

**CONFESSIONS
OF THE
EVOLUTIONISTS**

HARUN YAHYA

CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Charles Darwin's Confessions Regarding His Theory
2. Evolutionists' Confessions Regarding Darwin
3. Regarding the Invalidity of the Theory of Evolution
4. That They Espouse the Theory of Evolution for Ideological Reasons
5. That Natural Selection Has No Evolutionary Power
6. That Mutations Have No Evolutionary Power
7. Regarding the Dead-End of Molecular Evolution
8. Of the Sudden Emergence of Life
9. Of the Lack of Intermediate-Form Fossils
10. That There Is No Evidence of a Transition from Invertebrates to Vertebrates
11. Of the Impossibility of a Transition from Water to Dry Land
12. Of the Impossibility of Reptiles Evolving into Birds
13. That the Theory of Evolution Cannot Account for the Origin of Mammals
14. Regarding the Invalidity of the "Horse Series"
15. Regarding the Forebears of Man
16. That the Human Soul Cannot Be Explained in Terms of Evolution
17. That Complex Organs Cannot Appear by Way of Evolution
18. That the Theory of Evolution Cannot Explain Animal Instincts
19. That Plants Cannot Have Arisen by Way of Evolution
20. Regarding Variations
21. Of the Non-existence of Vestigial Organs
22. Of the Invalidity of the Claims of Homology
23. That the Theory Violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics
24. Of the Invalidity of the Theory of Recapitulation
25. That Life Can Only Have Been Created
26. Materialists' Confessions That the Universe Has a Beginning
27. That the Order in the Universe Cannot Have Come about by Chance
28. Regarding Darwinism's Negative Effect on Moral Values

Conclusion

References

INTRODUCTION

Various circles regard the theory of evolution as ideologically indispensable. From the day it was first proposed right up to the present, they have defended it by means of intense propaganda. Certain scientific publications, schools and a number of media organs portray it as a proven fact in terms of the origin of life. Since some scientists espouse the theory of evolution with the greatest devotion, most people imagine that the theory is scientifically valid.

In fact, however, over the last 150 years the theory of evolution has been totally discredited by such branches of science as paleontology, genetics, microbiology, biochemistry and biophysics. Countless findings revealed by these different branches make it obvious that evolution never happened.

Anyone reading this book may well naturally conclude that the adherents of the theory of evolution are scientists. Yet since those who find evidence that the theory of evolution is invalid are also scientists, therefore scientists must be divided into two groups: those who support evolution, and others who present evidence disproving it.

Yet this does not fully represent the true picture—because the proponents of the theory of evolution have no evidence that it ever took place. And with their own efforts, they even discover evidence that discredits their theory.

No doubt, it is a most contradictory and dishonest to strongly defend a theory while the evidence totally demolishes it. Yet that is exactly their current position.

Indeed, ever since the theory of evolution was first put forward, no scientist espoused because of the scientific evidence. What, then, is evolutionists' aim? And what can explain their inconsistent mindset?

The British zoologist D. M. S. Watson, himself an evolutionist, supplies the answer to those questions:

The theory of evolution (is) a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true but because the only alternative, special creation is clearly incredible.¹

This idea of Watson's is shared by scientists who espouse the theory of evolution. These others are well aware that no evidence proves the theory, but if they abandoned the theory of evolution, they would have to admit the existence of a Creator. Such a thing is unacceptable for proponents of materialist ideology, which we will be examining in due course.

However, the great majority of people, being unaware of this, imagine that those scientists who support evolution have worked along exceedingly scientific lines, with methods based solely on experiment and observation. Therefore, they believe every word those scientists say, feeling no need to investigate any further.

And by doing so, they commit a serious error. As their own admissions show, evolutionists espouse their theory in violation of science. They present evolution as the scientific foundation of the ideology they insist on, which is materialism.

¹ D.M.S. Watson, "Adaptation," *Nature*, Vol. 123 [sic Vol. 124] (1929), p. 233.

Materialist philosophy regards matter as absolute. According to that definition, matter has existed forever, and everything that exists consists of matter alone. As that logic requires, materialism has opposed belief in Allah (God) and the true religions ever since the most ancient times.

Yet when examined, materialism emerges as a philosophy devoid of any scientific evidence, and one incompatible with the truth.

The way to test the truth of any philosophy is through investigating that philosophy's claims regarding science. Using scientific methodology, we can investigate the claim of materialism. We can investigate whether or not matter has always existed, whether atoms and molecules can organize themselves in the absence of a super-material Creator, and whether or not they can give rise to life. When we do so, we see that materialism has effectively collapsed.

The idea that matter has existed for all time was demolished by the Big Bang theory, which indicated that the universe came into being from nothing. The claim that matter can organize itself is essentially what we refer to as the—whose invalidity was made crystal clear by the scientific discoveries during the 20th century.

Yet contemporary materialists do not follow such a rational and scientific course. They have conditioned themselves never to abandon their materialist beliefs, no matter what the cost. These people are materialists first, scientists second. They refuse to abandon their belief in evolution, even though they clearly see that even their own experiments and research refute it. Instead, they try to keep materialism alive by supporting evolution in any way necessary.

Richard Lewontin, a well-known geneticist and evolutionist from Harvard University, confesses that he is a materialist first, and a scientist second:

It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, so we cannot allow a Divine [intervention]...ⁱⁱ

The philosophical term "*a priori*" that Lewontin uses here is highly significant. Latin for "from the beginning," it refers to any root assumption accepted as a given. If you believe in the truth of an idea without question and assume it to be accurate, then that idea is *a priori*. This is how evolutionists seek to adapt science to their own preconceptions. Since materialists absolutely reject the existence of a Creator, their only alternative is to cling tightly to the theory of evolution.

The materialist dogma underlying the evolutionist propaganda in prominent Western media organs and well-known scientific journals is the result of this kind of ideological and philosophical requirements. Since ideology makes abandoning of the theory of evolution impossible, questioning Darwinism has been declared taboo by those materialists who determine scientific standards.

This book is confessions about the theory of evolution made by scientists who espouse the theory for the sake of their materialist ideologies. As we made clear at the start of this chapter, the very scientists who support the theory of evolution also discover the evidence that demolishes it. And generally, these scientists confess that as a result of research in their own specialized fields:

ⁱⁱ Richard Lewontin, "The Demon-Haunted World," *The New York Review of Books*, January 9, 1997, p. 28.

- * No such process as evolution could ever have taken place,
- * The theory of evolution has not been proven,
- * The theory is espoused essentially for ideological reasons, and that
- * The entire universe must be the work of an Omniscient Creator.

You can come across similar confessions in practically every book, academic study or lecture concerning evolution—for two reasons: First, when people do all they can to conceal an obvious fact, even resorting to lies and fraud in order to do so, still they will leave obvious clues behind them. Whenever they speak, they will unwittingly make open or implied confessions indicating the dilemma in which they find themselves. Indeed, all evolutionists—beginning with Charles Darwin, who first proposed the theory—make such confessions abundantly in all their books and lectures.

The facts of creation and the existence of a sublime Creator are perfectly obvious. No matter how unwilling people may be to accept the fact, if they possess even a small amount of rational thought, they will see around them, in all places and at all times, evidence of the existence of Allah (God), the Creator of all things. Yet these scientists have perhaps the very closest familiarity with the evidence of Allah's creation in the world. None who study the complex structure of the cell and is astounded by the flawless characteristics, extraordinary planning, and amazing intelligence inside, can avoid expressing their feelings in the face of the miracles of Allah's creation. Albeit for a brief moment, they will act according to the voices of their conscience and common sense.

One example of this is Francis Crick, a non-resident Fellow of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies before he died on 28 July 2004, who discovered DNA. In the face of the DNA's extraordinary complexity, Crick was forced to admit that the origin of life cannot be explained in terms of chance. Despite being a convinced evolutionist, Crick had to admit what was apparent after he witnessed the miraculous structure of DNA:

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.ⁱⁱⁱ

Having read these confessions, you might well imagine that these people had admitted the scientific facts with all sincerity and finally come to believe in the existence of Allah, as good conscience and reason demand.

However, no matter how much some scientists have seen the truth, the stirrings of their consciences have been very short-lived. They have never countenanced abandoning their ideology, but have continued in their denial despite the voice of their consciences.

Not only has our century witnessed people who, despite seeing the truth, refuse to abandon superstitious beliefs, because of their devotion to materialist dogma. People with such mindsets have existed at all times. The dialogues between materialists and Prophet Abraham (peace be upon him) in the Qur'an inform us of this. The materialists in his time worshipped idols that they had made with their own hands, adopting them as their deities. They claimed that certain effigies they themselves had created, which actually have no power to do anything, were in fact the creators, regulators, and lords of the entire universe.

You might imagine that such paganism is a feature of only ancient times, yet the logic of 21st century deniers is exactly the same. They too maintain that unconscious atoms and random events,

with no ability to do anything, actually created the flawlessly ordered universe and the life within it. Absolutely nothing has changed in the mindset of denial.

In his time, too, the Prophet Abraham (pbuh) employed various means to show people how irrational and illogical their beliefs were. And they then saw how corrupt their earlier beliefs had been and admitted they had been despotic.

They said, “Did you do this to our deities, Abraham?” He said, “No, this one, the biggest of them, did it. Ask them if they are able to speak!” They consulted among themselves and said, “It is you yourselves who are wrongdoers.”

(Surat al-Anbiya’, 62-64)

However, these stirrings of their consciences were only short-lived, and they soon returned to their corrupt ways:

But then they relapsed back into their disbelief: “You know full well these idols cannot talk.” He said, “Do you then worship, instead of Allah, what cannot help or harm you in any way? Shame on you and what you worship besides Allah! Will you not use your intellect?”

(Surat al-Anbiya’, 65-67)

We regard the evaluation of evolutionists’ own confessions as exceedingly useful to better understand this mindset described in the Qur’an 1,400 years ago. Any rational person of good conscience reading these confessions will inevitably wonder since they admit the theory is wrong, why do they still support it?

As has already been made clear, they believe in the theory because that is what their ideology demands. Otherwise they know they would need to admit the existence of Allah. Nor is this particular to our century alone. The Qur’an tells us that although their hearts realized the truth, some ignored the true facts because of their feelings of pride and arrogance, and still denied the existence of Allah:

And they repudiated them wrongly and haughtily, in spite of their own certainty about them. See the final fate of the corrupters.

(Surat an-Naml, 14)

CHAPTER I

CHARLES DARWIN'S CONFESSIONS REGARDING HIS THEORY

In 1859, Charles Darwin first published *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection Or The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. In this book, which he described as a “long argument,” he sought to explain the origin of life in terms of evolutionary development.

Throughout his book, he dealt with the subject matter very amateurishly, not based on any experiment, relying upon conjecture and hypothesis. Later, Darwin set out his ideas regarding human evolution at the same scientific level in his book *The Descent of Man*. Yet in both books, he admitted the weaknesses and inconsistencies in his theory and frequently reiterated his doubts concerning the truth of these hypotheses in question.

The British physicist H.S. Lipson makes this comment about these fears of Darwin's:

On reading *The Origin of Species*, I found that Darwin was much less sure himself than he is often represented to be; the chapter entitled “Difficulties of the Theory,” for example, shows considerable self-doubt. As a physicist, I was particularly intrigued by his comments on how the eye would have arisen.^{iv}

In addition, Darwin made similar confessions that were later collected in the book *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, edited by his son, Francis Darwin. Most of the letters written by Darwin to close friends or eminent scientists of his time are full of his confessions regarding his theory. Indeed, Darwin even had no qualms about expressing his ignorance of the relevant subjects.

Yet even though the founder of this theory had strong doubts about its accuracy and his own level of scientific knowledge, and admitted as much in the very plainest language, today's evolutionists still remain utterly convinced by his theory.

This chapter will examine only Darwin's own general confessions concerning the theory of evolution and also, confessions regarding his state of mind in making these claims. Darwin was concerned that his theory was actually contradictory, inconsistent and unrealistic:

Long before having arrived at this part of my work, a crowd of difficulties will have occurred to the reader. Some of them are so grave that to this day I can never reflect on them without being staggered.^v

I have now briefly recapitulated the answers and explanations which can be given to them. I have felt these difficulties far too heavily during many years to doubt their weight.^{vi}

^{iv} H. S. Lipson, “A Physicist's View of Darwin's Theory,” *Evolution Trends in Plants*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1988, p. 6.

^v Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter 6 – “Difficulties on Theory.”

^{vi} *Ibid.*, Chapter 14 – “Recapitulation and Conclusion.”

Nevertheless, I doubt whether the work [of writing *The Origin of Species*] was worth the consumption of so much time.^{vii}

Pray do not think that I am so blind as not to see that there are numerous immense difficulties in my notions.^{viii}

From a letter to Asa Gray, a close friend and Professor of Biology at Harvard University:

I am quite conscious that my speculations run quite beyond the bounds of true science.^{ix}

You will do a wonderful amount of good in spreading the doctrine of Evolution, supporting it as you do by so many original observations. . . . Has the problem of the later stages of reduction of useless structures ever perplexed you? This problem has of late caused me much perplexity.^x

From a letter to his second cousin William Darwin Fox:

All nature is perverse and will not do as I wish it, and just at present I wish I had my old barnacles to work at and nothing new.^{xi}

Sometimes I fear I shall break down, for my subject gets bigger and bigger with each month. . . .^{xii}

From a letter to his friend and botanist Sir Joseph Dalton Hooker:

I sometimes suspect I shall soon entirely fail.^{xiii}

I fancy I have lately removed many great difficulties opposed to my notions, but God knows it may be all hallucination.^{xiv}

I was beginning to think that perhaps I was wholly in the wrong and that [Richard Owen] was right when he said the whole subject would be forgotten in ten years.^{xv}

You ask about my book, and all that I can say is that I am ready to commit suicide; I thought it was decently written, but find so much wants rewriting. . . .^{xvi}

. . . but so much has been published since the appearance of the 'Origin of Species,' that I very much doubt whether I retain power of mind and strength to reduce the mass into a digested whole.^{xvii}

From a letter to Charles Lyell, the British geologist:

For myself, also, I rejoice profoundly; for, thinking of so many cases of men pursuing an illusion for years, often and often a cold shudder has run through me, and I have asked myself whether I may not have devoted my life to phantasy.^{xviii}

Robert Bingham Downs, an American author and librarian states:

As Darwin grew older, his views on religion changed. In his youth he accepted the idea of special creation without reservation. In the book *Life and Letters*, however, he said that mankind would be a far more perfect entity in the distant future. He then went on to add the following ideas:

Another source of conviction in the existence of God, connected with the reason, and not with the feelings, impresses me as having much more weight. This follows from the extreme difficulty or rather, impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe including man with his capacity of looking far backwards and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting, I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called Theist. This conclusion was strong in my mind about the time, as far as I can remember, when I wrote the *Origin of Species*; and it is since that time that it has very gradually, with many fluctuations, become weaker. But then arises the doubt: Can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions?

xix

At this point, Darwin raises his hands in despair and concludes by saying:

I cannot pretend to throw the least light on such abstruse problems. The mystery of the beginning of all thing is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an agnostic. ^{xx}

CHAPTER 2

EVOLUTIONISTS' CONFESSIONS REGARDING DARWIN

Charles Darwin's educational and scientific attainments were not exactly of the highest, particularly when compared to all the opportunities available in our own day. Darwin embarked on medical studies in Edinburgh, but failed to complete them and abandoned the course half-way through. For that reason, when he launched the theory of evolution, he was ignorant of many branches of science closely related to his theory.

Thomas Huxley was Darwin's closest friend and greatest supporter in terms of the theory of evolution. He is even remembered as "Darwin's bulldog" for his vociferous defense of the theory of evolution on Darwin's behalf. But even he admitted of this friend:

Like the rest of us, he had no proper training in biological science. ^{xxi}

From a letter written to Darwin by A. Sedgwick, his closest friend:

Parts of it I admired greatly, parts I laughed at till my sides were almost sore; other parts I read with absolute sorrow, because I think them utterly false and grievously mischievous. . . . Many of your wide conclusions are based upon assumptions. . . . ^{xxii}

^{xxi} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 315.

CHAPTER 3

EVOLUTIONISTS' CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE INVALIDITY OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

As stated in the Introduction, evolutionist scientists know perfectly well that not one single branch of science has corroborated their theory and that the whole concept is totally groundless. Yet for the sake of ideology, they continue to defend the theory, even while some evolutionists confess that it's invalid.

Pierre Paul Grassé is the former president of the French Academy of Sciences and author of the book *Evolution of Living Organisms*. As he writes:

Today our duty is to destroy the myth of evolution, considered as a simple, understood, and explained phenomenon which keeps rapidly unfolding before us. . . . The deceit is sometimes unconscious, but not always, since some people, owing to their sectarianism, purposely overlook reality and refuse to acknowledge the inadequacies and falsity of their beliefs. ^{xxiii}

After setting out the impossibility of random mutations having met all the needs of the living world, Grassé goes on to say:

There is no law against daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it. ^{xxiv}

Prof. Derek Ager, who is the former president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science (and head of the department of geology and oceanography at University College of Swansea):

It must be significant that nearly all the evolutionary stories I learned as a student . . . have now been debunked. ^{xxv}

Dr. Robert Milikan is a Nobel Prize winner and renowned evolutionist:

The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientist can ever prove. ^{xxvi}

^{xxiii} Pierre Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 8.

^{xxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 103.

^{xxv} Derek Ager, "The Nature of the Fossil Record." *Proceedings of the Geological Association*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 1976, p. 132.

^{xxvi} SBS Vital Topics, David B. Loughran, April 1996, Stewarton Bible School, Stewarton, Scotland, URL:<http://www.rmplc.co.uk/eduweb/sites/sbs777/vital/evolutio.html>

Dr. Lewis Thomas, the author of *Lives of a Cell*:

Biology needs a better word than error for the driving force in evolution. . . . I cannot make my peace with the randomness doctrine; I cannot abide the notion of purposelessness and blind chance in nature. And yet I do not know what to put in its place for the quieting of my mind. ^{xxvii}

Jerry Coyne is of the Chicago University Evolution and Ecology Department:

We conclude—unexpectedly—that there is little evidence for the neo-Darwinian view: its theoretical foundations and the experimental evidence supporting it are weak. ^{xxviii}

H. S. Lipson, the British physicist:

I have always been slightly suspicious of the theory of evolution because of its ability to account for any property of living beings (the long neck of the giraffe, for example). I have therefore tried to see whether biological discoveries over the last thirty years or so fit in with Darwin's theory. I do not think that they do. To my mind, the theory does not stand up at all. ^{xxix}

Gregory Alan Pesely is Professor of Philosophy:

One would immediately reject any lexicographer who tried to define a word by the same word, or a thinker who merely restated his proposition, or any other instance of gross redundancy; yet no one seems scandalized that men of science should be satisfied with a major principle which is no more than a tautology. ^{xxx}

Dr. Colin Patterson is an evolutionist paleontologist and curator of London's Natural History Museum, editor of the museum's journal and author of the book *Evolution*:

Now, one of the reasons I started taking this anti-evolutionary view—well, let's call it non-evolutionary—was [that] last year I had a sudden realization. For over twenty years, I had thought that I was working on evolution in some way. One morning I woke up, and something had happened in the night, and it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for twenty years, and there was not one thing I knew about it. That was quite a shock, to learn that one can be so misled for so long. . . . So for the last few weeks, I've tried putting a simple question to various people and groups of people.

The question is this: 'Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing, any one thing that you think is true? Is there one thing you can tell me about evolution?' I tried this question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology seminar in the University of Chicago—a very prestigious body of evolutionists—and all I got there was silence for a long time. But eventually one person said, 'I do know one thing—it ought not to be taught in high school.' ^{xxxi}

Dr. Albert Fleischman, zoologist at the University of Erlangen:

The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination. ^{xxxii}

W. R. Thompson is Head of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control in - Ottawa:

This situation, where scientific men rally to the defence of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science. ^{xxxiii}

E. O. Wiley of City University of New York's, Ichthyology Department and the American Museum of Natural History, expresses his thoughts on Norman Macbeth's book *Darwin Retried*:

Macbeth suggests that we try to look at evolution with new eyes, that we admit to the public, and, if needed, to ourselves, that we have misgivings about Darwinism, and the synthetic theory, that we open debate. ^{xxxiv}

Roger Lewin is a well-known evolutionist science writer and former editor of *New Scientist* magazine:

Our intelligence, our reflective consciousness, our extreme technological facility, our complex spoken language, our sense of moral and ethical values—each of these is apparently sufficient to set us apart from nature . . . this gap is an “embarrassment,” something to be explained away. ^{xxxv}

Dr. Nils Heribert-Nilsson, is a Swedish geneticist and Professor of Botany at the University of Lund in Sweden:

My attempts to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for more than 40 years have completely failed. At least I should hardly be accused of having started from any preconceived anti-evolutionary standpoint. ^{xxxvi}

Paul Lemoine, a former Director of the National Museum of Natural History at Paris:

The theories of evolution in which our student youth was cradled constitute a dogma that all the world continues to teach. But each in his own specialty, zoologist or botanist, comes to the conclusion that none of the available explanations is adequate. . . . The result of this summary is that the theory of evolution is impossible. ^{xxxvii}

Norman Macbeth, a Harvard-trained lawyer, has made the study of Darwinian theory his avocation for many years:

Unfortunately, in the field of evolution most explanations are not good. As a matter of fact, they hardly qualify as explanations at all; they are suggestions, hunches, pipe dreams, hardly worthy of being called hypotheses. ^{xxxviii}

Prof. Cemal Yıldırım, a Turkish evolutionist, is Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University and visiting scholar at California State University in Northridge:

No scientist, whether be Darwinist or neo-Darwinist, can suggest the notion that the theory of evolution is proven. ^{xxxix}

That's right, evolution theory is not proven. ^{xl}

It is far from being convincing to attribute this order in living things, which seems to have a particular purpose, to chance or coincidence. ^{xli}

François Jacob is a professor of cell genetics and winner of the 1965 Nobel Prize for Medicine:

But then again, we are far from having a final explanation regarding the mechanisms of evolution in particular. . . . In addition, we are a very long way from being able to know all the mechanisms at the basis of the universe, as revealed by various observations recently made regarding, for example, the structure of chromosomes. ^{xlii}

CHAPTER 4

EVOLUTIONISTS' CONFESSIONS THAT THEY ESPOUSE THE THEORY FOR IDEOLOGICAL REASONS

Numerous scientific findings in the second half of the 20th century and the current century clearly, definitively revealed the invalidity of the theory of evolution. As stated earlier, even the world's most prominent evolutionists are well aware of this. Indeed, despite their blind devotion to their theory, they still admit that the theory faces impossible quandaries. That being so, why are some scientists so determined to support the theory, even though they know full well that it is unscientific?

As discussed in the Introduction, the reason for scientists' devotion to the theory of evolution lies in their ideology. Evolutionists do not behave like real scientists at all and persist with their ideology despite all their experiments, observations and research. The basis of their ideology is their belief in materialism, which obliges them to deny the existence of Allah. That is why, even though all the scientific data clearly and irrefutably show the existence of a sublime creator, a lord of all, these materialist and evolutionist scientists deny that Allah exists. However, they make unequivocal statements that all evidence points to the existence of a Creator and the flawless creation brought into being by Him, though their ideology makes it impossible for them to admit this.

Prof. Chandra Wickramasinghe is Professor of Applied Mathematics and Astronomy at Cardiff University and Director of the Cardiff Centre for Astrobiology:

From my earliest training as a scientist, I was very strongly brainwashed to believe that science cannot be consistent with any kind of deliberate creation. That notion has had to be painfully shed. At the moment, I can't find any rational argument to knock down the view which argues for conversion to God. We used to have an open mind; now we realize that the only logical answer to life is creation—and not accidental random shuffling.^{xliii}

Prof. Fred Hoyle is a British astronomer and a mathematician at Cambridge University:

Indeed, 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.^{xliv}

François Jacob is Professor of Cell Genetics and winner of the 1965 Nobel Prize for Medicine:

^{xliii} Chandra Wickramasinghe, Interview in *London Daily Express*, August 14, 1981.

^{xliv} Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984, p. 130.

All these debates raise serious questions, heading the list of which is; is it really possible to develop a concept of evolution independent of biologists' preconceptions? ^{xlv}

Dr. Michael Walker is an anthropologist at the University of Sydney in Australia:

One is forced to conclude that many scientists and technologists pay lip-service to Darwinian theory only because it supposedly excludes a Creator. ^{xlvi}

Robert Shapiro is Professor Emeritus and Senior Research Scientist in the Department of Chemistry at New York University:

Another evolutionary principle is therefore needed to take us across the gap from mixtures of simple natural chemicals to the first effective replicator. This principle has not yet been described in detail or demonstrated, but it is anticipated, and given names such as chemical evolution and self-organization of matter. The existence of the principle is taken for granted in the philosophy of dialectical materialism. . . . ^{xlvii}

Hubert Yockey is an evolutionist biologist in University of California at Berkeley:

Faith in the infallible and comprehensive doctrines of dialectic materialism plays a crucial role in origin of life scenarios, and especially in exobiology and its ultimate consequence: the doctrine of advanced extra-terrestrial civilization. That life must exist somewhere in the solar system on 'suitable planets elsewhere' is widely and tenaciously believed, in spite of lack of evidence or even abundant evidence to the contrary. ^{xlviii}

Paul R. Ehrlich, President of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University and Fellow of the AAAS, and Richard W. Holm, Professor of Biological Sciences at Stanford University:

Perpetuation of today's theory [of evolution] as dogma will not encourage progress toward more satisfactory explanations of observed phenomena. ^{xlix}

Theodosius Dobzhansky, Ukrainian-American geneticist and evolutionist:

The evidence has not satisfied quite everybody; a few people who are not ignorant of the pertinent facts are nevertheless antievolutionists. ¹

Pierre Paul Grassé is, as you saw, a French zoologist and the former President of the French Academy of Sciences:

Chance becomes a sort of providence, which, under the cover of atheism, is not named but which is secretly worshipped. ^{li}

Prof. Cemal Yildirim is a Turkish evolutionist, and Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University:

There is no need to query Darwinism's thesis of natural selection. It moves away from being a scientific concept to the extent that it regards the truth as an evident principle and acquires the nature of an ideological teaching.^{lii}

Geoffrey Clark is an anthropologist at Arizona State University:

We select among alternative sets of research conclusions in accordance with our biases and preconceptions--a process that is, at once, both political and subjective. . . [paleoanthropology] has the form, but not the substance of a science.^{liii}

From an address that the evolutionist Greg Kirby gave at a Biology Teachers Association meeting:

If you were to spend your life picking up bones and finding little fragments of head and little fragments of jaw, there is a very strong desire there to exaggerate the importance of those fragments.

CHAPTER 5

EVOLUTIONISTS' CONFESSIONS THAT NATURAL SELECTION HAS NO EVOLUTIONARY POWER

The theory of evolution suggests that living things evolved thanks to two fundamental mechanisms: *natural selection* and *mutation*. Evolutionists maintain that the characteristics brought about by mutations in living things are then *chosen* by the mechanism of natural selection and thus survive to reproduce. Close inspection, however, shows that neither mechanism has any evolutionary force at all, not giving the slightest support to the idea that living things evolve and gradually turn into new species.

