance.

Prominent evolutionists admit this. For example, Stanley Miller and Francis Crick's colleague from San Diego University, the well-known evolutionist Dr. Leslie Orgel, says:

It is extremely improbable that proteins and nucleic acids, both of which are structurally complex, arose spontaneously in the same place at the same time. Yet it also seems impossible to have one without the other. And so, at first glance, one might have to conclude that life could never, in fact, have originated by chemical means.⁸²

ORIGIN OF THE AVIAN LUNG

Another factor that makes the scenario of evolution from dinosaur to bird impossible is the unique structure of the avian lung, which cannot be explained in evolutionary terms.



The lungs of terrestrial animals have a two-way structure: During inhalation, air travels down into the lungs through increasingly narrower channels, halting at tiny air sacs, where the exchange of oxygen and carbon dioxide takes place. Later, this CO₂-laden air moves in the opposite direction, leaving the lung by the same path through which it entered, and is expelled through the main bronchial passage.

In birds, on the other hand, the air travels in one way only along the so-called pulmonary canal. The lungs' entry and exit canals are different from one another, and air always travels in the same direction, thanks to the special air sacs extending along the passages. This means a bird can absorb oxygen in the air non-stop, meeting its high energy requirements.

This unique respiratory system, known as the *avian lung*, is described in these terms by Michael Denton, a molecular biologist from Otago University in Australia:

In the case of birds, the major bronchi break down into tiny tubes which permeate the lung tissue. These so-called

*parabronchi eventually join up together again, forming a true circulatory system so that air flows in one direction through the lungs. . . [T]he structure of the lung in birds and the overall functioning of the respiratory system is quite unique. No lung in any other vertebrate species is known which in any way approaches the avian system. Moreover, it is identical in all essential details in birds as diverse as humming birds, ostriches and hawks.*⁸³

It is impossible for the reptilian lung, with its two-way air flow, to have evolved into the avian lung, with a one-way flow. No transitional stage between these two pulmonary

structures is possible. Any vertebrate must breathe in order to survive, and the first step in any change of pulmonary structure would lead to the death of that intermediate stage.

Furthermore, the theory of evolution maintains that all changes took place gradually, over millions of years. Yet no creature whose lungs do not function can survive for more than a few minutes.

In his book *A Theory in Crisis*, Michael Denton sets out the impossibility of explaining the origin of the avian lung from an evolutionary perspective:



*This one-directional flow of air is maintained in breathing in and breathing out by a complex system of inter-connected air sacs in the bird's body, which expand and contract in such a way as to ensure a continuous delivery of air through the parabronchi . . . The structure of the lung in birds, and the overall functioning of the respiratory system, are quite unique. No lung in any other vertebrate species in any way approaches the avian system. Moreover, in its essential details, it is identical in [all] birds.*⁸⁴


In short, a transition from one type of lung to the other is not possible, because no "transitional" lung could function properly.

In addition, reptiles have a diaphragmatic respiratory system, while birds have no diaphragm. The differing structures also make evolution between the two types impossible. John Ruben, an authority on respiratory physiology, comments:


*The earliest stages in the derivation of the avian abdominal air sac system from a diaphragm-ventilating ancestor would have necessitated selection for a diaphragmatic hernia in taxa transitional between theropods and birds. Such a debilitating condition would have immediately compromised the entire pulmonary ventilatory apparatus and seems unlikely to have been of any selective advantage.*⁸⁵



REPTILE LUNG




BIRD LUNG



The anatomy of birds is very different from that of reptiles, their supposed ancestors. Birds lungs function in a totally different way from those of land-dwelling animals. Land-dwelling animals breathe in and out from the same air vessel. In birds, while the air enters into the lung from front, it goes out from the back. This distinct system is specially made for birds, which need great amounts of oxygen during flight. It is impossible for such a structure to evolve from the reptile lung.

Still another feature refuting the evolution of the avian lung is that its structure leaves it never empty of air, and faces the danger of collapse if it should become empty. Michael Denton has this to say:


Just how such a different respiratory system could have evolved gradually from the standard vertebrate design without some sort of direction is, again, very difficult to envisage, especially bearing in mind that the maintenance of respiratory function is absolutely vital to the life of the organism. Moreover, the unique function and form of the avian lung necessitates a number of additional unique adaptations during avian development. As H. R. Dunker,



one of the world's authorities in this field, explains, because first, the avian lung is fixed rigidly to the body wall and cannot therefore expand in volume and, second, because of the small diameter of the lung capillaries and the resulting high surface tension of any liquid within them, the avian lung cannot be inflated out of a collapsed state, as happens in all other vertebrates after birth. The air capillaries are never collapsed as are the alveoli of other vertebrate species; rather, as they grow into the lung tissue, the parabronchi are from the beginning open tubes filled with either air or fluid.⁸⁶


This system, totally different from the lungs of reptiles and other terrestrial vertebrates, cannot have formed gradually through un-

BIRDS' SPECIAL RESPIRATORY SYSTEM



WHEN INHALING


The air which enters the birds' respiratory passages goes to the lungs, and to air sacs behind them. The air which is used is transferred to air sacs at the front.



WHEN EXHALING

When the bird exhales, clean air collected in the rear air sacs flows into the lung. Thanks to this system, the flow of fresh air into the avian lung continues without interruption.

There are a great many other details in this respiratory system, which this diagram depicts in very simplified form. In. For instance, at the points where the air sacs are connected to the lungs, there are special valves and plugs to ensure the air travels in the right direction. These all represent a fatal blow to the idea of evolution, as well as being evident proofs of creation. Allah has created birds together with all their flawless characteristics. Allah is the Almighty Creator.



Parabronchial tubes, which enable air to circulate in the right direction in birds' lungs. Each of these tubes is just 0.5 mm. in diameter.

conscious mutations, as evolution maintains. Denton states that the avian lung's structure invalidates Darwinism:

The avian lung brings us very close to answering Darwin's challenge: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." ⁸⁷

ORIGIN OF THE BACTERIA

The oldest fossils are those of 3.5 billion year-old bacteria. From these remains, evolutionists claim that lifeless matter produced the first single-celled bacterium and claim, further that the first bacteria changed into multi-celled creatures over the course of time and became the ancestors of today's highly complex plants and animals. But with no scientific proof for these claims, evolutionists cannot explain how lifeless

matter could have produced bacteria.

Until recently, many scientists regarded bacteria as a simple life form. But detailed research has shown that they are quite complex, even though they are minute, single-celled creatures.

Nearly all species of bacteria are surrounded by a protective wall that shapes their cells and allows them to thrive in quite different environments. Some species of bacteria possess a thin layer which surrounds the cell wall. Within the cell wall of all bacteria, there is an elastic cell membrane. Tiny nutrient molecules enter the cell through pores on the surface of this membrane, through which larger molecules cannot pass.

Inside the membrane is a soft, gelatin-like substance called cytoplasm, which contain proteins called *enzymes*. These provide the cell with the raw materials it needs by break-


ing down the absorbed nutrients.

Like all living cells, bacteria contain DNA that controls the growth, reproduction and other activities. In bacteria, DNA moves freely in the cell's cytoplasm. Apart from cells without nuclei (called prokaryotes), every cell contains DNA in its nucleus, separated from the cytoplasm by a membrane.


Within these cells occur vital biochemical activities that ensure the continuation of life on Earth. Bacteria perform essential functions in the planet's ecological system. For example, some bacteria break down dead plant and animal matter, converting them into basic "raw" chemical compounds that living organisms can reuse. Some bacteria increase the fertility of the soil. Others convert milk into cheese, produce antibiotics for use against other harmful bacteria, and synthesize vitamins.

These are only a few of the countless purposes that bacteria serve. A close look at these bacteria's genetic structure shows that they are not simple life forms at all.

Besides all their hundreds of characteristics, bacteria contain the DNA that is evidence of creation. In theta-x-174, the smallest known bacteria, there are 5375 nucleotides—the



Despite being very small and single-celled, bacteria have a very complex structure.



These 1.9-million-year-old fossilized bacteria, discovered in western Ontario, have the same structure as bacteria living today.

building blocks of the nucleic acids that control all the hereditary characteristics of living creatures. A normal-sized bacterium contains as many as 3 million nucleotides.⁸⁸

Since the beginning of the 1900s, various studies of the intestinal bacteria *Escherichia coli* have shown that one of its chromosomes contains 5,000 genes. (Genes are special areas formed by particles on the DNA determining the function of an organ or a protein.)

This information is encoded in the DNA of every bacterium and is vital for its survival; the slightest change in it would destroy the bacterium's whole functioning system. If stretched out, the length of the information-carrying chromosome inside a typical bacterial cell, which itself is

only about 1 to 5 microns in size, is 1,400 microns⁸⁹ (A micron is 0.001 of a millimeter, or 0.000039 of an inch.) By special design, this wonderful chain of information is folded and packed to fit inside a tiny organism thousands of times smaller than itself.

As you can see, the slightest problem in the gene coding would result in the failure of its operational system. Bacteria would not survive, and their lineage would come to an end. As a result, the critical ecological balance would be broken, and the entire world of living things would be upset. Considering these complex characteristics, we understand—contrary to what evolutionists claim — that bacteria are not primitive at all.

Moreover, again contrary to the evolutionist claims, the evolution of bacteria into the so-called eukaryotic cells of plants and animals goes against every biological, physical and chemical law. Even though supporters of the evolutionary theory are completely aware of this, they do not abandon their untenable claims. For example, Dr. Ali Demirsoy, an evolutionist professor, admits that these bacteria cells, claimed to be primitive, cannot change into eukaryotic cells:

One of the most difficult stages of evolution to explain scientifically is how organelles and complex cells could develop from these primitive life forms. Actually, a transitional form between these two forms has not been found. Single-celled and multi-celled have this complex structure. No single life form or group of life forms has been found that is more primitive or has organelles with a simpler structure. That is, the carried organelles developed with all their characteristics. There is no simple or primitive form.⁹⁰

ORIGIN OF THE BATS

Bats, the only flying mammals, are without doubt one of the most interesting creatures in their class.

Heading the list of bats' fascinat-

ing characteristics is the complex sonar system they possess, thanks to which bats are able to fly and perform aerobatic maneuvers in pitch darkness, where they cannot see at all. They are able to detect and catch a tiny caterpillar on the floor of a pitch-black room.

The bat works this sonar by emitting a constant stream of high-frequency sounds, analyzing the echoes made by them, and thus obtaining a detailed perception of its surroundings. It does this at an extraordinary speed, non-stop and perfectly during the time it spends in flight.

Research into the sonar system in bats has revealed even more astonishing discoveries. The frequency range the bat can detect is very narrow, and since it can perceive sounds only within a specific range, a very important problem arises. According to the physical phenomenon known as the Doppler Effect, the frequency of a sound changes when it reflects off a moving body.


Therefore, when a bat emits sound waves in the direction of a moth flying away from it, the returning sound waves will be below the frequency that the bat can detect. For that reason, the bat should have enormous difficulty in detecting its moving prey.

Yet that is not actually the case, and bats continue to detect all kinds of moving object with no problem at all, because they raise the frequency of the sound waves they emit towards moving objects, just as if they were taking the Doppler Effect into account. For example, a bat will emit the highest frequency sounds in the direction of a fly moving away from it, so that when the sound echoes back, it will not fall below a detectable frequency.

Two types of neurons or nerve cells in the bat's brain supervise the sonar system; one of these perceives the ultrasound emitted, and the other adjusts the bat's squeaks by issu-

ing commands to particular muscles. These two types of neuron work together, so that when the frequency of the echoes changes, the first neuron detects this and causes the other neuron to adapt to the echo's frequency, either by suppressing or stimulating it. As a result, the bat changes its frequency according to its surroundings, using it in the most efficient manner.

It is easy to realize the lethal blow that this system deals to the theory of evolution's explanation of gradual improvements by way of random mutations. The sonar system in bats has an exceedingly complex structure, and can never be accounted for



The oldest known fossil bat, found in Wyoming in the USA. This fossil, some 50 million years old, is identical to modern bats.

in terms of random mutations. In order for the system to function, it must exist fully formed and complete, right down to the smallest details. The sonar will work only if the bat has the proper structure for emitting high-frequency sounds, the organs with which to detect and analyze these, and a system capable of varying the frequency, depending of changes in movement. Such sophistication cannot, of course, be explained in terms of random chance, but actually shows that the bat was created in the most perfect manner.

In addition, the fossil record also shows that bats appeared suddenly on Earth, and with all their present-day characteristics. The evolutionist paleontologists John Hill and James Smith make the following confession:

*The fossil record of bats extends back to the early Eocene . . . and has been documented . . . on five continents . . . [A]ll fossil bats, even the oldest, are clearly fully developed bats and so they shed little light on the transition from their terrestrial ancestor.*⁹¹

On the same subject, the evolutionist paleontologist L. R. Godfrey writes:

There are some remarkably well preserved early Tertiary fossil bats, such as Icaronycteris index, but

*Icaronycteris tells us nothing about the evolution of flight in bats because it was a perfectly good flying bat.*⁹²

It is impossible for the bat's complex bodily systems to have emerged through evolution, and the fossil records confirm that no such evolution ever took place. On the contrary, the first bats that came into being on Earth were exactly the same as their present-day counterparts. Bats have always existed as bats.

ORIGIN OF BEHAVIOR

Evolutionists regard all animal and human behavior as having specific evolutionary origins, believing that the present characteristics they possess have been passed down from their supposed ancestors, from the first cell through to their present-day forms.

Again according to evolutionists, the oldest form of behavior in animals is food-gathering, which behavior is common to all living things, from the first cells up to human beings. Impulses to survive (self-preservation) and to reproduce and preserve the race or species emerged later.. According to evolutionists, all behavior has one origin and one single cause, and under-



A butterfly that resembles a dry leaf

went appropriate changes during adaptation to various environmental conditions.

However, nothing about behavior squares with an evolutionary scenario. Because living things lack the reasoning abilities to learn by trial and error, and then record these lessons as "instinct" in the genes, and transmit them to subsequent generations. Right from birth, they possess such innate forms of behavior as defending themselves and nest -building..

Allah creates all living things with their own unique attributes and forms of behavior. It is impossible, for instance, for a butterfly to decide to assume the appearance of a dead leaf in order to camouflage itself and increase its chances of survival, and then refine the changes in its wings with that goal in mind. There can be no question of a beaver learning to build a dam, requiring highly ad-

vanced engineering calculations, across a river in order to stop the flow of water. It possesses the ability to do this from the moment of its birth.

Evolutionists sometimes claim that animals acquire some forms of behavior through experience, and the most effective behaviors become "fixed" by way of natural selection. These effective forms of behavior are subsequently passed on to later generations through genetic inheritance.

However, living things cannot survive in the absence of these instinctive forms of behavior. And therefore, they have no time in which to learn them. A living thing has to possess this behavior from the moment it is born. The idea that such behavior can "evolve" is therefore inconsistent right from the start, because evolutionist hypotheses allow for no consciousness to make any such selection. Living things are born possessing of various characteristics and instinctive forms of behavior that allow them to survive.

ORIGIN OF THE BIRDS

The theory of evolution maintains that birds descended from small, carnivorous theropod dinosaurs—in other words, from reptiles.

In fact, however, comparison of birds and reptiles reveals that these classes are very different from one another, and that no evolution between them is possible.

There are many structural differences between birds and reptiles, one of the most important of which is bone structure. The bones of dinosaurs are thick and solid. In contrast, the bones of both living and extinct species of birds are hollow, which makes them very light. Reptiles have the slowest metabolism in the living world, while birds hold the record for the fastest. For example, due to its rapid metabolism, a sparrow's body temperature may sometimes reach 48 degrees Celsius. But reptiles are unable to produce their own body heat, warming themselves by means of the

Sun's rays. Reptiles consume the least energy, and birds the most.

Despite being an evolutionist, North Carolina University's Professor Alan Feduccia opposes the theory that birds are related to dinosaurs. His opposition to the dino-bird claims is based on scientific findings:


"All in all, I find the whole dino-bird business a total hoax." ⁹³

Larry Martin,
a Kansas
University authority on ancient birds, also opposes the theory that birds are



Because of their heavy, bulky bodies, dinosaur bones are very thick and solid. On the other hand, the bones of all birds living today and that have so far been discovered as fossils are hollow and thus very light.

Harun Yahya - Adnan Oktar



descended from dinosaurs. In reference to the dilemma in which evolution finds itself, Martin says:

*To tell you the truth, if I had to support the dinosaur origin of birds with those characters, I'd be embarrassed every time I had to get up and talk about it.*⁹⁴

In the face of all the scientific findings, however, the dinosaur-bird evolution scenario, based on no concrete evidence whatsoever, is still stubbornly defended. Certain concepts that represent no evidence for this scenario are superficially portrayed as "evidence" for the link between birds and dinosaurs.

Some evolutionist publications, for instance, suggest that, based on differences in dinosaurs' hip bones, birds evolved from dinosaurs. The hip bone difference in question is that between the *Saurischian* (reptile-type hip-boned) and *Ornithischian* (bird-type hip-boned) groups. This concept of dinosaurs with bird-type hips is sometimes perceived as evidence for dinosaur-to-bird evolution.

In fact, however, this provides no support for the claim that dinosaurs are the forerunners of birds. Certain dinosaurs belonging to the Ornithischian group do not resemble birds at all in their other anatomical features. *Ankylosaurus*, for in-

stance, had short legs, an enormous body and skin covered in armor-like scales, but is a bird-type hip-boned dinosaur belonging to the Ornithischian group. On the other hand, *Struthiomimus*, some of whose anatomical features may be compared to birds, was thin with long back legs and short forearms, and belongs to the Saurischian group, with reptile-type hip bones.

Hip bone structure, therefore, represents no apparent evidence that dinosaurs and birds are related. The definition of "bird-type" hip-boned dinosaurs is one based solely on similarities, and other major anatomical gulfs between the two groups make it impossible to interpret that one similarity from an evolutionist perspective.

ORIGIN OF THE BIRD FEATHERS

The theory of evolution maintains that birds evolved from reptiles, but is totally unable to account for the enormous differences between these two separate living classes. One feature that widens the unbridgeable gulf between birds and reptiles is feathers, which are unique to birds.

The structure of bird feathers is

far too complex to be explained by means of any evolutionary process. The well known ornithologist Alan Feduccia does not consider it probable that a tissue so well suited for flight could have emerged initially to serve another purpose (for example, insulation, as is claimed by evolutionists). As he says: "Everything about them indicates an aerodynamic function... They're lightweight, they're excellent airfoils, they produce high lift at low speeds, and they have a Velcro-like quality that lets them be reassembled."⁹⁵

In addition, a long, stiff tube runs along the center of the feather. From both sides of this tube emerge hundreds of barbs. These barbs, which have differing lengths and degrees of softness, give


the feather its aerodynamic properties. Even more interestingly, on each barb are even smaller structures known as barbules, too small to be seen with the naked eye. On all of these barbules are tiny hooks, thanks to which the barbules are held together tightly, as if by zip-pers.

There are 650 barbs on either side of a stork feather's stem. Each one has 600 contraposed barbules, attached to one another by 390 hooks which, again, cling together like the two sides of a zipper. If the hooks become detached from one another, the bird has only to shake itself or groom its feathers with its beak for them to reattach.

To maintain that such a complex structure evolved as the result of random mutations from reptile scales is simply a dogmatic belief, based on no scientific foundation at all.

The scales covering the bodies of reptiles are different from bird feathers in every respect. Unlike feathers, scales do not extend beneath the skin, consisting solely of a hard layer on the surface of an animal's skin. They bear no resemblance to bird feathers, genetically, biochemically, nor anatomically.

This enormous difference between scales and feathers wholly invalidates the scenario of evolution from reptiles to birds.



Harun Yahya - Adnan Oktar

the complex structure of birds' feathers

When bird feathers are examined in detail, it is clear that they result from a very superior creation. There are even smaller filaments in every feather, as well as special hooks that attach them together. The picture shows a magnified close-up of a feather.



A. H. Brush, a Connecticut University professor of physiology and neurobiology, described the profound differences between reptile scales and bird feathers:

*Every feature from gene structure and organization, to development, morphogenesis and tissue organization is different [in feathers and scales. . . the protein structure of bird feathers and are unique among vertebrates . . . Feathers appear suddenly in the fossil record. . . .]*⁹⁶

This superior creation in feathers gave Charles Darwin considerable pause for thought. The magnificent beauty in peacock feathers actually made him "cold all over," as he put it. In a letter to his friend Asa Gray dated 3 April, 1860, he wrote:

*. . . I remember well the time when the thought of the eye made me cold all over.*⁹⁷




A Mesozoic Era fossil fish.

The fossil record shows that, like fish, all other living classes also appeared suddenly and with their different structures complete and fully formed.

ORIGIN OF THE FISH

Evolutionists maintain that invertebrate marine creatures that arose during the Cambrian Period developed into fish over the course of tens of millions of years. However, in the same way that Cambrian Period invertebrates had no ancestors neither are there any intermediate form to indicate any evolution between these same invertebrates and fish. (See **The Cambrian Period.**) Yet the very considerable



A photograph of a killer whale (Orcinus orca) breaching the surface of the ocean. The whale is captured mid-leap, with its dark, sleek back and white underbelly clearly visible. Its mouth is open, revealing rows of sharp, white teeth. The water around the whale is splashing and turbulent, with deep blue and white foam. The entire image is framed by a decorative orange border with a repeating circular pattern.

**Whales
have been created
with the most appropri-
ate structures and total-
ly unique sensory
systems for their
surroundings.**

transition between invertebrates—lacking skeletons and the hard parts of whose bodies are on the outside—and fish, whose hard parts act as supports in the middle of their bodies, should have left behind a vast number of fossilized intermediate forms. Yet all the different categories of fish appear suddenly in the fossil record, with no forerunners or "primitive" versions.

For 140 years, evolutionists have been combing the fossil strata in their search for these imaginary intermediate forms. Although millions of invertebrate fossils and millions of fish fossils have been discovered, no one has found even a single intermediate form. In an article titled "Evolution of the Lung and the Origin of Bony Fishes: A Casual Relationship," the evolutionist paleontologist Gerald T. Todd sets out the following questions that demonstrate evolutionists' despair:

All three subdivisions of the bony fishes first appear in the fossil record at approximately the same time . . . How did they originate? What allowed them to diverge so widely? How did they all come to have heavy armor? And why is there no trace of earlier, intermediate forms? ⁹⁸

The fossil record shows that just like other living classes, fish

emerged suddenly and with all their different structures intact. Fish were created in a single moment, with no evolutionary process behind them. Allah is the All-Powerful Creator.

ORIGIN OF THE FLIES

One explanation offered for the origin of birds is the cursorial theory, according to which reptiles' forearms developed into wings as they needed speed in their attempts to catch insects. This theory lacks any scientific evidence. Moreover, insects are definitely able to fly, which means that evolutionists face the problem of the origin of insects. (See **The Cursorial Theory.**)

Flies emerge also suddenly and with their own unique structures in the fossil record. For example, a great many dragonfly fossils from the Pennsylvanian period have been discovered, all identical to present-day specimens.

The interesting fact here is that both dragonflies and flies appear at the same time as species of wingless insects. This invalidates the hypothesis that wingless insects gradually developed wings.

R. Wootton and C. Ellington write on the subject in an article in the book *Biomechanics in Evolution*:

*When insect fossils first appear, in the Middle and Upper Carboniferous, they are diverse and for the most part fully winged. There are a few primitively wingless forms, but no convincing intermediates are known.*⁹⁹

One important feature of those flies that emerge suddenly in the fossil record is their extraordinary flight techniques. Human beings cannot raise and lower their arms ten times a second, yet the average fly can flap its wings 500 times a second. Moreover, both wings beat simultaneously. The slightest irregularity in wing beats will upset the insect's balance, but this never occurs.

In an article titled "The Mechanical Design in Fly Wings," R. Wootton writes:

*The better we understand the functioning of insect wings, the more subtle and beautiful their designs appear . . . Insect wings combine both in one, using components with a wide range of elastic properties, elegantly assembled to allow appropriate deformations in response to appropriate forces and to make the best possible use of the air. They have few if any technological parallels--yet.*¹⁰⁰

ORIGIN OF FLIGHT

—See The Arboreal Theory, The

Cursorial Theory, and The Transition from Land to the Air Myth.

ORIGIN OF THE HORSES

Until recently, schematic illustrations of the evolution of horses have been a prominent proof of the theory of evolution. Today, however, many evolutionists have openly refuted the validity of this scenario. In 1980, 150 evolutionists attended a four-day meeting at the Chicago Museum of Natural History in which the problems associated with stage-by-stage evolution were discussed. At that meeting, Boyce Rensberger stated that there was no support in the fossil record for the stage-by-stage evolution of horses:

*The popularly told example of horse evolution, suggesting a gradual sequence of changes from four-toed fox-sized creatures living nearly 50 million years ago to today's much larger one-toed horse, has long been known to be wrong. Instead of gradual change, fossils of each intermediate species appear fully distinct, persist unchanged, and then become extinct. Transitional forms are unknown.*¹⁰¹

About the "evolution of the horse" diagrams, the noted paleontologist Niles Eldredge said :

*There have been an awful lot of stories, some more imaginative than others, about what the nature of that history [of life] really is. The most famous example, still on exhibit downstairs, is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps fifty years ago. That has been presented as the literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now I think that that is lamentable, particularly when the people who propose those kinds of stories may themselves be aware of the speculative nature of some of that stuff.*¹⁰²

In spite of the lack of any scientific support, to create this horse-evolution scenario, fossils from different species were arranged in a series from the smallest to the largest. Evolutionists claimed that this evo-

lution occurred at different times in India, South America, North America and Europe. Various evolutionists proposed more than 20 different horse-evolution scenarios, but there is no agreement among them on the different proposed family trees. The only point they agreed on is that the 55-million-year-old dog-like creature called *Eohippus* (*Hyracotherium*) was the first so-called ancestor of horses. (See *Eohippus*.) However, this so-called ancestor of horses—supposed to have become extinct millions of years ago—is almost identical to a creature called the hyrax that still lives in Africa, but is no relation to a horse.¹⁰³



'The evolution of horses' exhibit at the British Natural History Museum. This and the like schemas of 'the evolution of horses' are constructed based on a totally sided point of view and by the extremely biased successive lining of the independent living kinds that have lived on different geographic areas in different epochs. In reality there is no scientific evidence on 'the evolution of horses'.

Every day that passes, a new fossil is discovered that clearly demonstrates the discrepancy of these claims about the evolution of horses especially since *Eohippus* fossils have been found in the same stratum as two modern horse species, *Equus nevadensis* and *E. occidentalis*.¹⁰⁴ This shows that horses living today lived at the same time as their supposed ancestors, proving that the so-called evolution of horses never occurred.

In his book *The Great Evolution Mystery*, the evolutionist writer Gordon R. Taylor examined topics that Darwinism could not explain. About the mythical horse series, he writes:

*But perhaps the most serious weakness of Darwinism is the failure of paleontologists to find convincing phylogenies or sequences of organisms demonstrating major evolutionary change. . . The horse is often cited as the only fully worked-out example. But the fact is that the line from Eohippus to Equus is very erratic. It is alleged to show a continual increase in size, but the truth is that some variants were smaller than Eohippus [the first in the sequence], not larger. Specimens from different sources can be brought together in a convincing-looking sequence, but there is no evidence that they were actually ranged in this order in time.*¹⁰⁵

All these facts show that one of the basic proofs for the series schema



of horse evolution is totally imaginary. Like other species, horses also come into existence without leaving any evolutionary ancestor in the fossil record.

ORIGIN OF THE INSECTS

With regard to the origin of birds, evolutionist biologists claim that certain reptiles that used their front legs developed wings to catch insects and evolved into birds. According to this speculative thesis, known as the cursorial theory, the forearms of the reptiles in question gradually elongated into wings as they attempted to catch flies. (See *The Cursorial Theory*.) The most important question regarding this theory, which is based on no scientific findings at all, is how insects, which were already able to fly, developed their wings. Insects, flies included, represent yet another dilemma for evolutionists.

In the classification of living things, insects represent a sub-phylum, Insecta, within the arthropod phylum (organisms with jointed legs). The oldest fossil insects belong to the Devonian Period. In the subsequent period, the Pennsylvanian, a large number of different insect species emerge suddenly. Fossilized cockroaches, for instance, appear

suddenly and with the same structures they have now. Betty Faber of the American Museum of Natural History says that the cockroaches of 350 million years ago are exactly the same as those of today.¹⁰⁶

Spiders, ticks and centipedes are not really insects, although they are generally referred to as such. At the 1983 annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, exceedingly important fossil findings regarding these organisms were presented. The 380-million-year-old spider, tick and centipede fossils were identical



A 35-million-year-old fly preserved in amber (fossilized tree resin). This fossil, discovered near the Baltic Sea, is identical to specimens living today.



