

The Cambrian Evidence That Darwin Failed to Comprehend

*“The fossil record had caused Darwin more grief than joy.
Nothing distressed him more than the Cambrian explosion,
the coincident appearance of almost all complex organic designs.”
(Stephen J. Gould)*

Harun Yahya

First English Edition in November 2007

Translated by Carl Nino Rossini

Edited by Tam Mossman

Published by:

GLOBAL PUBLISHING

Talatpasa Mah. Emirgazi Caddesi Ibrahim Elmas İş Merkezi

A Blok Kat 4 Okmeydani - Istanbul / Turkey

Phone: (+90 212) 222 00 88

Printed and bound by Secil Ofset in Istanbul

100 Yil Mah. MAS-SIT Matbaacilar Sitesi 4. Cadde No: 77

Bagcilar-Istanbul/Turkey

Phone: (+90 212) 629 06 15

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

www.harunyahya.com - www.harunyahya.net

Contents

Introduction

The Cambrian Period

The Cambrian, Evolution and Creation

The Origin of Species According to the Fossil Record

Fossil Sufficiency

The Pre-Cambrian World

Ediacaran: A False Intermediate-Form Fauna

The Variety of Life in the Ediacaran Period and
Evolutionists' Inconsistencies

The Cambrian Explosion

The Systematics of Organisms

Burgess Shale Fauna: Discovery of A Miracle

The Cambrian Explosion: A Dazzling Variety of Life

The Fossils Are Examined

In the Blink of an Eye

Cambrian Life Forms

Some Preserved Fossils

Marrella

Canadaspis

Hallucigenia

Odaraia

Anomalocaris

Pikaia

Opabinia

Insollicorypha

Branchiocaris

The Vertebrates That Evolutionists Never Expected!

The Fact Revealed by Fossils

What Is a Complex System?

The First Complex Life Forms

Cambrian Ecology and Suddenly Appearing Predators

Genomic Complexity

The Trilobite: A Flawless Cambrian Life Form

Amazing 530-Million-Year-Old Eyes

The Superior Complexity in *Phacops* Trilobites

The Problem and Its Solution

Extraordinary Sensitivity

The Trilobite Eye Is a Marvel of Creation

Evolutionists Cannot Account for the Trilobite

Evolutionists Seek a Way Out, Inventing Imaginary Scenarios for the Cambrian

The “Snowball Earth” Hypothesis

The Oxygen Theory

The Modern Evolutionary Synthesis (Neo-Darwinism)

Faced With the Cambrian Fauna,

Neo-Darwinism Is at a Complete Dead End

Hox Genes

The Fossil Record Reveals an Important Fact: Evolution Never Happened

Darwin’s Tree of Life Has Been Chopped Down

According to Darwin Himself, the Cambrian Explosion

Deals His Theory a Deadly Blow

The Idea of Ascent from the Simple to the Complex

Is a Deception

The Imaginary Mechanisms of Evolution Are Bankrupt

Evolution is a Deception,

As the Cambrian Explosion Makes Clear

Cambrian Facts Yet Again Reveal the

Darwinists’ Dogmatism

Cambrian Life Forms: Marvels of Creation

Conclusion

The Deception of Evolution

About the Author

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

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

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

All of Harun Yahya's works share one single goal: to convey the Qur'an's message, encourage readers to consider basic faith-related issues such as Allah's existence and unity and the Hereafter; and to expose irreligious systems' feeble foundations and perverted ideologies.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To the Reader

A special chapter is assigned to the collapse of the theory of evolution because this theory constitutes the basis of all anti-spiritual philosophies. Since Darwinism rejects the fact of creation – and therefore, Allah's existence – over the last 140 years it has caused many people to abandon their faith or fall into doubt. It is therefore an imperative service, a very important duty to show everyone that this theory is a deception. Since some readers may find the chance to read only one of our books, we think it appropriate to devote a chapter to summarize this subject.

All the author's books explain faith-related issues in light of Qur'anic verses, and invite readers to learn Allah's words and to live by them. All the subjects concerning Allah's verses are explained so as to leave no doubt or room for questions in the reader's mind. The books' sincere, plain, and fluent style ensures that everyone of every age and from every social group can easily understand them. Thanks to their effective, lucid narrative, they can be read at one sitting. Even those who rigorously reject spirituality are influenced by the facts these books document and cannot refute the truthfulness of their contents.

This and all the other books by the author can be read individually, or discussed in a group. Readers eager to profit from the books will find discussion very useful, letting them relate their reflections and experiences to one another.

In addition, it will be a great service to Islam to contribute to the publication and reading of these books, written solely for the pleasure of Allah. The author's books are all extremely convincing. For this reason, to communicate true religion to others, one of the most effective methods is encouraging them to read these books.

We hope the reader will look through the reviews of his other books at the back of this book. His rich source material on faith-related issues is very useful, and a pleasure to read.

In these books, unlike some other books, you will not find the author's personal views, explanations based on dubious sources, styles that are unobservant of the respect and reverence due to sacred subjects, nor hopeless, pessimistic arguments that create doubts in the mind and deviations in the heart.

Introduction

As Charles Darwin was forced to admit, “I remember well the time when the thought of the [structure of the] eye made me cold all over.”

One of the main reasons why was that his theory was unable to account for the eyeball’s flawless structures and complexity. The illusory mechanisms of evolution could not have given rise to such a complex organ. To prove that the eye could have come into being through the imaginary phases of evolution, Darwin needed to reduce the eye’s components to very simple forms—but this he was unable to do.

How did such a complex organ emerge? The lack of any explanation is as great a dilemma for present-day adherents of the theory of evolution as it was for its original architects. Darwinists encounter this dilemma wherever they encounter complexity. How could such intricate variety have come into existence by way of a trial-and-error process that, they maintained, took place over the course of millions of years? Evolutionists cannot offer any logical scenario to answer that question.

