

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Istanbul, August 2016

The Origin of Life and the Universe

**TECHNICS & SCIENCE RESEARCH
FOUNDATION**

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Altuğ Berker's presentation: "Darwinism Prevents Teaching of Science"	8
The "Discovery of the Transitional Forms" is a Fraud	10
The Disasters Caused by Darwinist Education: Young Murderers	14
Dr. Fazale R. Rana's presentation:	
"Why I Believe God Exists: A Biochemist Makes a Case for the Creator"	15
The Complex Structure of Life	18
DNA Challenges Coincidence	20
DNA Confessions from Evolutionists	24
Another Example of Evolutionists' Helplessness:	
The 'RNA World' Scenario	30
Dr. Anjeanette 'AJ' Roberts's presentation:	
"Un-Equivocating Evolution"	34
Evolutionists' Confessions Stating That DNA Cannot Form by Chance	35
Protein Cannot Form Unless the Cell Exists as An Integral Whole	37
Intracellular Molecular Machines That Perform Protein Care and Cleanup	40
Neo-Darwinism and Mutation Impasse	43
The Speciation Deception	46
The Micro and Macro Evolution Errors of Darwinists	51
Dr. Jeff Zweerink's presentation:	
"The Beginning and Design of the Universe"	56
The Expansion of Universe and the Discovery of the Big Bang	57
The Order in the Universe And Creation According to the Torah	59

The Triumph of the Big Bang	63
Distinguishing Between Science and Materialism	64
The Signs in the Qur'an in Regard to Creation of the Universe	68
Confessions of Evolutionists Stating that the Universe Has a Beginning	71
Why are Proteins Constituted of Only 20 of the 200 Amino Acids?	75
God, Not Chance, Created the Universe	78
Dr. Oktar Babuna's presentation:	
“Collapse of the Evolution Theory and the Fact of Creation”	81
The Idea That "Mutations Cause Evolution" is a Falsehood	86
The Concealment of Cambrian Fossils for 70 Years	92
“Piltdown Man” Was a Hoax	96
Darwinist Confessions Regarding the Ida Deception	97
Dr. Cihat Gündoğdu's presentation:	
“Darwinism Legitimizes All Kinds of Oppression”	106
The Error of Applying Nature's Laws to Human Beings	108
Conclusion	111

www.theoriginoflife.net

Published by: **GLOBAL PUBLISHING**

Kayıřdađı Mah. Deđirmen Sok. No: 3
Atařehir / İřtanbul / Turkey - Tel: (+90 216) 660 00 59

First Edition: February 2017

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

Abbreviation used:

(pbuh): Peace be upon him (following a reference to the prophets)

www.harunyahya.com
en.a9.com.tr - http://en.harunyahya.tv

Introduction

The conference on The Origin of Life and the Universe which scientists from the United States and Turkey participated as speakers along with academicians, researchers, students, businessmen and journalists from various countries organized by the Technics and Science Research Foundation under the auspices of its Honorary Chairman Mr. Adnan Oktar took place at Conrad Istanbul Bosphorus Hotel Ballroom on August 24th, 2016.

This important international conference has been a very significant organization in terms of making an emphasis on the essential requirement of science, presenting scientific evidence without bias and publicizing the attained outcomes to the general public in light of recent scientific findings.

The speakers at the conference where more than 500 participants took part are renowned scientists having expertise in fields of molecular biology, biochemistry, cell biology and astrophysics and who have written numerous books and given a great number of conferences on their fields and pursue their career in related university departments.

The proofs and scientific arguments that speakers provided will be directing the scientific world to merit and truth as these comprise of valuable knowledge which will enlighten the world. Thus, our international conference on The Origin of Life and the Universe has been a highly consequential and influential initiative that will illuminate the entire humanity and the future.

Altuğ Berker's presentation: "Darwinism Prevents Teaching of Science"

Albert Einstein once said:

"The scientists' religious feeling takes the form of a rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection." (Albert Einstein, The World as I See It, Secaucus, New Jersey: The Citadel Press, 1999, pp. 24-29)

The Owner of this awe-inspiring intelligence is God.

We don't actually need to hear it from a scientist to understand this fact. Our own intelligence is enough to show us the existence of a Creator because we all have the capability of assessing what we see and come to a conclusion.

Everywhere we look, we see an incredible order; from the perfect mechanisms of millions of different species to the endless variety of vegetables and fruits, from the delicate balances on our planet to the precise levels of oxygen in the air. Knowing and seeing all of this is enough to make us clearly realize the existence of God, Who has infinite wisdom. Needless to say, science and technology, which advance at a mind-boggling rate, are our biggest helpers in this understanding.

With the advance of technology, scientists are able to make much better and more accurate observations. For instance, the Hubble Telescope proved that the universe had a beginning and was created. With the advance of technology and the onset of advanced scanning electron microscopes, we were able to examine the tiniest details of the living cell, including the DNA, and there we encountered an incredible complexity that has absolutely no room for coincidences. This was such a precise order that the scientists leading the Human Genome Project, one of the most significant scientific researches in recent years, have clearly stated that the structure in the DNA and its perfect order unquestionably pointed to the existence of a superior intelligence.

Gene Myers, who was a part of the team in charge of the Human Genome Project, said the following about the order he saw in the DNA:

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. (Tom Abate, "Human Genome Project", San Francisco Chronicle, February 19, 2001)

One of the most important evidences of Creation is, no doubt, the fossil record. All of the 700 million fossils unearthed so far are identical to their living counterparts. This means that living things haven't changed at all; in other words, they haven't evolved. Just as we see in the shark fossil that is dated millions of years.

All scientific findings point us in direction of Creation. Despite this, majority of people are unaware of these facts. It is because world of science is under immense pressure to keep facts away from public eye and to this end, scientific facts are either hidden or distorted. This is the ideological pressure of materialism and economic pressure of capitalism that provides ideological support to materialism. Platforms where scientists are supposed to present their views to propel their careers are under control of those pressure circles.

The proponents of the superstitious religion of Darwinism are so adamant and tyrannical in this that speaking against evolution brings with it a great deal of difficulties for the relevant person. According to this Darwinist imposition, doubting evolution, or talking about Darwinist hoaxes, is tantamount to committing a crime. In addition, saying that evolution is a theory that has yet to be proven is another major crime for them. It is almost impossible for a scientist with an anti-Darwinist stance to lecture in the biology department of a university. It is impossible to see any picture of a fossil that refutes the evolutionary theory on the pages of a pro-Darwinist newspaper. It is considered a mistake for a biology teacher to express his doubts about the theory of evolution, and when that happens, that teacher will most probably be dismissed.

The examples of this oppression are abundant: For instance, biology professor Caroline Crocker; she was dismissed from George Mason University because she questioned evolutionary theory. This is how she describes her ordeal:

My supervisor called me to his office and said 'You have to be disciplined for teaching creation', and I lost my job at the end of that semester. (Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed, Dir. Nathan Francowski, 2008)

Biologist Richard von Sternberg, Ph.D., was dismissed from his duty at the National History Museum because he questioned evolution and allowed the publication of anti-evolution authors. There is only one reason for these discriminatory attitudes. Universities, scientific publications and similar institutions and organizations are under the control of those that support materialistic worldviews. They want the theory of evolution -which is trying to rationalize fairy tales of coincidences - to be supported and propagated. There is no room for anyone in their world if that someone has conflicting views. Such people are removed from their duties at universities. Their articles are no longer published in journals. These circles control the educational systems of all countries and compel these countries to teach children the fairy tales of evolution as if they are facts.

Children growing up with the ruthless dogmas of evolution like 'survival of the fittest', or 'the crush to survive'; they are indoctrinated with a cruel morality and a ruthless view of humanity and life. Needless to say, generations are raised with Darwinist lies that humans descend from animals and are therefore unworthy, turn problematic. Therefore, the efforts of honest scientists like yourselves, who believe in science and conscientiousness and who explain the facts will help thwart these dangers and brighten up the future. Bravely speaking about the facts is a great virtue and it is an important trait of courageous people. Truth triumphs over all wrongs and lies. Sometimes, it may take some time. Now it is that time.

There is no doubt that people, like you, like us, people who use this time wisely and to tell the facts, will win both in the eyes of people and in the sight of the Creator, Who creates those people. And by the means of them, other people will also win. They will win themselves, their lives and their eternal lives.

Before I conclude, I want to remind you of one more thing. When Darwinism is mentioned, one name immediately comes to mind, who has had great influence not only in Turkey, but all

around the world. Mr. Adnan Oktar, or Harun Yahya as he is mostly known outside Turkey, who is the Honorary Chairman of our Foundation.

Many presentations and studies to be discussed in this conference are based on his works.

Mr. Adnan Oktar, the Honorary Chairman of Technics and Science Research Foundation, has written more than 300 books and most are dedicated to the rebuttal of Darwinism. He also extensively writes and speaks against the Darwinist dictatorship, and proves the connection of the theory of evolution and Social Darwinism and its detrimental effects on society. I would like to note also that he is very happy that you came to Turkey and attended our scientific event.

The "Discovery of the Transitional Forms" is a Fraud

The absence of transitional fossils did not look like an insuperable one in Darwin's time. Darwin was amazed that not a single intermediate fossil to confirm his theory had been discovered in any of the Earth's strata, but he still believed they would be "found in the future." In the chapter titled "Difficulties on Theory" of his *The Origin of Species* he wrote:

... Why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined? But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth? Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links?¹

The lack of transitional fossils, which refuted Darwin's expectations, and not a single one of which has been discovered over the last 150 years, has demolished his theory. More than 700 million fossils have to date been unearthed. These fossils have definitively declared the crushing defeat of Darwinism. They all belong to complete and perfect life forms. A great many are specimens of life forms still living today. But not one of these 700 million is a transitional form.

The lack of transitional fossils means the death of Darwinism, and is something that the adherents of the superstitious faith that is Darwinism cannot accept. For that reason, Darwinists resorted to traditional methods and began manufacturing fictitious transitional fossils. Today, when we look at publications that are Darwinist in origin we see that all the fossils depicted as transitional forms are in fact the product of fraud. This false evidence, which may sometimes be based on extinct life forms, sometimes on fictitious illustrations, sometimes on just one single fossil tooth and sometimes on skulls fraudulently manufactured in a laboratory environment, is all important proof that transitional fossils do not exist and that Darwinism is a deception.

Professor of mathematics Wolfgang Smith is one of those scientists who openly admits that transitional fossils do not exist:

On the fundamental level, it becomes a rigorously demonstrable fact that there are no transitional types, and the so-called missing links are indeed non-existent.²

The evolutionist paleontologist Stephen Stanley makes this comment on the absence of transitional fossils:

The known fossil record fails to document a single example of phyletic evolution accomplishing a major morphology transition, and hence offers no evidence that gradualistic model can be valid.³

The University of Kansas geologist Ronald R. West comments:

If evolution were true, the fossil record should have demonstrated:

- The oldest rocks that bear evidence of life would contain the most primitive forms of life capable of fossilization.
- Younger rocks would contain evidence of more complex forms of life.
- There would be a gradual change in life forms from simple to complex.
- There would be huge numbers of transitional forms.

However, contrary to what most scientists write, the fossil record does not support the Darwinian theory of evolution.⁴

Darwinists have been unable to put forth a single genuine intermediate form. Not a single transitional fossil has ever been unearthed. There is not a single example of a genuine transitional form on display in museums of evolution. Each one of the 700 million fossils has refuted evolution. They are all fully formed and perfect fossils of life forms, whether still living or extinct.

The lack of transitional forms is such that even Darwinists cannot deny the obvious. Faced by various difficulties, they sometimes are forced to admit it. One such statement comes from the evolutionist paleontologist Colin Patterson:

I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book [Evolution]. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would have certainly have included them. ... I will lay it on the line – there is not one single transitional form in the fossil record for which one could make a watertight argument.⁵

The absence of intermediate forms is not something that should be glossed over with sophistry, as by the majority of Darwinists, or else regarded as unimportant. No transitional forms mean no evolution. One or a few fossils are not enough to validate the theory of evolution. There would have to be millions of them. But there exists not one single transitional fossil. This reality – that just about 100% of the fossil record has been unearthed by the first decade of the 21st century, and that not one of the millions of transitional fossils that there should theoretically have been has been found – is by itself very powerful and sound evidence that evolution is a lie.

Mark Ridley of the Oxford University Department of Zoology describes how all the fossil record shows that Darwinism is a lie:

In any case, no real evolutionist, whether a gradualist or a punctuationist, uses the fossil record as evidence in favor of the theory of evolution as opposed to special creation...⁶

The interesting thing is the way that, as we shall be seeing in due course – and in the face of this reality – Darwinists still try to depict fully formed, complete and perfect fossils as transitional forms, or else manufacture their own. The principal reason for their resorting to fraud is without doubt their inability to produce any scientific evidence and their desperation. The main element that makes Darwinism a fraud is that the followers of this superstitious religion have to engage in hoaxes, lies and deception. The adherents of this superstitious faith

claim to be acting in the name of science, but the findings of science openly refute the theory of evolution. In Darwinists' eyes, Darwinism can only be propped up by means of countless lies. That is why their "transitional form found" propaganda that constitutes part of this is also a huge fraud.

- 1- Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 172, 280
- 2- Wolfgang Smith, *Teilhardism and the New Religion, A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin*, Rockford IL, Tan Books and Publishers, Inc. 1988, p. 8 - Nicholas Comninellis, *Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution*, Master Books, 2001, p. 181
- 3- Stephen Stanley, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process*, San Francisco CA, W. H. Freeman, 1979, p. 39 - Nicholas Comninellis, *Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution*, Master Books, 2001, p. 153
- 4- Nicholas Comninellis, *Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution*, Master Books, 2001, p. 153
- 5- Nicholas Comninellis, *Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution*, Master Books, 2001, p. 152
- 6- Mark Ridley, "Who Doubts Evolution?", *New Scientist*, vol. 90, 1981, p. 831 - Nicholas Comninellis, *Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution*, Master Books, 2001, p. 152

The disasters caused by Darwinist education: Young murderers

A large number of students in schools have been killed in attacks using weapons on schools in Europe and the USA in recent years. The media have generally suggested that these attacks are the work of people with depression or psychopathic behavior or antisocial personality disorder. Looked at closely, however, there is another more striking factor behind these attacks; the theory of evolution, which claims that life is a struggle between weak and strong.

By spreading the lie that there is no purpose to human life, Darwinist education turns people into psychologically sick individuals, pessimistic and psychopathic, devoid of all hope and joy. Darwin's superstition that has poisoned vast numbers turns people into serial killers and even makes them psychopathic enough to eat human flesh. School massacres is one of those disasters that comes of this false religion which seeks to indoctrinate people with the idea they have no responsibility to a Creator, that convinces them they are purposeless, irresponsible and aimless entities, that regards human beings as animals and that seeks to turn people away from the fact of the hereafter by portraying death as the end.

The Jokela High School Massacre

In a message posted on the YouTube web site prior to the massacre, the 18-year-old Pekka-Eric Auvinen, who slaughtered seven students and a teacher on November 1st, 2007, before killing himself, described himself as an antisocial social Darwinist and went on to say:

"I am an anarchist who believes only in natural selection. People must again start applying natural selection. Animals live in that way, so why should human beings not? At the end of the day, we are simply animals. We human beings are the worst animals on Earth... That is where there must be [natural selection]. The earlier, the better. ...

The weak must die, while the strong survive. That is natural selection, the survival of the fittest. Animals constantly die. You never see a dog crying over having killed another dog. Human beings also die. The reaction must be the same. This is simply a natural thing, not a great or important one. I am not the law and the judge. I have no authority. I am ready to fight and die for my aim. Since I do not regard natural selection as sufficient, I will eliminate the disgraces of mankind, the failures of natural selection... I am different, I have evolved a stage further." (From Pecca-Eric Auvinen's video "My Philosophy")

The Columbine High School Massacre

On April 20th, 1999, two students at Columbine High School in the U.S. state of Colorado, 18-year-old Eric Harris and 17-year-old Dylan Klebold, entered their school with guns and bombs. After killing 12 students and a teacher in the space of 30 minutes, they then killed themselves. Harris' T-shirt read "Natural Selection." Most of the writings collected from Harris' home in the wake of the attack referred to natural selection and feelings of superiority. In videos previously uploaded onto the internet, Harris and Klebold constantly referred to themselves as "more evolved" and talked about how it felt to be supposedly "superhuman."

As we can see only in these examples, Darwinism can easily turn innocent people into monsters. With utmost priority, the one-sided Darwinist indoctrination should be ended in school education, and the scientific evidence against Darwinism should be a part of the school curricula.

The officials who are devising educational policies should be aware of such circumstances of Darwinist education and bear the responsibility. The educational system has to be amended accordingly to provide for the acknowledgment of the youth on the scientific invalidity of Darwinism and its ideological background.

Dr. Fazale R. Rana's presentation: "Why I Believe God Exists: A Biochemist Makes a Case for the Creator"

I am truly honored to be here today. It really is a privilege to be part of this conference. We live in a world today where there is so much conflict. It is refreshing to be part of a project where the goal is to show the world that Christians and Muslims can work together towards a common goal. Showing that there is scientific evidence for God's existence and also showing that there are genuine scientific challenges to the evolutionary paradigm. Both are objectives that Muslims and Christians can agree upon.

In the second point that there are scientific challenges to the theory of evolution is very important. Because if evolutionary mechanisms can explain the origin, history and the design of life, then both believers and nonbelievers, alike, can rightly ask: 'What role is a Creator to play?' In fact, evolutionary biologist and atheist Richard Dawkins says in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*:

"Although atheism might have been logically tenable before Darwin, Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist."

Statements like these cause many people to conclude around the world that conflict exists between science and religion with science eventually winning the war. In August 2015, The Pew Research Foundation in United States published data showing that 75% of people who never attend church or seldom attend church think that there is conflict between science and religion. And you have to wonder that perception of conflict is the reason why they refuse to entertain the possibility of God's existence. Tragically, 50% of people who attend church on a regular basis in the United States think there is conflict. This is a very sad state of affairs.

And yet, it was science that brought me to the conviction that a Creator must exist. When I entered college, I was an agnostic. I didn't know if God existed or not, and I honestly didn't care. I simply wasn't interested in religion as a young man. The focus of my attention was biochemistry. I wanted to do everything that I could to prepare myself to go to graduate school to earn a PhD in biochemistry. As an undergraduate student, I was convinced that evolutionary mechanisms could account for the origin, history, and design of biological systems. But my convictions were not based on a careful examination of the evidence. But instead, they were based on what my biology professors taught me. I admired my professors and because I respected them I accepted what they said about evolution uncritically. In many ways, my acceptance of the evolutionary paradigm fueled my agnosticism. When I speak on university campuses in the United States, I run into students who—like me— think that

evolution is a fact but it is not because they've examined the evidence, it is because their professors had taught them that very truth. Or that claimed "truth".

When I have graduated school my views changed. You might say that biochemistry convinced me that God must exist. One of the primary goals of graduate education is to teach the student to independently think through the scientific evidence and develop conclusions based on the evidence alone, regardless of what other scientists say. And because I was learning to think for myself, I was willing to ask questions that I did not ask as an undergraduate student. One of those questions was: How did life originate? The elegant design, the sophistication, and the ingenuity of biochemical systems prompted me to ask that question. I wanted to know: How does the scientific community account for the origin of such remarkable biochemical systems through strict mechanistic processes? After examining the various explanations available at that time- it was 30 years ago- I know I look much younger than that but it was 30 years ago - I was shocked. The explanations presented by the scientific community seemed to me to be woefully inadequate. I was convinced that chemical and physical processes could not generate life. This realization coupled with the elegant design and biochemical systems forced me to the only conclusion possible- for intellectual reasons alone- that a Creator must indeed exist and must have been responsible for bringing life into being. I reached that conclusion over 30 years ago. In the prevailing decades, the scientific evidence has continued to affirm my conclusions about God's existence. The case that can be made today for God's existence from biochemistry and the problems associated with the origin of life has even become more compelling than 30 years ago.

The goal of my lecture is to present to you the reasons why I think— that God exists as a biochemist. To summarize my argument you just need to remember 3 words: **Fingerprints**; **Failure**; and **Fashion**.

FINGERPRINTS: A Creator's fingerprints are evident in biochemical systems

As a biochemist, one of the things I find absolutely remarkable is that the whole mark features of the cell's chemical systems are identical to those features that we would recognize as evidence for the work of a human designer. In other words, when human beings design, create, and invent systems, objects, and devices, those things that we make, have certain properties that reflect the work of a mind. And it is provocative to think that those same features are defining biochemistry in its very essence. So if certain features reflect the work of a human mind, and we see them in biochemical systems is this not evidence that they too must be the work of "A Mind"?

Because of time constraints, I'm only going to focus on one of these features today, namely the fact that there are information systems found inside the cell. At their essence, biochemical systems are information systems. Two major classes of biomolecules that harbor information:

- 1) The nucleic acids, such as DNA and RNA; the DNA is depicted on the left and
- 2) Proteins.

Both types of molecules are chain-linked nature. These molecules are formed when the cell's machinery links together smaller, subunit molecules in a head-to-tail fashion to form molecular chains. In the case of DNA and RNA, the subunits are nucleotides or sometimes called the genetic letters abbreviated: A, G, C, and T. In the case of proteins, the subunit

molecules are amino acids. Twenty different amino acids are encoded by the genetic code. The cell's machinery uses these 20 amino acids to construct proteins.

Biochemists often think of the nucleotides used to build RNA and DNA and the amino acids used to build proteins, as molecular alphabets. Just as alphabet letters are used to build words in English or in the Turkish language, amino acid sequences are used to construct biochemical words—proteins—that carry out specific functions inside the cell. Nucleotide sequences are used to store information in DNA. In fact, the function of DNA is to store information that the cell's machinery uses to build proteins. The regions of the DNA molecule that contain the information needed to build a single protein is called a gene.

The recognition that biochemical systems are information systems indicates that life must come from a Mind. Why? Because whenever we encounter information we recognize that there is a mind behind that information. When you receive a text message; when you receive an email; if you receive a letter in the mail or you see a sign on the side of the road, you invariably conclude that there is a mind that undergirds that information. So in like manner, when we see that biochemical systems harbor information that is the first indication that these come from a mind.

But the case for a Creator doesn't rest solely on the existence of information in the cell. The argument is much more sophisticated. As it turns out, information theorists who study problems in molecular biology have come to the conclusion that the structure of the cell's information is identical to the structure of human language and its organization. It is not merely the presence of information, but the fact that the information is organized in the same way that we organize information. There is a language inside the cell. One of the most provocative insights I have ever learned relates to the structure and function of biochemical information. In fact, this insight keeps me awake at night as I think through the implications. It turns out that biochemical machinery that manipulates DNA is literally functioning like a computer system at its basic essence. Because this insight is so critical I think to the case for a Creator, I would like to spend a little bit of time elaborating on this point.

To understand that we need to think through the theoretical construct of a computer system. The theoretical basis for computer systems are abstract machines called Turing machines. These are not actual machines but rather abstract entities that exist in a mind of a computer scientist. Turing machines are simple. They consist of 3 parts:

- 1) The input;** which is a string of data that goes into something called a finite control.
- 2) And that finite control;** alters that string of data in a limited but prescribed manner producing an output string of data and this is a cartoon showing a hypothetical
- 3) Turing machine;** it turns out that you can link the output of one Turing machine to the input to another Turing machine. And in doing so, you can take rather simple machines and combine them to perform complex operations.

As it turns out, this is precisely what happens when the cell's machinery manipulates DNA. For example during the process of DNA replication where the DNA which harbors digital information can be thought as being the input and the proteins and the enzymes that manipulate DNA during the replication can be thought as the finite controls. Here is a cartoon showing DNA replication where again the DNA represents the input and the output and the enzymes that manipulate the DNA are the finite controls. In other words when the cell's machinery replicates the DNA it says if a computer system is operating in the very interior of the cell. Because of the similarity between how computer systems function and processes like DNA replication computer scientists have been inspired to develop a new technology called

DNA computing. The DNA computing essentially is based on the DNA and the proteins found inside the cell that manipulate DNA.

These DNA computers are found inside little tiny test tubes, that are this size. And these computers are more powerful than the most powerful silicone based computer system that we have. They are more powerful than super computer systems. And the reason is because you can perform massive parallel operations simultaneously. DNA computing is the brainchild of a computer scientist by the name of Leonard Adleman who is at the University of Southern California. And this is what Leonard Adleman says about the DNA computing:

"The most important thing about DNA computing is that it shows that DNA molecules can do what we normally think only computers can do. This implies that Computer Science and Biology are closely related.

That every living thing can be thought to be computing something, and that, sometimes, we can understand living things better by looking at them as computers. (Will Clifford, Feb 2, 2003, "DNA Computing: Meet Dr. Adleman", [Online] Youngzine) "

Again, DNA computing highlights the remarkable similarities between human designs and the designs that we see inside the cell. We can make advantage of these astounding similarities to construct a formal argument for God's existence by following in the footsteps of the British Natural Theologian William Paley. In the late 1700s, Paley wrote a book called Natural Theology. In this work, Paley advanced one of the best known arguments in the west for God's existence: the Watchmaker Argument.

