

THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE I

HARUN YAHYA

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.

A

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, clothes 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.¹ 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.

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://wwwFOUNDERSOFSCIENCE.NET/interest1.htm>

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

The Europeans’ extermination of the Aboriginals 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 Aboriginals on the same level as gorillas. He did not consider the Aboriginals 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 Aboriginals 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 Aboriginals in the attempt to find proof for their theory. The skulls were taken, the bullet holes

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.

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*)

⁵ Jani Roberts, “How neo-Darwinism justified taking land from Aborigines and murdering them in Australia”, <http://www.gn.apc.org/inquirer/ausrace.html>.

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.

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 CO₂ 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.

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.

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.

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:

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.

*. . . 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.

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.

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, neutralize 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.¹²

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:

¹² Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, 1902, Part II.

*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

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.

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.

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 impasses 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 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

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.

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 generation. 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)."*¹⁹ (See **Movement from Water to land, the.**)

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

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.

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. However, 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: those 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.²¹ 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 placental was severed when

²⁰ Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biyoloji 1* (“Biology 1”), 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.

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.

²² Prof. Dr. Eşref Deniz, *Tıbbi Biyoloji* ("Medical Biology"), 4th Edition, Ankara, 1992, p. 369.

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 explanation 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 gathered 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*

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.

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.

²⁵ Georges Politzer, *Principes Fondamentaux de Philosophie*, Paris: Editions Sociales, 1954, p. 84.

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 finely 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.*²⁶

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

²⁶ Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, London, 1984, p. 184.

*its sharp end that it can stay so even after one billion years. Moreover, this balance gets more delicate as the universe expands.*²⁷

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.

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.

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 being 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:

²⁹ Stuart B. Levy, "The Challenge of Antibiotic Resistance", *Scientific American*, March 1998, p. 35.

³⁰ *Medical Tribune*, 29 December 1988, pp.1, 23.

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, 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 exaggeratedly 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.

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.

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 employed 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

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.

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 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.³⁶

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 Dromesaurus 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*:

³⁶ John Ostrom, “Bird Flight: How Did It Begin?”, *American Scientist*, January-February 1979, Vol. 67.

- 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 feathers, [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 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

³⁷ Kevin Pedian, "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.

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 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 announced 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

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.*

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 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 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.⁴⁵

Archaeoraptor

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

The Archaeoraptor 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 Archaeoraptor was revealed

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, Vladimir 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.

*to be a forgery in which bones of a primitive bird and a non-flying dromaeosaurid dinosaur had been combined. . . . We conclude that Archaeoraptor 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.⁴⁶ (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 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.⁴⁷

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

⁴⁶ Timothy Rowe, Richard A. Ketcham, Cambria Denison, Matthew Colbert, Xing Xu, and Philip J. Currie, “Forensic palaeontology: The *Archaeoraptor* forgery,” *Nature*, 29 March 2001, Vol.: 410, pp. 539-540.

⁴⁷ Robert Kunzig, “The Face of an Ancestral Child,” *Discover*, December 1996, pp. 97-100.

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 schema; 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. aferensis*, *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 species 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

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.

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**)

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.

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 these 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 is untenable. And so far, no evolutionist biologist has tried to explain the origins of these flagella, which also 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 research vessel and claimed that this was an inanimate substance that turned into living matter. This so-called life-assuming matter is known as *Bathylus 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 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 existence 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 level—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.

⁵² Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*. New York: Free Press, 1996, pp. 232-233.

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

⁵³ H. S. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution", *Physics Bulletin*, vol. 138, 1980, p. 138.

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 encountered 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

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.

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 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 publication 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 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

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.

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. ⁵⁹

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 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. ⁶⁰

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, whereupon it came to influence Darwin.

Burgess Shale

⁵⁹ <http://www.evolutiondeceit.com/conferences.php>.

⁶⁰ D.R. Oldroyd, *Darwinian Impacts*, Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1983, pp. 23, 32.

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 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. ⁶²

⁶¹ *Trends in Genetics*, February 1999.

⁶² Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1983, p. 197.

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 Cambrian period].*”⁶³

⁶³ Levinton, Jeffrey S., “The Big Bang of Animal Evolution,” *Scientific American*, 267:84, November 1992.

C

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 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. Needless 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

⁶⁴ Richard Monastersky, "Mysteries of the Orient," *Discover*, April 1993, p. 40.

⁶⁵ Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 229.

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

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.

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, an 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 —instead, species appear and disappear abruptly, and this anomaly has fueled the creationist argument that each species was created by God. ⁶⁹

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

⁶⁹ Mark Czarnecki, "The Revival of the Creationist Crusade," *MacLean's*, January 19, 1981, p. 56.

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 specimen 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

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.

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 universe 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

⁷⁵ Michael Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, p. 106.

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 nothing—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 the 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 obscure 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

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.

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 modern counterparts. How, then, did the precursor cell arise? The only unequivocal rejoinder to this question is that we do not know.*⁷⁹

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 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**.)