There is no difference between this 320-million-year-old fossil cockroach and modern specimens. To the right can be seen a 145-million-year-old fossilized fly.



to specimens alive today. One scientist who examined these findings commented that they "looked like they might have died yesterday."¹⁰⁷

Of course, the way that these creatures, possessing flawless designs, appeared suddenly on Earth cannot be explained in terms of evolution. (See, **Origin of the Flies.**) For that reason, evolutionist scientist Paul Pierre Grassé, says that "We are in the dark concerning the origin of insects."¹⁰⁸ In conclusion, the sudden appearance of insects clearly confirms the fact of creation.

ORIGIN OF INSTINCT

Evolutionist scientists use the word *instinct* to describe certain behavior that animals possess from birth. However questions such as

"How did they acquire these instincts?" "How did instinctive behavior first emerge?" "how is such behavior transmitted from one generation to another?" always go unanswered.

The evolutionist geneticist Gordon Rattray Taylor makes this admission regarding the dilemma represented by instincts: "When we ask ourselves how an instinctive pattern of behaviour arose in the first place and became hereditarily fixed, we are given no answer."¹⁰⁹

Certain other evolutionists do not make such admissions. They try to gloss over these questions with veiled answers that do not actually mean anything at all. According to evolutionists, instincts are behaviors programmed in living things' genes. According to this explanation, a honeybee, for example, instinctively

builds its marvelous hexagonal combs that are marvels of mathematics. To put it another way, the genes of all the honeybees in the world are programmed with the instinct to construct perfect hexagonal combs. If living things perform the majority of their behaviors because they are programmed to do so, then who programmed them? Since no program can come into being of its own accord, this program must have a programmer. What evolutionists attempt to explain in terms of "instinct" or by saying "Animals have been programmed to do this," is actually the inspiration of Allah.

Charles Darwin, who first proposed the theory of evolution, realized that animal behavior and instinct represented major threats to his theory. In *The Origin of Species*, he openly admitted as much, several times:

Many instincts are so wonderful that their development will probably appear to the reader a difficulty sufficient to

overthrow my whole theory. ¹¹⁰

The difficulty that he experienced with regard to instincts is described in the book *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, a collection of his correspondence collected by his son, Francis Darwin:

Chapter III. of the Sketch, which concludes the first part, treats of the variations which occur in the instincts and habits of animals . . . It seems to have been placed thus early in the Essay to prevent the hasty rejection of the whole theory by a reader to whom the idea of natural selection acting on instincts might seem impossible. This is the more probable, as the Chapter on Instinct in the Origin is specially mentioned (Introduction, page 5) as one of the "most apparent and gravest difficulties on the theory." ¹¹¹

When left without an answer, evolutionists sometimes claim that animals learn some behavior by way of experience, and the best of that behavior is favored by natural selection. This good behavior is later handed on to subsequent generations by way of heredity.

The logical flaws and unscientific thinking in this claim are quite clear:

1. The erroneous claim that "useful behavior is favored by natural selection."



This thesis implies that Nature is a conscious force able to distinguish between useful and harmful behaviors and of making decisions. No consciousness or force in nature is capable of this distinction. An animal itself may decide what behavior is useful, but it cannot pass this insight along through its genes alone. Only an Entity possessed of consciousness and reason—namely, the Creator of nature and the life form in question—can make that selection.

Darwin himself admitted the impossibility of complex and beneficial behavior being acquired through natural selection, although he stated that he persisted in that claim despite it being nonsensical:

*Finally it may not be a logical deduction, but to my imagination it is far more satisfactory to look at such instincts as the young cuckoo ejecting its foster-brothers, ants making slaves . . . not as specially endowed or created instincts, but as small consequences of one general law leading to the advancement of all organic beings—namely, multiply, vary, let the strongest live and the weakest die.*¹¹²



Professor Cemal Yıldırım, one of Turkey's leading evolutionists, admits that behavior such as a mother's love for her young cannot be explained by natural selection:

*Is there any possibility of accounting for a mother's love for her young through any "blind" order [natural selection] not including a spiritual element? It is certainly hard to say that biologists [at this point Darwinists] have given a satisfactory reply to this question.*¹¹³

Since these organisms, lacking any reason and foresight, have a number of miraculous features; and since it is not possible for them to have acquired these features of their own will, some power must have bestowed these features on them. The mechanism of natural selection and nature itself has no consciousness and no such spiritual features, for which reason these cannot be the source of the characteristics these creatures possess. The obvious truth is this: all living things exist by the will and under the control of Allah. For this rea-

son, we frequently see exceedingly conscious and astonishing behavior in nature, inhabited by unconscious entities, of the kind that makes people ask. "How does this animal know how to do that?" or "How did this creature ever think of doing that?"

2. It is impossible for behavior acquired through natural selection to be transmitted genetically to subsequent generations.

In the second phase of evolutionists' claims, behavior acquired through natural selection must be genetically handed on to subsequent generations. However, such claims are full of various inconsistencies. First, even if animals learned behavior through experience, it is impossible for subsequently acquired behavior to be passed on genetically. Learned behavior belongs uniquely to the animal that learned it. It is absolutely impossible for any learned behavior to be encoded into a living thing's genes.

Evolutionists today are still unable to resolve that same contradiction posed by Darwin 150 years ago:

[I]t would be a serious error to suppose that the greater number of instincts have been acquired by habit in one generation, and then transmitted by inheritance to succeeding generations. It

can be clearly shown that the most wonderful instincts with which we are acquainted, namely, those of the hive-bee and of many ants, could not possibly have been acquired by habit. ¹¹⁴

If a working ant or other neuter insect had been an ordinary animal, I should have unhesitatingly assumed that all its characters had been slowly acquired through natural selection; namely, by individuals having been born with slight profitable modifications, which were inherited by the off-spring; and that these again varied and again were selected, and so onwards. But with the working ant we have an insect differing greatly from its parents, yet absolutely sterile; so that it could never have transmitted successively acquired modifications of structure or instinct to its progeny. It may well be asked how is it possible to reconcile this case with the theory of natural selection? ¹¹⁵



3. The invalidity of the claim that instincts evolve together with living things

Darwin was aware of the inconsistencies and impossibilities regarding evolutionary explanations for instincts and questioned the claim that instincts, following their acquisition, changed through natural selection:

[C]an instincts be acquired and modified through natural selection? What shall we say to the instinct which leads the bee to make cells, and which has practically anticipated the discoveries of profound mathematicians? ¹¹⁶

This inconsistency can be made clearer by citing examples of fish, which have their own unique ways of reproducing, hunting, defense

and nest-building. These characteristics have been perfectly regulated according to underwater conditions. In their mating season, some fish adhere their eggs to an undersea rock and provide them with oxygen by fanning their fins.

In that case, according to evolution theory, as these fish evolved their instincts must also have undergone great changes. Indeed, their instincts would have to change almost entirely for these fish to start clearing perfect round nests, in much the same way terrestrial animals do for the protection of their eggs.

In *The Origin of Species*, Darwin devoted some space to this criticism of his own theory:



It has been objected to the foregoing view of the origin of instincts that the variations of structure and of instinct must have been simultaneous and accurately adjusted to each other, as a modification in the one without an immediate corresponding change in the other would have been fatal." ¹¹⁷

As you have seen, instinctive behavior in animals cannot be explained in terms of any evolutionary process, chance, or "Mother nature". The source of animals' behavior lies neither in their own bodies nor in nature. Under the inspiration of Allah, all living things behave in the manner most suited to their own structures and to their surroundings.

ORIGIN OF THE LANGUAGE

Regarding the origin of language, there are two different views.. The first is that a human is born with a "blank slate" mind and merely learns to speak from observing those around him. However, the famous linguist Noam Chomsky has put forward a very different conclusion based on scientific facts, statistics and observations. In his view, the human mind has an innate propensity to learn language and to speak. Human beings are programmed in advance for language—in other

words, they have a special built-in ability. ¹¹⁸

The way that all babies in the world produce similar sounds shows that they are all born with a special inspiration toward speech. That human beings are created with this feature, not found in any other living thing, is Allah's sublime artistry.

ORIGIN OF THE MAMMALS

The theory of evolution maintains that a number of living things evolved by emerging from the sea, turning into amphibians and then into reptiles, and that birds evolved from those reptiles. According to the same scenario, reptiles are the ancestors not only of birds but also of mammals. Yet there are vast structural gulfs between cold-blooded reptiles, whose bodies are covered in scales and which reproduce by laying eggs, and warm-blooded mammals, which are covered in fur and give birth to live young.

One example of these gulfs involves the jaw structures of reptiles and mammals. The mammalian lower jaw consists of a single arc of bone, in which the teeth are set. A reptile's lower jaw, on the other hand, consists of three small bones



There is no structural difference between mammal fossils dating back tens of millions of years exhibited in natural history museums and specimens alive today. Moreover, these fossils appear suddenly in the Earth's strata, with no links to earlier species.

on each side. Another fundamental difference is that in the middle ears of all mammals, there are three small bones: the so-called anvil, hammer and stirrup. In contrast, in the middle ear of all reptiles, there is but a single bone.

Evolutionists maintain that the reptiles' jaw and ear gradually evolved into the mammalian jaw and ear. Of course, the question of how this came about goes unanswered. How did an ear consisting of one bone turn into one consisting of three? And how did the sense of hearing continue during this process? These other questions also go

unanswered.

Indeed, no intermediate form that could link reptiles to mammals has ever been found. That explains why the evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin was forced to say, "The transition to the first mammal . . . is still an enigma."¹¹⁹

George Gaylord Simpson, one of the 20th century's most eminent authorities on evolution and one of the founders of neo-Darwinist theory, makes an astonishing confession from the evolutionist point of view:

The most puzzling event in the history of life on earth is the change from the Mesozoic, the Age of Reptiles, to the

*Age of Mammals. It is as if the curtain were rung down suddenly on the stage where all the leading roles were taken by reptiles, especially dinosaurs, in great numbers and bewildering variety, and rose again immediately to reveal the same setting but an entirely new cast, a cast in which the dinosaurs do not appear at all, other reptiles are supernumeraries, and all the leading parts are played by mammals of sorts barely hinted at in the preceding acts.*¹²⁰

In addition, the mammals that suddenly appeared are very different from one another. The bat, horse, mouse and whale all emerged in the same geological period. It is impossible, even with the most powerful imagination, to construct an evolutionary relationship between these mammals. The evolutionist zoologist Eric Lombard writes in the journal *Evolution*:

*Those searching for specific information useful in constructing phylogenies of mammalian taxa will be disappointed.*¹²¹

All this goes to show that living things emerged on Earth suddenly and perfectly formed, as the result of no evolutionary process. This is concrete evidence that they were created. Evolutionists, however, seek to interpret the fact that living

species appeared in a particular order as an indication that they evolved. In fact, since no evolution ever took place, the order in which living things emerged is the order of creation. Fossils show that by means of a sublime and flawless creation, the Earth was filled first with marine animals and then with terrestrial ones, and that human beings came into existence after all these.

Human life on Earth began suddenly and in a perfect form, contrary to the "ape-man" myth that evolutionists seek to impose on the public.

ORIGIN OF THE MARINE MAMMALS

Whales and dolphins are classified as mammals because, just like terrestrial mammals, they give live birth, suckle their young, breathe with lungs and are warm-blooded. But the origin of marine mammals is one of the most difficult questions facing evolutionists.

Most evolutionist sources describe how the land-dwelling ancestors of seagoing mammals evolved in such a way as to move over to a marine environment as the result of a lengthy evolutionary process. According to this claim, marine mammals followed a path diametri-

cally opposed to the transition from water to dry land, returning to a marine environment as the result of a second process of evolution. However, this theory is based on no paleontological evidence—and is also logically inconsistent.

Mammals are regarded as the top rung of the evolutionary ladder. That being so, the question arises of how these creatures moved back to a marine environment. A subsequent question is that of how they adapted to that environment even better than fish. Dolphins, which are mammals and thus possess lungs, are even better adapted to their environment than fish, which breathe in water.

It is perfectly obvious that the imaginary evolution of marine mammals cannot be explained in terms of mutations and natural selection. One article published in *GEO* magazine refers to the origin of the blue whale, stating the despairing position of Darwinism on the subject:

Like blue whales, the bodily structures and organs of other mammals living in the sea also resemble those of fish. Their skeletons also bear similarities to those of fish. In whales, the rear limbs that we can refer to as legs exhibited a reverse development and did not reach full growth. Yet there is not the slightest information about these animals'

*form changes. We have to assume that the return to the sea took place not through a long-term, slow transition as claimed by Darwinism, but in momentary leaps. Paleontologists today lack sufficient information as regards which mammal species whales are evolved from.*¹²²

It's difficult indeed to imagine how, as the result of any evolutionary process, a small terrestrial mammal could become a whale 30 meters (98 feet) long and weighing 60 tons.. On this subject, all that Darwinists are able to do is, as in the account published in *National Geographic* magazine cited below, to exercise their imaginations:

*The whale's ascendancy to sovereign size apparently began sixty million years ago when hairy, four-legged mammals, in search of food or sanctuary, ventured into water. As eons passed, changes slowly occurred. Hind legs disappeared, front legs changed into flippers, hair gave way to a thick smooth blanket of blubber, nostrils moved to the top of the head, the tail broadened into flukes, and in the buoyant water world the body became enormous.*¹²³

Bearing in mind the adaptations that a mammal, using lungs to breathe with, would have to undergo in order to thrive in a marine en-

vironment, it can be seen that even the word *impossible* fails to do justice to the situation. The absence of even one rung of the ladder in such an evolutionary transition would deny the animal the ability to survive, and bring the evolutionary process to an end.

Marine Mammals and Their Unique Structures

The adaptations that marine animals would have to undergo during a transition to a water environment can be enumerated as follows:

1. Water Conservation. Marine mammals are unable to meet their water requirements in the same way as fish do, by using salt water. They need fresh water in order to live. Although the water sources of marine animals are not well known, it is thought that they meet a large part of their water requirements by eating creatures that contain up to one-third as much salt as exists in the ocean. For marine mammals, it is of great importance to conserve as much fresh water as possible. For that reason, they possess water conservation mechanisms like that seen in camels.

Like camels, marine mammals do not sweat. Their kidneys provide water for them by concentrating urine in a much bet-

ter way than in humans, thus reducing water loss to a minimum. Water conservation reveals itself in even the smallest details. For example, the mother whale feeds her young with milk of a dense consistency like that of cottage cheese, and which is some tens of times more fatty than human milk. There are number of chemical reasons why the milk should have such a high fat content. As the young processes the fat it releases water as a byproduct. In this way, the mother is able to meet her young's water requirements with a minimal water loss of her own.

2. Sight and Communication. The differences between the eyes of marine mammals and those of terrestrial life forms are surprising. On land, physical blows and dust represent threats to the eye, and for that reason, terrestrial animals have eyelids. In a marine environment, however, the main dangers are salt level, the increasing pressure when diving down to great



depths, and marine currents. The creature's eyes are positioned on the sides of the head in order to avoid direct contact with the current.

In addition, marine mammals have a hard layer to protect the eye during deep dives. Since there is increasing darkness beneath a depth of 9 meters (29 feet), the mammals' eyes have been equipped with a number of features that enable them to adapt to such a dark environment. The lens is spherical. There are many more light-sensitive rod cells than cone cells, which are sensitive to color and detail. Moreover, the eye has a special layer containing phosphorus. For these reasons, marine mammals can see very well in dark environments.

Then again, sight is not marine mammals' primary sense. Unlike land mammals, hearing is much

more important to them. Vision requires light, but many whales and dolphins hunt in dark regions under the sea thanks to a kind of natural sonar. Toothed whales in particular are able to "see" by means of the sound waves returning to them, much as a bat can. Sound waves are focused and sent to one point. The returning waves are then analyzed and interpreted in the animal's brain. This analysis quite clearly gives the shape, size, speed and position of an object. These animals' sonar system is exceedingly sensitive. Dolphins, for example, can detect a person's inside diving into the water. They use sound waves for communication as well as for direction-finding. Two whales hundreds of kilometers apart can communicate by the use of sound.

How do these animals produce



sounds for communication and direction finding? That question is still unanswered. Among other things, however, we do know one very surprising detail: The dolphin's skull is especially sound-proofed to protect its brain from being damaged by sound waves it emits so constantly and powerfully.

There is absolutely no possibility of all these astonishing characteristics of marine mammals having arisen by way of mutation and natural selection—the theory of evolution's only two mechanisms. Those who suggest that fish appeared in water by chance, and then later—again by chance—emerged onto dry land and evolved into amphibians, reptiles and mammals; and that these mammals then returned to the water and acquired the anatomy necessary for life there, cannot account for even one of these stages.

Indeed, the fossil record shows that whales and other marine mammals appeared in the seas in a single moment and with no ancestors behind them. Edwin Colbert, an authority in the field of paleontology, describes this fact:

These mammals must have had an ancient origin, for no intermediate forms are apparent in the fossil record between the whales and the ancestral

*Cretaceous placentals. Like the bats, the whales (using the term in a general and inclusive sense) appear suddenly in early Tertiary times, fully adapted by profound modifications of the basic mammalian structure for a highly specialized mode of life. Indeed, the whales are even more isolated with relation to other mammals than the bats; they stand quite alone.*¹²⁴

As with all other fundamental living groups, no findings support the claim of marine mammals' so-called evolution. It is impossible for them to have evolved from the land mammals that supposedly constitute their ancestors, but also, there are no transitional forms to show that such evolution ever took place.

ORIGIN OF THE MARINE REPTILES

The great majority of marine reptiles are now extinct, though turtles still survive as representatives of this group. The origin of these creatures cannot be explained through any evolutionist approach. The most significant known marine reptile is *Ichthyosaurus*. Edwin Colbert and Michael Morales admit that there can be no evolutionary explanation for these creatures' origin:

The Ichthyosaurs, in many respects the



A 250-million-year old Ichthyosaur fossil belonging to the species *Stenopterygius*

most highly specialized of the marine reptiles, appeared in early Triassic times. Their advent into the geologic history of the reptiles was sudden and dramatic; there are no clues in pre-Triassic sediments as to the possible ancestors of the Ichthyosaurs . . . The basic problem of Ichthyosaur relationships is that no conclusive evidence can be found for linking these reptiles with any other reptilian order.¹²⁵

Alfred Romer, another expert on vertebrate history, writes:


No earlier forms [of ichthyosaurs] are known. The peculiarities of ichthyosaur structure would seemingly require a

long time for their development and hence a very early origin for the group, but there are no known Permian reptiles antecedent to them.¹²⁶

In short, all the different marine reptiles appeared on Earth separately, with no evolutionary relationship among them. This constitutes manifest scientific proof that all living things are created.

ORIGIN OF THE QUADRUPEDS

Quadrupeds (or tetrapods) is the name given to four-footed land-dwelling vertebrates. This general classification includes amphibians, reptiles and mammals. The Darwinists' explanation is that quadrupeds evolved from fish. However, this claim is physiologically and anatomically



An Ichthyosaur fossil, approximately 200 million years old

Tetrapod fossil

untenable—and also, has no foundation in the fossil record.

In order for a fish to adapt to life on dry land, it would have to undergo tremendous changes in its respiratory system, excretory system and skeletal structure. Its gills would have to be supplemented by lungs; its fins would have to acquire sturdiness capable of bearing the weight of its body. Kidneys to dispose of bodily wastes would need to form, and its skin would have to acquire a structure to prevent loss of moisture.

So long as *all* these changes fail to take place, a fish could survive on dry land for only a few minutes. (See also *The Transition from Water to Land Thesis*.)

ORIGIN OF PHOTOSYNTHESIS


Photosynthesis is a major factor in sustaining life on Earth. Were it

not for photosynthesis, there would be no plants, and if there were no plants there would be little oxygen—and no animals and human beings. This chemical reaction, which cannot be replicated in any laboratory, represents one of the basic conditions for life.

In addition, there is a total balance between the photosynthesis performed by plants and the energy consumed by animals and human beings. Plants provide us with glucose and oxygen. In our cells, we combine that glucose with oxygen and oxidize it, thus releasing and using the solar energy that plants originally used to form glucose.

What we're actually doing is reversing the process of photosynthesis. As a result, carbon dioxide is given off as a waste product, which we release into the atmosphere through our lungs. This carbon dioxide is then used again by plants in further photosynthesis. And so this immaculate cycle continues.

As you see, photosynthesis is one of the most fundamental processes of life on Earth. Thanks to the chloroplasts inside them, plant cells produce starch by combining water and carbon dioxide, with the energy from sunlight. Animals, unable to produce their own nutrients, use the



Plant cells perform photosynthesis, a process that cannot be carried out in any laboratory. Thanks to an organelle in the cell known as the chloroplast, plants use water, carbon dioxide and the energy from sunlight to manufacture starch. This nutrient is the first link in the Earth's food chain and the source of nourishment for all living things on Earth. The details of this highly complex process have still not been fully deciphered.

starch that comes from plants. For that reason, photosynthesis is essential for any complex life forms—yet photosynthesis's highly complex process is not yet fully understood. Modern technology has not even unraveled its details, let alone been able to replicate it.

According to the theory of evolution, this complex process is a result

of natural events. The evolutionist hypothesis is that in order to perform photosynthesis, plant cells swallowed photosynthesizing bacteria and turned them into chloroplasts, much as modern-day lichens are a symbiotic combination of algae and fungi. However, the question of how bacteria learned to carry out such a complex process as photosyn-



thesis heads the list of those that the evolutionary scenario leaves unanswered.

Evolutionist sources say that this process, which humans even with all their advanced technology and

knowledge cannot perform, was in some way discovered by bacteria. These accounts are no different from fairy tales and are of absolutely no scientific worth. Those who look at the subject in any great detail have to

admit that photosynthesis constitutes a major dilemma for the theory of evolution.

For instance, evolutionist Professor Ali Demirsoy makes the following admission: "Photosynthesis is a highly complex process, and it would appear impossible for it to appear in an organelle inside a cell—because it is impossible for all the phases to appear at once, and meaningless for them to do so one by one."¹²⁷

The German biologist Hoimar von Ditfurth states that photosynthesis is a process that could not be learned by a cell that lacked such ability in the first place:

*No cell possesses the literal ability to "learn" a biological process. A cell is not in the position to function during the birth of a process such as respiration or photosynthesis and to discharge this during a subsequent vital process, and it is impossible for it to acquire the ability to do so.*¹²⁸

Since photosynthesis cannot develop as the result of chance and cannot be learned by any cell, then the first plant cell on Earth must have already possessed this ability. In other words, Allah created plants together with their ability to make photosynthesis.

ORIGIN OF THE PLANT CELLS

Plant and animals are composed of a type of cell known as *eukaryotic*. Eukaryotic cells' main distinguishing features are that they possess a nucleus, inside which is found the DNA molecule that encodes genetic information. Some single-celled organisms such as bacteria, on the other hand, have no cell nuclei, and their DNA molecules are in a free state inside the cell. (See **Bacteria**.)

This second cell type is known as *prokaryotic*—an ideal cell structure for bacteria, because plasmid transfer (the transfer of DNA from cell to cell)—an exceedingly important process from the point of view of bacteria populations—is made possible thanks to DNA being free within the prokaryotic cell.

Since the theory of evolution is obliged to arrange life from the primitive to the complex, it assumes that prokaryotes are primitive cells, and that eukaryotes evolved from them.

Before addressing the invalidity of this claim, it's useful to state that prokaryotic cells are not primitive at all. A bacterium has almost 2,000



Plants represent the foundation of life on Earth. Because they produce food for animals as well as providing the atmospheric oxygen they need to breathe, they represent an indispensable precondition for life..



genes, and each gene contains up to 1,000 letters of genetic code. This means that the information in a bacterium's DNA is at least 2 million "letters" long. Accordingly, the information contained in the DNA of a single bacterium is equivalent to 20 volumes of 100,000 words each.¹²⁹

Any change in this encoded information may damage the bacterium's entire operating system, spelling death for the bacterium.

In addition to DNA's sensitive structure that withstands random

changes, the lack of any intermediate form between bacteria and eukaryotic cells totally invalidates any claim of evolution. The Turkish evolutionist Professor Ali Demirsoy admits that the scenario of bacteria cells evolving into eukaryotic cells—from which more complex life forms then emerged—is invalid:

One of the most difficult phases to account for in evolution is the scientific explanation of how complex cells with organelles came into being from these primitive organisms. In fact, no tran-



There is no scientific basis to the evolutionist hypothesis that prokaryotic cells (left) gradually turned in eukaryotic ones (right).

sitional form between these two forms has ever been found. Single-celled and multi-celled organisms fully possess this complex structure, and no group or organism with simpler organelles or which is more primitive than either of these has ever been encountered. In other words, the organelles they possess emerged fully developed. There are no simple and primitive forms.¹³⁰

Bearing in mind the enormous structural differences between the bacterium cell and plant cells, the impossibility of any such transition becomes crystal-clear:

- The bacterium cell wall consists of polysaccharide and protein, whereas the plant cell wall is made of cellulose, which has a completely different structure.

- In a plant cell, there are various organelles with highly complex structures and surrounded by a membrane, but no organelles in the bacterium cell. The bacterium cell contains only very small ribosomes in a free state. In the plant cell, the ribosomes are much larger and connected to the membrane. In addition, each type of ribosome performs protein synthesis in a different way.¹³¹

- The structures of the DNA in the plant and bacterium cells are totally different.

- The DNA molecule in plant



A 25-million-year-old plant fossil with the same structure as plants living today.

cells is protected by a double-layered membrane, while the DNA in the bacterium cell is free within it.

- In terms of appearance the bacterium's DNA molecule resembles a closed loop. The DNA molecule in a plant cell is linear.

- The DNA molecule in the bacterium cell contains information regarding only that single cell, while the plant cell's DNA carries information about the entire plant. All the information concerning a fruit tree's roots, trunk, leaves, flowers and fruit exists separately in the DNA in each cell nucleus.

- Some species of bacteria are photosynthetic, performing photosynthesis. In contrast to plants, however, bacteria break down the compounds and do not emit oxygen. Moreover, inside the chloroplasts in

photosynthetic bacteria (cyanobacteria, for instance), chlorophyll and pigments do not exist. These are distributed throughout the cell, concealed in various membranes.

● The messenger RNAs in the bacterium and in the larger plant and animal cells are very different from one another in terms of biochemical structure.¹³²

Messenger RNA performs a function that is vital to the cell's survival. However, although messenger RNA plays the same essential role in both eukaryotic and prokaryotic cells, it has a different biochemical structure in each. Darnell writes on this subject in an article in *Science* magazine:

*The differences in the biochemistry of messenger RNA formation in eukaryotes compared to prokaryotes are so profound as to suggest that sequential prokaryotic to eukaryotic cell evolution seems unlikely.*¹³³

The enormous structural differences between bacteria and plant cells, of which we have listed a few examples, represent a major impasse for evolutionist biologists. Some bacteria and plant cells do have some features in common, but these structures are generally very different from one another. These differences, and the impossibility of any functional intermediate form, make it im-

possible for the plant cell to have evolved from a bacterium.

Professor Demirsoy actually admits this: "Complex cells never developed from primitive cells by a process of evolution."¹³⁴

ORIGIN OF REPTILES

Creatures such as dinosaurs, lizards, tortoises and crocodiles all belong to the reptile family. Reptiles possess unique characteristics: They are all covered in scales. They are cold-blooded and cannot produce their own body heat, for which reason they need to warm their bodies in the Sun every day. Their young hatch from eggs.

Evolution theory faces another major dilemma in explaining the origin of these creatures. Darwinists claim that reptiles evolved from amphibians, yet no concrete evidence supports this. On the contrary, a comparison of reptiles and amphibians shows enormous physiological differences between the two groups, and that any half-reptile, half-amphibian would stand no chance of survival.

One reason concerns the two groups' different egg structures. Amphibians deposit their eggs in water, and they are ideally suited to

aqueous development. These eggs are highly porous, they have a transparent membrane and a jelly-like consistency. Reptiles, on the other hand, lay their eggs on land, and their eggs are ideally suited to dry conditions. The hard shell of the reptile egg, known as an amniotic egg, contains an air sac, and is impermeable to water. The water needed by the young is contained inside the egg until it hatches.

Were amphibians to deposit their eggs on land, they would soon dry out and the embryos inside would die. This is a point that the evolution theory, which maintains that reptiles gradually evolved from amphibians, cannot explain. To begin life on dry


land, the amphibian's egg would have to become an amniotic one within a single generation. This could hardly occur through mutation and natural selection, the two suggested mechanisms of evolution.