Paley reasoned in this way: Just as a watch requires a watchmaker, life requires a Divine Watchmaker. In Paley's day, the watch was the pinnacle of engineering achievement. Paley pointed out that a watch is a contrivance — a machine composed of a number of parts that interact precisely to accomplish the purpose. Paley contrasted the operation of a watch with a rock. Paley argued that a rock finds explanation through the outworking of natural processes. But a watch requires a MIND to explain its existence. Based on a survey of biological systems, Paley concluded that living systems have more in common with the watch than a rock. And if a watch requires a watchmaker to explain its existence, then by analogy, living systems require a mind to explain their existence.

Advances in biochemistry allow us to bring the Watchmaker Argument up-to-date. We know from common experience that computer systems—the pinnacle of engineering achievement in our day—require a mind (in fact, many minds) to explain their existence. And because we find computer systems operating within the cell, we can reasonably conclude that life requires a Divine Mind to account for its existence. I find the Watchmaker Argument to be compelling. Yet, in my experience when I present this argument to skeptics, they will argue that evolutionary processes can serve as the watchmaker. In fact, they regard these processes as the Blind Watchmaker. This idea is articulated by Richard Dawkins in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*. Dawkins says this:

"[Paley] had a proper reverence for the complexity of the living world, and he saw that it demands a very special kind of explanation. The only thing he got wrong was the explanation itself... The true explanation...had to wait for...Charles Darwin."

Dawkins goes on to add:

"Natural selection, the blind, unconscious, automatic process which we now know is the explanation for the existence and apparently purposeful form of all life, has no purpose in mind. It has no mind and no mind's eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no

vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of a watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker."

This brings me to the second point of my argument.

The Complex Structure of Life

The primary reason why evolutionists ended up in such a great impasse regarding the origin of life is that even those living organisms Darwinists deemed to be the simplest have outstandingly complex features. The cell of a living thing is more complex than all of our man-made technological products. Today, even in the most developed laboratories of the world, no single protein of the cell, let alone a living cell itself, can be produced by bringing organic chemicals together.

The conditions required for the formation of a cell are too great in quantity to be explained away by coincidences. However, there is no need to explain the situation with these details. Evolutionists are at a dead-end even before reaching the stage of the cell. That is because the probability of just a single protein, an essential building block of the cell, coming into being by chance is mathematically "0."

The main reason for this is the need for other proteins to be present if one protein is to form, and this completely eradicates the possibility of chance formation. This fact by itself is sufficient to eliminate the evolutionist claim of chance right from the outset. To summarize,

1. Protein cannot be synthesized without enzymes, and enzymes are all proteins.
2. Around 100 proteins need to be present in order for a single protein to be synthesized. There therefore need to be proteins for proteins to exist.
3. DNA manufactures the protein-synthesizing enzymes. Protein cannot be synthesized without DNA. DNA is therefore also needed in order for proteins to form.
4. All the organelles in the cell have important tasks in protein synthesis. In other words, in order for proteins to form a perfect and fully functioning cell needs to exist together with all its organelles.

The DNA molecule, which is located in the nucleus of a cell and which stores genetic information, is a magnificent databank. If the information coded in DNA were written down, it would make a giant library consisting of an estimated 900 volumes of encyclopedias consisting of 500 pages each.

A very interesting dilemma emerges at this point: DNA can replicate itself only with the help of some specialized proteins (enzymes). However, the synthesis of these enzymes can be realized only by the information coded in DNA. As they both depend on each other, they have to exist at the same time for replication. This brings the scenario that life originated by itself to a deadlock. Prof. Leslie Orgel, an evolutionist of repute from the University of San Diego, California, confesses this fact in the September 1994 issue of the Scientific American magazine:

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.

(Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on Earth," Scientific American, vol. 271, October 1994, p. 78.)

No doubt, if it is impossible for life to have originated spontaneously as a result of blind coincidences, then it has to be accepted that life was created. This fact explicitly invalidates the theory of evolution, whose main purpose is to deny Creation.

DNA Challenges Coincidence

Today mathematics has proved that coincidence does not play a role in the formation of the coded information within DNA, let alone the DNA molecule made up of millions of base pairs. The probability of the coincidental formation of even a single gene out of the 30,000 genes making up DNA is so low that even the notion of impossible remains weak. Frank Salisbury, an evolutionist biologist, makes the following statement about this 'impossibility':

A medium protein might include about 300 amino acids. The DNA gene controlling this would have about 1,000 nucleotides in its chain. Since there are four kinds of nucleotides in a DNA chain, one consisting of 1,000 links could exist in 4^{1000} forms. Using a little algebra (logarithms) we can see that $4^{1000}=10^{600}$. Ten multiplied by itself 600 times gives the figure 1 followed by 600 zeros! This number is completely beyond our comprehension.¹

That is to say that even if we assume that all the necessary nucleotides are present in a medium, and that all the complex molecules and enzymes to combine them were available, the possibility of the these nucleotides being arranged in the desired sequence is 1 in 4^{1000} , in other words, 1 in 10^{600} . Briefly, the probability of the coincidental formation of the code of an average protein in the human body in DNA by itself is 1 in 1 followed by 600 zeros. This number, which is beyond even being astronomical, means in practice 'zero' probability. This means that such a sequence has to be effected under the control and knowledge of a wise and conscious power. There is zero probability of it happening by 'accident', 'chance', or 'coincidence'.

Think of the book you are reading right now. How would you regard someone who claimed that letters (by using a different printing stamp for every letter) have come together by chance on their own to form this writing? It is evident that it was written by an intelligent and conscious person. This is no different from the status of DNA.

Francis Crick, the biochemist who discovered the structure of DNA, won a Nobel prize with respect to the research he had made on the subject. Crick, who was an ardent evolutionist, stated the following scientific opinion in a book he has written after testifying 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."²

Even in Crick's view, who was one of the biggest experts on DNA, life could never originate on earth spontaneously.

The data in DNA, which is made up of 5 billion letters, is composed of a special and meaningful sequence of letters A-T-G-C. However, not even a single letter error should be made in this sequence. A misspelled word or a letter error in an encyclopedia may be overlooked and ignored. It would not even be noticed. However, even a single mistake in any

base pair of DNA, such as a miscoded letter in the 1 billion 719 million 348 thousand 632nd base pair, would cause terrible results for the cell, and therefore for the person himself.

For instance, hemophilia (child leukemia) is the outcome of such an erroneous coding. For instance, haemophilia (leukaemia) is the outcome of such an erroneous coding. There are several hereditary diseases that are caused by various disorders in genetic make-up. The only reason for these potentially very threatening diseases is that one or a few of the millions of letters in the genetic code are in the wrong place. Mongolism, or Down's Syndrome, is quite widespread. It is caused by the presence of an extra chromosome in the 21st chromosome pair in every cell. Another example is Huntington's Disease. The sufferer is quite healthy up to 35, but then uncontrollable muscular spasms appear in the arms, legs and face. Since this fatal and incurable disease also affects the brain, the sufferer's memory and powers of thought grow progressively weaker.

All these genetic diseases reveal one important fact: the genetic code is so sensitive and balanced, and so minutely calculated, that the smallest change can lead to very serious consequences. One letter too many or too few can lead to fatal sicknesses, or lifelong crippling effects. For this reason, it is definitely impossible to think that such a sensitive equilibrium came about by chance and developed by means of mutations, as the theory of evolution would have us believe. That being the case, how did the enormous information within DNA come about and how was it encoded? Evolutionists, who base the roots of life on coincidences, have actually no comment to make on the subject of the roots of life. When you ask them about the roots of DNA, in other words the genetic code, you get the same reply from all of them. Leslie E. Orgel for instance, one of the foremost evolutionist biochemists of our time, offers the following reply:

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.³

Those who claim that millions of pages, billions of pieces of information were written by chance are of course left quite speechless in this way. In the same way that every book or piece of information has a writer or owner, so does the information in DNA: and that Creator is our Lord God, the possessor of superior and infinite knowledge and reason.

1- Frank B. Salisbury, "Doubts About The Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution", p. 336

2- Francis Crick, *Life Itself: It's Origin and Nature*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 88

3- Orgel, Leslie E, "Darwinism at the Very Beginning of Life", *New Scientist*, vol. 94 (April 15, 1982), p.151

DNA Confessions from Evolutionists

The question of how such an extraordinarily designed molecule as DNA originated is one of the thousands of impasses evolutionists reach.

Evolutionist Douglas R. Hofstadter of Indiana University, states his despair in the face of this question:

"How did the Genetic Code, along with the mechanisms for its translation (ribosomes and RNA molecules), originate?" For the moment, we will have to content ourselves with a sense of wonder and awe, rather than with an answer.¹

Another evolutionist authority, world renowned molecular biologist Leslie Orgel, is more outspoken on the subject:

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.²

Saying "life could never have originated by chemical means" is the equivalent of saying that "life could never have originated by itself." Recognition of the truth of this statement results in the realization that life is created in a conscious way. For ideological reasons, evolutionists, however, do not accept this fact, clear evidence of which is before their eyes. To avoid accepting the existence of God, they believe in nonsensical scenarios, despite their evident impossibility.

Another evolutionist, Caryl P. Haskins, states how the DNA code could not have emerged by chance, and that this fact is strong evidence for creation:

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.³

In his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, writing of the invalidity of the theory of evolution, renowned molecular biologist Prof. Michael Denton explains the unreasonable conviction of Darwinists:

To the skeptic, the proposition that the genetic programmes of higher organisms, consisting of something close to a thousand million bits of information, equivalent to the sequence of letters in a small library of one thousand volumes, containing in encoded form countless thousands of intricate algorithms controlling, specifying, and ordering the growth and development of billions and billions of cells into the form of a complex organism, were composed by a purely random process is simply AN AFFRONT TO REASON. BUT TO THE DARWINIST, THE IDEA IS ACCEPTED WITHOUT A RIPPLE OF DOUBT - THE PARADIGM TAKES PRECEDENCE!⁴

Indeed, Darwinism is nothing but a totally unreasonable, superstitious belief. Anyone with any reason would see the evidence for that great fact by looking at DNA, or any other part of the universe. Human beings and all living things are created by God, the Almighty, who is the Lord of all the worlds.

1- Douglas R. Hofstadter, *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*, New York: Vintage Books, 1980, p. 548

- 2- Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on Earth", Scientific American, vol. 271, October 1994, p. 78
3- Haskins, Caryl P., "Advances and Challenges in Science in 1970", American Scientist, vol.59 (May/June 1971), p.305)
4- Michael Denton, Evolution: A Theory in Crisis, London: Burnett Books, 1985, p. 351

FAILURE: All attempts taken to explain the origin of life hence the origin of biochemical systems through chemical evolution or a blind watchmaker have resulted in failure.

In order to appreciate this point we must first have a very quick review of the way and which biochemist categorizes biomolecules. We've talked about information harboring molecules like DNA and proteins. But there is another class of molecules in the cell. These are small molecules that react with each other to form linear pathways, branched pathways and circular pathways. These are all interconnected with each other to form a vast network of chemical reactions in the cell. And these reactions harvest energy for the cell to use to produce the cell's building blocks. These are referred to as intermediary metabolic pathways. And finally the third category is cell membranes. These are boundaries that separate the interior of the cell from the exterior environment. Or they separate compartments inside the cell. And each category of biomolecules has spurred different scenarios for the origin of life. They are called replicator-first scenarios, metabolism-first scenarios and membrane-first scenarios. According to replicator-first scenarios it was information-rich molecules like DNA and RNA and proteins that emerged first and metabolism and membranes are secondary features. Metabolism-first scenarios argue that metabolism emerged first. And then information-rich molecules and membranes as secondary feature and finally membrane-first scenarios argue it was a cell membrane that appeared first. It is important to realize that each approach proposed by the origin of life researchers suffer from intractable problems. And I'm not going to discuss these problems this morning because of time constraints. My colleague Dr. Anjeanette Roberts will talk a little bit about some of these problems in replicator-first scenarios. But I want to tell you a story that illustrates how significant the problem is.

A number of years ago I attended an origin-of-life conference in Oaxaca Mexico. This conference was called ISSOL 2002. This meeting attracted some of the best origin-of-life researchers around the world. The opening lecture of that conference was delivered by a scientist by the name of Leslie Orgel. When he was alive, Orgel was considered the preeminent origin of life researcher in the world. And he was given the honor at this conference of presenting the opening lecture to the conference. And he was asked to summarize the status of the RNA World Hypothesis, an idea that he was one of the originators of. Throughout his lecture, Orgel detailed problem after problem with the RNA World scenario. Towards the end of his talk, he paused, and he said, "I hope that there are no creationists in the audience, but it would be a miracle if a strand of RNA ever appeared on the primitive Earth." It is remarkable. Orgel was known as an outspoken atheist. Yet, in an honest moment, he had to acknowledge that the origin of life at least from a replicator first stand point appeared to be basically a miracle.

Metabolism-first scenarios fare no better. Again there are problem after problem after problem we can identify with these scenarios because of time I'm not going into them, but I'm just going to simply say this that when Orgel was alive one of the last scientific journal articles

he wrote was a critical review a metabolism-first scenario where he said that these scenarios require: “an appeal to magic”, “a series of remarkable coincidences”, “a near miracle”.

And finally, when it comes to membrane-first scenarios they too are riddled with problems. Some of these problems are listed on the slide:

- Environmental conditions
- Amphiphile composition
- Amphiphile concentration
- Phase behavior

Again I’m not going into details because of time constraint. But a few years ago, a chemist by the name of Jackie Thomas and I published a paper in a journal called *Origins of Life and Evolution of Biospheres*. This is one of the World’s leading origin of life research journals. We detailed the problems associated with membrane-first scenarios. This was a remarkable achievement because both Jackie Thomas and I are creationists. And yet the problems we identified with membrane-first scenarios are so significant, even evolutionary biologists had to acknowledge that our critique was legitimate. The Editor-in-Chief of the journal consented to publish our critical assessment of membrane-first scenarios in this premier origin-of-life research journal. In other words, every attempt to explain the origin of life has resulted in failure from an evolutionary standpoint. When it comes to the origin of life, you cannot say there is a blind watchmaker.

When I present this evidence to origin of life researchers they are very quick to agree that at this point in time, we have no explanation for the origin of life. But they argue that we still think that we might be able to explain chemical evolution someday. Because of successes that they claim to have in the laboratory or they’ve been able to make for example building block materials through what are called prebiotic chemical experiments. Or they can make biopolymers or evolve RNA molecules in the lab or make self-replicating systems and manufacture protocells. And they point to this and say this demonstrates that chemical evolution could be conceivable and this brings me to the third point of my argument.

FASHION: Attempts to create or fashion life in the lab make a very powerful case for a Creator.

When chemists go into lab to perform prebiotic chemistry studies, they are working under highly controlled conditions. They carefully assemble the glassware. They fill the glassware with the appropriate solvents. They add the just-right chemicals at the just-right time at the just-right concentrations. They control the temperature of the reaction. They control the pH of the reaction. They stop the reaction at that just-right time. In other words, the chemists are contributing to the success of the prebiotic chemistry studies. It is highly questionable if these highly-controlled conditions would have ever existed on the early Earth. While chemists may be present in the laboratory today, they were not present on the early Earth to oversee prebiotic chemistry. To put it another way, intelligent agency insures the success of these prebiotic reactions in the lab.

Let me illustrate this point by discussing the RNA World Hypothesis. This centerpiece of this idea is the notion that the very first biochemistry was based on RNA. Later the RNA World evolved to give rise to the DNA-Protein World that characterizes contemporary biochemistry. There are a number of lines of evidence that origin-of-life researchers like to point to in favor

of the RNA World Hypothesis. I'm only going to tell you one of those lines of evidence and this has to do with the ability to make RNA on clay surfaces in the laboratory. In the mid-1990s, when this was accomplished this was heralded as a huge breakthrough in favor of the RNA World Hypothesis. But, when you examine the details of the experiments it very quickly becomes evident that Intelligent agency was critical for this process to take place.

The researchers for example have to operate under highly chemically pristine conditions. They have to exclude materials that would interfere with the production of the RNA chains. They have to exclude materials that would cause the RNA molecules to break down once they form. These materials would have been present in abundance on the early Earth. But again they are excluded from their experiments. They have to stop the reaction before the RNA chain gets too long. Because if it gets too long it becomes irreversibly attached to the clay surface. They also have to use what are called chemically-activated nucleotides. These materials would never have existed on the early Earth if they did somehow they would be so chemically reactive they would react with everything in sight and would not be available to make RNA molecules. In addition the clay they use has to come from a specific supplier in the United States. That clay has to be treated in the just right way in the laboratory if not it could not be used as a catalyst for this reaction.

This is what Paul Davies an astrobiologist has said about the RNA World Hypothesis: *"As far as biochemists can see, it is a long and difficult road to produce efficient RNA replicators from scratch. This conclusion has to be that without a trained organic chemist on hand to supervise, nature would be struggling to make RNA from a dilute soup under any plausible prebiotic conditions."* (P. Davies, *The Fifth Miracle: The Search for the Origin and Meaning of Life*, New York, Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1999, p. 131) Evolutionary biologist Simon Conway Morris goes one step further: *"Many of the experiments designed to explain one or other step in the origin of life are either of tenuous relevance to any believable prebiotic setting or involve an experimental rig in which the hand of the researcher becomes for all intents and purposes the hand of God."* (Simon Conway Morris, *Life's Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 41)

This is ironic, the very experiments that the scientists perform to try to demonstrate that validity of chemical evolution and a blind watchmaker approach to the origin of life have unwittingly demonstrated that intelligent agency is the key ingredient in the transformation of non-living molecules to life. This conclusion, and I'm going to close in just a minute, this conclusion is further illustrated by work in synthetic biology. Synthetic biology is relatively new area in biology where the goal is to create artificial life in the lab. And one of the goals is to make protocells. Starting with simple chemicals and try to make cellular entities. And it becomes readily apparent when you examine this work how important intelligent agency is.

And let me illustrate this by talking about a study done a few years ago where researchers were trying to make an enzyme from scratch unlike anything that existed in nature.

An enzyme could be thought of just a small component in the overall machinery of the cell. It took a team of quantum chemists, computational chemists, protein engineers, biochemists and molecular biologists to pull this off and it required hundreds of hours of supercomputer time to model the chemistry. And they had to use structural motifs from biology to build the proteins. It required highly skilled scientists working in highly controlled conditions in the laboratory utilizing sophisticated chemical instrumentation. That itself was intelligently designed to pull this off.

And what they made was laughable compared to what you see in nature. *'Although our results demonstrate that novel enzyme activities can be designed from scratch'* they write

“and indicate the catalytic strategies that are most accessible to nascent enzymes, there is still a significant gap between the activities of our designed catalysts and those of naturally occurring enzymes.”

There is no blind watchmaker. And so when you look at these three facts that when we examine biochemical systems we see evidence for the work of a Mind we see a Creator's fingerprints. We can show that every attempt to explain the origin of life through chemical evolution has led to fail. And we can show that attempts to create life in the lab unequivocally demonstrate the necessary role of intelligent agency really left with one conclusion.

The life itself must come from the work of a Mind.

It is gratifying to me to think that 30 years later the conclusions I came to as a young graduate student are valid. If you are open-minded and if you really follow the evidence where it leads, in my view, there is only one conclusion and that is:

There has to be a Creator, there has to be a Creator that brought life into existence. The question then becomes for all of us who is that Creator how do we relate to that Creator which are far more important questions than whether or not a Creator exists in my opinion.

Thank you so much.

Another Example of Evolutionists' Helplessness: The "RNA World" Scenario

Ever since the start of the 20th century, evolutionists have developed various theories to explain how the first living cell emerged. The Russian biologist Alexander Oparin, who proposed the first evolutionary thesis on the subject, suggested that in the primitive world of hundreds of millions of years ago, a series of coincidental chemical reactions led to first of all proteins, and that cells were then born when these came together. Discoveries made in the 1970s showed that even the most fundamental assumptions of this claim, which Oparin made in the 1930s, were mistaken. Oparin's "primitive world atmosphere" scenario contained the gases methane and ammonia to allow the formation of organic molecules. However, it was realized that the hypothesis of an early methane-ammonia atmosphere is without solid foundation and indeed is contradicted, and that the early atmosphere contained a large amount of oxygen which destroys organic molecules as they form.

This was a big blow to the theory of molecular evolution. Evolutionists then had to face the fact that the "primitive atmosphere experiments" by Stanley Miller, Sidney Fox and Cyril Ponnamperuma and others were invalid. For this reason, in the 1980s evolutionists tried again. As a result, "RNA World" hypothesis was advanced. This scenario proposed that, not proteins, but rather the RNA molecules that contained the information for proteins were formed first. According to this scenario advanced by Harvard chemist Walter Gilbert in 1986, billions of years ago an RNA molecule capable of replicating itself, formed somehow by accident. Then this RNA molecule started to produce proteins, having been activated by external influences. Thereafter, it became necessary to store this information in a second molecule, and somehow the DNA molecule emerged to do that.

Made up of a chain of impossibilities in each and every stage, this scarcely credible scenario, far from providing any explanation of the origin of life, only magnified the problem and raised many unanswerable questions:

1. Since it is impossible to explain the coincidental formation of even one of the nucleotides making up RNA, how can it be possible for these imaginary nucleotides to form RNA by coming together in a particular sequence? Evolutionist John Horgan admits the impossibility of the chance formation of RNA:

As researchers continue to examine the RNA-world concept closely, more problems emerge. How did RNA initially arise? RNA and its components are difficult to synthesize in a laboratory under the best of conditions, much less under really plausible ones.¹

2. Even if we suppose that it formed by chance, how could this RNA consisting of just a nucleotide chain have "decided" to self-replicate and with what kind of a mechanism could it have carried out this self-replicating process? Where did it find the nucleotides it used while self-replicating? Even evolutionist microbiologists Gerald Joyce and Leslie Orgel express the desperateness of the situation in their book titled *In the RNA World*:

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.²

3. Even if we suppose that there was self-replicating RNA in the primordial world, that numerous amino acids of every type ready to be used by RNA were available and that all of these impossibilities somehow took place, the situation still does not lead to the formation of even one single protein. For RNA only includes information concerning the structure of proteins. Amino acids, on the other hand, are raw materials. Nevertheless, there is no mechanism for the production of proteins. To consider the existence of RNA sufficient for protein production is as nonsensical as expecting a car to assemble itself by simply throwing the blueprint onto a heap of parts piled on top of each other. A blueprint cannot produce a car all by itself without a factory and workers to assemble the parts according to the instructions contained in the blueprint; in the same way, the blueprint contained in RNA cannot produce proteins by itself without the cooperation of other cellular components which follow the instructions in the RNA.

Proteins are produced in the ribosome factory with the help of many enzymes, and as a result of extremely complex processes within the cell. The ribosome is a complex cell organelle made up of proteins. This leads, therefore, to another unreasonable supposition—that ribosomes, too, should have come into existence by chance at the same time. Even Nobel Prize winner Jacques Monod, who was one of the most fanatical defenders of evolution, explained that protein synthesis can by no means be considered to depend merely on the information in the nucleic acids:

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... When and how did this circle become closed? It is exceedingly difficult to imagine.³

How could an RNA chain in the primordial world have taken such a decision, and what methods could it have employed to make protein production happen by doing the work of 50 macromolecular components on its own? Evolutionists have no answer to these questions.

Dr. Leslie Orgel, one of the associates of Stanley Miller and Francis Crick from the University of California at San Diego, uses the term "scenario" for the possibility of "the origination of life through the RNA world." Orgel described what kind of features this RNA would have had to have and how impossible these would have been in his article, "The Origin of Life," published in *American Scientist* in October 1994:

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.⁴

As should by now be clear, to expect these two complex and extremely essential processes from a molecule such as RNA is only possible from the evolutionist's viewpoint and with the help of his power of imagination. Concrete scientific facts, on the other hand, make it explicit that the "RNA World" hypothesis, which is a new model proposed for the chance formation of life, is an equally implausible fable.

1- John Horgan, "In the Beginning", Scientific American, vol. 264, February 1991, p. 119

2- G.F. Joyce, L. E. Orgel, "Prospects for Understanding the Origin of the RNA World", In the RNA World, New York: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, 1993, p. 13

3- Jacques Monod, Chance and Necessity, New York: 1971, p.143

4- Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on the Earth", Scientific American, October 1994, vol. 271, p. 78

Dr. Anjeanette AJ Roberts's presentation: "Un-Equivocating Evolution"

I too would like to thank the organization of Technics & Science Research for inviting us to Turkey. I've thoroughly enjoyed my visit to Turkey and it is obvious to me that Turkey's greatest resource is her people. And so we pray often for your peace and for your welfare especially in light of recent events.

So, perhaps you've heard this statement, I was once asked if I believe this statement is true. *'There is more evidence for evolution than there is that the Earth revolves around the Sun'*. Well, it might be true. It depends on what you mean by the word evolution. And that's what the rest of my talk is about.