Charles Darwin, founder of the theory of evolution, first claimed that natural selection was an evolutionary force. The title he gave to his book emphasizes that natural selection represented the basis of his theory: *The Origin of Species, by Means of Natural Selection*. . .

Natural selection predicts the survival of living things possessing the most appropriate characteristics for the conditions prevailing in the natural locations they inhabit, and the extinction of those individuals that lack these advantages. For example, in a herd of deer threatened by wolves, those deer able to run the fastest will naturally survive. The others will be hunted down and eliminated. The result will be a remaining herd of swift-running deer.

Yet the one important point is that no matter how long this process continues, it will never transform deer into any other species. A deer cannot turn into a horse, for instance. Deer always remain deer, no matter how swift.

In fact, Darwinists have been unable to reveal a single finding to show that natural selection causes living things to evolve. Evolutionists are aware of this and starting with Darwin himself, have many times admitted that natural selection cannot cause new species to develop, much less new life forms.

Charles Darwin:

Is it possible that an animal having, for instance, the structure and habits of a bat, could have been formed by the modification of some other animal with widely different habits and structure? Can we believe that natural selection could produce, on the one hand, an organ of trifling importance, such as the tail of a giraffe, which serves as a fly-flapper, and, on the other hand, an organ so wonderful as the eye? ^{lv}

I shall know that the theory of Natural Selection, is, in the main, safe; that it includes, as now put forth, many errors, is almost certain, though I cannot see them. ^{lvi}

^{lv} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter VI, "Difficulties of the Theory."

^{lvi} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 10.

Alfred Russell Wallace is a British naturalist and co-formulator with Charles Darwin of the theory of biological evolution via natural selection:

I found this argument [natural selection] convincing until I attempted to explain the advanced state of human faculties. ^{lvii}

The late Professor Stephen Jay Gould was a professor of geology and paleoanthropology at Harvard University and the main spokesman for evolution in the second half of the 20th century:

Paleontologists [fossil experts] have paid an exorbitant price for Darwin's argument. We fancy ourselves as the only true students of life's history, yet to preserve our favored account of evolution by natural selection. We view our data as so bad that we almost never see the very process we profess to study. ^{lviii}

The essence of Darwinism lies in a single phrase: natural selection is the creative force of evolutionary change. No one denies that selection will play a negative role in eliminating the unfit. Darwinian theories require that it create the fit as well. ^{lix}

Prof. Cemal Yıldırım is, as you saw, a Turkish evolutionist, and Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University:

Yet various aspects of natural selection have never managed to avoid being the subject of debate, neither today nor when it was first put forward. We know that theologians on the one hand and also biologists find evolution unsatisfying as an explanation. ^{lx}

Scientists of the nineteenth century were easily misled into adopting the thesis that nature is a battlefield, because more often than not, they were imprisoned in their studies or laboratories and generally didn't bother to acquaint themselves with nature directly. Not even a respectable scientist like Huxley could exempt himself from this error. ^{lxi}

Another criticism from the scientific point of view concerns the claim that the living world is in a constant fight for survival. Many reliable observations have revealed that organisms, particularly those at a more advanced level, display solidarity and behaviour that can be defined as "cooperation." A third, more important criticism concerns the way the inadequacy of natural selection as an explanatory principle. According to this criticism, living things in all stages from amoeba to human beings exhibit an extraordinary organization and purposefulness incompatible with physical and chemical explanation. It is impossible to account for this mechanical order based on random variations by way of natural selection.

Take the human eye, for example. Is there any chance that such a delicate and functional organ with such complex structures and workings could have come about in a solely mechanical order with no purposeful creative power? Is it sufficient to say that human beings, who create civilization out of their artistry, philosophy and science evolved by way of natural selection? Can a mother's love be explained by the blind process of natural selection, which has no spiritual aspects? For such questions, it's hardly possible for Darwinist biologists to give satisfactory answers. ^{lxii}

J. B. S. Haldane is a British geneticist and famous evolutionist biologist:

To sum up, no satisfactory cause of evolution other than the action of natural selection on fortuitous variations has ever been put forward. It is by no means clear that natural selection will explain all the facts...^{lxiii}

He will probably attempt to account for it as a result of natural selection, but natural selection is more fitted to explain the origin of given adaptations than the existence of living beings to which the term adaptation can be applied with a meaning.^{lxiv}

J. Hawkes:

I have difficulty in believing that the dazzling beauty in birds, fish, flowers, etc., came about by natural selection. Beyond that, he asks the question whether human consciousness can be the product of such a mechanism. In his article, finally, he concludes that the human mind that produced the blessings of civilization, and the creative imagination that immortalized those such as Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci, Shakespeare, Newton and Einstein cannot be the gift of the law of the jungle called the “struggle for survival” to us.^{lxv}

Roger Lewin is a prize-winning author and former News Editor of *Science Magazine*:

It [natural selection] may have a stabilizing effect, but it does not promote speciation. It is not a creative force, as many people have suggested.^{lxvi}

Dr. Colin Patterson a senior palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History:

No one has ever produced a [new] species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever got near it and most of the current argument in neo-Darwinism is about this question.^{lxvii}

Arthur Koestler is a Hungarian-born British novelist, journalist, and critic:

In the meantime, the educated public continues to believe that Darwin has provided all the relevant answers by the magic formula of random mutations plus natural selection—quite unaware of the fact that random mutations have turned out to be irrelevant and natural selection a tautology.^{lxviii}

Pierre Paul Grassé is the former president of the French Academy of Sciences:

The “evolution in action” of J. Huxley and other biologists is simply the observation of demographic facts, local fluctuations of genotypes, geographical distributions. Often the species concerned have remained practically unchanged for hundreds of centuries! Fluctuation as a result of circumstances, with prior modification of the genome, does not imply evolution, and we have tangible proof of this in many panchronic species.^{lxix}

CHAPTER 6

EVOLUTIONISTS' CONFESSIONS THAT MUTATIONS HAVE NO EVOLUTIONARY POWER

Along with natural selection, the second supposed mechanism proposed by the theory of evolution is mutations. Radiation and chemical effects result in breakages and dislocations in the DNA molecule, carrying genetic data, that's located in the cell nucleus. Mutations are accidental and either damage the nucleotides that make up DNA or else dislocate them. They typically give rise to irreparable damage and alterations in the cell.

For that reason, the mutations that evolutionists depend on for biological development are not, as is popularly thought, some magic wand that transports living things to a more advanced and perfect state. Mutations' net effects are harmful. The only changes caused by mutations are similar to those suffered by humans in Hiroshima, Nagasaki or Chernobyl: in other words, birth defects, illness, or death.

For the sake of proving evolution, the results obtained from subjects exposed to radiation in the laboratory go no further than fruit flies with legs protruding from their heads. No instance of a beneficial mutation has ever been observed. All the mutations observed to date have been harmful.

During an interview, Richard Dawkins—one of the best-known evolutionists of our time—was asked if any mutations were known to be beneficial. He could not answer the question, but openly showed his discomfort in not being able to give any facts to support evolution.^{lxx}

Prof. Richard Goldschmidt is a zoologist at the University of California:

It is true that nobody thus far has produced a new species or genus, etc., by macromutation [a combination of many mutations]; it is equally true that nobody has produced even a species by the selection of micromutations [one or only a few mutations]. In the best-known organisms, like *Drosophila*, innumerable mutants are known. If we were able to combine a thousand or more of such mutants in a single individual, this still would have no resemblance whatsoever to any type known as a [new] species in nature.^{lxxi}

Kevin Padian is Professor in Department of Integrative Biology at University of California, Berkeley and Curator of Paleontology at UC Museum of Paleontology:

How do major evolutionary changes get started? Does anyone still believe that populations sit around for tens of thousands of years, waiting for favorable mutations to occur (and just how does that happen, by the way?), then anxiously guard them until enough accumulate for selection to push

^{lxx} "Biological Evidence of Creation: From a Fog to a Prince," Keziah, American Portrait Films, Cleveland, OH, 1998.

^{lxxi} Richard B. Goldschmidt, "Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist," *American Scientist*, Vol. 40 (January 1952), p. 94.

the population toward new and useful change? There you have the mathematical arguments of Neo-Darwinism that Waddington and others rightly characterized as “vacuous.” ^{lxxii}

Pierre-Paul Grassé is a French biologist and former President of the French Academy of Sciences:

No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution. ^{lxxiii}

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 daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it. ^{lxxiv}

Francisco J. Ayala is University Professor of Biological Sciences, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology at University of California:

High-energy radiations, such as X-rays, increase the rate of mutation. Mutations induced by radiation are random, in the sense that they arise independently of their effects on the fitness of the individuals which carry the m. Randomly induced mutations are usually deleterious. In a precisely organized and complex system like the genome of an organism, a random change will most frequently decrease, rather than increase, the orderliness or useful information of the system. ^{lxxv}

James F. Crow is president of the Wisconsin University Medical Genetics Department and an expert on radiation and mutation:

Almost every mutation is harmful, and it is the individual who pays the price. Any human activity that tends to increase the mutation rate must therefore raise serious health and moral problems for man. ^{lxxvi}

A random change in the highly integrated system of chemical processes which constitute life is certain to impair—just as a random interchange of connections [wires] in a television set is not likely to improve the picture. ^{lxxvii}

Frederick Seymour Hulse is Professor Emeritus at the University of Arizona and a member of the National Academy of Sciences:

Mutations occur at random, not because it would be convenient to have one. Any chance alteration in the composition and properties of a highly complex operating system is not likely to improve its manner of operation, and most mutations are disadvantageous for this reason. There is a delicate balance between an organism and its environment which a mutation can easily upset. One could as well expect that altering the position of the foot brake or the gas pedal at random would improve the operation of an automobile. ^{lxxviii}

David L. Stern is an evolutionist zoologist at University of Cambridge:

One of the oldest problems in evolutionary biology remains largely unsolved. Which mutations generate evolutionarily relevant phenotypic variation? What kinds of molecular changes do they entail? ^{lxxix}

Stephen Jay Gould is the evolutionary theorist at Harvard University:

You don't make new species by mutating the species. . . . A mutation is not the cause of evolutionary change. ^{lxxx}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German Professor of Neurology and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

In seeking an answer to the question of whether an infinitely complex biological process, an organic order, can emerge as the result of aimless, purposeless and random mutations, our power of judgment will remain fairly pedestrian. . . . Indeed, would we not be going much too far and corrupting those who think otherwise to claim that even if evolution had sufficient time for the emergence of new orders, new mechanisms of the kind we are discussing, and that new organization and order was the product of coincidences? If it is not inappropriate to say so, these strange entities were like a deformed neonate. They were the result of a mutation. The results of mutation have almost always given birth to a catastrophe. ^{lxxxii}

At this point, objectors tend to propose a counter-thesis to the idea that the number of mutations will not be sufficiently large from the point of view of providing a sufficient quantity of significant and fit for purpose characteristics by entirely coincidental means. In fact, according to the laws of probability, not even large numbers of mutations can avoid being harmful and even deadly, let alone support development. ^{lxxxiii}

Dr. Mahlon B. Hoagland is faculty member at Harvard Medical School and former President and Scientific Director of the Worcester Foundation for Biomedical Research:

The information that resides in organisms that are alive today . . . is far more refined than the work of all the world's great poets combined. The chance that a random change of a letter or word or phrase would improve the reading is remote; on the other hand, it is very likely that a random hit would be harmful. It is for this reason that many biologists view with dismay the proliferation of nuclear weapons, nuclear power plants, and industrially generated mutagenic (mutation-producing) chemicals. ^{lxxxiiii}

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. ^{lxxxiv}

Warren Weaver, an evolutionist scientist, wrote the following in a report prepared by the Committee on Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation, established in the wake of the Second World War to investigate the mutations arising as the result of the use of nuclear weapons:

Many will be puzzled about the statement that practically all known mutant genes are harmful. For mutations are necessary parts of the process of evolution. How can a good effect—evolution to higher forms of life—result from mutations practically all of which are harmful? ^{lxxxv}

Moreover, the mutant genes, in the vast majority of cases, and in all the species so far studied, lead to some kind of harmful effect. In extreme cases the harmful effect is death itself, or loss of the ability to produce offspring, or some other serious abnormality. ^{lxxxvi}

Michael Pitman is Chief Scientist of Australia and Foreign Secretary of the Australian Academy of Science:

Morgan, Goldschmidt, Muller, and other 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. ^{lxxxvii}

Gordon Rattray Taylor is an evolutionist author and Chief Science Advisor at BBC:

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 around 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.

^{lxxxviii}

CHAPTER 7

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE DEAD-END OF MOLECULAR EVOLUTION

To the question of how life on Earth originally emerged, the theory of evolution has no answers to give, even right from the very beginning of the debate. Evolutionists claim that life began with when one single cell that came into being by chance. According to this scenario, under the effects of lightning and earthquakes, various inanimate substances entered into a reaction in the primordial atmosphere of some 4 billion years ago; thus giving rise to the first cell.

This scenario cannot be true, because life is far too complex to have emerged in any chance manner. Even the very smallest organism has literally millions of biochemical components that interact with it, each one of them vital for the organism to survive at all.

W. H. Thorpe, an evolutionist scientist admits as much: “The most elementary type of cell constitutes a ‘mechanism’ unimaginably more complex than any machine yet thought up, let alone constructed, by man.”^{lxxxix} There is absolutely no chance of the components of this exceedingly complex system to form all at once, in the right place, at the right time, in total compatibility with one another.

It is also impossible for such a complex system to have come into being gradually, as Darwin maintained, because it can function only when all its parts are ready and operative. More primitive stages would serve no purpose at all. Indeed, the thesis that inanimate substances can combine together in such a way as to give rise to life is an unscientific one that has never been verified by any experiment or observation. On the contrary, all the scientific findings show that life can only originate from life.

Every living cell is the result of the division of another, earlier cell. No one on Earth, not even in the most advanced laboratories, has ever managed to combine inanimate substances and produce a living cell.

The theory of evolution, however, maintains that the living cell—which cannot be replicated as the result of human intelligence, science and technology—assembled itself under the conditions on the primeval Earth.

But the meaninglessness of this claim is made obvious by evolutionists’ own admissions. Various evolutionists have explained, with the use of different analogies, the impossibility of life appearing spontaneously from inanimate matter:

Prof. Fred Hoyle:

A junkyard contains all the bits and pieces of a Boeing 747, dismembered and in disarray. A whirlwind happens to blow through the yard. What is the chance that after its passage a fully assembled 747, ready to fly, will be found standing there? So small as to be negligible, even if a tornado were to blow through enough junkyards to fill the whole Universe.^{xc}

^{lxxxix} W.R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, pp. 298-99.

At all events, anyone with even a nodding acquaintance with the Rubik's cube will concede the near-impossibility of a solution being obtained by a blind person moving the cubic faces at random. Now imagine 1,050 blind persons each with a scrambled Rubik's cube, and try to conceive of the chance of them all simultaneously arriving at the solved form. You then have the chance of arriving by random shuffling of just one of the many biopolymers on which life depends. The notion that not only the biopolymers, but the operating programme of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on the Earth is evidently nonsense of a high order. Life must plainly be a cosmic phenomenon. ^{xci}

If there were a basic principle of matter which somehow drove organic systems toward life, its existence should easily be demonstrable in the laboratory. One could, for instance, take a swimming bath to represent the primordial soup. Fill it with any chemicals of a non-biological nature you please. Pump any gases over it, or through it, you please, and shine any kind of radiation on it that takes your fancy. Let the experiment proceed for a year and see how many of those 2,000 enzymes [proteins produced by living cells] have appeared in the bath.

I will give the answer, and so save [you] the time and trouble and expense of actually doing the experiment. You will find nothing at all, except possibly for a tarry sludge composed of amino acids and other simple organic chemicals. How can I be so confident of this statement? Well, if it were otherwise, the experiment would long since have been done and would be well-known and famous throughout the world. The cost of it would be trivial compared to the cost of landing a man on the Moon. . . . ^{xcii}

Prof. Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, who is a professor of applied mathematics and astronomy at Cardiff University:

. . . troops of monkeys thundering away at random on typewriters could not produce the works of Shakespeare, for the practical reason that the whole observable universe is not large enough to contain the necessary monkey hordes, the necessary typewriters, and certainly the waste paper baskets required for the deposition of wrong attempts. The same is true of living material . . . One to a number with $10^{40,000}$ noughts after 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. ^{xciii}

Prof. Malcolm Dixon, a British biochemist, at the University of Cambridge:

Enzyme systems are doing every minute what battalions of full-time chemists cannot. . Can anyone seriously imagine that naturally occurring enzymes realized themselves, along with hundreds of specific friends, by chance? Enzymes and enzyme systems, like the genetic mechanisms whence they originate, are masterpieces of sophistication. Further research reveals ever finer details of design. ^{xciv}

Prof. Michael Pitman is the Chief Scientist of Australia:

There are perhaps, 10^{80} atoms in the universe, and 10^{17} seconds have elapsed since the alleged 'Big Bang.' More than 2,000 independent enzymes are necessary for life. The overall probability of building any one of these polypeptides can hardly be greater than one in 10^{20} . The chance of getting them all by a random trial is one in 10^{40000} , an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup. ^{xcv}

Prof. Ali Demirsoy is a biologist at Hacettepe University and specializes in zoogeography:

In essence, the probability of the formation of a cytochrome-C sequence is as likely as zero. That is, if life requires a certain sequence, it can be said that this has a probability likely to be realized once in the whole universe. Otherwise some metaphysical powers beyond our definition must have acted in its formation. To accept the latter is not appropriate for the scientific cause. We thus have to look into the first hypothesis. ^{xcvi}

Harold F. Blum is Professor of Biology at Princeton University:

The spontaneous formation of a polypeptide of the size of the smallest known proteins seems beyond all probability. ^{xcvii}

Andrew Scott is an evolutionist biochemist and science writer:

Take some matter, heat while stirring and wait. That is the modern version of Genesis. The 'fundamental' forces of gravity, electromagnetism and the strong and weak nuclear forces are presumed to have done the rest. . . . But how much of this neat tale is firmly established, and how much remains hopeful speculation? In truth, the mechanism of almost every major step, from chemical precursors up to the first recognizable cells, is the subject of either controversy or complete bewilderment. ^{xcviii}

Dr. Christian Schwabe is Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at the Medical University of South Carolina:

Molecular evolution is about to be accepted as a method superior to paleontology for the discovery of evolutionary relationships. As a molecular evolutionist, I should be elated. Instead, it seems disconcerting that many exceptions exist to the orderly progression of species as determined by molecular homologies: so many in fact, that I think the exception, the quirks, may carry the more important message. ^{xcix}

Prof. Cemal Yıldırım is a Turkish evolutionist, and Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University:

One suggestion made in order to prove that life cannot appear by chance is the unbelievably low probability of a functional enzyme emerging. A typical enzyme consists of 100 amino acids.

Since there are 20 kinds of amino acid, we are looking at 20,100 possible combinations. The possibility of a specific enzyme forming by chance in a single step from among so many possible combinations is 1 in 10^{130} . The point that is ignored is that molecular kinetics are not random, and that functional enzymes appear all the time. ^c

Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy is a biologist at Hacettepe University and specializes in zoogeography:

An enzyme consists of an average of 100 amino acids. The number of possible combinations of an enzyme consisting of 100 amino acids of 20 different types is 20^{100} . Bearing in mind that the total number of atoms in the universe is 10^{80} , and that the number of seconds that have gone by since the formation of the universe is 10^{16} , one can better appreciate how low the odds of an enzyme with a specific sequence forming really are. So how did enzymes emerge? ^{ci}

Scientific American is a well-known American scientific magazine with strongly pro-evolution views:

Even the simpler molecules are produced only in small amounts in realistic experiments simulating possible primitive earth conditions. What is worse, these molecules are generally minor constituents of tars: It remains problematical how they could have been separated and purified through geochemical processes whose normal effects are to make organic mixtures more and more of a jumble. With somewhat more complex molecules, these difficulties rapidly increase. In particular, a purely geochemical origin of nucleotides [the subunits of DNA and RNA] presents great difficulties. ^{cii}

Prof. Chandra Wickramasinghe is Professor of Applied Mathematics and Astronomy at Cardiff University and Director of the Cardiff Centre for Astrobiology:

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. ^{ciii}

Carly P. Haskins is an evolutionist biologist. The following is excerpted from an article published in *American Scientist* magazine:

But the most sweeping evolutionary questions at the level of biochemical genetics are still unanswered. How the genetic code first appeared and then evolved and, earlier even than that, how life itself originated on earth remain for the future to resolve. . . . Did the code and the means of translating it appear simultaneously in evolution? It seems almost incredible that any such coincidence could have occurred, given the extraordinary complexities of both sides and the requirement that they be coordinated accurately for survival. By a pre-Darwinian (or a skeptic of evolution after Darwin), this puzzle would surely have been interpreted as the most powerful sort of evidence for special creation. ^{civ}

Alexander I. Oparin is a Russian evolutionist biochemist at Moscow University and director of Moscow's A. N. Bakh Institute:

Unfortunately, however, the problem of the origin of the cell is perhaps the most obscure point in the whole study of the evolution of organisms. ^{cv}

Loren Eiseley, anthropologist:

To grasp in detail the physio-chemical organization of the simplest cell is far beyond our capacity. ^{cvi}

Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy is a biologist at Hacettepe University:

In essence, no satisfactory explanation for the development of groups of cells with very different structures and functions has yet been provided. ^{cvi}

Prof. Dr. Klaus Dose is president of the Johannes Gutenberg University Biochemistry Institute in Germany:

More than 30 years of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on Earth rather than to its solution. At present, all discussions on principal theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance. ^{cvi}

In spite of many attempts, there have been no breakthroughs during the past 30 years to help to explain the origin of chirality in living cells. ^{cix}

David A. Kaufman has PhD from University of Florida):

Evolution lacks a scientifically acceptable explanation of the source of the precisely planned codes within cells, without which there can be no specific proteins and hence, no life. ^{cx}

Jeffrey Bada is Professor of Marine Chemistry at the San Diego State University:

Today, as we leave the twentieth century, we still face the biggest unsolved problem that we had when we entered the twentieth century: How did life originate on Earth? ^{cx}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth studied medicine, psychology and philosophy at the universities of Berlin and Hamburg, where he attained his Ph.D. in medicine:

Our present knowledge shows that the general principle of the universe does not apply here; there is no question of a primitive cell gradually turning into one with a nucleus and organelles. ^{cxii}

The cell has to have exactly the right amount of enzymes from the moment it is born— in other words, before it comes into direct contact with the oxygen in the atmosphere. Is it really possible for such a compatibility to have emerged *solely by chance*? Thinkers who answer that question are divided into two groups. To say *Yes, it is possible*, is like a confirmation of belief in modern science. Adopting a more pessimistic viewpoint, we may say that non-supporter of modern science has any alternative but to reply *Yes*. Because such a person will have the intention of coming up with an explanation by way of comprehensible natural phenomena and to produce these on the basis of natural laws without the assistance of any supernatural interventions.

But at this point, accounting for what has happened in terms of natural laws, and therefore *coincidences*, shows that the person in question has been backed into a corner. Because what are they left with under such circumstances other than to believe in coincidence. How is it possible to account for the existence of a single *breathing* cell without violating scientific understanding when it comes to evolution continuing development?

If we wish to account in a scientific manner for a single cell, capable of behaving compatibly with oxygen, forming in a moment in exactly the required form, and to account not just for that significant event but also the way that such a complex chemical reaction is essential for the survival of life on Earth, then what alternative have we other than to shelter behind the idea of coincidence? . . .

But the accumulation of coincidences that serve a specific purpose brings our credibility into question. ^{cxiii}

. . . In the absence of a plan setting out where and when construction is to commence and in what order the various projects will be brought together, even the best blueprint will serve no purpose. We know that if we are dealing with a building, we need to start with the foundations and move onto the roof once the walls have been finished. We cannot move on to the plastering before the wiring and plumbing are completed. Every building site has a time frame to which construction work adheres, in addition to the construction blueprint.

This also applies to what nature builds, and of course to cells. However, we know next to nothing about this before-and-after relationship in the ordering of the cell. Biologists have still been unable to find who told the cell what part of the blueprint to build, and when. How it is that some genes are cut off at just the right moment, how the embargos on some genes are lifted, and who instructs the suppressor genes and those that lift such suppression are all questions shrouded in darkness and waiting to be answered. . . . ^{cxiv}

When we look back, we see that there is no call for surprise at the total failure to find those transitional forms, so long almost painfully sought. Because in all probability, such a stage never took place. Our current knowledge shows that the general principle of evolution does not apply here, and that there is no question of the primitive cell gradually turning into one with a nucleus and organelles. ^{cxv}

G.A. Kerkut, is an evolutionist and zoologist in the Department of Physiology and Biochemistry at University of Southampton:

The first assumption was that non-living things gave rise to living material. This is still just an assumption.... There is, however, little evidence in favor of biogenesis and as yet we have no indication that it can be performed....

David E. Green is an American biochemist at University of Wisconsin, Madison and Robert F. Goldberger is Professor Emeritus of biochemistry and molecular biophysics and former Provost of Columbia University:

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. ^{cxvi}

Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy is a biologist at Hacettepe University:

Complex cells never developed from primitive cells by a process of evolution. ^{cxvii}

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

^{vii} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, Vol. I*, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1888, p. 315.

^{viii} *Ibid.*, p. 395.

^{ix} N.C. Gillespie, *Charles Darwin and the Problem of Creation*, University of Chicago, 1979, p. 2. [

^x Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, Vol. II*, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1888, p. 358.

^{xi} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 413.

^{xii} *Ibid.*, p. 430.

^{xiii} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 152.

^{xiv} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 439.

^{xv} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 117.

^{xvi} *Ibid.*, p. 501.

^{xvii} *Ibid.*, p. 388.

^{xviii} *Ibid.*, p. 25.

^{xix} Robert B. Downs, *Books that Changed the World*, Revised edition (March 2, 2004), New York: Signet Classics; p. 286.

^{xx} *Ibid.*

^{xxii} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 43.

^{xxvii} Lewis Thomas, "On the Uncertainty of Science," *Key Reporter*, Vol. 46 (Autumn 1980), p. 2.

^{xxviii} H.A. Orr and Jerry Coyne (1992), "The Genetics of Adaptation: A Reassessment," *American Naturalist*, pp. 140, 726.

^{xxix} H. S. Lipson, "A Physicist Look at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin*, 31 (1980), p. 138.

^{xxx} G.A. Peseley, "The Epistemological Status of Natural Selection," *Laval Theologique et Philosophique*, Vol. 38 (Feb. 1982), p. 74.

^{xxxi} Dr. Colin Patterson, "Evolution and Creationism: Can You Tell Me Anything About Evolution?" November 1981 Presentation at the American Museum of Natural History, New York City.

^{xxxii} <http://www.rmplc.co.uk/eduweb/sites/sbs777/vital/evolutio.html>

^{xxxiii} Charles Darwin, *Introduction to The Origin of Species*, 6th Edition (1956) p. xxii.

^{xxxiv} E.O.Wiley, "Review of Darwin Retried by MacBeth," *Systematic Zoology*, Vol. 24 (June. 1975), p. 270.