On the other hand, the fossil record also removes the possibility of an evolutionary origin for reptiles. In an article, "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," the well-known evolutionist paleontologist Lewis L. Carroll admits as much:

*Unfortunately, not a single specimen of an appropriate reptilian ancestor is known prior to the appearance of true reptiles. The absence of such ancestral forms leaves many problems of the amphibian-reptilian transition unanswered.*¹³⁵

Robert L. Carroll, regarded as an authority on vertebrate paleontology,

**Seymouria
fossil**





**Allah created every animal
from water. Some of them go on
their bellies, some of them on
two legs, and some on four.
Allah creates whatever He
wills. Allah has
power over all things.
(Surat an Nur, 45)**

accepts that "The early amniotes are sufficiently distinct from all Paleozoic amphibians that their specific ancestry has not been established."¹³⁶ Carroll also makes these comments in his book:

*When they first appear in the fossil record, both frogs and salamanders appear essentially modern in their skeletal anatomy. . . . Despite these similarities, frogs, salamanders, and caecilians are very different from one another in skeletal structure and ways of life, both now and throughout their known fossil record . . . we have found no fossil evidence of any possible antecedents that possessed the specialized features common to all three modern orders.*¹³⁷

The most important creature that evolutionists have so far sought to portray as the "ancestor of reptiles" is the fossil amphibian *Seymouria*. Yet the discovery that reptiles were alive 30 million years before *Seymouria*'s appearance revealed that this cannot be an intermediate species. (See **Seymouria**.)

It is of course impossible for "the forerunner of reptiles" to have first appeared long after them. The scientific facts show that reptiles emerged on Earth not through the gradual change maintained by the theory of evolution, but suddenly, with no antecedents.

ORIGIN OF SPECIES, THE

In 1859, Charles Darwin published a book called *The Origin of Species, By Means of Natural Selection or, The Preservation of Favored Races in The Struggle for Life*. In this book, Darwin added his own errors of logic to Lamarck's theory and advanced his thesis of natural selection. (See **Natural Selection** and **Lamarckism**.)

In his book, which he described as a "long argument," Darwin claimed that all living things on Earth shared a common origin and that living things descended from one another by way of natural selection.

In addition, Darwin said that only those best able to adapt to their environment handed on their characteristics to subsequent generations. Over the course of time, these beneficial changes would accumulate, and living things would turn into other forms of life very different from their ancestral species. Man was the most advanced product of so-called natural selection. Darwin thought he had found the origin of species: The origin of any one species was another, earlier species.

Darwin's greatest difficulty was that paleontology, the science he

hoped would provide answers to the problems facing his theory, would in fact only make them worse.

To be fair, he was aware of at least some of these problems. In the appendix to his book, titled "Difficulties of the Theory," he even admitted them. However, the answers he supplied to these problems lacked any scientific validity. The American physicist Lipson comments on Darwin's "difficulties":

*On reading The Origin of Species, I found that Darwin was much less sure of himself than he is often represented to be; the chapter entitled "Difficulties of the Theory," for example, shows considerable self-doubt. As a physicist, I was particularly intrigued by his comments on how the eye would have arisen.*¹³⁸

Darwin hoped that as scientific research progressed, these difficulties would be resolved. On the contrary, however, later scientific findings only worsened them.

ORIGIN OF TURTLES

Turtles, members of the reptile family, emerge suddenly in the fossil record together with their unique shells. As evolutionist source "Unfortunately, the origin



Remains of the oldest known sea turtle. Found in Brazil, this 110-million-year-old fossil is indistinguishable from present-day specimens.

highly successful order is obscured by the lack of early fossils, although turtles leave more and better fossil remains than do other vertebrates. By the middle of the Triassic Period (about 200,000,000 years ago), turtles

138





A 45-million-year-old freshwater turtle fossil.

portant transitions and radiations [are] still poorly known."¹⁴⁰

This living class appeared suddenly on Earth, which represents evidence that they were created by Allah.

ORIGIN OF VERTEBRATES

One of the phyla that emerged suddenly in the Cambrian period is the phylum Chordata. These are a sub-class of vertebrates, with a central nervous system. Vertebrates are divided into such basic classes as fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals.

Since evolutionist paleontologists regard every living phylum as the evolutionary continuation of another,

they claim that the Chordata evolved from another, invertebrate phylum. However, like all phyla, members of the phylum Chordata appeared suddenly in the Cambrian Period, which invalidates that theory right from the outset. The oldest member of the phylum, a sea creature with a long body rather resembling a worm's at first glance is, known as *Pikaia*..¹⁴¹ It emerged at exactly the same time as species in all the other phyla that could be proposed as its ancestor, and with no previous intermediate form.

In his book *Vertebrate Animals*, the evolutionist biologist Professor Mustafa Kuru refers to the absence of such an intermediate form: "There is no doubt that the Chordata formed from invertebrate animals. However, the absence of any fossil that might shed light on the passage between invertebrates and Chordata has caused many hypotheses on this subject to be jettisoned."¹⁴²

If there is no intermediate form, how can one say that there is "no doubt" about this evolution? Blindly accepting a hypothesis with no evidence to support it is dogmatic rather than scientific. Indeed, after going into a lengthy account of evolutionist assumptions regarding the origin


of vertebrates, Professor Kuru once again has to admit that no evidence is available at all: "The views regarding the origin and evolution of the Chordata expressed above have always been treated with suspicion, since they are not based on a fossil record."¹⁴³

Evolutionist biologists sometimes offer the following sort of rationale: There is no fossil record regarding the origin of the Chordata and other vertebrates because invertebrates are soft-tissued and therefore leave no fossil traces behind. But in fact, there are many fossil invertebrate remains. All the living things from the Cambrian Period are invertebrates, and they have left tens of thousands of fossils behind them. Many fossils of soft-tissued creatures have been found in the Burgess Shale bed in Canada; scientists think that in regions such as Burgess Shale living things were quickly covered in layers of mud with low oxygen content and thus fossilized without their soft tissues having broken down.¹⁴⁴


The theory of evolution hypothesizes that Chordata such as *Pikaia* gradually turned into fish. However, just as there is no intermediate form to support the idea of the evolution of Chordata, so there are none to support that of the evolution of fish. On the contrary, all the different categories of fish appear suddenly in the fossil record and with no ancestors preceding them. There are millions of invertebrate fossils, but nobody has ever found a single intermediate-form fossil. Fish dating back to the Cambrian Period, especially those discovered in China such as *Haikouichthys* and *Mylokunmingia*, invalidate evolutionist claims of gradual development. Philippe Janvier, a palaeontologist from the Museum of Natural History in Paris, states that these life forms found in China were "definitely vertebrates" and sets out their importance:

It's important

The conjectural anatomy of *Pikaia*, the oldest known chordate



The oldest chordate *Pikaia* fossil to appear in the Cambrian Period



because up to now the vertebrates were absent from the big bang of life, as we call it—that is, the great early Cambrian explosion, where all the major animal groups appeared suddenly in the fossil record . . . It is practically certain that these are vertebrates.¹⁴⁵

ORIGIN OF VIRUSES

Some evolutionists maintain that viruses represent the biological beginning of life:

*When we look at the pre-cellular stages of life, we see evolution here, too. The first, most primitive forms of biological organisms are not cells, but viruses.*¹⁴⁶

On the one hand, while evolutionists seek to account for the origin of life in terms of viruses, they also say that viruses cannot represent the foundation of life. This impossibility is mentioned in a number of evolutionist sources:


Viruses were initially regarded as very

small organisms. It was later established in detailed studies conducted under the electron microscope that these were structurally very different and that they lived solely as parasites in the cell.

*No matter how many virions one or a few enzymes contain, this enzyme series is still insufficient for establishing a virion. (virion, the state in which viruses have the capacity to cause infection).*¹⁴⁷

Viruses multiply as parasites in the cells of a foreign organism. They have no metabolisms beyond those of the host cells. Since viruses have no metabolisms and ability to be stimulated they do not possess the features of independence unique to life, and are therefore not truly alive, in the usual sense.

Viruses are known as *virions* when they are still outside the cell. Virions are not alive. Only two of the key processes in living things are found in viruses: replication and



A virus lives as a parasite in the cells of a foreign organism. Viruses have no metabolisms of their own outside the host cell. The diagram above shows how a virus takes over a cell. It first attaches itself to the cell, then injects it with its own DNA. The cell is thus forced into copying the virus. Eventually, the cell explodes and the new virus particles are released.

mutation. Viruses cannot perform these functions independently outside the cell, in their form as virions. They need complete organisms in order to "come to life."¹⁴⁸

As you can see, viruses cannot be regarded as a pre-life stage, because they can perform such key stages as replication and mutation only in the cells of the organisms they inhabit. Viruses are unable to survive in the absence of a complete organism. For that reason, there can be no question of their constituting a preliminary stage for bacteria, for example.

Professor Ali Demirsoy, a Turkish expert on evolution, refers to the invalidity of the claims regarding the origins of viruses:

Our accumulated knowledge is far from telling us about the origin of vi-

ruses and their development to date. At the same time, the existence of three very different physical stages, and the inability of any one of these to provide a fully satisfactory account regarding viruses, makes any comment even more difficult. The comments summarized below are based more on fiction than on scientific foundations.

Once upon a time, the origins of viruses were cellular organisms. These vital cells entered other cells as parasites and gradually lost all their organelles.

The origins of viruses were a free-living pre-cell. Later, with the emergence of cellular organisms, these primitive forms began living inside them as parasites.

Viruses are descended neither from pre-cells nor from cellular organisms. They emerged from fragments released

from the genetic material of other organisms.

*Although the first concept was for long favored by microbiologists, it is now regarded as the least likely. Because there are such profound differences between the two groups that one cannot be hypothesized as the origin of the other. Although the second possibility appears rather more attractive, it also appears impossible for the reasons cited above. No intermediate form between organisms and viruses has ever been found. The last possibility appears more reasonable.*¹⁴⁹

As you can see from these comments, viruses do not represent the beginning of life. Even evolutionist biologists point the living organisms as the origin of viruses.

ORIGINS OF BIPEDALISM (WALKING UPRIGHT)

Human beings walk upright on two legs in a way not encountered in any other life form. (See **Bipedalism**.) Some other animals possess a limited ability to walk on two legs. Mammals such as the bear and monkey can move on their hind legs for short periods of time, such as when they're reaching for something to eat). However, they have stooped skeletons and normally

walk on four legs.

According to the classifications made in the imaginary human family tree, it is claimed that apes classified under the names *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis* walked upright. However, through research into their fossil skeletons in question by a great number of scientists, the invalidity of these claims has been revealed.

The claim of bipedalism is one that evolutionist paleontologists such as Richard Leakey and Donald Johanson have supported for decades. Wide-ranging research into *Australopithecus* specimens by two world famous anatomists, Lord Solly Zuckerman of Britain and Professor Charles Oxnard of the USA, showed that these beings were not bipedal, but moved in the same way as present-day apes. Despite being an evolutionist himself, Lord Zuckerman, who for 15 years examined the bones of these creatures with a team consisting of five experts, backed by the British government, concluded that *Australopithecus* was an ordinary species of ape and very definitely did not walk upright.¹⁵⁰

Professor Oxnard, another evolutionist anatomist well known for his research on this subject, compares

the *Australopithecus* skeleton to that of modern orangutans.¹⁵¹

Finally in 1994, Liverpool University's Fred Spoor and his team carried out wide-ranging studies in order to arrive at a definitive conclusion regarding the *Australopithecus* skeleton. During that research, the inner ear structures of *Australopithecus* fossils were examined. An organ known as the cochlea determines the body's position relative to the ground in the inner ears of human beings and other complex life forms. That organ's function is similar to the bubble level used to maintain level surfaces by carpenters.. In order to determine whether the creatures portrayed as ancestors of man walked upright, Fred Spoor investigated this particular organ. The comparison analyses made on the balance centers revealed that apes classified as *Homo habilis* did not walk upright, but were bent forward.¹⁵²

ORIGIN OF WHALES

Whales and dolphins comprise a group known as *marine mammals*. Just like mammals on land, they give birth to their young, suckle them,

use lungs to breathe and warm their own bodies. The origin of marine mammals is one of the most difficult subjects for evolutionists to account for. Most evolutionist sources suggest that their forerunners lived on dry land, evolved as the result of a lengthy evolutionary process, in such a way as to return to a marine environment. According to this claim, marine mammals followed a path which was the exact opposite of the supposed transition from water to land, via a second process of evolution. However, this theory is based upon no paleontological findings, and is also logically inconsistent.

Mammals are regarded as the creatures at the top of the evolutionary ladder. That being so, it is very hard to explain why these animals reverted to a marine environment. The next question is, how did these animals adapt to the marine environment even better than fish? Because creatures such as killer whales, which are mammals and therefore have lungs, exhibit an even more perfect adaptation to their environment than fish, which actually do breathe in water.

In recent years, various fossils have been suggested as solution to

this dilemma, but in fact benefit the theory of evolution not at all.

The first of these fossils is *Pakicetus inachus*, extinct mammal first discovered in 1983. The finder of the first specimen, Philip D. Gingerich and his colleagues had no qualms about claiming it to be a primitive whale, even though they had discovered only a skull. However, the fossil had not the slightest connection to whales in any shape or form. The skeleton had a four-footed structure, resembling that of modern wolves. The region where the fossil was discovered contained seams of oxidized iron as well as fossils of such terrestrial animals as snails, tortoises and crocodiles. In other words, its environment had been dry land, not a marine bed.

So why was this quadruped land dweller deemed to be a primitive whale? The answer is supplied in *National Geographic* magazine, an evolutionist publication:

Subtle clues in combination—the arrangement of cusps on the molar teeth, a folding in a bone of the middle ear, and the positioning of the ear bones within the skull—are absent in other land mammals. ¹⁵³

However, these features represent no evidence for constructing a

relationship between *Pakicetus* and fish:

First, as National Geographic indirectly makes clear by employing the words "subtle clues in combination," some of these features also exist in other land-dwelling mammals.

In addition, none of the characteristics in question constitutes evidence for an evolutionary relationship. Most of the theoretical relationships between species that evolutionists seek to establish on the basis of anatomical similarities are exceedingly flawed—as evolutionists themselves admit. Pakicetus is a unique species with different anatomical features in its body. Robert Carroll, an authority on invertebrate paleontology, states that the family of Mesonychids, in which Pakicetus should be included, displays a combination of peculiar characteristics. Prominent evolutionists such as Gould admit that such mosaic life forms cannot be regarded as intermediate forms.

In an article titled "The Overselling of Whale Evolution," the science writer Ashby L. Camp describes the invalidity of the claim that the Mesonychids, of which land mammals such as *Pakicetus* are a part, are the ancestors of *Archaeocetes*, the extinct whales:

The reason evolutionists are confident that mesonychids gave rise to archaeo-

cetes, despite the inability to identify any species in the actual lineage, is that known mesonychids and archaeocetes have some similarities. These similarities, however, are not sufficient to make the case for ancestry, especially in light of the vast differences. The subjective nature of such comparisons is evident from the fact so many groups of mammals and even reptiles have been suggested as ancestral to whales.¹⁵⁴

Pakicetus is followed in the evolutionary tree by *Ambulocetus natans*. This fossil, first announced in an article published in *Science* magazine in 1994, is a terrestrial animal that evolutionists have attempted to force into a whale mould.

The name *Ambulocetus natans* is a combination of the Latin words *ambulare* (to walk), *cetus* (whale) and *natans* (swimming), and thus means "a swimming and walking whale." Obviously, this animal walked, because like all terrestrial mammals, it had four feet, and even wide claws on its feet and paws on its hind legs. Apart from evolutionist preconceptions, however, there is absolutely no foundation, for the idea that the animal swam in water or that it lived both on land and in water, as hippos and alligators do. In fact, there is no evidence that either *Pakicetus* or

Ambulocetus were related to whales in any way. They are merely potential ancestors which evolutionists, obliged to find a terrestrial ancestor for marine mammals as required by their theory, have suggested on the basis of various limited similarities. No evidence shows that these creatures were related to the marine mammals that emerge in the fossil record in a geological period very soon after..

A number of true marine mammals are listed in the fictitious evolutionary tree after *Pakicetus* and *Ambulocetus*: Archaeocetes ("ancient whale") species such as *Procetetus* and *Rhodcetetus*. These creatures are extinct mammals that genuinely did live in water, as you shall see in subsequent sections. However, there are considerable anatomical differences between *Pakicetus* and *Ambulocetus* and these marine animals:

- In *Ambulocetus*, a four-footed land mammal, the backbone ends in the pelvic bone, from which powerful leg bones extend. This is the typical anatomy for land mammals. In whales, on the other hand, the backbone continues right down to the tail and there is no pelvic bone at all. *Basilosaurus*, thought to have lived up to 10 million years after *Ambulocetus*, possesses just such an anatomy—in other words, it is a typical whale. There is no in-

intermediate form between *Ambulocetus*, a typical terrestrial animal, and *Basilosaurus*, a typical whale.

● *Basilosaurus* and sperm whales (cachalots) have small bones independent of the backbone in their lower bodies. Some evolutionists claim that these are shrunken leg bones. However, the bones in question assist with assuming the mating position in *Basilosaurus*, whereas in cachalot they support the reproductive organs.¹⁵⁵ To describe skeleton components that perform a very important function as the vestigial organs of another function is simply evolutionist prejudice.

In conclusion, it is clear that marine mammals appeared with all their unique structures and with no intermediate form between them and terrestrial mammals. Robert Carroll admits this, albeit reluctantly and in evolutionist language, that there is no chain of evolution here.:

*It is not possible to identify a sequence of mesonychids leading directly to whales.*¹⁵⁶

Some rather more unbiased scientists, on the other hand, openly admit that the animals that evolutionist sources refer to as "walking whales" are actually a completely separate group and have nothing to do with true whales.

The Russian scientist G. A.

Mchedlidze, a well-known expert on whales, disagrees with the description of *Pakicetus*, *Ambulocetus natans* and similar quadrupeds as possible ancestors of the whale, and regards them as a completely isolated group.

¹⁵⁷

This summarizes the invalidity of the evolutionist claim that marine mammals evolved from terrestrial life forms. Scientific findings show no link between marine mammals and the two land mammals (*Pakicetus* and *Ambulocetus natans*) that evolutionists place right at the beginning of this scenario.

In the remaining part of the scenario, the theory of evolution is also at an impasse. The theory seeks to establish a family relationship between the extinct, genuine marine mammal known as *Archaeocetes* ("archaic whale") and living dolphins and whales.

The fact is that experts in the field think differently. The evolutionist paleontologist Barbara J. Stahl writes:

*The serpentine form of the body and the peculiar serrated cheek teeth make it plain that these archaeocetes [i.e., Basilosaurus and related creatures] could not possibly have been ancestral to any of the modern whales.*¹⁵⁸

With regard to the origin of ma-

rine mammals, the evolutionist scenario is also contradicted by molecular biology's findings.

The classic evolutionist scenario hypothesizes that the two major whale groups, in order words toothed whales (*Odontoceti*) and baleen whales (*Mysticeti*), evolved from a common ancestor. However, Michel C. Milinkovitch of Brussels University opposed this view with a new theory, emphasizing that that hypothesis, constructed on anatomical similarities, and was invalidated by molecular discoveries:

Evolutionary relationships among the major groups of cetaceans is more problematic since morphological and molecular analyses reach very different conclusions. Indeed, based on the conventional interpretation of the morphological and behavioral data set, the echolocating toothed whales (about 67 species) and the filter-feeding baleen whales (10 species) are considered as two distinct monophyletic groups . . . On the other hand, phylogenetic analysis of DNA... and amino acid. . . sequences contradict this long-accepted taxonomic division. One group of toothed whales, the sperm whales, appears to be more closely related to the morphologically highly divergent baleen whales than to other odontocetes.¹⁵⁹

In short, marine mammals all refute the imaginary family tree in which evolutionists seek to locate them.

ORIGIN OF THE WINGS

How could the immaculate structure of wings have emerged as the result of consecutive random mutations? That question is one that evolutionists are unable to answer. They are totally unable to explain how a reptile's front legs could have turned into a flawless wings as the result of successive defects (mutations) arising in its genes.

The Turkish evolutionist and scientist Engin Korur describes the impossibility of wings evolving:

The common feature of eyes and wings is that they can only fulfill their tasks in the event that they are fully formed. To put it another way, one cannot see with a deficient eye, nor fly with half a wing. How these organs came into being has remained as one of the secrets of nature that has not yet been unraveled.¹⁶⁰

ORTHOGENESIS MUDDLE, THE (DIRECTED SELECTION)

Orthogenesis is an old thesis that is no longer accepted even by theory of evolution's own adherents. This thesis assumes that living things evolved not according to environmental conditions, but solely according to their own genetic structures.

According to the orthogenetic view, a kind of internal program leads living things to evolve in a particular way. This view also led to orthogenesis being known as *the pre-determination theory*. This hypothesis, based on no scientific evidence whatsoever, lost all credence in the second half of the 20th century.


OTA BENG

After Darwin claimed that human beings evolved from ape-like creatures in his book *The Descent of Man*, a search began for fossils to back up his theory. Some evolutionists, however, believed that half-man, half-ape creatures could be found not only in the fossil record, but still living in

various parts of the world. In the early part of the 20th century, this search for living intermediate forms led to various shameful actions. One of these involved the pygmy Ota Benga.

He was captured in Congo in 1904 by an evolutionist researcher named Samuel Verner. Ota Benga, whose name meant *friend* in his own language, was married with two children. Yet he was chained, placed in a cage like an animal and transported to the U.S.A. There, evolutionist scientists put him in a cage with various apes at the St. Louis World Fair and exhibited him as the closest intermediate form to man. Two years later they took him to the Bronx Zoo in New York and exhibited him together with a few chimpanzees, a gorilla named Dinah and an orangutan called Dohung as man's oldest ancestors.

The evolutionist director of the zoo, Dr. William T. Hornaday, made long speeches about how honored he was to own this intermediate form, and visitors to the zoo treated Ota Benga like any other animal.



Unable to withstand the treatment he was subjected to, Ota Benga committed suicide.¹⁶¹

An article published in The New York Times at the time described visitors' behavior:

*40,000 visitors roamed the New York Zoological Park... the sudden surge of interest... was entirely attributable to Ota Benga. The crowds were so enormous that a police officer was assigned full-time to guard Ota (the zoo claimed this was to protect him) as he was "always in danger of being grabbed, yanked, poked, and pulled to pieces by the mob."*¹⁶²

The 17 September 1906 edition of The New York Times emphasized that although this was all done in order to prove evolution; it was actually a great injustice and act of cruelty:

Further, many of the ministers opposed the theory of evolution, concluding that "the exhibition evidently aims to be a demonstration of the Darwinian theory of evolution."

These men, without thought and intelligence have been exhibiting in a cage of monkeys, a small human dwarf from Africa. Their idea, probably, was to inculcate some profound lesson in evolution.

As a matter of fact, the only result achieved has been to hold up to scorn the African race, which deserves at

least sympathy and kindness from the whites of this country, after all the brutality it has suffered here ...

*It is shameful and disgusting that the misfortune, the physical deficiency, of a human being, created by the same Force that puts us all here and endowed with the same feelings and the same soul, should be locked in a cage with monkeys and be made a public mockery.*¹⁶³

The New York Times also covered the way in which Ota Benga was put on display in the zoo in order to demonstrate evolution. The defense issued by the Darwinist zoo director was lacking in all conscience:

*The exhibition of an African pygmy in the same cage with an orang outang at the New York Zoological Park last week stirred up considerable criticism. Some persons declared it was an attempt on the part of Director Hornaday to demonstrate a close relationship between Negroes and monkeys. Dr. Hornaday denied this. "If the little fellow is in a cage," said Dr. Hornaday, "it is because he is most comfortable there, and because we are at a loss to know what else to do with him. He is in no sense a prisoner, except that no one would say it was wise to allow him to wander around the city without some one having an eye on him."*¹⁶⁴


Ota Benga's being put on show in the zoo alongside gorillas, just like an animal, made many people uneasy. Some organizations declared that Ota Benga was a human being and that such treatment was very cruel, and applied to the authorities to put an end to the situation. One of these applications appeared in the 12 September 1906 edition of the *New York Globe*:

Sir—I lived in the south several years, and consequently am not overfond of negro, but believe him human. I think it a shame that the authorities of this great city should allow such a sight as that witnessed at the Bronx Park—a

negro boy, on exhibition in a monkey cage . . .

*This whole pygmy business needs investigation . . .*¹⁶⁵





PALEONTOLOGY

Paleontology is a branch of science that investigates fossils of organisms that lived in various geological periods and helps provide information about species living in those eras.¹⁶⁶ Another definition of paleontology is the branch of science that studies the fossils and biology of extinct organisms. The first paleontological research began in the 19th century, studying plant and animal fossils to determine the life forms that existed in the geological past, as well as their morphology, structure, taxonomic relations with present-day species, geographical distribution and environmental relationships. Information obtained from paleontology is used to determine the age of geological strata.

The theory of evolution most commonly manifests itself in paleontological research, because fossil findings have been highly prone to evolutionists' distortions and biased interpretations. History is full of forgeries perpetrated in the search for supposed evidence for the theory of evolution. (See *The Piltdown Man Fraud*, *The Nebraska Man Fraud*, and *The Neanderthal Man Fraud*.)

The false impression that paleontology supports the theory of evolution is described in an article in


Science magazine:

*A large number of well-trained scientists outside of evolutionary biology and paleontology have unfortunately gotten the idea that the fossil record is far more Darwinian than it is. This probably comes from the oversimplification inevitable in secondary sources: low-level textbooks, semipopular articles, and so on. Also, there is probably some wishful thinking involved. In the years after Darwin, his advocates hoped to find predictable progressions. In general these have not been found yet the optimism has died hard, and some pure fantasy has crept into textbooks.*¹⁶⁷

The leading evolutionists N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall make an important comment:

*That individual kinds of fossils remain recognizably the same throughout the length of their occurrence in the fossil record had been known to paleontologists long before Darwin published his Origin. Darwin himself, . . . prophesied that future generations of paleontologists would fill in these gaps by diligent search . . . One hundred and twenty years of paleontological research later, it has become abundantly clear that the fossil record will not confirm this part of Darwin's predictions. Nor is the problem a miserably poor record. The fossil record simply shows that this prediction is wrong.*¹⁶⁸

The observation that species re-



One of the most important branches of science to shed light on the origin of life is paleontology, the study of fossils. The fossil beds studied with enormous dedication over the last 100 years reveal a picture in stark contrast to Darwin's theory. Species did not emerge by evolving, but appeared suddenly on Earth, with all their various structures fully formed.

main amazingly stable, and for very long periods of time, contains all the features of the story of "The Emperor's New Clothes." Everyone saw the truth, but all chose to ignore it. Paleontologists were faced by a fossil record that definitively refutes the picture that Darwin imagined, but openly turned their backs on the truth.

The American paleontologist S.M. Stanley describes how this fact, revealed by the fossil record, is completely ignored by the Darwinist dogma that dominates the world of science:

The known fossil record is not, and never has been, in accord with gradualism. What is remarkable is that, through a variety of historical circumstances, even the history of opposition

has been obscured... "The majority of paleontologists felt their evidence simply contradicted Darwin's stress on minute, slow, and cumulative changes leading to species transformation." . . . [but] their story has been suppressed.

169

PALEOANTHROPOLOGY

Paleoanthropology is a branch of science that studies the origin and developmental process of man. Studies in this field are backed up by many other branches of science, but the greatest use is made of information obtained from fossils.

However, as in many other branches of science, fossils are interpreted in the light of the assumptions of the theory of evolution. Findings obtained from the fields of archaeology and ethnology are interpreted in a biased manner so as to demonstrate the physical and mental development of man's supposed forerunners, who must have existed according to the claims of the theory of evolution.