Many of the facts revealed by science are by themselves sufficient to demolish the theory of evolution. However, one piece of evidence demolishes the very foundations of the theory and poses practically every question that Darwinists cannot explain—namely, the variety and complexity of life, exhibited with such magnificence all over the world, some 530 million years ago.

The eyeball, for which evolutionists attempt to account with developmental scenarios, existed in all its complexity at a time when, according to evolutionists themselves, no “eye-like” organs should have existed. In an environment in which only single-celled organisms had existed, a wealth of highly complex living species suddenly came into being, with no trace at all of any supposed forerunners, as if to provide living proof to refute the theory of evolution.

So persuasive is the fossil record, and so compelling is this phenomenon from evolutionists’ point of view, that scientists refer to this event as “the Cambrian Explosion” or “the Biological Big Bang.” They continue to search for undiscovered pre-Cambrian fossils that might prove to be the “ancestors” of these multitude of organisms. Yet all their efforts keep pointing to one single explanation: a sudden, flawless, widely differing and complex creation.

But evolutionists, constantly striving to account for this sudden variety, are unable to comprehend that there is a special reason behind this extraordinary phenomenon. It shows that all living things on Earth, just like those of the Cambrian, were created.

The utter lack of any “intermediate form” fossils is one of the best, most effective and unequivocal responses to Darwinists’ struggle against the fact of creation. Allah (God), the most auspicious Creator of order, reveals His own existence and supreme artistry by way of His living creations. Marvels of anatomy that existed some 530 million years ago are set out before our eyes, even for those unwilling to see the perfect and flawless proofs of creation that

populate the world. Those who still wish to strive against Almighty Allah are only diverting themselves, seeking a grandeur for themselves that they can never achieve:

[He is] the Lord of the heavens and the Earth and everything in between them, if you are people with certainty. There is no deity but Him—He gives life and causes to die—your Lord and the Lord of your forefathers, the previous peoples. Yet they play around in doubt. (Surat ad-Dukhan, 7-9)

This book describes proofs of creation that can liberate individuals from the floundering described in the Qur'an and will enable them to see the infinite might of Allah. Here you will learn of the traits of Cambrian life forms that existed 530 million years ago, yet which still amaze scientists today. To all rational people of good conscience, it thus demonstrates that creation is the only valid explanation for the origin of the millions of species, both extinct and still living today—indeed, of life itself.

The Cambrian Period

Life on Earth exhibits the most amazing variety. From the Poles to the Amazon, from mountain peaks to the ocean deeps, our planet overflows with an endless variety of life forms. Its many organisms, from bacteria to worms, from ants to trees, from sea gulls to dolphins, have each been equipped with extraordinarily sensitive systems and gloriously complex structures, thanks to which they can survive in such close harmony with their environment. These systems, whose details are still being discovered by biologists, contain features that astonish human beings.

Scientists and thinkers have investigated nature in all periods of history, witnessed its flawless harmony and planning, and have sought to answer such questions as these:

- * How did such a wide variety of living things first appear on Earth?
- * How did they acquire the ideal systems in their bodies that permitted them to thrive?
- * How is such harmony and equilibrium between these organisms possible?

In any search for the answers to these questions, the origin of multi-celled organisms assumes a particular importance, because they make the greatest contribution to the biological variety on Earth. It is indisputable that single-celled organisms are highly complex life forms that make an enormous contribution to the survival of life on Earth. Yet the structures possessed by single-celled organisms are far less complex than those in multi-celled organisms, which display an extraordinarily advanced variety and complexity.

The Cambrian Period is the name assigned to that geological age when all the present-day phyla of multi-cellular organisms suddenly appeared. So sudden and comprehensive was their appearance that many scientists refer to it as “the Cambrian Explosion.” The late evolutionist paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould has described this phenomenon as “most remarkable and puzzling event in the history of life,” while the evolutionist zoologist Thomas S. Ray writes that the origin of multi-cellular life is an event of comparable significance to the origin of life itself.

The last 25 years have seen a major increase in our knowledge of the Cambrian Period, and the extraordinary nature of its “explosion” has attracted enormous scientific interest. Scientists analyzing the discoveries made by various disciplines have realized that this phenomenon is one that took place even more suddenly, and in an even more unique manner, than they had previously imagined. Our better understanding of the concrete facts and characteristics unique to the Cambrian explosion has resulted in reliable explanations for the origins of multi-celled organisms and of life in general.

This information, obtained in the light of modern science, actually constitutes proofs of Allah’s flawless creation during the period in question. Modern scientific discoveries regarding this phenomenon—which Darwin himself described as a “serious difficulty”—have sounded the death knell for the theory of evolution.

The subject of the origin of life on Earth cannot be fully understood without a thorough knowledge of what actually took place in the Cambrian explosion. To that end, all the details and facts discovered to date about the Cambrian Period have been set out in this book.

The first section deals with the ingeniously complex structures of Cambrian life forms, the invalidity of Darwinist attempts to interpret the fossil record, and the current hopeless situation of evolutionists and their unscientific beliefs. The second section considers the living fossils that defy the theory of evolution.

The Cambrian explosion is just one of the glorious creations of Allah that modern science has managed to discover. Almighty Allah brought all living things into existence simply by commanding them to “Be!” His flawless creation is revealed as follows in one verse:

He is Allah—the Creator, the Maker, the Giver of Form. To Him belong the Most Beautiful Names. Everything in the heavens and Earth glorifies Him. He is the Almighty, the All-Wise. (Surat al-Hashr, 24)

The Cambrian, Evolution and Creation

Before moving on to consider the Cambrian explosion itself, we first need to briefly compare what features are to be expected from the fossil record according to the theory of evolution, versus creation.