Evolution is a word that is often equivocated. Equivocation is a process that depends on the word having more than one meaning. It involves using a word in a context where the meaning is glossed over in order to make a faulty assertion and to make it more defensible. In equivocating you're assuming one meaning but actually using the word in a different context. This is often what happens with the word evolution. Someone makes a statement like this. Is it true? Well, it can be. But it may also be false. It is critical by what you mean by evolution. The word evolution, we're going to spend the next several minutes un-equivocating this word. Trying to bring some clarity to whether or not this statement might be true. The word is used in different contexts. Actually in reference to five different categories of different types of naturalistic processes that are dependent on different underlying mechanisms to work.

These are the five categories that we will be looking at: Chemical evolution, microevolution, microbial evolution, speciation, and macro-evolution. My colleague Fazale Rana just spoke to you in some detail within 30 minutes about chemical evolution. So I will not spend too much time on this topic and I will only highlight a couple of hurdles that chemical evolution faces.

But chemical evolution as Fazale Rana said refers to the process of generating life from non-life. It is sometimes called abiogenesis. And it is synthesizing biogenic molecules from inorganic compounds. And these are the building blocks for cells. It is, at the basis of the naturalistic explanation for the origin of life. But the hurdles it faces are many. One of them are the chemistries required for the syntheses of many of the biogenic molecules. These chemistries are not compatible with one another. So if you're trying to generate a sugar, you'll have a different chemistry than if you're trying to generate a fatty acid or a nucleic acid which is at the heart of the DNA and RNA. But not only are the chemistries not compatible with one another, the chemistries are not compatible with early earth conditions.

A second hurdle which I will spend a little more time on is the homo-chirality of the sugars in RNA and DNA. And also the homo-chirality of amino acids that are found in proteins. Chirality refers to the orientation of a molecule, and is sometimes referred to as the "handedness" of a molecule. If you think about your left hand and your right hand you can see that they are mirror opposites of one another. Although both have a palm, and thumbs, and four fingers you cannot superimpose one upon the other because they're mirror opposites. This is the problem of chirality. It is true that the sugars in DNA and RNA, and the amino acids

in all proteins share only one orientation. Either a right-handedness for sugars or a left-handedness for amino acids. But if you try to generate sugars or amino acids through naturalistic processes in the laboratory, you don't get a single type of left handed molecule for amino acids or a single type of right handed molecule for sugars. You get a mixture. That's called a racemic mixture. And a ratio is about %50 left handed and %50 right handed sugars, %50 left handed and %50 right handed amino acids. This makes it very difficult to synthesize RNA or DNA because of steric inhibition and chain termination. Yet biological processes those that occur inside the cell in stark contrast, produce only left-handed amino acids and only right-handed sugars for RNA and DNA syntheses. This is a challenge for the naturalistic explanations of the origin of life. And I think it points to a Mind behind the molecules that we find in cellular processes. So all life in summary has only right handed sugars and only left handed amino acids. And yet there is no known naturally occurring mechanism for generating, or selecting, or stably maintaining a solution of only one or other molecule.

A third hurdle is the naturalistic account, for the origin of life, is one of information, which again my colleague Fazale Rana has spoken to you at length in his thirty minutes. The DNA as he described is the molecular blueprint for all genes and all gene regulations, and by RNA intermediance for all proteins that are produced inside the cell. The information that is stored in the DNA molecule is one that is often appealed to as indicating an Intelligent Designer. And many argue that it requires an Intelligent Designer or God to produce this type of information. But it is not the information that is most difficult to explain within the cell. There is also information at the system level, which Doctor Rana also referred to. How do the cells orient different proteins in different cellular subsystems that accomplish different molecular processes? Or where does the information come for structuring these things in the right orientation and also for making them work in concert together, in a way that is highly complex integrated and almost orchestrated like a symphony. It's not enough to just account for the information in DNA but it's necessary to account for this higher level subsystem metabolic process information as well.

Maybe it would help if I gave you an analogy. So if you think about trying to build a car from the ground up, you need all of the parts of the car. And each one whether it's the plastic parts or the rubber parts or the metal parts or the gasoline, requires information on how to produce those parts. But it also requires mechanisms to produce those parts not just the information. Okay so, now you need information for the mechanisms, you need information for the production of parts but that's still not enough. You're left now with just parts of the car. You still need information on how the car systems interact in order to generate locomotion, in order to generate combustion. And so you have to have system level information in order to put the parts together in the right way, in order to get an automobile that you can drive. But even this, I think is a poor analogy for trying to express the complexity within a human cell, within a living cell. A better analogy would be, if someone was able to account for all of the functional inner actions all of the pieces, all of the mechanisms that are involved as something complex as the city of Istanbul.

The forth hurdle which I will not spend any time on since I have four more topics to talk about is that life on earth occurred very early. And the life that occurred on earth, occurred almost as soon as life could be sustained on earth. And it occurred in a highly complex and diversified manner. This challenges, as Fazale addressed in his talk, and I have mentioned so far in my talk, leads many scientists who are committed to a naturalistic paradigm, to appeal to something called panspermia. Panspermia is a hypothesis that the biogenic molecules are perhaps even life itself did not originate on earth. But it originated somewhere else in the universe. And then it was transmitted to earth either through natural things like comets or

meteorites or perhaps through advanced species. But Panspermia does not actually account for the naturalistic origin of life. It just displaces the problem to some unknown place in the universe where the biochemical and physical and chemical laws would be the same, and where the challenges are producing life from non-life have not changed. They've just been moved to a different location. So panspermia is not a solution to the problem of the origin of life and in conclusion we must reach this: the chemical evolution is not a logical conclusion based on scientific evidence for the origin of life on earth. It is only a naturalistic appeal to account for what we see.

So the second category is microevolution. Microevolution is the process of accruing unguided changes or mutations in the DNA sequence. The mechanism and the characteristics of microevolution are two-fold: they are unguided or random and they occur through natural selection. These two elements, unguided and natural selection are the hallmarks of Darwinian or Neo-Darwinian evolution. The mutations themselves occur due to different types of stress that are encountered by the organism. Such as UV radiation, hormone responses to stress or heat. And as a result the DNA can become damaged, it can break. But repair mechanisms exist within the cell, they can repair and rejoin the double stranded DNA ends. Mutations can then occur either through damage done to the DNA or through the repair mechanism itself. Unguided mutations in the nucleic acid sequence can also occur when the DNA is replicated by the polymerase protein. As it copies the nucleic acid sequence sometimes it makes mistakes. And it has the ability to actually correct mistakes but it is not 100% accurate in correcting mistakes. So it still makes a mistake about one in every ten million base pairs. So mutations can result from damaged or broken DNA, repair of DNA, or replication of DNA.

The main point is that according to evolutionist claims: mutations create variability and when there is variability, selection can occur through natural processes. This means when a mutation occurs that allows an organism to survive and thrive in a given environment then that organism will survive and thrive. If on the other hand it is a deleterious mutation, then the organism will not survive nor thrive.

It should be apparent and Dr. Rana also pointed this out, that natural selection is non teleological. It's his blind watchmaker reference. It's not goal-oriented, it's not being driven towards a specific goal or a specific purpose. It is simply natural selection done through the blind process that cannot foresee which mutations might one day provide the ability to thrive in a different environment or in a more complex organism. This is a very important element in the Darwinian and neo-Darwinian theory: that evolution including microevolution is non teleological.

I find this to be one of the biggest and most confusing problems that people face when they talk about evolution and specifically about cellular and molecular biological processes. It actually leads them to endow the organism with the teleology of the organism's own design. The organism becomes self directing towards some explicit goal, present or future. And others endow molecules or segments of DNA with an intention to survive and propagate. Perhaps you've heard of "selfish genes". At heart, this is imaginative story telling effect to captivate an audience. At worst it is utterly nonsensical and ridiculous. Either way it is not scientific. In fact, it's counterintuitive to what we know is true about scientific mechanisms and processes. But cells and organisms are so richly endowed with complexity and adaptive capacities and variations that it is hard to describe such layers of complexity without resorting to language like this which is often wrongly employed.

So the third category of evolution is microbial evolution. Microbial evolution refers to the process of unicellular organisms such as bacteria, archaea, simple eukaryotes, yeast, etc. as

they rapidly reproduce and adapt to changing environments via selection of beneficial micro evolutionary mutations and promiscuous gene swapping. So bacteria and other single cell organisms can actually gain genetic information through three different mechanisms. The first is one called conjugation. Conjugation occurs when bacteria come and contact with one another, and one bacteria transmits genetic information to a different bacteria. The second type of horizontal gene transfer or exchange of genetic information is transduction. Transduction is vector-mediated. Viruses that infect bacteria can carry genetic information into the bacteria and if it's a temperate virus it remains in the bacteria without killing the bacteria and the bacteria can replicate having gained new genetic information from the virus. A third mechanism the bacteria or single cell organisms can use to exchange genetic information is one called transduction or sometimes transformation. And this occurs when a bacteria dies or it is lysed, it releases genetic information into the environment. At such a time it's possible for other bacteria to come and contact with the genetic information and take it up into itself, acquiring new genetic information from the bacteria that had just lysed.

So whether it's through horizontal gene transfer or micro-evolutionary mutations transfer of genetic material again is unguided and non teleological, and can be deleterious or beneficial or neutral. But it should be obvious that once the genetic information is taken up into a bacteria, then it can quickly spread throughout the population of subsequent progeny. Because it's a single cell organism. So all the mutations that occur in a single cell are then reproduced in all of the progeny that result from that cell. So this mechanism is a very powerful mechanism that allows bacteria and single cell organisms to survive and thrive in changing environments.

This brings us now to our forth category which is speciation. And much like the word evolution which we're in the process of trying to un-equivocate, species is an other world that is often equivocated, used in many different terms and meanings under different conditions. It actually has a name. It's called the species problem. And the species problem results from a wide range of approaches in defining how species are identified and in how species function in nature. And each approach for trying to identify how species function and how they're identified within themselves is known as a species concept. And currently, there are at least twenty six different recognized species concepts. That's phenomenal. But the important point is that you must be very careful to know what the other person is talking about when they are going to use the word species, especially in the context of this topic of speciation.

So speciation refers to the process in which a given species becomes genetically, phenotypically, and by appearance, behaviorally distinct species, typically do to geographical isolation, that results in reproductively independent groups. During speciation, radiation events occur when a single starting species is split into various ecological niches where they encounter variable environmental pressures.

In relative isolation, organisms undergo different types of environmental stresses and pressures that effect the organism at a micro-evolutionary level and also at a genetic-drift level because now we're talking about multicellular organisms that sexually reproduce. These variables stresses and environmental pressures can also result in epigenetic changes that can affect a species' phenotype and behavior.

And over time, each niche will mold and support a species that will be specific to that ecological niche. So Darwin actually described a speciation event in the observation of the different types of finches on the Galapagos Islands. He identified fifteen or sixteen different types of finch that were primarily one of the homework of the different species was the size and width and thickness of the beak of the finch. But recent studies have indicated that beak

morphology or the shape of the beak changes in an oscillating fashion not in a progressive fashion towards some new and novel structure. So in wet environments the beak will be thin and narrow. In dry environments the beaks will tend to be thicker and wider. So this suggests at least one level speciation results from a type of phenotypic plasticity that is adaptive to varying environmental changes. In other words, it's not unidirectional change or a progression to something utterly new. It's an oscillating change. And it's also not allowing an organism to make giant leaps from one taxonomical level to another. All of Darwin's finches remained finches.

Evolutionists erroneously maintain that living things on different continents or in different environments develop into different species. However, the different characteristics arising in different regions are nothing more than population differences. The genetic combination of those life forms obliged to reproduce in any one region is restricted, and specific characteristics in their genes come to the fore. Yet there is no question of any new species emerging.

It's also true for evolutionary biologist Stephen Jay Gould's research in snails, also on an island environment, where the snails were isolated into different geographical regions. But again, what Stephen Jay Gould described was biodiversity within snails that were well suited to particular ecological niches. But they were all snails. It wasn't adaptive diversification within snails. More recently, red and eastern wolves, which are geographically, phenotypically, and behaviorally distinct canids have been examined at a genomic level. These canids are actually protected as endangered species in the US and in Canada. But at the genomic level, what they've discovered is that these different species are really just genetic hybrids of coyotes and grey wolves.

This new data is actually threatening their protected classification and status as endangered species and it highlights the species problem in regard to evolution. Much like selective breeding in dogs, wolves, coyotes seem to be the result of variations over time within an ongoing species-radiation event. No doubt populations are now isolated certainly by behavioral and geographic constraints, but the various "species" may not actually be isolated in the sense that they can no longer cross breed. So recent research also shows a connection of species within an ecological web. But yet even these examples, contrary to what papers claim, has no significance to macroevolution the change in a particular species into a different kind or different taxonomical classification.

And even if we, like the North American wolf study shows choose to call species something entirely different like wolves, coyotes or dogs it doesn't mean that one kind, a canid is giving rise to something other than a canid. Finches remained finches, snails remained snails, plants, flies and wasps although they're changing and co-adapting together, remained plants, flies and wasps.

Finally, if we consider the speciation in the context of humanity and what we believe as Christians, that there was a primordial human pair Adam and Eve, that were created in God's image according to Torah: In His image, He created them male and female. If you believe the scientific data that dates mitochondrial Eve, and Y-chromosomal Adam to one hundred and fifty thousand years ago, then all of the diversity that we see in the human population today, results from an ongoing speciation event in humanity. Consider the differences of the major races and ethnicities. Compare some of the island groups of Australia to Asia or Middle Eastern or European or Native American people. Or consider a dwarf and compare it to an extremely tall human being. Nevertheless, no matter our diversity is, we are all human. We are all homo sapien sapiens.

The last category is that of macro-evolution. And be very careful here because this is where equivocation takes place most often. Macroevolution refers to a series of naturalistic processes. It's occurring over long stretches of time, that account for all of life's history, forms, and complexity resulting from descent with modification under pressures of natural selection, acting upon unguided changes in population genetics, in a contingent and non-teleological fashion. It is supposed that macroevolution involves multiple different mechanisms for achieving its end goals.

One mechanism is that of genome duplication. But genome duplication is simply replicating a genome that you already have, you now have twice as much that genome. And it provides no new information, just greater amounts of DNA. In current observation, genome duplication in human cells is most frequently associated with cancer. And so this type of genetic increase in information is actually deleterious. Similarly with translocation or jumping genes for some segments of DNA can be transferred and copied into new positions in the chromosome or different positions in the genome, this type of mechanism can shuffle DNA, information within a genome and replicate some portions of the DNA, it's not providing new DNA. And in current observations these two is associated with human diseases.

Horizontal gene transfer, although it occurs by viral mediated mechanisms, it is not the same as that occurs in single cellular organisms. For horizontal gene transfer, to even take a hold in a human population, it absolutely must occur in the germ line, in the egg of the female or the sperm of the male. Two other mechanisms, co-option or symbiogenesis are often appealed to as well, to account for some of the diversity. But each of these has its own hurdle.

Generation of new organisms by these mechanisms is not evident today. It is rather an appeal to a sketchy, if not well-imagined, extrapolation of observed complex interdependence of symbiotic organisms to account for large-scale naturalistic changes in life's history. Although many mechanisms are appealed to for macroevolution, no plausible account has yet rationally and reasonably described the "muddy middle layer of mechanism".

No credible mechanism or explanation has been offered for generating true novelty. No account can be given for the rapid appearance of most known phyla and fossils that occurred 540 million years ago in the Cambrian explosion. No true transitional species has ever been identified in the fossil record or through phylogenetic analysis. And no genetic map exists showing a clear Darwinian pathway from one order, kingdom, phyla, class or order to another.

So what do we do with the evidence? I believe the evidence concludes that we must reject chemical evolution and macroevolution as not being well evidenced in scientific data. Each of us knowingly or unknowingly interprets the data in a way that fits into our view of reality. Molecular adaptation I think is a better phrase or perhaps even molecular variation to take the place of the word evolution in our opening statement. I think it's better to rephrase "*There is more evidence for a molecular based adaptation or variation of highly complex and wildly diverse organisms than there is that the Earth revolves around the Sun*".

But I think that this view supports the view of progressive creationism: that God created life over long apex of time, according to specific kinds. And God endowed his creatures with the ability to adapt to challenging and changing environments for their continued survival. So progressive creationism is a reasonable and rational conclusion, concordant with the data, accounting for the diversity and early appearance of complex life. And it also accounts for the fine-tuning and intelligibility of the universe, which my colleague Dr. Zweerink will talk about this afternoon.

As a first century follower of Jesus puts it, *"For ever since the world was created, people have seen the Earth and sky. Through everything God made, they can clearly see His invisible qualities - His eternal power and divine nature. So they have no excuse for not knowing God."* (Romans, 1:20)

Or as the Psalm of David puts it:

"The heavens proclaim the glory of God. The skies display His craftsmanship. Day after day they continue to speak; night after night they make Him known. They speak without a sound or word; their voice is never heard. Yet their message has gone throughout the earth, and their words to all the world." (Psalms, 19:1-4)

Former atheist and philosopher, Anthony Flew actually converted to theism before his death. Even though he was a major proponent of atheism prior to this. And he puts it this way near the end of his life:

"We have all the evidence we need in our immediate experience and only a deliberate refusal to 'look' is responsible for atheism of any kind." (A. Flew, *There is A God*, Harper Collins, 2008, p. 163)

Francis Crick says that, *"Biologists must constantly keep in mind that what they see was not designed, but rather evolved."* (F. Crick, *What Mad Pursuit*, New York, Basic Books, 1998, p. 138) Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the structure of DNA was a naturalist. And the only basis for his comment is an undying dedication to a naturalistic paradigm, not a clear and open-minded examination of the evidence.

So, in conclusion I would say that a Christian paradigm or theistic paradigm is far better for science than a Darwinian, naturalistic paradigm. Because according to the Christian paradigm, theistic paradigm, natural laws allow reproducible regularities that we can examine. We must observe the world in order to know what it is like. As my colleague said in introduction, nature is a reliable revelation of God. The Scriptures tell us that God reveals Himself in nature. And He has created for us for inquiry and discovery. He wants to be known. The Scriptures also tell us that truth can be sought and obtained in the words of Jesus when we seek with all of our hearts, we will find the truth. In conclusion, God wants to be known and He has revealed himself clearly to those who have an open mind and a humble heart in nature and in scriptures and in the person of Jesus Christ. So those who seek will find that there is a Creator of all that we see.

Thanks be to God!

Evolutionists' Confessions Stating 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 30,000 genes making up DNA forming by chance, let alone a DNA molecule consisting of billions of components. Evolutionists make the following confessions in regard to this topic:

Carly P. Haskins (Evolutionist biologist):

"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."¹

Leslie E. Orgel (Evolutionist biochemist):

"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."²

Paul Auger (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."³

Douglas R. Hofstadter:

"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."⁴

Francis Crick (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."⁵

John Maddox (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."⁶

Pierre Grassé (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."⁷

- 1- Haskins, Caryl P., "Advances and Challenges in Science in 1970", American Scientist, vol. 59 (May/June 1971), p. 305
- 2- Orgel, Leslie E, "Darwinism at the Very Beginning of Life", New Scientist, vol.94 (April 15, 1982), p.151
- 3- Paul Auger, De La Physique Theorique a la Biologie, 1970, p. 118
- 4- Douglas R. Hofstadter, Godel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid, New York: Vintage Books, 1980, p. 548
- 5- Francis Crick, Life Itself: It's Origin and Nature, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 88
- 6- <http://www.icr.org/headlines/darwinvindicated.html>; Was Darwin Really "Vindicated"?, Frank Sherwin, Institute for Creation Research, April 30, 2001
- 7- Pierre P. Grassé, The Evolution of Living Organisms, 1977, p. 168

Protein Cannot Form Unless the Cell Exists as an Integral Whole

Darwinists can write as many deceptive books jam packed with formulae, produce as many false fossils as they like, make as many demagogic assaults on the scientific evidence for Creation as they choose or stick posters up full of fantastical illustrations and present these as exhibitions of evolution all over the place, but none of this will ever change the fact of their fundamental defeat. Because the worst nightmare for Darwinists is the very beginning of life. Darwinists **HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO PRODUCE A SINGLE EXPLANATION** of how just one protein came into being. This is an expression of the despairing situation into which, Dawkins, Futuyma, Tim White and all other Darwinists now find themselves. None of this demagoguery can resolve this great and stupendous rout in the face of a single protein. **A SINGLE PROTEIN HAS TOTALLY DEMOLISHED DARWINISM.**

One important feature of Darwinist demagoguery is that Darwinists always tended to reduce the question of the origin of life to the very simple, despite all the complexity of life, by portraying everything within it as very simple. That is the reason for such myths as "the cell emerged from muddy water" and "DNA spontaneously began replicating itself." Darwinists imagined it would be easier to deceive people in this way. But they have now seen that the time for such deception has passed. Not only do people now know that a single protein is far too complex ever to come into being spontaneously, they are also aware that neither a protein, DNA, RNA or any other minute component of the cell **WILL SERVE ANY PURPOSE IN THE ABSENCE OF THE CELL AS A WHOLE.**

This fact is of great importance in terms of the defeat of Darwinism:

- DNA is essential for a single protein to form
- DNA cannot form without protein
- Protein cannot form without DNA
- Protein cannot form in the absence of protein
- Sixty separate proteins are needed for a single protein to form
- Protein cannot form in the absence of any one of these
- Protein cannot form with no ribosome
- Protein cannot form with no RNA
- Protein cannot form without ATP

- Protein cannot form without the mitochondria to manufacture ATP
- Protein cannot form without the cell nucleus
- Protein cannot form without the cytoplasm
- Protein cannot form in the absence of a single organelle in the cell
- And proteins are necessary for all the organelles in the cell to exist and function
- There can be no protein without these organelles.

This is an interconnected system that has to function simultaneously. You cannot have one part without the other.

Even if one component exists, it will still not function in the absence of the others.

In short,

THE WHOLE CELL IS NECESSARY FOR A PROTEIN TO FORM. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR A SINGLE PROTEIN TO FORM IN THE ABSENCE OF THE WHOLE CELL, with its perfect complex structure we see today, but of which we understand only a very small part.

Even if this protein did form spontaneously (which is in any case impossible), it will still serve no purpose. It will just wander around alone and die.

NO MOLECULE IN THE HUMAN CELL POSSESSES THE ABILITY TO REPLICATE ITSELF SPONTANEOUSLY WITHOUT THE HELP OF ANY OTHER MOLECULE.

The Cambridge University Professor of Philosophy Stephen C. Meyer describes this in his book *The Signature in the Cell*:

Following the elucidation of the structure and function of DNA during the 1950s and early 1960s, a radically new conception of life began to emerge. Not only did molecular biologists discover that DNA carried information; they soon began to suspect that living organisms must contain systems for processing genetic information. Just as the digital information stored on a disc is useless without a device for reading the disc, so too is the information on DNA useless without the cell's information-processing system. As Richard Lewontin notes, "No living molecule (i.e., biomolecule) is self-producing. Only whole cells may contain all the necessary machinery for self-reproduction... Not only is DNA incapable of making copies of itself, aided or unaided, but it is incapable of 'making' anything else... The proteins of the cell are made from other proteins, and without that protein-forming machinery nothing can be made."¹

1- Stephen C. Meyer, *The Signature in the Cell*, Harper One, 2009, p. 132-133

Intracellular Molecular Machines That Perform Protein Care and Cleanup

In a typical mammal cell, there are approximately ten to twenty thousand functioning protein varieties. For a cell to be healthy, these proteins need to be healthy first. For this reason, the existence of intracellular quality control mechanisms is crucial.

The latest studies revealed a quality control system made up from proteins:

A protein leaves the ribosome as a chain formed by thousands of amino acids, however it can't fulfill its functions without transforming into the three-dimensional state folded onto itself. Proteins called chaperons transform these amino acid chains into their designed final state and turn them into functional nano-machines. However, during this folding phase, which requires sensitive connections at molecular level, errors can be made and broken amino acid aggregates can be formed.

Accumulation of this waste material poses a health risk for the cell and the entire body. Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases, various heart diseases, diabetes and certain cancers arise due to improper handling of the intracellular protein balance. Faulty proteins cause "accumulation" by sticking to each other and other proteins and therefore a cytotoxic effect, in other words, intracellular intoxication ensues.¹

For a cell to fulfill its functions in a healthy way, a broad and effective quality control network has to be in process at any given time. For this, faulty proteins should be collected and immediately removed from the cell. For this purpose, chaperon molecules and protein breakdown mechanisms that work in combination with each other have to be on continuous duty.

While chaperons enable folding, they also play a role in repair and maintenance tasks. They inspect other proteins for errors in quality. When they identify a misfolded broken protein, they engage the protein-breakdown mechanism. This is the **ubiquitin-proteasome** (protein degradation) system.