Despite being an evolutionist, the Arizona State University anthropologist Geoffrey Clark admitted as much in a text published in 1997:

We select among alternative sets of research conclusions in accordance with

our biases and preconceptions—a process that is, at once, both political and subjective.... paleoanthropology has the form but not the substance of a science. ¹⁷⁰

Niles Eldredge of Harvard University and Ian Tattersall of the American Museum of Natural History, two of the USA's leading paleontologists, comment on paleontological findings:

It is a myth that the evolutionary histories of living things are essentially a matter of discovery. If this were true, one could confidently expect that as more hominid fossils were found the story of human evolution would become clearer. Whereas if anything, the opposite has occurred. ¹⁷¹

Many other evolutionist experts on the subject also harbor pessimistic ideas about the very theory they support. Henry Gee, Nature magazine's best-known writer, says that "between about 10 and 5 million years ago—several thousand generations of living creatures—can be fitted into a small box." The conclusion Gee draws from this is very interesting:

To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story—amusing,

*perhaps even instructive, but not scientific.*¹⁷²

Why is this branch of science, offering no evidence for the theory of evolution, regarded as so important by evolutionists? Why is every fossil discovery interpreted in such a biased, exaggerated manner? At a meeting held at the Biology Teachers' Association, the evolutionist Greg Kirby described this mentality:

*If you were to spend your life picking up bones and finding little fragments of head and little fragments of jaw, there is a very strong desire there to exaggerate the importance of those fragments.*¹⁷³

No scientific paleoanthropological findings provide any support for evolution. All the "proofs" that evolutionists offer are fossils one-sidedly interpreted in order to deny the existence of Allah, the supreme Creator.

"PANDA'S THUMB" ERROR, THE

One of the classic evolutionist arguments is that of the Panda's thumb, made famous by Stephen Jay Gould. Along with its five fingers, the panda also has a bony protrusion



As can be seen here, the bone that protrudes from the panda's wrist is not really a bone at all, but a support making it easier for the animal to cling onto bamboo stalks.

on its wrist known as the radial sesamoid bone.

In evolutionists' view, the panda—originally a carnivore like dogs and cats—began feeding on bamboo. According to the evolutionist scenario, the sixth finger emerged so that the panda could grasp bamboo more easily. A different evolutionist claim is that though this sixth finger is not perfect, it's as good as natural selection could make it. But in fact, these are claims made entirely in line with evolutionist preconceptions, devoid of proof and explain nothing.

Of pandas being descended from carnivorous ancestors:

Evolutionists include the panda among the carnivores because it has wide jaws, teeth and strong claws.

They claim that the panda's alleged ancestors used these features against other animals. Yet the panda's only enemy is man; among other animals, it has no enemies. Its powerful teeth and jaws are for breaking off and chewing bamboo stems. Its strong claws serve for climbing up bamboo stems. Therefore, there is not the slightest evidence that pandas—which generally eat bamboo and fruit and other plants from time to time—evolved from carnivorous forerunners.

Evolutionists have been unable to agree on which animal the panda might have evolved from. Some evolutionists place the panda in the same category as bears; others in the same category as raccoons, because no findings suggest that these an-

imals have evolved from any other class. Evolutionists speculate on the basis of similarities alone, and disagree with one another because their conjectures are sheer fantasy.


Of the panda's thumb not being perfect, being the work of chance:

Evolutionists say that the panda's thumb is not perfect, but still serves a purpose.

In fact, this sixth finger is a kind of bone known as the *radial sesamoid bone*, which generally facilitates movement at the joints and prevents the tendons from tearing. This structure, emerging from the wrist, is actually no finger at all, but a support that helps the other fingers grip onto bamboo stalks.¹⁷⁴

Evolutionists maintain that this bone devel-

Evolutionists look for disharmony or flaws in nature, in their efforts to find evidence for denying Allah's flawless creation. As with the subject of the panda's "thumb," however, these efforts have always been in vain.



oped in place of a finger, but does not serve as one—saying, for example, that it cannot strip shoots. However, they also say that it is sufficiently developed for grasping. That is in any case the job of this sixth finger, and the panda has enough other fingers to perform other tasks perfectly.¹⁷⁵ The idea that this structure's ideal shape would be that of a complete finger is a groundless, based on evolutionist prejudices. The bone is perfectly suitable in its present state.

One study published in *Nature* magazine in 1999 shows that in the panda's natural habitat, its thumb is highly efficient. The study, carried out by four Japanese researchers and performed using computerized tomography and magnetic resonance imaging, concluded that the panda's thumb is "one of the most extraordinary manipulation systems in mammalia."¹⁷⁶

Evolutionists look for incompatibility or flaws in nature only to find evidence for denying Allah's immaculate creation. Yet these efforts have always proved fruitless. The panda's thumb is yet another instance of this.

PANGENESIS THEORY, THE

The ancient Greek philosopher

Aristotle maintained that one part of all the cells in the body came together to form the egg and sperm. He also suggested that all the changes taking place in the body throughout an organism's life could be passed along to later generations.

This idea was taken up by Lamarck and Darwin in the 19th century, although it was eventually shown to be false. Reproductive cells are not a product of the body's cells, and changes in them do not affect the ovum and spermatazoa. (See **Lamarck's Evolution Scenario.**)

PANSPERMIA THEORY, THE

Faced by the fact that amino acids cannot form by chance, evolutionists looked for a new explanation of how life might have arisen spontaneously under the conditions of the primeval world. According to their new claims, amino acids in meteors falling to Earth reacted with organic substances and thus gave rise to life.

According to this view, the first organic substance originated beyond the Earth, on another planet. The spores or seeds of these organisms were then carried to Earth by meteors, and life thus began. In the light of our current knowledge, however, it doesn't appear possible for spores



It is impossible for meteors falling to Earth to carry living organisms with them because of the high temperatures created as they enter the atmosphere and the severity of their impacts. Above you can see a crater left by a meteorite in Arizona. Even if one postulates the existence of life beyond Earth, there can still be no other explanation for its origin than creation.

or seeds to withstand such outer-space conditions as cold, utter vacuum, and harmful radiation on their way to Earth—not to mention the intense heat and impact of passing through the atmosphere.¹⁷⁷

Conditions in space make it impossible for life to survive. The well-known Russian scientist George Gamow says:

... there is a still more serious threat awaiting spores traveling through space than freezing to death. The Sun is well known to emit a significant level of ultraviolet rays. These rays, only

a small proportion of which are permitted to pass through the atmospheric layer surrounding the Earth, represent the most serious danger to these micro-organism spores with no defensive mechanisms with which to protect themselves, and are sufficiently powerful to kill them instantaneously. For that reason, even a fictitious journey by these bacteria to the nearest planet will still result in death. Another study conducted in 1966 led to the "out of space" hypothesis being totally abandoned. The most highly resistant micro-organisms were installed on the outer surface of the spacecraft Gemini-

9 and this was then launched into space. Examinations revealed that these micro-organisms all died within seven hours. Yet according to this hypothesis, the bacteria that supposedly gave rise to life must have traveled for many years. ¹⁷⁸

The crystal-clear fact that emerges is that it is impossible for micro-organisms to reach Earth from outer space. However, even if large quantities of amino acids had come from space, and even if the entire surface of the primitive Earth world was covered with them, this would still not account for the origin of life. It would be impossible for amino acids to combine randomly and haphazardly and form an exceedingly complex, three-dimensional protein; for proteins to form the organelles in cells; and then for these organelles to produce the miraculous structure of the cell itself.

PARALLEL EVOLUTION IMPASSE, THE

One of the subjects that pose the worst dilemmas for evolutionists is those organs with exceedingly complex structures. Evolutionists claim that living things with very complex organs in common but with no common ancestor must have undergone

evolution independently of one another.

According to evolutionists, these living things developed in parallel to one another and came to possess similar organs; however this might have come about. To cite one example, the structure of the eye in squid and vertebrates is identical, though no attempt is made to construct an evolutionary relationship among these creatures. Evolutionists claimed parallel evolution to account for the origin of these organs. However hard it is to explain how such developed organs came into existence once, it's quite impossible to account for how they might have come into being twice, and independently.

Briefly, the only difference between parallel evolution and other forms of evolution is that the former needs even more chances to come about. The more flawless structures appear in living things, the less scientific appear evolutionists' scenarios.

PASTEUR, LOUIS

As a result of lengthy research and experiments, the famous French biologist Louis Pasteur concluded that: "Never will the doctrine of



Louis Pasteur's discoveries buried the idea that inanimate substances could give rise to life.

spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow struck by this simple experiment." ¹⁷⁹

With his view that life comes only from life, also known as biogenesis, Pasteur totally invalidated the belief in spontaneous generation that constituted the essence of Darwin's evolution. (See **Abiogenesis and Biogenesis**.)

Proponents of the theory of evolution long resisted Pasteur's findings. However, as scientific advances revealed the complex structure of the living cell, their claim that life could form spontaneously found itself in an ever-deeper impasse.

PEKING MAN FRAUD, THE

In 1921, Dr. Davidson Black discovered two molar teeth in a depression near the village of Choukoutien, attached to the Chinese city of Peking (Beijing). These two teeth were given the name *Sinanthropus pekinensis* and were suggested to belong to a hominid, or human-like creature. Dr. W.C. Pei found a third tooth in 1927, and several skull fragments and two pieces from the jaw in 1928. Black claimed that these belonged to *S. pekinensis* and announced that its skull volume was 900 cubic centimeters. Its age was estimated at 500,000 years.

In 1936 three skulls were discovered in the same place by Pei and the American Professor Franz Weidenreich. These skulls, too, were declared to belong to *S. pekinensis*, and the skull volume was enlarged to 1,200 cubic centimeters. Apart from the two molars, all the materials found as evidence disappeared between 1941 and 1945. All that remains is Weidenreich's plaster models of them.

Professor Duane Gish, known for his many years of research into the invalidity of the theory of evolution, says this:

Of most critical importance to an eval-

uation of this material is . . . that all of this material except two teeth disappeared sometime during the period 1941-1945, and none of it has ever been recovered. Many stories concerning the disappearance of this material have circulated, the most popular being that it was either lost or seized by the Japanese during an attempt to move it from Peking to a U.S.

Marine detachment that was evacuating China. None of these stories has been verified. No living person apparently knows what happened to the material.

As a result, we are totally dependent on models and descriptions of this material left by a few investigators, all of whom were totally committed to the idea that man had evolved from animal ancestors. Even a scientist is a completely objective as humanly possible, the model of description he fashions on the basis of scanty and incomplete material with reflect to a critical degree what he thinks the evidence ought to show. Furthermore, there is ample evidence that objectivity was seriously lacking in the treatment and evaluation of the material recovered at Choukoutien.


All we have available are the models

fashioned by Weidenreich. How reliable are these models? Are they accurate casts of the originals, or do they reflect what Weidenreich thought they should look like? ¹⁸⁰

Increasing discoveries in the years that followed, and particularly after the 1990s, made it clear that no such evolutionary process as the tree of descent, proposed by evolutionists, ever took place. In terms of their age, geographical regions and anatomical features, the fossils discovered could not be placed in any evolutionary sequence. Increasingly, therefore, the idea that Peking Man was to the missing link lost support, and evolutionists abandoned hope of having found any missing link.

In the present day, there are no longer frequent claims of intermediate forms imputed to *Homo erectus*, under which Peking Man had been classified. Many anthropologists emphasise that *H. erectus* (and therefore Peking Man) was no different from modern humans. *H. erectus* is not an intermediate form, but an extinct human race.

This view was generally accepted



Peking Man fossil

at a conference attended by well-known palaeontologists and anthropologists in Germany. *American Scientist* magazine reported the developments at the conference:

... most of the participants at the Senckenberg conference got drawn into a flaming debate over the taxonomic status of Homo erectus started by Milford Wolpoff of the University of Michigan, Alan Thorne of the University of Canberra and their colleagues. They argued forcefully that Homo erectus had no validity as a species and should be eliminated altogether. (Pat Shipman, "Doubting Dmanisi", American Scientist, November- December 2000, p. 491)

The latest developments with regard to H. erectus, under which Peking Man is classified, forced the *National Geographic's* TV channel to make an important admission. The program quoted the physical anthropologist Gary Sawyer of the American Museum of Natural History as saying that Peking Man,

in terms of his physical characteristics, was a genuine human being. This retreat once again shows that the scenario of the human line of descent has collapsed. The crystal reality is that humans and apes are life forms created separately by Allah.

PENTADACTYL HOMOLOGY

- See Five-Digit Homology.


PEPTIDE BOND

It's not enough for the varieties of amino acid necessary to form a protein to be in the appropriate number and sequence and to have the needed three-dimensional structure. They must also bond to one another by specific amino acid molecules with more than one arm. The bond formed in this way is known as a *peptide bond*.

Amino acids may attach to one another by a variety of different

No matter how powerful or how technologically advanced that car's engine may be, that car will still be unable to cover any distance. In the same way, if just a single amino acid in a protein molecule is attached by some other bond than a peptide bond, the entire molecule will be useless.





bonds, but proteins can emerge only from amino acids attached to one another by peptide bonds.

To use analogy, imagine that all the components of an automobile are present, and in just the right place. However, let one of the wheels be attached by a coil of wire rather than by bolts. No matter how powerful or how technologically advanced that car's engine may be, that car will still be unable to cover any distance. Everything else appears to be in order, yet one of the wheels be-

ing attached in a wrong way makes the whole car functionless. In the same way, if just a single amino acid in a protein molecule is attached by some other bond than a peptide bond, the entire molecule will be useless.

Research has revealed that random bonding of amino acids results in 50% peptide bonds at most, the rest being attached by bonds that are not found in proteins. Therefore, in calculating the probability of a protein coming into being by chance, we

must include the requirement that all amino acids be left-handed, and the fact that every amino acid can only be attached to the others by a peptide bond. If we consider a 400-amino acid protein, the chances of all the amino acids being attached to one another by peptide bonds alone is 1 in 2399 —a figure that cannot possibly be achieved by random factors.

PHYLOGENY

Phylogeny is the term used to describe the supposed evolutionary history of any group of living things. Phylogeny is evolutionists' attempts

to ascribe degrees of relatedness among living things, to reveal all the possible similarities and differences of a species or group and set out the stages they underwent from their supposed ancestors. (See **Phylum, and Taxonomy.**)

By such means, evolutionists hope to indicate the lines of descent they assume occurred among living things. In addition, based on various similarities in species, they try to place all living things on certain branches of the evolutionary family tree. But this is all based on their pre-conceptions. These are all fictitious studies, devoid of any scientific evidence.

Canlı grupları olan filumların tamamına yakını, Kambriyen devri olarak bilinen jeolojik dönemde, hiçbir sözde evrimsel ataya sahip olmadan aniden ortaya çıkmışlardır. Bu, evrim teorisini çürüten, yaratılışı destekleyen önemli bir delildir.



PHYLUM (PLURAL: PHYLA)

Biologists classify living things into various separate groups. This classification, known as *taxonomy* or *systematic biology*, consists of hierarchical categories.

Living things are first divided into *kingdoms*, such as the plant and animal kingdoms, which are then subdivided into phyla.

In determining these phyla, each of all the different basic body types has been considered. For instance, arthropods (jointed legs) are one separate phylum, and all the species in it have a similar body plan. The phylum known as Chordata contains all those species with a central nervous system. All the animals familiar to us, such as fish, birds, reptiles and mammals represent a subdivision—vertebrates—of the phylum Chordata.


Among the different animal phyla there are very different categories, such as Mollusca, which include soft-bodied creatures such as octopus, and the phylum Nematode, which includes roundworms. The categories beneath phyla have basically similar body plans, but phyla are altogether different from one another.

PILTDOWN MAN FRAUD, THE

In 1912, Charles Dawson, a famous doctor and also an amateur paleontologist, claimed to have discovered a jawbone and part of a skull in a gravel pit near the village of Piltdown in England. Although the jawbone resembled that of an ape, the teeth and skull resembled those of human beings. These specimens were given the name of Piltdown Man, an age of 500,000 was estimated for them, and they were exhibited in various museums as incontrovertible proof of evolution. For some 40 years, they were the subject of many scientific papers, analyses and reconstructions. Some 500 academics from various universities all over the world prepared doctoral theses on the subject of Piltdown Man.¹⁸¹

On a visit to the British Museum in 1935, the famous American paleo-anthropologist H.F. Osborn proclaimed Piltdown "a discovery of transcendent importance to the pre-history of man," and added, "We have to be reminded over and over again that nature is full of paradoxes ..."¹⁸²

In 1949, Kenneth Oakley of the British Museum's



AN ORANGUTAN JAW TO A HUMAN SKULL

The Piltdown Man fossil that deceived the world of science for some 40 years was actually a fraud concocted by evolutionists putting together bones of a man and an ape.

Paleoanthropology Department sought permission to perform a new dating technique, the fluoride test, on some old fossils. When it was carried out on the Piltdown Man fossil, it was revealed that the jawbone contained no fluoride. This showed that it had been underground for no more than a few years. The skull contained a low level of fluoride, making it only a few thousand years old.

Subsequent chronological investigations based on the fluoride method confirmed that the skull was only a few thousand years old. It was also realized that the teeth had been artificially abraded, and that the primi-

tive artifacts found alongside the fossils were mere reproductions, made with modern steel implements.¹⁸³

With the detailed analyses performed by Weiner, this fraud was definitively revealed in 1953. The skull was 500 years old and human, and the jaw belonged to a newly dead orangutan! The teeth had been added later, and their joints abraded to give the impression they were human. Later, all the parts had been stained with potassium dichromate to give them an aged appearance. When the bones were placed in acid, the stains disappeared.

Le Gros Clark, a member of the team that uncovered the fraud, was unable to mask his astonishment:



A depiction of Piltdown Man, based on the fraudulent fossil

"the evidences of artificial abrasion immediately sprang to the eye. Indeed so obvious did they seem it may well be asked— how was it that they had escaped notice before?" ¹⁸⁴

Piltdown Man, which had been exhibited for the previous 40 years or so, was then hurriedly removed from the British Museum.

PITHECANTHROPUS ERECTUS

—see Nebraska Man Fraud, The.

PLASMID TRANSFER

Bacteria contain a small DNA molecule known as a plasmid in ad-

dition to the main DNA strands, or chromosomes. A plasmid is a small DNA ring found outside the chromosomes in many species of bacteria. A rounded DNA molecule of no fundamental importance to the bacterium, a plasmid—according to evolutionists—provides selective benefits. This plasmid DNA's round shape enables it to enter or leave the bacterium with ease. This feature of plasmids led to DNA combination research.

Plasmid transfer is one of the techniques that scientists discovered for the purpose of combining DNA. Research into newly combined (recombinant) DNA is performed by combining the DNAs of different organisms to obtain large enough quantities of specific genes to be able to study them. Many biologists regard this method as one of the most valuable means of biological research yet discovered. ¹⁸⁵

One of the discoveries revealed by this technique is bacteria's antibiotic resistance. The genes of bacteria that have proved resistant in the past are transmitted to other bacteria by way of plasmids. Resistant genes are generally found in plasmids. In this way, a resistant gene acquired by a non-resistant bacterium can easily be added onto its own DNA. This

means that from a single resistant bacterium, a resistant bacterial colony can emerge in a very short time.

However, nothing about this mechanism provides evidence for evolution, because the genes that endow resistance in bacteria are not formed as the result of mutations. All that occurs is the transmission of genes already existing among bacteria.

PLATYPUS

The platypus, a member of the marsupial family that lives in Australia, is an excellent example that invalidates evolutionist claims. Despite being a mammal, covered in fur and possessing milk glands, the platypus also lays eggs. More interestingly, it has a bill like a duck.

Since this creature has mammalian, avian and reptilian features, evolutionists point to it as a simple animal and as an intermediate form. Yet the truth is very different.

So highly developed is the platypus that it possesses a literal sixth sense. Since it lives in muddy waters, it has been equipped with a mechanism that allows it to move by use of electrical signals. This electroreceptor system bears no similarity to the systems found in certain fish,

but is far more complex. With its own unique movements, the platypus sets up an electrical current in the river waters and uses this to determine the river surface.


The platypus is a mosaic animal. However, if it became extinct and if traces of it were later found in the fossil record, evolutionists would not hesitate to suggest that it was an intermediate form between reptiles and mammals. All the supposed intermediate forms cited today are in fact the result of such distortions.

PLEIOTROPIC EFFECT, THE

One of the proofs that mutations inflict only harm on living things is the coding of the genetic code. In developed animals, almost all the known genes contain more than one piece of information about that organism. For example, a single gene may control both height and eye color.

The molecular biologist Michael Denton describes this feature, known as genes' pleiotropic effect:

The effects of genes on development are often surprisingly diverse. In the house mouse, nearly every coat-colour gene has some effect on body size. Out of seventeen X-ray-induced eye colour mutations in the fruit fly Drosophila



On the left can be seen normal development in a domestic chicken, and on the right, the harmful effects caused by a pleiotropic gene mutation. Close inspection shows that a mutation in a single gene can damage several organs at the same time. Even if we were to admit that mutations did have a positive effect, the pleiotropic effect would eliminate this advantage by damaging several different organs at once.

melanogaster, fourteen affected the shape of the sex organs of the female, a characteristic that one would have thought was quite unrelated to eye colour. Almost every gene that has been

studied in higher organisms has been found to effect more than one organ system, a multiple effect which is known as pleiotropy. As Mayr argues in *Population, Species and Evolution*:

"It is doubtful whether any genes that are not pleiotropic exist in higher organisms." ¹⁸⁶

Due to this characteristic in living things' genes, any defect occurring in any gene in the DNA as a result of a chance mutation will affect more than one organ. Thus the mutation will have more than one destructive effect. Even if one of these effects is hypothesized to be beneficial, as the result of an extremely rare coincidence, the other effects' inevitable damage will cancel out any advantage. (See **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism.**)

Therefore, it is impossible for living things to have undergone evolution, because no mechanism exists that can cause them to evolve.

POPULATION

Populations are aggregations of a single species whose members often display considerable genetic variety. The individuals in any population determine that population's genetic structure. In ecological terms, a population is defined as a society consisting of members of the same species, spread over a specific area.

The realization that hereditary features affected populations more

than individuals—and that individuals within that population were nothing more than gene-carrying vehicles—brought population genetics to the fore.

PRE-ADAPTATION MYTH, THE

Evolutionists' efforts to account for the origin of species in terms of transition from water to land, and from land to the air, require wide-ranging changes. Consider, for instance, how a fish emerging from water might adapt to dry land. Unless it undergoes rapid changes in its respiratory system, excretory mechanism and skeletal structure, it will inevitably die. A series of mutations must immediately endow the fish with lungs, elongate its fins into feet, bestow kidneys on it, and give its skin a water-retaining property. It is essential that this entire string of mutations takes place within the lifespan of only a single animal.

No evolutionist biologist proposes such a chain of mutations, since the idea is too nonsensical and illogical. Instead, they refer to the concept of *pre-adaptation*. By this, they mean is that fish underwent changes necessary for them to live on land while they were still living in water.

According to this theory, a fish acquired features that would permit it to live on land while it had no need of them. Then when it was ready, it emerged onto dry land to begin living there.

Yet even within the theory of evolution's own hypotheses, there is no logic to such a scenario. A sea creature acquiring features suitable for dry land gives it no advantage. Therefore, there is no logic for claiming that these "just in case" features emerged by means of natural selection. On the contrary, a living thing undergoing pre-adaptation should be eliminated by means of natural selection, since as it acquires features appropriate to the land, it will be progressively disadvantaged.

PRIMEVAL ATMOSPHERE, THE

The term "primeval atmosphere" is used to describe the atmosphere when the Earth was first formed. For a long time, adherents of the theory of evolution maintained that the primitive atmosphere consisted of a mixture of gasses that permitted the spontaneous appearance of organic compounds that would form the building blocks of life. Evolutionists hypothesized that these primeval

gasses consisted of ammonia, methane, hydrogen and water vapor. On that assumption, they carried out a large number of experiments aimed at synthesizing amino acid molecules, the building blocks of life. These experiments' objective was to simulate those primeval atmospheric conditions in a laboratory environment.

Nothing about these experiments (apart from the fact they pulled the wool over people's eyes) provided any backing for evolution. First of all, the laboratory environment was controlled in every way. Such an environment bore no resemblance to the spontaneous, uncontrolled, disordered and destructive atmosphere of the primeval world.

The best-known of this series of primitive atmosphere experiments was the **Miller Experiment**. In that experiment, Stanley Miller prepared an artificial environment similar to the primeval atmosphere in order to show that amino acids could have been synthesized by chance. To that end, he reacted ammonia, methane, hydrogen and water vapor—gasses he assumed were present in the primeval atmosphere, but which subsequently, were realized to not be present at all. As a result, he did indeed synthesize a few amino acid forms. Yet research in later years revealed

that the mixture of gasses that Miller has assumed to have constituted the primeval atmosphere did not reflect the actual state of affairs. It was realized that carbon dioxide and nitrogen, present in the primitive atmosphere, were not chemically suited to forming amino acids and other organic compounds. An article titled "Life's Crucible" in the February 1998 edition of the well-known evolutionist publication *Earth* admitted this:

Geologists now think that the primordial atmosphere consisted mainly of carbon dioxide and nitrogen, gases that are less reactive than those used in the 1953 experiment. And even if Miller's atmosphere could have existed, how do you get simple molecules such as amino acids to go through the necessary chemical changes that will convert them into more complicated compounds, or polymers, such as proteins? Miller himself throws up his hands at that part of the puzzle. "It's a problem," he sighs with exasperation.



"How do you make polymers? That's not so easy." ¹⁸⁷

Miller was now aware that his experiment was meaningless in terms of accounting for the origin of life. Another article, titled "The Rise of Life on Earth," in the March 1998 edition of *National Geographic*, contained the following lines:

Many scientists now suspect that the early atmosphere was different from what Miller first supposed. They think it consisted of carbon dioxide and nitrogen rather than hydrogen, methane, and ammonia.

That's bad news for chemists. When they try sparking carbon dioxide and nitrogen, they get a paltry amount of organic molecules—the equivalent of dissolving a drop of food coloring in a swimming pool of water. Scientists find it hard to imagine life emerging from such a diluted soup. ¹⁸⁸

In short, neither the Miller experiment nor any other evolutionist endeavors have answered the question of the origin of life on Earth. All the research reveals the impossibility of life's coming into being by chance, and thus shows that life was created.

PRIMEVAL EARTH, THE

Evolutionists claim that the amino acids, the building blocks of life,

came into being spontaneously in the environment of the primeval Earth. However, apart from a few chemical syntheses carried out consciously in regulated, controlled laboratory conditions, there is no scientific proof that amino acids can form spontaneously.

Evolutionists then face an even greater problem than amino acids in the form of proteins—hundreds of different amino acids, the building blocks of life, being added onto one another in a specific sequence.

It's even more illogical to claim that proteins form spontaneously under natural conditions than to suggest that amino acids can do so. It is mathematically impossible for amino acids to spontaneously assume the necessary sequences to form proteins. In addition, protein formation is chemically impossible under the conditions of the primeval Earth. (See *The Primeval Atmosphere*, and *The Chemical Evolution Deception*.)

PRIMEVAL SOUP, THE

—See *The Chemical Evolution Deception* and *The Primordial Soup Fantasy*.

THEORY OF FAVORED RACES, THE

—See Darwinism and Racism.

PRIMORDIAL SOUP FANTASY, THE

According to the theory of evolution, life emerged in the oceans between 3.5 and 4 billion years ago in an environment known as the "primordial soup." According to the myth of evolution, primitive life began with proteins and subsequently with single-celled organisms, and continued in the oceans for some 2 billion years, reaching its final point with the evolution of fish with backbones.

After that point, according to the tale, some of the fish felt the need to progress to a dry land environment. And thus it was that life on dry land began.

This entirely fictional tale, based on no evidence, actually faces a separate dilemma at every different stage. First of all, how did the first protein come into being? And how, even before that, did the amino acids that comprise proteins come into being and manage to add on to one another in an ordered manner? These questions completely undermine the

theory of evolution from the outset. Because as even evolutionists admit, the structure of proteins is so complex that the chances of their forming by chance is practically zero.

One of the most important figures in this area, the geochemist Jeffrey Bada from the San Diego Scripps Institute, wrote in the February 1998 edition of *Earth* magazine:

Today as we leave the twentieth century, we still face the biggest unsolved problem that we had when we entered the twentieth century: How did life originate on earth? ¹⁸⁹

Professor Klaus Dose, head of the Johannes Gutenberg University Biochemistry Department in Germany, stated in the *Journal Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*:

More than 30 years of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on earth rather than to its solution. At present all discussions on principal theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance. ¹⁹⁰

The claim put forward by Darwinism, the result of the primitive level of science in the 19th century, that a cell will spontaneously


occur if organic substances combine together, is totally unscientific. Science manifests the fact that Allah has flawlessly created living things.

PROTEIN

Proteins are giant molecules consisting of specific numbers and types of smaller molecules, known as *amino acids*, set out in particular sequences. The simplest proteins consist of around 50 amino acids, while others may contain thousands.

The absence of even a single amino acid in the protein structure or one amino acid changing place, or the addition of one amino acid too many to the chain will make that protein a useless collection of molecules. For that reason, every amino acid must be in exactly the right place and in exactly the right order. The theory of evolution, however, suggests that life came into being by chance. In the face of this regularity, it's in a hopeless position. So extraordinary is this regularity that it cannot possibly be explained in terms of chance. Simple probability calculations easily show that proteins' functional structure can never come into being as the result of coincidences.