^{xxxv} Roger Lewin, *In the Age of Mankind*, Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1988. p. 22.

^{xxxvi} Heribert Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbildung* (Lund, Sweden: Verlag CWK Gleerup, 1953), p. 31.

^{xxxvii} Introduction: De (Evolution), *Encyclopedie Française*, Vol. 5 (1937) p. 6.

^{xxxviii} Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, Boston: Gambit, 1971, p. 147

^{xxxix} Cemal Yildirim, *Evrîm Kuramı ve Bâgnazlık* ["The Theory of Evolution and Bigotry"], Bilgi Publishing, January 1989, pp. 56-57.

^{xl} *Ibid.*, p. 131.

^{xli} *Ibid.*, p. 108.

^{xlii} François Jacob, *Le Jeu des Possibles* ["The Play of Possibilities"], Paris: LGF, 1986.

Dr. Alfred G. Fisher, who is an evolutionist, mentions in the fossil section of *Grolier* multimedia encyclopedia:

Both the origin of life and the origin of the major groups of animals remain unknown. ^{cxviii}

Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy:

^{xlv} François Jacob, *Le Jeu des Possibles* ["The Play of Possibilities"], Paris: LGF, 1986.

^{xlvi} Dr. Michael Walker, *Quadrant*, October 1982, p. 44.

^{xlvi} Robert Shapiro, *Origins: A Sceptic's Guide to the Creation of Life on Earth*, New York: Summit Books, 1986, p. 207.

^{xlvi} Hubert Yockey, "Self-Organization Origin of Life Scenarios and Information Theory," *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 91, 1981, pp. 27-28.

^{xlvi} Paul R. Ehrlich and Richard W. Holm, "Patterns and Populations," *Science*, Vol. 137 (August 31, 1962), pp. 656-7.

ⁱ Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Evolution at Work," *Science*, May 9, 1958, p. 1092.

^{li} Pierre Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York, Academic Press, 1977, p.107.

^{lii} Cemal Yıldırım, *Evrin Kuramı ve Bağnazlık*, ["The Theory of Evolution and Bigotry"], p. 51.

^{lii} G. A. Clark, C. M. Willermet, *Conceptual Issues in Modern Human Origins Research*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1997, p. 76.

^{liv} Paul S. Taylor, *Origins Answer Book*, 5th edition, 1995, p. 35.

^{lvii} Roger Lewin, *In the Age of Mankind*, Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1988, p. 26.

^{lviii} Stephen Jay Gould, *The Panda's Thumb*, 1982, pp. 181-182.

^{lix} Stephen Jay Gould, "The Return of Hopeful Monsters," *Natural History*, Vol. 86, July-August 1977, p. 28.

^{lx} Cemal Yıldırım, *Evrin Kuramı ve Bağnazlık*, ["The Theory of Evolution and Bigotry"], p. 36.

^{lxi} *Ibid.*, p. 49.

^{lxii} *Ibid.*, p. 185.

^{lxiii} J.B.S. Haldane, *Possible Worlds*, Chatto & Windus, 1928, p. 43.

^{lxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 128.

^{lxv} J. Hawkes, "Nine Tantalizing Mysteries of Nature," *New York Times Magazine*, 1957, p. 33.

^{lxvi} *Science*, 1982, No. 217, pp. 1239-1240.

^{lxvii} Colin Patterson, "Cladistics," *BBC*, Interview with Brian, Peter Franz, 4 March 1982.

^{lxviii} Arthur Koestler, *Janus: A Summing Up*, Vintage Books; 1978, p. 185.

^{lxix} Pierre Paul Grassé, *Evolution On Living Organisms: Evidence for a New Theory of Information*, Academic Press, Jan. 1978.

^{lxxii} Kevin Padian, "The Whole Real Guts of Evolution," Review of *Genetics, Paleontology and Macroevolution*, by Jeffrey S. Levinton, p. 77.

^{lxxiii} Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, p. 88.

^{lxxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 103.

^{lxxv} Francisco J. Ayala, "Genotype Environment and Population Numbers," *Science*, Vol. 162 (27 December 1968), p. 1456.

^{lxxvi} James F. Crow, "Ionizing Radiation and Evolution," *Scientific American*, Vol. 201 (September 1959), p. 138.

^{lxxvii} "Genetic Effects of Radiation," *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, Vol. 14, pp. 19-20.

^{lxxviii} Frederick S. Hulse, *The Human Species*, New York: Random House, 1971, pp. 61-62.

^{lxxix} D. Stern, "Evolutionary developmental biology and the problem of variation," *Evolution Int J Org Evolution*. 2000 Aug;54(4):1079-91.

^{lxxx} Stephen J. Gould, speech at Hobart College, February 14, 1980.

^{lxxxi} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2*, ["The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 2"], Alan Yayıncılık, Kasım 1996, İstanbul, Translation: Veysel Atayman, pp. 66-69.

^{lxxxii} *Ibid.*, p. 97.

^{lxxxiii} Mahlon B. Hoagland, *The Roots of Life: A Layman's Guide To Genes, Evolution, and the Ways of Cells*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1981, p. 64.

^{lxxxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 145.

^{lxxxv} Warren Weaver, "Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation," *Science*, Vol. 123, June 29, 1956, p. 1159.

In fact, the probability of the random formation of a protein and a nucleic acid (DNA-RNA) is inconceivably small. The chances against the emergence of even a particular protein chain are astronomic.^{cxix}

One of the most difficult stages to be explained in evolution is to scientifically explain how organelles and complex cells developed from these primitive creatures. No transitional form has been found between these two forms. One- and multicelled creatures carry all this complicated structure, and no creature or group has yet been found with organelles of a simpler construction in any way, or which are more primitive. In other words, the organelles carried forward have developed just as they are. They have no simple and primitive forms.^{cxx}

The heart of the problem is how the mitochondria have acquired this feature, because attaining this feature by chance even by one individual, requires extreme probabilities that are

^{lxxxvi} *Ibid.*, p. 1158.

^{lxxxvii} Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, London: River Publishing, 1984, p. 70.

^{lxxxviii} Gordon R. Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, New York: Harper & Row, 1983, p. 48.

^{xc} Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, Dorling Kindersley Limited, 1983, p. 19.

^{xc i} Sir Fred Hoyle, "The Big Bang in Astronomy," *New Scientist*, Vol. 92 (19 November 1981), pp. 526-527.

^{xc ii} Sir Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1983, pp. 20-21.

^{xc iii} Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984, p. 148.

^{xc iv} Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution* (1988), p. 144.

^{xc v} *Ibid.*, p.148.

^{xc vi} Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* ["Inheritance and Evolution"], Ankara: Meteksan Publishing Co., 1984, p. 61.

^{xc vii} W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, p. 304.

^{xc viii} Andrew Scott, "Update on Genesis," *New Scientist*, Vol. 106, May 2, 1985, p. 30.

^{xc ix} Christian Schwabe, "On the Validity of Molecular Evolution," *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, Vol. 11, July 1986, p. 280.

^c <http://yolgezer.fisek.com.tr/renkler/evrim.html> - Cemal Yıldırım, *Evrin Kuramı ve Bağnazlık*, Ankara 1998

^{ci} Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları* ["Basic Rules of Life"], Genel Biyoloji/Genel Zooloji, Vol. 1, Chapter 1, 5th edition, p. 569.

^{cii} Cairns-Smith, Alexander G., "The First Organisms," *Scientific American*, 252: 90, June 1985.

^{ciii} Sir Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, p. 148.

^{civ} Caryl P. Haskins, "Advances and Challenges in Science in 1970," *American Scientist*, Vol. 59, May-June, 1971, p. 305.

^{cv} Alexander I. Oparin, *Origin of Life*, New York: Dover Publications, 1936, 1953 (reprint), p. 196.

^{cvi} Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey* (1957), p. 206 (Quoting German biologist Von Bertalanffy.

^{cvi i} Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim*, [Inheritance and Evolution], p. 158.

^{cvi ii} Klaus Dose, "The Origin of Life: More Questions Than Answers," *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, Vol. 13, no. 4, 1988, p. 348.

^{cix} Klaus Dose, "The Origin of Life: More Questions than Answers," *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, p. 352.

^{cx} <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/SBS777/vital/evolutio.html>

^{cx i} Jeffrey Bada, "Life's Crucible," *Earth*, February 1998, p. 40.

^{cx ii} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2*, ["The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 2"], p. 22.

^{cx iii} *Ibid.*

^{cx iv} *Ibid.*

^{cx v} *Ibid.*

^{cx vii} Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* ["Inheritance and Evolution"], Ankara: Meteksan Publications, p. 79.

^{cx viii} <http://www.icr.org/headlines/darwinvindicated.html>; "Was Darwin Really 'Vindicated'?", Frank Sherwin, Institute for Creation Research, April 30, 2001.

^{cx ix} Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* ["Inheritance and Evolution"], p. 39.

^{cx x} *Ibid.*, p. 79.

incomprehensible. . . . The enzymes providing respiration and functioning as a catalyst in each step in a different form make up the core of the mechanism. A cell has to contain this enzyme sequence completely, otherwise it is meaningless. Here, despite being contrary to biological thought, in order to avoid a more dogmatic explanation or speculation, we have to accept, though reluctantly, that all the respiration enzymes completely existed in the cell before the cell first came in contact with oxygen. ^{cxxi}

However, there is a major problem here. Mitochondria use a fixed number of enzymes during the process of breaking (with oxygen). The absence of only one of these enzymes stops the functioning of the whole system. Besides, energy gain with oxygen does not seem to be a system which can proceed step by step. Only the complete system performs its function. That is why, instead of the step-by-step development to which we have adhered so far as a principle, we feel the urge to embrace the suggestion that, all the enzymes (Krebs enzyme) needed to perform the reactions of the mitochondria entered a cell all at once by coincidence or, were formed in that cell all at once. That is merely because those systems failing to use oxygen fully, in other words, those systems remaining in the intermediate level would disappear as soon as they react with oxygen. ^{cxxii}

Harold F. Blum is Professor of Biology at Princeton University:

The spontaneous formation of a polypeptide of the size of the smallest known proteins seems beyond all probability. ^{cxxiii}

Britannica Encyclopedia of Science, which is an outspoken defender of evolution, states that the amino acids of all living organisms on earth, and the building blocks of complex polymers such as proteins, have the same left-handed asymmetry. It adds that this is tantamount to tossing a coin a million times and always getting heads. The same encyclopedia states that it is impossible to understand why molecules become left-handed or right-handed, and that this choice is fascinatingly related to the origin of life on earth. ^{cxxiv}

Wendell R. Bird is the author of *The Origin of Species Revisited*:

This unique sequence represents a choice of one out of 102,000,000 alternative ways of arranging the bases! We are compelled to conclude that the origin of the first life was a unique event, which we cannot be discussed in terms of probability. ^{cxxv}

Evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson is Professor of Zoology at Columbia University:

Above the level of the virus, the simplest fully living unit is almost incredibly complex. It has become commonplace to speak of evolution from amoeba to man, as if the amoeba were the simple beginning of the process. On the contrary, if, as must almost necessarily be true, life arose as a simple molecular system, the progression from this state to that of the amoeba is at least as great as from amoeba to man. ^{cxxvi}

Prof. Michael Pitman is Chief Scientist of Australia and Foreign Secretary of the Australian Academy of Science:

Time is no help. Bio-molecules outside a living system tend to degrade with time, not build up. In most cases, a few days is all they would last. Time decomposes complex systems. If a large 'word' (a protein) or even a paragraph is generated by chance, time will operate to degrade it. The more time you allow, the less chance there is that fragmentary 'sense' will survive the chemical maelstrom of matter. ^{cxxvii}

Evolutionists' Confessions That DNA Cannot Form by Chance

Mathematics has now proven that chance plays no role in the formation of the data encoded in DNA. The word "impossible" fails to do justice to the probability of just one of the 200,000 genes making up DNA forming by chance, let alone a DNA molecule consisting of billions of components.

Some evolutionists admit that such is the case:

Carly P. Haskins is an evolutionist biologist. The following is excerpted from an article published in *American Scientist* magazine:

But the most sweeping evolutionary questions at the level of biochemical genetics are still unanswered. How the genetic code first appeared and then evolved and, earlier even than that, how life itself originated on Earth remain for the future to resolve . . . Did the code and the means of translating it appear simultaneously in evolution? It seems almost incredible that any such coincidence could have occurred, given the extraordinary complexities of both sides and the requirement that they be coordinated accurately for survival. By a pre-Darwinian (or a skeptic of evolution after Darwin) this puzzle would surely have been interpreted as the most powerful sort of evidence for special creation. ^{cxxviii}

Leslie E. Orgel is a senior fellow and researcher Professor at the Salk Institute for Biological Sciences in San Diego:

We do not understand even the general features of the origin of the genetic code . . .

[It] is the most baffling aspect of the problem of the origins of life and a major conceptual or experimental breakthrough may be needed before we can make any substantial progress. ^{cxxix}

Paul Auger is an evolutionist and French scientist:

It is extremely improbable that proteins and nucleic acids, both of which are structurally complex, arose spontaneously in the same place at the same time. Yet it also seems impossible to have one without the other. And so, at first glance, one might have to conclude that life could never, in fact, have originated by chemical means. ^{cxix}

Douglas R. Hofstadter Pulitzer Prize winner and Professor of Cognitive Science and Computer Science at Indiana University:

How a single egg cell divides to form so numerous differentiated cells, and the perfect natural communication and the cooperation between these cells top the events that amaze scientists. ^{cxxxi}

Francis Crick is the Nobel Prize-winning evolutionist geneticist who, together with James Watson, discovered DNA:

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. ^{cxxxii}

John Maddox is the former editor of *Nature* magazine:

It is disappointing that the origin of the genetic code is still as obscure as the origin of life itself. ^{cxxxiii}

Pierre Grassé is the renowned French evolutionist and zoologist:

Any living being possesses an enormous amount of “intelligence,” very much more than is necessary to build the most magnificent of cathedrals. Today, this “intelligence” is called information, but it is still the same thing. It is not programmed as in a computer, but rather it is condensed on a molecular scale in the chromosomal DNA or in that of every other organelle in each cell. This “intelligence” is the *sine qua non* of life. Where does it come from? . . . This is a problem that concerns both biologists and philosophers, and, at present, science seems incapable of solving it. ^{cxxxiv}

Confessions Regarding the Impossibility of the “RNA World” Thesis

In the 1970s, scientists realized that the gasses actually contained in the primeval Earth’s atmosphere made protein synthesis impossible. This came as a grave blow to the theory of evolution, when the primeval atmosphere experiments conducted by evolutionists such as Miller, Fox and Ponnamperna were proved to be totally invalid.

In the 1980s, therefore, evolutionists began looking elsewhere. As a result, the thesis of the RNA world was put forward by the chemist Walter Gilbert in 1986. He suggested that proteins did not form first, but rather the RNA molecule that carries protein data.

Billions of years ago, according to this scenario, an RNA molecule somehow capable of replicating itself came into being in a chance manner. Under the effect of environmental conditions, this RNA molecule subsequently began suddenly producing proteins. The need then arose to store these data in another molecule, and in some way, the DNA molecule was formed.

This scenario is difficult even to imagine, and every stage of it consists of a separate impossibility. Instead of explaining the origin of life, it actually expanded the problem and gave rise to a number of unanswerable questions. Since it’s impossible to account for even one of the

nucleotides making up RNA having formed by chance, how could nucleotides have come to make up RNA by combining in just the correct imaginary sequence?

Even if we assume that by coincidence, it somehow did, then with what awareness could this RNA, consisting of just one nucleotide chain, have decided to copy itself? And with what mechanism did it succeed in doing so? Where did it find the nucleotides it would need during the replication process?

Even if we assume that, no matter how impossible, all these things actually happened, they are still not enough to form a single protein molecule. Because RNA is merely data regarding protein structure; amino acids are the raw materials. Yet there is no mechanism here for producing proteins. To say that the existence of RNA is enough for the production of protein is no less ridiculous than saying that throwing the blueprint for a car onto the thousands of its components is enough for that car to eventually assemble itself—spontaneously.

There are no factories or workers around to let production take place. Even Jacques Monod, the Nobel Prize-winning French zoologist and fanatical adherent of evolution, states that it is impossible to reduce protein manufacture solely to the information contained in nucleic acid:

The code is meaningless unless translated. The modern cell's translating machinery consists of at least 50 macromolecular components, which are themselves coded in DNA: the code cannot be translated otherwise than by products of translation themselves. It is the modern expression of *omne vivum ex ovo* [Latin for “All that lives arises from an egg”]. When and how did this circle become closed? It is exceedingly difficult to imagine. ^{cxv}

Gerald Joyce is a researcher at The Scripps Research Institute, and Dr. Leslie Orgel is an evolutionist microbiologist at the Salk Institute for Biological Sciences in San Diego:

This discussion. . . has, in a sense, focused on a straw man: the myth of a self-replicating RNA molecule that arose *de novo* from a soup of random polynucleotides. Not only is such a notion unrealistic in light of our current understanding of prebiotic chemistry, but it would strain the credulity of even an optimist's view of RNA's catalytic potential. ^{cxvi}

Dr. Leslie Orgel:

This scenario could have occurred, we noted, if prebiotic RNA had two properties not evident today: A capacity to replicate without the help of proteins and an ability to catalyze every step of protein synthesis. ^{cxvii}

Manfred Eigen is a German biophysicist and former Director of the Max Planck Institute for Biophysical Chemistry in Göttingen:

One can safely assume that primordial routes of synthesis and differentiation provided minute concentrations of short sequences of nucleotides that would be recognized as ‘correct’ by the standards of today's biochemistry. ^{cxviii}

John Horgan is a writer for *Scientific American* magazine:

DNA cannot do its work, including forming more DNA, without the help of catalytic proteins, or enzymes. In short, proteins cannot form without DNA, but neither can DNA form without proteins.^{cxix}

CHAPTER 8

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE SUDDEN EMERGENCE OF LIFE

Investigation of the geological strata and the fossil record shows that life on Earth emerged all of a sudden. The deepest stratum in which fossils of living things are encountered is that known as the *Cambrian*, dating back 520 to 530 million years.

The fossils in Cambrian rocks belong to radically different life forms. What comes as a terrible disappointment to evolutionists is that all of these species emerged suddenly and with no primitive forerunners preceding them.

Most of the life forms in Cambrian strata possess complex systems, such as eyes, gills and blood circulatory systems, and often, advanced physiological features no different from those of creatures living today. This is a sign that all of life was created in a single act, with no common ancestors or evolutionary process being involved.

Darwin warned that if such a possibility were ever proven—that life began suddenly—it would represent a lethal blow to this theory. As can be seen from the evolutionist statements below, the theory of evolution suffers the first of many such blows from the Cambrian fossils, among the earliest forms of life.

Charles Darwin:

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. ^{cxl}

For instance, I cannot doubt that all the Silurian trilobites have descended from some one crustacean, which must have lived long before the Silurian age, and which probably differed greatly from any known animal. . . . Consequently, if my theory be true, it is indisputable that before the lowest Silurian stratum was deposited, long periods elapsed, as long as, or probably far longer than, the whole interval from the Silurian age to the present day; and that during these vast, yet quite unknown, periods of time, the world swarmed with living creatures. To the question why we do not find records of these vast primordial periods, I can give no satisfactory answer. ^{cxli}

Niles Eldredge is a paleontologist at Harvard University:

Then there was something of an explosion. Beginning about six hundred million years ago, and continuing for about ten to fifteen million years, the earliest known representatives of the major kinds of animals still populating today's seas made a rather abrupt appearance. This rather

^{cxl} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 302.

^{cxli} *Ibid.*, pp. 313-14.

protracted 'event' shows up graphically in the rock record: all over the world, at roughly the same time, thick sequences of rocks, barren of any easily detected fossils, are overlain by sediments containing a gorgeous array of shelly invertebrates: trilobites (extinct relatives of crabs and insects), brachiopods, mollusks. Creationists have made much of this sudden development of a rich and varied fossil record where, just before, there was none. Indeed, the sudden appearance of a varied, well-preserved array of fossils, which geologists have used to mark the beginnings of the Cambrian Period (the oldest division of the Paleozoic Era) does pose a fascinating intellectual challenge. ^{cxlii}

Daniel Axelrod is Professor of Geology and Botany at the University of California:

One of the major unsolved problems of geology and evolution is the occurrence of diversified, multi-celled marine invertebrates in the lower Cambrian rocks on all the continents and their absence in rocks of greater age. ^{cxliii}

Barbara Jaffe Stahl is an evolutionist paleontology professor and senior faculty member at Saint Anselm College, Manchester:

Finding vertebrate bone in Cambrian rocks, for instance, has proved that the backboneed animals are as old as most of the known invertebrates. ^{cxliv}

Richard Monastersky is senior writer at The Chronicle of Higher Education in Washington:

A half-billion years ago, . . . the remarkably complex forms of animals we see today suddenly appeared. This moment, right at the start of Earth's Cambrian Period, some 550 million years ago, marks the evolutionary explosion that filled the seas with the world's first complex creatures. The Chengyang fauna demonstrates that the large animal phyla of today were present already in the early Cambrian and that they were as distinct from each other as they are today. ^{cxlv}

Richard Dawkins is a British zoologist and one of the leading contemporary evolutionists:

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. ^{cxlvi}

Stephen Jay Gould is Professor of Geology and Paleoanthropology at Harvard University:

Where, then, are all the Precambrian ancestors—or, if they didn't exist in recognizable form, how did modern complexity get off to such a fast start? ^{cxlvii}

The Cambrian explosion was the most remarkable and puzzling event in the history of life. ^{cxlviii}

Marshall Kay is a geologist and Professor at Columbia University and Edwin H. Colbert is an authority on paleontology and curator at the American Museum of Natural History:

The introduction of a variety of organisms in the early Cambrian, including such complex forms of the arthropods as the trilobites, is surprising. . . The introduction of abundant organisms in the record would not be so surprising if they were simple. Why should such complex organic forms be in rocks about six hundred million years old and be absent or unrecognized in the records of the preceding two billion years? . . . If there has been evolution of life, the absence of the requisite fossils in the rocks older than the Cambrian is puzzling.^{cxlix}

CHAPTER 9

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE LACK OF INTERMEDIATE-FORM FOSSILS

According to the theory of evolution, life forms are descended from one another. One species supposedly gradually developed into another, and each new species emerged in that same way. According to the theory, this transition took place over a very long period of time, hundreds of millions of years, and proceeded stage by stage. That implies that countless intermediate life forms must have emerged and lived during the course of such a lengthy transition.

For example, semi-fish, semi-amphibian creatures that, despite having fish-like features, had also acquired some amphibious ones must once have existed. And since these were in a process of transition, their limbs must have been rudimentary flawed and awkward, if not handicapped. Evolutionists refer to these fictitious entities, which they believe existed at one time, as “intermediate forms.” If such life forms had really existed, then there must have been untold billions of them. Traces of them should still be visible in the fossil record. Yet not one single fossil belonging to an intermediate form has ever been discovered!

In other words, no traces of half-fish, half-amphibian, or half-reptile, half-bird—much less any half-ape, half-human creature—have ever been encountered in any of the Earth’s strata. All the fossils discovered have been identical to their present-day counterparts, or else belong to species that subsequently became extinct.

What follows is a selection of evolutionist admissions on this, one of the most serious dilemmas confronting the theory of evolution:

Charles Darwin:

But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the Earth? ^{cl}

But in the intermediate region, having intermediate conditions of life, why do we not now find closely-linking intermediate varieties? This difficulty for a long time quite confounded me. ^{cli}

First, 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? ^{clii}

But just in proportion as this process of extermination has acted on an enormous scale, so must the number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed, be truly enormous. Why,

^{cl} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, p. 179

^{cli} Ibid.

^{clii} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, New York: The Modern Library, pp. 124-25.

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 serious objection which can be urged against my theory. ^{cliii}

From these several considerations, it cannot be doubted that the geological record. . . becomes much more difficult to understand why we do not therein find closely graduated varieties between the allied species which lived at its commencement and at its close. ^{cliv}

But I do not pretend that I should ever have suspected how poor was the record in the best preserved geological sections, had not the absence of innumerable transitional links between the species which lived at the commencement and close of each formation, pressed so hardly on my theory. ^{clv}

On this doctrine of the extermination of an infinitude of connecting links, between the living and extinct inhabitants of the world, and at each successive period between the extinct and still older species, why is not every geological formation charged with such links? Why does not every collection of fossil remains afford plain evidence of the gradation and mutation of the forms of life? ^{clvi}

Derek W. Ager is a famous English paleontologist and head of the department of geology and oceanography at University College of Swansea:

The point emerges that if we examine the fossil record in detail, whether at the level of orders or of species, we find—over and over again—not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another. ^{clvii}

W. R. Thompson is an entomologist and Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control:

Modern Darwinian paleontologists are obliged, just like their predecessors and like Darwin, to water down the facts with subsidiary hypotheses. . . . ^{clviii}

Mark Czarnecki is an evolutionist paleontologist:

A major problem in proving the theory [of evolution] has been the fossil record, the imprints of vanished species preserved in the Earth's geological formations. 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. ^{clix}

Carlton E. Brett is Professor of Geology at the University of Cincinnati:

Did life on Earth change steadily and gradually through time? The fossil record emphatically says “no.” ^{clx}

Dr. David Raup is a paleontologist at University of Chicago:

. . . most people assume that fossils provide a very important part of the general argument in favour of Darwinian interpretations of the history of life. Unfortunately, this is not strictly true. ^{clxi}

Edmund J. Ambrose is Professor Emeritus at the University of London and head department of Cell Biology at the Chester Beatty Research Institute University of London:

We have to admit that there is nothing in the geological records that runs contrary to the views of conservative creationists. ^{clxii}

Gareth Nelson of the American Museum of Natural History:

It is a mistake to believe that even one fossil species or fossil “group” can be demonstrated to have been ancestral to another. The ancestor-descendant relationship may only be assumed to have existed in the absence of evidence indicating otherwise. . . . The history of comparative biology teaches us that the search for ancestors is doomed to ultimate failure, thus, with respect to its principal objective, this search is an exercise in futility. Increased knowledge of suggested “ancestors” usually shows them to be too specialized to have been direct ancestors of anything else. ^{clxiii}

Dr. Colin Patterson is an evolutionist paleontologist and curator of London’s Natural History Museum:

In a letter of reply to Luther D. Sutherland, who asked why he never referred to intermediate forms in his book *Evolution*, he says:

I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them. As a paleontologist myself, I am much occupied with the philosophical problems of identifying ancestral forms in the fossil record. You say that I should at least “show a photo of the fossil from which each type of organism was derived.” I will lay it on the line—there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument. ^{clxiv}

David B. Kitts is Professor of the History of Science at Oklahoma University:

Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of “seeing” evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists, the most notorious of which is the presence of “gaps” in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species, and paleontology does not provide them. ^{clxv}

John Adler and John Carey are journalists:

The more scientists have searched for the transitional forms that lie between species, the more they have been frustrated.^{clxvi}

Mark Ridley is a zoologist at the University of Oxford:

In any case, no real evolutionist . . . uses the fossil record as evidence in favor of the theory of evolution as opposed to special creation. . . .^{clxvii}

Steven M. Stanley is Professor of Paleontology at The University of Hawaii at Manoa:

The known fossil record fails to document a single example of phyletic evolution [*the evolution of a species' entire population into a new species*] accomplishing a major morphologic[structural] transition and hence offers no evidence that the gradualistic model can be valid.^{clxviii}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

When we look back, we see there is no need to have been surprised at our failure to find those transitional forms searched for almost painfully. Because the great likelihood is that such transitional stages never existed.^{clxix}

The most ancient fossils discovered to date are objects fossilized inside minerals, such as non-nucleic algae. No matter how primitive these may be, they still represent relatively complex and expertly organized forms of life. The story of the development between these first fossil organisms and molecules emerging by way of chemical combinations, biopolymers in other words is a gap that we have been as yet unable to fill. . . . On the other hand, this “temporary” gap that has been unable to be filled is quite attractive to some people, for understandable reasons. Someone who sees that it is impossible for life to begin in the absence of any supernatural effect can see the signs of a miracle in such a gap, intervention by a supernatural force.^{clxx}

George Gaylord Simpson is Professor of Zoology at Columbia University:

It remains true, as every paleontologist knows, that most new species, genera, and families, and that nearly all categories above the level of families, appear in the [fossil] record suddenly, and are not led up to by gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences.^{clxxi}

In the early days of evolutionary paleontology it was assumed that the major gaps would be filled in by further discoveries, and even, falsely, that some discoveries had already filled them. As it became more and more evident that the great gaps remained... The failure of paleontology to produce such evidence was so keenly felt that a few disillusioned naturalists even decided that the theory of organic evolution, or of general organic continuity of descent, was wrong, after all.^{clxxii}

Tom Kemp is a Curator of the Zoological Collections at the University of Oxford:

As is now well known, most fossil species appear instantaneously in the record, persist for some millions of years virtually unchanged, only to disappear abruptly. . . .^{clxxiii}

In no single adequately documented case is it possible to trace a transition, species by species, from one genus to another.^{clxxiv}

Prof. Fred Hoyle is a British astronomer and a mathematician at Cambridge University:

Over ten thousand fossil species of insects have been identified, over thirty thousand species of spiders, and similar numbers for many sea-living creatures. Yet so far the evidence for step-by-step changes leading to major evolutionary transitions looks extremely thin.^{clxxv}

Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge in “Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered” published in *Paleobiology*:

From such scrappy data it is hard to see how anyone could derive with confidence the gradualistic interpretation . . . unless one were predisposed to gradualism from the start..^{clxxvi}

Stephen Jay Gould is Professor of Geology and Paleoanthropology at Harvard University:

The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches. . . .^{clxxvii}

I regard the failure to find a clear “vector of progress” in life’s history as the most puzzling fact of the fossil record. . . . we have sought to impose a pattern that we hoped to find on a world that does not really display it.^{clxxviii}

. . . one feature stands out as most puzzling—the lack of clear order and progress through time among marine invertebrate faunas. We can tell tales of improvement for some groups, but in honest moments, we must admit that the history of complex life is more a story of multifarious variation about a set of basic designs than a saga of accumulating excellence.^{clxxix}

The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. We fancy ourselves as the only true students of life’s history, yet to preserve our favored account of evolution by natural selection, we view our data as so bad that we never see the very process we profess to study.^{clxxx}

The history of most fossil species includes two features particularly inconsistent with gradualism:

1. *Stasis*. Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on Earth. They appear in the fossil record looking much the same as when they `disappear; morphological change is usually limited and directionless.