⁷⁹ David E. Green, Robert F. Goldberger, *Molecular Insights into the Living Process*, Academic Press, New York, 1967, s. 403.

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 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 chromosomes 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 characteristics. 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

⁸⁰ Mahlon B. Hoagland, *Hayatın Kökeni* ("The Roots of Life"), Ankara: Tubitak, 1998, p. 40.

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 proponent 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.

⁸¹ www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1G1-55683967.html.

⁸² M. Yılmaz Öner, *Canlıların Diyalektiği ve Yeni Evrim Teorisi*, Belge Publishing, 2000, p. 165.

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 evolutionists. 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 *Coelacanths* 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 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 intermediate 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

⁸³ Jean-Jacques Hublin, *The Hamlyn Encyclopaedia 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.

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, though 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 Experiment, 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.

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 reactions. 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

⁸⁷ Richard B. Bliss and Gray A. Parker, *Origin of Life*, California, 1979, p. 14.

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 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, evolution'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 Vertebrate 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.

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.

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 increased 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

⁹⁰ Ozer Bulut, Davut Sagdic, Elim Korkmaz, *Lise Biyoloji 3* ("High School Biology 3"), p. 135.

⁹¹ Musa Ozet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biology 1*, 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.

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.*⁹⁴

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 exceedingly 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 produce 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

⁹³ Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984, p. 148.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, p. 130.

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

Crossing-over

⁹⁵ Francis Crick, *Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 88.

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.*⁹⁶

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

⁹⁶ Edward S. Deevey, Jr. 1967, "The Reply: Letter from Birnam Wood," *Yale Review*, 61, pp. 631-640.

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 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 *Coelacanth* 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 intermediate 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 neandertalis*), 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

⁹⁷ Maria Genevieve Lavanant, *Bilim ve Teknik* magazine, April 1984, No. 197, p. 22.

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 describe 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

⁹⁸ Erik Trinkhaus, "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.

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 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

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.

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, incomplete 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

¹⁰⁵ <http://www.strangescience.net/cuvier.htm>.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* ("Heredity and Evolution"), Ankara: Meteksan Publishing, 1995, p. 61.

*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.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

D

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 individuals' 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 science 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:

*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

¹⁰⁹ Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, 2nd Edition, New York: A L. Burt Co., 1874, p. 178.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

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 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 ignoring 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

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.

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 Vidyarthi 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

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>.

*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 Lapouge 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 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

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.

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 Charles 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 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

¹¹⁹ Desmond King-Hele, *Doctor of Revolution: 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.

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. ¹²²

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

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.

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

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.

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, however, 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. Lavanant 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

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.

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 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 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 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 nucleotides in its chain. Since there are four kinds of nucleotides in a DNA chain, one consisting of 1,000 links could exist in 4^{1000} or 10^{600} . Ten multiplied by itself 600 times gives the figure 1 followed by 600 zeros! Imagine how many universes it would take to accommodate 10^{600} 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 questions, 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:

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, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, Ankara: Meteksan Yayınları, 1984, p. 39.

*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, hedonism, 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

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

Drosophila—See Fruit flies.

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

E

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? 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

¹³⁵ Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, , 1977, p. 87.

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 reproductive cells of a woman’s, ovary. This theory, proposed long before by Aristotle, maintained that the

¹³⁶ Niles Eldredge, “Is Evolution Progress?” *Science Digest*, September 1983, pp. 40, 160.

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**.)

¹³⁷ http://www.repromed.org.uk/history/history_1500.htm.

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**.) Certain 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

¹³⁸ G.G. Simpson, W. Beck, *An Introduction to Biology*, New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1965, p. 241.

*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

¹³⁹ Elizabeth Pennisi, "Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered", *Science*, 5 September 1997: Vol. 277. no. 5331, p. 1435.

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 apparatus, 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:

¹⁴⁰ Pat Shipman, “Birds Do It. . . Did Dinosaurs?,” *New Scientist*, p. 28.

¹⁴¹ D. Lloyd, *The Mitochondria of Microorganisms*, 1974, p. 476.

¹⁴² Gray & Doolittle, “Has the Endosymbiont Hypothesis Been Proven?,” *Microbiological Review*, Vol. 30, 1982, p. 46.

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*:

¹⁴³ Wallace-Sanders-Ferl, *Biology: The Science of Life*, 4th Edition, Harper Collins College Publishers, p. 94.

*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 no-where.*¹⁴⁶

Law of Entropy, the —See, Second law of Thermodynamics, the.

Eohippus

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.

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

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.

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 enforced, showing no

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.

*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 evolutionists had to suppose another transitional form between them.

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.

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**.)

Evolutionary Family Tree

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

¹⁵⁴ Maria Genevieve Lavanant, *Bilim ve Teknik* magazine, April 1984, No. 197, p. 22.

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 teaching 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 living 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

¹⁵⁵ R. Wesson, *Beyond Natural Selection*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991, p. 45.

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:

¹⁵⁶ Huxley, J. as cited in *The Best of Humanism*, ed. Roger E. Greeley. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus, 1988. pp. 194-5.