For instance, the 288 amino acids of 12 different kinds contained in an




Proteins are giant molecules consisting of specific numbers and types of smaller molecules, known as amino acids, set out in particular sequences. This structure of the protein is a big deadlock for evolutionists.

average-sized protein molecule, may be set out in 10^{300} ways. (This is the astronomical figure of 1 followed by 300 zeros.) However, only one of all these sequences can give rise to the protein. All the remaining sequences are meaningless strings of amino acids that are either useless, or may even be harmful.

Therefore, the chances of just the "right" protein molecule forming by chance are 1 in 10^{300} . In practical terms, this cannot happen. (In mathematics, any probability smaller than 10^{50} is regarded as zero probability.)

Moreover, a protein consisting of 288 amino acids can be regarded as a rather humble structure, compared with giant proteins consisting of thousands of amino acids found in many living things. When the same probability calculations are applied



The illustration shows the three-dimensional structure of the myoglobin protein and the peptide groups among the atoms. Such a flawless structure cannot be explained in terms of chance.

to these giant molecules, even the word *impossible* fails to do justice to the situation.

Moving up one rung in the development of living things, we see that a protein on its own means nothing. *Mycoplasma hominis* H39, one of the smallest known bacteria, has been observed to possess 600 kinds of proteins. Therefore, we need to

square the probability calculation we carried out on just one protein by 600. The figure that emerges goes way beyond the concept of merely impossible.

Nor can evolutionists object to these figures. They also accept that the chances of a single protein coming into being by chance are as slim as those of "a monkey writing the

history of mankind by randomly striking the keys of a typewriter." ¹⁹¹ Yet rather than accept the true explanation—creation—they prefer this utter impossibility.

Many evolutionists admit this. The evolutionist scientist Harold Bloom, for instance, says, "The spontaneous formation of a polypeptide of the size of the smallest known proteins seems beyond all probability." ¹⁹²

Evolutionists claim that molecular evolution took a very long time and that this time frame made the impossible possible. But no matter how much time is allowed, it is still impossible for amino acids to randomly give rise to proteins. In his book *Essentials of Earth History*, the American geologist William Stokes admits that "it would not occur during billions of years on billions of planets, each covered by a blanket of concentrated watery solution of the necessary amino acids."

Professor of Chemistry Perry Reeves describes what all this actually means: ¹⁹³

When one examines the vast number of

possible structures that could result from a simple random combination of amino acids in an evaporating primordial pond, it is mind-boggling to believe that life could have originated

in this way. It is more plausible that a Great Builder with a master plan would be required for such a task. ¹⁹⁴



The three-dimensional structure of a protein

PROKARYOTIC CELLS

—See Origin of the Bacteria.)

PROTOAVIS

In pointing to *Archaeopteryx* as an intermediate form, evolutionists began with the assumption that it was the earliest bird-like creature on Earth. However, the discovery of certain far older bird fossils displaced *Archaeopteryx* from its perch as the ancestor of birds. In addition, these creatures were flawless birds with none of the supposed reptilian features attributed to *Archaeopteryx*.

The most significant of them was *Protoavis*, estimated at 225 million years old. The fossil, whose existence was announced in a paper in

the August 1986 edition of the magazine *Nature*, demolished the idea that *Archaeopteryx*, 75 million years younger was the forerunner of all birds. Its bodily structure, with hollow bones as in all other birds, long wings and traces of feathers on those wings showed that *Protoavis* was capable of perfect flight.

N. Hotton of the Smithsonian institute describes the fossil thus: "*Protoavis* has a well-developed furcula bone and chest bone, assisting flight, hollow bones and extended wing bones . . . Their ears indicate that they communicate with sound, while dinosaurs are silent." ¹⁹⁵

The German biologists Reinhard Junker and Siefried Scherer describe the blow dealt to evolutionist theses: "Because *Archaeopteryx* is 75 million years younger than *Protoavis*, it emerged that this was a dead end for evolution. Therefore, the idea put forward by the proponents of creation that there are no intermediate forms, only mosaic forms, has been strengthened. The fact that *Protoavis* resembles modern birds in many ways makes the gap between bird and reptile even more apparent." ¹⁹⁶

Furthermore, the age calculated for *Protoavis* is so great that this bird—again according to dating provided by evolutionist sources—is



The *Protoavis* fossil, estimated to be 225 million years old, demolished the theory that *Archaeopteryx*, a bird 75 million years younger than it, was the ancestor of birds.

even older than the first dinosaurs on Earth. This means the absolute collapse of the theory that birds evolved from dinosaurs!

PUNCTUATED EQUILIBRIUM

—See Punctuated Model of Evolution Myth, The below.

PUNCTUATED MODEL OF EVOLUTION MYTH, THE

When the *theory of evolution* is mentioned, the neo-Darwinist model is still the first theory that comes to mind. (See *The Neo-Darwinist Comedy*.) However, in the last few

decades, a different model was born: punctuated evolution.

This model began with great fanfare by two American paleontologists, Niles Eldredge and Stephen Jay Gould, in the 1970s. These two evolutionist scientists were aware that the claims of neo-Darwinian theory were totally refuted by the fossil record. Fossils proved that living things had not appeared on Earth through gradual evolution, but had appeared suddenly and perfectly formed. Neo-Darwinists were living with the hope that the fossils they sought would one day be found—which indeed is still the case today. But Eldredge and Gould realized that this hope was unfounded. Since they were unwilling to abandon the dogma of evolution, they therefore proposed a new model; punctuated evolution, the claim that evolution occurred not with small, gradual changes, but in very large sudden ones.

This was actually a fantasy model. For example, Otto Schindewolf who had preceded Eldredge and Gould, had given a conjectural example of punctuated evolution, claiming that the first bird in history emerged from a reptile egg through a gross mutation—some giant, random mutation in its genetic struc-

ture.¹⁹⁷ (See *The Macro-Mutation Deception*.) According to the theory, certain terrestrial animals might have turned into giant whales as a result of sudden and comprehensive changes, within a single generation. These claims conflict with all known genetic, biophysical and biochemical laws, and were about as scientific as tales of princes turning into frogs. But some evolutionist paleontologists, troubled by the crisis facing the claims of neo-Darwinism, clung to this theory even though it was even more nonsensical than neo-Darwinism itself.

This theory's sole aim of was to account for the fossil gaps that the neo-Darwinist model was unable to explain. However, it is completely irrational to explain away the fossil gaps by claims along the lines that "Birds suddenly emerged from reptile eggs." For any species to evolve into another, there must be a very large and beneficial change in its genetic data. Yet no mutation can *develop* genetic information or add any new data to it. Mutations lead solely to a loss of, or damage to, existing data. The wholesale mutations imagined by the adherents of punctuated evolution would actually represent reductions and defects in genetic information.

Like the neo-Darwinist model, the punctuated evolution model collapses at the outset when faced with the question of how the first living thing came into existence. Since a single protein cannot come into being by chance, organisms composed of trillions of proteins cannot emerge in a punctuated or gradual manner.

At present, the punctuated evolution theory maintains that living populations exhibit no changes for long periods of time, remaining in a kind of equilibrium. According to the claim, evolutionary changes take place in very brief spaces of time among very narrow populations. (Equilibrium is thus interrupted, or "punctuated.") Since the population is so very small, mutations are quickly chosen by way of natural selection, and the emergence of new species is thus made possible.

According to this theory, a reptile species can survive for millions of years without undergoing any changes. However, one small group of reptiles that somehow separates away from the others is subjected, in a manner that is not explained, to a series of intense mutations. The group evolves rapidly and soon turns into a new reptile species, or maybe even into mammals. Since this process takes place very quickly

within a narrow population, very few fossil traces, if any, are left behind.

Close inspection shows that this theory was proposed to answer the question, of "How can evolution progress so fast as to leave no fossil trace behind?" In developing an answer, two fundamental assumptions are made:

1. That *macro-mutations*, wide-ranging mutations that cause major changes in genetic data, provided advantages for living things and produced new genetic information. (See **The Macro-Evolution Deceit**.)

2. That narrow animal populations are genetically advantaged. (See **Narrow Population**.)

Yet both assumptions conflict with the scientific facts.




A large, stylized orange letter 'R' with a white outline is positioned at the bottom center of the image. The background is a collage of various animals, including a butterfly, leopard, peacock, parrot, zebra, penguin, swan, and flamingo, arranged in a grid pattern over a forest path. The entire image is framed by a decorative orange border.

RAMAPITHECUS ERROR, THE

Evolutionists who suggested that the *Ramapithecus* fossils discovered in India go back some 15 million years also proposed that these fossils were a definite intermediate form in the scenario of human evolution. However, it was realized that these fossils actually belonged to an ex-


tinct species of ape, and *Ramapithecus* was quietly removed from the imaginary human family tree.¹⁹⁸

The first *Ramapithecus* fossil discovered consisted of an old jaw made up of two parts. Yet on the basis of these parts, evolutionist artists somehow managed to draw pictures



EVOLUTIONISTS' SOURCE OF INSPIRATION WAS A SINGLE JAWBONE!

The first *Ramapithecus* fossil discovered consisted of a partial jaw, broken into two pieces. Evolutionist artists, however, had no difficulty in portraying *Ramapithecus* and even his family and habitat, based solely on these jaw fragments.



of *Ramapithecus* in his natural habitat, together with his family.

RECAPITULATION THEORY

— See Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny Theory, The.

RECOMBINATION

Recombination means a new genotype (or hereditary structure) being produced by the genetic characters of the two genders combining. However, recombinations must not be confused with mutations. In mutation, in order for changes taking place in the individual's genotype to be effective, they must take place in the reproduction genes.

Recombination, on the other hand, is a constant process that gives rise to new combinations of genes in every offspring, as a result of natural sexual reproduction. Recombination results from the regrouping of genes from the mother and father during the formation of their reproductive cells. Before cell division, the fertilized egg always takes half its genetic material from the mother and half from the father, but recombination plays a definitive and influential role in the formation of variety. (See

Variation.) Thus except in the case of identical twins, two offspring are never identical to one another, and neither are their genetic contents exactly the same as their parents'.

Some evolutionists interpret variation through recombination as an evolutionary factor.¹⁹⁹ However, this is not scientifically valid. Variation is a natural process arising from genetic mixing during reproduction. Yet there is no question of a new species emerging through recombination, or of new information being added beyond that already recorded in the genes.

Studies on recombination occupy a very important place in the understanding of genetic mechanisms. Recombination has guided scientists' production of the chromosome map, identification of genetic abnormalities, and in genetic transplants of one chromosome to another.

RECONSTRUCTION (IMAGINARY PICTURES)

Using various propaganda techniques, evolutionists seek to camouflage their lack of any evidence to support their theories. The most important of these techniques is reconstruction, which involves an "artist's conception" of what a living thing

might have looked like, based on a piece of bone that has been unearthed. All the ape-men one sees in newspaper and magazine illustrations are reconstructions.

However, since the fossil records regarding the origin of man are generally scattered and deficient, any estimations based on them depend largely on imagination. Accordingly, reconstructions of the fossils are designed totally in line with the requirements of the ideology of evolution. The Harvard University anthropologist David Pilbeam emphasizes this: "At least in paleoanthropology, data are still so sparse that theory heavily influences interpretations. Theories have, in the past, clearly reflected our current ideologies instead of the actual data."²⁰⁰

Only the very general features of a creature can be produced based on bone remains alone. The really distinguishing features are the soft tissues, which soon disappear over the course of fossilization. It is easy for an evolutionist to come up

with an imaginary being by shaping those soft tissues however he sees fit.

As Earnst A. Hooton says:

To attempt to restore the soft parts is an even more hazardous undertaking. The lips, the eyes, the ears, and the nasal tip leave no clues on the underlying bony



This picture, based on a skull bone, is a good example of the imaginative way in which evolutionists interpret fossils.

parts. You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthaloid skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely only to mislead the public... So put not your trust in reconstructions. ²⁰¹

The biased interpretation of fossils and the production of fantastic drawings are evidence of how intensively evolutionists resort to deception. Yet compared with the various concrete frauds that have been perpetrated over the past 150 years, these pale into insignificance.

No concrete fossil evidence supports the picture of the ape-man constantly propagated

in the media and in academic sources. Evolutionists may draw and paint imaginary beings, but the lack of any fossils belonging to those creatures is a major stumbling block for them. One of the methods often used to resolve this problem has been to manufacture whatever fossils they have been unable to find. Piltdown Man, a major scandal in the history of science, is one instance. (See **Piltdown Man Fraud, The.**)

REDUCTIONISM

Reductionism is the idea that things that do not appear material can be explained in terms of material effects. The materialist philosophy underlying the theory of evolution assumes that everything that exists consists solely of matter. (See **Materialism.**) According to this philosophy, matter has existed for all time, and nothing exists apart from matter. Materialists employ a logic known as reductionism to support these claims.

For example, the human mind cannot be touched or seen. In addition, the mind is not centered anywhere in the human brain. This inevitably leads us to conclude that the mind is a super-material concept. In



Reconstructions reflect only the imagination of evolutionists, not the scientific facts.

FALSE

other words, the entity you refer to as "me," which thinks, loves, feels anger and sadness, and that experiences pleasure or pain, is not a material entity in the same way as a table or a stone is.

But materialists say that the mind can be reduced to matter. According to their claim, the way we think, love, feel sadness and all our other mental activities actually consist of chemical reactions taking place among the neurons in our brains. Our love for another person is a chemical reaction produced by certain cells in the brain, and our feeling fear in the face of an appropriate event is still another chemical reaction. The well-known materialist philosopher Karl Vogt described this logic in the famous words, "Just as liver secretes gall, so do our brains secrete thought."²⁰²

Gall is a material fluid, of course, but there is no evidence to suggest that thought is also just matter.

REGULATORY GENE

It is evident that mutations give rise to no evolutionary development, which places both neo-Darwinism and the punctuated model of evolution in a very severe predicament. (See **Mutation** and *The*

Punctuated Model of Evolution.)

Since mutations have a destructive effect, then the macro-mutations referred to by the proponents of punctuated evolution would lead to major damage in living things. Some evolutionists place their hopes in mutations occurring in regulatory genes. However, the destructive character that applies to other mutations also applies to these. The problem is that any mutation is a random change, and any random change in such a structure as complex as DNA gives rise to damaging consequences.

The geneticist Lane Lester and the population geneticist Raymond Bohlin describe the mutation predicament:

*However though macro-mutations of many varieties produce drastic changes, the vast majority will be incapable of survival, let alone show the marks of increasing complexity. If structural gene mutations are inadequate because of their inability to produce significant enough changes, then regulatory and developmental mutations appear even less useful because of the greater likelihood of nonadaptive or even destructive consequences.*²⁰³

Experiments and observations show that mutations develop no new genetic information, but only

damage the mutated individual, and that it is clearly inconsistent for the proponents of punctuated evolution to expect any such great successes from mutations.

RIBOSOME

Proteins are produced as the result of highly detailed processes inside the cell, with the assistance of many enzymes, in an organelle called the *ribosome*. The ribosome itself consists of proteins. This therefore brings with it an unrealistic hypothesis that the ribosome came into being by chance. Even Jacques Monod, a Nobel prize-winner and well-known advocate of the theory of evolution, describes how protein synthesis cannot be reduced solely to information in nucleic acids:

The code [in DNA or RNA] is meaningless unless translated. The modern cell's translating machinery consists of at least 50 macromolecular components, which are themselves coded in DNA: the code cannot be translated otherwise than by products of translation themselves... When and how did this circle become closed? It is exceedingly difficult to imagine. ²⁰⁴

The genetic system requires the enzymes to read this code from the DNA, the mRNA to be manufac-


tured through the reading of these codes, the ribosome to which the mRNA with the code will go and bind to for production, a transporter RNA that carries the amino acids to be used in production to the ribosome, and the exceedingly complex enzymes that ensure the countless other intermediate processes in the same environment. Bear in mind that such a controlled environment needs to be completely isolated and also to contain all the requisite energy sources and raw materials, and the invalidity of the claims of chance can be seen only too clearly.

RIGHT-HANDED (DEXTRO) AMINO ACIDS



— See Left-Handed Amino Acids

RNA WORLD SCENARIO, THE

Asked how the first cell came into being, evolutionists since the early 20th century have offered various theories. The Russian biologist Alexander Oparin proposed the first evolutionist thesis on this subject, suggesting that proteins formed first with a number of random chemical reactions on the primeval Earth, and



The ribosome "reads" the messenger RNA and sets the amino acids out in accordance with the information it contains. The diagrams show val, cyc and ala amino acids set out by the ribosome and transporter RNA. All proteins in nature are produced in this sensitive manner. No protein has come into being by chance.



val

valine

cys

cysteine

ala

alanine

that these then combined together to give rise to the cell. In the 1970s, it was realized that even Oparin's most basic assumptions, which he made in the 1930s were false: In the *primitive world atmosphere* scenario, he had included the gasses methane and ammonia that would permit the emergence of organic molecules. Yet it was realized that the atmosphere at the time was not rich in methane and ammonia, but contained high levels of oxygen that would break down organic molecules. (See *The Primitive Earth*.)

This dealt a serious blow to the theory of molecular evolution. It meant that all the "primitive atmosphere" experiments, carried by evolutionists such as Miller, Fox and Ponnamperna, were invalid. For that reason, other evolutionist quests were launched in the 1980s, and the RNA World scenario was put forward. This suggested that rather than proteins, the RNA molecule containing protein information emerged first. According to this scenario—proposed in 1986 by the Harvard chemist Walter Gilbert—billions of years ago, an RNA molecule somehow capable of copying itself came into existence by chance. Later, under the influence of envi-

ronmental conditions, this RNA molecule suddenly began producing proteins. Later, when the need was felt to hide their information in a second molecule, the DNA molecule somehow emerged.

Instead of accounting for the beginning of life, this scenario—every stage of which is distinctly impossible and which is difficult to even imagine—made the problem even worse. It raised a number of insoluble questions:

1- Not even one of the nucleotides that comprise RNA can be accounted for in terms of chance. Then how did nucleotides come together in the appropriate sequence to give rise to DNA?

The evolutionist biologist John Horgan admits the impossibility of RNA forming by chance:

*As researchers continue to examine the RNA-World concept closely, more problems emerge. How did RNA initially arise? RNA and its components are difficult to synthesize in a laboratory under the best of conditions, much less under really plausible ones.*²⁰⁵

2- Even if we assume that RNA, consisting solely of a chain of nucleotides, did come into being by chance, how did it decide to copy itself? By what mechanism did it suc-

ceed in doing so? Where did it find the nucleotides it would use while copying itself?

The evolutionist biologists Gerald Joyce and Leslie Orgel state the hopelessness of the situation:

*Our discussion has focused on a straw man: the myth of a small RNA molecule that arises de novo and can replicate efficiently and with high fidelity under plausible prebiotic conditions. Not only is such a notion unrealistic in light of our current understanding of prebiotic chemistry, but it should strain the credulity of even an optimist's view of RNA's catalytic potential.*²⁰⁶

3- Even assuming that an RNA capable of copying itself did appear in the primeval world, and infinite amounts of all varieties of amino acids that the RNA needed were available in the environment—if all these impossibilities were somehow overcome, this is still not enough to form a single protein molecule. Because RNA is solely information about protein structure. Amino acids, on the other hand, are raw materials. Yet there is no mechanism here to produce protein. Viewing the existence of RNA as sufficient for protein production is as nonsensical as throwing the thousands of components of a car onto a blueprint and

expecting a car to assemble itself. This production cannot take place in the absence of a factory and workers.

Dr. Leslie Orgel, a well-known evolutionist biochemist and also known as one of the founding fathers of the 'RNA world' hypothesis, uses the term *scenario* for the chances of life beginning with RNA. Orgel sets out the features this RNA would need to possess, and the impossibility thereof, in an article titled "The Origin of Life on Earth," in the October 1994 edition of *American Scientist*:

*This scenario could have occurred, we noted, if prebiotic RNA had two properties not evident today: A capacity to replicate without the help of proteins and an ability to catalyze every step of protein synthesis.*²⁰⁷

As you can plainly see, only evolutionist imagination and prejudice could expect these two complex processes, which Orgel describes as indispensable, from a molecule like RNA. Scientific facts reveal that the RNA World thesis, a new version of the claim that life was born by chance, could never come true.

The image is a complex collage. At the top, a blue sky transitions into a landscape with a body of water, mountains, and a forested valley. A blue grid is superimposed over the entire scene. Various rectangular images are placed within the grid's intersections: a butterfly, a leopard print, a peacock, a parrot, a zebra, a penguin, a swan, a cat, a flamingo, and a toucan. The entire composition is enclosed in a thick, ornate orange border with a repeating circular pattern.

S-\$

SCHINDEWOLF, OTTO

Otto Schindewolf, a European paleontologist, is known for the "Hopeful Monster" theory he proposed in the 1930s.²⁰⁸ (See *The Hopeful Monster Fantasy*.)

Schindewolf suggested that living things evolved through sudden and giant mutations, rather than by the small step-by-step mutations advocated by neo-Darwinists. As an example of his theory, Schindewolf claimed that the first bird in history emerged from a reptile egg through a gross mutation—a giant, random mutation in its genetic structure.

According to the theory, certain large terrestrial animals might have suddenly turned into whales as a result of sudden and comprehensive changes. Schindewolf's fantastical theory was later adopted in the 1940s by the geneticist Richard Goldschmidt of Berkeley University. Yet so inconsistent was the theory that it was swiftly abandoned.²⁰⁹

SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS, THE (THE LAW OF ENTROPY)

The Second Law of Thermodynamics states that left to themselves and abandoned to natu-

ral conditions, all systems in the universe will move towards irregularity, disorder and corruption in direct relation to the passage of time. This is also known as the Law of Entropy. In physics, *entropy* is a measurement of the irregularity within a system. A system's passage from a regular organized and planned state to an irregular, disordered and unplanned one increases that system's entropy. This means that the more irregularity in a system, the higher its level of entropy.

This is something we all observe during the course of our daily lives. For example, if you leave a car in the desert and go back to it some months later, of course you can't expect it to have become more advanced and better maintained. On the contrary, you will find the tires have gone flat, the windows are cracked, the metalwork has rusted and the battery is dead.. Or if you leave your home to its own devices, you will see that it becomes untidier and dustier with every passing day. That process can be reversed only by conscious intervention—by your tidying and dusting it.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics, or the Law of Entropy, has been definitively proven by theory and experiment. Albert



If you abandon a car to natural conditions, it will age, rust and decay. In the same way, in the absence of a conscious order, all systems in the universe tend towards chaos. This is an inescapable law of nature.

Einstein, described it as the first law of all the sciences. In his book *Entropy: A World View*, the American scientist Jeremy Rifkin says:

*The Entropy Law will preside as the ruling paradigm over the next period of history. Albert Einstein said that it is the premier law of all science: Sir Arthur Eddington referred to it as the supreme metaphysical law of the entire universe.*²¹⁰

The Law of Entropy definitively invalidates the materialist view that the universe is an assembly of matter closed to all forms of supernatural

intervention. There is evident order in the universe, although the universe's own laws should work to corrupt that order. From this, two conclusions emerge:

1) The universe has not, as materialists suggest, existed for all time. Were that the case, the Second Law of Thermodynamics would long ago have done its work, and the universe would have become a homogeneous collection of matter with no order to it at all.

2) The claim that after the Big Bang, the universe took shape with

no supernatural intervention or control is also invalid. In the universe that initially emerged in the wake of the Big Bang, only chaos ruled. Yet the level of order in the universe increased, and the universe eventually attained its present state. Since this took place in violation of the law of

entropy, the universe must have been ordered by way of a supernatural creation.

The order in the universe reveals the existence of Allah, sublime ruler of the universe. The Nobel Prize-winning German physicist Max Planck describes this order:

You can not think of a high-end car that you find among trees to be the outcome of the randomly coming together of the various elements in the forest in millions of years. Since the sudden and perfect appearance of a complex structure is a sign that it is created by a conscious willpower.



*At all events we should say, in summing up, that, according to everything taught by the exact sciences about the immense realm of nature in which our tiny planet plays an insignificant role, a certain order prevails—one independent of the human mind. Yet, in so far as we are able to ascertain through our senses, this order can be formulated in terms of purposeful activity. There is evidence of an intelligent order of the universe.*²¹¹

Materialism, which maintains that the universe has existed for ever and has never been ordered in any way, is today in an impasse in the face of the universe's great equilibrium. The well-known British physicist Paul Davies says:

Everywhere we look in the Universe, from the far-flung galaxies to the deep-


est recesses of the atom, we encounter order. . . Central to the idea of a very special, orderly Universe is the concept of information. A highly structured system, displaying a great deal of organised activity, needs a lot of information to describe it. Alternatively, we may say that it contains much information.

*We are therefore presented with a curious question. If information and order always has a natural tendency to disappear, where did all the information that makes the world such a special place come from originally? The Universe is like a clock slowly running down. How did it get wound up in the first place?*²¹²

Einstein said that the order in the universe was something unexpected and stated that it needed to be regarded as a miracle:

Well, a priori one should expect that the world would be rendered lawful

In order for the energy in a car's fuel to be converted, there is a need for transmission systems and control mechanisms to operate them, is because energy entering a system from the outside is not enough to make that system an ordered, efficient one.



[obedient to law and order] only to the extent that we [human beings] intervene with our ordering intelligence... [But instead we find] in the objective world a high degree of order that we were a priori in no way authorized to expect. This is the "miracle" that is strengthened more and more with the development of our knowledge. ²¹³

The order in the universe, which contains such enormous information, was brought into being by a supreme Creator and Lord of the universe. To put it another way, Allah has created and ordered the entire universe.

"SELFISH GENE" THEORY, THE

The altruistic behavior seen in living things cannot be explained by evolutionists. (See **Altruism**.) For example, male and female penguins defend their offspring literally to the death. The male penguin keeps its young chick between its feet for an uninterrupted period of four months, eating nothing during that time. Meanwhile, the female penguin swims through the sea hunting for food for her offspring, and carries what she finds in her craw. Such altruistic behavior, of which a great many examples can be seen in na-



Male and female penguins defend their offspring literally to the death. . Such altruistic behavior, of which a great many examples can be seen in nature, undermines the fundamental premise of the theory of evolution.

ture, undermines the fundamental premise of the theory of evolution.

Indeed, the well-known evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould describes "the vexatious problem of altruism"²¹⁴ in nature. The evolutionist Gordon Rattray Taylor writes that the altruistic behavior in living things "has long presented a challenge for Darwinism,"²¹⁵ making it clear what a dilemma evolutionists face in the area. Nature contains instances of altruism and affection, which are completely non-material values, which deals a mortal blow to the materialist view that sees all of nature as random interactions of matter.

However, unwilling to admit the invalidity of evolutionary scenarios, some evolutionists came up with the so-called Selfish Gene Theory. According to this claim, whose leading proponent was Richard Dawkins, one of the most avid present-day proponents of evolution, behavior that appears to be altruistic actually stems from selfishness, in exhibiting altruistic behavior, animals are actually thinking of preserving their genes rather than of helping another living thing. In sacrificing her own life for that of her offspring, a mother is actually protecting her own genes. If her off-

spring survive, there will be a greater chance of her genes being handed on to the subsequent generations.

According to this perspective, all living things, human beings included, are gene machines. And every living thing's most important task is to be able to hand on its genes to later generations.

Evolutionists say that living things are programmed to continue their own bloodlines and to wish to pass on their genes, and so behave in a manner appropriate to that programming. The following quote is an example of the classic evolutionist account of animal behavior:

*What could account for potentially self-destructive behavior? At least some altruistic acts are reputed to stem from so-called selfish genes. Parents that work themselves ragged to feed insatiable offspring or go without food as long as a predator is near are probably carrying out genetically programmed behavior—behavior that increases the chances of parental genes within the offspring being passed on to yet another generation. These innate, instinctive responses to predators may seem "purposeful" to the human observer, but in fact they are behavioral programs triggered by sights, sounds, odors, and other cues.*²¹⁶

Consequently, evolutionists say

that at first sight, the behavior of living things may appear to be deliberate. But in fact, living things engage in such behavior unconsciously, not in a manner directed towards a particular objective, but because they are programmed to do so. Yet the genes proposed as the source of this programming consist of coded packages of information, with no ability to think. Therefore, if an animal's genes possess an instruction that predisposes it to altruistic behavior, then the source of that instruction cannot be the gene itself. That a living thing is programmed to engage in altruistic behavior to transmit its genes on to subsequent generations clearly shows the existence of a Power possessed of reason and knowledge to program those genes in such a way, and therefore clearly demonstrates the existence of Allah.