Darwin’s theory of evolution claims that all forms of life are descended from one original single cell. According to that claim, all the millions of plant and animal species must have descended from this single cell. In the fossil record, therefore, there should exist various traces of the “family tree” deriving from this common ancestor. Evolutionists maintain that there is a direct line of descent between this imaginary first cell and all later living species, from fish to primates and from octopuses to frogs. If this hypothesis is true, then it should have left available traces. Namely:

1. An enormous number of intermediate forms, and
2. A slow, incremental, gradual change in the anatomy of specimens in the fossil record,
3. The earliest living things should display a simple structure and show evidence of their development from even simpler forms,
4. New life forms should emerge not as entirely different species, but as subspecies barely distinguishable from one another. And these subspecies should diverge from one another more and more over the course of time. Higher biological categories such as families, order and classes should gradually appear as the living world expanded—that is, slowly.

All these four requirements can be summed up as the condition of *continuity*. That is because evolutionists claim that all forms of life are descended from one another, straight back to that first imaginary cell. They believe that the process of change between species took place on a constant basis. Such continuity logically demands that countless intermediate forms must

once have existed—and so, evidence of their assumed evolutionary development must be observable—in fact, plentiful!—in the fossil record.

On the other hand, the fact of creation requires none of these imaginary preconditions. It teaches that living things were flawlessly created by Allah, in their complete and present forms, and with all their characteristic features. For that reason alone, it does not presuppose that “later” form of life must be more complex than the one that preceded it. There is no need to observe similarities of structures and behaviors between different living groups. On the contrary, the fact of creation suggests that all living things were created with their own unique structures, and can be conveniently classified into distinct groups on the basis of anatomical characteristics.

When you examine the information regarding the Cambrian explosion provided by paleontologists, you can clearly see why this information verifies creation while demolishing the theory of evolution. That explosion saw the emergence of dozens of organisms distinguished from one another by enormous differences. This reveals that there are unbridgeable gaps—in terms of both descent and complexity—between the complex living things that appeared during the Cambrian and those that existed before.

So striking are these differences that evolutionists, who need to be able to prove continuity between living groups, have been unable to establish any familial links between them, even on the theoretical level.

The Cambrian Period shows that even the very earliest creatures appeared suddenly with all their exceedingly complex structures—which is exactly what creation teaches. The origin of the perfect structures possessed by living things is creation by Allah. These perfect structures exhibit no deficiencies, no missing or functionless stages of the kinds predicated by the theory of evolution. Instead, each one appears in flawless fashion in the fossil record.

In short, the Cambrian explosion makes the absence of continuity in the fossil record plain for all to see; and this constitutes one of the most concrete pieces of evidence for creation.

The Origin of Species According to the Fossil Record

When Charles Darwin published his *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, he set out his own ideas on their origin and claimed that this was based on various mechanisms of the imaginary evolutionary process.

According to his thinking, evolution led to minute changes in species through these mechanisms; and these differences then increased, until every new living species developed from some previous one, as a result of very small changes. Again according to the theory, living species are not distinguished from one another by major anatomical differences, but begin diverging from one another through minuscule variations.

This implies that all living things are related to one another. One living species experienced random and gradual changes over a period of time lasting for millions of years, at the end of which its descendents have developed into another species entirely. In that case, evidence of the long transformation period—fossils of at least some of the various intermediate forms—should exist in the Earth's fossil record. Since they lived in a kind of transitional period, many of these transitional forms had yet to complete the development of their more sophisticated organs, and must have been deformed, crippled and deficient in some way.

Since this supposed process of evolutionary change lasted for millions of years, these alleged intermediate forms must have existed on Earth for almost the entire intervening time—and should have left a great many surviving traces in the fossil record.

That is exactly what Darwin believed. He expected that later fossil researchers would unearth the intermediate forms in question that would thus confirm his claim. He formulated his theory in the light of this hope—which was devoid of any scientific basis.

Darwin's theory required that countless intermediate forms must once have lived—and as he himself stated:

... that the number of intermediate and transitional links, between all living and extinct species, must have been inconceivably great.¹

He expressed the same idea in other parts of his book:

If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking most closely all the species of the same group together, must assuredly have existed... Consequently evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains.²

However, Darwin was also aware that no such intermediate-form fossils had yet been found—and admitted that this fact was a major dilemma that threatened his theory. That is why, in the chapter titled "Difficulties on Theory," 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? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.³

According to Darwin, species, differentiating themselves by way of minuscule changes, must first have formed families, then orders, then classes and finally phyla—the largest division in the living world that separates living things in terms of their basic anatomical structures.

Yet the fossil findings were incompatible with Darwin's theory!

Cambrian fossils discovered in Wales dealt a severe blow to the classification with which Darwin set out his theory. The Cambrian Period (from 542 to 488 million years ago), the oldest in the history of multi-cellular organisms, represented the sudden emergence of a great many phyla and classes of animals, all in their fully formed states, in an environment where only single-celled organisms had existed before. To put it another way, biology operated in the exact opposite manner of what Darwin predicted: Phyla emerged along with individual species, not afterward.

No doubt, this was a matter of concern for any evolutionist! Darwin himself was well aware of the results already emerging from the fossil discoveries of his own day, and he described this as one of the gravest difficulties that could threaten his theory:

Consequently, if my theory be true, it is indisputable that before the lowest Silurian* [Cambrian] stratum was deposited, long periods elapsed, as long as, or probably far longer than, the whole interval from the Silurian age to the present day; and that during these vast, yet quite unknown, periods of time, the world swarmed with living creatures. To the question why we do not find records of these vast primordial periods, I can give no satisfactory answer.⁴

When Darwin learned that some of the most fundamental classes of the animal world appeared suddenly in the oldest known rock strata, he described this as a “serious” problem, and said, “The case at present must remain inexplicable, and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained.”⁵

However, in Darwin's view, this problem was only an ostensible one, because he believed that the difficulty would be resolved in the future. For that reason, he claimed as a sort of alibi that, the history of the Earth was not preserved well in the fossil record.