*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 Darwinists, 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.

¹⁵⁷ <http://www.jcn.com/manifestos.html>.

*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

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.

F

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 doing 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:

¹⁶⁰ Pierre P. Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, p. 103.

. . . 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 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

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

*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 *Archæoraptor*, *Sinornithosaurus* and *Beipiaosaurus*. (See **Archæoraptor**). 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 *Archæoraptor*, *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 *Archæoraptor*, *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:

¹⁶² Ann Gibbons, "Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur," *Science*, Vol. 278, no. 5341, 14, November 1997, pp.1229–1230.

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 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 newer turn into another species of bird. They merely exhibit variation within themselves. Many living things in

¹⁶³ Pat Shipman, "'Birds Do It. . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, p. 28.

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.

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

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.

*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 selection, 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:

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.

*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, because 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

¹⁶⁷ <http://www.evolutiondeceit.com/conferences.php>.

*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

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.

human, but only 500 years old, whereas the jawbone belonged to a newly deceased orangutan! (See **Piltdown 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

¹⁷¹ *Bilim ve Yaşam Ansiklopedisi*, İstanbul: 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.

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.)

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,

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.

*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 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:

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.

*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.

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.

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, 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 researcher 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

¹⁸³ Richard B. Bliss and Gary E. Parker, *Origin of Life*, California, 1979, p. 25.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

The proteinoids that Fox obtained were certainly far from being true proteins in terms of structure and function. They 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. Under 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.

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 laboratory, let alone come into being by chance.

¹⁸⁵ S. W. Fox, K. Harada, G. Kramptiz, G. Mueller, "Chemical Origin of Cells," *Chemical Engineering News*, June 22, 1970, p. 80.

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 mutations, 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

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*

¹⁸⁶ Gordon R. Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, p. 48.

¹⁸⁷ Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, London: River Publishing, 1984, p. 70.

*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 hewed the final planks of the platform of mechanism and materialism.”*¹⁸⁹

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.

G

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 of 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

¹⁹⁰ K. Ludmerer, “Eugenics” in *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, Edited by Mark Lappe, New York: The Free Press, , 1978, p. 457.

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 could 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*:

*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

¹⁹¹ Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, New York: Harvard Common Press, 1971, p. 33.

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 characteristics 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 specific 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.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*

¹⁹³ Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları*, Genel Biyoloji/Genel Zooloji, Vol. I, Part I, Ankara, 1993, p. 606.

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 implies 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 impoverished 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 Creation 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 Institute 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 Communism finally collapsed entirely.

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)

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 according 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

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 finally emerged as the greatest deception in the history of science.

¹⁹⁶ Loren Eiseley, *Darwin's Century*, p. 283.

H

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

¹⁹⁷ George Stein, "Biological science and the roots of Nazism," *American Scientist*, Vol. 76(1), 1988, p. 54.

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 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 (NH₃), methane (CH₄), hydrogen (H₂) and water vapor (H₂O)—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, teeth and skeletal structure like those in *Archaeopteryx* make it a unique species of bird, not a reptile.

¹⁹⁸ J. Lear Grimmer, *National Geographic*, August 1962, p. 391.

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 species known as *Homo antecessor*, to which they ascribed the Atapuerca skull.

Homo erectus

Evolutionists regard the classification *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 a known that there is no correlation between brain size

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.

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

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.

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***.)

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 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.

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.

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 *Australopithecus* 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

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.

C. Loring Brace from Michigan University arrived at the following conclusion 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

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.

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 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**.)

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.

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 evolutionist 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 "ancestral" or "primitive" or "advanced" compared with its relatives There is little doubt that if this molecular evidence had been

²¹¹ Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, p. 145.

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 eagles 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

²¹² Ibid., pp. 290-291.

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 major 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

²¹³ Dr. David N. Menton, “The Hopeful Monsters of Evolution,” <http://www.gennet.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.

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.

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

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, *Biyoloji 1* ("Biology 1") İstanbul: 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.

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 form. 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 completely 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

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.

living Coelacanth and once again demonstrated that all the scenarios dreamed up by evolutionists were a fantasy.

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.

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:

²²⁰ Ilya Prigogine, Isabelle Stengers, *Order Out of Chaos*, New York: Bantam Books, 1984, p. 129.

²²¹ *Ibid.* p. 175.

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 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 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.

²²² Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, Ankara: Meteksan Yayınları, 1984, p. 644.

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 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

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.

*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 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.*²²⁶

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 provided 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.

²²⁵ Pierre P. Grassé, *The Evolution of Living Organisms*, 1977, p. 168.

²²⁶ Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 189.

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. That merely enables 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,

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.

²²⁹ Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, p. 689.

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, because 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 distributed 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.

J

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

²³⁰ Marvin L. Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 88.

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

²³¹ Phillip E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 155.

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

²³² 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.

base pairs, taken from various living things, they reported that the “empty” DNA that makes up 90% of human DNA 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. ²³⁴

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,*” ²³⁵ 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.

**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)**

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.

**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.**