SELF-ORDERING ERROR, THE

Evolutionist claims and concepts are generally employed in a deceptive manner. One of these misrepresentations is the deliberate confusion of the concepts of "ordered" and "organized."

To clarify this, imagine a long,

straight stretch of sand along the seaside. The wind produces sand dunes large and small. This is an *ordering* process. Yet that same wind cannot make a sandcastle. If you see a sandcastle, you can be sure that somebody has made it, because a castle is an *organized* system, possessing information organized in a specific form. It has been made by someone with advanced planning.

Complex and organized systems can never come about through natural processes. Even if simple ordering does occur from time to time, this never exceeds certain specific bounds.

Yet evolutionists say that self-ordering phenomena emerging spontaneously as a result of natural process are significant evidence of evolution and are examples of *self-organization*. (See ***The Self-Organization Nonsense***.) They then suggest that living systems can come into being as a result of natural phenomena and chemical reactions.

But while ordered systems feature simple sequences and repeated structures, organized systems contain exceedingly complex and inter-related structures and processes. Consciousness, information and organization are essential for them to

emerge. This important difference is described by the evolutionist scientist Jeffrey Wicken:

"Organized" systems are to be carefully distinguished from "ordered" systems. Neither kind of system is "random," but whereas ordered systems are generated according to simple algorithms and therefore lack complexity, organized systems must be assembled element by element according to an external "wiring diagram" with a high information content . . . Organization, then, is functional complexity and carries information. ²¹⁷

In their book *The Mystery of Life's Origin*, the American scientists Thaxton, Bradley and Olsen clarify the issue:

The widespread recognition of the severe improbability that self-replicating organisms could have formed from purely random interactions has led to a great deal of speculation—speculation that some organizing principle must have been involved. In the company of many others, Crick has considered that the neo-Darwinian mechanism of natural selection might provide the answer. An entity capable of self-replication is necessary, however, before natural selection can operate. Only then could changes result via mutations and environmental pressures which might in turn bring about the dominance of entities with the greatest

probabilities of survival and reproduction.

The weakest point in this explanation of life's origin is the great complexity of the initial entity which must form, apparently by random fluctuations, before natural selection can take over. ²¹⁸

"SELF-ORGANIZATION" NONSENSE, THE

Evolutionists use the concept of *self-organization* to claim that inanimate matter can so organize itself as to produce a living entity. This belief flagrantly ignores all experiments and observations that have shown that matter possesses no such ability. Sir Fred Hoyle, the famous British astronomer and mathematician, describes how matter cannot spontaneously give rise to life with an example:

To press the matter further, if there were a basic principle of matter which somehow drove organic systems toward life, its existence should easily be demonstrable in the laboratory. One could, for instance, take a swimming [pool] to represent the primordial soup. Fill it with any chemicals of a non-biological nature you please. Pump any gases over it, or through it, you please, and shine any kind of radiation on it that takes your fancy. Let the experi-



The two famous advocates of the punctuated model of evolution; Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge.

*ment proceed for a year and see how many of those [vital] 2,000 enzymes have appeared ... I will give the answer, and so save the time and trouble and expense of actually doing the experiment. You would find nothing at all, except possibly for a tarry sludge composed of amino acids and other simple organic chemicals.*²¹⁹

The evolutionist biologist Andrew Scott admits the same thing:

Take some matter, heat while stirring and wait. That is the modern version of Genesis. The "fundamental" forces of gravity, electromagnetism and the strong and weak nuclear forces are presumed to have done the rest . . . But how much of this neat tale is firmly established, and how much remains hopeful speculation? In truth, the

*mechanism of almost every major step, from chemical precursors up to the first recognizable cells, is the subject of either controversy or complete bewilderment.*²²⁰

Yet evolutionists insist on advocating such an unscientific scenario as the self-organization of matter. Their motive for this lies hidden in materialist philosophy, the basis of the theory of evolution. Materialist philosophy, accepting only the existence of matter, therefore must produce an explanation for life based on matter alone. The theory of evolution was born of that need and, no matter how much it may violate scientific findings, it is advocated solely for the sake of that requirement.

Robert Shapiro, a professor of chemistry and DNA expert from

New York University, describes the materialist dogma underpinning evolutionists' belief in matter organizing itself it:

Another evolutionary principle is therefore needed to take us across the gap from mixtures of simple natural chemicals to the first effective replicator [DNA or RNA]. This principle has not yet been described in detail or demonstrated, but it is anticipated, and given names such as "chemical evolution" and "self-organization of matter." The existence of the principle is taken for granted in the philosophy of dialectical materialism, as applied to the origin of life by Alexander Oparin.

221

the extinct amphibian species *Seymouria*. However, it then emerged that *Seymouria* could not be an intermediate form, since reptiles were living on Earth 30 million years before *Seymouria* first appeared. The oldest *Seymouria* fossils date back to the Lower Permian stratum of 280 million years ago. Yet *Hylonomus*, the oldest known reptile species (310 million years old) and *Paleothyris* (300 million years old) have both been found in Early Pennsylvanian strata, dating back 330 to 315 million years.²²²

It is of course impossible for the ancestor of reptiles to have lived long after reptiles themselves.

SEYMOURIA

The creature that was long proposed as the ancestor of reptiles was

SHAPIRO, ROBERT

Robert Shapiro, a New York



Evolutionists once claimed that the *Seymouria* fossil above was an intermediate form between amphibians and reptiles. According to this scenario, *Seymouria* was the primitive ancestor of reptiles. But subsequent fossil discoveries proved that reptiles were living on Earth 30 million years before *Seymouria*. This meant that evolutionists were forced to withdraw their claims regarding *Seymouria*.



Robert Shapiro

University professor of chemistry and DNA expert, calculated the probability of the 2,000 types of proteins in a simple bacterium coming into existence by chance. (The human cell contains around 200,000 different types of proteins. .) The figure obtained is a probability of 1 in $10^{40,000}$.²²³ (This is the astronomical figure of 1 followed by 40,000 zeroes.)

A bacterium's complexity refutes chance and clearly points to the existence of a Creator. But this evident truth is still denied because of blind devotion to the materialist world view. Robert Shapiro, a researcher into the origin of life, reveals this irrational materialist stance in these words:

*Similarly, the existence of bacteria and other living beings, all of which are much more complex than a watch, implies the existence of a creator, as only a higher being could design creatures so fit for their function. We will not take this escape route in our book, for we are committed to seeking an answer within the realm of science . . . We must look for another solution if we wish to remain within science.*²²⁴


SICKLE CELL ANEMIA

The sole example of a "useful mutation" that evolutionist biologists refer to is the disease sickle cell anemia, in which the hemoglobin molecule responsible for transporting oxygen becomes deformed and changes shape. As a result, its ability to transport oxygen is seriously impaired.

Victims of sickle cell anemia suffer increasing respiratory difficulties. Yet this example of mutation, discussed under blood diseases in medical textbooks, is regarded as advantageous by some evolutionist biologists.

Sufferers from this disease enjoy a partial immunity to malaria, and this is described as an evolutionary adaptation. Using that kind of inconsistent logic, one could say that the genetically lame were spared being killed in traffic accidents since they could not walk, and that lameness is a useful genetic trait..

It is clear that mutations have only destructive effects. Pierre Paul Grassé, former president of the French Academy of Sciences, compares mutations to spelling mistakes during the copying of a written text. Like spelling mistakes, mutations add no further information, but rath-



The shape and function of red blood cells are distorted in sickle cell anemia. Their ability to transport oxygen is thus impaired.

er damage what is already there. Grassé goes on to say:

*Mutations, in time, occur incoherently. They are not complementary to one another, nor are they cumulative in successive generations toward a given direction. They modify what preexists, but they do so in disorder, no matter how . . . As soon as some disorder, even slight, appears in an organized being, sickness, then death follow. There is no possible compromise between the phenomenon of life and anarchy [disorder].*²²⁵

SINGLE CELL TO MULTI-CELL TRANSITION MYTH, THE

According to the evolutionist sce-

nario, primitive single-celled organisms that came into existence by chance were the original ancestors of all living things. Over the course of time, these organisms that formed multiplied and gave rise to multi-celled organisms.

According to evolutionists, this was the first step in the passage from one cell to many. Organisms at this stage of development became genuinely multi-cellular with the division of labor among cells in their colony. Cells lost the ability to exist independently once they gave rise to multi-cellular organisms.

The scenario continues thus: . At this stage of the evolutionary process, as the need to act independently



Despite being very small, bacteria possess exceedingly complex features, in terms of both structure and function.

decreased—or as their chances of survival improved by living as a group—the differences between cells grew more distinct. For whatever reason, cells continued differentiating and increasing their division of labor, giving rise to increasingly multicellular organisms.

At the beginning of this fantastical view lie single-celled organisms that are regarded as primitive and simple. Yet single-celled organisms are not simple life forms, as evolutionists suggest, but neither do they have the consciousness with which to make decisions and assume new duties. Single-celled organisms may have a simpler structure than multicellular ones, but by itself is not evidence that they are primitive. Indeed, although a single-celled bacterium still possesses a complexity that amazes those who investigate it.

Sir James Gray, the well-known British zoologist, says this about the bacteria that Darwinists described as "simple":

A bacterium is far more complex than any inanimate system known to man. There is not a laboratory in the world which can compete with the biochemical activity of the smallest living organism. ²²⁶

The evolutionist James A. Shapiro admits that these highly detailed characteristics features make bacteria a complex form of life:

Although bacteria are tiny, they display biochemical, structural and behavioral complexities that outstrip scientific description. In keeping with the current microelectronics revolution, it may make more sense to equate their size with sophistication rather than with simplicity. . . ²²⁷

SOCIAL DARWINISM

One of the theory of evolution's most basic claims is that the development of living things is based on a struggle for survival. According to Darwin, there was a ruthless eternal conflict in nature. The strong always vanquished the weak, thanks to which progress became possible. The subtitle to his book *On The Origin of Species* summed up his view: *By Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*.

Darwin's source of inspiration on this subject was the British economist Thomas Malthus's book *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, which implied a rather gloomy future for the human race. Malthus calculated that, left to itself, the human population would grow very fast, doubling every 25 years. However, food resources could not increase at nearly that quickly. The human race would therefore face a constant shortage of food. The main factors keeping population under control were such disasters as war, famine and disease. In short, some people would have to die while others lived. Survival meant constant war.

Darwin admitted that he had drawn the idea of the struggle for

survival in nature from Malthus:

In October, 1838, that is, fifteen months after I had begun my systematic inquiry, I happened to read for amusement Malthus on population, and being well prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence which everywhere goes on from long continuous observation of the habits of animals and plants, it at once struck me that under these circumstances, favourable variations would tend to be preserved and unfavourable ones to be destroyed. The result of this would be the formation of new species. Here, then, I had at last got a theory by which to work. ²²⁸

Influenced by Malthus, Darwin applied this view to the whole of nature and suggested that in this conflict, the strongest and fittest would survive. Darwin's claim covered all plants, animals and human beings. Moreover, he particularly emphasized that the struggle for survival was a legitimate, unchanging law. He encouraged people to abandon their religious beliefs by denying creation, and thus targeted all those moral criteria that might stand in the way of the ruthless struggle for survival.

For that reason, Darwin's theory acquired a great deal of support from the moment he announced it—first from the established order in



These photos reflect a very small part of the tragedies inflicted on humanity by Social Darwinism. Conflicts in the name of racism, fascism, communism or imperialism assumed a scientific guise with Social Darwinism. Conflict was claimed to exist among animals and nature, and was regarded as being inherent in human beings, too. Powerful states used this flawed logic and the slogans of Darwinism to oppress weaker nations and try to eliminate them.



Britain, and then from that in the wider Western world. The imperialists, capitalists and other materialists delighted in a theory that scientifically justified the political and social order they had established, and lost no time in supporting it.

In a very short time, the theory of evolution became the sole criterion in every field of concern to human societies, from sociology to history and from psychology to politics. The basic idea in all spheres was the slogan "survival of the fittest," and nations, political parties, administrations, businesses and individuals all began behaving in light of them. Since the ideologies that dominated society had lined up behind Darwinism, open and covert Darwinist propaganda appeared in all fields, from education to art and from politics to history.

Attempts were made to link everything to Darwinism and to account for everything in Darwinian terms. As a result, even if people were ignorant of Darwinism, societies that lived the kind of life it foresaw began to emerge.

Darwin himself approved moral conceptions based on evolution and their application to the social sciences. In a letter to H. Thiel written in 1869, he wrote:

*You will readily believe how much interested I am in observing that you apply to moral and social questions analogous views to those which I have used in regard to the modification of species. It did not occur to me formerly that my views could be extended to such widely different, and most important, subjects.*²²⁹

With the adoption of the idea that the conflicts in nature also existed in human societies, in the forms of racism, fascism, communism and imperialism, the powerful nations' attempts to crush those they regarded as weaker acquired a supposedly scientific justification. Those who carried out barbaric slaughter, who began wars, who denigrated others because of their race, who caused businesses to close due to unfair competition, and those who refused help the poor were now not to be criticized or restrained—because they acted in conformity with a law of nature.

This new, supposedly scientific theory assumed the name of Social Darwinism.

The American paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould, one of the leading present-day advocates of the theory of evolution, admits as much:

Subsequent arguments for slavery, colonialism, racial differences, class

struggles, and sex roles would go forth primarily under the banner of science.

230

In his book *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, the professor of history Jacques Barzun analyzes the scientific, sociological, and cultural reasons for the terrible moral collapse in the modern world. These comments in Barzun's book are noteworthy in terms of Darwinism's impact on the world:

... in every European country between 1870 and 1914 there was a war party demanding armaments, an individualist party demanding ruthless competition, an imperialist party demanding a free hand over backward peoples, a socialist party demanding the conquest of power, and a racist party demanding internal purges against aliens—all of them, when appeals to greed and glory failed, or even before, invoked Spencer and Darwin, which was to say, science incarnate . . . Race was biological, it was sociological, it was Darwinian. ²³¹

Despite being an evolutionist, Robert Wright, author of *The Moral Animal*, summarizes the disasters that the theory of evolution inflicted on the mankind:

Evolutionary theory, after all, has a long and largely sordid history of application to human affairs. After being

mingled with political philosophy around the turn of the century to form the vague ideology known as "social Darwinism," it played into the hands of racists, fascists, and the most heartless sort of capitalists. ²³²

SPECIATION

—See Allopatric Isolation.

SPENCER, HERBERT

Herbert Spencer was the main theoretician of Social Darwinism, who adapted Darwin's principles to the life of society. He wrote that if someone was poor, that was his own fault: No one should help anyone else to improve themselves. If someone is rich, even if he had acquired that wealth immorally, that was due to his own talent. Therefore, while the poor are eliminated, the rich live on. This view dominates just about all modern societies, and is the essence of capitalist morality. (*See Social Darwinism.*)

Spencer, an advocate of that morality, completed his study entitled *Social Statistics* in 1850. In this he opposed all forms of state assistance, health-protection measures, state schools and compulsory vaccinations. That was because, in the view

of Social Darwinism, the social order was based on the principle of the survival of the fittest. Supporting the weak and keeping them alive to propagate was a violation of that principle. The rich were rich because they were more fit, and some nations governed others because they were superior. Some nations had come under the yoke of others because the latter were more intelligent.

Spencer strongly advocated the adaptation of this thesis to human societies, summing up the Social Darwinist view in these words:

If they are sufficiently complete to live, they do live, and it is well they should live. If they are not sufficiently complete to live, they die, and it is best they should die. ²³³

SPONTANEOUS GENERATION

—See Abiogenesis.

STASIS

The fossil record shows that living species emerged in a single moment with all their different structures fully formed, and that they remained unchanged over very long geological periods of time.

Had any evolution actually taken place, then living things would have appeared on Earth through gradual changes and should have continued to change. Yet the fossil records demonstrate the exact opposite. Different living classes emerged suddenly with no ancestors even remotely resembling them and remained in a state of stasis, undergoing no change at all, for hundreds of millions of years.

STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL, THE

The fundamental assumption of the theory of natural selection is that every living thing thinks only of itself in the struggle to the death. In proposing this idea, Darwin was influenced by the theories of Thomas Robert Malthus, a British economist. Malthus said that food resources increased arithmetically, while the human population increased geometrically—for which reason it was inevitable that humans should wage a constant fight for survival. Darwin applied this concept to nature and claimed that the result of this struggle was natural selection.

Subsequent research, however, showed that there was no such struggle for survival of the kind that

Darwin had postulated. Lengthy studies on animal populations in the 1960s and '70s by the British zoologist Wynne-Edwards showed that animal communities balanced their populations in very interesting ways, to prevent competition for food.

Animal communities generally regulate their populations in accordance with the available food supplies. Population is controlled not by such "eliminators of the unfit" as starvation and epidemic diseases, but by control mechanisms instinctively present in animals. In other words, animals stabilized their populations not by the life-or-death competition to the death postulated by Darwin, but by restricting their own reproduction.²³⁴

Even plants exhibited signs of self-regulation, rather than competition through natural selection as proposed by Darwin. Observations by the botanist A.D. Bradshaw proved that as plants multiplied, they behaved according to their density in the area they grew in—and that as plant numbers increased, reproduced declined.²³⁵

In addition, the examples of altruism encountered in such communities as ants and bees represent a model that is the exact opposite of

Darwin's concept of a struggle for survival. (See **Altruism.**)

Some recent research has revealed that altruistic behavior can be found even in bacteria. These organisms have no brain or nervous system, and thus lack any ability to think. Yet when invaded by viruses, they commit suicide in order to protect other bacteria.²³⁶

These examples invalidate the concept of the struggle for survival, which is the fundamental hypothesis of natural selection. (See **Malthus, Thomas** and **Social Darwinism.**)

SYNTHETIC EVOLUTION THEORY, THE

—See Neo-Darwinism Comedy, The.

SYSTEMATIC

—See Taxonomy.



TAUNG CHILD FOSSIL, THE

All *Australopithecus* fossils have been unearthed in the southern part of the African continent. The reason why this species has been given the name *Australopithecus*, meaning "South African ape," is that these animals have features very similar to those of present-day apes.

The first fossils claimed to belong to this species were found in a coal mine in the Taung region of South Africa in 1924. The first fossil described as *Australopithecus* consisted of a young ape's face and lower jaw bones, and a skull of 410 cubic centimeters in volume. The discoverers of the fossil took it to Raymond Dart, an anthropologist.

Based on the skull's fine structure and thinking that its teeth resembled human teeth, Dr. Dart suggested that the fossil belonged to a hominid. Shortly afterwards, he published an article in *Nature* magazine titled "*Australopithecus*:"



The Taung Child fossil

Ape-Man in South Africa." Scientists who said that the fossil actually belonged to a chimpanzee did not take Dart seriously. Yet he persisted with the idea that the fossil was a hominid and convinced Dr. Robert Bloom, a famous physicist, of this, devoting the rest of his life to finding support for the new species he had found. Even then, scientific circles began jokingly referring to the fossil he had found as "Dart's baby." Evolutionists then lined up behind the fossil, inventing a new species to which they had given the name *Australopithecus*. The first fossil discovered was given the full name *Australopithecus africanus*.

Following the discovery of this

fossil, which was given

the nickname

of "the Taung

Child" because

it was thought

to belong to a

young individual,

other paleontologists—espe-

cially the Leakey

family—stepped

up their own re-

search. In the

1950s, other fossils

regarded as be-

longing to

Australopithecus were found in digs financed by *National Geographic* magazine in Kromdraai, Swartkrans and Makapansgat in South Africa. Some of these ape fossils had a coarser structure, while others were smaller and finer. The coarser ones were bulkier and heavier than the others, with a larger bottom jaw and bony protrusions over the eyebrows being their most distinguishing features.

Although these are all typical examples of gender differences between modern-day male and female monkeys, scientists persisted in regarding them as separate species.

After Dart presented the fossil given the name *Australopithecus africanus*, he received substantial criticism from scientists. Arthur Keith, one of the most prominent anatomists to comment on the fossil, said:

*[Dart's] claim is preposterous, the skull is that of a young anthropoid ape . . . and showing so many points of affinity with the two living African anthropoids, the gorilla and chimpanzee, that there cannot be a moment's hesitation in placing the fossil form in this living group.*²³⁷

According to evolutionists, what *Australopithecines* shared with human beings was they had left the trees and adapted to bipedalism (walking upright). Dart concluded

that the Taung Child he had found was able to walk on two legs, since according to him, that part of the spinal cord known as the magnum was further back than that in humans, but further forward than in monkeys. On the basis of this, Dart then claimed that the animal was capable of standing on its two hind legs. This theory was not accepted by scientists at the time, but was supported until the 1950s. However, no part of the skeleton that might permit an estimation of bipedalism was available. The only specimens consisted of the skull and a few fragmented thigh, hip and foot bones. Yet evolutionists still insisted on their claims regarding bipedalism.

Lord Solly Zuckerman had carried out perhaps the most detailed studies of the *Australopithecines* family. Despite being an evolutionist, Zuckerman thought that *Australopithecus* was nothing more than an ape. Together with a four-member team, Zuckerman used the most advanced methods of anatomical investigation, which began in 1954 and lasted for several years. In the wake of these investigations, he declared that these creatures had not walked on two legs and were not an intermediate form between humans and apes. The concluding report by

Zuckerman and his team read:

*For my own part, the anatomical basis for the claim that the Australopithecines walked and ran upright like man is so much more flimsy than the evidence which points to the conclusion that their gait was some variant of what one sees in subhuman Primates, that it remains unacceptable.*²³⁸

These judgments, published by Zuckerman in the mid-1950s, were confirmed by subsequent researchers. Dean Falk, a specialist in neuro-anatomy, declared that the Taung skull belonged to a young monkey. "In his 1975 article, Dart had claimed that the brain of Taung was human-like. As it turned out, he was wrong about that. . . . Taung's humanlike features were overemphasized," claimed Falk, who went on to say:

*Like humans, [apes and monkeys] go through stages as they grow up. In his analysis of Taung, Dart did not fully appreciate that infant apes have not had time to develop features of the skull, such as thickened eyebrow ridges or attachment areas for heavy neck muscles, that set adult apes apart from human. Apparently he did not carefully consider the possibility that Taung's rounded forehead or the inferred position of the spinal cord might be due to the immaturity of the apelike specimen rather than to its resemblance to humans.*²³⁹

The protrusions over the eyebrows, the most important feature that led to *Australopithecus africanus* being described as a hominid, can be seen in young gorillas today. From all this, it appears that the skull ascribed to *Australopithecus africanus* by evolutionists did not belong to an ancestor of man but in all probability, to a young ape.

TAXONOMY

Biologists divide living things into specific classes. This classification, known as *taxonomy*, dates back to Carolus Linnaeus in the 18th century. The classification system that Linnaeus constructed has been expanded and revised, but is still in use today.

This system of classification contains hierarchical categories. Living things are first divided into kingdoms, such as the animal and plant kingdoms. Kingdoms are then subdivided into phyla, which are then further subdivided. Classification takes the following form, in descending order:

- kingdom
- phylum (*plural* phyla)
- class
- order
- family

genus (*plural* genera)

species

Most biologists today accept the existence of five separate kingdoms. In addition to the plant and animal kingdoms, they regard fungi, monera (single-celled organisms with no cell nucleus, such as bacteria) and protista (cells with a nucleus, such as algae) as separate kingdoms.

The most important of these is without doubt that animal kingdom. The major divisions within the animal kingdom are its various phyla. In the classification of these phyla, their differing bodily structures are considered. Arthropods, for example, constitute a separate phylum, and all the creatures within that phylum have a similar body plan. The phylum known as Chordata consists of creatures with a central nervous system. All the animals familiar to us such as fish, birds, reptiles and mammals are included in the vertebrate category, a subdivision of the Chordata.

TETRAPOD FINGER STRUCTURE, THE

—See, Five Digit Homology.

THEORY

A hypothesis that can be supported with large numbers of observations and experiments is known as a *theory*. To put it another way, a theory is a deep-rooted hypothesis. However, although a theory is proven with experiments, it may also be disproved.

For example, the claim that "The atom is the smallest known component of matter," known as Dalton's atomic theory, today has lost all validity.²⁴⁰ Advances in science and technology have revealed the existence of much smaller particles than the atom and even the proton, such as the quark.

A scientific theory is an attempt to explain certain phenomena occurring in nature. A frequently occurring phenomenon may be explained in terms of a *theory*, a fact, or a law. Gravity, example, is a fact. Even if we cannot perceive gravity directly, we can still see its effect when we drop something. There is also a theory of gravity that answers the question of how this takes place. Even if we do not know exactly how gravity works, there are theories that seek to account for it. The *law of gravity* formulated by Isaac Newton is one such.

In summary, a scientific fact is an observable natural law, and a scientific theory is a mathematical description of how a scientific law works.

The first and most important requirement of empirical (experimental) science is that the object or phenomenon we wish to investigate should be observable. The second condition is that the object or phenomenon should be repeatable. Any observable and repeatable event must be capable of being tested. This enables us to determine whether or not an experiment validates a theory. If the explanation that someone postulates regarding a phenomenon is one that cannot be tested or validated, then this is not a theory, but a belief.²⁴¹

Evolutionists say that the main evolutionary changes take place very slowly, or so rarely that people cannot observe them during their lifetimes. According to the evolutionist Theodosius Dobzhansky, even when evolutionary changes occur, they are events that by nature are rare, unrepeatable and irreversible. Paul Ehrlich, a well-known evolutionist, maintains that the theory of evolution cannot be refuted by any observation, for which reason it needs to be regarded as being out-

side the scope of empirical science.²⁴²

On the other hand, by suggesting that evolution takes place in two ways—observable micro-evolution and unobservable macro-evolution—evolutionists attempt to portray this imaginary evolutionary process as a scientific fact. (See **The Invalidity of Micro-Evolution and The Macro-Evolution Myth.**) According to evolutionists, macro-evolution is the process of infinite variation necessary for reptiles to turn into birds, or apes into human beings. Yet nobody has ever observed this happening.²⁴³

Micro-evolution, on the other hand, again according to evolutionists, is a limited process of variation of a specific species that we can observe and that produces divergence. However, the changes postulated as micro-evolution cannot produce a new species or a new characteristic. Therefore, they are not, as is claimed, mechanisms with any evolutionary power. In addition, micro-evolution is raised in order to imply that it is a dorm of variation that gives rise to macro-evolution. (See **Variation.**) This is mere conjecture regarding a phenomenon that cannot be observed and which lacks any evidence.

Evolution cannot be observed

and cannot be repeated, and for these reasons, is therefore not a scientific fact or theory. Neither is it an evident scientific fact, as some circles imagine or as they seek to portray it.²⁴⁴ On the contrary, when the theory of evolution is compared with scientific findings, a great contradiction emerges. In terms of the origin of life, population genetics, comparative anatomy, paleontology and biochemical systems, the theory of evolution is in a state of crisis, as the famous biochemist Michael Denton puts it.²⁴⁵


THEROPOD DINOSAURS

The theory of evolution claims that birds evolved from a small, carnivorous reptile known as the theropod dinosaur. In fact, however, a comparison of birds and reptiles shows that these classes are very different from one another and that no evolution can have taken place between them. (See *The Origin of Birds*.)

An examination of the anatomies and fossil records of birds and reptiles also shows no evidence that evolution ever happened. In an article titled "Demise of the 'Birds Are Dinosaurs' Theory," the American biologist Richard L. Deem writes:

*The results of the recent studies show that the hands of the theropod dinosaurs are derived from digits I, II, and III, whereas the wings of birds, although they look alike in terms of structure, are derived from digits II, III, and IV . . . The second study shows that the theropod dinosaurs did not possess the correct skeletal structure or lung structure to have evolved into birds. The evolution of theropods into birds would have required the introduction of a serious handicap (a hole in their diaphragm), which would have severely limited their ability to breathe. As Dr. Ruben said, such a debilitating mutation "seems unlikely to have been of any selective advantage."*²⁴⁶

There are other problems regarding the "Birds Are Dinosaurs" theory. In comparison with *Archaeopteryx*, theropods' front legs are very small in relation to their bodies. (See *Archaeopteryx*.) Bearing in mind the body weight of these animals, the development of any proto-wing appears impossible. The majority of theropod dinosaurs have no semilunatic wrist bone (which is found in birds), and possess other wrist components that are absent in *Archaeopteryx*. In all theropods, the VI nerves leave the skull from the side, together with various other nerves. In birds, however, the same nerves leave the skull through a



hole, which is unique to them, in the front of the skull. Another problem is that a great many theropods emerged after *Archaeopteryx*.²⁴⁷

Another major distinguishing feature between theropod dinosaurs and birds is the structure of these dinosaurs' hip bones. Dinosaurs are divided into two kinds, depending on their hip bone structure: *Saurischian* (with reptile-like hip bones) and *Ornithischian* (with bird-like hip bones). In members of the Ornithischian group, the hip bones really do closely resemble those of birds, hence their name. However, in other respects they bear no resemblance to birds whatsoever. For that reason, evolutionists are forced to regard Saurischian dinosaurs (those with reptile-like hip bones), which include the theropods, as the ancestors of

It is impossible for birds to have evolved from theropod dinosaurs, because there is no mechanism capable of overcoming the enormous differences between the two life forms.