2. *Sudden appearance*. In any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and fully formed. ^{clxxxix}

Dr. Colin Patterson is an evolutionist paleontologist and curator of London's Natural History Museum:

[Stephen Jay] Gould [of Harvard] and the American Museum people are hard to contradict when they say there are no transitional fossils. ^{clxxxii}

Niles Eldredge and Ian Tattersall, a (paleontologist from the American Museum of Natural History):

That individual kinds of fossils remain recognizably the same throughout the length of their occurrence in the fossil record had been known to paleontologists long before Darwin published his *Origin*. Darwin himself . . . prophesied that future generations of paleontologists would fill in these gaps by diligent search. . . . One hundred and twenty years of paleontological research later, it has become abundantly clear that the fossil record will not confirm this part of Darwin's predictions. Nor is the problem a miserably poor record. The fossil record simply shows that this prediction is wrong.

The observation that species are amazingly conservative and static entities throughout long periods of time has all the qualities of the emperor's new clothes: everyone knew it but preferred to ignore it. Paleontologists, faced with a recalcitrant record obstinately refusing to yield Darwin's predicted pattern, simply looked the other way. ^{clxxxiii}

Lewis L. Carroll is an evolutionist paleontologist and author of *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*:

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. ^{clxxxiv}

Edwin H. Colbert is an authority on paleontology and curator at the American Museum of Natural History and M. Morales is the author of *Evolution of the Vertebrates*:

The ichthyosaurs, in many respects the most highly specialized of the marine reptiles, appeared in early Triassic times. Their advent into the geologic history of the reptiles was sudden and dramatic; there are no clues in pre-Triassic sediments as to the possible ancestors of the ichthyosaurs. . . . The basic problem of ichthyosaur relationships is that no conclusive evidence can be found for linking these reptiles with any other reptilian order. ^{clxxxv}

Confessions That Evolutionists Interpret Fossils in a Biased Manner

Dr. Tim White is an evolution anthropologist at the University of California in Berkeley:

A five million-year-old piece of bone that was thought to be a collarbone of a humanlike creature is actually part of a dolphin rib. The problem with a lot of anthropologists is that they want so much to find a hominid that any scrap of bone becomes a hominid bone. ^{clxxxvi}

Ernst A. Hooten of Harvard University:

To attempt to restore the soft parts is an even more hazardous undertaking. The lips, the eyes, the ears, and the nasal tip leave no clues on the underlying bony parts. You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthaloid skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely only to mislead the public. . . . So put not your trust in reconstructions. ^{clxxxvii}

Confessions That the Fossil Record Is Abundant Enough

As always, some evolutionists resort to demagoguery and sleight of hand in order to explain away their failure to find any intermediate-form fossils. They say that the fossil record is “not sufficiently rich” and that the long-sought intermediate forms will eventually be discovered. However, a very large part of the fossil record has actually been unearthed. And as will be apparent from the statements below, there is general agreement that it seems ever more unlikely that fossilized remains of intermediate forms will ever appear:

David M. Raup is a paleontologist at University of Chicago:

Well, we are now about 120 years after Darwin, and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species, but the situation hasn’t changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin’s time. ^{clxxxviii}

Prof. Nils Heribert-Nilsson is a Swedish geneticist and Professor of Botany at the University of Lund in Sweden:

My attempts to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for more than 40 years have completely failed. The fossil material is now so complete that it has been possible to construct new classes, and the lack of transitional series cannot be explained as being due to the scarcity of material. The deficiencies are real, they will never be filled. ^{clxxxix}

D. Dwight Davis of the Chicago Natural History Museum:

The sudden emergence of major adaptive types as seen in the abrupt appearance in the fossil record of families and orders, continues to give trouble. The phenomenon lay in the genetical no-

man's land beyond the limits of experimentation. A few paleontologists even today cling to the idea that these gaps will be closed by further collecting . . . but most regard the observed discontinuities as real and have sought an explanation.^{cxc}

Prof. T. Neville George is a paleontologist at Glasgow University:

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.^{cxi}

CHAPTER 10

CONFESSIONS THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF A TRANSITION FROM INVERTEBRATES TO VERTEBRATES

Evolutionists claim that the invertebrate marine organisms that appeared in the Cambrian Period turned into fish over the course of tens of millions of years. But in the same way that none of the Cambrian invertebrates have any forerunners, there are also no intermediate forms to indicate any evolution between these invertebrates and fish. The fact is that the evolution of invertebrates—which have no skeletons and whose hard parts are on the outside of their bodies—into bony fish, whose hard parts are on the inside of their bodies, would be a transition on a giant scale, and countless traces of this should have been left behind in the fossil record.

Evolutionists have been digging up the fossil strata for the last 140 years in their search for these imaginary life forms. Millions of invertebrate fossils have been turned up, and millions of fish fossils. But nobody has yet come across a single intermediate form.

Gerald T. Todd is an evolutionist paleontologist:

All three subdivisions of the bony fishes first appear in the fossil record at approximately the same time. . . . How did they originate? What allowed them to diverge so widely?. . . And why is there no trace of earlier, intermediate forms? ^{cxlii}

J. R. Norman is in the Department of Zoology at the British Museum of Natural History:

The geological record has so far provided no evidence as to the origin of the fishes. ^{cxliii}

^{cxlii} N. Eldredge, *The Monkey Business: A Scientist Looks at Creationism* (1982), p. 44.

^{cxliii} D. Axelrod, *Science*, 128.7, 1958

^{cxliv} Barbara J. Stahl, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, New York: Dover Publications, 1985, p. vii

^{cxlv} Richard Monastersky, "Mysteries of the Orient," *Discover*, April 1993, p. 40

^{cxlvi} Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, W. W. Norton, London, 1986, p. 229.

^{cxlvii} Stephen Jay Gould, "A Short Way to Big Ends", *Natural History*, vol. 95 (Jan 1986), p. 18

^{cxlviii} Stephen Jay Gould, "The Evolution of Life on Earth", *Scientific American*, vol. 271 (October 1994), p. 89

^{cxlix} Kay, Marshall, and Edwin H. Colbert, *Stratigraphy and Life History*, 1965, 736 pp. 102-103

^{cliii} *Ibid.*

^{cliv} Darwin, C.R., *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, [1872], Everyman's Library, London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 6th Edition, 1928, reprint, pp. 303-04.

^{clv} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species and the Descent of Man* (New York: The Modern Library, Random House) p. 249

^{clvi} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter XV, "Recapitulation and Conclusion."

^{clvii} Derek A. Ager, "The Nature of the Fossil Record," *Proceedings of the British Geological Association*, Vol. 87, 1976, p. 133.

^{clviii} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, "Introduction," Everyman's Library, 1965.

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

Gordon Rattray Taylor is an evolutionist author and Chief Science Advisor at BBC:

. . . there are no intermediate forms between finned and limbed creatures in the fossil collections of the world. ^{cxci}

Dr. F. D. Ommaney is an English scientist of the 1930s:

How this earliest chordate stock evolved, what stages of development it went through to eventually give rise to truly fish-like creatures, we do not know. Between the Cambrian, when it probably originated, and the Ordovician, when the first fossils of animals with really fish-like

^{clx} Carlton E. Brett, "Stasis: Life in the Balance." *Geotimes*, Vol. 40, Mar. 1995, p. 18.

^{clxi} Dr. David Raup, Curator of Geology, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago,
<http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/SBS777/vital/evolutio.html>

^{clxii} Evolutionist Edmund Ambrose, <http://atschool.eduweb.co.uk/SBS777/vital/evolutio.html>

^{clxiii} Gareth V. Nelson, "Origin and Diversification of Teleostean Fishes," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1971, pp. 22-23.

^{clxiv} From a letter dated 10 April, 1979, quoted in L. D. Sunderland's *Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems*, 4th edition, Master Books, 1988.

^{clxv} David B.J. Kitts, "Paleontology and Evolutionary Theory," *Evolution*, Vol. 28, September 1974, p. 487.

^{clxvi} Jerry Adler and John Carey, "Is Man a Subtle Accident?," *Newsweek*, November 3, 1980, p. 95.

^{clxvii} Mark Ridley, "Who Doubts Evolution?," *New Scientist*, Vol. 90; June 25, 1981, p. 831.

^{clxviii} Stanley, Stephen M., *Macroevolution--Pattern and Process*, San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Co., 1979, p. 39.

^{clxix} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2*, ["The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 2"] p. 22.

^{clxx} *Ibid.*, p. 199.

^{clxxi} George Gaylord Simpson, *The Major Features of Evolution*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1953, p. 360.

^{clxxii} G.G. Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1949, Third Printing p. 115.

^{clxxiii} Thomas S. Kemp, "A Fresh Look At The Fossil Record," *New Scientist*, Vol. 108 (5 December 1985), p. 66.

^{clxxiv} Thomas S. Kemp, *Mammal-Like Reptiles and the Origin of Mammals*, New York: Academic Press, 1982, p. 319.

^{clxxv} Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe: A New View of Creation and Evolution*, p. 43.

^{clxxvi} Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge, "Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered," *Paleobiology*, Vol.3 (Spring 1977), p. 125.

^{clxxvii} Stephen Jay Gould, "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History*, May 1977, p. 13.

^{clxxviii} Stephen Jay Gould, "The Ediacaran Experiment," *Natural History*, Vol. 93; February 1984, p. 23.

^{clxxix} *Ibid.*, p. 22.

^{clxxx} S. J. Gould, *Natural History*, May, 1977, p. 14.

^{clxxxi} Gould, Stephen J. "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History*, May 1977, p. 14.

^{clxxxii} Colin Patterson, letter to Luther Sunderland dated April 10, 1979, quoted in L.D. Sunderland *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 89.

^{clxxxiii} N. Eldredge, and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982, pp. 45-46.

^{clxxxiv} Carroll, Lewis L., "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 44 (1969), p. 393.

^{clxxxv} E. H. Colbert, M. Morales, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1991, p. 193.

^{clxxxvi} Dr. Tim White, *New Scientist*, 28 April 1983, p. 199.

^{clxxxvii} Earnest A. Hooton, *Up From The Ape*, New York: McMillan, 1931, p. 332.

^{clxxxviii} David M. Raup, "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology," *Field Museum of Natural History*, Vol. 50, No. 1, Jan, 1979, p. 25.

^{clxxxix} Arthur C. Custance, *The Earth Before Man*, Part II, Doorway Publications, p. 51.

^{cxc} D. Dwight Davis, "Comparative Anatomy and the Evolution of Vertebrates" in *Genetics, Paleontology and Evolution*, ed. by Jepsen, Mayr and Simpson, Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1949, p. 74.

^{cxc} T. Neville George, "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *Science Progress*, Vol. 48, January 1960, pp. 1, 3.

characteristics appeared, there is a gap of perhaps 100 million years, which we will probably never be able to fill. ^{CXCV}

CHAPTER 11

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF A TRANSITION FROM WATER TO DRY LAND

The evolutionist scenario maintains that after a time, fish—which had evolved from invertebrates—developed limbs and turned into amphibians capable of living on dry land. But, as you might imagine, there is no evidence for such a scenario. Not a single fossil of a half-fish, half-amphibian creature has ever been found.

The process of a transition from water to dry land espoused by evolutionists never happened.

In addition to the complete absence of the fossils needed to indicate such a transition, a great many important changes would have had to take place for any living thing to move from water to land. But such a transition is impossible, and many factors make it so. For example, fishes' gills would have to turn into lungs for them to be able to live on land, and their fins would have to strengthen and lengthen into legs. Radical changes would also have to take place in a wide range of internal areas, such as energy consumption and the circulatory and excretory systems. Moreover, all these radical changes would have to take place at once for a creature moving from water to dry land to survive.

But it is of course impossible for such physiological changes to take place by chance and simultaneously. And evolutionists are in fact well aware of these impossibilities.

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

As we have seen, life on land is a difficult and wearisome one, constantly raising problems needing to be resolved. In that case one cannot refrain from asking yet again: why, yes why, did we leave the water? The more one ponders this, the less logical this evolutionary step appears, and what happened seems to be an irresolvable puzzle.^{cxcvi}

Robert L. Carroll is the author of *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*:

We have no intermediate fossils between rhipidistian fish and early amphibians.^{cxcvii}

^{cxcvi} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2*, ["The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 2"] p. 149.

^{cxcvii} Robert L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1988, p. 4.

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.^{cxcviii}

Edwin H. Colbert is an authority on paleontology and curator at the American Museum of Natural History and M. Morales is the author of *Evolution of the Vertebrates*:

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.^{cxcix}

From the *Encyclopedia Britannica*:

The origin of this highly successful order is obscured by the lack of early fossils, although turtles leave more and better fossil remains than do other vertebrates. . . . Intermediates between turtles and cotylosaurs . . . reptiles from which turtles [supposedly] sprang, are entirely lacking.^{cc}

Lewis L. Carroll is an evolutionist paleontologist and author of *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*:

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.^{cci}

Robert L. Carroll is a vertebrate paleontologist and Professor of Biology at McGill University:

We have no intermediate fossils between rhipidistian fish and early amphibians.^{ccii}

CHAPTER 12

CONFESSIONS OF THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF REPTILES EVOLVING INTO BIRDS

The impossible scenarios of evolution also require the life forms that emerged onto dry land, evolved into first amphibians, then reptiles and finally turned into flying creatures. Since evolutionists are convinced that birds evolved in *some* way, they maintain that they evolved from reptiles.

But none of the physical mechanisms in birds—which have a totally different anatomy from that of terrestrial life forms—can be explained in terms of the gradual evolutionary model. First of all, , birds’ wings represent an enormous dilemma for the theory of evolution. Evolutionists themselves state the impossibility of a reptile ever being able to fly, admitting that the idea conflicts with the fossil record:

William Elgin Swinton is an Emeritus Professor of Zoology at the University of Toronto and dinosaur expert of the Natural History Museum in London:

The [evolutionary] origin of birds is largely a matter of deduction. There is no fossil evidence of the stages through which the remarkable change from reptile to bird was achieved. ^{cciii}

Alan Feduccia is Professor of Avian Evolution, Paleobiology and Systematics at University of North Carolina:

How do you derive birds from a heavy, earthbound, bipedal reptile that has a deep body, a heavy balancing tail, and fore-shortened forelimbs? Biophysically, it’s impossible. ^{cciv}

Evolutionist John E. Hill and James D. Smith are the authors of *Bats - A Natural History*:

The fossil record of bats extends back to the early Eocene. . . . [A]ll fossil bats, even the oldest, are clearly fully developed bats and so they shed little light on the transition from their terrestrial ancestor. ^{ccv}

^{cciii} W.E. Swinton, “The Origin of Birds,” *Biology and Comparative Physiology of Birds*, editor A.J. Marshall, New York: Academic Press, 1960, Vol. 1, Chapter 1, p. 1,

^{cciv} Alan Feduccia, “Jurassic Bird Challenges Origin Theories,” *Geotimes*, January 1996, p. 7.

^{ccv} John E. Hill-James D. Smith, *Bats: A Natural History*, London: British Museum of Natural History, 1984, p. 33.

^{ccviii} Robert L. Carroll, “Problems of the Origin of Reptiles,” *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 44, No. 3, July 1969, p. 393.

^{ccix} Edwin H. Colbert, M. Morales, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1991, p. 99.

^{cc} *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, “Turtle”

^{cci} Lewis L. Carroll, “Problems of the Origin of Reptiles,” p. 393.

^{ccii} Carroll, Robert L., *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, p. 138.

Robert L. Carroll is a vertebrate paleontologist:

. . . all the Triassic pterosaurs were highly specialized for flight. . . . They provide little evidence of their specific ancestry and no evidence of earlier stages in the origin of flight. ^{ccvi}

Exactly 1 year ago, paleontologists were abuzz about photos of a so-called “feathered dinosaur,” which were passed around the halls at the annual meeting of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. The *Sinosauropteryx* specimen from the Yixian Formation in China made the front page of *The New York Times*, and was viewed by some as confirming the dinosaurian origins of birds. But at this year’s vertebrate paleontology meeting in Chicago late last month, the verdict was a bit different: The structures are not modern feathers, say the roughly half-dozen Western paleontologists who have seen the specimens. . . . Paleontologist Larry Martin of Kansas University, Lawrence, thinks the structures are frayed collagenous fibers beneath the skin—and so have nothing to do with birds. ^{ccvii}

Confessions of the Impossibility of Reptilian Scales turning into Bird Feathers

Evolutionists maintain that reptile scales gradually turned into bird feathers by way of mutations and natural selection. However, as evolutionists themselves admit, this is an anatomical and physiological impossibility, because reptile scales and bird feathers have totally different structures.

A. H. Brush is Professor of Physiology and Neurobiology at the University of Connecticut:

Every feature from gene structure and organization, to development, morphogenesis and tissue organization is different [in feathers and scales] . . . Moreover, protein structure of birds feathers are unique among vertebrates. ^{ccviii}

Alan Feduccia is a famous ornithologist at University of North Carolina:

Every feature of them has aerodynamic functions. They are extremely light, have the ability to lift up which increases in lower speeds, and may return to their previous position very easily. ^{ccix}

Feathers are features unique to birds, and there are no known intermediate structures between reptilian scales and feathers. Notwithstanding speculations on the nature of the elongated scales found on such forms as *Longisquama* . . . as being featherlike structures, there is simply no demonstrable evidence that they in fact are. ^{ccx}

Barbara J. Stahl is an evolutionist paleontology professor and senior faculty member at Saint Anselm College, Manchester:

No fossil structure transitional between scale and feather is known, and recent investigators are unwilling to found a theory on pure speculation. . . . So far, the fossil record does not bear out that supposition. ^{ccxi}

How [feathers] arose initially, presumably from reptiles scales, defies analysis. . . .

It seems, from the complex construction of feathers, that their evolution from reptilian scales would have required an immense period of time and involved a series of intermediate structures. So far, the fossil record does not bear out that supposition. ^{ccxii}

Confessions About the Supposed Intermediate Form *Archaeopteryx*

Asked why there are no semi-winged or half-winged fossils, evolutionists refer to one life form in particular: the fossil known as *Archaeopteryx*, the best known of the small number of supposed intermediate forms so fiercely espoused by evolutionists.

According to their thesis, *Archaeopteryx*, the forerunner of modern birds, lived around 150 million years ago and was a semi-bird possessing various reptilian characteristics. This unlikely tale is repeated in just about every evolutionist publication. The fact is, however, that the latest researches into *Archaeopteryx* fossils have shown that the creature was very definitely not any intermediate form, merely an extinct species of bird with some features slightly different from those of modern birds.

The evidence that *Archaeopteryx* was a true bird and not a semi-dinosaur, semi-bird transitional form can be summarized as follows:

1. The fact that it had no sternum, or breastbone, with the same structure as that in modern flying birds was depicted as the most important evidence that *Archaeopteryx* could not fly. But the seventh *Archaeopteryx* fossil to be discovered in 1992 provoked enormous astonishment among evolutionist circles, because it did indeed possess a sternum of the kind evolutionists had for long failed to believe in. *Nature* magazine said, “This attests to its strong flight muscles.”^{ccxiii}

This discovery totally invalidated the most fundamental basis for the claim that *Archaeopteryx* was a proto-bird lacking the full ability to fly.

2. On the other hand, one of the main proofs that *Archaeopteryx* was genuinely capable of flight is the animal’s asymmetrical feather structure, identical to that in present-day birds, showing that it was able to fly perfectly.

3. Features that evolutionists rely on when portraying *Archaeopteryx* as an intermediate form are the claws on its wings and the teeth in its mouth. However, these features do not demonstrate that it was connected to reptiles in any way. Two living species of birds, the *Taouraco* and *Hoatzin*, also have claws that allow them to cling to branches. Yet they are fully fledged birds, with no reptilian characteristics whatsoever. Therefore, the idea that *Archaeopteryx* was an intermediate form because of its clawed wings is totally invalid.

The *Archaeopteryx* Fossil

Nor do the teeth in *Archaeopteryx*’s mouth make it a transitional form. In stating that its teeth are a reptilian characteristic, evolutionists are engaging in deliberate deception. Teeth are not a universal feature among reptiles. Some modern reptiles lack teeth. The fossil record shows that there was another group that may be described as toothed birds that lived in the same period as *Archaeopteryx*, and even before and after it—indeed, until quite recent times.

Even more importantly, the tooth structure of *Archaeopteryx* and that of other toothed birds is very different from that of dinosaurs, birds’ supposed evolutionary ancestors.

^{ccxiii} *Nature*, Vol. 382, August, 1, 1996, p. 401.

Archaeopteryx and Other Ancient Bird Fossils

In 1995, two paleontologists by the names of *Lianhai Hou* and *Zhonghe Zhou*, researching at the Vertebrate Paleontology Institute in China, discovered a new bird fossil they named *Confuciusornis*. This bird, the same age as *Archaeopteryx*, had no teeth, but its beak and feathers exhibited the same features as modern-day birds. The wings of this creature, whose skeleton was also the same as that of modern birds, had claws.

Hoatzin

Another fossil, discovered in China in November 1996, provoked yet more controversy. The existence of this 130-million-year-old bird, called *Liaoningornis*, was announced by Hou, Martin and Alan Feduccia in a paper published in *Science* magazine. This creature was identical to modern birds in all respects, and yet was a contemporary of *Archaeopteryx*. The only difference was the absence of teeth in its mouth. This went to show that, in contrast to evolutionist claims, toothed birds were in no way “primitive.”

Another fossil that totally discredited evolutionist claim regarding *Archaeopteryx* was *Eoalulavis*. This animal was said to be 30 million years younger than *Archaeopteryx*—in other words, around 120 million years old—and its wing structure can still be seen in slow-flying birds today. This proved that living things, no different in many ways to modern birds, were flying in the skies 120 million years ago.

These data proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that *Archaeopteryx* and other birds resembling it were not intermediate forms. These fossils did not demonstrate that different species of bird evolved from one another. On the contrary, they proved that various independent bird species not unlike *Archaeopteryx* and those alive today lived alongside one another.

In fact, the majority of evolutionists are well aware that *Archaeopteryx* cannot be an intermediate form, and that is simply an extinct species of bird.

Scientists describe such creatures as the platypus as *mosaic creatures*. That mosaic creatures do not count as intermediate forms is also accepted by such foremost paleontologists as Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge.^{ccxiv}

The evolutionist magazine *Nature* described how, with every new *Archaeopteryx* fossil discovery, it was realized that the animal cannot have been half-bird and half-reptile, still unable to fly, but that on the contrary it was a fully flying bird:

The recently discovered seventh specimen of the *Archæopteryx* preserves a partial, rectangular sternum, long suspected but never previously documented. This attests to its strong flight muscles.

ccv

Alan Feduccia:

In conclusion, the robust furcula of *Archaeopteryx* would have provided a suitable point of origin for a well developed pectoralis muscle . . . thus the main evidence for *Archaeopteryx* having been a terrestrial, cursorial predator is invalidated. There is nothing in the structure of the pectoral girdle of *Archaeopteryx* that would preclude its having been a powered flier. ^{ccxvi}

But in *Archaeopteryx*, it is to be noted, the feathers differ in no way from the most perfectly developed feathers known to us. ^{ccxvii}

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. ^{ccxviii}

John H. Ostrom is Professor of Geology Chair at Yale University:

No fossil evidence exists of any pro-avis. It is a purely hypothetical pre-bird, but one that must have existed. ^{ccxix}

From *Science* magazine:

True birds have existed at least as long as *archaeopteryx* so that the latter could hardly have been their ancestor.. ^{ccxx}

Carl O. Dunbar is Professor of Paleontology and Stratigraphy at Yale University:

Because of its feathers, [*Archaeopteryx* is] distinctly to be classed as a bird. ^{ccxxi}

Larry Martin is an American vertebrate paleontologist and curator of the Natural History Museum and Biodiversity Research Center at the University of Kansas:

^{ccxvi} Storrs L. Olson, Alan Feduccia, "Flight Capability and the Pectoral Girdle of *Archaeopteryx*, *Nature*, No. 278, 15 March 1979, p. 248.