Protein breakdown is an annihilation process kept under tight control through consecutive steps. In addition to chaperons, **Doa10** ligase enzyme was discovered to also detect faulty proteins.² When a Doa10 enzyme detects a faulty protein, it marks that protein with the **ubiquitin** molecule. However, when generating the degradation signal, **Ubc6** enzyme first has to attach the ubiquitin molecule to the faulty protein. Following this initial step, another enzyme, **Ubc7** steps in and forms a homogeneous chain consisting of many ubiquitin molecules. Once the chain is completed, the annihilation process begins. As it is seen, two separate enzymes are needed for the breakdown signal to be triggered.²

At this phase, **proteasome**, which consists of 33 subunits and two sub-complexes, detects the ubiquitin and breaks the marked protein's peptide bonds. The faulty protein has now been separated into its amino acids.

When we consider the fact that 30% of the proteins produced within the cell are defected, we can understand how vital a role this garbage disposal system plays. Faulty production aside, in time, all properly functioning proteins wear down and are replaced by new ones and that means proteins, which have reached the end of their lifespan, are likewise marked and annihilated.

Each detail in our body is an indication of a magnificent creation

If it were not for this precise control system, we could never speak of cellular health at all. This vital balance system has to function with the same perfection inside each one of the almost 100 trillion cells that constitute human body, which can only be explained by a superior management and coordination.

Proteins overseeing other proteins, molecules acting systematically in a specific order as well as the degradation system being activated only when and where it is needed, can be explained neither with coincidences nor other idle reasoning.

It is obvious that the absence of even one step in this process would lead to the cell's death. There should be no deficiency in the entire system and all should be working in coordination at the same time. This evidently guides us to the truth that there is only a single "Power" Who has knowledge of all things and created life and all living things. The Owner of this marvelous and breathtaking Power is Almighty God, Who knows and has dominion over all things in the heavens and the earth.

1. In vivo aspects of protein folding and quality control, David Balchin, Manajit Hayer-Hartl and F. Ulrich Hartl (June 30, 2016) *Science* 353 (6294), [doi: 10.1126/science.aac4354]
2. Sequential Poly-ubiquitylation by Specialized Conjugating Enzymes Expands the Versatility of a Quality Control Ubiquitin Ligase. Annika Weber et al, *Molecular Cell* 63. DOI: 10.1016/j.molcel.2016.07.020

Neo-Darwinism and Mutation Impasse

All mutations have always proved to be harmful for human beings as well as all other living things. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, evolutionary biologists have sought examples of beneficial mutations by creating mutant flies. But these efforts have always resulted in sick and deformed creatures. This fact is a great impasse in terms of Darwinist claims.

In order to find a solution, Darwinists advanced the "Modern Synthetic Theory," or as it is more commonly known, Neo-Darwinism, at the end of the 1930s. Neo-Darwinism added mutations, which are distortions formed in the genes of living beings due to such external factors as radiation or replication errors, as the "cause of favorable variations" in addition to natural mutation.

Today, the model that Darwinists espouse, despite their own awareness of its scientific invalidity, is neo-Darwinism. The theory maintains that millions of living beings formed as a result of a process whereby numerous complex organs of these organisms (e.g., ears, eyes, lungs, and wings) underwent "mutations," that is, genetic disorders. Yet, there is an outright scientific fact that totally undermines this theory: Mutations do not cause living beings to develop; on the contrary, they are always harmful.

The reason for this is very simple: DNA has a very complex structure, and random effects can only harm it. The American geneticist B. G. Ranganathan explains this as follows:

First, genuine mutations are very rare in nature. Secondly, most mutations are harmful since they are random, rather than orderly changes in the structure of genes; any random change in a highly ordered system will be for the worse, not for the better. For example, if an earthquake were to shake a highly ordered structure such as a building, there would be a random change in the framework of the building which, in all probability, would not be an improvement. (B. G. Ranganathan, *Origins?*, Pennsylvania: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1988, p. 7)

Not surprisingly, no mutation example, which is useful, that is, which is observed to develop the genetic code, has been observed so far. All mutations have proved to be harmful. It was understood that mutation, which is presented as an "evolutionary mechanism," is actually a genetic occurrence that harms living things, and leaves them disabled. (The most common effect of mutation on human beings is cancer.) Of course, a destructive mechanism cannot be an "evolutionary mechanism." Natural selection, on the other hand, "can do nothing by itself," as Darwin also accepted. This fact shows us that there is no "evolutionary mechanism" in nature. Since no evolutionary mechanism exists, no such imaginary process called "evolution" could have taken place.

The Speciation Deception

Evolutionists maintain that the first single-celled organism emerged billions of years ago from inorganic substances, and that the glorious diversity of life on Earth, emerged over the course of hundreds of millions of years. Note that according to the Darwinist claim, millions of species formed from one single species under the influence of natural processes and coincidence. As this irrational and unscientific claim shows, the formation of species—that is, speciation—represents the basis of the theory of evolution. It is particularly clear that a claim not based on concrete evidence, observations and scientific research is of no value at all. Darwinism's claim that one species turned into millions of other species is a huge one that requires countless amounts of evidence and findings. In fact, though, there is not a single piece of scientific evidence for evolutionists' claims regarding speciation ever since the time of Darwin, evolutionists have produced a conceptual confusion and depict variations as evidence for speciation.

First let's consider the concept of species to get a better understanding of the evolutionist deception. Descriptions have been produced by various experts from different biological fields. As put by Troy Wood and Loren Rieseberg of Indiana University, "Evolutionary biologists have proposed a diverse, almost innumerable list of species concepts..."¹

Biologist John Endler explains the complication as follows:

Species are "tools that are fashioned for characterizing organic diversity" (Lewin,1979). Just as there are a variety of chisels made for different purposes, different species concepts are best for different purposes; and just as it is inadvisable to use a carving chisel to cut a mortise, problems arise when one species concept is used when it is inappropriate. Confusion and controversy have often resulted because different people working with different groups of organisms mean different things by "species."²

Ali Demirsoy, one of Turkey's most prominent exponents of Darwinism, expresses the truth of the matter this way:

The question of by what bounds the species, the basic unit in the classification of plants and animals, should be separated from other species—in other words, "Species Definition"—is one of the most difficult for biology to answer. It appears impossible in the present state of our knowledge to give a definition of the species that applies to all plant and animal groups.³

Mention the word species, and most people will think of life forms such as dogs, horses, spiders, dolphins, wheat or apples. However, biologists define the concept of species in a rather different way. In modern-day biology, a living species in the most general sense consists of a population of individuals able to mate and reproduce with one another. This

definition divides life forms that we generally speak of as if they were one single species into a number of different ones. For example, some 34,000 species of spiders have been described.⁴

To better understand the evolution deception regarding speciation, we first need to define geographic isolation. Within any living species, there will be differences stemming from genetic variation. If geographical obstacles such as a mountain chain or river arise between individuals of a species, and if they become isolated from one another, then in all likelihood, within these two separated groups, different variations will begin to dominate.⁵ Assume that in one group (variation A), darker skin and longer fur begin to predominate; and that another group (variation B) has shorter fur and lighter color. The longer the two populations remain separated from one another, the sharper variations A and B will become.⁶ Variations like these, with clear morphological differences despite their belonging to the same species, are known as subspecies.

At this point, the speciation claim enters the picture. Sometimes, after variations A and B have split away from one another due to geographic isolation and are brought back together again, their members are unable to interbreed with one another. Since they cannot mate, they cease being subspecies, according to the biological definition, and become separate species. This is known as speciation.

Evolutionists take this concept and extrapolate it "Look! There is speciation in nature. In other words, new species emerge through natural mechanisms. So all species must have come into being in this same way."

In fact, however, a serious deception is being perpetrated here, because important points are being overlooked or ignored:

1) Variations A and B, after being isolated from one another, may be unable to mate when reunited again. Yet this phenomenon generally stems from mating behavior. In other words, individuals belonging to variations A and B regard each other as foreigners by the other, and thus feel no inclination to mate with others that they perceive as different—even though there is no genetic incompatibility to prevent it. In terms of genetic information, they all remain members of the same species. (For this very reason, the concept of species remains a subject of debate in biology.)

2) The really important factor is that this speciation means a loss of genetic information, rather than an increase. The two variations have separated, but the reason for their division is not that either one has acquired any new genetic data. Neither variation has acquired any proteins or new enzymes, much less a new organ. There is no development here. On the contrary, instead of a previous population that contains different, possibly recessive, pieces of genetic information (using our example, a population with both long and short fur, and dark and light coloration), there are now two populations that is each relatively impoverished in terms of genetic data.

Therefore, nothing about speciation provides any support for the theory of evolution. Because it claims that all living species developed by chance, from the simple to the more complex, therefore, in order for the theory of evolution to be taken seriously, it needs to demonstrate mechanisms that can increase genetic information. The bifurcation of an existing species because of a loss of genetic variation, obviously, a different phenomenon entirely.

Evolutionists actually admit this lack of relevance. For that reason, evolutionists describe examples of variations within a species, and speciation by division into two populations (as you saw in the previous section) in their own way as micro-evolution—in the sense of variation

within a species that already exists. However, the use of the word "evolution" in the term is deliberately misleading, because no evolutionary process is happening at all. The situation consists of only various combinations and distributions of genetic information already existing in that species' gene pool.

Then how did living types first emerge? How did the five kingdoms—monera, protista, fungus, plant and animal—emerge on Earth? How did the higher categories—the phyla, classes, orders, families; and for that matter, such basic categories as mammals, birds, vertebrates and crustaceans—first appear? These are the questions that evolutionists need to address.

As already stated, evolutionists refer to these subjects as macro-evolution, which is actually what they mean by the theory of evolution, because the genetic variations that Darwinists insist on calling "micro-evolution" are biological phenomena that everyone can observe and agree on. And no matter how much evolutionists employ the term evolution in describing such phenomena, they actually have nothing to do with evolution at all. On the other hand, the macro-evolution claim, has no supporting evidence, either in biological observations or in the fossil record.

People lacking sufficient information on the subject may well fall into the error of thinking with the assumption that "Since micro-evolution takes place in a very short space of time, macro-evolution could take place over tens of millions of years." Some evolutionists fall into the exact same error or seek to make use of it to convince others of the truth of their theory. All the so-called proofs of evolution proposed by Charles Darwin in *The Origin of Species* are of that kind, as are the examples put forward by later evolutionists. In their examples, they seek to use as evidence for their theory the genetic variety that they describe as micro-evolution but which actually has nothing at all to do with what they describe as macro-evolution.

Despite all this discussion of micro- and macro-evolution and speciation, living things appeared on Earth as types with their own different structures (as is confirmed by the fossil record). Different variations and subspecies may appear within them, thanks to the richness of their gene pools. For example, there are rabbits that exhibit variations such as white fur, grey fur, longer or shorter ears, and these variations become more pronounced in a given environment, depending on which natural conditions support them most appropriately. But species never turn into other species. There is no natural mechanism that can effect this, that can design new types and develop the new organs, systems and body plans they require. Every species has been created with its own unique structures. And since God has created every one of them with a potential for variety, a wide but finite variation often emerges within each type.

- 1- Troy E. Wood, Loren H. Rieseberg, "Speciation: Introduction", *Encyclopedia of Life Sciences*, 1999.
- 2- J.A. Endler, "Conceptual and Other Problems in Speciation", p. 625, D. Otte, J.A. Endler (editors), *Speciation and Its Consequences*, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts, 1989.
- 3- Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Yaşamın Temel Kuralları*, vol. 1, November 1, 11th issue, Meteksan Yayınları, Ankara, 1998, p. 624.
- 4- M. Encarta Encyclopedia 2001 Deluxe Edition CD, "Spider (arthropod)".
- 5- Timothy A. Mousseau, Alexander E. Olvido, "Geographical Variation", *Encyclopedia of Life Sciences*, 2000.
- 6- D.H. Erwin, "Macroevolution is more than repeated rounds of microevolution", *Evolution & Development*, Vol. 2, 2000, p. 78-84.

The Micro and Macro Evolution Errors of Darwinists

Variation does not constitute evidence for evolution because variations are but the outcomes of different combinations of already existing genetic information and they do not add any new characteristic to the genetic information. The science of genetics has revealed that the variations that Darwin imagined accounted for the origin of species in fact bear no such significance.

Therefore, evolutionist biologists have been forced to distinguish between variation within species and the formation of new species, and to advance two separate concepts regarding them. Up to their claims, they gave the name micro-evolution to variation within species, and defined the formation of entirely new species as macro-evolution.

The concept of macro-evolution was first used in 1927 by the Russian biologist Juri'i Filipchenko.¹ The idea that micro-evolution could be used as evidence for macro-evolution was proposed by a student of Filipchenko's, Theodosius Dobzhansky, in the 1930s. In his book *Genetics and The Origin of Species*, one of the basic texts of Darwinism, Dobzhansky suggested that the mechanisms of micro- and macro-evolution were the one and the same.² This view received wide acceptance from evolutionist circles and has survived down to the present day. Richard Goldschmidt, a Berkeley University geneticist during those years, expressed the erroneous nature of this view:

"The facts of microevolution do not suffice for an understanding of macroevolution."³

In fact, what Goldschmidt referred to as micro-evolution was nothing more than variations within species.

These two concepts have long appeared in biology textbooks, where a deceptive style is often used. The examples of variation that evolutionist biologists describe as micro-evolution actually have nothing whatsoever to do with the theory of evolution. That's because the theory of evolution maintains that living things can acquire new genetic information through the mechanisms of mutation and natural selection. But as we have already seen, variations can never give rise to any new genetic information and therefore, cannot lead to evolution. Referring to variations as micro-evolution reflects an ideological preference on the part of evolutionist biologists.

The variations that Darwinists deliberately refer to as micro-evolution are a simple biological phenomenon, examples of which we encounter frequently in daily life. Think of all the varieties of cats, dogs, apples, tomatoes, plants and animals you have ever seen. Macro-evolution, on the other hand, refers to major changes such as that of a dinosaur into a bird, or a bear into a whale. In other words, there is no difference between the claims of macro-evolution and fairy tales in which a frog transforms into a prince.

By using the concept of macro-evolution, evolutionist biologists seek to give the impression that is variations can give rise to brand new living species—and even genera—over the course of time. Indeed, many people who lack a sound knowledge of the subject are taken in by the superficial idea that micro-evolution can become macro-evolution in the long term. One can see many examples of this thinking. Some amateur evolutionists suggest that since the average height of human beings has increased by 2 centimeters (0.78 of an inch) over just the last century, that means that all kinds of evolution can occur over millions of

years. But the fact is, as we have already seen, all variations such as increases in stature take place within specific genetic bounds and have nothing to do with evolution.

We frequently see examples of biological variations in our daily lives. All such instances of variations are simply fluctuations that occur within specific genetic bounds and that have nothing at all to do with evolution.

In fact, even contemporary evolutionist authorities accept that the variations described as micro-evolution cannot give rise to new living classes, or lead to macro-evolution. In a 1996 paper published in the journal *Developmental Biology*, the evolutionist biologists Scott Gilbert, John Opitz and Rudolf Raff stated that:

The Modern Synthesis is a remarkable achievement. However, starting in the 1970s, many biologists began questioning its adequacy in explaining evolution. Genetics might be adequate for explaining microevolution, but micro-evolutionary changes in gene frequency were not seen as able to turn a reptile into a mammal or to convert a fish into an amphibian. Microevolution looks at adaptations that concern only the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fittest. As Goodwin (1995) points out⁴, "the origin of species—Darwin's problem—remains unsolved."⁵

That the variations falsely alleged as micro-evolution cannot account for the claim of macro-evolution, and cannot explain the origin of species, is also admitted by other evolutionist biologists. The well-known evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin set out his conclusion at a four-day symposium attended by 150 evolutionists at the Chicago Museum of Natural History in November 1980:

The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution ... The answer can be given as a clear, No.⁶

The evolutionist biologists Fagerstrom, Schuster and Szathmary stated the same thing in an article published in *Science* magazine in 1996:

Major transitions in evolution—such as the origin of life, the emergence of eukaryotic cells, and the origin of the human capacity for language, to name but a few—could not be farther away from an equilibrium. Also, they cannot be described satisfactorily by established models of microevolution⁷

Other scientists, however, are aware that such a claim totally conflicts with the picture revealed by scientific findings and the fossil record. Douglas Erwin, from the American Museum of Natural History emphasized this in a paper that appeared in the journal *Evolution and Development* in 2000.⁸ According to the American biologists Douglas Erwin and James Valentine, to account for the origin of new physical characteristics with micro-evolutionary changes that are in fact nothing more than variations within species is incompatible with the available evidence.⁹

The fact is, macro-evolution has never been observed. There is no explanation compatible with reason, logic and science as to how this might take place. Professor of Microbiology Carl Woese expresses his view on the subject: "[T]he term 'macroevolution' serves more to hide our ignorance than symbolize our understanding."¹⁰

Consider the subjects depicted by evolutionists as concrete and observed instances of Darwinism, which they put forward at every opportunity as fundamental proofs of evolution. The Galapagos finches, the Industrial Revolution moths, bacterial resistance to antibiotics, and insects' resistance to DDT immediately come to mind, but it is absolutely misleading to

portray these as evidence of evolution. These cases are cases of variations that present no evidence for evolution.

- 1- Hilary p. CGodan, "Microevolution and Macroevolution: Introduction", Encyclopedia of Life Sciences, 2001, g.els.net.
- 2- Theodosius Dobzhansky, Genetics and the Origin of Species, Columbia University Press, New York, 1937.
- 3- Richard B. Goldschmidt, The Material Basis of Evolution, New Haven Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1940, p. 8.
- 4- Brian Goodwin, "Neo-Darwinism has failed as an evolutionary theory", The Times Higher Education Supplement, 19 May 1995.
- 5- Scott Gilbert, John Opitz, Rudolf Raff, "Resynthesizing Evolutionary and Developmental Biology", Developmental Biology 173, Article No. 0032, 1996, p. 361.
- 6- R. Lewin, "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire", Science, vol. 210, 21 November 1980, p. 883.
- 7 T. Fagerstrom, P. Jagers, P. Schuster, E. Szathmary, "Biologists put on mathematical glasses", Science, vol. 274, 20 Aralık 1996, p. 2039-2040.
- 8- D.H. Erwin, "Macroevolution is more than repeated rounds of microevolution", Evolution & Development, Vol. 2, 2000, p. 78-84.
- 9- J.W. Valentine, D.H. Erwin, "Interpreting Great Developmental Experiments: The Fossil Record", p. 95, R.A. Raff, E.C. Raff (editors), Development as an Evolutionary Process, Alan R. Liss, Inc., New York, 1987.
- 10- C.R. Woese, "Macroevolution in the microscopic world", C. Patterson (editor), Molecules and Morphology in Evolution, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

The Whale Tale from Evolutionists

One of the curious evolutionary fables is the one about the "evolution of whale" that was published in *National Geographic*, widely respected as one of the most scientific and serious publications in the world:

*The Whale's ascendancy to sovereign size apparently began sixty million years ago when hairy, four-legged mammals, in search of food or sanctuary, ventured into water. As eons passed, changes slowly occurred. Hind legs disappeared, front legs changed into flippers, hair gave way to a thick smooth blanket of blubber, nostrils moved to the top of the head, the tail broadened into flukes, and in the buoyant water world the body became enormous.*¹

Besides the fact that there is not a single scientific basis for any of this, such an occurrence is also contrary to the principles of nature. This fable published in *National Geographic* is noteworthy for being indicative of the extent of the fallacies of seemingly serious evolutionist publications.

- 1- Victor B. Scheffer, "Exploring the Lives of Whales", National Geographic, vol. 50, December 1976, p. 752

Dr. Jeff Zweerink's presentation: "The Beginning and Design of the Universe"

It's good to be here today...

Listened to a lot of cosmologist talk and there's a very prominent cosmologist; atheist cosmologist named Lawrence Krauss; and he's fond of making statements like this:

"The amazing thing is that every atom in your body came from a star that exploded. And, the atoms in your left-hand probably came from a different star than your right hand. It is really the most poetic thing I know about physics: you are all stardust. You couldn't be here if stars hadn't exploded, because the elements – the carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, iron, and all the things that matter for evolution – weren't created at the beginning of time. They were created in the nuclear furnaces of stars, and the only way they could get into your body is if those stars were kind enough to explode... The stars died so you could be here today." (Lawrence M. Krauss, A Universe from Nothing: Why There Is Something Rather Than Nothing)

Now, obviously Lawrence Krauss's statements are specifically antagonizing Christians, but I think his statements are actually offensive to all forms of religion with a theistic worldview – those that argue for a God Who created the universe and all that it contains. Essentially Krauss argues that science can explain everything and therefore we don't need a god. As a Christian who is a scientist I actually find a different conclusion: A theistic worldview provides the best explanation of all our scientific understanding of the universe. Let me say that again: A theistic worldview provides the best explanation of our scientific understanding of the universe. So let me share the three most powerful examples that support my conclusion.

At the start of the 1900s scientists had an understanding of the universe characterized by three significant features. First, the universe was eternal and had existed forever. Second, the universe was static and unchanging on the largest scales. That doesn't mean that planets didn't orbit around stars but when you got out to big enough scales, the universe wasn't changing. And third, as one moved through the universe the laws of physics changed in subtle ways.

Now, before describing how scientific advances through the 20th century changed this picture, I want to contrast this early scientific view with the universe described by scripture. Starting in the very first book we see that God created the heavens and the earth. In this description, God brought the universe into existence out of nothing. You know in Genesis 1:1, *"In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth."* That word for created is to bring into existence out of nothing. This isn't that the universe existed and it was refashioned. God brought it completely into existence from nothing that existed before.

And this is an aspect that is very definitive about God being the Creator, the Fashioner Who brought everything into existence. If you look other places throughout the Bible

specifically, the Prophet Isaiah talks about: *"I am the Lord, the Maker of all things, Who stretches out the heavens, Who spreads out the earth by Myself."* (Isaiah 44:24)

And not only does this affirm this idea that God is the Creator of all things but it has this idea that the universe is also dynamic. That its being stretched out, or let's say its being expended if you will. And if you go look at other prophets, the Prophet Jeremiah talks about universe this way:

"This is what the Lord says: 'If I have not made My covenant with day and night and established the laws of heaven and earth.'" (Jeremiah 33:25)

It then goes on to say, if that's true if those fixed patterns are constant and the patterns of heaven and night are not constant then He's going to break His promises. And so God's reliability is likened to how reliable the Creation operates.

And so you see this big contrast between the universe described through the prophets and the Torah and the scientific understanding then. Scientific understanding is the universe was eternal, while the theistic understanding is that the universe was created and it had a beginning. The scientific understanding said the universe is static and unchanging. But in the in the religious books the universe is dynamic on the largest scales. And in the scientific view the laws of physics change as you move throughout the universe. And yet the theistic worldview talks about how the laws of physics were constant, that the fixed patterns of day and night.

What is it that governs how day and night happen in the fixed patterns of the heavens? That's nothing other than the laws of physics. And so at the start of the twentieth century science thought that the universe was eternal, static and unchanging and governed by changing laws of physics. And yet God had revealed a universe that began to exist, was dynamic and governed by constant laws of physics.

So let's take a look at some of the important discoveries throughout the twentieth century. Well, during the early 1900s, Albert Einstein recognized this scientific description of the day and that the laws of physics changed as your move throughout the universe. And philosophically he didn't like the idea. So he set about developing a model of the universe where the laws of physics were constant. In doing so he developed this theory of special relativity and theory of general relativity. And the key feature of these theories that the laws of physics are constant, regardless of how you're moving or where you're located in the universe. Now I can tell you this, throughout the twentieth century scientists have thrown numerous experimental test to the theory of general relativity, to see if it's true or not and it has passed every one of those tests with flying colors. It is one of the best-established and best accepted scientific theories known today.

One of the consequences of the theory of general relativity is that when you solve the equations, the universe ought to be dynamic either expanding or contracting. Initially Einstein didn't like this idea, but re-measurements in the 1920 and 1930 showed that the universe is indeed expanding. Edwin Hubble looking out at these fuzzy blobs, they were called island universes at the time, we now call them galaxies; found that these galaxies behaved in a very peculiar fashion. The farther away a galaxy was, the faster it was moving away from us. This is a telltale signature of an expanding universe. And so general relativity predicted a dynamic or expanding universe. And the measurements of these distant galaxies showed that the universe was expanding and if it's expanding perhaps if you run time backwards there was a beginning.

Now scientists resisted this idea for quite some time and in fact they still resist it today. And they look for numerous ways to have an eternal universe, one that it existed forever. But in the 1960, with the measurement of the cosmic microwave background radiation, Stephen Hawking and Roger Penrose and other scientists were able to show or develop some very powerful theorems. And these theorems showed that if general relativity is true and accurately describes the dynamics of the universe -and it's passed every test we've thrown at it- so all scientists believe this is the case. And, if the universe contains mass and we're pretty much guarantee that it is correct, then you can draw the conclusion that when you run time backwards, the universe has a boundary. Now stated another way the universe began to exist.

So in spite of the scientific view of the universe at the beginning, looking very different from the theistic worldview, significant and important discoveries throughout the twentieth century have demonstrated that we live in a universe that began to exist. The universe is expanding and the universe is governed by constant laws of physics. These three features our essential features of all Big Bang models. So what we see is that in other words the universe that God revealed to us through the Holy Books matches the universe we see when we study Creation.