It is impossible for birds to have evolved from theropod dinosaurs, and there is no mechanism to support such an illusory claim.

birds. Yet as can be seen from their description, the hip bone structure in these dinosaurs bears absolutely no resemblance to that in birds.²⁴⁸

In short, it is impossible for birds to have evolved from theropod dinosaurs, because no mechanism exists that could possibly overcome the enormous differences between the two classes.

TRANSITION FROM JUNGLE TO OPEN SAVANNA MYTH, THE

Since the science of genetics and the laws of heredity were not fully known in the 19th century, Darwin and the early evolutionists who followed him regarded bipedalism as something easy to account for. The most popular theory was that apes

living in the African savanna grew more upright in order to be able to see over the surrounding grasses.²⁴⁹ However, it did not take long to realize that this Lamarckist theory was completely wrong.

Modern-day evolutionists have only a single thesis with which they seek to account for the origin of bipedalism. According to the theory of transition from jungle to open spaces,, the ancestors of humans and apes once lived together in the jungle. Due to jungle shrinking or for some other reason, some of them moved over to open plains, and bipedalism was born as a result of adaptation. Both the apes in the trees and the bipedal human beings began evolving in their own separate directions.

When examined, however, this thesis, dreamed up under the logic of "making the best of a bad job," is seen to be just like its predecessors, very far from being able to account for bipedalism. It is impossible at the molecular level for there to be such an adaptation. Even if such a thing is assumed to have taken place, there is no evidence of it in the fossil record. Moreover, according to this theory, the East African jungles must have begun shrinking 10 to 15 million years ago. Yet research carried out

proves the exact opposite, and no such development ever took place in East Africa.²⁵⁰ The plants observed in the region have remained unchanged for millions of years. In short, the transition from jungle to the open plains never happened.

Even when considered in logical terms, the theory in question about the origin of bipedalism is unacceptable. In the event of trees disappearing, the most natural course would be for apes to migrate to another region, or be wiped out with the elimination of their natural habitat. There is no basis for the theory that monkeys adapted to living on the ground.

Uluğ Nutku, who holds evolutionist views, describes why the account based on the shrinking of the jungles is insufficient:

It may be suggested that the shrinking of the jungles was the factor that initiated the phenomenon of humanization. This is a palaeontological fact. Napier's thesis is compatible with this, but it leaves out the following question: While one animal species was leaving the jungle and setting out on the path to becoming human, why did its closest relative, the ape, remain in the jungle? The less speculation, the harder it is to find an answer. The answer given by Hermann Klaatsch, in the early part of the century, when an-

thropology was in its infancy, was very interesting. According to Klaatsch, hominid apes also attempted to become human, but theirs was 'an unfortunate endeavour.' They were unable to rise up in the process of evolution, and withdrew into the 'protective darkness of the jungles.' But then the question of 'Why were apes unsuccessful?' comes to mind.²⁵¹

There were a great many other questions apart from "Why were apes unsuccessful?", and they are all unanswered

TRANSITION FROM LAND TO AIR MYTH, THE

Since evolutionists believe that birds evolved in some way, they claim that they are descended from reptiles. One of the theories they propose to account for the origin of flight is that reptiles developed wings while attempting to catch flies. In fact, however, birds have totally different structures from those in terrestrial animals. No physical mechanism can be accounted for in terms of gradual evolution.

First of all, the flawless structure of the wing, the evolutionary main distinguishing feature of birds, represents a major dilemma for evolutionists. The question of how the wing could have developed as the

result of consecutive random mutations is one that evolutionists cannot answer. Evolution is unable to explain how a reptile's front legs could have turned into wings as the result of some mutation arising in its genes. No new organ can form as the result of mutations, and any reptile would be naturally disadvantaged if its forelegs lost functionality. (See *The Origin of Wings* and *The Origin of Flight*.)

In addition, simply possessing wings is not enough to turn a terrestrial animal into a bird. Land dwellers lack many of the structural mechanisms that birds use to fly. For example, avian bones are much lighter than those of terrestrial creatures. Their lungs have a wholly different structure and function. Birds have different muscular and skeletal structures, as well as far more specialized heart and circulatory systems—mechanisms that cannot form gradually, being added to one another.

Evolutionists who maintain that dinosaurs developed wings while chasing flies cannot explain how those flies developed wings in the first place. Yet according to their own claims, the flies' wings in their most complex forms must have come into being through various

mutations. This clearly demonstrates that the claims of evolutionists are simply fictional. In addition, no fossil record confirms this unscientific tale. There are thousands of perfectly formed bird fossils, but not a single example of bird-like creatures, with half-developed wings, has ever been found.


TRANSITION FROM SEA TO LAND THESIS, THE

—See *Transition from Water to Land Dilemma, The*.

TRANSITION FROM WATER TO LAND DILEMMA, THE

According to the theory of evolution, life began in the seas, and the first advanced vertebrate animals were fish. Again according to the theory, these fish began to move toward dry land and in some way, came to use feet instead of fins and lungs instead of gills!

Many books on evolution never consider the *how* of this major claim, whose baselessness is glossed over in most scientific textbooks in some summary like ". . . and living things moved from the water to dry land."



**imaginary
transition from
dinosaurs to
birds**

FALSE

**imaginary
transition to
winged dinosaurs**

tempts for millions of years, the end result would always be the same: All the fish would die. No organ as complex as the lung can emerge suddenly, by way of mutation. Yet a half-lung would serve no purpose at all.

Both fossil findings and physiological studies totally disprove the claim that fish are the ancestors of terrestrial animals. The huge anatomical and physiological differences between marine and terrestrial animals cannot possibly be bridged by gradual evolution based on chance. Among the most evident of these differences:

1) *Weight bearing*: Marine creatures do not face the problem of having to support their own weight, so their bodily structures are not directed towards such a function. Those living on land, however, expend 40% of their energy just in moving around. Any water dweller about to pass onto dry land needs to develop new muscles and a new skeletal structure to meet that need—but it is impossible for such complex structures to form through random mutations.


Evolutionists imagine the coelacanth and other similar fish to be the ancestors of terrestrial animals because of the bony nature of their fins.

If one fish that moved out of the water onto dry land couldn't survive for longer than a minute or two, then any of the other fish that did so would also die within a few minutes. Even if fish kept making the same at-

They assume that these bones gradually developed into weight-bearing feet. Yet unlike the feet of land dwellers, the bones in a fish's fins are not connected directly to their back-bone. This means they cannot perform a weight-bearing function, as do the leg bones in terrestrial animals. Therefore, the claim that these fins slowly evolved into feet is groundless.

2) *Heat protection:* On land, temperatures can change very fast and within a wide range. A terrestrial animal's metabolism allows it to adapt to these temperature changes in. In the sea, however, temperatures change very slowly, and do not range as widely as on land. A creature accustomed to the sea's even temperatures therefore needs to acquire a protective system appropriate to the temperature swings on land. It would be ridiculous to claim that fish acquired such a system through random mutations as soon as they emerged onto dry land.

3) *Use of water:* Water is an essential requirement for living things, and on land, its availability is limited. For that reason water, and even moisture, must be used economically. For example, skin must prevent water loss and evaporation, and land dwellers must be able to feel



The Kidney Barrier

Fish release harmful byproducts in their bodies directly into the water. Terrestrial animals, however, need kidneys. Therefore, any animal that makes the transition from water to land requires kidneys before making the change. However, kidneys have a highly complex structure. Moreover, a kidney has to be fully formed and flawless if it is to function. Only 50%, or 70% or even 90% of a kidney will serve no purpose. Since the theory of evolution is predicated on the idea that organs that are not used disappear over time, a kidney that is 50% lacking will be eliminated from the body at the first stages of evolution.

thirst when they need water. Yet underwater creatures have no sense of thirst and their skins are not suited to a dry environment.

4) *Kidneys:* Due to the abundant water in their environment, marine

creatures can immediately filter and expel their bodies' waste products, particularly ammonia. On land, however, water must be used at minimum levels. For that reason these living things have kidneys, thanks to which ammonia is filtered out as urea and stored in the bladder, and the minimum amount of water is used when it is expelled. In addition, there is a need for new systems that enable the kidneys to function. In order for a transition from water to land, creatures without kidneys will need to develop them immediately.

5) *Respiratory system*: Fish breathe

the oxygen dissolved in water through their gills. Out of the water, however, they are unable to survive for more than a few minutes. In order to live on dry land, they need to acquire a pulmonary system.

It is of course impossible for all these physiological changes to take place by chance and all at the same time.

According to the evolutionist scenario, fish first evolved into amphibians. Yet there is no evidence for that scenario: Not a single fossil has been found to show that half-fish, half-amphibian creatures ever existed.

Robert L. Carroll, the well-known

The "transition from water to land" scenario portrayed in many imaginative illustrations like the one above, is based on Lamarckist logic and conflicts even with the theory of evolution's own hypotheses.



FALSE

evolutionist and author of *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, admits this, albeit reluctantly: "We have no intermediate fossils between rhipidistian fish and early amphibians."²⁵² (See **Amphibians**.)

The evolutionist paleontologist Barbara J. Stahl wrote a book, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, in which she says:

*Although the relationship of the rhipidistians to the amphibians will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter, it should be said here that none of the known fishes is thought to be directly ancestral to the earliest land vertebrates. Most of them lived after the first amphibians appeared, and those that came before show no evidence of developing the stout limbs and ribs that characterized the primitive tetrapods.*²⁵³

TRANSITIONAL FORMS, THE (THE TRANSITIONAL SPECIES)

The theory of evolution claims that all living species on Earth, past and present evolved from one another. The transformation from one species to another, according to this theory, occurred slowly and in stages. Therefore, there must have been at least several transitional forms be-

tween two successive species, exhibiting characteristics of each. For example, there must have been creatures with both gills and lungs, fins and feet, alive during the millions of years between the time that fish first left the water and became amphibians. Evolutionists call these imaginary creatures "transitional forms."

If this theory were true, there would have to be millions, even billions of such creatures that lived in the past, and some of these monstrosities must have left remains in the fossil record. But so far, the fossil record has revealed not one single transitional form. In his book *The Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin writes these words in his chapter entitled "Difficulties on Theory":

Why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined? . . . But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth? . . . Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most



There is no gradual change in the fossil records of the kind envisaged by Darwin. Different living species emerged suddenly with all their unique characteristics. Evolutionists deny this, trying to back up their claims with groundless and speculative images of the kind shown here.

*obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.*²⁵⁴

Taking their lead from these words, evolutionist paleontologists since the 19th century have been scouring the globe in search of these transitional forms. In spite of all their efforts, they have not found any. All the findings from their research and excavations have revealed, contrary to their expectations, that living creatures appeared on Earth all at once and fully formed.

The evolutionist Gordon R. Taylor, points out in his book, *The Great Evolution Mystery*:

Professor G. G. Simpson is an ardent Darwinist, but he goes so far as to say: 'The absence of transitional forms is an almost universal phenomenon.' This is true of invertebrates as well as verte-

*brates and also of plants. He adds: 'The line making connection with common ancestry is not known even in one instance.' The rodents, he notes, appear suddenly, already equipped with their specialized gnawing teeth. As to the mammals, 'In all 32 orders of mammals, the break is so sharp and the gap so large that the origin of the order is speculative and much disputed.'*²⁵⁵

Today, there are more than 100 million fossils in thousands of museums and collections all over the world. All these are divided from the others by definite demarcations, and all have their own unique structures. No fossils of semi-fish/semi-amphibian, semi-dinosaur/semi-bird, semi-ape/semi-human and similar life forms of the kind so optimistically expected by evolutionists have ever been unearthed. The absence of a single intermediate form among such a rich fossil record shows, not that the fossil record is lacking, but that the theory of evolution is untrue.

As the noted biologist, Francis Hitching, writes this in his book, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*:

If we find fossils, and if Darwin's theory was right, we can predict what the rock should contain; finely graduated fossils leading from one group of creatures to another group of creatures at a

higher level of complexity. The 'minor improvements' in successive generations should be as readily preserved as the species themselves. But this is hardly ever the case. In fact, the opposite holds true, as Darwin himself complained; "innumerable transitional forms must have existed, but why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?" Darwin felt though that the "extreme imperfection" of the fossil record was simply a matter of digging up more fossils. But as more and more fossils were dug up, it was found that almost all of them, without exception, were very close to current living animals.²⁵⁶

The fossil record shows that living species came into being all at once, fully formed in all their variety, and remained unchanged throughout long geological periods. A noted evolutionist paleontologist at Harvard University, Stephen Jay Gould, acknowledges this fact:

The history of most fossil species includes two features particularly inconsistent with gradualism:

1) *Stasis*—most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking much the same as when they disappear; morphological change is usually limited and directionless;

2) *Sudden appearance*—in any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and "fully formed."²⁵⁷

In general, evolutionists deliberately use the concept of transitional forms to mislead. The term "transitional form" refers to a developing creature midway between two species with insufficient and partly formed organs. Sometimes, because they misunderstand the idea of a transitional form, Darwinists impute transitional-form characteristics to a creature that is not transitional at all. For example, the fact that one group of living creatures exhibits characteristics commonly found in another group, does not imply that the first group is a transitional form.

A fine example is the Australian platypus. This creature is a mammal but lays eggs like a reptile, and also has a beak like a duck's. Scientists call the platypus and other such animals "mosaic creatures." Noted paleontologists such as Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge state that evolutionist paleontologists do not count the platypus as an example of a transitional form.²⁵⁸ (See **Platypus**.)

TREE OF LIFE

According to Darwinism, the course of evolution resembles a tree, starting from a single stem and then diverging into branches. Indeed, this hypothesis is strongly emphasized in Darwinist sources, where the concept of the tree of life is frequently used. According to this imaginary metaphor, phyla, one of the basic classifications into which living things are divided, must have "branched out" in stages.

According to Darwinism, a single phylum must first have appeared, and other phyla must

then have emerged slowly through small changes and over very long periods of time. (See **Phylum**.)

According to this hypothesis, there must have been a gradual rise in the number of animal phyla. Illustrations made on this subject show a gradual rise in the number of phyla, in conformity with Darwinist expectations that the living things should have developed this way. But the fossils refuse this



Different living classifications emerged suddenly with no similar forebears and remained stable, undergoing no change, for hundreds of millions of years.


imaginary tree of life. The true picture that emerges from the fossil record is that species have been thoroughly different and very complex, ever since the period when they first appeared.

All the animal phyla known today appeared suddenly on Earth in a geological age known as the Cambrian Period.

Berkeley University's professor Phillip Johnson, one of the world's major critics of Darwinism, states that this fact revealed by paleontology is in clear conflict with the theory of evolution:

Darwinian Theory predicts a "cone of increasing diversity," as the first living organism, or first animal species, gradually and continually diversified to create the higher levels of taxonomic order. The animal fossil record more resembles such a cone turned upside down, with the phyla present at the start and thereafter decreasing.²⁵⁹

In the Pre-Cambrian Period, there were three phyla consisting of single-celled organisms. In the Cambrian Period, however, nearly 60 animal phyla emerged all at once.



The imaginary tree of life drawn up by the evolutionist biologist Ernst Haeckel in 1866.

Some of these phyla then became extinct in the period that followed, and only a few phyla have survived down to the present day.

The well-known evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin refers to this extraordinary state of affairs that demolishes all the assumptions of Darwinism:

The most important evolutionary

event during the entire history of the Metazoa, the Cambrian explosion established virtually all the major animal body forms—Bauplane or phyla—that would exist thereafter, including many that were "weeded out" and became extinct. Compared with the 30 or so extant phyla, some people estimate that the Cambrian explosion may have generated as many as 100.²⁶⁰

TRILOBITES

Trilobites are one of the most interesting living groups that suddenly emerged in the Cambrian Period and subsequently became extinct. They belong to the phylum Arthropoda, and are very complex creatures with hard shells, segmented bodies and complex organs. The fossil records have allowed a great deal of information to be obtained regarding the trilobite eye. It consisted of scores of tiny cells, each of which contains a pair of lenses. This eye structure is a marvel of creation.

Richard Fortey, an evolutionist paleontologist from London's Natural History Museum, says this about the extraordinary number of lenses possessed by some trilobites:

One of the most difficult jobs I ever attempted was to count the number of lenses in a large trilobite eye. I took

several photographs of the eye from the different angles and then made enormous prints magnified large enough to see individual lenses. I started counting as one might "one, two, three, four" . . . and so on to a hundred or two. The trouble was that you had only to look away for an instant, or sneeze, to forget exactly where you were, so it was back again to "one, two, three." ²⁶¹

More than 3,000 lenses means the animal received more than 3,000 images. This clearly shows the scale of the complexity in the eye and brain structure of a creature that lived 530 million years ago, and displays a flawless structure that cannot have come into existence through evolution.


David Raup, a professor of geology from Harvard, Rochester and

Chicago universities, says: "the trilobites 450 million years ago used an optimal design which would require a well trained and imaginative optical engineer to develop today." ²⁶²



This extraordinarily complex structure in trilobites is by itself sufficient to invalidate Darwinism. No comparable complex creature existed in earlier geological periods, which shows that trilobites emerged with no evolutionary stages behind them.

This extraordinary state of affairs in the Cambrian period was more or



The above fossils are trilobites, some of the highly complex invertebrates that appeared suddenly in the Cambrian Period, some 500 million years ago. The most significant feature in trilobites, and one that represents a major quandary for evolutionists, is their compound eyes. These eyes, which are highly advanced and complex, possess a multi-cell system. This system is identical to that found in modern spiders, bees, flies and other creatures. The fact that such a complex structure emerged abruptly in creatures living 500 million years ago demolishes evolutionist claims based on the idea of coincidence.

less known when Charles Darwin wrote his book *The Origin of Species*. It had been observed in the fossils from that period that life emerged suddenly in the Cambrian, and that trilobites and certain other invertebrates made a spontaneous appearance. That is why Darwin had to refer to the situation in his book. At that time, the Cambrian Period was known as the *Silurian Period*. Darwin touched on the subject under the heading, "On the sudden appearance of groups of allied species in

the lowest known fossiliferous strata," and wrote the following about the Silurian Period:

... I cannot doubt that all the Silurian trilobites have descended from some one crustacean, which must have lived long before the Silurian age, and which probably differed greatly from any known animal . . . Consequently, if my theory be true, it is indisputable that before the lowest Silurian stratum was deposited, long periods elapsed, as long as, or probably far longer than, the whole interval from the Silurian age to the present day; and that during these vast, yet quite unknown, periods of time, the world swarmed with living creatures. To the question why we do not find records of these vast primordial periods, I can give no satisfactory answer. ²⁶³

Fossils from the Cambrian Period show that both trilobites, with their complex bodies, and other living things with very different anatomy all emerged suddenly, thus demolishing Darwin's conjectures. In his book, Darwin wrote: "If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have really started into life all

Trilobite fossils from the Cambrian Period

The Evolution Impasse II




at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of descent with slow modification through natural selection." Some 60 different classes began life suddenly and simultaneously in the Cambrian Period. This confirms the picture described by Darwin as a "fatal" blow.

TURKANA BOY FOSSIL, THE

The most famous *Homo erectus* fossil discovered in Africa is the *Nariokotome homo erectus* or Turkana Boy fossil found near lake Turkana in Kenya. It has been determined that this fossil belonged to a 12-year-old male who would have reached around 1.83 meters (5'6" feet) in height when fully grown. Its upright skeleton is identical to that of any modern human. The American paleo-anthropologist Alan Walker says that he doubted that the average pathologist could tell the difference between the fossil skeleton and that of a modern human²⁶⁵, because *Homo erectus* is in fact a modern human race.

Professor William Laughlin of Connecticut University spent years researching Eskimos and the inhabitants of the Aleut islands and observed a striking level of similarity between them and *Homo erectus*.

Harun Yahya - Adnan Oktar



The Turkana Boy's fossilized skull

Laughlin's conclusion was that all these different races in fact belonged to *Homo sapiens* (human):

*When we consider the vast differences that exist between remote groups such as Eskimos and Bushmen, who are known to belong to the single species of Homo sapiens, it seems justifiable to conclude that Sinanthropus [an erectus specimen] belongs within this same diverse species.*²⁶⁶



UREY, HAROLD

Harold Urey was the teacher of the American researcher Stanley Miler at Chicago University. Because of Urey's contribution to Miller's 1953 experiment on the origin of life, this is also known as the Urey-Miller Experiment. This experiment is the only "proof" used to supposedly confirm the molecular evolution thesis, which is put forward as the first stage in the evolutionary process. However, the experiment was never able to offer any findings to support evolutionist claims regarding the origin of life. (See *The Miller Experiment*.)

UREY-MILLER EXPERIMENT, THE

—See Miller Experiment, The.



The image is a vibrant collage featuring a central landscape of a blue lake and green hills. This central image is surrounded by various smaller images of animals, including a butterfly, a leopard, a peacock, a parrot, a zebra, a penguin, a swan, and a flamingo. The entire collage is overlaid with a blue grid pattern. The entire composition is framed by a thick, ornate gold border with a repeating circular pattern.

V-W

VARIATION

Variation is a term used in genetic science, and concerns the emergence of different varieties, or species. This genetic phenomenon causes individuals or groups within a given species to possess different features from others. For example, all human beings on Earth possess essentially the same genetic information. But thanks to the variation potential permitted by that genetic information, some people have round eyes, or red hair, or a long nose, or are short and stocky in stature.

Darwinists, however, seek to portray variation within a species as evidence for evolution. The fact is, however, that variations constitute no such thing, because variation consists of the emergence of different combinations of genetic information that *already* exists, and cannot endow individuals with any new genetic information or characteristics.

Variation is always restricted by existing genetic information. These boundaries are known as the *gene pool* in genetic science. (See **The Gene Pool**.) Darwin, however, thought that variation had no limits when he proposed his theory²⁶⁷, and he depicted various examples of variation as the most important evidence for

evolution in his book *The Origin of Species*.

According to Darwin, for example, farmers mating different variations of cow in order to obtain breeds with better yields of milk would eventually turn cows into another species altogether. Darwin's idea of limitless change stemmed from the primitive level of science in his day. As a result of similar experiments on living things in the 20th century, however, science revealed a principle known as *genetic homeostasis*. This principle revealed that all attempts to change a living species by means of interbreeding (forming different variations) were in vain, and that between species, there were unbreachable walls. In other words, it was absolutely impossible for cattle to evolve into another species as the result of farmers mating different breeds to produce different variations, as Darwin had claimed would happen.

Luther Burbank, one of the world's foremost authorities on the subject of genetic hybrids, expresses a similar truth: "there are limits to the development possible, and these limits follow a law."²⁶⁸ Thousands of years of collective experience have shown that the amount of biological change obtained using cross-breed-



All human beings on Earth share basically the same genetic information, but thanks to the variation potential permitted by this genetic information, they often look very different from one another.

ing is always limited, and that there is a limit to the variations that any one species can undergo.

Indeed, in the introduction to their book *Natural Limits to Biological Change* Professor of Biology Lane P. Lester and the molecular biologist Raymond G. Bohlin wrote:

That populations of living organisms may change in their anatomy, physiology, genetic structure, etc., over a period of time is beyond question. What remains elusive is the answer to the question, How much change is possible, and by what genetic mechanism will these changes take place? Plant and animal breeders can marshal an impressive array of examples to demonstrate the extent to which living systems can be altered. But when a breeder begins with a dog, he ends up with a dog—a rather strange looking one, perhaps, but a dog nonetheless. A fruit

*fly remains a fruit fly; a rose, a rose, and so on.*²⁶⁹

Variations and their various changes are restricted inside the bounds of a species' genetic information, and they can never add new genetic information to species. For that reason, no variation can be regarded as an example of evolution.

The Danish scientist W. L. Johannsen summarizes the situation:

*The variations upon which Darwin and Wallace placed their emphasis cannot be selectively pushed beyond a certain point, that such variability does not contain the secret of "indefinite departure."*²⁷⁰

The fact that there are different human races in the world or the differences between parents and children can be explained in terms of variation. Yet there is no question of

any new component being added to their gene pool. For example, no matter how much you seek to enrich their species, cats will always remain cats, and will never evolve into any other mammal. It is impossible for the sophisticated sonar system in a marine mammal to emerge through recombination. (See

Recombination.) Variation may account for the differences between human races, but it can never provide any basis for the claim that apes developed into human beings.

VESTIGIAL ORGANS **THESIS, THE**

One claim that long occupied a place in the literature of evolution but was quietly abandoned once it was realized to be false is the concept of vestigial organs. Some evolutionists, however, still imagine that such organs represent major evidence for evolution and seek to portray them as such.

A century or so ago, the claim was put forward that some living

things had organs that were inherited from their ancestors, but which had gradually become smaller and even functionless from lack of use.

Those organs were in fact ones whose functions had not yet been identified. And so, the long list of organs believed by evolutionists to be vestigial grew ever shorter. The list of originally proposed by the German anatomist R. Wiedersheim in 1895 contain approximately 100 organs, including the human appendix and the coccyx. But the appendix was eventually realized to be a part of the lymph system that combats microbes entering the body, as was stated in one medical reference source in 1997:

Other bodily organs and tissues—the thymus, liver, spleen, appendix, bone

The tonsils, which evolutionists long sought to define as vestigial organs, have been found to play an important role in protecting against throat infections, particularly up until adulthood.

Harun Yahya - Adnan Oktar



marrow, and small collections of lymphatic tissue such as the tonsils in the throat and Peyer's patch in the small intestine—are also part of the lymphatic system. They too help the body fight infection. ²⁷¹

The tonsils, which also appeared on that same list of vestigial organs, were likewise discovered to play an important role against infections, especially up until adulthood. (Like the appendix, tonsils sometimes become infected by the very bacteria they seek to combat, and so must be surgically removed.) The coccyx, the

end of the backbone, was seen to provide support for the bones around the pelvic bone and to be a point of fixation for certain small muscles.

In the years that followed, other organs regarded as vestigial were shown to serve specific purposes: The thymus gland activates the body's defense system by setting the T cells into action. The pineal gland is responsible for the production of important hormones. The thyroid establishes balanced growth in babies and children. The pituitary en-

It has now been realized that the appendix (below), which evolutionist biologists imagined to be vestigial, plays an important role in the body's immune system. The lowest bone in the spinal column, known as the coccyx, is also not vestigial, but a point for muscles to attach to.



sures that various hormone glands are functioning correctly.

Today, many evolutionists accept that the myth of vestigial organs stemmed from sheer ignorance. The evolutionist biologist S.R. Scadding expresses this in an article published in the magazine *Evolutionary Theory*:

Since it is not possible to unambiguously identify useless structures, and since the structure of the argument used is not scientifically valid, I conclude that 'vestigial organs' provide no special evidence for the theory of evolution. ²⁷²

Evolutionists also make a significant logical error in their claim that vestigial organs in living things are a legacy from their ancestors: Some organs referred to as "vestigial" are *not present* in the species claimed to be the forerunners of man.

For example, some apes have no appendix. The zoologist Professor Hannington Enoch, an opponent of the vestigial organ thesis, sets out this error of logic:

Apes possess an appendix, whereas their less immediate relatives, the lower apes, do not; but it appears again among the still lower mammals such as the opossum. How can the evolutionists account for this? ²⁷³

The scenario of vestigial organs

put forward by evolutionists contains its own internal inconsistencies, besides being scientifically erroneous. We humans have no vestigial organs inherited from our supposed ancestors, because humans did not evolve randomly from other living things, but were fully and perfectly created in the form we have today.

WALLACE, ALFRED RUSSELL

The British natural historian Alfred Russell Wallace (1823-1913) is known for the idea that species emerged through natural selection. In a paper he wrote in 1855 titled "On the Law Which Has Regulated the Introduction of New Species,"

Wallace maintained that all species were extensions of other species to which they were closely related.