According to Darwin, complex organic entities had indeed appeared long before the formation of Cambrian strata, and their fossil remains must have been left behind somewhere in the oldest—and so far, unknown—sedimentary rocks laid down in the history of the Earth.⁶ He assumed that pre-Cambrian fossil beds had been altered due to heat and pressure—much as sedimentary limestone is transformed into metamorphic marble—for which reason all traces of fossils in those rocks might well have been eradicated.

He therefore maintained that all the major animal groups had erroneously been ascribed as appearing during the Cambrian Period. One day, according to Darwin, detailed fossil researches and excavations would inevitably reveal those missing specimens.⁷

But Darwin was wrong!

Our current knowledge regarding the pre-Cambrian is doubtless much more complete than it was in Darwin's time. Ever since then, enormous research has been conducted into pre-Cambrian fossils—and the emerging results have actually made the problems facing evolutionists even more difficult, rather than resolving Darwin's original concerns. New Cambrian fossil beds were discovered in Canada, Greenland and China.⁸

All that was obtained from the pre-Cambrian was a number of single-celled organisms. There was no trace of any fossil similar to Cambrian ones, or which could be regarded as their ancestors.

That the Cambrian strata exhibit a wide spectrum of such complex living things is by itself sufficient to undermine Darwin's fundamental claims concerning the origin of species. Darwin did not live to witness these new fossil discoveries, which he would no doubt have described as a tragedy for his theory. But these findings did present a severe dilemma for his followers. Discoveries in the Cambrian fossil beds shattered their claims regarding the origin of species.

But what was the great difference between the Cambrian and other previous eras? What was it about Cambrian organisms that so worried evolutionists?

We may examine this question from various different angles:

Fossil Sufficiency

In Darwin's day, the living cell was thought of as merely a sac filled with liquid. Scientists of the Victorian era were ignorant of the organelles in the cell and its other microscopic structures. Nobody knew that the DNA molecule contained enough information to fill many volumes of an encyclopedia. It was thought that if a baby was born handicapped, that was because of fears the mother had experienced during the gestation process.

In Darwin's time it was believed that the soil of a land being plowed away could change that region's climate. People imagined that outer space was a colorless fluid known as ether and that if people's hands were severed over the course of a few generations eventually children without any hands would be born. The electron microscope did not yet exist in 1859. Neither did the refrigerator (which was invented only in 1938), the telephone (1876), the typewriter (1867), or even the ballpoint pen (1863). Researchers of the time tried to understand natural phenomena by means of such rudimentary equipment as compasses, thermometers and the like.

Accordingly, in the days when Darwin was making his studies and conjectures, research into biology and the knowledge resulting from that research were very limited.

In Darwin's day, it was estimated that the Cambrian Period extended no further back than 60 million years. According to this view, the Earth was estimated to be only around 200 million years old.⁹ (It is now estimated to be 4.6 billion years old.)

In Darwin's day, all branches of science were in a relatively primitive state. For that reason, conjectures regarding the imaginary evolutionary process were left dependent upon advancing science and technology and the opportunities that these were expected to provide. The expectation that future fossil discoveries would shed light on what was then unknown led the public to regard the theories put forward as completely reasonable.

Ever since, in fact, attempts have continued uninterrupted to find specimens of intermediate forms that might account for species' sudden appearance in the Cambrian Period. Paleontologists still hope to find a few specimens from the pre-Cambrian that are recognizably similar to Cambrian fossils, which can let them construct a supposedly evolutionary progression between the Cambrian and earlier periods.

150 years went by. Advances in science and technology elicited important information. Developments in such specialized fields as biochemistry, biophysics, genetics and molecular biology demonstrated there is such complete perfection in Earth's living things at the molecular level that they could not possibly have evolved.

Discoveries in the field of paleontology have unearthed a large portion of the fossils still concealed in the Earth's sedimentary crust, but revealed *not one single intermediate form* that might justify the illusory process of evolution that Darwin had postulated.

This was the 21st century's most important contribution with regard to paleontology. A large part of the world had been excavated, and many fossil specimens had been obtained as a result of wide-ranging research. In terms of the missing Cambrian "intermediate form" fossils that Darwin imagined would be eventually discovered, the fact that emerged was a most surprising one for Darwinists: All complex organisms thought to be half a billion years old and more in fact belonged to the Cambrian Period.

Pre-Cambrian fossil beds gave up no specimens revealing any transition to the Cambrian species. In the Cambrian Period, a stunning complexity and variety emerged quite suddenly all of which disappeared again after the Cambrian. This was really a most extraordinary state of affairs.

However, the claims made by Darwin's followers that there are insufficient fossils, made as an excuse for the missing fossils in question, were proved to be totally unfounded. The Harvard University evolutionist paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould had no qualms about making this admission:

The most famous such burst, the Cambrian explosion, marks the inception of modern multicellular life. Within just a few million years, nearly every major kind of animal anatomy appears in the fossil record for the first time. . . . The Precambrian record is now sufficiently good that the old rationale about undiscovered sequences of smoothly transitional forms will no longer wash.¹⁰

The realization that the present-day fossil record is entirely adequate represents a major disappointment for evolutionist paleontologists. Along with providing no evidence for evolution, the fossils obtained so far have also eliminated a number of *false* pieces of evidence.

The fabricated and deceptive evidence put forward by proponents of evolution has been entirely eliminated with (1) detailed studies of the fossils obtained, (2) examples of “living fossils” that go back, unchanged, for millions of years, and (3) the realization of the existence of stasis (stability) in fossils of the same creatures from different periods in time. (For more specifics, see www.living-fossils.com.) In other words, far from confirming Darwin’s expectations, fossil research has provided results that he never foresaw.