Now in recent years scientists have proposed multiverse models where our universe is one of the great ensemble of universes. And this seems to challenge the notion of a beginning. In fact the first time I encountered this idea of a multiverse that was the challenge this guy was saying, 'our universe may have had a beginning but if the multiverse exist is that really have a beginning or not.' But I spent a lot of time studying the multiverse and what I know is this is that even if an inflationary multiverse exists, it's still affirms the conclusion that the universe began to exist. Even the multiverse has a beginning.

Now this first piece of scientific evidence that we live in a big bang universe that began to exist, that it is expanding and is governed by constant laws of physics. This conclusion supports the Kalam cosmological argument. And that argument and syllogism form basically says whatever begins to exist has a cause. The universe begins to exist. Therefore the universe must have a cause. Something outside the universe brought it into existence. Seems very consistent with the idea that there is a God who created the universe. So let's turn to the second piece of evidence. The second piece of evidence that points to the existence of a Creator, relates to the pervasive evidence of design and the universe.

Consider what it takes for humanity to live. I can count at least three things. First you got to have diamonds. No, I'm joking. You don't need diamonds but you need carbon, this was just the best picture of carbon that I could find. You need to have carbon. Second, you need to have water, since water is the liquid that allows all the biochemistry that life requires to take place. And third you need to have a planet where liquid water could exist in its liquid form with an abundance of carbon. Now as scientists try to understand how the universe is supportive of life, many come to the conclusion that the universe looks designed to support life. Let me share a couple of quotes by people who are self-professed atheists and agnostics. These are not people, religious people who are looking for God but this is what they have to say.

Fred Hoyle stated,

"A common sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super intellect has monkeyed with physics, as well as with chemistry and biology... the numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost

beyond question.” (Fred Hoyle, "The Universe: Past and Present Reflections", Engineering and Science, November, 1981. pp. 8–12)

Roger Penrose, colleague of Stephen Hawking, goes on to say, *“I would say the universe has a purpose. It’s not there just somehow by chance.”* (See A Brief History of Time (1991) film script - springfieldspringfield.co.uk) It is uncontroversial to say that the best scientific evidence indicates that the universe appears designed for life, and we see evidence for that design across the scientific disciplines.

Let's take a look at some of those areas where the universe looks designed to support life. We live in a universe with three large spatial dimensions of one time dimension. But we can analyze what would happen if the universe were different if it had two or one spatial dimensions. Three, four, five spatial dimensions. Multiple time dimensions. We can ask that question: So what happens if there were only two spatial dimensions? As it turns out if there were two or less spatial dimensions the universe is not complicated enough for life. Imagine an animal in two dimensions. If the animal has a passage for food intake, and a different passage to expel the waste, in two dimensions such passages would cut the animal in half. Now you might say well, you know maybe the food came back out the same way, but it misses the key point. In two dimensions there are not enough connections to be made for the complexity that life requires. It's not just about whether the food has to come out the same way it came in. It's actually far more fundamental.

So perhaps if one or two dimensions is too simple maybe if we had more spatial dimensions. That's better, would that adds to the complexity? And it turns out that that's not correct. If you go to four or five or more dimensions, it turns out that there are no stable orbits. Now this means two things, with more spatial dimensions, atoms are not stable. So the carbon and the nitrogen and the oxygen in the life requires wouldn't exist. And planets are not stable they cannot form stable orbits around stars, they either spiral very rapidly into the star or they spiral away from the star. And so you miss two of the key requirements for life if you have more than three spatial dimensions. You don't have the atoms that life requires and you don't have the planets that life requires.

Changing the number of time dimensions makes things even worse. Now, so if you look at this diagram here just as you change, the number of time dimensions you get into a lot of these places where physics is unpredictable. Now you may say, well I don't know how to do physics why is it necessary for it to be predictable? Again it turns out to be a more foundational principle than that. Because if physics isn't predictable what that means is that measurements of what goes on right now, tell you nothing about what's happened in the past and will give you no insight as to what will go on in the future. So organisms that sense the environment and say there's food there and there's danger there, if physics is unpredictable, that's impossible. And so again the key features that life requires do not exist in any kind of universe except for a universe with three large spatial dimensions, and one time dimension.

So now let's turn our attention to the laws of physics. Particularly let's look at how carbon, oxygen and nitrogen exist in the universe. To do that we got a look a little bit about how the universe has developed over time. So in Big Bang cosmology, after the first few minutes the only elements that exist in the universe are hydrogen and helium. There are small amounts of lithium and beryllium but for all intents and purposes you can ignore that. All the elements heavier than this, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, those are formed in the hearts of stars. So Lawrence Krauss is very much right, the carbon and nitrogen and oxygen in our bodies, is the dust left over from stars, so we are made up of stardust. But as scientists have studied how well stars produced the carbon and the oxygen, they found huge deficiencies in how much

they expected to be produced and how much was necessary for life to exist. Unless some remarkable coincidences were true.

In particular, the difficulty of producing carbon is that three helium nuclei have to come together to make carbon. So carbon has six protons and six neutrons, each helium has two protons and two neutrons. To get helium to come together to form carbon you have to have three of them come together at the same time. And because it's three of them coming together at the same time that's an incredibly slow reaction. However as scientists look more closely they recognize two important factors that allow the formation of carbon. First when two helium atoms come together, they can actually form a beryllium-8 nucleus. Two of them stick together, now that beryllium-8 nucleus is not actually stable. So it doesn't stick around for a long time. But it does stick around for a while. What that means is that in order for carbon to be made now another helium just has to come and hit that beryllium nucleus. That's a 2-body reaction that proceeds much more rapidly. So in order to form carbon this beryllium-8 nucleus speeds up the reaction considerably.

However even with this metastable beryllium-8 nucleus, stars would not produce enough carbon. Something else was missing. It's when scientists working on the problem recognized a solution that would produce carbon rapidly enough. If carbon had a particular energy level just above its ground state, so if this is its ground state they had energy level just a little bit higher, then the reaction would proceed much more rapidly. Now, this energy level was unknown at the time. But scientists subsequently studied this prediction made by Fred Hoyle and found that it indeed existed. And so without this stable brilliant eight nucleus and a finely tuned energy level for carbon the universe would produce insufficient carbon. Yet in order for the universe to contain sufficient carbon one more coincidence was necessary.

So if you take carbon and add one more helium nucleus to it it'll make oxygen. If oxygen had the same kind of energy state where here's oxygen and its ground state and there's this energy level right above then all of the carbon would have been converted into oxygen and again you end up with the universe with no carbon. And it turns out that the oxygen energy level was just below its ground state. And so therefore it doesn't exist. And so what you end up with is three coincidences. The beryllium eight is just stable enough it's not stable for a long time, that would use up all the helium. But it's stable enough that another helium can come in. And carbon has just the right energy level so that reaction proceeds rapidly and oxygen doesn't have that level so it doesn't proceed very rapidly at all.

And all three of those put together those amazing coincidences allow universe with lots of carbon in oxygen in it. In fact Fred Hoyle was the scientist who did a lot of the work discovering this. And his quote that I put up earlier about how a super intellect has monkeyed with physics as well as with chemistry and biology, was in response to recognizing these three amazing coincidences. Now I use the term coincidences. But I really think that the universe is designed to produce the carbon and oxygen the life requires.

So let's turn our attention to similar design features that also enable the universe to have the necessary hydrogen for life. And again to consider what happens in the early moments of the universe, there is only hydrogen and helium. But in those first few moments the universe is hot enough that hydrogen can come together and make helium. And it just adds one more proton or neutron and it eventually builds it up. And it turns out that hydrogen has one proton, there's a form of hydrogen with 1 proton and 1 neutron 1 proton or 3 neutrons. You can have a couple of different forms of helium that have up to 4 of your 2 protons and 2 neutrons. And it turns out that there is not an atom with this that has 5 where you add protons and neutrons and get to 5. Because if there were in those earliest moments of the

universe all of the hydrogen would have been fused into these heavier elements. Like there's not a 5-nucleon element and there's not an 8-nucleon element. And because of that most of the hydrogen is left in the universe it only at 75 percent of the atoms in the universe are hydrogen. If there were a 5-nucleon atom or a 8-nucleon on atom, all of the hydrogen would have been fused into something else. And with no hydrogen, you get no water.

So if we take a look at how the strong nuclear interaction, that's what determines how protons and neutrons join together. And the electromagnetic that's what determines how charges interact. You can make a diagram and don't get hung up on all the details of the diagram I just want you to notice this. If you ask the question, "Where do all the conditions necessary for life to exist in the universe all meet?" It turns out if you're down here, carbon is unstable clearly that's not sufficient for one. Up here you only have atoms that move close to the speed of light. Really not conducive to life. Up here all of the protons would be joined together and you would have no hydrogen left. It turns out that when you do all of the calculations the only place where all the conditions for life is matter this little teeny tiny region. Of all the different ways we could envision the laws of physics being put together, only a small range allows the elements that life requires. And so this really looks like we live in a universe that is designed to support life. And this points to design and that there is a Creator who fashion the universe for a purpose.

So let's look a little closer to home. We see evidence of design in the moon that orbits the earth. Not only is it pretty to look at during the night, but it actually is important. Now Jupiter and Saturn both have satellites that are larger than Earth's moon. But when compared to the size of its host planet, earth's moon is in a class by itself. The large size of the moon plays an important role in Earth's capacity to support life. The moon stabilizes the rotation axis. Earth rotates around an axis. And the moon stabilizes that rotation axis, so it doesn't flip around. Without such a large moon, the Earth's rotation axis would wobble in that would cause catastrophic and violent changes to the Earth's climate. The moon prevents this wobble and the earth is maintained a climate conducive to life for billions of years. Perhaps more importantly the size of the moon also provides the critical heat that enables the planet to have tectonic activity.

We think of earthquakes and volcanoes are bad, but they're just evidence of this tectonic activity that is crucial for regulating the climate of the earth as well as building the continents where the bulk of life live. And the gravitational tug of the sun and the moon and the Earth, heats up Earth's interior causing it to flex and stretch and compress. And this heat drives the plate tectonics on Earth's surface. As scientists seek to understand how the Earth acquired such a large moon they recognize that it took a remarkable collision early in Earth's history. This collision needed to happen at just the right speed, at just the right time, at just the right angle and with just the right sized object. It really is an unusual collision. The moon looks designed so that Earth can support life. And it also looks like the Earth is just the right size so the tectonic activity is not too large or too small. If it were larger the plates would be too thick and the tectonic activity would be too small. If it were any small tectonic plates would be much thinner and the tectonic activity would be too great. We live on a planet with just the right size so that the tectonic activity is just right.

I want to mention one more piece of evidence for design, that we see when we look inside the cell. When we study the genetic code we see that it's made up of four compounds represented by the letters U, C, G and A. I'm not going to go into all the details of that. I'm going to look at it from a computer-programming standpoint. So these letters come in groups of three that specify the production of amino acids. The sequence of 3 letters where each letter has 4 options means that there are 64 different possibilities, so $4 \times 4 \times 4$. But they are

only 20 different amino acids involved in life so this means that different combinations of three will produce the same amino acids. You know and so if you look here there are different combinations and you can have two different ones produce phenylalanine, there's leucine, and you can see that there is some redundancy there. Different combinations of letters still produce the same amino acid. To go on further, the amino acid sequences determine how proteins will fold. And sometimes, different amino acids will still produce the same protein folding.

And so that's really kind of the big thing, "do we get the right protein folding?" And so scientists can then ask the question "how well does this genetic code ensure that proteins fold and function properly even with mutations of these specific letters?" because we live in an environment where mutations are going to happen. So given that mutations are going to happen, how well does this code do what it is supposed to do? All right, the short answer is this; our genetic code is one in a million. If you ask how many different ways could you produce a genetic code, that corrects errors, this is one in a million and its ability to correct errors. Not only that it's it can carry multiple layers of code as well and I know from a computer-programming standpoint, error correcting in a code is incredibly important. Especially when you're carrying multiple lines of code that's very sophisticated programming and that looks like it's designed.

So I am just kind of reminded of Francis Crick statement: *"Biologists must constantly keep in mind that what they see was not designed but rather evolved."* I guess I disagree, when scientists look at the universe they see evidence of fine-tuning and design. We see fine-tuning in the fabric of space, in the form of the strength of the laws of physics and the size of the moon, the genetic code and many others that are not mentioned. It seems to me more reasonable to conclude that where we see a design, a "Designer" exists. And that a "Designer" created the universe to support humanity.

Now. Third point is that the laws of earth, when you look at the requirements for science. There are philosophical assumptions you have to make. And you have to ask the question, "What worldview anchors all of those assumptions?" And I'm just going to go through them rapidly, but the bottom line is going to be this: I have looked at the Christian faith, I know that it anchors all of these presuppositions that you have to do for doing science. And so anybody who wants to say, "Oh, science supports my worldview" has to ask the question: *"Does your worldview anchor all the necessary presuppositions for science?"*

The laws of physics must be uniform throughout the physical universe. The physical universe is a distinct objective reality. Not something that's just an illusion. The laws of nature exhibit order patterns and regularity. I think of Greek mythology where Zeus gets upset and throws up lightning bolts, that's not real conducive to science developing. The physical universe must be intelligible. The world is an object of rational study because it's not divine and therefore not an object to worship. The world is good and valuable and worthy of study. I remember reading about Siddhartha Gautama and how genuine enlightenment came from being detached from the world. Well, if you want to be detached from the world, why would you want to study it to figure out how it works?

Now the free agency of a Creator necessitates empirical methods that God could have done things different and so we have to measure what He actually did. God encourages, in fact, tells us to take dominion over the natural world. That encourages and propels science. Intellectual virtues make science essentially the part of God's moral law. Perhaps most important is that humans possess an ability to discover the universe's intelligibility. I asked

the question does this make sense if atheism is true? I'm reminded of a quote by C.S. Lewis that I think summarizes it well.

*"If the solar system was brought about by an accidental collision, then the appearance of organic life on this planet was also an accident, and the whole evolution of man was an accident too. If so, then all our present thoughts are mere accidents - the accidental by-product of the movement of atoms. And this holds for the thoughts of the materialists and astronomers as well as for anyone else's. But if their thoughts - i.e., of Materialism and Astronomy - are merely accidental byproducts, why should we believe them to be true? I see no reason for believing that one accident should be able to give me a correct account of all the other accidents." (C.S. Lewis, *Essays on Theology and Ethics*, Cambridge, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970, p.41)*

If my brain is just an accident, why should it be able to describe the rest of the universe? Given these assumptions and philosophical presuppositions of the scientific enterprise one should ask the question: "What world view properly anchors these philosophical presuppositions?" A theistic worldview where God creates humanity with a purpose and a moral code and desire to worship and know God; that does anchor all those assumptions. I'm not saying that a scientist must be a theist to do science. But I am saying, that a scientist must adopt a worldview theistic for the scientific enterprise to progress consistently and do it over time.

So we live in a universe where the scientific description matches that revealed by God. We live in a universe that's designed to support life. And we live in a universe where a theistic worldview anchors all the presuppositions of science. To me that says the latest scientific evidence or our scientific understanding of the universe is best described or best accounted for, by a theistic worldview. That points to a God, Who created everything. Thank you very much.

The Expansion of Universe and the Discovery of the Big Bang

The 1920s were important years in the development of modern astronomy. In 1922, the Russian physicist Alexandra Friedman produced computations showing that the structure of the universe was not static and that even a tiny impulse might be sufficient to cause the whole structure to expand or contract according to Einstein's Theory of Relativity. George Lemaitre was the first to recognize what Friedman's work meant. Based on these computations, the Belgian astronomer Lemaitre declared that the universe had a beginning and that it was expanding as a result of something that had triggered it. He also stated that the rate of radiation could be used as a measure of the aftermath of that "something".

The theoretical musings of these two scientists did not attract much attention and probably would have been ignored except for new observational evidence that rocked the scientific world in 1929. That year the American astronomer Edwin Hubble, working at the California Mount Wilson observatory, made one of the most important discoveries in the history of astronomy. Observing a number of stars through his huge telescope, he discovered that their light was shifted towards the red end of the spectrum and, crucially, that this shift was directly related to the distance of the stars from Earth. This discovery shook the very basis of the universe model held until then.

According to the recognized rules of physics, the spectra of light beams travelling towards the point of observation tend towards violet while the spectra of light beams moving away from the point of observation tend towards red. (Just like the fading of a train's whistle as it moves away from the observer) Hubble's observation showed that according to this law, the heavenly bodies were moving away from us. Before long, Hubble made another important discovery; The stars weren't just racing away from Earth; they were racing away from each other as well. The only conclusion that could be derived from a universe where everything moves away from everything else is that the universe constantly "expands".

Hubble had found observational evidence for something that George Lemaitre had anticipated a short while ago and one of the most important minds of our age had recognized almost fifteen years earlier. In 1915, Albert Einstein had concluded that the universe could not be static because of calculations based on his recently-discovered theory of relativity (thus anticipating the conclusions of Friedman and Lemaitre). Shocked by his findings, Einstein added a "cosmological constant" to his equations in order to make the answer compatible with the atheist view, because astronomers assured him that the universe was static and there was no other way to make his equations match such a model. Years later, Einstein was to admit that his cosmological constant was the biggest mistake of his career.

Hubble's discovery that the universe was expanding led to the emergence of another model that needed no fiddling around with to make the equations work right. If the universe was getting bigger as time advanced, going back in time meant that it was getting smaller; and if one went back far enough, everything would shrink and converge at a single point.

The conclusion to be derived from this model was that at some time, all the matter in the universe was compacted in a single point-mass that had "zero volume" because of its immense gravitational force. Our universe came into being as the result of the explosion of this point-mass that had zero volume. This explosion has come to be called the "the Big Bang" and its existence has repeatedly been confirmed by observational evidence.

There was another truth that the Big Bang pointed to. To say that something has zero volume is tantamount to saying that it is "nothing". The whole universe was created from this "nothing". And furthermore this universe had a beginning, contrary to the view of materialism, which holds that "the universe has existed for eternity".

The Order in the Universe and Creation According to the Torah

The Creation of the Heavens and the Earth

- * In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Now the earth was form-less and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep... (Genesis, 1:1-2)
- * And God said, "Let there be an expanse between the waters to separate water from water." So God made the expanse and separated the water under the expanse from the water above it. And it was so. God called the expanse "sky"... (Genesis, 1:6-8)
- * ... When the Lord God made the earth and the heavens... (Genesis, 2:4-5)

- * You alone are the Lord. You made the heavens, even the highest heavens, and all their starry host, the earth and all that is on it, the seas and all that is in them... the multitudes of heaven worship You. (Nehemiah, 9:6)
- * And God said, "Let the water under the sky be gathered to one place, and let dry ground appear." And it was so. God called the dry ground "land," and the gathered waters He called "seas"... (Genesis, 1:9-10)
- * Thus the heavens and the earth were completed in all their vast array. (Genesis, 2:1)
- * Praise the Lord, O my soul. O Lord my God, You are very great; are clothed with splendor and majesty... He set the earth on its foundations; it can never be moved. (Psalms, 104:1, 5)

The Creation of Celestial Bodies

- * And God said, "Let there be lights in the expanse of the sky to separate the day from the night, and let them serve as signs to mark seasons and days and years, and let them be lights in the expanse of the sky to give light on the earth." And it was so. God made two great lights—the greater light to govern the day and the lesser light to govern the night. He also made the stars. God set them in the expanse of the sky to give light on the earth. (Genesis, 1:14-17)
- * O Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Your name in all the earth! You have set Your glory above the heavens... When I consider Your heavens... the Moon and the stars, which You have set in place, what is man...? (Psalms, 8:1-4)

The Creation of Night and Day

- * God called the light "day," and the darkness He called "night." And there was evening, and there was morning... (Genesis, 1:5)
- * As long as the earth endures, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night will never cease. (Genesis, 8:22)

The Creation of the Heavens Within an Order

- * This is what the Lord says, He Who appoints the Sun shine by day, Who decrees the Moon and stars to shine by night, stirs up the sea so that its waves roar—the Lord Almighty is His name... (Jeremiah, 31:35-36)
- * Lift your eyes and look to the heavens: Who created all these? He Who brings out the starry host one by one, and calls them each by name. Because of His great power and mighty strength, not one of them is missing. (Isaiah, 40:26)
- * Can you bring forth the constellations in their seasons or lead out the bear with its cubs? Do you know the laws of the heavens?... (Job, 38:32-33)

The Triumph of the Big Bang

In 1948, George Gamov carried George Lemaitre's calculations several steps further and came up with a new idea concerning the Big Bang. If the universe was formed in a sudden, cataclysmic explosion, there ought to be a definite amount of radiation left over from that explosion. This radiation should be detectable and, furthermore, it should be uniform throughout the universe.

Within two decades, observational proof of Gamov's conjecture was forthcoming. In 1965, two researchers by the name of Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson discovered a form of radiation hitherto unnoticed. Called "**cosmic background radiation**", it was unlike anything coming from anywhere else in the universe for it was extraordinarily uniform. It was neither localized nor did it have a definite source; instead, it was distributed equally everywhere. It was soon realized that this radiation was the echo of the Big Bang, still reverberating since the first moments of that great explosion. Gamov had been spot-on for the frequency of the radiation was nearly the same value that scientists had predicted it would be. Penzias and Wilson were awarded a Nobel prize for their discovery.

In 1989, George Smoot and his NASA team sent a satellite into space. Called the "Cosmic Background Emission Explorer" (COBE), it took only eight minutes for the sensitive instruments on board the satellite to detect and confirm the levels of radiation reported by Penzias and Wilson. These results conclusively demonstrated the existence of the hot, dense form remaining from the explosion out of which the universe came into being. Most scientists acknowledged that COBE had successfully captured the remnants of the Big Bang.

More evidence for the Big Bang was forthcoming. One piece had to do with the relative amounts of hydrogen and helium in the universe. Observations indicated that the mix of these two elements in the universe was in accord with theoretical calculations of what should have been remained after the Big Bang. That drove another stake into the heart of the steady state theory because if the universe had existed for eternity and never had a beginning, all of its hydrogen should have been burned into helium.

Confronted by such evidence, the Big Bang gained the near-complete approval of the scientific world. In an article in its October 1994 issue, Scientific American noted that the Big Bang model was the only one that could account for the constant expansion of the universe and for other observational results.

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:

There was at that time a somewhat acrimonious debate between some of the proponents of the steady state theory and observers who were testing it and, I think, hoping to disprove it. I played a very minor part at that time because I was a supporter of the steady state theory, not in the sense that I believed that it had to be true, but in that I found it so attractive I wanted it to be true. When hostile observational evidence became to come in, Fred Hoyle took a leading part in trying to counter this evidence, and I played a small part at the side, also making suggestions as to how the hostile evidence could be answered. But as that evidence piled up, it became more and more evident that the game was up, and that one had to abandon the steady state theory. (Stephen Hawking, Evreni Kucaklayan Karınca, 1993, p. 62-63)

Distinguishing Between Science and Materialism

The theory of evolution has no scientific basis, on the contrary, evolutionist claims conflict with scientific facts. In other words, the force that keeps evolution alive is not science. Evolution may be maintained by some "scientists," but behind it there is another influence at work.

This other influence is materialist philosophy. The theory of evolution is simply materialist philosophy applied to nature, and those who support that philosophy do so despite the scientific evidence.

This relationship between materialism and the theory of evolution is accepted by "authorities" on these concepts. For example, the discovery of Darwin was described by Leon Trotsky as "the highest triumph of the dialectic in the whole field of organic matter."¹ The evolutionary biologist Douglas Futuyma writes, *"Together with Marx's materialist theory of history and society.... Darwin hewed the final planks of the platform of mechanism and materialism."*² And the evolutionary paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould says, *"Darwin applied a consistent philosophy of materialism to his interpretation of nature."*³

Materialist philosophy is one of the oldest beliefs in the world, and assumes the absolute and exclusive existence of matter as its basic principle. According to this view, matter has always existed, and everything that exists consists of matter. Materialism denies the evident existence of a Creator.

So the question becomes one of why the materialist point of view is false. One method of testing whether a philosophy is true or false is to investigate the claims it makes about science by using scientific methods. For instance, a philosopher in the tenth century could have claimed that there was a divine tree on the surface of the moon and that all living things actually grew on the branches of this huge tree like fruit, and then fell off onto the earth. Some people might have found this philosophy attractive and believed in it. But in the twenty first century, at a time when man has managed to walk on the moon, it is no longer possible to seriously hold such a belief. Whether such a tree exists there or not can be determined by scientific methods, that is, by observation and experiment.

We can therefore investigate by means of scientific methods the materialist claim that matter has existed for all eternity and that this matter can organize itself without a supramaterial Creator and cause life to begin. When we do this, we see that materialism has already collapsed, because the idea that matter has existed since the beginning of time has been overthrown by the Big Bang theory which shows that the universe was created from nothingness. The claim that matter organized itself and created life is the claim that we call the theory of evolution—which this book has been examining—and which has been shown to have collapsed.