^{ccxvii} A. Feduccia and H.B. Tordoff, in *Science*, 203 (1979), p. 1020.

^{ccxviii} Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It . . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, 1 February 1997, p. 28.

^{ccxix} John Ostrom, "Bird Flight: How Did It Begin?," *American Scientist*, January-February 1979, Vol. 67, p. 47.

^{ccxx} J. Marx, "The Oldest Fossil Bird: A Rival for *Archaeopteryx*?" *Science*, 199 (1978), p. 284.

^{ccxxi} Carl O. Dunbar, *Historical Geology*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1961, p. 310.

^{ccvi} Robert L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, p. 336.

^{ccvii} Ann Gibbons, "Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur," *Science*, Vvol. 278, No. 5341, 14 November 1997, pp. 1229-30.

^{ccviii} A.H. Brush, "On the Origin of Feathers," *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, Vol. 9, 1996, pp. 131-133.

^{ccix} Douglas Palmer, "Learning to Fly," Review of *The Origin of and Evolution of Birds* by Alan Feduccia (Yale University Press, 1996) in *New Scientist*, Vol. 153, March 1, 1997, p. 44.

^{ccx} Alan Feduccia, "On Why Dinosaurs Lacked Feathers," *The Beginning of Birds*, Eichstatt, West Germany: Jura Museum, 1985, p. 76.

^{ccxi} Barbara J. Stahl, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, Dover, 1985, pp. 349-350.

^{ccxii} *Ibid.*

^{ccxiv} S. J. Gould and N. Eldredge, *Paleobiology*, Vol. 3, 1977, p. 147.

^{ccxv} *Nature*, Vol. 382, August, 1, 1996, p. 401.

To tell you the truth, if I had to support the dinosaur origin of birds with those characters, I'd be embarrassed every time I had to get up and talk about it. ^{ccxxii}

Nicholas Hotton is an American paleontologist at the University of Chicago:

Protoavis has a well-developed furcula bone and chest bone, assisting flight, hollow bones and extended wing bones. . . . Their ears indicate that they communicate with sound, while dinosaurs' are silent. ^{ccxxiii}

Richard L. Deem is an American biologist at the University of Southern California:

The results of the recent studies show that the hands of the theropod dinosaurs are derived from digits I, II, and III, whereas the wings of birds, although they look alike in terms of structure, are derived from digits II, III, and IV. . . . There are other problems with the "birds are dinosaurs" theory. The theropod forelimb is much smaller (relative to body size) than that of *Archaeopteryx*. The small "proto-wing" of the theropod is not very convincing, especially considering the rather hefty weight of these dinosaurs. The vast majority of the theropod lack the semilunate wrist bone, and have a large number of other wrist elements which have no homology to the bones of *Archaeopteryx*. In addition, in almost all theropods, nerve V1 exits the braincase out the side, along with several other nerves, whereas in birds, it exits out the front of the braincase, through its own hole. There is also the minor problem that the vast majority of the theropods appeared after the appearance of *Archaeopteryx*. ^{ccxxiv}

Evolutionists also Admit They Cannot Account for the Origin of Flies

In maintaining that dinosaurs turned into birds, evolutionists suggest that some dinosaurs beat their forearms together in order to catch flies, eventually grew wings and took to the air. This theory is devoid of any scientific foundation and is merely a product of the imagination. But it also contains a logical vicious circle. Because the insect that evolutionists cite in order to explain the origin of flight was already able to fly to perfection!

An Example of Evolutionist Scenarios: Dinosaurs that Suddenly Developed Wings as They Chased after Flies

Humans are unable to rise and lower their arms even 10 times a second, yet some flies are capable of beating their wings 1,000 times a second. They also beat both their wings simultaneously. Even the slightest time lag in one wing would impair the fly's balance, but such an event never occurs.

Evolutionists should account for how the perfect flying ability in flies emerged, rather than coming up with scenarios about how flies induced a much clumsier life form—the reptile—to be able to fly.

Robin Wootton, an evolutionist British biologist, admits the sublime design in the fly and sets out the dilemmas inherent in the question:

The better we understand the functioning of insect wings, the more subtle and beautiful their designs appear. . . . Insect wings combine both in one, using components with a wide range of elastic properties, elegantly assembled to allow appropriate deformations in response to appropriate forces and to make the best possible use of the air. They have few if any technological parallels—yet.

ccxxv

Pierre Paul Grassé is the former president of the French Academy of Sciences and author of the book *Evolution of Living Organisms*:

We are in the dark concerning the origin of insects.

ccxxvi

CHAPTER 13

CONFESSIONS THAT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION CANNOT ACCOUNT FOR THE ORIGIN OF MAMMALS

According to the evolutionist scenario, reptiles are the ancestors of birds, just as they are of mammals. Yet there are huge structural difference between reptiles—whose bodies are covered in scales, whose blood is cold, and who reproduce by laying eggs—and mammals, whose bodies are covered in fur, which are warm blooded and reproduce by giving birth.

In the same way that no biological or physiological explanation of how reptiles supposedly turned into mammals has ever been given, so evolutionists cannot cite even a single intermediate form fossil to indicate that such a transition ever took place.

Moreover, it is impossible even to imagine such a transition, as first admitted by Charles Darwin, the founder of the theory:

I cannot conceive any existing reptile being converted into a mammal. ^{ccxxvii}

Roger Lewin is a well-known evolutionist science writer and former editor of *New Scientist* magazine:

The transition to the first mammal . . . is still an enigma. ^{ccxxviii}

George Gaylord Simpson is one of the main evolution authorities of 20th Century and one of the founders of Neo-Darwinist theory:

The most puzzling event in the history of life on Earth is the change from the Mesozoic, the Age of Reptiles, to the Age of Mammals. It is as if the curtain were rung down suddenly on the stage where all the leading roles were taken by reptiles, especially dinosaurs, in great numbers and bewildering variety, and rose again immediately to reveal the same setting but an entirely new cast, a cast in which the dinosaurs do not appear at all, other reptiles are supernumeraries, and all the leading parts are played by mammals of sorts barely hinted at in the preceding acts. ^{ccxxix}

This is true of all thirty-two orders of mammals The earliest and most primitive known members of every order [of mammals] 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

^{ccxxvii} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 128.

^{ccxxviii} Roger Lewin, "Bones of Mammals, Ancestors Fleshed Out," *Science*, Vol. 212, June 26, 1981, p. 1492.

^{ccxxix} George Gaylord Simpson, *Life Before Man*, New York: Time-Life Books, 1972, p. 42.

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. ^{ccxxx}

Eric Lombard is Professor of Organismal Biology and Anatomy at the University of Chicago:

Those searching for specific information useful in constructing phylogenies of mammalian taxa will be disappointed. ^{ccxxxi}

Tom S. Kemp is a Curator of the Zoological Collections at the University of Oxford:

Each species of mammal-like reptile that has been found appears suddenly in the fossil record and is not preceded by the species that is directly ancestral to it. It disappears some time later, without leaving a directly descended species. ^{ccxxxii}

While the great majority of evolutionists are unable to suggest any explanation for the emergence of mammals, some others have behaved more outrageously and produced various ridiculous and irrational tales. One such tale regarding the evolution of reptiles into mammals is described in one evolutionist publication:

Some of the reptiles in the colder regions began to develop a method of keeping their bodies warm. Their heat output increased when it was cold and their heat loss was cut down when scales became smaller and more pointed, and evolved into fur. Sweating was also an adaptation to regulate the body temperature, a device to cool the body when necessary by evaporation of water. But incidentally, the young of these reptiles began to lick the sweat of the mother for nourishment. Certain sweat glands began to secrete a richer and richer secretion, which eventually became milk. Thus the young of these early mammals had a better start in life. ^{ccxxxiii}

The above account is a completely unscientific stretch of the imagination. There is no evidence that anything in this account actually happened. Neither is it possible for them to have happened. To suggest that a living thing caused such a substance as milk—so finely calculated and of such enormous nutritional value—by licking sweat from its mother's body is the kind of nonsense one might have heard in the ignorant scientific environment of the Middle Ages. This and other such tales which frequently appear in evolutionist publications show how far removed the theory of evolution is from genuine science.

CHAPTER 14

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE INVALIDITY OF THE HORSE SERIES

Until recently, the imaginary sequence showing the supposed evolution of the horse headed the list of fossil chronologies portrayed as evidence for the theory of evolution. However, many evolutionists now openly admit that the horse-evolution scenario is a fabrication.

The *equine evolution* scenario was proposed on the basis of evolutionists' imaginations with invented sequences of fossils, set out in order of size, belonging to different life forms that lived at different times in India, North America, South America and Europe. Various researchers have proposed more than 20 different equine evolution sequences. There is absolutely no consensus regarding these completely different alleged lines of descent. The only thing these sequences have in common is the belief that the first ancestor of the horse was a dog-like animal known as *Eohippus* (*Hyracotherium*) that lived in the Eocene period some 55 million years ago. In fact, however, *Eohippus*, which supposedly became extinct millions of years ago, is in fact identical to the animal known as the hyrax, which is still to be found in Africa today, which has nothing to do with the horse and bears no resemblance to it.

The inconsistency of the idea of equine evolution is becoming more and more apparent with every new fossil discovery. It has been established that fossils of horse breeds living today (*Equus nevadensis* and *E. occidentalis*) have been found in the same strata as *Eohippus*. This shows that the modern horse was living at the same time as its supposed ancestor and is therefore obvious proof that no such process as the evolution of the horse ever took place.

Boyce Rensberger, an evolutionist, addressed a conference held at the Chicago Museum of Natural History in November 1980, with the participation of 150 evolutionists at which the problems of the theory of evolution were discussed. He described how the scenario of equine evolution was unsupported by the fossil record and that no gradual equine evolution ever occurred:

^{ccxxii} Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It . . . Did Dinosaurs?," *New Scientist*, p. 28.

^{ccxxiii} "Paleontology: Fossil Revisionism," *Science*, October 1986, p. 85; *Scientific American*, September 1986, p. 70.

^{ccxxiv} Richard L. Deem, "Demise of the 'Birds are Dinosaurs' Theory," <http://www.direct.ca/trinity/dinobird.html>

^{ccxxv} J. Robin Wootton, "The Mechanical Design of Insect Wings," *Scientific American*, Vol. 263, November 1990, p. 120.

^{ccxxvi} Pierre-P Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 30.

^{ccxxx} George G., Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. 105, 107.

^{ccxxxi} R. Eric Lombard, "Review of Evolutionary Principles of the Mammalian Middle Ear, Gerald Fleischer," *Evolution*, Vol. 33, December 1979, p. 1230.

^{ccxxxii} Tom Kemp, "The Reptiles that Became Mammals," *New Scientist* 92 [*sic*, it's actually 93]: 583, 4 March 1982.

^{ccxxxiii} George Gamow, Martynas Ycas, Mr. Tompkins *Inside Himself*, New York: The Viking Press, 1967, p. 149.

The popularly-told example of horse evolution, suggesting a gradual sequence of changes from four-toed fox-sized creatures living nearly 50 million years ago to today's much larger one-toed horse, has long been known to be wrong. Instead of gradual change, fossils of each intermediate species appear fully distinct, persist unchanged, and then become extinct. Transitional forms are unknown. ^{ccxxxiv}

Some other evolutionists have also made confessions about this fact:

Gordon R. Taylor is an evolutionist author and Chief Science Advisor at BBC:

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*, 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. ^{ccxxxv}

Dr. Colin Patterson is a famous evolutionist professor at the British Museum of Natural History):

There have been an awful lot of stories, some more imaginative than others, about what the nature of that history [of life] really is. The most famous example, still on exhibit downstairs, is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps fifty years ago. That has been presented as the literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now, I think that is lamentable, particularly when the people who propose those kinds of stories may themselves be aware of the speculative nature of some of that stuff. ^{ccxxxvi}

Prof. N. Heribert-Nilsson, a famous evolutionist botanist at the University of Lund in Sweden:

The family tree of the horse is beautiful and continuous only in the textbooks. . . . The construction of the horse is therefore a very artificial one, since it is put together from non-equivalent parts, and cannot therefore be a continuous transformation series. ^{ccxxxvii}

Stephen Jay Gould:

Prothero and Shubin conclude: "This is contrary to the widely-held myth about horse species as gradualistically varying parts of a continuum, with no real distinctions between species. Throughout the history of horses, the species are well-marked and static over millions of years. At high resolution, the gradualistic picture of horse evolution becomes a complex bush of overlapping, closely related species. ^{ccxxxviii}

G.G. Simpson is Professor of Zoology at Columbia University:

Perhaps the best known demonstration of an evolutionary scenario is that of the horse series displayed in school and college textbooks and in museums. These charts and displays make the theory of horse evolution very neat, seemingly historical, all cut- and-dried. Actually, there are important problems with the theory and some serious disagreement, even among evolutionary scientists.^{ccxxxix}

Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy:

Nowhere have any intermediate forms demonstrating a transition from a five-toed ancestor to *Hyracotherium* (*Eohippus*) with four toes on its front feet and three on the back.^{ccxl}

CHAPTER 15

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE FOREBEARS OF MAN

The theory of evolution maintains that human beings and modern-day apes share a common ancestor. These primitive creatures gradually evolved, with one branch coming to form present-day apes, and the other group modern human beings.

Evolutionists point to *Australopithecus*, whose Latin name means “South African ape,” as the first supposed common ancestor between humans and apes. The various types of *Australopithecus* were in fact nothing more than an extinct species of ape. Some of these were very large and others much smaller, while others had more delicate features.

Evolutionists attach the prefix *Homo*, meaning “man,” to the next stage, or genus, of human evolution. They claim that creatures in the *Homo* sequence were more advanced than *Australopithecus* and not all that different from modern-day humans. The final stage of this supposed evolutionary process is *Homo sapiens sapiens*, modern man.

The facts, however, are that *Australopithecus* is an extinct ape, while those in the *Homo* series are races of human beings who once lived but have since become extinct. Evolutionists have set out various ape and human fossils in order of size to produce a chronology of human evolution. Yet scientific facts prove that these fossils do not prove any evolutionary process: Some of these entities depicted as the forerunners of modern humans were genuine apes, while others were genuine humans. (For more details, see *The Evolution Deceit*, by Harun Yahya.)

However, since evolutionists had made such a daring claim, they needed to prove it, at least in their own minds, and so attempt to present so-called evidence by resorting to various frauds.

In their search for evidence to substantiate the theory of evolution, they most frequently resort to the fossil record. But when examined carefully and objectively, the fossil record does not support the theory of evolution at all, but totally undermines it. Yet because evolutionists generally offer biased evaluations of fossils and pass them on to the public, many people imagine that the fossil record actually corroborates the theory of evolution.

That some fossil discoveries are open to all kinds of interpretation is of the very greatest use to evolutionists. Fossils are usually insufficient for any certain conclusions. They tend to consist of partial and scattered bone fragments. It is therefore a simple matter to distort the data in whatever direction one chooses. Indeed, evolutionists construct their imaginary reconstructions (models or drawings) on the basis of fossil remains in such a way as to corroborate the claims of evolution. Since people are most easily influenced by visual materials, their aim is to use imagination to convince people that such creatures actually once existed.

Evolutionist researchers generally produce their reconstructions of imaginary, human-like beings on the basis of a single tooth, fragment of jawbone, or a tiny arm bone and then sensationally declare these to be links in the story of human evolution. Such drawings have played a considerable role in forming the public's image of primitive man.

Yet even so, evolutionists still make frequent confessions that such interpretations are often most open to fraud and bias.

Charles Darwin:

You ask whether I shall discuss “man”;—I think I shall avoid whole subject. . . My work, on which I have now been at work more or less for 20 years, will not fix or settle anything. . . . ^{ccxli}

. . . but I was dreadfully disappointed about [the evolution of] Man. ^{ccxlii}

Richard Leakey, a well-known evolutionist:

“David Pilbeam [a well-known expert in human evolution] comments wryly, ‘If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meager evidence we’ve got, he’d surely say, ‘Forget it: there isn’t enough to go on.’ ” ^{ccxliii}

Many discoveries of supposed hominids consist of only a mouth fragment, a leg bone, a hip bone, or a knee joint. ^{ccxliv}

Donald C. Johanson is an American paleoanthropologist and Professor at Arizona State University, in addition he is the director of the Institute of Human Origins:

There is no such thing as a total lack of bias. I have it; everybody has it. The fossil hunter in the field has it.... I was trying to jam evidence of dates into a pattern that would support conclusions about fossils which, on closer inspection, the fossils themselves would not sustain. ^{ccxlv}

F. Clark Howell, Professor and Chairman of the Anthropology Department at University of Chicago, discusses Piltdown Man, one of the most notorious forgeries in history:

Piltdown was discovered in 1953 to have been nothing more than an ape’s jaw placed with a human skull. It was a hoax placed on purpose. They recognized neither the jaw to be an ape’s or the skull to be a human’s. Instead, they declared each part as [from] an in-between [species] of

^{ccxli} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 467.

^{ccxlii} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 298.

^{ccxliii} Richard E. Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, London: Michael Joseph Limited, , 1981, p. 43.

^{ccxliv} Richard Leakey and Roger Lewin, *Origins*, New York: E.P. Dutton, 1977, p. 111; David Johanson , and Edy Maitland, , *Lucy*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981. p. 157.

^{ccxlv} Johanson, Donald C. and Maitland Edey (1981), *Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind*, New York: Simon & Schuster, pp. 257,258.

^{ccxxxiv} Boyce Rensberger, *Houston Chronicle*, November 5, 1980, p. 15.

^{ccxxxv} Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, p. 230.

^{ccxxxvi} Colin Patterson, *Harper’s*, February 1984, p. 60.

^{ccxxxvii} Prof. Heribert Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbildung*, Verlag CWE Gleerup, Sweden, 1954, pp. 551-552.

^{ccxxxviii} Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge, “Punctuated Equilibrium Comes of Age,” *Nature*, Vol. 336 (18 November 1993), p. 226.

^{ccxxxix} Simpson, G.G., *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, p. 167.

^{ccxli} Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* [Inheritance and Evolution], p. 37.

ape and human. They dated it to be 500,000 years old, gave it a name (*Eoanthropus Dawsoni* or “Dawson’s Dawn Man”), and wrote some 500 books on it. The “discovery” fooled paleontologists for forty-five years.^{ccxvi}

Wray Herbert is psychology editor for *Science News*, editor-in-chief of *Psychology Today*, and science and medicine editor at *US News & World Report*:

According to John Hopkins University anthropologist Alan Walker, there is a long tradition of misinterpreting various bones as human clavicles; in the past, he says, skilled anthropologists have erroneously described an alligator femur and the toe of a three-toed horse as clavicles.^{ccxlvii}

Boyce Rensberger is author of popular science books and director of the Knight Science Journalism Fellowships program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology:

In 1984, a 12-year old boy of the *Homo erectus* species, dated at 1.6 million years old, was dug up in Kenya. His body skeleton was virtually indistinguishable from our own.^{ccxlviii}

Jerald M. Loewenstein and Adrienne L. Zihlman in *New Scientist*, dated December 1988:

. . . anatomy and the fossil record cannot be relied upon for evolutionary lineages. Yet palaeontologists persist in doing just this. . . . The subjective element in this approach to building evolutionary trees, which many palaeontologists advocate with almost religious fervour, is demonstrated by the outcome: there is no single family tree on which they agree. On the contrary, almost every conceivable combination and permutation of living and extinct hominoids has been proposed by one cladist or another.^{ccxlix}

Robert D. Martin is Curator of Anthropology at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and Adjunct Professor of Anthropology at Northwestern University:

It should be noted at the outset that substantial fossil remains are known for all of the species listed below (a quite unusual situation with respect to the primate fossil record generally), but that there is virtually no fossil evidence relating to human evolution, other than a few fragments of dubious affinities, before about 3.8 Ma [million years] ago.^{cc}

David Pilbeam is Professor of Social Sciences at Harvard University and Curator of Paleontology at the Peabody Museum:

My reservations concern not so much this book [Richard Leakey’s *Origins*], but the whole subject and methodology of paleoanthropology. . . . Perhaps generations of students of human evolution, including myself, have been flailing about in the dark; . . . our data base is too sparse, too slippery, for it to be able to mold our theories.^{ccli}

Theory shapes the way we think about, even perceive, data. . . . We are unaware of many of our assumptions. ^{cclii}

In the physical realm, any theory of human evolution must explain how it was that an ape-like ancestor, equipped with powerful jaws and long, dagger-like canine teeth and able to run at speed on four limbs, became transformed into a slow, bipedal animal whose natural means of defense were at best puny. Add to this the powers of intellect, speech and morality, upon which we “stand raised as upon a mountain top,” as Huxley put it; and one has the complete challenge to evolutionary theory. ^{ccliii}

Robert B. Eckhardt is Professor of Anthropology at Penn State University:

Amid the bewildering array of early fossil hominoids, is there one whose morphology marks it as man’s hominid ancestor? If the factor of genetic variability is considered, the answer appears to be no. ^{ccliv}

John Reader holds an Honorary Research Fellowship in the Department of Anthropology at University College London:

The entire hominid collection known today would barely cover a billiard table, but it has spawned a science because it is distinguished by two factors which inflate its apparent relevance far beyond its merits. First, the fossils hint at the ancestry of a supremely self-important animal—ourselves. Secondly, the collection is so tantalisingly incomplete, and the specimens themselves often so fragmented and inconclusive, that more can be said about what is missing than about what is present. ^{cclv}

Lyall Watson has degrees in botany and zoology doctor of philosophy degree in ethology under Desmond Morris at London Zoo:

Modern apes, for instance, seem to have sprung out of nowhere. They have no yesterday, no fossil record. And the true origin of modern humans—of upright, naked, tool-making, big-brained beings—is, to be honest with ourselves, an equally mysterious matter. ^{cclvi}

William R. Fix is the author of the book, *The Bone Peddlers*:

The fossil record of man is still so sparsely known that those who insist on positive declarations can do nothing more than jump from one hazardous surmise to another and hope that the next dramatic discovery does not make them utter fools. . . . Clearly, some people refuse to learn from this. As we have seen, there are numerous scientists and popularizers today who have the temerity to tell us that there is “no doubt” how man originated. If only they had the evidence. . . . ^{cclvii}

Dr. Tim White is an evolution anthropologist at the University of California in Berkeley:

A five million-year-old piece of bone that was thought to be a collarbone of a humanlike creature is actually part of a dolphin rib according to an anthropologist at the University of California, Berkeley . . . The problem with a lot of anthropologists is that they want so much to find a hominid that any scrap of bone becomes a hominid bone. ^{cclviii}

In 1994, the American anthropologist Holly Smith conducted detailed analyses indicating that *Homo habilis* was not *Homo*—in other words, not human at all—but rather unequivocally an ape. Speaking of the analyses she made on the teeth of *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, *H. erectus* and *H. neanderthalensis*, Smith stated;

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. ^{cclix}

Stephen J. Gould:

What has become of our ladder if there are three coexisting lineages of hominids (*A. africanus*, the robust australopithecines, and *H. habilis*), none clearly derived from another? Moreover, none of the three display any evolutionary trends during their tenure on Earth. ^{cclx}

Evolutionist paleontologists Claude A. Villevieille is Professor of Biological Chemistry at Harvard Medical School, Eldra P. Solomon is licensed psychologist at Center for Mental Health Education, Tampa, Florida, and Percival William Davis is a professor of Life Science at Hillsborough Community College:

We [humans] appear suddenly in the fossil record. . . . ^{cclxi}

Niles Eldredge is a paleontologist at Harvard University and Ian Tattersall is curator at American Museum of Natural History:

It is a myth that the evolutionary histories of living things are essentially a matter of discovery. If this were true, one could confidently expect that as more hominid fossils were found, the story of human evolution would become clearer. Whereas if anything, the opposite has occurred. ^{cclxii}

Henry Gee is an author who has been published in *Nature* magazine:

. . . the chain of ancestry and descent . . . [is] a completely human invention created after the fact, shaped to accord with human prejudices. . . . To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story—amusing, perhaps even instructive, but not scientific. ^{cclxiii}

John Durant is a historian at Oxford University; from a meeting at British Association for the Advancement of Science:

Could it be that, like “primitive” myths, theories of human evolution reinforce the value-systems of their creators by reflecting historically their image of themselves and of the society which they live? ^{cclxiv}

. . . Time and again, ideas about human origins turn out on closer examination to tell us as much about the present as about the past, as much about our own experiences as about those of our remote ancestors. . . . [W]e are in urgent need of the de-mythologisation of science. ^{cclxv}

Confessions Regarding “Lucy”

During the course of research in Ethiopia’s Hadar Desert in 1974, a 25% intact hominid skeleton estimated to be 3 million years old was discovered and was given the name “Lucy.” This skeleton, which evolutionists claimed was of a forerunner of modern man, was 1.20 meters high and had a skull volume of 410 cubic centimeters, which is very small, even by the standard of modern apes.

Although evolutionists were perfectly well aware that Lucy was nothing more than an extinct form of ape, they ignored all her ape-like characteristics for the sake of the role as the ancestor of man that they had ascribed to her.

Richard Leakey:

Echoing the criticism made of his father’s *habilis* skulls, he added that Lucy’s skull was so incomplete that most of it was “imagination made of plaster of Paris,” thus making it impossible to draw any firm conclusion about what species she belonged to. ^{cclxvi}

Albert W. Mehlert is an evolutionist and paleoanthropology researcher:

The evidence given above makes it overwhelmingly likely that Lucy was no more than a variety of pygmy chimpanzee, and walked the same way (awkwardly upright on occasions, but mostly quadrupedal). The “evidence” for the alleged transformation from ape to man is extremely unconvincing. ^{cclxvii}

Confessions Regarding the Neanderthals

The Neanderthals appeared suddenly in Europe around 100,000 years ago, disappearing again—or else assimilating with other human races—just as rapidly and silently 35,000 years ago. The only difference between these and modern-day humans is that their skeletons were rather more powerful and their skulls, on average, slightly larger.

Neanderthals were a human race, and this is generally agreed upon by all. Evolutionists for long attempted to portray these people as a primitive species, but all the findings showed that the Neanderthals were no different to any well-built individual walking down the street today.

For that reason, many contemporary researchers refer to Neanderthal Man as *Homo sapiens Neandertalensis* and as a subspecies of modern man. Findings show that the Neanderthals buried their dead, used a variety of musical instruments and shared an advanced culture with *Homo sapiens sapiens*, living at the same time. In short, the Neanderthals were simply a large-bodied race of humans that gradually disappeared.