The evolutionist David M. Raup, former director of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, has this to say:

We are now about 120 years after Darwin, and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species, but the situation hasn’t changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transitions than we had in Darwin’s time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information—what appeared to be a nice, simple progression when relatively few data were available, now appear to be much more complex and much less gradualistic. So Darwin’s problem has not been alleviated in the last 120 years . . .¹¹

The evolutionist zoologist David Kitts interprets the facts presented by the fossil record as a “difficulty” for evolutionists:

. . . paleontology. . . had presented. . . difficulties. . . the most notorious of which is the presence of ‘gaps’ in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms . . . paleontology does not provide them.¹²

The fact revealed by paleontology is that the pre-Cambrian Period was one in which only single-celled organisms existed. In the environment of 1.2 billion years ago, single-celled organisms with a nucleus containing DNA were the dominant form of life. Towards the beginning of the Cambrian, sponge-like organisms emerged, consisting of only a few different cells. Those cells were now specialized, with each performing its own separate functions. However, these organisms still had no comprehensive internal structures, nervous systems or muscle fibers.¹³ In other words, they were very different from the later Cambrian life forms.

The Cambrian fossil record has revealed the characteristics of an enormous variety of living things, all appearing suddenly and independently of one another. And these are not the descendents of the organisms described above!

The California University evolutionist biologist James W. Valentine makes this confession:

The fossil record is of little use in providing direct evidence of the pathways of descent of the phyla or of invertebrate classes. Each phylum with a fossil record had already evolved its characteristic body plan when it first appeared, so far as we can tell from the fossil remains.

And no phylum is connected to any other via intermediate fossil types [*emphasis added*]. Indeed, none of the invertebrate classes can be connected with another class by a series of intermediates. The relationships among phyla and classes must be inferred on the basis of their resemblance. However, even the most sophisticated techniques of phylogeny analysis have thus far failed to resolve the great differences of opinion concerning the relationships among phyla (or among many classes as well).¹⁴

Valentine admits that the fossil record constitutes no evidence for evolution, and that living things emerged suddenly wherever on Earth they may be found. To put it another way, he—and other experts—are forced to admit that no evolution took place in the ages preceding the Cambrian. Instead of imaginary pre-Cambrian intermediate-form fossils, we encounter an increasing number of complex Cambrian organisms. This fact prompted Bruce Runnegar, the California University evolutionist and professor of paleontology, to make this admission:

As might be expected, the paleontologists have concentrated on the fossil record and have therefore provided wealth of information on the early history of a great variety of invertebrate groups, but little insight into their origins.¹⁵

The fossil record is the sole foundation on which the theory of evolution relies. However, the fossil record's very sufficiency—the fact that a large part of the Earth's strata have been excavated—is enough to make it abundantly clear that living things never underwent evolution. No evolutionary process ever took place.

Statements by evolutionists to the effect that “the fossil record is sufficient and no intermediate form has yet been encountered” are actually a simple admission that there's not the slightest evidence to support the theory of evolution.

This fact makes the existence of Almighty Allah, His creative artistry and infinite power, abundantly clear. Living things, with all their astonishing attributes, are created by Allah's will, at whatever moment He chooses.

Yes, everything in the heavens and Earth belongs to Allah. Yes, Allah's promise is true but most of them do not know it. He gives life and causes to die and you will be returned to Him. (Surah Yunus, 55-56)

The Pre-Cambrian Earth

Cambrian rocks no older than 550 My **contained the earliest animal fossil record—arthropods, mollusks, brachiopods, and others. Below them there were no animal fossils** [*emphasis added*]. Darwin himself conceded that his theory of evolution by natural selection required a history of previous populations for all these creatures to have descended from. Scientists hatched a brood of suggestions; all fossil-bearing rocks from the critical interval of animal evolution had been eroded or metamorphosed, or animals arose in freshwater lakes and only later entered the oceans. None proved satisfactory, and the wealth of animal fossils that defined the beginning of the Cambrian age remained an enigma.¹⁶

Logically enough, “the Pre-Cambrian Era” is the name given to the vast stretch of time between the formation of the Earth up to the Cambrian Period.

The Earth itself is estimated to be around 4.6 billion years old. Direct evidence of the oldest organisms from this period date back around 3.5 billion years. In certain strata, colonies of bacteria are laid out like carpets. Known as cyanobacteria, these prokaryotic single-celled microorganisms lived in the seas and were capable of photosynthesis.

Eukaryotic organisms appear in the fossil record some 2 billion years ago. These organisms consisted of a single cell with a distinct nucleus and other organelles with a membrane, with DNA packed inside the nucleus—characteristics that are absent from prokaryotic cells. Between 3.5 billion and 600 million years ago, the Earth was populated only by prokaryotic and eukaryotic single-celled organisms. Therefore, these single-celled organisms constitute more than 85% of the life forms that have ever existed in the history of the planet.

Multi-celled organisms first appear in 600-million-year-old rock beds. The majority of these fossilized traces of organisms are poorly preserved and difficult to interpret, and often their existence can be deduced only from imprints and partial remains in mud. In structure they are generally flattened and appear to lack organs. They have no eyes or appendages permitting them to walk or swim—in short, they possess no complex physiological systems.

Therefore, for a very long time in the pre-Cambrian Period, life forms consisted only of single-celled organisms. Multi-celled organisms, most of whose characteristics are still unclear, appeared at the end of the pre-Cambrian.

In contrast to the limited nature of pre-Cambrian organisms, those of Cambrian Period are far wider ranging and literally flourishing in their diversity. This plethora of species drew the curtain on the long period during which organisms devoid of any organs prevailed, and ushered in a brand new age. Different ecosystems supported an extraordinary increase in biological complexity. During that period, flawless varieties of shelled marine invertebrates appeared at more or less the same time, and everywhere on Earth.

Anatomically, each of the living groups that emerged possessed unique bodily structures that enable us to easily distinguish them from one another. They comprise such distinct phyla as arthropods, brachiopods and mollusks, some specimens of which are still living today.