However, if someone is determined to believe in materialism and puts his devotion to materialist philosophy before everything else, then he will act differently. If he is a materialist first and a scientist second, he will not abandon materialism when he sees that evolution is disproved by science. On the contrary, he will attempt to uphold and defend materialism by trying to support evolution, no matter what. This is exactly the predicament that evolutionists defending the theory of evolution find themselves in today.

Interestingly enough, they also confess this fact from time to time. A well-known geneticist and outspoken evolutionist, Richard C. Lewontin from Harvard University, confesses that he is "a materialist first and a scientist second" in these words:

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]... .⁴

The term "a priori" that Lewontin uses here is quite important. This philosophical term refers to a presupposition not based on any experimental knowledge. A thought is "a priori" when you consider it to be correct and accept it as so even if there is no information available to confirm it. As the evolutionist Lewontin frankly states, materialism is an "a priori" commitment for evolutionists, who then try to adapt science to this preconception. Since materialism definitely necessitates denying the existence of a Creator, they embrace the only alternative they have to hand, which is the theory of evolution. It does not matter to such scientists that evolution has been belied by scientific facts, because they have accepted it "a priori" as true.

This prejudiced behavior leads evolutionists to a belief that "unconscious matter composed itself," which is contrary not only to science, but also to reason. The concept of "the self-organization of matter," which we examined in an earlier chapter, is an expression of this.

Evolutionist propaganda, which we constantly come across in the Western media and in well-known and "esteemed" science magazines, is the outcome of this ideological necessity. Since evolution is considered to be indispensable, it has been turned into a taboo subject by the circles that set the standards of science.

Some scientists find themselves in a position where they are forced to defend this far-fetched theory, or at least avoid uttering any word against it, in order to maintain their reputations. Academics in Western countries have to have articles published in certain scientific journals in order to attain and hold onto their professorships. All of the journals dealing with biology are under the control of evolutionists, and they do not allow any anti-evolutionist article to appear in them. Biologists, therefore, have to conduct their research under the domination of this theory. They, too, are part of the materialist order, which regards evolution as an ideological necessity, which is why they blindly defend all the "impossible coincidences" we have been examining in this book.

The Definition of the "Scientific Cause"

The German biologist Hoimar von Ditfurth, a prominent evolutionist, is a good example of this bigoted materialist understanding. After Ditfurth cites an example of the extremely complex composition of life, this is what he says concerning the question of whether it could have emerged by chance or not:

Is such a harmony that emerged only out of coincidences possible in reality? This is the basic question of the whole of biological evolution. ...Critically speaking, we can say that somebody who accepts the modern science of nature has no other alternative than to say "yes," because he aims to explain natural phenomena by means that are

*understandable and tries to derive them from the laws of nature without reverting to supernatural interference.*⁵

Yes, as Dittfurth states, the materialist scientific approach adopts as its basic principle explaining life by denying "supernatural interference," i.e., creation. Once this principle is adopted, even the most impossible scenarios are easily accepted. It is possible to find examples of this dogmatic mentality in almost all evolutionist literature. Professor Ali Demirsoy, the well-known advocate of evolutionary theory in Turkey, is just one of many. According to Demirsoy, the probability of the coincidental formation of cytochrome-C, an essential protein for life, is "as unlikely as the possibility of a monkey writing the history of humanity on a typewriter without making any mistakes."⁶

There is no doubt that to accept such a possibility is actually to reject the basic principles of reason and common sense. Even one single correctly formed letter written on a page makes it certain that it was written by a person. When one sees a book of world history, it becomes even more certain that the book has been written by an author. No logical person would agree that the letters in such a huge book could have been put together "by chance."

However, it is very interesting to see that the evolutionist scientist Professor Ali Demirsoy accepts this sort of irrational proposition:

*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.*⁷

Demirsoy writes that he prefers the impossible, in order not to have to accept supernatural forces—in other words, the existence of a Creator. However, the aim of science is not to avoid accepting the existence of supernatural forces. Science can get nowhere with such an aim. It should simply observe nature, free of all prejudices, and draw conclusions from these observations. If these results indicate that there is planning by a supernatural intelligence, which is the case in every corner of the universe, then science must accept the fact.

Under close examination, what they call the "scientific cause" is actually the materialist dogma that only matter exists and that all of nature can be explained by material processes. This is not a "scientific cause," or anything like it; it is just materialist philosophy. This philosophy hides behind such superficial words as "scientific cause" and obliges scientists to accept quite unscientific conclusions. Not surprisingly, when Demirsoy cites another subject—the origins of the mitochondria in the cell—he openly accepts chance as an explanation, even though it is "quite contrary to scientific thought":

*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 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.*⁸

The conclusion to be drawn from such pronouncements is that evolution is not a theory arrived at through scientific investigation. On the contrary, the form and substance of this theory were dictated by the requirements of materialistic philosophy. It then turned into a

belief or dogma in spite of concrete scientific facts. Again, from evolutionist literature, we can clearly see that all of this effort has a "purpose"—a purpose that requires maintaining, at no matter what cost, that living things were not created.

Coming to Terms with the Shocks

As we recently stressed, materialism is the belief that categorically rejects the existence of the nonmaterial (or the "supernatural"). Science, on the other hand, is under no obligation to accept such a dogma. The duty of science is to observe nature and produce results.

And science does reveal the fact that living things were created. This is something demonstrated by scientific discoveries. When we examine the fantastically complex structures in living things, we see that they possess such extraordinary features that they can never be accounted for by natural processes and coincidences. Every instance of extraordinary feature is evidence for an intelligence that brought it into being; therefore, we must conclude that life, too, was created by a power. This power belongs to a nonmaterial wisdom—the superior wisdom of the All-Powerful God, Who rules all of nature... In short, life and all living things were created. This is not a dogmatic belief like materialism, but a plain fact revealed by scientific observation and experiment.

We see that this fact comes as a terrible shock for scientists who are used to believing in materialism, and that materialism is a science. See how this shock is described by Michael Behe, one of the most important scientists to stand against the theory of evolution in the world today:

The resulting realization that life was designed by an intelligence is a shock to us in the twentieth century who have gotten used to thinking of life as the result of simple natural laws. But other centuries have had their shocks, and there is no reason to suppose that we should escape them.⁹

Mankind has been freed from such dogmas as that the world is flat, or that it is the center of the universe. And it is now being freed from the materialist and evolutionist dogma that life came about by itself.

The duty that befalls a true scientist in this respect, is to do away with materialist dogma and evaluate the origin of life and living things with the honesty and objectivity befitting a real scientist. A real scientist must come to terms with the "shock," and not tie himself to outdated nineteenth-century dogmas and defend impossible scenarios.

1- Alan Woods, Ted Grant. "Marxism and Darwinism", Reason in Revolt: Marxism and Modern Science, London: 1993

2- Douglas Futuyma, Evolutionary Biology, 2. Baskı, Sunderland, MA: Sinauer, 1986, s.3

3- Alan Woods, Ted Grant, "Marxism and Darwinism", Reason in Revolt: Marxism and Modern Science, London: 1993.

4- Richard Lewontin, "The Demon-Haunted World", The New York Review of Books, 9 Ocak, 1997, s. 28.

5- Hoimar Von Ditfurth, Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi, cilt 2, Çev. Veysel Atayman, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Alan Yayıncılık, Mart 1995, s. 64.

6- Prof. Ali Demirsoy, Kalıtım ve Evrim, Ankara: Meteksan Yayınları, 1984, s. 61.

7- Prof. Ali Demirsoy, Kalıtım ve Evrim, s. 61.

8- Prof. Ali Demirsoy, Kalıtım ve Evrim, s. 94.

9- Michael Behe, Darwin's Black Box, New York, The Free Press, 1996, s. 252-53

The Signs in the Qur'an in Regard to Creation of the Universe

In addition to explaining the universe, the Big Bang model has another important implication. As the quotation from Anthony Flew cited above points out, science has proven an assertion hitherto supported only by religious sources.

This truth is the reality of Creation from nothingness. This has been declared in the holy books that have served as guides for mankind for thousands of years.

In the only book revealed by God that has survived completely intact, the Qur'an, there are statements about the Creation of the universe from nothing as well as how this came about that are parallel to 20th-century knowledge and yet were revealed fourteen centuries ago.

First of all, the Creation of this universe from nothingness is revealed in the Qur'an as follows:

He (God) is the Originator of the heavens and the earth...(Surat al-An'am, 101)

Another important aspect revealed in the Qur'an fourteen centuries before the modern discovery of the Big Bang and findings related to it is that when it was created, the universe occupied a very tiny volume:

Do those who are unbelievers not see that the heavens and the earth were sewn together and then We unstitched them and that We made from water every living thing? So will they not have faith? (Surat al-Anbiya, 30)

There is a very important choice of words in the original Arabic whose translation is given above. The word *ratk* translated as "sewn to" means "mixed in each, blended" in Arabic dictionaries. It is used to refer to two different substances that make up a whole. The phrase "we unstitched" is the verb *fatk* in Arabic and implies that something comes into being by tearing apart or destroying the structure of *ratk*. The sprouting of a seed from the soil is one of the actions to which this verb is applied.

Let us take a look at the verse again with this knowledge in mind. In the verse, sky and earth are at first subject to the status of *ratk*. They are separated (*fatk*) with one coming out of the other. Intriguingly, cosmologists speak of a "cosmic egg" that consisted of all the matter in the universe prior to the Big Bang. In other words, all the heavens and earth were included in this egg in a condition of *ratk*. This cosmic egg exploded violently causing its matter to *fatk* and in the process created the structure of the whole universe.

Another truth revealed in the Qur'an is the expansion of the universe that was discovered in the late 1920s. Hubble's discovery of the red shift in the spectrum of starlight is revealed in the Qur'an as:

It is We Who have built the universe with (Our creative) power, and, verily, it is We Who are steadily expanding it. (Surat adh-Dhariyat, 47)

In short, the findings of modern science support the truth that is revealed in the Qur'an and not materialist dogma. Materialists may claim this all to be "coincidence" but the plain fact is that the universe came into being as a result of an act of Creation on the part of God

and the only true knowledge about the origin of universe is to be found in the word of God as revealed to us.

Confessions of Evolutionists Stating that the Universe Has a Beginning

Until the beginning of the 20th century, the prevailing view was that the universe was of infinite dimensions, and that it had always 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. This view is still accepted, in various forms, by evolutionists for ideological reasons. They espouse their claims by maintaining that the universe is eternal end without end. This view, refuted by science, is used by its supporters to keep the false religion of Darwinism alive, in the face of all the scientific evidence.

Today, modern physics has proven with a certainty that does not permit any hesitations or objections, through 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. This utterly repudiated all evolutionists' accounts, claims and statements to the effect that matter and the universe are without beginning or end.

Anthony Flew (British philosopher known for several decades as an atheist but who later acknowledged that atheism is an empty philosophy and stated that he believed in God. He expressed his views about how the Big Bang proved Creation as follows):

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.¹

Dennis Sciama (Together with Fred Hoyle defended steady-state theory):

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.²

Stephen W. Hawking:

*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.*³

Prof. Fred Hoyle (British astronomer and mathematician):

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.⁴

1- Henry Margenau, Roy Abraham Vargesse, Cosmos, Bios, Theos, La Salle IL: Open Court Publishing, 1992, s.241

2- Stephan Hawking, Evreni Kucaklayan Karınca, Alkım Kitapçılık ve Yayıncılık, 1993, s.62-63

3- Stephen W. Hawking, "The Direction of Time", New Scientist, vol. 115, 9 Temmuz 1987, s.47

4- Fred Hoyle, The Intelligent Universe, London, 1984, s. 184-185

Why are Proteins Constituted of Only 20 of the 200 Amino Acids?

In theory, one would expect the number of amino acids in nature to be far more than 200. Even in human body, many amino acids not used in human proteins are used in the body's metabolic functions. Why, therefore, do proteins select only 20 amino acids when so many are more available?

We can answer this question by examining proteins' functions and structures. In order to perform their functions essential to life, proteins need to possess specific features, and amino acids are one of the main elements that give them those properties. For instance, it is essential that an amino acid possess hydrophobic (or water-repellent) side chains. But these side chains must not be very large, or else it will be impossible to pack and install them inside the proteins.

Side chains must also possess two features known as helix and layered formations. As a result of these, a protein can assume a three-dimensional form, and these are also essential for the protein to work properly.

Research has shown that of the 20 amino acids used in proteins, most are hydrophobic side chains. Half possess α -helix properties and the other half, β -layer properties.

Examine the properties of these 20 amino acids one by one, and you can understand why they have been specially selected for proteins. For instance, even glycine—the smallest and simplest amino acid—has a very important role to play in collagen, which is one of the most

important proteins. If the three amino acids that comprise collagen, one is glycine. Its small dimensions play an important role in the structure of collagen, by permitting the chains comprising the protein to bind tightly together, which increases the resistance of the collagen fibers. Collagen fibers have been determined to have greater tensile strength than steel. If another side-chain amino acid were used in place of glycine, the resulting collagen fibers could not possess the same level of tensile strength. At the same time, were it not for glycine, the collagen fibers would also lack enough strength to bind cells to one another.

As you can see from this brief description, there is a consciousness and planning behind the selection of these 20 specific amino acids from among the 200 occurring naturally. Had this selection taken place at random, then the proteins necessary for life could never have formed. If only a single amino acid were any different from how it needs to be, a vital function would collapse, and life would therefore become impossible. It is apparent that there are conscious systems, rational selection, and order in every phase of life.

God, Not Chance, Created The Universe

The universe was created in a moment by Almighty God telling it “Be!” Created in such a short time, the universe still possesses a glorious variety and harmony. God’s creation of the entire universe is a great blessing for human beings, because it shows us that we are under the control of the Omniscient God.

The universe, which enfolds outer space and all things, possesses an immaculate creation, matchless systems and includes our Earth with a balance and order meeting all the conditions needed to sustain life. All scientific findings in the 20th and 21st Centuries in particular show that the universe is the result of an immaculate creation. The one truth revealed by science is that All-Mighty and All-Knowing God created the universe.

The observable universe

Researchers calculate the age of the universe at 13.8 billion years. However, that calculation is based on the link between the speed of light and distance, and a distance of 13.8 billion light years is observable from the Earth. This is rather like only being able to see a certain distance around from a ship in the middle of the ocean. In the same way, scientists are able to see a distance of 13.8 billion light years from the Earth with their telescopes. As shown by the use of the word “observable,” we are still unaware of the existence of a region beyond that distance. It is therefore impossible for us to acquire absolutely definitive information about the age of the universe or its dimensions. However, the scientifically proven fact is that this universe we are still unable to observe is constantly expanding. Another interesting feature of the universe, whose age we are unable to calculate, is that it was created from nothing in the explosion known as the “Big Bang.” The universe we cannot observe, and whose age we do not know, survives at this wondrous size within a flawless order at the command of our Almighty Lord. In revealing this matchless creation of the universe in the Qur’an, Almighty God also reminds us of His greatness:

“Do those who are disbelievers not see that the heavens and the earth were sewn together and then We unstitched them and that We made from water every living thing? So will they not have faith?” (Surat al-Anbiya, 30)

The sensitive tasks of supernovae in the universe

A giant star destroys itself in a huge explosion and all the matter it contains is scattered at high speed in all directions. The light emitted during this explosion is thousands of times more powerful than that normally given off by the star. The scattering of a star in this way is known as a supernova.

Astronomers estimate that these explosions serve to carry matter from one point in the universe to another. The stellar wastes scattered in the explosion are believed to collect in other corners of the universe and to form new stars or stellar systems. According to this hypothesis, the sun, the planets in the solar system and of course our earth all emerged as the result of a supernova explosion in very, very remote times.

The amazing thing however is that supernovae, which might look like ordinary explosions at first sight, are in fact built around highly sensitive balances. As Michael Denton writes in his book *Nature's Destiny*:

*The distances between supernovae and indeed between all stars is critical for other reasons. The distance between stars in our galaxy is about 30 million miles. If this distance was much less, planetary orbits would be destabilized. If it was much more, then the debris thrown out by a supernova would be so diffusely distributed that planetary systems like our own would in all probability never form. If the cosmos is to be a home for life, then the flickering of the supernovae must occur at a very precise rate and the average distance between them, and indeed between all stars, must be very close to the actual observed figure. (Michael Denton, *Nature's Destiny: How the Laws of Biology Reveal Purpose in the Universe*, New York: The Free Press: 1998, p. 11)*

Perfect Order in the Solar System

One of the areas where we can most clearly observe the regularity in the universe is the solar system, home to our earth. The solar system contains eight planets and 54 satellites dependent on those planets. In order of their proximity to the sun, these planets are Mercury, Venus, Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Neptune and Uranus. The only one of these planets and 54 satellites with a surface and atmosphere suited to life is our Earth.

When we look at the structure of the Solar System, we again encounter a remarkable balance. The effect that protects the planets from being cast off into the icy depths of space is the balance between the "gravitational attraction of the sun" and the "centrifugal force" of the planets. Due to its great gravitational force, the sun attracts the planets toward it, while they try to escape from it through the centrifugal force set up by their orbits. However, if the planets' orbits were slightly slower, these planets would be pulled toward the sun and be swallowed by it in a tremendous explosion.

The opposite might also apply. If the planets orbited the sun slightly faster, the power of the sun would be unable to restrain them and the planets would simply spin off into the void of outer space. Yet this highly sensitive balance has been put in place, and the system survives because it is maintained by that balance.

At this point it needs to be stated that the balance in question is instituted separately for each planet because the planets lie at very different distances from the sun. Their masses are also very different. They all therefore need to have different orbital velocities in order not to fly away into space or plunge into the sun. Almighty God reveals this glorious order He has created in this verse:

“It is not for the sun to overtake the moon nor for the night to outstrip the day; each one is swimming in a sphere.” (Surah Ya Sin, 40)

Each one of the planets in the universe, great or small, is a component that is of crucial importance to this order. Neither their positions in space nor their courses are at all random: On the contrary, they are all created with numerous details, some of which we know and others not, and for a specific purpose. Indeed, of all the factors that affect the balances in the universe, just a minute change in the position of the planets would be enough to tear apart all these inter-related balances. Yet these balances are never compromised, and the perfect order in the universe continues uninterrupted. This is the immaculate creation by Almighty God.

Dr. Oktar Babuna's presentation: "Collapse of the Evolution Theory and the Fact of Creation"

Thank you very much everybody. My best regards and also greetings and '*salam*' of Mr. Adnan Oktar whom I represent, he sends his greetings specifically to all of you.

Today the topic we'll talk about is a very important topic; Darwinism. Darwinism claims life originated by chance and this, and also the idea of a selfish struggle in nature inevitably leads to some perverted ideologies like Marxism, fascism and wild capitalism which my colleague will talk about that in detail in a little bit. Karl Marx said about the evolution theory that "this is the basis in natural history for our view" and because Darwinism prevailed in the world, more than 300 million people were killed in the 20th Century. It prevails throughout the entire world but it is not based on any scientific evidence, about which I will go into the detail.

Now, Darwinism proposes the lie that human beings came into this world as the result of a series of chance events and that they are a "species of animals." Darwinism furthermore claims that the only law in life is a selfish struggle for survival. The strong individuals survive by crushing the weak individuals and there is a ruthless struggle in nature, where the weak ones get eliminated. And these ideas of course have been the foundation of wars, violence and terrorism that we see in the world today.

Darwinism is the application of materialism onto nature. Materialism absolutely rejects the existence of anything beyond matter. However, science is not obliged to accept such materialistic dogma. Science means exploring nature and deriving conclusions from one's findings. If these findings lead to the conclusion that nature is created, then science has to accept it. This is the duty of a true scientist, not defending impossible scenarios by defending outdated materialist dogmas of the 19th Century.

Charles Smith is the founder of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism. This is exactly what he said; "Evolution is atheism". That is the reason why so many people defend it, in spite of the evidence that falsifies Darwinism, to keep atheism alive. That is the reason why Darwinism is defended in spite of these scientific evidence which falsifies Darwinism.

Now, Darwinism's false god is random mechanisms and chance. They say life emerged by chance events, by natural selection and mutations. I will explain in detail what they mean actually and of course the other speakers also explained what they mean. Evolutionists claim time and chance are capable of creating all these complex design and information in living things. But this is nonsense; it is illogical and unscientific of course.

All life forms are the work of an Omnipotent Mind, Who is Almighty God. We see mathematical perfection, symmetry, harmony and organization wherever we look in the universe. We look at the galaxies with its harmony and organization and the delicate

balances. We look at the Earth, animals, plants, atoms, cells and also proteins. Wherever we look we see beautiful mathematical perfection and Omnipotent Intelligence behind that. So there is such a delicate balance, and the slightest deviation from these balances would mean the elimination of the entire system. That is a very powerful evidence for the existence of God.

Now, the most powerful and fundamental evidence which refutes Darwinism is the impossibility of proteins to emerge by chance. You see protein molecules are being synthesized over here. That requires an entire system consisting of amino acids; these are synthesized by proteins and added all together in the ribosome. Ribosomes consist of proteins and RNA molecules. And the three dimensional folding of proteins requires other protein molecules. Basically PROTEINS can only be synthesized by other PROTEINS. For one protein to exist, at least 100 different proteins must exist before, but is this enough? No, DNA must exist, because the right sequence of the amino acid is encoded in the DNA. For DNA to exist, proteins must exist, because DNA is synthesized by the proteins. The ribosome is needed, which is the protein factory to synthesize proteins. And, ribosome is also synthesized by proteins, is this enough? No. An energy organelle is needed, a complete living cell must exist to produce the first protein on the earth. You know what that means? Creation by God. This is the most powerful evidence, the impossibility of proteins to emerge by chance, which refutes and eliminates the Darwinism completely. There is nothing to talk about because the first step is refuted by the science means all other steps are refuted by scientific evidences.

So the Law of the Biogenesis in nature is life comes only from life and that of its kind. So life is only generated from life. Each living cell is replicated by another cell, formed by the replication of another cell. Therefore the first life on earth must have originated from another life. This is the manifestation of the name of God, 'Hayy' (meaning, the Owner of Life). Life can only start and continue and end by His will.

Now, neo-Darwinism, which is the "mainstream" argument today, claims that there are two imaginary mechanisms of evolution: "Natural selection" and "mutations". They say this is the claim of Darwinism, that there are two complementary factors. First they say, mutations help new traits to be developed, and suitable ones are selected by natural selection therefore they say living things evolve. But this is very unscientific.

First, you see this is a slide about the natural selection and mutations always cause asymmetry and pathology. I will go into detail. Natural selection holds that the living things which are more suited to the natural conditions of their habitats will succeed and produce an offspring, and those, which are unfit, will vanish. Take this example over here. If a herd of deer is threatened by predators like jaguars, leopards or lions for example, of course those which run faster will survive. That is true. However no matter how long this process goes on there will be only faster running deer. It will not transform it into another species such as horses, because natural selection cannot change DNA by any means. It cannot add new genetic information; it cannot generate brand-new proteins or brand new organs. It only eliminates the weak or sick individuals from the population. Natural selection is not capable of planning and foresight. So, it is impossible for a blind and unconscious mechanism such as natural selection to have created all these complex design and information in living things. What is nature? Nature is air, soil and rocks. Nature itself is created; it cannot have any consciousness. The consciousness belongs to the omnipotent intelligence of God.

So natural selection is not a conscious mechanism of course. That is the reason why Charles Darwin admitted in his book, he is the first one who talked about natural selection. But in his book he said, "Natural selection can do nothing until favorable variations chance to

occur". And as the cause of these favorable variations, the Neo-Darwinists had to add "mutations." What are mutations? Mutations are defined as breaks or replacements in the complex structure, the extremely complex structure of the DNA. Changing of the letters, insertions of new letters or deletions of the letters out of the DNA. These are breaks or replacements. They only cause cancer, disability or death; there is no beneficial mutation. Even though some scientists say there are silent mutations, even in most of the silent mutations, it is understood that those are harmful to the organisms. Mutations are caused during replication of the DNA, the copying of the DNA, or by external harmful effects such as ultraviolet radiation or chemical substances. And they are only damaging and degenerate; they cause cancer for example, as well as pathologies, asymmetry, disability and death. Because it is like hitting a computer with a hammer. Hitting a computer with a hammer never generates better computers. Everybody knows that, you don't need to be a scientist to understand that.

The most famous biology textbook in the world is called *Campbell and Reece*. It is a standard textbook all over the world. In this textbook, although it defends evolution and Darwinism, in the mutations section it says; for mutations to be beneficial, it is like shooting the hood of the car. Of course shooting the car never makes the engine better he says. But although he knows that mutations are not beneficial, in the following pages he still defends mutations as a beneficial mechanism and backs evolution. Then, this is not being a scientist of course. This can only be a pagan preacher because it's a pagan ideology. Darwinism defends a pagan religion.

So, if we summarize why mutations are not an evolutionary mechanism: The direct effect of mutations is harmful. Mutations add no new information to an organism's DNA. All the examples given by some evolutionists such as sickle cell anemia, CCR5 mutations of the HIV, or the citric acid cycle in *E. coli* experiments all have damaging effects decreasing the information in the genome. So there is no beneficial mutation. That is the reason why Richard Dawkins was asked to give a single example of a beneficial mutation and he stopped the recording, he could not answer. According to Darwinism there should be trillions of beneficial mutations. He was asked to give one example and Richard Dawkins looked into the air for 17 seconds and he stopped the recording.