Charles Darwin:

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that some skulls of very high antiquity, such as the famous one of Neanderthal, are well developed and capacious. ^{cclxviii}

C. Loring Brace, an evolutionist anthropologist:

Neanderthals had short, narrow skulls, large cheekbones and noses and, most distinctive, bunlike bony bumps on the backs of their heads. Many modern Danes and Norwegians have identical features, Brace reported at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Phoenix Indeed, the present-day European skulls resemble Neanderthal skulls more closely than they resemble the skulls of American Indians or Australian aborigines. ^{cclxix}

Erik Trinkaus is Professor of Physical Anthropology at Washington University in St. Louis:

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. ^{cclxx}

From *Prevention* magazine, an evolutionist periodical:

Dr. Francis Ivanhoe has claimed that the teeth of Neanderthal Man show specific evidence of rickets (caused by a Vitamin D deficiency) and that X-rays of the bones of Neanderthal Man show the characteristic rickets ring pattern. ^{cclxxi}

Bonnie Blackwell is an evolutionist geologist at the City University of New York's Queens College:

Neanderthals were apparently quite similar to *Homo sapiens* in their behavior and cognitive capacities. In both groups, musical traditions probably extend back very far into prehistory. The Slovenian bone closely resembles several hole-bearing bones that were likely to have been used as musical instruments by humans at later European sites, according to archaeologist Randall K. White of New York University. ^{cclxxii}

Sarah Bunney is an executive editor and science writer:

Paleontologists in Israel have discovered a fossil bone which shows that Neanderthals may have been just as capable of speech as modern humans. The bone, known as the hyoid, is from a Neanderthal who lived between 50 000 and 60 000 years ago. The hyoid, a small U-shaped bone, is a key part of the vocal apparatus in modern human beings. According to B. Arensburg and Yoel Rak of Tel Aviv University and their colleagues, the fossil hyoid, in size and shape, is just like a modern human's . . . The researchers believe that, despite their heavy jawbones, Neanderthals spoke a language. ^{cclxxiii}

The Neanderthals were a human race, with large, powerful muscles, who managed to survive in a harsh environment. Their tools remained the same for thousands upon thousands of years. There is no indication of evolution in their technology or behaviour. ^{cclxxiv}

Milford Wolpoff is Professor of Anthropology at the University of Michigan:

Others helped a Neanderthal survive. Did they love him, did he make a valuable contribution to his community, were these his children and did they protect only their own relatives? Yes, we can invent all kinds of stories as to why this happened. The important thing is that these all belong to human beings. There are no animal fables and this behaviour of theirs points to a social depth. They knew everything, and the Neanderthals lacked nothing of modern man's behavioural capacity.. ^{cclxxv}

Chris Stringer is a British anthropologist at the Natural History Museum in Britain:

I think the evolution debate is being highly personalized, and we are occupied with fields with great numbers of uncertainties. . . . ^{cclxxvi}

Confessions Regarding Cro-Magnon Fossils

Cro-magnon Man fossils were first discovered in March 1868 in a cave in Les Eyzies in France. There is no major anatomical difference between these individuals and modern humans, yet evolutionists try to use biased interpretations to portray Cro-magnon Man as different from modern human beings. In fact, Cro-magnon Man is a human race now estimated to have lived around 30,000 years ago.

The skull structure of people living in Europe today does not resemble that of Cro-magnons. Their skull structure and volume do, however, resemble that of some races currently living in Africa and tropical climes. On the basis of that resemblance, we can say that Cro-magnon Man is an ancient race originating from Africa.

Cro-magnon Man disappeared very quickly. There is only one reason for that; paleoanthropological discoveries have shown that the Cro-magnon and Neanderthal races combined with one another to form the basis of today's races.

Randall White is Professor of Anthropology at New York University:

Cro-magnon artifacts have a right to stand alongside those of the entire history of mankind. From a 20th century perspective the extraordinary thing about the existence of Cro-magnons is that

they underwent no direct, gradual evolution from the crude and unformed to selectivity and perfection. The history of art begins 35,000 years ago. ^{cclxxvii}

James Shreeve is a science journalist in magazines like *Science*, *National Geographic* and *Smithsonian*:

A Cro-magnon skull

New dating methods have revealed that fossils thought to be 40,000 years old are actually 100,000 years old. Now, if Cro-magnons are older than the Neanderthals who lived 60,000 years ago, how can they be descended from them?

Britain; Dorothy Great discovered both Neanderthal and Cro-magnon remains in the Stark Hills behind Tel Aviv. Assumed that they were compatible with the previously estimated chronology, the Neanderthals were concluded to be around 60,000 years old, and the Cro-magnons around 40,000. Some researchers were unconvinced. They believed that the stratification in the caves had been damaged by water currents and determined a new date using another dating method.

Eventually it was concluded that modern humans appeared in the land of Israel *before* the Neanderthals. The new dating provoked considerable surprise, because it stated that modern-looking fossils were actually 100,000 years old. The Neanderthals, on the other hand, were 60,000 years old. On the basis of this evidence, Cro-magnons cannot have evolved from the Neanderthals.

There are many scenarios concerning the extinction of species. . . . These are full of assumptions. There is no evidence of any wars or violent conflict in these valleys. All there is, is a strange disappearance, and isolated fossils. ^{cclxxviii}

Confessions About an 800,000-Year Human Fossil

One of the human fossils that have attracted the most attention was one uncovered in 1995 in a cave called Gran Dolina in the Atapuerca region of Spain by three Spanish paleoanthropologists from the University of Madrid. The fossil revealed the face of an 11-year-old boy who looked entirely like modern man. Yet the child had died 800,000 years ago. This fossil even shook the convictions of Juan Luis Arsuaga Ferreras, who led the Gran Dolina excavation. Ferreras 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 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. ^{cclxxix}

Confessions About 3.6-Million-Year-Old Human Footprints

In 1977, Mary Leakey discovered footprints in the Laetoli region of Tanzania. These were in a stratum calculated to be 3.6 million years old and, even more importantly, were identical to those any modern human being would leave. These footprints were later examined by eminent paleoanthropologists, Tim White among them:

Make no mistake about it, . . . They are like modern human footprints. If one were left in the sand of a California beach today, and a four-year old were asked what it was, he would instantly say that somebody had walked there. He wouldn't be able to tell it from a hundred other prints on the beach, nor would you. ^{cclxxx}

Louise Robbins is the anthropologist who worked closely with Mary Leakey on the Laetoli project:

The arch is raised—the smaller individual had a higher arch than I do—and the big toe is large and aligned with the second toe The toes grip the ground like human toes. You do not see this in other animal forms. ^{cclxxxi}

Russell H. Tuttle is Professor of Anthropology at the University of Chicago:

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. ^{cclxxxii}

In sum, the 3.5 million-year-old footprint traits at Laetoli site G resemble those of habitually unshod modern humans. None of their features suggest that the Laetoli hominids were less capable bipeds than we are. If the G footprints were not known to be so old, we would readily conclude that there were made by a member of our genus *Homo*. . . . In any case, we should shelve the loose assumption that the Laetoli footprints were made by Lucy's kind, *Australopithecus afarensis*. ^{cclxxxiii}

Elaine Morgan is an evolutionist writer and researcher for documentary television in Britain:

Four of the most outstanding mysteries about humans are: 1) Why do they walk on two legs? 2) why have they lost their fur? 3) why have they developed such large brains? 4) why did they learn to speak?

The orthodox answers to these questions are: 1) "We do not yet know"; 2) "We do not yet know"; 3) "We do not yet know"; 4) "We do not yet know." The list of questions could be considerably lengthened without affecting the monotony of the answers. ^{cclxxxiv}

Lord Solly Zuckerman is Professor of Anatomy at Birmingham University and chief scientific adviser to the British government:

We then move right off the register of objective truth into those fields of presumed biological science, like extrasensory perception or the interpretation of man's fossil history, where to the

faithful, anything is possible—and where the ardent believer is sometimes able to believe several contradictory things at the same time. ^{cclxxxv}

Lord Zuckerman candidly stated that if special creation did not occur, then no scientist could deny that man evolved from some apelike creature, without leaving any fossil traces of the steps of the transformation. ^{cclxxxvi}

Robert Eckhardt is Professor of Anthropology at Penn State University:

Neither is there compelling evidence for the existence of any distinct hominid species during this interval, unless the designation “hominid” means simply an individual ape that happens to have small teeth and a correspondingly small face. ^{cclxxxvii}

CHAPTER 16

CONFESSIONS THAT THE HUMAN SOUL CANNOT BE EXPLAINED IN TERMS OF EVOLUTION

Another subject that evolutionists cannot explain is how, during the process of evolution, humans acquired characteristics that separate them from all other life forms. Human beings are conscious entities possessed of free will, able to think, speak, reason, take decisions and make judgments. All these characteristics are processes belonging to the human *soul*, which is the main feature creating the enormous gulf between humans and other animals.

Man is the only living thing in nature with a soul, and no supposed mechanism of evolution can account for the features of the soul and its formation.

All evolutionists, Darwin included, are well aware of this. Here are a few examples of evolutionist admissions on this subject:

Charles Darwin:

We have seen in the last two chapters that man bears in his bodily structure clear traces of his descent from some lower form; but it may be urged that, as man differs so greatly in his mental power from all other animals, there must be some error in this conclusion. ^{cclxxxviii}

Prof. Cemal Yıldırım, a Turkish evolutionist, is Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University:

The question today that cannot easily be answered is this: Do we know the natural factors directing the course of human evolution? To put it another way, under the effect of what natural conditions did nature turn towards the conscious entity, with cultural activity, we refer to as “man”? ^{cclxxxix}

Darwin restricts natural selection, which he proposed as a propulsive force, to the formation of new species and forms on the biological level. He regards various factors affecting the emergence of the various activities we refer to as *culture* and *civilization* during the process of developing the emotional, mental and moral attributes we see in their clearest form in humans. Man is not only the biological product of natural selection, but also of progress in the psychological, moral and cultural spheres.

^{cclxxxviii} Charles Darwin, *The Descent Of Men*, Chapter III – “Comparison of the Mental Powers of Man and the Lower Animals.”

^{cclxxxix} Cemal Yıldırım, *Evrin Kuramı ve Bağnazlık* [“Evolution Theory and Bigotry”], p. 93.

However, it is far from clear how the aimless, mechanical process of natural selection, can have led to such extraordinary advances. We cannot even say that Darwin provided a satisfactory resolution of this difficulty. ^{ccxc}

Moral (ethical) behaviour is not a natural form of behaviour, but a cultural one unique to man alone. We know that Darwin failed to see that distinction sufficiently clearly. If he had seen it, he would not have gone down the road of locating certain activities rooted in the human mind and moral awareness within a biological evolutionary framework. In his view, “thought” was something to be seen as totally related to the brain. “In the same way that gravity is a feature of matter, so thought is a characteristic of our brains,” says Darwin. But is this equation, which confuses physiology and psychology, strictly accurate? . . . At this point, it is clear that Darwin is in error. ^{ccxi}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German professor of neurology and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

We are unable to provide any answer to how consciousness, the soul, reason and emotion came into being along the path of natural history and genetic development. Because the psychic-awareness dimension, at least in this world, is currently the highest level attainable by evolution. Therefore, although we can look at steps and stages beyond evolution, again with the help of our consciousness, and look down on them from the outside, we are devoid of the means of adopting such an approach towards the soul itself. Because there is no superior attribute to the soul we possess. In the words of evolutionary theoreticians, we have no equation by which we can perceive and understand the soul as a whole. ^{ccxii}

Roger Lewin is a well-known evolutionist science writer and former editor of New Scientist magazine:

In the physical realm, any theory of human evolution must explain how it was that an ape-like ancestor, equipped with powerful jaws and long, dagger-like canine teeth and able to run at speed on four limbs, became transformed into a slow, bipedal animal whose natural means of defense were at best puny. Add to this the powers of intellect, speech and morality, upon which we “stand raised as upon a mountain top” as Huxley put it; and one has the complete challenge to evolutionary theory. ^{ccxiii}

CHAPTER 17

CONFESSIONS THAT COMPLEX ORGANS CANNOT APPEAR BY WAY OF EVOLUTION

How could highly complex organs such as the eye, lung and wings have emerged gradually during the evolutionary process? That is one of the greatest dilemmas facing evolutionists, who leave it unanswered. These interconnected structures, one of which serves no purpose in the absence of another, cannot emerge in stages, as evolutionists claim. Organs possessing such a characteristic, known as *irreducible complexity* in the scientific literature, will become functionless if any one of their components is missing.

The eye, for example, consists of some 40 different organelles and will be unable to see if any one of those 40—the retina, for instance—is absent. That being so, in order for an eye to function, all these 40 organelles must all come into being, together with the other systems that make sight possible—and that can only happen by way of creation.

Contrary to what evolutionists claim, it is impossible for the eye to have formed as the result of these organelles all emerging, one by one, over millions of years. Because in the absence of just one organelle, an eye that's unable to see will, to use an evolutionist term, become *vestigial* and disappear before it even fully forms. This also applies to all other complex structures. Confronted by this scientific reality, evolutionists try to prevent the issue from being raised or else, as you shall see below, feel forced into making confessions on the subject.

Darwin himself was one of the first to realize this predicament, and admitted that even thinking about the eye and other complex organs gave him a “cold shudder”:

The eye to this day gives me a cold shudder, but when I think of the fine known gradations, my reason tells me I ought to conquer the cold shudder. ^{ccxciv}

I remember well the time when the thought of the eye made me cold all over, but I have got over this stage of the complaint, and now small trifling particulars of structure often make me very uncomfortable. The sight of a feather in a peacock's tail, whenever I gaze at it, makes me sick. ^{ccxcv}

The recur to the eye. I really think it would have been dishonest, not to have faced the difficulty. ^{ccxcvi}

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. ^{ccxcvii}

^{ccxciv} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 67.

^{ccxcv} *Ibid.*, p. 90.

^{ccxcvi} *Ibid.*, p. 84.

^{ccxcvii} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter VI. “Difficulties of the Theory.”

Although we must be extremely cautious in concluding that any organ could not have been produced by successive, small, transitional gradations, yet undoubtedly serious cases of difficulty occur. One of the most serious is that of neuter insects, which are often differently constructed from either the males or fertile females; but this case will be treated of in the next chapter. The electric organs of fishes offer another case of special difficulty; for it is impossible to conceive by, what steps these wondrous organs have been produced. ^{ccxcviii}

Finally then, although in many cases it is most difficult even to conjecture by what transitions organs have arrived at their present state; yet, considering how small the proportion of living and known forms is to the extinct and unknown, I have been astonished how rarely an organ can be named, towards which no transitional grade is known to lead. It certainly is true, that new organs appearing as if created for some special purpose, rarely or never appear in any being;—as indeed is shown by that old, but somewhat exaggerated, canon in natural history of “*Natura non facit saltum*.” [Nature does not make leaps]. ^{ccxcix}

How a nerve comes to be sensitive to light, hardly concerns us more than how life itself originated. ^{ccc}

To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree. . . . Reason tells me, that if numerous gradations from a simple and imperfect eye to one complex and perfect can be shown to exist, each grade being useful to its possessor, as is certainly the case; if further, the eye ever varies and the variations be inherited, as is likewise certainly the case and if such variations should be useful to any animal under changing conditions of life, then the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by natural selection, though insuperable by our imagination, should not be considered as subversive of the theory. How a nerve comes to be sensitive to light, hardly concerns us more than how life itself originated; but I may remark that, as some of the lowest organisms, in which nerves cannot be detected, are capable of perceiving light, it does not seem impossible that certain sensitive elements in their sarcode should become aggregated and developed into nerves, endowed with this special sensibility. ^{ccci}

The common feature of eyes and wings is that they can perform their functions only when they are fully developed. To put it another way, sight is impossible with a deficient eye, and flight is impossible with half a wing. How these organs appeared is still one of those secrets of nature that have not yet been fully illuminated. ^{cccii}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German Professor of Neurology and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

The question of how the division of a fertilized egg leads to the birth of countless cells differentiated from each other in every possible respect heads the list of those that leave scientists scratching their heads. Although conceptual frameworks capable of giving a rough analysis of what is going on have been established, the phenomenon as a whole still represents a collection of unanswerable questions. ^{ccci}

Richard Dawkins is a British zoologist and one of the leading contemporary evolutionists:

Evolution is very possibly not, in actual fact, always gradual. But it must be gradual when it is being used to explain the coming into existence of complicated, apparently designed objects, like eyes. For if it is not gradual in these cases, it ceases to have any explanatory power at all. Without gradualness in these cases, we are back to miracle, which is simply a synonym for the total absence of explanation. ^{ccciv}

Prof. Russell Doolittle is Professor of Biochemistry at the University of California at San Diego:

How in the world did this complex and delicately balanced process evolve? . . . The paradox was, if each protein depended on activation by another, how could the system ever have arisen? Of what use would any part of the scheme be without the whole ensemble? ^{cccv}

From a letter that Sir Charles Lyell, a renowned geologist of the mid-nineteenth century, wrote to Darwin:

Pages would be required thus to state an objection and remove it. It would be better, as you wish to persuade, to say nothing. ^{cccv}

A letter to Darwin from Asa Gray, American botanist of the 19th century, and one of his best friends:

Well, that seems to me the weakest point on the book is the attempt to account for the formation of organs, the making of eyes, &c., by natural selection. Some of this reads quite Lamarckian. ^{cccvi}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth:

When nature found an eye socket, it was confronted by the same dilemma. This eye, which emerged as a quite unexpected step with the successive accumulation of light-sensitive cells in the front part of the body due to very different causes, must have faced the threat of instant elimination because of the way it was a functionless mechanism. Because two totally opposing demands, illumination or clarity, could not have been met in its state at that time. We know that the eye overcame this dilemma by using a lens. Because no matter how large the aperture, no matter how much light enters the chamber, the lens still provides images with no lack of clarity by performing

“net focusing.” But is the universe a physicist? Because only physicists know how the lens will overcome this difficulty, and we who read their words. ^{cccviii}

Frank B. Salisbury is Professor and Head of the Department of Plant Science at Utah State University:

Even something as complex as the eye has appeared several times; for example, in the squid, the vertebrates, and the arthropods. It's bad enough accounting for the origin of such things once, but the thought of producing them several times according to the modern synthetic theory makes my head swim. ^{cccix}

Professor Ali Demirsoy is a biologist at Hacettepe University and specializes in zoogeography:

It is rather hard to reply to a third objection. How was it possible for a complicated organ to come about suddenly even though it brought benefits with it? For instance, how did the lens, retina, optic nerve, and all the other parts in vertebrates that play a role in seeing suddenly come about? Because natural selection cannot choose separately between the visual nerve and the retina. The emergence of the lens has no meaning in the absence of a retina. The simultaneous development of all the structures for sight is unavoidable. Since parts that develop separately cannot be used, they will all be meaningless, and also perhaps disappear with time. At the same time, their development all together requires the coming together of unimaginably small probabilities. ^{cccix}

Prof. Cemal Yıldırım, a Turkish evolutionist, is Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University:

In order to see, there is a need for a large number of mechanisms to cooperate: we may speak of links between the eye and its internal mechanisms and between the eye and the special center in the brain. How did this complex structure come about?

According to biologists, during the process of evolution the first step in the formation of the eye was taken with the formation of a small, light-sensitive region in the skins of certain primitive creatures. However, what evolutionary advantage could such a small occurrence bestow on an organism all by itself? Together with that region, a nerve network connecting it to a visual center in the brain would also need to be constructed.

Unless these rather complex mechanisms are linked together, we cannot expect the phenomenon we know as “sight” to emerge. Darwin believed that variations emerged at random. If that were so, would it not be a mysterious puzzle how the great number of variations necessary for sight all came together and cooperated at the same time in various different parts of the organism's body? . . . The fact is that a string of complementary changes—all of which must work together—are necessary for sight. . . .

Some mollusks' eyes have retina, cornea, and a lens just like ours. How can we account for this construction in two species on such very different evolutionary levels solely in terms of natural

selection? . . . It is a matter for debate whether Darwinists can supply a satisfactory answer to that question. . . .^{cccxi}

Ernst Mayr is one of the 20th century's leading evolutionary biologists:

It is a considerable strain on one's credulity to assume that finely balanced systems such as certain sense organs (the eye of vertebrates, or the bird's feather) could be improved by random mutations.^{cccxi}

CHAPTER 18

CONFESSIONS THAT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION CANNOT EXPLAIN ANIMAL INSTINCTS

Many characteristics observed in living things represent enormous quandaries for the theory of evolution. Bees and ants live together in enormous communities and exhibit the finest examples of excellent, disciplined social life. Bees build those architectural marvels called honeycombs. Spiders spin such high-quality webs that technology is barely able to begin replicating them. Even the fiercest animals show devotion to their own young and even to other species. Countless other actions involving reason, judgment and decision-taking—features supposedly unique to human beings—cannot be explained in terms of any of the mechanisms proposed by the theory of evolution.

Evolutionists say that these modes of living or behavior in living things emerged as the result of “impulses” from inside. However, they are unable to say what those impulses were.

Darwinists admit the fact that an enormous force affects the behavior of living things. They attribute the devotion, division of labor and perfect organization among life forms to direction by a *force*.

However, they then bring the issue to an end by simply referring to this force as *instinct*. To describe the origin of that force, they employ the clichéd term “Mother Nature.”

In fact, however, no evolutionist to date can say where instincts are located in living things’ bodies. In what part of the anatomy do these impulses, described as instincts, lie? In the brain, weighing just a few hundred grams? Or tucked away in some of the proteins and amino acids that make up the tissues?

It is Allah Who has inspired bees to make the same totally perfect hexagonal combs for millions of years.

When we open up the bodies of living things to examine them, we are still unable to establish the source of this information. Because; instinct is an impulse that expresses the spiritual and has no material counterpart. This shows the serious inconsistency among Darwinists and materialists, who reject the spiritual and maintain that all things are simply accumulations of matter.

In fact, evolutionists have been unable to shed any light on this question. If instinct is present in any living thing, that means that some force is inspiring it to do things. That power is obviously Allah, the sole lord and ruler of the Universe.

Given the obvious nature of these facts, evolutionists have been forced to make confessions regarding instinct too. And as in all areas, the clearest admissions come from those known for their outspokenness.

Charles Darwin:

What shall we say to the instinct which leads the bee to make cells, and which has practically anticipated the discoveries of profound mathematicians? ^{cccxiii}

Many instincts are so wonderful that their development will probably appear to the reader a difficulty sufficient to overthrow my whole theory. ^{cccxiv}

But it would be a serious error to suppose that the greater number of instincts have been acquired by habit in one generation, and then transmitted by inheritance to succeeding generations. It can be clearly shown that the most wonderful instincts with which we are acquainted, namely, those of the hive-bee and of many ants, could not possibly have been acquired by habit. ^{cccxv}

If a working ant or other neuter insect had been an animal in the ordinary state, I should have unhesitatingly assumed that all its characters had been slowly acquired through natural selection; namely, by an individual having been born with some slight profitable modification of structure, this being inherited by its offspring, which again varied and were again selected, and so onwards.

But with the working ant we have an insect differing greatly from its parents, yet absolutely sterile; so that it could never have transmitted successively acquired modifications of structure or instinct to its progeny. It may well be asked, how is it possible to reconcile this case with the theory of natural selection? ^{cccxvi}

I have not attempted to define intelligence; but have quoted your remarks on experience, and have shown how far they apply to worms. It seems to me that they must be said to work with some intelligence, anyhow they are not guided by a blind instinct. ^{cccxvii}

Finally, it may not be a logical deduction, but to my imagination it is far more satisfactory to look at such instincts as the young cuckoo ejecting its foster-brothers,—ants making slaves,—the larvae of ichneumonidae feeding within the live bodies of caterpillars,—not as specially endowed or created instincts, but as small consequences of one general law, leading to the advancement of all organic beings, namely, multiply, vary, let the strongest live and the weakest die. ^{cccxviii}

But the greater number of the more complex instincts appears to have been gained in a wholly different manner, through the natural selection of variations of simpler instinctive actions.

Such variations appear to arise from the same unknown causes acting on the cerebral organization, which induce slight variations or individual differences in other parts of the body; and these variations, owing to our ignorance, are often said to arise spontaneously. We can, I think, come to no other conclusion with respect to the origin of the more complex instincts, when we reflect on the marvelous instincts of sterile worker-ants and bees, which leave no offspring to inherit the effects of experience and of modified habits. ^{cccxix}

^{cccxiii} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, VI. "Difficulties of the Theory of Descent with Modification."

^{cccxiv} *Ibid.*, Chapter VIII. "Instinct, Instincts Comparable with Habits, but Different in Their Origin," p. 184.

^{cccxv} *Ibid.*, p. 185.

^{cccxvi} *Ibid.*, p. 208.

^{cccxvii} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 419.

^{cccxviii} Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 208.

. . . it seems to me wholly to rest on the assumption that instincts cannot graduate as finely as structures. I have stated in my volume that it is hardly possible to know which, *i.e.*, whether instinct or structure, change first by insensible steps. ^{cccx}

Francis Darwin, son of Charles Darwin:

Chapter III. of the Sketch, which concludes the first part, treats of the variations which occur in the instincts and habits of animals . . . It seems to have been placed thus early in the Essay to prevent the hasty rejection of the whole theory by a reader to whom the idea of natural selection acting on instincts might seem impossible. This is the more probable, as the Chapter on Instinct in the Origin is specially mentioned (Introduction, page 5) as one of the “most apparent and gravest difficulties on the theory.” ^{cccxix}

Gordon Rattray Taylor is an evolutionist author and Chief Science Advisor at BBC:

When we ask ourselves how any instinctive pattern of behavior arose in the first place and became hereditarily fixed, we are given no answer . . . ^{cccxii}

Biologists assume freely that such inheritance of specific behaviour patterns is possible, and indeed that it regularly occurs. Thus Dobzhansky roundly asserts: “All bodily structures and functions, without exception, are products of heredity realized in some sequence of environments. So are all forms of behaviour, without exception.” This simply isn’t true and it is lamentable that a man of Dobzhansky’s standing should dogmatically assert it.

If in fact behaviour is heritable, what are the units of behaviour which are passed on—for presumably there are units? No one has suggested an answer. ^{cccxiii}

Evolutionists’ Admissions About the Altruism in Living Things

Contrary to what evolutionists maintain, nature is not a battleground. Quite the opposite: Nature is full of instances of acts of altruism and rational cooperation, even at the price of the death of the individuals concerned, or their coming to harm. These countless examples of altruism, self-sacrifice and solidarity disprove evolutionists’ claims that nature is simply a battleground, with the selfish, those putting their own interests first, surviving.

John Maynard Smith, a famous evolutionist:

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? ^{cccxiv}

Prof. Cemal Yıldırım, a Turkish evolutionist, is Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University:

Scientists of the 19th century were easily misled into adopting the thesis that nature is a battlefield, because more often than not, they were imprisoned in their studies or laboratories and generally didn't bother to acquaint themselves with nature directly. Not even a respectable scientist like Huxley could exempt himself from this error. ^{cccxxv}

Peter Kropotkin an evolutionist author:

. . . 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, who certainly is considered as one of the ablest exponents of the theory of evolution, 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". . . it may be remarked at once that Huxley's view of nature had as little claim to be taken as a scientific deduction. ^{cccxxvi}

From *Scientific American* magazine:

In spite of male baboons' lack of genetic relationship, they do display one type of cooperative behavior. When two baboons are in some kind of contest, one of them may enlist the aid of a third baboon. The soliciting baboon asks for help with an easily recognized signal, turning its head repeatedly back and forth between its opponent and its potential assistant. ^{cccxxvii}

From *Bilim ve Teknik* magazine:

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 we observe that animals can indeed behave selflessly.