Despite developing his thesis at approximately the same time as

Darwin, Wallace held different views on a number of points. As a believer in the human soul, Wallace



Alfred Russel Wallace

believed that Allah had created by means of evolution, and maintained that human mental capacities could not be explained in terms of natural selection and similar naturalistic mechanisms. In contrast to Darwin, he believed that non-biological factors outside natural selection were responsible for the emergence of human physical traits and mental capabilities.²⁷⁴

WATSON, JAMES

The famous American biologist James Watson is best known for his work in the field of molecular biology. He and Francis Crick revealed the extraordinarily complex structure in DNA as a result of their joint work in 1955.

Watson and Crick's discovery of nucleic acids—DNA and RNA, for short—gave birth to new problems for the theory of evolution. With their discovery of the structure of




When Watson and Crick discovered the structure of DNA, they revealed that life had a far more complex structure than had previously been imagined.

DNA, they also revealed that life was far more complex than had previously been imagined.

The theory of evolution seeks to account for the origin of life in terms of coincidences, but cannot provide any consistent explanation regarding the existence of the most basic molecules. And these advances in genetic science represented a major impasse facing evolutionists.





ZINJANTHROPUS

So far have evolutionists gone in their adoption of evolution as a dogma that they can even ascribe very different faces to the same skull to provide supposed evidence for their theories.

The three totally different reconstructions produced for the fossil known as *Australopithecus robustus* (*Zinjanthropus*) are a well-known ex-


ample of this attitude. (See *Australopithecus*.)

three separate reconstructions from the same fossil

These three totally different reconstructions based on the fossil Zinjanthropus are an excellent example of how imaginatively evolutionists often interpret fossils.



FALSE

A tropical beach scene with palm trees and a decorative orange border. The text is overlaid on the image.

**They said,
"Glory be to You!
We have no knowledge
except what You have
taught us. You are
the All-Knowing,
the All-Wise."
(Surat al-Baqara, 32)**

NOTES

1. Bryan Patterson, Anna K. Behrensmeyer, William D. Sill, "Geology and Fauna of a New Pliocene Locality in Northwestern Kenya," *Nature*, Vol. 226, June 6, 1970, pp. 918-921.
2. Bryan Patterson, W. W. Howells, "Hominid Humeral Fragment from Early Pleistocene of Northwestern Kenya," *Science*, Vol. 156, April 7, 1967, p. 65.
3. Henry M. McHenry, "Fossils and the Mosaic Nature of Human Evolution," *Science*, Vol. 190, October 31, 1975, p. 428.
4. Bill Sardi, "Is 'Flat-Faced Man' Your Ancestor?," <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/sardi3.html>
5. Daniel E. Lieberman, "Another face in our family tree," *Nature*, March 22, 2001, pp. 419-420.
6. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/1234006.stm>
7. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/1234006.stm>
8. J. E. Cronin, N. T. Boaz, C. B. Stringer, Y. Rak, "Tempo and Mode in Hominid Evolution," *Nature*, Vol. 292, 1981, pp. 113-122.
9. C. L. Brace, H. Nelson, N. Korn, M. L. Brace, *Atlas of Human Evolution*, 2nd edition, New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
10. B. A. Wood, "Koobi Fora Research Project," *Hominid Cranial Remains*, Vol. 4, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
11. Tim Bromage, "Faces From the Past," *New Scientist*, Vol. 133, Issue 1803, 11 January 1992, p. 41.
12. R. G. Klein, *The Human Career: Human Biological and Cultural Origins*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
13. Donald C. Johanson & M. A. Edey, *Lucy, The Beginnings of Humankind*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 250.
14. "The Leakey Footprints: An Uncertain Path," *Science News*, Vol. 115, 1979, p. 196.
15. Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Abacus, 1984, pp. 36-41.
16. Richard Dickerson, "Chemical Evolution," *Scientific American*, Vol. 239:3, 1978, p. 75.
17. Richard Leakey and Alan Walker, "Unearthed," *National Geographic*, November 1985, p. 629.
18. Richard Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, London: Sphere Books, 1981, p. 116.
19. Richard Lewontin, "Billions and billions of demons," *The New York Review*, January 9, 1997, p. 31.
20. "Old Bird," *Discover*, March 21, 1997.
21. *Ibid.*
22. <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/history/linnaeus.html>
23. Isabelle Bourdial, "Adieu Lucy," *Science et Vie*, May 1999, No. 980, pp. 52-62.
24. Roger Lewin, "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire," *Science*, Vol. 210, 21 November, 1980, p. 883.
25. R. A. Fisher, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.
26. Walter L. Starkey, *The Cambrian Explosion*, WLS Publishing, , 1999, p. 158.
27. Lane Lester, Raymond Bohlin, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Dallas: Probe Books, 1989, pp.141-142.
28. <http://www.trufax.org/avoid/nazi.html>
29. David Jorafsky, *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961, p.12.
30. Ralph Colp, Jr., "The Contacts Between Karl Marx and Charles Darwin," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Apr.-Jun., 1974), pp. 329-338.
31. Conway Zirkle, *Evolution, Marxian Biology and the Social Scene*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959, pp. 85-86.
32. Tom Bethell, "Burning Darwin to Save Marx," *Harper's Magazine*, December 1978, pp. 31-38.
33. Karl Marx, *Biyografi* (Biography), Sorun Publishing, 1995, p. 368.
34. A. E. Wilder-Smith, *The Natural*

- Sciences: Know Nothing of Evolution*, T. W. F. T. Publishers, ABD, p. 77.
35. Hubert Yockey, "Self-Organization, Origin of Life Scenarios and Information Theory," *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 91, 1981, pp. 27-28.
 36. Stanley Sobottka, A Course in Consciousness, <http://faculty.virginia.edu/consciousness>
 37. Ernst Mayr, *Populations, Species, and Evolution*, p. 235.
 38. *Ibid.*, p.296.
 39. B. E. Bishop, "Mendel's Opposition to Evolution and to Darwin," *Journal of Heredity*, Vol. 87, 1996, pp. 205-213.
 40. www.evrimaldatmacasi.com/bilimarastirmavakfi.html
 41. "A surprising tale of a frog's tail— research into a tadpole's metamorphosis into a frog," *Science News*, July 17, 1999, p. 43.
 42. Scott Gilbert, John Opitz, and Rudolf Raff, "Resynthesizing Evolutionary and Developmental Biology," *Developmental Biology*, Vol. 173, article no. 0032, 1996, p. 361.
 43. Richard B. Bliss, Gary E. Parker, Duane T. Gish, *Origin of Life*, California, 1979, pp. 14-15.
 44. Stanley Miller, *Molecular Evolution of Life: Current Status of the Prebiotic Synthesis of Small Molecules*, 1986, p. 7.
 45. J. P. Ferris, C. T. Chen, "Photochemistry of Methane, Nitrogen, and Water Mixture As a Model for the Atmosphere of the Primitive Earth," *Journal of American Chemical Society*, Vol. 97:11, 1975, p. 2964.
 46. "New Evidence on Evolution of Early Atmosphere and Life," *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, Vol. 63, November 1982, pp. 1328-1330.
 47. Richard B. Bliss & Gary E. Parker, Duane T. Gish, *Origin of Life*, p. 16.
 48. W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 325.
 49. Henry Gee, "Statistical Cloud over African Eden," *Nature*, Vol. 355, February 13, 1992, p. 583.
 50. Marcia Barinaga, " 'African Eve' Backers Beat a Retreat," *Science*, 255, February 7, 1992, p. 687.
 51. S. Blair Hedges, Sudhir Kumar, Koichiro Tamura, and Mark Stoneking, "Human Origins and Analysis of Mitochondrial DNA Sequences," *Science*, 255, 7 February 1992, pp. 737-739.
 52. Barinaga, "Choosing a Human Family Tree," *Science*, 255, 7 February 1992, p. 687.
 53. William A. Dembski, James M. Kushiner, *Signs of Intelligence*, Brazos Press, ABD, 2001, p 109.
 54. Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Genetics of the Evolutionary Process*, New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1970, pp. 17-18.
 55. Pierre Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York Academic Press, 1977, p. 194.
 56. Christian Schwabe, "On the Validity of Molecular Evolution," *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, Vol. 11, July 1986, p. 280.
 57. Christian Schwabe, "Theoretical Limitations of Molecular Phylogenetics and the Evolution of Relaxins," *Comparative Biochemical Physiology*, Vol. 107B, 1974, pp. 171-172.
 58. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp. 290-291.
 59. Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biyoloji 1*, Istanbul: Sürat Publishing, 1998, p. 10,
 60. Prof. Dr. Eşref Deniz, *Tıbbi Biyoloji(Medical Biology)*, 4th edition, Ankara, 1992, p. 6.
 61. <http://www.evrimaldatmacasi.com/bilimarastirmavakfi.html>
 62. S. J. Gould & N. Eldredge, *Paleobiology*, Vol. 3, 1977, p. 147.
 63. Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning was Information*, Master Books, 2006, p. 126.
 64. B. G. Ranganathan, *Origins?*, Pennsylvania: The Banner Of Truth Trust, , 1988.
 65. Warren Weaver, "Genetic Effects of

- Atomic Radiation," *Science*, Vol. 123, June 29, 1956, p. 1159.
66. David Demick, "The Blind Gunman," *Impact*, No. 308, February 1999.
67. Michael E. Soulé, L. Scott Mills, "No need to isolate genetics," *Science* 282: 1998, p. 1658.
68. Wetermeirer, R.L., J.D. Brawn, S.A. Simpson, T.L. Esker, R.W. Jansen, J.W. Walk, E.L. Kershner, J.L. Bouzat, and K.N. Paige, "Tracking the long-term decline and recovery of an isolated population," *Science* 282, 1998, p. 1695.
69. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, New York: The Modern Library, p. 127.
70. Stephen Jay Gould, "The Return of Hopeful Monsters," *Natural History*, vol. 86, June/July 1977, pp. 22-30.
71. C. Loring Brace, *American Scientist*, Vol. 82, September/October 1994, p. 484-486.
72. Erik Trinkaus, "Hard Times Among the Neanderthals," *Natural History*, Vol. 87, December 1978, p. 10.
73. W. K. Gregory, "Hesperopithecus Apparently Not An Ape Nor A Man," *Science*, Vol. 66, p. 579.
74. Frank Salisbury, "Doubts About the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution," *American Biology Teacher*, September 1971, p. 338.
75. Keith S. Thompson, "Ontogeny and Phylogeny Recapitulated," *American Scientist*, Vol. 76, May/June 1988, p. 273.
76. Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, p. 204.
77. Alexander I. Oparin, *Origin of Life*, 1936, New York: Dover Publications, 1953 (Reprint), p. 196.
78. John Ross, *Chemical and Engineering News*, 27 July, 1980, p. 40.
79. Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley and Roger L. Olsen, *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories*, 4th edition, Dallas, 1992, p. 151.
80. *Ibid.*, pp. 119-120.
81. I. Prigogine, G. Nicolis ve A. Babloyants, "Thermodynamics of Evolution," *Physics Today*, November 1972, Vol. 25, p. 23.
82. Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on Earth," *Scientific American*, Vol. 271, October 1994, p. 78.
83. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp. 210-211.
84. *Ibid.*, pp. 211-212.
85. J. A. Ruben, T. D. Jones, N. R. Geist, and W. J. Hillenius, "Lung Structure And Ventilation in Theropod Dinosaurs and Early Birds," *Science*, Vol. 278, p. 1267.
86. Michael J. Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, New York: Free Press, 1998, p. 361.
87. *Ibid.*, pp. 361-362.
88. http://www.pathlights.com/ce_encyclopedia/Encyclopedia/08dna02.htm
89. http://www.microbiologytext.com/index.php?module=Book&func=displayarticle&art_id=53
90. Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* ("Heredity and Evolution"), Ankara: Meteksan Publishing, p.79.
91. John E. Hill, James D Smith, *Bats: A Natural History*, London: British Museum of Natural History, 1984, p. 33.
92. L. R. Godfrey, "Creationism and Gaps in the Fossil Record," *Scientists Confront Creationism*, W. W. Norton and Company, 1983, p. 199.
93. Feduccia, A., email to J. David, 26 October, 1999; permission to share this email given 3 November 1999.
94. Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It . . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, February 1, 1997, p. 28.
95. Pat Shipman, *Ibid.*, p. 26.
96. A. H. Brush, "On the Origin of Feathers," *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, Vol. 9, 1996, pp. 131-132.
97. Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, Harvard Common Press, 1971, p. 131.
98. Gerald T. Todd, "Evolution of the Lung and the Origin of Bony Fishes: A Casual Relationship," *American Zoologist*, Vol 26, No. 4, 1980, p. 757.
99. R. J. Wootton, C. P. Ellington,

- "Biomechanics & the Origin of Insect Flight," *Biomechanics in Evolution*, ed. J. M. V. Rayner & R. J. Wootton, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 99.
100. J. Robin Wootton, "The Mechanical Design of Insect Wings," *Scientific American*, vol. 263, November 1990, p. 120.
101. Boyce Rensberger, *Houston Chronicle*, 5 November 1980, Part 4, p. 15.
102. Niles Eldredge, quoted in *Darwin's Enigma* by Luther D. Sunderland, Santee, CA: Master Books, 1988, p. 78.
103. Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, pp. 30-31.
104. *Ibid.*
105. Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Sphere Books, 1984, p. 230.
106. M. Kusnitz, *Science World*, 4 February 1983, p. 19.
107. New York Times Press Service, San Diego Union, 29 May 1983; W. A. Shear, *Science*, Vol. 224, 1984, p. 494.
108. Pierre-P Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 30.
109. Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd, 1983, p. 222.
110. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species and The Descent of Man*, The Modern Library, Random House, p. 184.
111. Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1888, p. 374.
112. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species and The Descent of Man*, The Modern Library, Random House, p. 208.
113. Cemal Yıldırım, *Evrım Kuramı ve Bağnazlık, (Evolution Theory and Bigotry)*, p. 185.
114. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, Elibron Classics, 2005, p. 206.
115. *Ibid.*, p. 229.
116. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
117. *Ibid.*
118. Noam Chomsky, *Language and Responsibility*, p. 60.
119. Roger Lewin, "Bones of Mammals' Ancestors Fleshed Out," *Science*, vol. 212, June 26, 1981, p. 1492.
120. George Gaylord Simpson, *Life Before Man*, New York: Time-Life Books, 1972, p. 42.
121. R. Eric Lombard, "Review of Evolutionary Principles of the Mammalian Middle Ear, Gerald Fleischer," *Evolution*, Vol. 33, December 1979, p. 1230.
122. Uwe George, "Darwinismus der Irrtum des Jahrhunderts," *Geo*, January 1984, pp. 100-102.
123. Victor B. Scheffer, "Exploring the Lives of Whales," *National Geographic*, Vol. 50, December 1976, p. 752.
124. E.H. Colbert, M. Morales, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1955, p. 303.
125. E.H. Colbert, M. Morales, Eli C. Minkoff, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, Wiley-Liss; 5 Sub edition, p.193.
126. A. S. Romer, *Vertebrate Paleontology*, 3rd ed., Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1966, p. 120.
127. Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, p. 80.
128. Hoimar Von Dittfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2*, Alan Yayıncılık, Nov 1996, İstanbul: Çev: Veysel Atayman, pp. 60-61.
129. Mahlon B. Hoagland, *Hayatın Kökleri*, Tübitak Publishing, 8th edition, p. 25.
130. Prof.Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, Ankara: Meteksan Publishing, p. 79.
131. Prof. Dr. İlhami Kızıroğlu, *Genel Biyoloji, (General Biology)* İstanbul:Desen Publications,
132. Robert A. Wallace, Gerald P. Sanders, Robert J. Ferl, *Biology, The Science of Life*, Harper Collins College Publishers, p. 283.
133. Darnell, "Implications of RNA-RNA

- Splicing in Evolution of Eukaryotic Cells," *Science*, Vol. 202, 1978, p. 1257.
134. Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim*, p. 79.
135. Lewis L. Carroll, "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 44, p. 393.
136. Robert L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1988, p. 198.
137. *Ibid.*, pp. 180-182.
138. H. S. Lipson, "A Physicist's View of Darwin's Theory," *Evolution Trends in Plants*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1988, p. 6.
139. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, "Turtle—Origin and Evolution."
140. Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 296-97.
141. Douglas Palmer, *The Atlas of the Prehistoric World*, Discovery Channel, London: Marshall Publishing, 1999, p. 66.
142. Mustafa Kuru, *Omurgalı Hayvanlar*, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları, , 1996, p. 21.
143. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
144. Douglas Palmer, *The Atlas of the Prehistoric World*, Discovery Channel, p. 6.
145. Richard Monastersky, "Waking Up to the Dawn of Vertebrates," *Science News*, Vol. 156, No. 19, 6 November 1999, p. 292.
146. Prof. Dr. Muammer Bilge, *Hücre Bilimi*, p. 59.
147. Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim*, pp.65, 72.
148. M. Yılmaz Öner, *Canlıların Diyalektiği ve Yeni Evrim Teorisi*, pp. 84-89
149. Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim*, p. 73.
150. Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, New York: Toplinger Publications, 1970, pp.75-94.
151. Charles E. Oxnard, "The Place of Australopithecines in Human Evolution: Grounds for Doubt," *Nature*, Vol 258, p. 389.
152. Fred Spoor, Bernard Wood, Frans Zonneveld, "Implication of Early Hominid Labryntine Morphology for Evolution of Human Bipedal Locomotion," *Nature*, Vol. 369, June 23, 1994, pp. 645-648.
153. "Evolution of Whales," *National Geographic*, November 2001, pp. 64-77.
154. Ashby L. Camp, "The Overselling of Whale Evolution," *Creation Matters*, May/June 1998, <http://www.trueorigin.org/whales.asp>
155. "Evolution of Whales," *National Geographic*, pp. 64-77.
156. Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 329.
157. G. A. Mchedlidze, *General Features of the Paleobiological Evolution of Cetacea*, Translated from the Russian, Rotterdam: A.A. Balkema, 1986, p. 91.
158. B.J. Stahl, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, Dover Publications, Inc., 1985, p. 489.
159. Michel C. Milinkovitch, "Molecular phylogeny of cetaceans prompts revision of morphological transformations," *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 10 (August 1995): pp. 328-334.
160. Engin Korur, "Gözlerin ve Kanatların Sırrı," *Bilim ve Teknik*, No: 203, October 1984, p. 25.
161. Philips Verner Bradford, Harvey Blume, *Ota Benga: The Pygmy in The Zoo*, New York: Delta Books, , 1992.
162. *Ibid.*, p. 269.
163. *Ibid.*, p. 267.
164. *Ibid.*, p. 266.
165. Geoffrey C. Ward, "The Man in the Zoo," *American Heritage* magazine, October 1992, Vol: 43, Issue 6.
166. Prof. Dr. Eşref Deniz, *Tıbbi Biyoloji*, 4th Edition, Ankara, 1992, p. 354.
167. *Science*, July 17, 1981, p. 289.
168. N. Eldredge, and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982, pp. 45-46.
169. S. M. Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable: Fossils, Genes, and the Origin*

- of *Species*, New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers, 1981, p. 71.
170. G. A. Clark, C. M. Willermet, *Conceptual Issues in Modern Human Origins Research*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1997, p. 76.
171. Niles Eldredge, Ian Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, pp. 126-127.
172. Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time*, New York: The Free Press, 1999, pp. 116-117.
173. <http://www.catholicintl.com/noncatholicissues/devolution.htm>
174. Paul J. Morris, and Susan F. Morris, "The Panda's Thumb," Jan 2000 <http://www.athro.com/evo/pthumb.html>
175. "The Panda's Thumb . . . No Evidence For Evolution" <http://www.us-ers.bigpond.com/rdoolan/panda.html>
176. Endo, H., Yamagiwa, D., Hayashi, Y. H., Koie, H., Yamaya, Y., and Kimura, J., "Role of the giant panda's 'pseudo-thumb'", *Nature*, Vol. 397, 1999, p. 309.
177. Özer Bulut, Davut Sağdıç, Selim Korkmaz, *Biyoloji Lise 3*, MEB Basımevi, İstanbul, 2000, p. 182.
178. Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biyoloji 3*, Sürat Yayınları, August 1999, p. 254.
179. Sidney Fox, Klaus Dose, *Molecular Evolution and The Origin of Life*, San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1972, p. 4.
180. Gish, D. T., *Evolution: The Fossils Say "No,"* San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1979.
181. Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, p. 59.
182. Stephen Jay Gould, "Piltdown Revisited," *Natural History*, March 1979, p. 98.
183. Kenneth Oakley, William Le Gros Clark & J. S., "Piltdown," *Meydan Larousse*, Vol. 10, p. 133.
184. Stephen Jay Gould, "Smith Woodward's Folly," *New Scientist*, p. 444.
185. Mahlon B. Hoagland, *Hayatın Kökleri* ("The Roots of Life"), pp.78-79.
186. *Ibid*, p. 149.
187. Peter Radetsky, "Life's Crucible," *Earth*, February 1998, p. 34.
188. "The Rise of Life on Earth," *National Geographic*, March 1998.
189. Jeffrey Bada, *Earth*, February 1998, p. 40.
190. Klaus Dose, "The Origin of Life: More Questions Than Answers," *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1988, p. 348.
191. Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim* ("Heredity and Evolution"), p. 61.
192. W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 304.
193. *Ibid*, p.305.
194. J. D. Thomas, *Evolution and Faith*, Abilene, TX: ACU Press, , 1988, pp. 81-82.
195. Reinhard Junker, Siefried Scherer, *Entstehung und Geschichte der Lebewesen*, Wegel Biologie, Brühlsche Universitätsdruckerei, Giessen, 1986, p.175.
196. *ibid*.
197. Stephen M. Stanley, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process*, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1979, pp. 35, 159.
198. Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2nd edition, 1997, p. 86.
199. Prof. Dr. Yalçın Şahin, *Genel Biyoloji*, Bilim Teknik Yayınevi, Eskişehir, 1995, p.349.
200. David R. Pilbeam, "Rearranging Our Family Tree," *Human Nature*, June 1978, p. 45.
201. Earnest A. Hooton, *Up From The Ape*, New York: McMillan, 1931, p. 332.
202. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "Modern Materialism"
203. Lane Lester, Raymond Bohlin, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Dallas: Probe Books, 1989, 9.141.
204. Monod, Jaques, *Chance and Necessity: An Essay on the Natural Philosophy of Modern Biology*, 1971, London Penguin:1997, reprint, p. 143.

205. John Horgan, "In the Beginning," *Scientific American*, Vol. 264, February 1991, p. 119.
206. Gerald F. Joyce and Leslie E. Orgel, "Prospects for Understanding the Origin of the RNA World," in *The RNA World*, edited by Raymond F. Gesteland, Thomas R. Cech, John F. Atkins, 2nd ed., Cold Spring Harbor, New York: Laboratory Press, 2000, p. 62.
207. Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on the Earth," *Scientific American*, October 1994, Vol. 271, p. 78.
208. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Heinrich_Schindewolf
209. <http://www.revelationwebsite.co.uk/index1/menton/b8.htm>
210. Jeremy Rifkin, *Entropy: A New World View*, New York: Viking Press, 1980, p. 6.
211. Barth, A., "The Creation in the Light of Modern Science," (1966) *Jerusalem Post Press*, Jerusalem, p. 144..
212. Paul Davies, *The Accidental Universe*, 1982, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Preface.
213. Albert Einstein, *Letters to Maurice Solovine*, 1956, pp.114-115.
214. Gordon Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, p. 223.
215. *Ibid.*
216. Janet L. Hopson, Norman K. Wessells, *Essentials of Biology*, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Vol. 45, 1990, pp. 837-839.
217. Jeffrey S. Wicken, "The Generation of Complexity in Evolution: A Thermodynamic and Information-Theoretical Discussion," *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 77, April 1979, p. 349.
218. Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley & Roger L. Olsen, *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories*, 4th edition, Dallas; 1992, p. 146..
219. Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, London: Michael Joseph, 1983, pp. 20-21.
220. Andrew Scott, "Update on Genesis," *New Scientist*, Vol. 106, May 2, 1985, p. 30.
221. Robert Shapiro, *Origins: A Sceptics Guide to the Creation of Life on Earth*, New York:, Summit Books, 1986, p. 207.
222. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hylonomus>
223. Robert Shapiro, *Origins: A Sceptic's Guide to the Creation of Life on Earth*, p. 127.
224. *Ibid.*, p. 207.
225. Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, pp. 97-98.
226. Sir James Gray, chapter in *Science Today* (1961), p. 21.
227. James A. Shapiro, "Bacteria as Multicellular Organisms," *Scientific American*, Vol. 258, No. 6, June 1988, p. 82.
228. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Introductory Note, p.4, <http://www.bartleby.com/11/101.html>
229. Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, pp. 293-294.
230. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, , 1981, p.72.
231. Jacques Barzun, Darwin, Marx, Wagner, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958, pp. 94-95, cited in Henry M. Morris, *The Long War Against God*, Baker Book House, 1989, p. 70.
232. Robert Wright, *The Moral Animal*, New York: Vintage Books, 1994, p. 7.
233. Herbert Spencer, *Social Status*, 1850, pp. 414-415.
234. Wynne-Edwards, V. C., "Self Regulating Systems in Populations of Animals," *Science*, Vol. 147, 1965, pp. 1543-1548.
235. Lee Spetner, *Not By Chance!: Shattering the Modern Theory of Evolution*, New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1997, pp. 16-17.
236. Andy Coghlan, "Suicide Squad," *New Scientist*, July 10, 1999.
237. David Johanson and James Shreeve, *Lucy's Child*, NewYork: William Morrow and Co., 1989, p. 56.
238. Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond the Ivory Tower* (1970), p. 93.

239. Dean Falk, *Braindance*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1992, pp.12, 13
240. Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biyoloji 1*, İstanbul: Sürat Yayınları, 1998, p. 7.
241. Dr. David N. Menton, *Is Evolution a Theory, A Fact or A Law?*, 1993, <http://emporium.turnpike.net/C/cs/theory.htm>;
242. *Ibid.*
243. *Ibid.*
244. *Ibid.*
245. Prof. Dr. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, London: Burnett Books, 1985.
246. Richard L. Deem, "Demise of the 'Birds are Dinosaurs' Theory," <http://www.direct.ca/trinity/dinobird.html>
247. *Ibid.*
248. Duane T. Gish, *Dinosaurs by Design*, Master Books, AR, 1996, pp. 64-65.
249. Donald Johanson, "Comment J'ai Trouvé le Passage du Singe a L'homme: Du Nouveau Sur Les Ance**[circonflex needed!]**tres De L'Homme," *Cahier Sciences du Figaro-Magazine*, 1983, p. 110.
250. J. D. Kingston, "Isotopic Evidence for Neogene Hominid Paleoenvironments in the Kenya Rift Valley," *Science*, vol. 264, 1994, pp. 955-959.
251. Uluğ Nutku, *Felsefe Arşivi*, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Vol. 24, 1984, p. 86.
252. R. L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1988, p. 4.
253. Barbara J. Stahl, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, Dover, 1985. p. 148.
254. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, pp.172-280.
255. Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Abacus, Sphere Books, 1984, p. 78.
256. Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, New Haven: Ticknor and Fields, 1982, p. 40.
257. S.J. Gould, "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History*, Vol. 86, May 1977.
258. S.J. Gould & N. Eldredge, *Paleobiology*, Vol 3, 1977, p.147
259. Phillip E. Johnson, "Darwinism's Rules of Reasoning," *Darwinism: Science or Philosophy*, Foundation for Thought and Ethics, 1994, p. 12.
260. R. Lewin, *Science*, Vol. 241, July 15, 1988, p. 291.
261. Richard Fortey, *Trilobite, Eyewitness to Evolution*, Vintage Books, 2000, p. 98.
262. David Raup, "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology," *Bulletin*, Field Museum of Natural History, Vol. 50, January 1979, p. 24.
263. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 1859, pp. 313-314.
264. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 302..
265. Boyce Rensberger, *The Washington Post*, November 19, 1984.
266. Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992. p. 136.
267. Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, Vintage Books, 1958, p.186; Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, New York Harvard Common Press, , 1971, p. 33.
268. *Ibid.*, p.36.
269. Lane P. Lester, Raymond G. Bohlin, *Natural Limits to Biological Change*, pp. 13-14.
270. Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, Vintage Books, 1958, p. 227.
271. *The Merck Manual of Medical Information, Home edition*, Rahway, New Jersey: Merck & Co., Inc. The Merck Publishing Group, , 1997.
272. S. R. Scadding, "Do 'Vestigial Organs' Provide Evidence for Evolution?," *Evolutionary Theory*, Vol. 5, May 1981, p. 173.
273. Hannington Enoch, *Creation or Evolution*, New York, 1966, pp. 18-19.
274. "Darwin or Wallace?: Scientific and Religious Interpretations of the Human Being," H. James Bix, http://www.theharbinger.org/articles/rel_sci/darwin.html