Now the fossils, we have 600 million fossils today. Fossils are the remnants of the living things, which lived in the past. For example you see a frog fossil over here these are the remnants. Millions of years old, sometimes the whole skeleton, sometimes piece of a skull, sometimes even one single tooth. We have 600 million fossils today. But as you see over here the fossils appear abruptly and they never change in the history of life. 600 million fossils, yet it is asserted by the evolutionists that the fossils of living things appeared over billions of years by successive random changes in the DNA: Successive random changes they say, over billions of years. Of course, then evolutionists have to show us fossilized examples. They have to show us; if evolution would be a fact of course, they have to show us half fish, half amphibian fossils. For example, 90 percent fish, 10 percent amphibians. All the transitions have to be pathologically asymmetrical through mutations because of the random mechanism of mutations. They have to show us half amphibians, half reptiles, and they have to show us transitional forms from reptiles to mammals. These are the so-called transitional forms. If there are no transitional forms of course that means no evolution.

Now we have 600 million fossils today. You see from the fossil evidence that the fossils appear suddenly, abruptly and in complete form and never change during their tenure on the Earth. This is, I want to explain to you over here, evolutionists say the starfish evolved into fish over a 100 million-year period. So we look at the fossil evidence. Of course we have to

see the scientific evidences of this. Do we have starfish fossils? Yes, we have millions of them. We have millions of starfish fossils. Do we have fish fossils? Yes, we have millions of them. So do we have these transitions, half fish and half starfish? 90 percent fish and 10 percent starfish; or 95 percent fish and five percent starfish? No, we don't have even a single example of this. You know what that means? God did not create through evolution, but God did create through sudden creation with His commandment "Be." And millions of fossils verify this evidence; verify this fact.

So we ask Charles Darwin. We look into his book in *The Origin of Species*, what did he say about the transitional forms? Because he said evolution must have transitional forms, if evolution is a fact. Let's see what he says. Darwin said: "Why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations." So he said species evolve to other species gradually and randomly through transitional forms. "...do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms?" We do not see transitional forms because there are no transitional forms of course. "Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined? But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the Earth? Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links?" (Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 172, 280) Darwin himself said there are no transitional forms. Of course, no transitional forms means, no evolution. He said why do not we have them, because we do not have a transitional form. He said we look at every layer, single layer, so there are a lot of fossils, more than enough fossils in this time. But he said maybe in the future, it will be found.

Now we look at today, this is one of the most prominent paleontologists. Paleontologist means fossil scientist. This is the most prominent paleontologist of the world and he is a Darwinist. His name is Niles Eldredge, he is the curator of the American Natural History Museum. He said: "*The record jumps*," the fossil record jumps he said. Horses, elephants, birds, reptiles, and nothing in between, it jumps. That means no transitional forms. "... and all the evidence shows that the record is real." He said the evidence shows that this record is real. "*The gaps we see*," that means no transitional forms we see, "*reflect real events in life's history - not the artifact of a poor fossil record.*" (Niles Eldredge and Ian Tattersall, ***The Myths of Human Evolution***, Columbia University Press, 1982, p. 59)

So he admits that there are no transitional forms. Darwin said there are no transitional forms. Stephen Jay Gould said there are no transitional forms, then we ask of course why do these people defend Darwinism and evolution if there are no transitional forms? That is, in the very beginning I explained to you. As Charles Smith said, evolution is atheism. In spite of the scientific evidences, to keep atheism alive, they defend this Darwinism nonsense. So, facts from paleontology, you see what was the expectation of Darwinism. First a single cell would come into being by chance and then it would diversify all these organisms we have today. From a single cell to all other species is what they were expecting, right? And this is the real fossil evidence.

This line represents the Cambrian era 540 million years ago. This line. Before that, like 600 million years ago for example, there were only three different phyla. Phylum means specific animal groups that have a certain body plan, body structure. Like this for example the *Crustaceans*; mollusks, nematodes, arthropods. That kind of a structure according to their body plan, here there are only three of them.

They are called *Cnidarians* or *Porifera*; sponges for example, there were some sponges and worms. And those kind of animals existed, and here are three of them. 540 million years ago in the Cambrian era, explosively, that's the reason why they call it the "Cambrian explosion",

50 different phyla came into existence with the commandment “Be” of God. 50 different animal groups and you know what happened with time, only it decreased with time today. Today we have 35 of these phyla. But you see they appeared all at once. Boom, like this, with the creation of God, the 50 different animal groups came into being. And then remain 35 different animal groups.

At the very beginning *Cyanobacteria* was the first living cell on earth. It is 3.8 billion years ago the first cell on earth came into existence all of a sudden with sudden creation. That is a blue algae, it's called *Cyanobacteria* that produces oxygen through photosynthesis. It is an extremely complex living cell and it comes into existence all at once, that means sudden evolution not creation through evolution of course. And this is from the Cambrian period. Vertebrate and invertebrate animals, of course some vertebrate fish were also found at the end of 1990's in China.

All these animal groups and I want you to pay attention to this living being over here, it's called *Anomalocaris*. The fossil was found in 2012. I will also explain to you the trilobite. They have an eye structure, which is called a “compound eye structure”, consisting of many lenses. It is an extremely complex eye structure and this is the first eye in the history of life as an organ. Before that there are some light sensitive cells that exist in the three phyla that I showed you before. However these are the first animals with the first eye in the history of earth like this eye of the *Anomalocaris*. Now, I have two eyes with two lenses right, one lens over here the other over here. But this living being *Anomalocaris* has 16,000 lenses in one eye, 16,000 lenses in the second eye, a total of 32,000 lenses. This is called the compound eye structure and it appears all of a sudden. That means sudden creation. Or the trilobite eye that you see over here, it consists of 3,000 lenses that also appear all at once in the Cambrian era. We have that kind of an eye structure in the modern insects today, in the bees for example, in the flies, in the dragonfly. Extremely complex eye structure appears all of a sudden in the history of life that means creation with the commandment “Be” of God.

Now if you ask evolutionists they sometimes give less than a dozen transitional forms. The most famous one of these fossils is *Archaeopteryx* over here and the *Tiktaalik roseae*. They talk too much about these and there are some others of course. But, for this *Archaeopteryx*, although evolutionists claimed this is the ancestor of the bird, it is understood that it is a full bird. The most prominent ornithologists, meaning scientists who research the origin of flight, admit this. Alan Fedducia is one of the most famous of them, he is also a Darwinist, a defender of Darwinism. He said it's a full bird, a perfect bird. The sternum bone was missing but it was found in 1919's in Germany.

And this is *Tiktaalik roseae*. In 2004 it was in the world media all over the place as a transitional form. They said this with claims that it is a half-land, half-fish organism, but it turned out to be a forgery. Because they found a flat skull, this skull belongs to a crocodile very similar to the *Alligator sinensis*, which lives in China. Only the skull was found and then a body, a fish body was added to that to make it look like something between the land and sea animals. It is a forgery. Why do these people do forgeries? Because there is a lack of evidence, there are no transitional forms. They generate fossils, fake fossils, which belong to either extinct species or complete forgeries to support Darwinism. Now, here is the famous myth of the ancestor of man.

They are embarrassed to claim that the so-called ancestor of man is an ape. What they do is they call it a common ancestor. If they find skulls for example which belong to apes, extinct ape species, which we have more than 6,500 that lived throughout history. Nowadays, only 120 of them are alive. So they find some extinct ape species' skulls and they put it in an order

from the smaller to the larger one and they add some vanished human races to that at the end, and they say this is the evolution of humans. They never say humans' ancestor is an ape, but there is a common ancestor because they are embarrassed to say that their ancestors are apes. But always they show us some extinct ape species. What they do is if they find a piece of a skull mostly, it can be a tooth, a piece of a skull or a complete skull. They go to their workshops. This is the most famous Darwinist artist of the world. He generates his imagination all the time. His name is John Gurche. In his lab, he takes cast from human beings. This is his friend actually. He has taken a cast from him. Then he starts to play, to play around with this cast. He generates something like this. At the end this is complete imaginary based on no scientific evidence. He generates something like this as if a half-ape, half-human fossil lived in the past. And here it is looking at you and he put some human eyes at the end. So if you would give this piece of skull for example to 100 different artists they would generate 100 different illustrations. So it does not have any scientific value. Of course, here are fake reconstructions where they took an orangutan and on purpose put human eyes to make it look like half-human, half-orangutan looking at you. But this is all fake doesn't have any scientific value.

So, I want to give you some examples of forgeries, there are many forgeries. This one is called Nebraska Man. In this Nebraska Man they found a single tooth in the state of Nebraska, the United States years and years ago. Based on a single tooth, they made illustrations of his family, his cousins, his children, his father, and his mother. Based on a single tooth. You know what happened after that; they found that the rest of the fossil turned out to belong to a pig. And they apologized of course. This is Haeckel, Ernst Haeckel, he did some illustrations based on the embryo. He did similar drawings of human, monkey and dog embryos to make them look like they resemble each other. Then he admitted he had done fraudulent drawings. You know what he said. I'm not going to apologize he said, because everybody else is doing fraudulent drawings or forgeries. That was his excuse. Or, Piltdown Man for example, for 40 years it was displayed at the British Museum. They found a skull, the skull belonged to a human. They added the jaw of an ape and teeth of a human being, and they generated this. For 40 years it was displayed in the British Museum, and it turned out to be a forgery also. They then apologized. So Darwinists always do that, because not having any evidence to support Darwinism, they generate these illustrations, such forgeries without having any scientific evidence.

This is from *Discovery* magazine actually titled, ***"Is this the face of our past?"*** They found this in Gran Dolina, a Spanish paleontologist found the skull. It is 800,000 years old and exactly looks like an 11-year old child's skull. This looks like a modern skull of a living person today. So all the evidence falsifies Darwinism and supports the fact of Creation by God.

Now another forgery from our time is the lemur fossil found in 2009. There are extinct species of lemurs also, and they presented this as the ancestor of men. The *BBC*, *The New York Times*, all the magazines, *The Guardian*, in the Turkish media, everywhere it was presented as the ancestor of man. Mr. Adnan Oktar stated this is a lemur fossil, not the ancestor of man and it only belongs to a lemur, which is a monkey with a tail. In a few months BBC apologized with headlines, "Primate fossil not an ancestor." *The New York Times* said, ***"Fossil skeleton known as IDA is no ancestor of humans."***

This always happens. They present it first, it is like brainwashing. And everybody reads that and at the end they apologize. So, science is anti-Darwinist, anti-atheist, science is the enemy of Darwinism. Science is against Darwinism; science is anti-communist, and anti-Marxist. Science destroys Marxist, atheist and Darwinist thought.

All the religions teach us one fact, the Fact of Creation. Creation by omnipotent intelligence in other words by Almighty God, with His commandment "Be." This is what religions teach with reason and scientific evidences. This is also same in all the Divine faiths. We are being taught the Creation of God. So science is compatible with religion. Some people say, "do not confuse religion with science." However this is a misconception. What contradicts with science is evolution. Evolution is not science. It is defended in the face of so many scientific evidence, the non-existence of transitional forms, and the impossibility of proteins to appear by chance. And all this complexity and information in living things falsify the claims of Darwinism one by one. And also, you don't have any transitional forms.

And could God create through evolution?

Of course, God could have created through evolution, but then we would have all the transitions between the species. And I would be, and all my friends and the Honorary Chairman of TBAV, Mr. Adnan Oktar would be one of the most powerful defenders of evolution of course. But God did not create through evolution. So why should we defend evolution then? Evolution is not science.

The problem with evolution is that evolution claims the emergence of life to be the result of random mechanisms, mutations and natural selection. If somebody, any believer goes to the side of evolution that opens the way to atheism, and then to be an unbeliever. God created with sudden creation, not through evolution, that is what science shows us. In one verse in the Qur'an -I seek refuge in God from the accursed satan- God reveals:

"Everything is obedient to Him. The Originator of the heavens and earth. When He decides on something, He just says to it 'Be!' and it is." (Surat al-Baqara, 116-117)

God created with His commandment "Be" and we know this from the fossil evidence. We see the species appear all at once and suddenly in the history of life. For example, if we go back enough in time, we meet the plant and the first animal. And we meet, 3.8 billion years ago, the first living cell. And again being alive is something completely different. This is the manifestation of God's name "Hayy". Only God may create and sustain life. Only God may start and continue life by His will. So, science and religion are compatible of course, what is not compatible with science is evolution.

And we see mathematical perfection in living things, for example, the golden ratio. We look at the plants, we look at the galaxies, we look at the DNA, and we see the golden ratio. Golden ratio is a number, which was discovered by Fibonacci in the Middle Ages. It is 1.618, this is the golden ratio that God uses in the plants and in the snails for example. Also we see it in the galaxies, in our DNA, in our face, in our teeth, and the fingers. Wherever we look we see this golden ratio. This is the mathematical perfection of God's Creation. And symmetry is another aspect. God has no need for natural laws for Creation. God is the Creator of the natural laws, sometimes believers are under the influence of naturalism. Yet, all the laws of nature are created by God. God is not bound to the natural laws He created. He can change them anytime He wills. God creates in particular ways; for instance, He uses some stages in His Creation. For example for a human being He uses the sperm and egg cell. When they come together, in their junction a human being is brought to life in various embryological stages. Or out of seed, God creates the plant, but this does not have anything to do with evolution. Through the same DNA, God uses certain stages for Creation.

But evolution, which is the emergence of life by chance events, is impossible. And there is no mechanism for evolution, and this is a very important issue also. And this fact is also stated in the Bible. God reveals:

“When they heard this, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, You are God, Who have made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them.” (Acts, 4:24)

“God, Who made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth.” (Acts, 17:24)

Now lastly, this is actually a very important issue. We live in our brains. Everything we perceive comes as electric signals to certain parts of our brain. There is no light outside scientifically in the atoms there is no light. It is complete darkness outside. The photons are coming from the electrons emitted from the electrons, entering the lens and hitting the retina where there are the nerve cells that generate electric signals. There is complete silence, complete darkness, in our brain. These electric signals are interpreted as color, as vision, as hearing, as music for example, or as a smell of strawberry or banana. Now we are only in direct contact with the perceptions in our minds. We have never heard, we have never tasted, we have never touched, we have never seen the real existing anything beyond this perceptions. You know what that means; there must be an inner-eye, which can see. There must be an inner-ear to listen to this music. There must be an inner-hand, which can touch the hardness of the materials. The matter is not hard. There is no hardness of the matter, there is no color or vision outside, but there is an inner-eye, which can see that. Inevitably that leads to the fact that there must be a soul. The soul, which God breathes into our bodies, this is the soul of human beings. And these perceptions are created by God. This is the most powerful evidence, which destroys materialism and Darwinism. This is the existence of the soul, for that reason Darwinists never talk about the existence of the soul. If there is a soul, there is God. So, of course, this fact leads to the inevitable existence of God.

Eternal existence was created in an infinite fraction of time. God created the past, the time that we live in now, and the future and finished it. So all of the scientific evidence again shows us one important fact: God is the Creator of everything, and God created through sudden Creation not through evolution. There is no evolutionary mechanism, even a single protein to emerge by chance is impossible, DNA impossible, they must coexist in a living cell to produce a single protein. And Cyanobacteria are the first living cells that appeared on earth. This is a complete living cell, which can do photosynthesis. And all the species appear abruptly, perfectly formed.

There are 700 million fossils that falsify claims of Darwinism. That means the 21st Century will be a century without Darwinism, without perverted ideologies of fascism and communism. Love will prevail throughout the world. We are living in very specific times. The signs, the wars, the terrorism that we are living through right now are the signs of these specific times we are living in right now. In the very near future, in five to ten years, the world will be a very different world. The love, which has been taken away from the world, will return back to the world and we will have very good times, we are very hopeful in that.

Thank you.

The Idea That "Mutations Cause Evolution" Is a Falsehood

Mutations are dislocations, breaks and impairments as a result of radiation or chemical effects in the DNA molecule in the nucleus of the living cell which carries all the information about a human being. The information in DNA is set out by 4 separate nucleotides, symbolized by the letters A, T, C and G, laid out in a special and significant sequence. But an error in a single letter in that sequence will damage the entire structure. For example, the leukemia observed in children appears because one of the nucleotide sequences in the DNA is incorrect. The reason for diseases such as cancer appearing or subsequent generations being deformed as a result of the radiation leakage at Chernobyl, or the atom bomb dropped over Hiroshima, is again because of the harmful effects of mutations occurring in people's bodies.

Almost all mutations are harmful, and they are generally lethal to living things. Examples of mutations that are not harmful generally do the organism no good, and are at best neutral. Scientists have concluded that not a single mutation, out of all those that have been studied, has ever had a positive effect on the life of an organism.¹

But the theory of evolution is based on these fictitious mutations that supposedly produce "new" living things and work miracles. Darwinists maintain that species emerge from one another through structures and organs appearing as a result of countless fictitious and beneficial mutations. This claim, which is a source of terrible shame for Darwinists, is put forward by Darwinist scientists who know that mutations always harm an organism. Furthermore, Darwinists are well aware of these harmful effects of mutations yet they still point to a mutant, four-winged fruit fly. The four-winged fruit fly emerged as a result of being subjected to radiation in the laboratory. Darwinists use this example in support of their claims. Darwinists portrayed the extra pair of wings produced in a fruit fly as a result of laboratory-engineered mutations as the greatest evidence that mutations could lead to evolution. But the two wings in question actually damage the creature rather than benefiting it, leading to its losing the ability to fly. The University of California at Berkeley molecular biologist Jonathan Wells summarizes the position as follows:

In the 1970s, Cal Tech geneticist Edward B. Lewis discovered that by carefully breeding three mutant strains he was able to produce a fruit fly in which the balancers were transformed into a second pair of normal-looking wings.

At first glance, this might seem to provide evidence for Carroll's claim that small developmental changes in regulatory DNA can produce large evolutionary changes in form. But the fruit fly is still a fruit fly. Furthermore, although the second pair of wings looks normal, it has no flight muscles. A four-winged fruit fly is like an airplane with a second pair of wings dangling uselessly from its tail. It has great difficulty flying or mating, so it can survive only in the laboratory. As evidence for evolution, a four-winged fruit fly is no better than a two-headed calf in a circus sideshow.²

Jonathan Wells continues:

Disabled fruit flies with extra wings or missing legs have taught us something about developmental genetics, but nothing about evolution. All of the evidence points to one conclusion: no matter what we do to a fruit fly embryo, there are only three possible outcomes – a normal fruit fly, a defective fruit fly, or a dead fruit fly. Not even a horsefly, much less a horse.³

As we have seen, the four-winged mutant fruit fly that is the only evidence that Darwinists point to in support of their warped claims is in fact nothing more than a disabled fruit fly. No matter what effect mutations may have on a life form, they do not possess the miraculous property of bestowing a characteristic belonging to another life form onto it. But Darwinists want people to believe the lie that miracles occur in living things by way of mutations.

The interesting thing is that although Darwinist scientists know that the fruit fly in question is defective, attempts are still made to depict it as the greatest evidence for evolution by mutation in school textbooks. Jonathan Wells writes:

According to Peter Raven and George Johnson's 1999 textbook, *Biology*, "all evolution begins with alterations in the genetic message... Genetic change through mutation and recombination [the re-arrangement of existing genes] provides the raw materials for evolution." The same page features a photo of a four-winged fruit fly, which is described as "a mutant because of changes in *Ultrabithorax*, a gene regulating a critical stage of development; it possesses two thoracic segments and thus two sets of wings."

Adding to the confusion, textbook accounts typically leave the reader with the impression that the extra wings represent a gain of structures. But four-winged fruit flies have actually lost structures which they need for flying. Their balancers are gone, and instead of being replaced with something new have been replaced with copies of structures already present in another segment. Although pictures of four-winged fruit flies give the impression that mutations have added something new, the exact opposite is closer to the truth.⁴

Even if we assume that the "fictitious first cell" that Darwinists claim represents the beginning of life and that cannot possibly have come into being by chance did actually emerge spontaneously, even the smallest stage of the imaginary evolutionary process that would have to take place to give rise to a human with his complex structure would require an astounding amount of information to be produced and countless mutations to take place. "All" of these many mutations have to be beneficial to the life form or else bring about the appearance of something "new." A single error in this fictitious developing life form will cause the entire system to go wrong and collapse. Ninety-nine percent of mutations are harmful while only one percent are neutral. It flies in the face of both reason and science, therefore, to suggest that every single one of these mutations that would have to take place according to the theory of evolution can be beneficial.

It is therefore impossible for a brand new organ or characteristic that did not exist before to appear by chance as the result of mutations. Mutations have no power to bestow new information on a life form that does not belong to it, or to turn it into a different organism. The idea of mutation represents the greatest manifestation of the falsehood and illogicality of Darwinism because the idea of evolution is based on these illusory "beneficial mutations" that do not in fact exist.

The Infinite Amount of Time Needed for Hypothetical Beneficial Mutations

Even if we hypothesize that beneficial mutations could take place, the idea of mutation is still incompatible with the theory of evolution. In a paper titled "The Inadequacy of Neo-Darwinian Evolution As a Scientific Theory," Professor Murray Eden from the MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) Faculty of Electrical Engineering showed that if it required a mere six mutations to bring about an adaptive change, this would occur by chance

only once in a billion years - while, if two dozen genes were involved, it would require 10,000,000,000 years, which is much longer than the age of the Earth.⁵

Even if we assume that mutations were effective and beneficial in complex organs, and structures requiring more than one mutation to occur at the same time, mathematicians still say the problem of time is an acute dilemma for Darwinists. Even Professor of Paleontology George G. Simpson, one of the most unrepentant Darwinists, clearly states that it would take an infinite length of time for five mutations to happen at the same time.⁶ An infinite amount of time means zero probability. And that is a probability which applies to all the structures and organs possessed by living things. Thus, there is no possibility of the glorious variety of life we see in our daily lives coming about through mutations.

The evolutionist George G. Simpson has performed another calculation regarding the mutation claim in question. He admitted that in a community of 100 million individuals, which could hypothetically produce a new generation every day, a positive outcome from mutations would only take place once every 274 billion years. That number is many times greater than the age of the Earth, estimated to be at 4.5 billion years old.⁷ These, of course, are all calculations assuming that mutations have a positive effect on the generations which gave rise to them, and on subsequent generations; but no such assumption applies in the real world.

Why Is the Body That Is Supposedly Evolving Protected against Mutations?

All evolutionist scientists know that the probability of a replication error occurring in a living organism's DNA for no reason is very low. Research has revealed that there are protective elements in the cell that prevent genetic errors from arising. The information in DNA cannot be copied in the absence of particular enzymes that control one another against errors. These include double-filter enzymes for ensuring that the right amino acid binds to the right tRNA. One filter rejects amino acids that are too large, and the other those that are too small. This is a very sensitive and rational system. There are also enzymes that do final checks against the possibility of any error arising in this intelligent system. Scientists have concluded that they could not imagine a better cellular control and protection system aimed at maintaining the integrity of DNA.⁸

Pierre Paul Grassé, who spent 30 years as professor of evolution at the Sorbonne, wrote this on the subject:

The probability of dust carried by the wind reproducing Dürer's "Melancholia" is less infinitesimal than the probability of copy errors in the DNA molecules leading to the formation of the eye.⁹

Darwinists ignore this miraculous system present in DNA and avoid going deeply into the subject and coming up with any explanation of it; yet they construct a scenario of the history of life built on replication errors with an almost zero possibility of happening. This once again reveals the nonsensical nature of Darwinist logic.

Following the realization that Darwin's idea of natural selection most definitely did not constitute an account of evolution and the emergence of the laws of genetics becoming a lethal blow to Darwinism, the claim of the **"evolutionary effect of mutations,"** which had been the main weapon of neo-Darwinism, was seen to be no more than a deception. It is absolutely ridiculous to claim that a mechanism such as a mutation, which damages, destroys and kills the living organism, as well as sometimes harming all subsequent generations, can

give rise to entirely new living things. But masses of people were taken in by this lie for years. Darwinist scientists of course know that mutations have no such miraculous power. Even Richard Dawkins, one of the present day's most fervid Darwinists, admits that "most mutations are deleterious, so some undesirable side effect is pretty likely."¹⁰ The reason why Darwinists still propose this discredited claim as a mechanism for evolution is their devotion to the superstitious religion of Darwinism.