The number of phyla that appeared in the Cambrian varies according to who is doing the interpreting, but averages around 50. Some Cambrian organisms were equipped with highly complex physiological structures and organs, such as compound eyes, gills, feelers, feet and stomachs, which structures had never existed before in any life form. In short, all the familiar forms of the hard-shelled invertebrates we see in today’s oceans first appeared in the Cambrian seas.

What makes the pre-Cambrian so important to evolutionists is that they believe it can provide clues about the species, which appeared in the Cambrian explosion, and offer evidence of their evolution—which never actually happened. According to evolutionists, all the ingredients of the Cambrian explosion should have appeared in the pre-Cambrian. All the

supposed ancestors of the dozens of Cambrian life forms must have manifested themselves in the pre-Cambrian. Otherwise, the scenario of the evolution of living things would progress no further than being a conjecture, a speculation, a fantasy—and would be consigned to the shelf.

The more characteristics of Cambrian organisms were deduced from the examination of their fossils, the more importance the pre-Cambrian assumed. Increasing research and increased knowledge, however, provided only this information about the period: Nothing existed in the pre-Cambrian other than monocellular organisms.

Detailed research revealed nothing else than this. The fossils found belonged to these organisms that have left behind evidence of their soft tissue. They revealed no information of how they could have been the evolutionary forerunners of the later complex Cambrian anatomy—which made matters even more difficult for evolutionists.

The California University evolutionist professor of botany Daniel I. Axelrod described how pre-Cambrian rocks did not produce the fossils that had been hoped and sought for:

One of the major unsolved problems of geology and evolution is the occurrence of diversified, multicellular marine invertebrates in Lower Cambrian rocks on all the continents and their absence in rocks of greater age.¹⁷

The findings in question make one fact obvious: One of the empty gaps in the fossil record that evolutionists encounter constantly also appears in pre-Cambrian strata.

Robert G. Wesson, a political scientist and also an evolutionist, discussed this aspect of the fossil record, which evolutionists cannot ignore:

The gaps in the record are real, however. The absence of a record of any important branching is quite phenomenal. Species are usually static, or nearly so . . . **genera never show evolution into new species or genera [emphasis added]**, but replacement of one by another, and change is more or less abrupt.¹⁸

The picture revealed by paleontologists is that the Earth's ecology of 4 billion years ago remained virtually unchanged until 600 million years ago. This long period of time featured a largely barren environment. Only single-celled organisms have ever been encountered.

Evolutionists have made enormous efforts in order to account for this long gap. Yet all their explanations produced so far have been invalid and incapable of accounting for the lack of fictitious intermediate forms in the pre-Cambrian era.

Various evolutionists seek to account for this situation, which represents such a difficulty for their theory, in various ways. The evolutionist Niles Eldredge, for instance, takes refuge behind the following account:

We don't see much evidence of intermediates in the Early Cambrian because the intermediates had to have been soft-bodied, and thus extremely unlikely to become fossilized.¹⁹

In fact, it's surprising that Eldredge or any other scientist should offer such an explanation! That is because according to their scenario, no matter what the origin of shelled Cambrian life forms, still they must have possessed a complex structure, rather than being soft-bodied.

Moreover, this account is nothing more than a deception, because a good many fossils of single-celled organisms of the pre-Cambrian have survived, and many such specimens are available to researchers. Moreover, of those Cambrian life forms in the fossil record a large part of the soft tissues, including nervous systems, have survived. Right from the outset, therefore, pre-Cambrian and Cambrian rocks invalidate the fictitious claim that soft-bodied intermediate forms left no fossil traces behind them.

Indeed, Eldredge felt the need to make the following admission:

There is still a tremendous problem with the sudden diversification of multicellular life. There is no question about that. That's a real phenomenon.²⁰

Stephen Jay Gould—who, together with Eldredge, formulated the theory of punctuated equilibrium—makes an even more interesting confession:

I regard the failure to find a clear “vector of progress” in life's history as the most puzzling fact of the fossil record.²¹

But actually, for anyone viewing the facts objectively and thinking logically, there is nothing surprising here at all. It's perfectly natural that the Earth provides no information at all about any transitional process that never happened!

Only single-celled organisms have been recovered from pre-Cambrian rock beds, because they were the only organisms living at that time. The remains they left behind confirm this—as does our knowledge of the features of the Earth and its atmosphere during that time.

No evolution took place in the pre-Cambrian period, nor in the eras that came after it, and fossils prove this in the clearest possible way. Abundant fossils show that living things that existed millions of years ago were complete and fully formed, each one a marvel of creation; and that they were brought into being in a single moment, through the sublime Might of Allah. Paleontology, which is the only science that evolutionists have to rely on, has proved the fact of creation and totally invalidated the theory of evolution. (For details, see *The Transitional Form Dilemma* by Harun Yahya.)

Some of the advocates of evolution have accepted this. However, it appears that it will take some considerable time for certain of their colleagues to agree.

George Neville, an evolutionist and professor of geology from Glasgow University, admits the fact that the pre-Cambrian provides no intermediate form specimens and that for this, there is no other explanation than a “special creation”:

Granted an evolutionary origin of the main groups of animals, and not an act of special creation, the absence of any record whatsoever of a single member of any of the phyla in the Pre-Cambrian rocks remains as inexplicable on orthodox grounds as it was to Darwin.²²

It is Allah Who created the single-celled creatures that lived in the pre-Cambrian, who determined their way of life and knows their every detail. It is Allah, too, Who created Cambrian creatures in all their wide variety, gave them all their widely different features and enabled them to live together. Allah is the Creator of all things. So long as evolutionists fail to see and admit this, all events regarding the history of the Earth will continue to leave them baffled.