One classic way of accounting for self-sacrifice is maintaining that this will work to the benefit of the group or species concerned, and that communities consisting of self-sacrificing individuals will be more successful in evolution than communities made up of selfish ones. The question now made clear here, however, is how can self-sacrificing communities preserve these characteristics? The appearance of just one selfish individual in such a society will be able to hand on a higher level of selfish attributes to later generations, because that individual will fail to sacrifice itself.

Another unclarified point is that if evolution takes place on the societal level, what the dimensions of that society will be. Family? Herd/Flock? Species? Order? What would happen if the results of the evolution taking place at more than one level if these were to be incompatible with one another? ^{cccxxviii}

CHAPTER 19

CONFESSIONS THAT PLANTS CANNOT HAVE ARISEN BY WAY OF EVOLUTION

The theory of evolution is at another complete loss to explain the emergence of plants, just as it is with its claims regarding human and animal evolution. Not a single fossil indicates that one plant species was the forerunner of another or else constituted an intermediate form between two species. A great many plant fossils have been unearthed to date, and all share one particular feature: They all are flawless and bear an identical resemblance to their counterparts today.

For example, algae—which evolutionists describe as primitive cells and claim to be the ancestors of all “higher” plants—are known to have been the same billions of years ago, just as they are today.

It is also impossible to account for the emergence of the photosynthesis produced by plants in terms of chance. Photosynthesis, which we are unable to duplicate even using modern technology, has been successfully achieved even by algae that evolutionists regard as the most “primitive” of plants, for billions of years. All these are signs that botany disproves evolution and corroborates creation.

As always, however, evolutionists cannot avoid from admitting this manifest reality:

Richard B. Goldschmidt is a German-born U.S. zoologist and geneticist:

The evolution of the animal and plant worlds is considered by all those entitled to judgment to be a fact for which no further proof is needed. But in spite of nearly a century of work and discussion there is still no unanimity in regard to the details of the means of evolution. ^{cccxix}

Chester Arthur Arnold is Professor Emeritus of Botany in The University of Michigan:

As yet we have not been able to trace the phylogenetic history of a single group of modern plants from its beginning to the present. ^{cccx}

It has long been hoped that extinct plants will ultimately reveal some of the stages through which existing groups have passed during the course of their development, but it must be freely admitted that this aspiration has been fulfilled to a very slight extent, even though paleobotanical research has been in progress for more than one hundred years. ^{cccxix}

^{cccxix} Richard Goldschmidt, “Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist,” *American Scientist*, Vol. 409, January 1952, p. 84.

^{cccx} Chester A. Arnold, *An Introduction to Paleobotany*, New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1947, p. 7.

^{cccxix} *Ibid.*

[W]e have not been able to track the phylogenetic history of a single group of modern plants from its beginning to the present. ^{cccxxxii}

Not only are plant evolutionists at a loss to explain the seemingly abrupt rise of the flowering plants to a place of dominance, but their origin is likewise a mystery. ^{cccxxxiii}

Dr. Edred Corner is Professor of Botany at Cambridge University:

I still think that, to the unprejudiced, the fossil record of plants is in favour of special creation. If, however, another explanation could be found for this hierarchy of classification, it would be the knell of the theory of evolution. Can you imagine how an orchid, a duckweed, and a palm have come from the same ancestry, and have we any evidence for this assumption? The evolutionist must be prepared with an answer, but I think that most would break down before an inquisition. ^{cccxxxiv}

Edmund J. Ambrose, is Professor Emeritus at the University of London and head department of Cell Biology at the Chester Beatty Research Institute University of London:

At the present stage of geological research, we have to admit that there is nothing in the geological records that runs contrary to the view of conservative creationists, that God created each species separately. . . . ^{cccxxxv}

From *Science News*:

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

Prof. Ali Demirsoy:

Photosynthesis is a rather complicated event, and it seems impossible for it to emerge in an organelle inside a cell, because it is impossible for all the stages to have come about at once. And it is meaningless for them to have emerged separately. ^{cccxxxvii}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth:

No cell possesses the means of “learning” a biological process in the literal sense of the word. A cell is not in a position to perform a function such as respiration or photosynthesis during birth, and it is impossible for it to come by the ability to enable this process, to overcome this during the course of its later life. ^{cccxxxviii}

Daniel Axelrod is Professor of Geology and Botany at the University of California:

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. ^{cccxix}

N. F. Hughes is an author on Paleobiology and Paleobotany:

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. ^{cccxl}

CHAPTER 20

CONFESSIONS REGARDING VARIATION

Variation is a term employed in genetics for a phenomenon that causes individuals or groups within a living species to display different characteristics from one another. For example, all humans on Earth possess essentially the same genetic information, but the potential for variation allowed by that information means that some of us have almond-shaped eyes, some have red hair, others have long noses and still others are short in stature.

Evolutionists, however, see the diversity within species as evidence for their theory. Yet diversity constitutes no proof of evolution at all, because variation consists of different combinations of *already* existing genetic information, but can add no new characteristics to that information.

Charles Darwin:

With respect to my far-distant work on species, I must have expressed myself with singular inaccuracy, if I led you to suppose that I meant to say that my conclusions were inevitable. They have become so, after years of weighing puzzles, to myself alone; but in my wildest day-dream, I never expect more than to be able to show that there are two sides to the question of the immutability of species, *i.e.* whether species are directly created, or by intermediate laws, (as with the life & death of individuals). I did not approach the subject on the side of the difficulty. . . . ^{cccqli}

You ask what effect studying species has had on my variation theories; I do not think much—I have felt some difficulties more. ^{cccxlii}

Certainly I have felt it humiliating, discussing and doubting and examining over and over again, when in my own mind, the only doubt has been, whether the form varied today or yesterday. . . . After describing a set of forms, as distinct species, tearing up my M.S., and making them one species; tearing that up and making them separate, and then making them one again (which has happened to me) I have gnashed my teeth, cursed species, and asked what sin I had committed to be so punished. . . . ^{cccxlili}

Birds, which have struggled in their own homes, when settled in a body, nearly simultaneously in a new country, would not be subject to much modification, for their mutual relations would not be much disturbed. But I quite agree with you, that in the time they ought to undergo some. ^{cccxliv}

^{cccqli} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 394.

^{cccxlii} *Ibid.*, p. 397.

^{cccxlili} *Ibid.*, p. 400.

^{cccxliv} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 5.

When we descend to details ... nor can we prove that the supposed changes are beneficial, which is the groundwork of the theory. Nor can we explain why some species have changed and others have not. The latter case, seems to me hardly more difficult to understand precisely and in detail than the former case of supposed change. ^{cccxliv}

Francis Darwin:

In the *Autobiography*, my father has stated what seemed to him the chief flaw of the 1844 Sketch; he had overlooked “one problem of great importance,” the problem of the divergence of character. This point is discussed in the *Origin of Species*, but, as it may not be familiar to all readers, I will give a short account of the difficulty and its solution. The author begins by stating that varieties differ from each other less than species, and then goes on: “Nevertheless, according to my view, varieties are species in process of formation How then does the lesser difference between varieties become augmented into the greater difference between species?” ^{cccxlvi}

Luther Burbank, a geneticist and one of the world’s most eminent authorities on the subject of livestock breeding:

There are limits to the development possible, and these limits follow a law. ^{cccxlvii}

Norman Macbeth, an evolutionist known for his criticisms of Darwinism:

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. ^{cccxlviii}

W. L. Johannsen, a Danish scientist:

The variations upon which Darwin and Wallace placed their emphasis cannot be selectively pushed beyond a certain point, that such variability does not contain the secret of “indefinite departure.” ^{cccxlxi}

CHAPTER 21

CONFESSIONS THAT THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A VESTIGIAL ORGAN

The idea of vestigial organs is not a scientific one. According to that claim, the bodies of living things contain organs inherited from their forebears, but that have gradually lost their functions through lack of use.

This is very definitely no scientific claim, because it was based on ignorance. Functionless organs are ones whose function has not yet been identified. The best indication of this has been the continued shrinkage of the list of vestigial organs proposed by evolutionists. It has now been established that those organs originally described as vestigial actually possess wide-ranging functions.

Charles Darwin:

There remains, however, this difficulty. After an organ has ceased being used, and has become in consequence much reduced, how can it be still further reduced in size until the merest vestige is left; and how can it be finally quite obliterated? It is scarcely possible that disuse can go on producing any further effect after the organ has once been rendered functionless. Some additional explanation is here requisite which I cannot give. ^{cccl}

S. R. Scadding is an evolutionist zoologist at the University of Guelph, Ontario:

Since it is not possible to unambiguously identify useless structures, and since the structure of the argument used is not scientifically valid, I conclude that “vestigial organs” provide no special evidence for the theory of evolution. ^{cccli}

^{cccl} Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, <http://www.zoo.uib.no/classics/darwin/origin.chap14.html>

^{cccli} S. R. Scadding, “Do ‘Vestigial Organs’ Provide Evidence for Evolution?,” *Evolutionary Theory*, Vol. 5, May 1981, p. 173.

CHAPTER 22

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE INVALIDITY OF HOMOLOGY

Efforts to provide proof of the theory of evolution have included the interpretation of similarities among living things as evidence of some common ancestor. With that aim in mind, every similarity between living things is portrayed as evidence of yet another evolutionary relationship.

However, scientific discoveries made over the last 20 to 30 years show that resemblances between life forms constitute no evidence for the theory of evolution:

1- There are *homologous* (similar-looking) organs even between classes between which evolutionists cannot trace any familial relationship,

2- The genetic information in bodies of different life forms with similar organs is based on very different genetic codes, and

3- These organs are very different from one another during the course of embryological development, This shows that homology provides no basis for evolution.

These similar structures in very different life forms, among which no evolutionary links can be established, represent a serious problem for evolutionists. Indeed, they frequently refer to the discomfort this causes them:

Frank Salisbury is Professor and Head of the Department of Plant Science at Utah State University:

Even something as complex as the eye has appeared several times; for example, in the squid, the vertebrates, and the arthropods. It's bad enough accounting for the origin of such things once, but the thought of producing them several times according to the modern synthetic theory makes my head swim.^{ccclii}

William Fix, an evolutionist biologist:

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-fingered] 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

^{ccclii} Frank Salisbury, "Doubts About the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution," *American Biology Teacher*, September 1971, p. 338.

different species. The concept of homology in terms of similar genes handed on from a common ancestor has broken down. ^{cccliii}

Dr. Christian Schwabe Schwabe is Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at the Medical University of South Carolina:

Molecular evolution is about to be accepted as a method superior to paleontology for the discovery of evolutionary relationships. As a molecular evolutionist, I should be elated. Instead, it seems disconcerting that many exceptions exist to the orderly progression of species as determined by molecular homologies: so many in fact that I think the exception, the quirks, may carry the more important message. ^{cccliv}

CHAPTER 23

CONFESSIONS THAT THE THEORY VIOLATES THE SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

The Second Law of Thermodynamics, one of the fundamentals of physics, states that left to themselves and natural conditions, all systems in the universe will gradually move towards disorder, fragmentation and corruption, in direct relation to the passage of time.

All things—living and inanimate—eventually erode, decay, fragment and fall apart. This is the eventual and inescapable end of all entities, and according to the Second Law, no way back from the process is possible.

This fact is something you can observe in your daily life. For instance, if you leave a car in the desert and then return a few months later, it is in, it will not be in any better condition. You will see that the tires have burst, the windows are cracked, the body has rusted and the battery no longer works.

The same inevitable process takes place, but even faster, in living things. This natural process of the Second Law of Thermodynamics is an expression of physical equations and calculations.

However, the theory of evolution is completely at odds with this law, because evolution maintains that all kinds of systems—and life in particular—came into being spontaneously, with no conscious intervention involved. However, it is a scientifically proven that, left to natural conditions, all things made of matter will head towards disorder and chaos. Despite the reality described above, the presence in the universe of order and perfection is one of the proofs that a Sublime Creator—in other words, Allah— is responsible for it.

In fact, evolutionists are well aware that the Second Law of Thermodynamics places their theory in an untenable position:

J. H. Rush works at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado:

In the complex course of its evolution, life exhibits a remarkable contrast to the tendency expressed in the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Where the Second Law expresses an irreversible progression toward increased entropy and disorder, life evolves continually higher levels of order.

^{ccclv}

Roger Lewin is a well-known evolutionist science writer and former editor of *New Scientist* magazine:

One problem biologists have faced is the apparent contradiction by evolution of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Systems should decay through time, giving less, not more, order. ^{ccclvi}

^{ccclv} J. H. Rush, *The Dawn of Life*, New York: Signet, 1962, p. 35.

^{ccclvi} Roger Lewin, “A Downward Slope to Greater Diversity,” *Science*, Vol. 217, 24 September, 1982, p. 1239.

George P. Stavropoulos, in the magazine *American Scientist*:

Yet, under ordinary conditions, no complex organic molecule can ever form spontaneously, but will rather disintegrate, in agreement with the Second Law. Indeed, the more complex it is, the more unstable it will be, and the more assured, sooner or later, its disintegration. Photosynthesis and all life processes, and even life itself, cannot yet be understood in terms of thermodynamics or any other exact science, despite the use of confused or deliberately confusing language. ^{ccclvii}

Jeremy Rifkin is an American economist, writer, and public speaker:

The Entropy Law says that evolution dissipates the overall available energy for life on this planet. Our concept of evolution is the exact opposite. We believe that evolution somehow magically creates greater overall value and order on Earth. ^{ccclviii}

Prof. Ilya Prigogine, known for his research into thermodynamics at the Université Libre de Belgique:

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? ^{ccclix}

The problem of biological order involves the transition from the molecular activity to the supermolecular order of the cell. This problem is far from being solved. ^{ccclx}

CHAPTER 24

CONFESSIONS REGARDING THE INVALIDITY OF RECAPITULATION

The Theory of Recapitulation, first proposed by Ernst Haeckel towards the end of the 19th century, claimed that during their embryological development, living things repeated the evolutionary process experienced by their forerunners.

He suggested, for example, that during its development in its mother's womb, the human embryo exhibited first fish-like and then reptilian features, before finally becoming human. Subsequently, however, it emerged that this theory was totally a figment of the imagination. In fact, Haeckel himself confessed to the frauds he had perpetrated in the illustrations he produced to support this imaginary scenario. The fact that some evolutionists still put credence to Haeckel's imaginary scenario, and the illustrations that he admitted were fraudulent, shows how far they have lagged behind the scientific literature.

Ernst Haeckel:

After this compromising confession of “forgery,” I should be obliged to consider myself condemned and annihilated if I had not the consolation of seeing side by side with me in the prisoner's dock hundreds of fellow-culprits, among them many of the most trusted observers and most esteemed biologists. The great majority of all the diagrams in the best biological textbooks, treatises and journals would incur in the same degree the charge of “forgery,” for all of them are inexact, and are more or less doctored, schematised and constructed. ^{ccclxi}

George Gaylord Simpson Professor of Zoology at Columbia University:

Haeckel misstated the evolutionary principle involved. It is now firmly established that ontogeny does not repeat phylogeny. ^{ccclxii}

From an article in *American Scientist*:

Surely the biogenetic law is as dead as a doornail. It was finally exorcised from biology textbooks in the fifties. As a topic of serious theoretical inquiry it was extinct in the twenties ^{ccclxiii}

From an article in *Science* magazine:

^{ccclxi} Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1982, p. 204.

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

^{ccclxiii} Keith S. Thomson, “Ontogeny and Phylogeny Recapitulated,” *American Scientist*, Vol. 76, May/June 1988, p. 273.

The impression [Haeckel's drawings] give, that the embryos are exactly alike, is wrong, says Michael Richardson, an embryologist at St. George's Hospital Medical School in London. . . . So he and his colleagues did their own comparative study, reexamining and photographing embryos roughly matched by species and age with those Haeckel drew. Lo and behold, the embryos “often looked surprisingly different.”

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

From an article in *New Scientist*:

[Haeckel] called this the biogenetic law, and the idea became popularly known as recapitulation. In fact, Haeckel’s strict law was soon shown to be incorrect. For instance, the early human embryo never has functioning gills like a fish, and never passes through stages that look like an adult reptile or monkey.^{ccclxv}

CHAPTER 25

CONFESSIONS THAT LIFE CAN ONLY HAVE BEEN CREATED

Every living thing in the world has been equipped with flawless systems and immaculate harmony. The impeccable biological characteristics and systems that living things possess to protect themselves, reproduce, feed or hunt, and their compatibility with their environmental surroundings, is definitive evidence of the existence of a single Creator.

The planned activity that even a tiny caterpillar demonstrates in order to protect and camouflage itself, the combs that honeybees construct using a sophisticated mathematical calculations, and the muscles possessed by the mosquito, accurate down to millimetrical levels, thanks to which it is able to beat its wings 1,000 times a second, all introduce us to the artistry of our Omniscient Lord.

No evolutionist can explain how these characteristics came into existence, because mechanisms such as random mutations and natural selection cannot give rise to these perfections. That is why evolutionists express their despair in the face of all the miraculous attributes they observe in all living things. They have generally had to admit that such perfection exists, for which reason a conscious Intelligence must have been involved.

Charles Darwin:

I cannot anyhow be contented to view this wonderful universe, and especially the nature of man . . . I am inclined to look at everything as resulting from designed laws. . . . All these laws may have been expressly designed by an omniscient Creator, who foresaw every future event and consequence. But the more I think, the more bewildered I become.^{ccclxvi}

I am conscious that I am in an utterly hopeless muddle. I cannot think that the world, as we see it, is the result of chance; and yet I cannot look at each separate thing as the result of design.^{ccclxvii}

I could give many most striking and curious illustrations in all [biological] classes; so many that I think it cannot be chance.^{ccclxviii}

You have most cleverly hit on one point, which has greatly troubled me; if, as I must think, external conditions produce little direct effect, what the devil determines each particular variation?^{ccclxix}

^{ccclxvi} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 105.

^{ccclxvii} *Ibid.*, p. 146.

^{ccclxviii} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 455.

^{ccclxix} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 28.

I remember well the time when the thought of the eye made me cold all over, but I have got over this stage of complaint . . . and now trifling particulars of structure often make me very uncomfortable. The sight of a feather in a peacock's tail, whenever I gaze at it, makes me sick. ^{ccclxx}

Roger Lewin is a well-known evolutionist science writer and former editor of *New Scientist* magazine:

Much of evolution looks as if it had been planned to result in man, and in other animals and plants to make the world a suitable place for him to dwell in. Like Wallace, Broom also saw a spiritual guiding hand behind the whole process. ^{ccclxxi}

Prof. Fred Hoyle is a British astronomer and a mathematician at Cambridge University:

Once we see, however, that the probability of life originating at random is so utterly minuscule as to make it absurd, it becomes sensible to think that the favourable properties of physics on which life depends are in every respect deliberate. ^{ccclxxii}

Rather than accept that fantastically small probability of life having arisen through the blind forces of nature, it seemed better to suppose that the origin of life was a deliberate intellectual act. By "better." I mean less likely to be wrong. ^{ccclxxiii}

Prof. Cemal Yıldırım Yıldırım is a Turkish evolutionist, and Professor of Philosophy at Middle East Technical University:

According to some critics, equating evolution with natural selection alone is like expecting a cat or a pigeon sat at a typewriter keyboard to be able to write Shakespeare's *Hamlet* or Goethe's *Faust* by tapping the keys for a million years. When we examine even the simplest life form, however, we cannot ignore the fact that a sublime intelligence has played an active role in it. ^{ccclxxiv}

It is far from being convincing to attribute this order in living things, which seems to have a particular purpose, to chance or coincidence. ^{ccclxxv}

Niles Eldredge is an evolutionist paleontologist at the American Museum of Natural History :

Indeed, the only competing explanation for the order we all see in the biological world is the notion of Special Creation. ^{ccclxxvi}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

These two polymers [egg white and nucleic acids] have been constructed in such a complex manner and, as if that were not enough, their structures exhibit such a high level of individuality that

to imagine these came to that level by acquiring wealth solely as the result of chance goes far beyond being even an astronomically and inconceivably small possibility. ^{ccclxxvii}

The statistical impossibility of the living structures in question emerging as the result of chance alone is a rather current example of the present-day level of development of science. Indeed, looking at those extraordinary individual features in the formations of a single protein carrying out biological functions, it appears impossible to explain a large number of atoms combining together, all in the correct and requisite sequence, at the right time and moment and with the right electrical and mechanical features, all in terms of chance. ^{ccclxxviii}

No matter how large the universe may be, chance giving rise to the birth of protein and nucleic acid is [an] impossibility that. . . ^{ccclxxix}

It is of course possible to account for the story of the birth of the world in all its details, and the emergence of the complex structure of the building blocks of living organisms in particular, with the possibility of a planned course being followed and the direct intervention of a supernatural power. In fact, we can ascribe the conditions on Earth, and ask why subsequent developments occurred in such an astonishing way as to meet the requirements of life, as if this had been foreseen beforehand, only to the intention to create life from one end of the world to the other of a Creator existing beyond nature, omnipotent. ^{ccclxxx}

The question posed in a mocking tone of voice by one ever-present celebrity during a debate on the origin of life constitutes a well-known example on this subject: “How long would a human being’s 1,000 trillion atoms have to be mixed up for a Volkswagen to merge by chance?” Another variation of the same question is “How long would 100 monkeys have to sit randomly tapping the keys of a typewriter until they produced a single one of Shakespeare’s sonnets?” Such objections are really astonishing. ^{ccclxxxi}

The life span of the Earth would be insufficient for cytochrome-C (or any other enzyme currently in existence) to be manufactured once again in exactly that form out of coincidences. ^{ccclxxxii}

It is more reasonable seeming to think that the development of animate and inanimate nature is the work of a single moment, a flash of creation. ^{ccclxxxiii}

Attempting to produce a conclusion on the basis that life is the work of a miracle may more reasonable in the current state of affairs. ^{ccclxxxiv}

Pierre-Paul Grassé is a French biologist and former President of the French Academy of Sciences:

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 daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it. ^{ccclxxxv}

Chance becomes a sort of providence, which, under the cover of atheism, is not named but which is secretly worshipped. ^{ccclxxxvi}

Prof. Ali Demirsoy is a biologist at Hacettepe University and specializes in zoogeography:

In essence, the probability of the formation of a cytochrome-C sequence is as likely as zero. That is, if life requires a certain sequence, it can be said that this has a probability likely to be realized once in the whole universe. Otherwise some metaphysical powers beyond our definition must have acted in its formation. To accept the latter is not appropriate for the scientific cause. We thus have to look into the first hypothesis. ^{ccclxxxvii}

Douglas Futuyma is Professor of Ecology and Evolution at the State University of New York:

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. ^{ccclxxxviii}

What really astounds me is the architecture of life. . . . The system is extremely complex. It's like it was designed. . . . There's a huge intelligence there. ^{ccclxxxix}

CHAPTER 26

CONFESSIONS THAT THE UNIVERSE DID HAVE A BEGINNING

Up to the beginning of the 20th century, the prevailing view was that the universe was of infinite dimensions, and that it had existed and would continue to exist for ever. According to this view, known as the Static Universe Model, there was no question of the universe having any beginning or an end.

This perspective, which represents the basis of materialist philosophy, regarded the universe as being a stable, fixed and unchanging accumulation of matter, while denying the existence of any Creator.

In these days, the threshold of the 21st century, modern physics has proven, with many experiments, observations and calculations, that the universe had a beginning and was created in a single moment with an explosion known as the Big Bang.

In addition, it has been established that contrary to materialist claims, the universe is not fixed and stable, but is rather in a constant state of flux and change, and is also expanding. These facts are today accepted by the scientific world.

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German Professor of Neurology and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

To put it another way, scientists encountered phenomena suggesting that the universe had a beginning.

This idea seemed so revolutionary, or unscientific to put it in other terms, or odd, a word beloved of many scientists, that a number of concepts and opinions were put forward in order to avoid the striking conclusion that would be reminiscent of those in ancient myths and religions. We are not going to discuss these often complex concepts and universal models here. Because as stated at the beginning, we consider that the American Penzias and Wilson's discoveries represent a final answer to this question. The universe did indeed have a beginning. ^{cccxc}

Anthony Flew is a British philosopher known for several decades as an atheist but who later expressed his views in favor of theism:

Notoriously, confession is good for the soul. I will therefore begin by confessing that the Stratonician atheist has to be embarrassed by the contemporary cosmological consensus. For it seems that the cosmologists are providing a scientific proof, that the universe had a beginning. So long as the universe can be comfortably thought of as being not only without end but also without beginning, it remains easy to urge that its brute existence, and whatever are found to be its most fundamental features, should be accepted as the explanatory ultimates. Although I believe that it remains still correct, it certainly is neither easy nor comfortable to maintain this position in the face of the Big Bang story. ^{cccxi}

^{cccxc} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 1 (The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs)*, p. 56.

Dennis Sciama is a scientist who, together with Fred Hoyle, spent many years defending the fixed universe theory. In Stephen Hawking's words:

Defending the steady-state theory alongside Fred Hoyle for years, Dennis Sciama described the final position they had reached after all the evidence for the Big Bang theory was revealed. Sciama stated that he had taken part in the heated debate between the defenders of the steady-state theory and those who tested that theory with the hope of refuting it. He added that he had defended the steady-state theory, not because he deemed it valid, but because he wished that it were valid.

Fred Hoyle stood out against all objections as evidence against this theory began to unfold. Sciama goes on to say that he had first taken a stand along with Hoyle but, as evidence began to pile up, he had to admit that the game was over and that the steady-state theory had to be dismissed.

cccxcii

Stephen W. Hawking is a British theoretical physicist and Professor of Mathematics at the University of Cambridge:

Why should the Universe be in a state of high order at one end of time, the end that we call the past? Why is it not in a state of complete disorder at all times? After all, this might seem more probable. And why is the direction of time in which disorder increases the same as that in which the Universe expands? One possible view is that God simply chose that the Universe should be in a smooth and ordered state at the beginning of the expansion phase. We should not try to understand why, or question His reasons because the beginning of the Universe was the work of God. But the whole history of the Universe could be said to be the work of God. cccxciii

Don N. Page is Professor of Physics at the University of Alberta:

There is no mechanism known as yet that would allow the Universe to begin in an arbitrary state and then evolve to its present highly ordered state. cccxciv

Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy is a biologist at Hacettepe University and specializes in zoogeography:

Today, however, we know that infinite time and infinite space belong to God, that the universe is finite... cccxcv

Hoimar Von Ditfurth:

We cannot know what there was before this point and at its beginning. That is a sphere closed to science. Even the question of why there was a beginning is unanswerable. In addition, the questions of the origins of the first structure of the initial matter, hydrogen, its characteristics, and what gave rise to that hydrogen, are all parts of this mystery. cccxcvi

Leonard Huxley is a biographer and writer, and Elder Professor of Physics in the University of Adelaide:

. . . “creation” in the ordinary sense of the world, is perfectly conceivable. I find no difficulty in conceiving that, at some former period, this universe was not in existence; and that it made its appearance in six days . . . in consequence of the volition of some pre-existing Being. ^{cccxcvii}

Prof. Fred Hoyle is a British astronomer and a mathematician at Cambridge University:

The Big Bang theory holds that the universe began with a single explosion. Yet as can be seen below, 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. ^{cccxcviii}

CHAPTER 27

CONFESSIONS THAT THE ORDER IN THE UNIVERSE CANNOT HAVE COME ABOUT BY CHANCE

Paul Davies is a theoretical physicist and cosmologist at Arizona State University:

Everywhere we look in the Universe, from the far flung galaxies to the deepest recesses of the atom, we encounter order. . . Central to the idea of a very special, orderly Universe is the concept of information. A highly structured system, displaying a great deal of organized activity, needs a lot of information to describe it. Alternatively, we may say that it contains much information.