- 1- Nicholas Comninellis, Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution, Master Books, 2001, s. 74-75
- 2- Jonathan Welss, Ph.D., The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design, Regnery Publishing Inc., Washington, 2006, sf.34
- 3- Jonathan Welss, Ph.D., The Politically Incorrect Guide to Darwinism and Intelligent Design, Regnery Publishing Inc., Washington, 2006, sf.36
- 4- Jonathan Wells, Evrimin İkonları, Gelenek yayınları, Ocak 2003, s. 172-173
- 5- Gordon Rattray Taylor, The Great Evolution Mystery, Sphere Books Ltd., 1984, s. 4
- 6- Gordon Rattray Taylor, The Great Evolution Mystery, Sphere Books Ltd., 1984, s. 230
- 7- Nicholas Comninellis, Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution, Master Books, 2001, s. 81
- 8- Nicholas Comninellis, Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution, Master Books, 2001, s. 74-75
- 9- Nicholas Comninellis, Creative Defense, Evidence Against Evolution, Master Books, 2001, s. 81
- 10- Richard Dawkins, The Extended Phenotype, Oxford University Press, 1999, s. 141

The Concealment of Cambrian Fossils for 70 Years

Cambrian life forms are identical to present-day living things that exhibit a flawless complexity. This repudiates Darwin's fictitious evolutionary tree, and overturns the false mechanisms which have been proposed for this mythical process. According to Darwin's theory of evolution, following the formation of the first cell, supposedly by chance, single-celled organisms must have ruled the world. After that, the active life that began with simple-structured multi-celled organisms must continue in the form of a single, water dwelling phylum. The number of phyla should increase gradually, and the number of species should grow in proportion. But the reality revealed by the Cambrian findings is very different. Things happened in the exact reverse to Darwin's imaginary evolutionary tree, with a greater diversity than that in existence today appearing right from the beginning of natural history, immediately after single-celled organisms. *(For details see The Cambrian Evidence That Darwin Failed to Comprehend, Harun Yahya)*

It will certainly be devastating for someone utterly devoted to Darwinist ideology to discover this. As one of the most loyal followers of this heretical religion Charles Doolittle Walcott, a paleontologist and also director of the Smithsonian Institute, one of the best-known museums in the United States, was appalled by the diversity in the Cambrian fossils he began discovering in 1909. During his research, which he continued until 1917, he collected a total of 65,000 fossils. These all belonged to complex Cambrian life forms.

Bearing in mind Darwinist frauds, it should come as no surprise that these fossils, which heralded the destruction of Darwinism, were immediately hidden away by the same Darwinist who found them. Walcott decided to conceal these fossils which so terrified him, as they threatened to demolish the superstitious faith of which he was a member and so contradicted his own beliefs. He locked the photographs he had taken and other documentation away in drawers in the Smithsonian Museum. These special and important fossils would only see the light of day 70 years later.

The Israeli scientist Gerald Schroeder comments:

Had Walcott wanted, he could have hired a phalanx of graduate students to work on the fossils. But he chose not to rock the boat of evolution. Today fossil representatives of the Cambrian era have been found in China, Africa, the British Isles, Sweden, Greenland. The explosion [in the Cambrian Period] was worldwide. But before it became proper to discuss the extraordinary nature of the explosion, the data were simply not reported. (Gerald Schroeder, "Evolution: Rationality vs. Randomness", <http://www.geraldschroeder.com/evolution.html> p. 74-75)

The Cambrian fossils found by Walcott in Burgess Shale were re-examined decades after his death. A team of experts known as the "Cambridge Group" made up of Harry Blackmore Whittington, Derek Briggs and Simon Conway Morris conducted a detailed analysis of the fossils in the 1980s, and they concluded that the fauna was much more diverse and extraordinary than Walcott had determined. They reached the conclusion that some of the fossils could not be classified under the categories of life known today, for which reason they represented different phyla from those currently in existence. Life forms emerged suddenly, in perfect and complex states, in the Cambrian Period of 490 to 543 million years ago.

The conclusion was so unexpected for Darwinists that scientists referred to this sudden activity as an "explosion." The "Cambrian Explosion" was one of the most incomparable and inexplicable phenomena in the history of science for evolutionist scientists.

Darwinists are still silent on the subject of the Cambrian Explosion that exhibits higher life forms and God's magnificent Creation. Darwinists have gone very quiet in the face of these extraordinary findings and behave quite literally as if they did not exist. They publish countless deceptive scenarios they have dreamed up about the history of life in scientific journals, but try to avoid reminding people of this huge phenomenon of 540 million years ago and how it totally refutes the theory of evolution. The blatant deception of Charles Doolittle Walcott, who concealed Cambrian fossils, is a perfect example of the lengths that Darwinists will go to in order to conceal the truth and perpetuate a groundless theory.

“Piltdown Man” was a Hoax

In 1912, Charles Dawson, a well-known doctor and also an amateur paleontologist, claimed to have found a jaw bone and skull fragment in a depression near Piltdown, England. Although the jaw bone resembled an ape jaw, the teeth and skull resembled those of a human being. The fossils were given the name "Piltdown Man," dated at 500,000 years old, and put on display in the British Museum as the most significant evidence of so-called human evolution. A great many scientific papers, analyses and illustrations were produced over the next 40 years. Some 500 academics from different universities wrote doctoral theses about Piltdown Man.¹

On a visit to the British Museum in 1935, the well-known American paleoanthropologist H. F. Osborn said, "... *Nature is full of paradoxes... a discovery of transcendent importance to the prehistory of man.*"² But Piltdown Man was a huge fraud, a deliberately manufactured hoax.

In 1949, Kenneth Oakley from the British Museum Paleontology Department sought permission to use the newly developed "fluoride test" on a number of ancient fossils. The Piltdown Man fossil was duly tested using the technique. The test revealed that there was no fluoride in the Piltdown Man jaw bone. This meant that the jaw bone had been underground for no more than a few years. The skull itself contained a small amount of fluoride and must have been a few thousand years old.

Subsequent chronological research based on the fluoride technique revealed that the skull was no more than a few thousand years in age. It was also realized that the teeth in the jaw bone had been artificially worn down, and that the primitive tools found beside the fossils were replicas carved out using steel equipment.³ Oxford professor of physical anthropology Joseph Weiner's detailed analyses definitively confirmed this fraud in 1953. The skull was human, around 500 years old, while the jaw bone belonged to a recently deceased orangutan! The teeth had been added on and set afterwards to give the impression of being human, and the insertion points had been planed down. All the fragments had then been stained with potassium dichromate in order to give an aged appearance. This staining disappeared when the bones were placed in acid. Le Gros Clark, from the team that exposed the hoax, was unable to conceal his amazement and said: "*The evidences of artificial abrasion immediately sprang to the eye. Indeed so obvious did they seem it may well be asked-how was it that they had escaped notice before?*"⁴

The science writer Hank Hanegraaff referred to this astonishing state of affairs as follows:

... as Marvin Lubenov explains, 'The file marks on the orangutan teeth of the lower jaw were clearly visible. The molars were misaligned and filed at two different angles. The canine tooth had been filed down so far that the pulp cavity had been exposed and then plugged.'⁵

Following this surprising and, for Darwinists, embarrassing discovery, Piltdown Man was hastily removed from the British Museum where it had been on display for some 40 years.

The Darwinist deception was so enormous that a hand-made fossil had fooled the whole scientific world and all mankind for 40 years. This would inevitably go down as one of the blackest marks in the history of evolution.

1- Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1980, p. 59

2- Stephen Jay Gould, "Smith Woodward's Folly", *New Scientist*, April 5, 1979, p.44

3- Kenneth Oakley, William Le Gros Clark & J. S., "Piltdown", *Meydan Larousse*, vol. 10, p. 133.

4- Stephen Jay Gould, "Smith Woodward's Folly", *New Scientist*, April 5, 1979, p.44

5- Hank Hanegraaff, *Fatal Flaws "What Evolutionists Don't Want You To Know"*, W Publishing Group, 2003 p. 34

Darwinist Confessions Regarding the Ida Deception

Charles Beard, a paleontologist from the Johns Hopkins University Carnegie Museum of Natural History:

"This fossil is not as close to monkeys, apes, and humans as we are being led to believe."¹

Duke University paleontologist Richard Kay:

"There is no scientific analysis to prove that Ida is a missing link," IN OTHER WORDS, THERE IS NO EVIDENCE FOR IT AT ALL.²

Timesonline:

"Attenborough...was just one element of the media circus turning Ida into humanity's newest and best link with its ancient past. ... Such finds are usually unveiled to the

world through the sober pages of an academic journal, but for Ida nothing less than a glittering press conference at the American Museum of Natural History in New York would do. Later the scientists who studied Ida outlined the details of their research. Their pronouncements were just as extravagant."³

Robert Foley, a professor of human evolution at Cambridge University:

"It is 'meaningless' to describe this creature as a missing link."⁴

"Dr. Simons phoned me for the first time in 10 years to share his outrage about this MALARKEY and, for the first time in a decade, I agree with him," said Beard last week. "...The roll-out was extraordinary and it is now clear that the scientists were under pressure to meet the showbusiness deadlines."

Simons had said: "It's absurd and dangerous. ... This is all bad science... Darwinius is a wonderful fossil, but IT IS NOT A MISSING LINK OF ANY KIND. IT REPRESENTS A DEAD END IN EVOLUTION."

1 The Missing Link? Nightline, ABC News television, May 20, 2009. The Missing Link? Nightline, ABC News television, May 20, 2009

2 Gibbons, A. "Revolutionary" Fossil Fails to Dazzle Paleontologists. ScienceNOW Daily News. Posted on sciencenow.sciencemag.org May 19, 2009, accessed May 20, 2009

3 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/science/article6350095.ece>

4 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/science/article6350095.ece>

Dr. Cihat Gündoğdu's presentation: “Darwinism Legitimizes All Kinds of Oppression”

First and foremost, I would like to thank each one of our precious participants and colleagues for sharing their valuable remarks with us.

The detailed analyses and all the scientific data presented in this important meeting once again leads us to a single truth: That God exists.

The universe is not a product of random chance or disorder. In every corner of the universe there exists a flawless and perfect order, which is glorious down to its finest details. This orderliness leaves no room for errors.

Despite its clarity, some scientists however ignore and hide this fact, which all the branches of science subscribe to.

On the other hand those academicians who see and want to express this truth are dismissed from their positions in their universities only because they criticize the theory of evolution. The question is; why do these people, speaking on behalf of science, hide the scientific facts?

In order to understand this, let's make a brief outline:

The theory of evolution, which is the ideology of Darwinism, claims that there is a struggle in life. And it alleges that life is so-called a field of struggle, the stronger will eliminate the weakest one and then this way the humanity will improve, the species will change from lesser ones to the higher ones that will improve. So, this way the theory of Darwinism, the theory of evolution legitimizes all kinds of oppression, all kinds of bloodshed. And this way we observe all the wars, all the bloodshed, all the oppression, all racism in the world today. So, Darwinism should be refuted in the scientific sense.

Everyone accepts that the last century was one of the darkest and most horrific centuries we lived. And it caused inordinate bloodshed and violence. We can give a few examples of the disasters Darwinism visited upon the world in the 20th Century as follows:

- Bloody dictators such as Stalin, Hitler and Pol Pot massacred millions of people and became notorious with their cruelty.
- In the 20th century, 160 million people were killed in wars. This figure is many times more than the number of people killed since the beginning of the history of humankind till the 19th Century.
- Hitler even had thousands of his own people killed in gas chambers. Why? Because he considered them to be “useless.”

- In many Western countries from England to Germany, from the USA to Sweden, hundreds of thousands of human beings were sterilized or left to die because of the ideology of Darwinism.
- Racism became the official ideology of some states and, because of their race, some people were not considered as human beings and massacred easily.
- Conflicts and wars between the East and the West, communists and capitalists, the left and the right took place. For this reason, people of the same nationalities and even brothers turned hostile to one another.

So, the ideological foundation that pushed the 20th Century into such turmoil, conflicts, wars and commotion takes its roots from Social Darwinism. Social Darwinism is also responsible for the hate and enmity among people now in the 21st Century.

Consequently, what needs to be done for the vicious cycle of violence to come to an end is obvious: The materialist viewpoint, which is the basis of Social Darwinism, must be defeated in the intellectual sense. This will bring peace, happiness, love and respect to the whole world. For this end, it is vitally important to explain that Darwinism has been refuted in each and every field of science. So as to make people understand that Darwinism has nothing to do with science but in contradiction with the evidence from the scientific field.

Finally, on behalf of the Technics & Science Research Foundation, we want to thank every participant once again.

We thank you for supporting us to establish a better world in the light of the evidence shown by objective and true science and we wish that the friendships we have established today would become long-lasting.

I thank you for your attendance and wish you a good evening, and hope to see you all again in our next meeting.

Thank you.

The Error of Applying Nature's Laws to Human Beings

At the time when Darwin proposed his theory, science was still rather backward in many respects. The electron microscope had not yet been invented, for which reason the minute details of living organisms were unseen. The cell still resembled a simple blot, and no one knew that it possessed a structure no less complex than that of a city, made up of a great many different organelles. There was no science of genetics; the biological laws of inheritance remained to be discovered. Many biologists and scientists, including Darwin himself, were sufficiently ignorant as to believe that “acquired” characteristics could be passed on to subsequent generations. For example, they believed that if a blacksmith developed powerful muscles because of his work, his sons would have equally strong muscles.

In that primitive scientific climate, Darwin developed his theory. Neither Darwin nor any who supported him was able to submit evidence for the theory of evolution from such branches of science as paleontology, biology or anatomy. Moreover, observations and experiments performed in the following years, and especially new findings obtained in the 20th century, revealed that the theory was clearly wrong. But despite the theory's scientific

weakness, its providing a basis for materialist and atheist thought led to its immediate adoption by one part of the scientific world.

Certain circles began to apply the theory of evolution to the social sphere, on account of the ideological messages it contained. It took its place at the root of such 20th-century disasters as genocide, mass slaughter, civil wars in which brother slew brother, and world wars that ruined nations. Religious moral values and the virtues they bring with them, were abandoned in favor of the law of the jungle in which the weaker are oppressed and eliminated. This theory, devoid of any scientific validity, influenced an entire century.

One of Social Darwinists' major errors was their attempt to implement that theory to the social arena.

Another of their errors was to assume that laws applying to animals also applied to human beings whom God has created with conscience, reason, consciousness and the ability to make judgments. Therefore, contrary to what Social Darwinists claim, the laws of the jungle do not apply to human beings, every one of whom is responsible for using his abilities as best as he can throughout his life. God has also created human beings with a finite life span. When it comes to an end, all individuals will die, and will then be resurrected to account for all their behavior during their life of this world.

In nature, living things may die or become extinct when they cannot adapt to the prevailing conditions. For example, a dark-haired rabbit in a snow-covered forest may soon fall prey to a fox who can see it clearly. Yet, contrary to what Darwinists would have us believe, dead dark-haired rabbits don't give rise to the emergence of a new lighter-haired species. Furthermore, animals are very different from human beings, who do not have to adapt to natural conditions in order to live. We possess the means to change our surroundings in accordance with our needs and wishes. For instance, we adapt our buildings, heating and cooling systems and clothing according to the climate where we live. There is no natural selection in human societies, because human beings' reason and abilities prevent such elimination.

Such errors lead Social Darwinists to look at societies from an inhuman perspective. An important example of that perspective, so devoid of reason and conscience, is how they thought that societies could progress by abandoning the weak and needy, the powerless and handicapped to their own devices. The fact is that such a selfish refusal brings with it decline, not progress. Those whom Darwinism maintains should be neglected and left uncared for are conscious human beings, able to think and reason. When abandoned to injustice and cruelty, unless they possess the virtues of patience, forgiveness and understanding imparted by religious moral values, they may feel great anger and hatred for those who inflict such treatment on them. To assuage that anger, as many recent examples have shown, they may then resort to violence, which can then give rise to conflict and chaos. As a result of all the material and spiritual means expended to resolve those conflicts, there will be a decline in all spheres—from art to technology, from the economy to science—rather than progress.

Furthermore, killing the sick or handicapped in the name of eugenics, is not only terribly brutal, but also contributes nothing whatsoever to social progress. Such an open acceptance of murder will bring enormous losses that will spell ruin for society. Today, some 6% of the world's population—some half a billion people, a very large number—are handicapped. That would mean that everyone would lose someone from his family or circle of acquaintances, and will have acquiesced in their deaths. This will open spiritual wounds that wreak great harm on people's psychological well-being. In any society where a mother cannot trust her children, children their mother, or brothers each other, where one can allow another to be

killed at any time, there will be severe degeneration and depression. In any case, a society that kills people just because they are handicapped is undergoing a devastating moral collapse. It must already have lost all spiritual values, all humanity. Without doubt, to claim progress by means of murder indicates very serious mental and psychological problems.

The greatest suffering will be experienced by those condemned to “elimination,” and that suffering will give rise to deep wounds in the consciences of others.

Social Darwinism sought, to apply to societies the theory of evolution—itsself based on Charles Darwin's rather backward scientific understanding—but its world view is in total conflict with human nature. When put into practice, it belittles humanity and drags it back towards depression and chaos, bringing hatred that leads to conflict, warfare, and murder.

Social Darwinism reached its peak during the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th, but its adverse effects can still be seen in the present day. Under such names as “evolutionary psychology” and “genetic determinism,” attempts are still being made to evaluate societies according to the errors of Darwinism. In order to protect the 21st century from further catastrophes, the dangers of Social Darwinism must be revealed in all their aspects, and the world must be told that there is no scientific evidence for the theory on which this philosophy is based.

Conclusion

The joint opinion of the speakers and scientists, academicians, university students, artists, politicians and representatives of non-governmental organizations who have participated in the conference is to revise the curriculum in its entirety beginning from elementary education. Evolutionary claims should not be presented as scientific facts and this one-sided education should be brought to an end by introducing the scientific proofs for Creation in the school curricula.

It must be explained to our youth that the theory of evolution is obsolete and this theory that lies 150 years in the past is particularly introduced under the pretext of science to distance people from the values of religion, although it no longer has any scientific validity in the light of today's scientific findings.

Our proposal is: In those parts of textbooks where evolutionary theory is given as an explanation to origin of life, the scientific proofs that refute evolutionary claims (that will be summarized below) should be included along with the scientific evidence for the fact of Creation that rebuts evolution theory. There is an important requirement to provide for scientific facts besides evolutionary claims. This is the only way in which students will not be misdirected and it will allow them to make objective decisions based on the scientific truths displayed for them. For that reason, there is definitely a need for changing the school curricula to present these scientific facts. Today, our children have no access to such truths of science in the educational system, and thus they are subjected to a biased education.

It is possible to give an outline of the scientific impasses of the evolutionary theory as below: The theory of evolution cannot give an explanation as to how inanimate molecules attained life. It cannot give an account to how the first protein came into existence.

The simplest protein molecule is in need of other proteins and the complete cell to come into being. The imaginary mechanisms suggested by scientists in advocacy of evolution theory have all been refuted by scientific data.

Evolution theory cannot give an explanation for how the human soul and mind came into existence. The so-called transitional forms alleged by evolutionists have not been found in fossil records despite the 150 years of research: THERE IS NOT EVEN ONE SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL. Hundreds of millions of fossils were unearthed, but none of these are intermediary links but intact forms of certain species of living beings that have gone extinct.

Detailed research has demonstrated that fossils such as Archaeopteryx, which were claimed to be transitional forms by evolutionists, are in fact not intermediary forms. That is why evolutionists can only bring up imaginary drawings for their claims of transitional forms today, as they simply cannot show any single intermediary fossil.

Fossils of extremely complex creatures such as trilobites were discovered in the period described as the Cambrian Explosion where the first traces of living beings emerged. The sudden appearance of highly complex organs such as the 3,000 lenses in the compound eye structure of the trilobite destroys the gradual evolutionary claims and is evidence for the fact of Creation.

In light of the first data received via the Hubble Telescope, which has proven that the universe had a definitive beginning, which commenced with the Big Bang. This discovery debunked theories of those who claimed the universe was eternal and thus did not have a Creator – surely God is beyond such thoughts. The universe has a beginning and it was created.

If deemed appropriate, we as the Technics and Science Research Foundation would like submit this work for your most valuable evaluation in assertion that we may conceive that all the evidence that scientifically refutes evolution theory be included in the textbooks used in every level of education in concert with a scientific committee consisting of researchers, instructors and experts on the topic and we are prepared to offer every means of support and contribution to this end.

RESİM ALTI YAZILARI

s.7

A fossil exhibition was held during the conference displaying fossils, which are proof that evolution never happened. As the fossil record shows, living things came into being in a single moment, with all the characteristics they possess and never altered in the least for so long as the species survived.

s.9

95-million-year old fossil horn shark is identical to its living counterpart and shows no change.

s.11

There are more than 380 fossil beds all over the Earth. More than 700 million fossils have been unearthed to date. All of these fossils are evidence of God's creation. Not even a single one of these fossils is an intermediary link; they all are proofs of the Fact of Creation.

s.13

Adnan Oktar

s.20

Francis Crick and James Watson won the Nobel Prize with their discovery of the astonishing structure of the DNA.

s.21

There are 46 chromosomes in human cells in 23 pairs and they are responsible for the operation of various activities in the body. Any deficiency in these chromosomes would lead to irreparable damages.

s.23

DNA: the molecule of life

chromosomes

cell

gene

DNA

protein

s.31

1) A mRNA copy is made of the information in the DNA. **2)** A Ribosome gets prepared for protein synthesis. **3)** mRNA goes to the cytoplasm, that is, to the ribosomes. **4)** Transfer RNAs move freely in the cytoplasm. **5)** mRNA settles in the protein synthesis site of ribosomes. **6)** In the ribosomes, messenger RNA and transfer RNA interact with each other and bind. Amino acids that are properly positioned are joined by peptide bonds in the correct sequence to form proteins. **7)** Transfer RNA collects the amino acids in the cytoplasm and transfers them to the ribosome.

When the need is felt for a protein in a cell, a signal is sent to the DNA molecule. The DNA molecule receiving the signal understands which protein is needed. Then the DNA makes an RNA copy carrying specific information for making a protein, which is called messenger RNA. After receiving the information, mRNA leaves the nucleus and heads straight for the ribosomes, the protein production factory. At the same time, another RNA copied from the DNA, called transfer RNA, carries the amino acids for the proteins to the ribosomes. Each tRNA is an "adapter" molecule that can link with a specific amino acid. The tRNA which carries the amino acid sequence information of the protein to be formed settles in the production site of the ribosome. The amino acids brought by the tRNA take their places according to the sequence notified by the messenger RNA. Then another RNA molecule copied from DNA, called ribosomal RNA, enables the messenger and transfer RNAs to join together. Amino acids brought in by the transfer RNAs develop peptide bonds to form protein chains. The messenger RNAs leave the ribosome having deposited their loads. The protein that is produced then proceeds to where it will be used.

s.43

All mutations observed on living beings have proved to be harmful. The reason is that the DNA has a very complex structure, and random effects on this molecule will only harm the organism. The result of any change due to mutations will only result in genetic disorders, fatality or disability. On the side, there are examples of deformed living beings that were subjected to mutations.

DNA Damage

Debilitated organisms due to mutations

s.52

Variation is a genetic phenomenon that causes individuals or groups within a species to exhibit different characteristics. Variation always takes place within the boundaries of genetic information, which bounds are referred to as the gene pool but such variation represents no evidence for evolution.

s.53

False

s.63

1965

1992

2003

The cosmic background radiation discovered in 1965 by Penzias and Wilson is regarded as incontrovertible evidence of the Big Bang by the scientific world.

s.75

1. Pro

2. Gly

The amino acid structure of the protein collagen is seen. As you see, one of each three amino acids is glycine (Gly). Being very small, glycine is the most suitable amino acid for the structure of collagen.

s.83

THE DNA:

ONE OF THE PROOFS OF CREATION

The DNA molecule that serves as a databank, 40 times larger than the world's greatest encyclopedia, with millions of different entries.

s.87

The harmful effects of mutations can clearly be seen in the living creatures illustrated. Mutations either cripple or kill. Mutations cannot improve living things, they can only harm them.

s.99

Mr. Adnan Oktar has written more than 300 books, translated into 76 different languages.

s.101

Fossil darkling beetle 100 million years old

Fossil halfbeak 52 million years old

Fossil sycamore leaf 54 - 37 million years old

s.102

Distylium Leaf

Period: Eocene

Age: 50 million years

Region: Green River Formation, Bonanza, Utah, USA

Ground Cricket

Period: Cretaceous

Age: 125 million years

Region: Santana Formation, Araripe Basin, Brazil

s.103

Mantis

Period: Cretaceous

Age: 100 million years

Region: Burma

The fossil in the picture is a double aspect positive-negative one.

Coelacanth

Period: Triassic

Age: 210 million years

Region: Madagascar

s.104

Jellyfish

Period: Cambrian

Age: 500 million years

Region: Wisconsin, USA

Trumpet Coral (*Caulastrea curvata*)

Period: Jurassic

Age: 150 million years

Region: Germany

s.105

Fossil bird

Confuciusornis Sanctus

Period: Cretaceous

Age: 125 million years

Region: China

s.108

The primitive microscopes of Darwin's time gave the impression that the cell was merely a simple structure of undifferentiated protoplasm. On the other hand, modern day microscopes have shown how complex and flawless the structure of the cell truly is.

s.110

The materialist viewpoint, which is the basis of Social Darwinism, must be defeated in the intellectual sense. This will bring peace, happiness, love and respect to the entire world.

GOD IS THE CREATOR OF EVERYTHING

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION IS NOT SCIENTIFIC