In one verse of the Qu'ran, Allah states:

It is He Who originated creation and then regenerates it. That is very easy for Him. His is the most exalted designation in the heavens and the Earth. He is the Almighty, the All-Wise. (Surat ar-Rum, 27)

Ediacaran:

A False Intermediate-Form Fauna*

The rocks that generally underlie the Cambrian rocks are simply called Precambrian rocks. Some are thousands of feet thick, and many are undisturbed—perfectly suitable for the preservation of fossils. If it is possible to find fossils of microscopic, single-celled, soft-bodied bacteria and algae, it should certainly be possible to find fossils of the transitional forms between those organisms and the complex invertebrates. Many billions times billions of the intermediates would have lived and died during the vast stretch of time required for the evolution of such a diversity of complex organisms. The world's museums should be bursting at the seams with enormous collections of the fossils of transitional forms. As a matter of fact, not a single such fossil has ever been found! Right from the start, jellyfish have been jellyfish, trilobites have been trilobites, sponges have been sponges, and snails have been snails. Furthermore, not a single fossil has been found linking, say, clams and snails, sponges and jellyfish, or trilobites and crabs... ²³ (Duane T. Gish, Ph.D. in Biochemistry from University of California at Berkeley)

Ediacaran fauna represents multi-celled organisms that lived in the pre-Cambrian, between 620 and 543 million years ago. Fossils discovered on the Ediacara hills in Australia, and dating back some 600 million years to the late pre-Cambrian, were regarded as a ray of hope for evolutionists who had failed to obtain any results from previous excavations. Evolutionists sought to interpret the variety observed in multi-celled Ediacaran organisms as an evolutionary process that extended to Cambrian life forms.

Modern evolutionist scientists claimed that these fossils could be used to account for the Cambrian Period, and they came up with various theories. However, none of the efforts they made along these lines could be proven with any scientific findings, and remained hollow.

The fossils discovered in 1946 by the Australian geologist Reginald Spriggs in the Ediacara Hills in Australia's Flinders Mountains dated back 580 to 560 million years. Scientists gave the name "Ediacaran" to this geological period preceding the Paleozoic. Some multi-celled Ediacaran organisms that appeared suddenly during this period were regarded with great excitement as intermediate forms by evolutionist scientists. Because of these fossils' proximity in time to the Cambrian period, evolutionists took them to be of great importance.

Following the discovery in Australia of many fossils from this period, specimens from the same age were found in Southern Namibia, Russia, Great Britain, Sweden, Canada and America as well. Thorough examination of all these fossils showed that the 16 or so different

species found in the Ediacara strata had left behind no remains of their hard tissues.²⁴ To put it another way, these creatures were entirely soft-bodied.

It is true that a wide variety of multi-celled organisms emerged suddenly in Ediacaran-period strata, immediately following after the pre-Cambrian. However, their forms were completely unique and different from those of the later Cambrian life forms. Unlike Cambrian life forms, they had no hard tissues, no complex structures and organs. They were generally shaped like ferns, pouches or discs. These organisms had various sensory extensions, but no apparent head sections or respiratory, nervous or digestive systems. They had no complex physiological systems, and their features are generally unclear.

The fact that these multi-cellular organisms emerged immediately before the Cambrian led to their being the subjects of considerable speculation. Every evolutionist scientist trying to account for Cambrian life forms looked for an ancestor by formulating a theory on Ediacaran life forms.

For example, the evolutionist paleontologist Martin Glaessner and his colleagues claimed that in this fauna, they could detect certain features belonging to present-day phyla, but that these fossilized remains were not sufficiently well preserved to be able to identify their characteristics.

Another evolutionist, Adolf Seilacher, believed that jellyfish would have been preserved as depressions in the sand. The Ediacaran jellyfish, however, appeared as bumps on the undersides of sandstone beds. In his view, this implied that those animals lived on the bottom mud rather than floating in the water.²⁵ For Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard University, these fossils were unsuccessful “experiments” that had taken place during the transition to the great variety of species in the Cambrian.

For the Oregon University paleontologist Gregory Retallack, the Ediacaran fossils were not even animals. In his opinion, they were probably lichens—symbiotic species emerging from fungi and algae living together. They were able to feed by way of photosynthesis and their impressions were preserved in sandstones up to 5 kilometers deep.²⁶

As we have seen, there was no consensus even among evolutionists regarding the Ediacaran Period. What really matters is that none of these claims provides any explanation for the sudden, later explosion of life that occurred during the Cambrian. None provided any clues as to where the supposed ancestors of Cambrian life forms had been. In addition, they gave no account of the origin of these new forms of Ediacaran fauna, which are described in so very different terms from Cambrian life forms. For that reason, Ediacaran species actually represent another major difficulty for evolutionists, rather than any ray of hope.

The University of California at Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology website says this about the creatures of the period:

The question of what these fossils are is still not settled to everyone’s satisfaction; at various times they have been considered algae, lichens, giant protozoans, or even a separate kingdom of life unrelated to anything living today. Some of these fossils are simple blobs that are hard to interpret and could represent almost anything. Some are most like cnidarians,

worms, or soft-bodied relatives of the arthropods. Others are less easy to interpret and may belong to extinct phyla. But besides the fossils of soft bodies, Vendian rocks contain trace fossils, probably made by wormlike animals slithering over mud.²⁷

For evolutionists still speculating about a few fossils belonging to Ediacaran fauna, the situation became even more precarious when fossils from the Ediacaran began being found in other parts of the world. The newly discovered fossils exhibit more complex features than the former ones, yet it is still impossible to link these to Cambrian life forms. This only emphasizes that a great variety of new species emerged during the period in question.

The Variety of Life in the Ediacaran Period and Evolutionists' Inconsistencies

"It is considered likely that all the animal phyla became distinct before or during the Cambrian, for they all appear fully formed, without intermediates connecting one form to another,"²⁸ says evolutionist Douglas Futuyma, New York University's professor of evolutionary biology.