We are therefore presented with a curious question. If information and order always has a natural tendency to disappear, where did all the information that makes the world such a special place come from originally? The Universe is like a clock slowly running down. How did it get wound up in the first place? ^{cccxcix}

Careful measurements put the rate of expansion very close to a critical value at which the universe will just escape its own gravity and expand forever. A little slower and the cosmos would collapse, a little faster and the cosmic material would have long ago completely dispersed. It is interesting to ask precisely how delicately the rate of expansion has been “fine tuned” to fall on this narrow dividing line between two catastrophes.

If at time t_S (by which the time pattern of expansion was already firmly established) the expansion rate had differed from its actual value by more than 10⁻¹⁸, it would have been sufficient to throw the delicate balance out. The explosive vigour of the universe is thus matched with almost unbelievable accuracy to its gravitating power. The Big Bang was not evidently any old bang, but an explosion of exquisitely arranged magnitude. ^{cd}

The laws [of physics] . . . seem to be the product of exceedingly ingenious design. . . The universe must have a purpose. ^{cdi}

It is hard to resist that the present structure of the universe, apparently so sensitive to minor alterations in the numbers, has been rather carefully thought out. . . . The seemingly miraculous concurrence of numerical values that nature has assigned to her fundamental constants must remain the most compelling evidence for an element of cosmic design. ^{cdii}

Had nature opted for a slightly different set of numbers, the world would be a very different place. Probably we would not be here to see it . . . Recent discoveries about the primeval cosmos oblige us to accept that the expanding universe has been set up in its motion with a cooperation of astonishing precision. ^{cdiii}

If the world's finest minds can unravel only with difficulty the deeper workings of nature, how could it be supposed that those workings are merely a mindless accident, a product of blind chance? ^{cdiv}

If you wanted to produce carbon and oxygen in roughly equal quantities by stellar nucleosynthesis, these are the two basic levels you would have to fix, and your fixing would have to be just about where these levels are actually found to be. . . . A commonsense interpretation of the facts suggests that a superintellect has monkeyed with physics . . . and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. ^{cdv}

I do not believe that any scientist who examined the evidence would fail to draw the inference that the laws of nuclear physics have been deliberately designed with regard to the consequences they produce inside the stars. ^{cdvi}

Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a German Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry and a well-known evolutionist science writer:

If dozens of mutual relationships and just about countless natural phenomena, of which we have only become aware as the result of centuries of experiments and a great deal of hard work by scientists, are not sources of amazement and astonishment, genuine awe, then what will be? There is an endless list of astonishing natural phenomena that we have only learned as the result of scientific research, from the dimensions of the universe and the laws governing the rate of expansion of stars to the secret-filled relationship between matter and energy, and from the events taking place in the cell nucleus, in which is stored the blueprint for a living organism to the discovery of the electrical currents in our brains. . . . Indeed, looking at the unique properties inherent in the formation of a single protein molecule performing biological functions, it appears impossible to account for the atoms needing to combine at the right moment, in the correct sequence, and with the correct electrical and mechanical properties, to do so by chance. ^{cdvii}

W. Press, an astrophysicist, writing in an article in *Nature* magazine:

There is a grand design in the Universe that favours the development of intelligent life. ^{cdviii}

CHAPTER 28

CONFESSIONS REGARDING DARWINISM'S NEGATIVE EFFECT ON MORAL VALUES

In the 19th century, the theory of evolution began to exert an influence over a wide sphere, beyond such branches of science as biology and paleontology, extending from human relations to the analysis of history, from politics to society. Efforts were made to adapt Darwin's idea of the struggle for survival in nature—as a result of which *the fittest* would survive while the weak were eliminated—to human thought and behavior. Applying Darwin's claim that nature was a battleground to human societies served as a justification of class conflicts, a social order in which the strong oppressed the weak, racism, colonialism, exploitation, repression and other forms of inhumanity.

Reading between the lines, even evolutionists admit the inhumanity that Darwinist ideas continue to inflict on societies:

Theodosius Dobzhansky is a geneticist and evolutionary biologist at Columbia University:

Natural selection can favor egoism, 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 mankind. ^{cdix}

P. J. Darlington is of Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge:

The first point is that selfishness and violent are inherent in us, inherited from our remotest animal ancestors. . . . Violence is, then, natural to man, a product of evolution. ^{cdx}

Robert Wright, author of the book, *The Moral Animal*:

Evolutionary theory, after all, has a long and largely sordid history of application to human affairs. After being mingled with political philosophy around the turn of the century to form the vague ideology known as “social Darwinism,” it played into the hands of racists, fascists, and the most heartless sort of capitalists. ^{cdxi}

We were victims of a cruel social ideology that assumes that competition among individuals, classes, nations or races is the natural condition of life, and that it is also natural for the superior to dispossess the inferior The law of natural selection is not, I will maintain, science. It is an ideology, and a wicked one. . . . ^{cdxii}

Conclusion

Of course, the evolutionist confessions collected in this book represent only a very small fraction of those that could be found. Evolutionists, who have had to make such clear and honest admissions despite their dogmatic devotion to their theory, are in an even worse state when it comes to their internal thoughts. The famous American professor of biochemistry Michael Behe summarizes the condition of such scientists:

Over the past four decades modern biochemistry has uncovered the secrets of the cell. The progress has been hard won. It has required tens of thousands of people to dedicate the better parts of their lives to the tedious work of the laboratory. . . .

-
- ccxlv F. Clark Howell, *Early Man*, New York: Time Life Books, 1973, pp. 24-25.
- ccxlvii Herbert, Wray, "Hominids Bear Up, Become Porpoiseful," *Science News*, Vol. 123 (April 16, 1983), p. 246.
- ccxlviii Boyce Rensberger, "Human Fossil is Unearthed," *Washington Post*, October, 19, 1984, p. 11.
- ccxlix Lowenstein, J. & Zihlman, A., "The Invisible Ape," *New Scientist*, Vol. 120, 3 December 1988, pp. 56, 58, 59.
- cel Robert D. Martin, *Primate Origins and Evolution*, Princeton University Press, 1990, p. 82.
- celi David Pilbeam, *American Scientist*, Vol. 66, May-June, 1978, p. 379.
- celii David Pilbeam, "Rearranging Our Family Tree," *Nature*, June 1978, p. 40.
- celiii Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention: Controversies in the Search for Human Origins*, 1987, New York: Simon and Schuster, pp. 312-313.
- celiv Robert B. Eckhardt, "Population genetics and human origins," *Scientific American*, Vol. 226(1), January 1972, p. 94.
- celv John Reader, "Whatever Happened to *Zinjanthropus*?," *New Scientist*, Vol. 89, No. 12446, 26 March, 1981.
- celvi Lyall Watson, "The Water People," *Science Digest*, May 1982, p. 44.
- celvii William R. Fix, *The Bone Peddlers*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1984, pp. 150-153.
- celviii Dr. Tim White, *New Scientist*, April 28, 1983, p. 199.
- celix Holly Smith, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Vol. 94, 1994, pp. 307-325.
- ccx S. J. Gould, *Natural History*, Vol. 85, 1976, p. 30.
- ccxi Villee, Solomon and Davis, *Biology*, Saunders College Publishing, 1985, p. 1053.
- ccxii Niles Eldredge, Ian Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, pp. 126-127.
- ccxiii Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time*, New York: The Free Press, 1999, pp. 32, 116-117.
- ccxiv Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, p. 312.
- ccxv John R. Durant, "The Myth of Human Evolution," *New Universities Quarterly* 35 (1981), pp. 425-438.
- ccxvi Richard Leakey, *The Weekend Australian*, 7-8 May 1983, p. 3.
- ccxvii Albert W. Mehlert, "Lucy—Evolution's Solitary Claim for Ape/Man," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 3, (Dec 1985), p. 145.
- ccxviii Charles Darwin, *Descent of Man*, Chapter II, "On The Manner Of Development Of Man From Some Lower Form"
- ccxix C. Loring Brace, "Neanderthal Traits Extant, Group Told," *The Arizona Republic* (Phoenix), p. B-5,
- ccxx Erik Trinkaus, "Hard Times Among the Neanderthals," *Natural History*, Vol. 87, December 1978, p. 10.
- ccxxi F. Ivanhoe, "Was Virchow Right About Neanderthal?," *Nature*, Vol. 227, August 8, 1970, pp. 577-579.
- ccxxii "Neanderthal Noisemaker," *Science News*, vol. 15, (23 November 1996), p. 328.
- ccxxiii Sarah Bunney, "Neanderthals Weren't So Dumb After All," *New Scientist*, Vol. 123, 1 July 1989, p. 43.
- ccxxiv July 25, 1998, Neanderthalles *Discovery Channel*
- ccxxv *Ibid.*
- ccxxvi *Ibid.*
- ccxxvii *Ibid.*
- ccxxviii *Ibid.*
- ccxxix "Is This The Face of Our Past?" *Discover*, December 1997, pp. 97-100.
- ccxxx D. Johanson & M. A. Edey, *Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 250.

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, should occasion much hand-slapping and high-fiving, and perhaps even be an excuse to take a day off.

But no bottles have been uncorked, no hands slapped. Instead, a curious embarrassed silence surrounds the stark complexity of the cell. When the subject comes up in public, feet start to shuffle, and breathing gets a bit labored. In private, people are a bit more relaxed; many explicitly admit the obvious but then stare at the ground, shake their heads, and let it go at that.

ccclxxxi *Science News*, Vol. 115, 1979, pp. 196-197.

ccclxxxii Ian Anderson, *New Scientist*, Vol. 98, 1983, p. 373.

ccclxxxiii Russell H. Tuttle, *Natural History*, March 1990, pp. 61-64.

ccclxxxiv Elaine Morgan, *The Scars of Evolution*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 5.

ccclxxxv Sir Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, New York: Toplinger Publications, 1970, p. 19.

ccclxxxvi *Ibid.*, p. 64.

ccclxxxvii Robert Eckhardt, “Population Genetics and Human Origins,” *Scientific American*, Vol. 226, 1972, p. 101.

ccxc *Ibid.*, p. 100.

ccxci *Ibid.*, pp.106-107.

ccxcii Hoimar Von Dittfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 3* [“The Silent Nights of the Dinosaurs 3”], p. 13.

ccxciii John Peet, *The True History of Mankind*, <http://saturniancosmology.org/files/humans/mankind.txt>

ccxcviii *Ibid.*

ccxcix *Ibid.*

ccc Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, New York: New York University Press, p. 151.

ccci *Ibid.*, p. 198.

cccii Engin Korur, “Gözlerin ve Kanatların Sirri” [“The Secret of Eyes and Wings”], *Bilim ve Teknik*, No. 203, October 1984, p. 25.

ccciiii Hoimar Von Dittfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2* [“The Silent Nights of the Dinosaurs 2”], p. 126.

ccciv Richard Dawkins, *River Out of Eden*, New York: Basic Books, 1995, p. 83.

cccvi Michael Behe, *Darwin’s Black Box*, Free Press; 2nd Rev. Ed edition (March 7, 2006), p. 91.

cccvi Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 3.

cccvi *Ibid.*, p. 66.

cccvi Hoimar Von Dittfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 3*, [“The Silent Nights of the Dinosaurs 3”], p. 165.

cccix Frank Salisbury, “Doubts About the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution,” *American Biology Teacher*, September 1971, p. 338.

cccix Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* [“Inheritance and Evolution”], p. 475.

cccxi Cemal Yildirim, *Evrin Kurami ve Bagnazlik* [“The Theory of Evolution and Bigotry”], pp. 58-59.

cccxi Ernst Mayr, *Systematics and the Origin of Species*, New York: Dove Press, 1964, p. 296.

cccxi Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, Chapter III, “Comparison of the Mental Powers of Man and the Lower Animals.”

cccxi Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, pp. 111-112.

cccxi Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 374.

cccxi Gordon R. Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, p. 222.

cccxi *Ibid.*, p. 221.

cccxi John Maynard Smith, “The Evolution of Behavior,” *Scientific American*, December, 1978, Vol. 239, No.3, p. 176.

cccxi Cemal Yildirim, *Evrin Kurami ve Bagnazlik* [“The Theory of Evolution and Bigotry”], p. 49.

cccxi Peter Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution*, 1902, Chapter I, <http://www.etext.org/Politics/Spunk/library/writers/kropotki/sp001503/index.html>

cccxi John Maynard Smith, “The Evolution of Behavior,” *Scientific American*, September 1978, Vol. 239, No. 3, p. 184.

cccxi *Bilim ve Teknik* [“Science and Technology”] *Turkish Scientific Journal*, No.190, p. 4.

cccxi *Ibid.*, p. 334.

cccxi *Ibid.*

cccxi Dr. Eldred Corner, *Evolution in Contemporary Botanical Thought*, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961, p. 97.

cccxi Edmund J. Ambrose, *The Nature and Origin of the Biological World*, John Wiley & Sons, 1982, p. 164.

Why does the scientific community not greedily embrace its startling discovery? Why is the observation of design handled with intellectual gloves? The dilemma is that while one side of the elephant is labeled “intelligent design,” the other side might be labeled “God.”^{cdxiii}

So far, someone may have remained loyal to materialism and Darwinism and so, have set out his beliefs and perspective on life in accord with that philosophy and theory. He may even have spent decades in defending this theory and ideology, have written books and articles on the subject and held seminars and courses on it. But as Professor Behe states above, advances in science have

-
- ^{cccxxvi} “Ancient Alga Fossil Most Complex Yet,” *Science News*, Vol. 108, September 20 1975, p. 181.
- ^{cccxxvii} Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitım ve Evrim* [“Inheritance and Evolution”], p. 8.
- ^{cccxxviii} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2* [“The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 2”], pp. 60-61.
- ^{cccxxix} Daniel Axelrod, “The Evolution of Flowering Plants,” in *The Evolution Life*, 1959, pp. 264-274.
- ^{cccx} N. F. Hughes, *Paleology of Angiosperm Origins: Problems of Mesozoic Seed-Plant Evolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, , 1976, pp. 1-2.
- ^{cccxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 210.
- ^{cccxlv} Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, p. 376.
- ^{cccxlvii} Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, Boston: Harvard Common Press, , 1971, p. 36.
- ^{cccxlviii} *Ibid.*, p. 33.
- ^{cccxlix} Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, Vintage Books, 1958, p. 227.
- ^{cccliii} William Fix, *The Bone Peddlers: Selling Evolution*, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1984, p. 189.
- ^{cccliv} Christian Schwabe, “On the Validity of Molecular Evolution,” *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, Vol. 11, July 1986, p. 280.
- ^{ccclvii} George P. Stravopoulos, “The Frontiers and Limits of Science,” *American Scientist*, Vol. 65, November-December 1977, p. 674.
- ^{ccclviii} Jeremy Rifkin, *Entropy: A New World View*, p. 55.
- ^{ccclix} Ilya Prigogine, Isabelle Stengers, *Order Out of Chaos*, New York, Bantam Books, 1984, p. 129.
- ^{ccclx} *Ibid.*, p. 175.
- ^{ccclxiv} Elizabeth Pennisi, “Haeckel’s Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered,” *Science*, 5 September, 1997.
- ^{ccclxv} Ken McNamara, “Embryos and Evolution,” *New Scientist*, vol. 12416, 16 October 1999.
- ^{ccclxx} Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, p. 101.
- ^{ccclxxi} Lewin, R., *In the Age of Mankind: A Smithsonian Book of Human Evolution*, Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1988, p. 26.
- ^{ccclxxii} Fred Hoyle and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, p. 141.
- ^{ccclxxiii} Fred Hoyle, “The Universe: Past and Present Reflections,” in *Engineering and Science*, November 1981, pp. 8, 12.
- ^{ccclxxiv} Cemal Yıldırım, *Evrim Kuramı ve Bağnazlık* [“Evolution Theory and Bigotry”], p. 62.
- ^{ccclxxv} *Ibid.*, p.108.
- ^{ccclxxvi} Niles Eldredge, *Time Frames: The Rethinking of Darwinian Evolution and the Theory of Punctuated Equilibria*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1985, p. 29.
- ^{ccclxxvii} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 1*, [“The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 1”], p. 122.
- ^{ccclxxviii} *Ibid.*, p. 123.
- ^{ccclxxix} *Ibid.*, p. 126.
- ^{ccclxxx} *Ibid.*, pp. 126-127.
- ^{ccclxxxi} *Ibid.*, p. 260.
- ^{ccclxxxii} *Ibid.*, p. 265.
- ^{ccclxxxiii} *Ibid.*, p. 27.
- ^{ccclxxxiv} *Ibid.*, p. 91.
- ^{ccclxxxv} Pierre-P Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, p. 103.
- ^{ccclxxxvi} *Ibid.*, p. 107.
- ^{ccclxxxvii} Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitım ve Evrim* [“Inheritance and Evolution”], p. 61.
- ^{ccclxxxviii} Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1983. p. 197.
- ^{ccclxxxix} *San Francisco Chronicle*, 19 February, 2001.
- ^{ccxc} Henry Margenau, Roy Abraham Vargesse, *Cosmos, Bios, Theos*, La Salle II: Open Court Publishing, 1992, p. 241.
- ^{ccxcii} Stephen Hawking, *Evreni Kucaklayan Karınca*, Alkim Kitapçılık ve Yayıncılık, 1993, pp. 62-63.

clearly set out the true facts. And after having seen these, persisting in denial will inevitably cause humiliation for such people before the whole world.

Malcolm Muggeridge expresses the matter as follows:

I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books in the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has. ^{cdxiv}

When even evolutionist scientists admit that the theory of evolution has no scientific and rational basis, blindly defending the theory on their behalf will doubtless represent the greatest irrationality and waste.

Up to here, we have set out how evolution is at variance with the scientific facts, how even the theory's adherents admit as much, and that the theory is therefore an enormous error. What's really important, however, is that this error is not merely a scientific one. A person may believe in a theory that is physically incorrect—for example, that the atom cannot be subdivided, a belief that was widely held at one time. But when findings show this to be incorrect, that person will have made merely a scientific error.

The position is very different, however, when it comes to the theory of evolution, because this theory attempts to answer the question of how we came into existence. It offers an atheistic answer, for which reason it leads to atheism most of those who believe in it, and to deny the existence of Allah (God). The fact is, however, that reason and science together show that Allah does exist, and that He is the Creator of the whole universe and of living things.

Denying Allah, however, means denying the existence of the only entity to which human beings owe their lives, which is terrible ingratitude and a terrible crime.

^{ccccxliii} Stephen W. Hawking, "The Direction of Time," *New Scientist*, Vol. 115, 9 July 1987, p. 47.

^{ccccxiv} Don N. Page, "Inflation Does Not Explain Time Asymmetry," *Nature*, Vol. 304, July 7, 1983, p. 40.

^{ccccxv} Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* ["Heredity and Evolution"], p. 21.

^{ccccxvi} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 3* ["The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 3"], p. 7.

^{ccccxvii} Leonard Huxley, *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley*, MacMillan, 1938, Vol.1. p. 241.

^{ccccxviii} Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, London, 1984, pp. 184-185.

^{ccccxix} Paul Davies, *The Accidental Universe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982, Preface.

^{cd} Paul Davies, *Superforce: The Search for a Grand Unified Theory of Nature*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984, p. 184.

^{cdi} *Ibid.*, p. 243.

^{cdii} Paul Davies. *God and the New Physics*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983, p. 189.

^{cdiii} Paul Davies. *The Accidental Universe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982, Foreword.

^{cdiv} Paul Davies, *Superforce*, pp. 235-236.

^{cdv} Paul Davies. *The Accidental Universe*, p. 118.

^{cdvi} Fred Hoyle, *Religion and the Scientists*, London: SCM, 1959; M. A. Corey, *The Natural History of Creation*, Maryland: University Press of America, 1995, p. 341.

^{cdvii} Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 1*, ["The Silent Night of the Dinosaurs 1"], p. 123.

^{cdviii} W. Press, "A Place for Teleology?," *Nature*, Vol. 320, 1986, p. 315.

^{cdix} 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.

^{cdx} P.J. Darlington, *Evolution for Naturalists*, 1980, pp. 243-244.

^{cdxi} Robert Wright, *The Moral Animal*, New York: Vintage Books, 1994, p. 7.

^{cdxii} Earthwatch, March 1989, p. 17; cited in Henry M. Morris, *The Long War Against God*, Baker Book House, 1989, p. 57.

Therefore, those who believe in the theory of evolution, especially under the influence of various scientists, and who devote themselves to it blindly, must seriously reconsider their position. They must analyze the extent to which evolutionists have adopted an inconsistent logic, defective powers of judgment, unreliable natures and dogmatic attitudes.

They must realize that it may be a handicap to be influenced by anyone else in the life of this world. They must realize that they have been influenced by falsehoods due to lack of knowledge or sheer ignorance, and can correct themselves by abandoning these when they realize the truth. And indeed, all people must hope to be freed from errors, corrupt beliefs and ideas as long as they live. After death, however, blaming anyone else for the errors into which one fell will serve absolutely no purpose.

Every ideological movement opposed to reality and truth naturally has its own leaders and theoreticians, as is revealed by Allah in the Qur'an: **"We made them leaders, summoning to the Fire, and on the Day of Rising they will not be helped."** (Surat al-Qasas, 41) Those who follow such leaders and thus come closer to denial have rejected with a terrible stubbornness and hatred the truths vouchsafed to them in this world. In the hereafter, they will curse the guides and leaders whom they followed, will want them to be punished in the very lowest pit of Hell, and will feel a sincere regret at not having followed along Allah's path.

Their regret is described in these terms in the Qur'an:

They will say on the Day their faces are rolled over in the Fire, "If only we had obeyed Allah and obeyed the Messenger!" And they will say, "Our Lord, we obeyed our masters and great men and they misguided us from the Way. Our Lord, give them double the punishment and curse them many times over!"

(Surat al-Ahzab, 66-68)

The only reason why some people still try to keep the theory of evolution alive is to keep alive materialism, a philosophy based on denial of Allah and His religion. Hitherto, people may have believed this lie, either through ignorance or through propaganda. But if they are honest, they must investigate the truth that such a dogma will result in humiliation in this world and in the hereafter, and must then act accordingly. If they are honorable and honest men of science and ideas, they must behave in a civilized and respectful way by saying, "We went along with a lie, as if we had been bewitched." This should not humiliate them. On the contrary, it will be a means whereby they enjoy great esteem, both today and in the future.

Honesty and sincerity will receive a fine reward in this world and in the hereafter. Allah tells us that it is always possible to abandon denial, but that those who persist in it will suffer eternal punishment:

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

^{cdxiv} Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, p. 43.

=====

. . . except for those who repent and put things right and make things clear. I turn towards them. I am the Ever-Returning, the Most Merciful. But as for those who disbelieve and die while they are disbelievers, the curse of Allah is upon them and that of the angels and all humanity. They will be under it for ever. The punishment will not be lightened for them. They will be granted no reprieve. (Surat al-Baqara, 160-162)

Ever since it was first put forward, certain materialist circles have attempted to portray the theory of evolution as scientific fact. In fact, however, the theory, which claims that life emerged as the result of chance processes, has been utterly disproved by various branches of science. Over the 150 or so years separating Charles Darwin, the founder of the theory, and the present day, such scientific fields as paleontology, biochemistry, genetics and anatomy have demolished the theory's assumptions. The more the details of nature have been revealed, the more extraordinary characteristics have been discovered that can never be explained in terms of chance.

For all these reasons, in the words of the famous molecular biologist Professor Michael Behe, evolution is "A theory in crisis."

From time to time, this crisis leads scientists who support the theory to make a number of confessions. They reject the theory not despite their materialist preconceptions, but because they realize that it flies in the face of scientific findings.

In this book you will find statements made by these evolutionist scientists regarding the theory they believe in. Hundreds of evolutionists, from Charles Darwin to eminent present-day supporters of his theory, such as Richard Dawkins, Stephen Jay Gould and Richard Leakey, have admitted that it is groundless, incorrect, and even ridiculous.

If you want to see why not even Darwinism's most determined proponents believe in it, you must read this book.

-
- ^{cxvi} Green, David E., and Robert F. Goldberger, *Molecular Insights into the Living Process*, New York: Academic Press, 1967, p. 403.
- ^{cxvi} *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- ^{cxvii} Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *The Basic Laws of Life: General Zoology*, Volume 1, Section 1, Ankara, 1998, p. 578.
- ^{cxviii} W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, p. 304.
- ^{cxix} *Fabbri Britannica Bilim Ansiklopedisi* ["Fabbri Britannica Science Encyclopaedia"], Vol. 2, no. 22, p. 519.
- ^{cx} W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, p. 303.
- ^{cxvi} Michael Anthony Corey, *Back to Darwin*, Rowman and Littlefield, 1994, p. 32.
- ^{cxvii} Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, p. 233.
- ^{cxviii} Caryl P. Haskins, "Advances and Challenges in Science in 1970," *American Scientist*, Vol. 59, May-June, 1971, p. 305.
- ^{cxix} Leslie E. Orgel, "Darwinism at the Very Beginning of Life," *New Scientist*, vol.94 (April 15, 1982), p. 151.
- ^{cx} Paul Auger, *De La Physique Theorique a la Biologie*, 1970, p. 118.
- ^{cxvi} Douglas R. Hofstadter, *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*, New York: Vintage Books, 1980, p. 548.
- ^{cxvii} Francis Crick, *Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 88.
- ^{cxviii} "The Genesis Code by Numbers," *Nature*, 367:111, January 1994.
- ^{cxix} Pierre P. Grassé, *The Evolution of Living Organisms*, 1977, p. 168.
- ^{cx} Jacques Monod, *Chance and Necessity*, New York, 1971, p. 143.
- ^{cxvi} G.F. Joyce, L. E. Orgel, "Prospects for Understanding the Origin of the RNA World," *In the RNA World*, Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Laboratory Press, 1993, p. 13.
- ^{cxvii} Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on the Earth," *Scientific American*, October 1994, vol. 271, p. 78
- ^{cxviii} Manfred Eigen, William Gardiner, Peter Schuster and Ruthild Winkler-Oswatitsch, "The Origin of Genetic Information," *Scientific American*, Vol. 244, (April 1981), p. 91.
- ^{cxix} John Horgan, "In the Beginning," *Scientific American*, Vol. 264, February 1991, p. 119.
- ^{cx} Gerald T. Todd, "Evolution of the Lung and the Origin of Bony Fishes: A Casual Relationship," *American Zoologist*, Vol. 26, No. 4, 1980, p. 757.
- ^{cxvi} J.R. Norman, "Classification and Pedigrees: Fossils," in *A History of Fishes*, British Museum of Natural History, 1975, p. 343.
- ^{cxvii} Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, New York, L Harper and Row, 1983, p. 60.
- ^{cxviii} F. D. Ommanney, *The Fishes*, Life Nature Library, New York: Time-Life, Inc., 1964, p. 60.