Ediacaran life forms were interesting creatures with very different characteristics from those that came both before and after them. *Dickinsonia*, around half a meter in length, *Palaeophragmodictya*, a sponge-like organism with a flattened appearance, and *Aspidella*, with small cavities on its surface, were just a few of the Ediacaran life forms. Some of these bore no resemblance to any creatures living today. A few, however, had similar features to present-day jellyfish, starfish, sponges and crinoids.

The emergence of these unusual-looking creatures opened a wide divergence of opinion among evolutionists. The Cambridge University evolutionist Simon Conway-Morris said, "The problem is that the same fossils are interpreted in completely different ways by different people."²⁹

However, subsequent discoveries made in Russia confirmed that these were actually multi-celled organisms with certain complex characteristics. Various *Dickinsonia* specimens were found, as well as *Kimberella* fossils, which resembled teardrops in shape and had scalloped edges. The remains left behind by *Kimberella* showed that these creatures were capable of movement. In other words, they did not live and reproduce in one place, as did the single-celled creatures before them. They had organs and extensions that permitted them to walk.³⁰ Ediacaran fossils found in Newfoundland had brush-like appendages rather resembling hairs, and these creatures consisted of various colonies. Each of these animals' hair-like extensions was divided into at least three separate parts. The end parts extended forwards. Such microscopic extensions could be seen in even the smallest of these creatures.³¹ Therefore, Ediacaran life forms were not merely simple collections of fluid-filled cells, as some scientists imagine.

Evolutionists made enormous efforts in order to establish an evolutionary scenario for how these very different life forms all emerged in the same period; and set all these fossils out in different orders. However, those found in Namibia were incompatible with those discovered

in Scotland, and those found in Russia failed to match those discovered in England. The efforts to link these fossils—which failed to constitute a coherent whole among themselves—with Cambrian life forms represented a severe disappointment for evolutionists. No fossil evidence linked Cambrian life forms to any organisms that had existed before them. The remains of these perfectly preserved pre-Cambrian fossils refuted the long history of gradual change predicted by Darwin’s theory.³²

Simon Conway-Morris admitted this evident fact in these words:

Nevertheless, it remains true that the overall differences between the faunas of Ediacaran and Cambrian age are much more striking than any similarities. These differences cannot be simply be explained by the dilution of an Ediacaran component by a crowd of Cambrian newcomers. Rather, the change that occurred between the two faunas looks much more like a case of replacement.³³

As it became apparent that the life forms that emerged in the Cambrian were so very different from those that had appeared in the Ediacaran, some evolutionists ascribed the failure to find the supposed “ancestors” of Cambrian life forms to the scattered, dispersed nature of the fossil record. Some maintained that the supposed ancestors of Cambrian life forms were either very small, or else had failed to fossilize because of their soft body structure. Others, through various molecular comparisons, referred to an imaginary ancestor that had lived millions of centuries before the Cambrian.

None of these, or any similar claims, had any scientific basis, and certainly went no further than being hypotheses. The idea of “dispersed fossil record” was rejected by many paleontologists. Sufficient pre-Cambrian and Cambrian fossils had been found, and paleontologists were convinced that if there had been any ancestor anywhere, it would have been discovered by now.

The claim that organisms from before the Cambrian had left behind no fossilized remains because they were small and soft-bodied is, as we have already seen, highly unrealistic. In order to see just how unrealistic it is, only consider the fact that microfossils of bacteria have been discovered in rocks dating back nearly 3 billion years.³⁴ In the Ediacaran period, therefore, had there existed living things with a soft structure and a complexity comparable to that of Cambrian life forms, they would inevitably have left traces in the fossil record. Yet the organisms we have from the Ediacaran consist of various multi-celled species, completely different from and independent of the phyla that would later emerge.

And despite their being soft-bodied, these have left traces behind in the fossil record.

Simon Conway-Morris had this to say on the subject:

[German paleontologist Adolf] Seilacher has pioneered a radical alternative. He suggests that the Ediacaran fossils are certainly not cnidarians, arthropods or annelids, and might not even be metazoans. One reason to think he might be correct is the highly anomalous preservation of these fossils. Despite being almost entirely soft-bodied, the Ediacaran fossils are typically preserved in relatively coarse-grained sediments (siltstones and sandstones)

deposited in shallow, turbulent water—the last place a paleontologist could normally expect or look for preservation of soft parts.³⁵

In 1984, *Natural History* magazine published a long article by Stephen Jay Gould concerning the Ediacaran fossils in Australia. Gould stated that, as in the Cambrian, these life forms shared a basic mode of organization, with their unique characteristics. By the time Cambrian life forms emerged to replace Ediacaran ones, the latter had become extinct. Therefore, Cambrian life forms were not more advanced forms of Ediacaran ones, and Ediacaran forms could not be the ancestors of Cambrian species. With their soft bodies and unique features, Ediacaran life forms were very different from Cambrian ones, which had hard exoskeletons and were much more complex.³⁶

Faced with this significant fact, Gould was forced to make the following confession:

As we survey the history of life since the inception of multicellular complexity in Ediacaran times, one feature stands out as most puzzling—the lack of clear order and progress through time among marine invertebrate faunas.³⁷

Simon Conway-Morris's admission on the subject took this form:

Apart from the few Ediacaran survivors, . . . there seems to be a sharp demarcation between the strange world of Ediacaran life and the relatively familiar Cambrian fossils.³⁸

In 1983, a series of conferences was held to resolve the question of the origin of Cambrian species. On the fourth day of this assembly, organized jointly by *Science News* and the International Geological Correlation Project committee, the scientists voted that it be postponed indefinitely in order to determine the boundary between the Cambrian and pre-Cambrian periods, to serve as a reference point for all future research.

After the postponement, Allison Palmer of the Geological Society of America made the following statement:

I don't think we're going to have an easy time. We are all going to go away unhappy in varying degrees.³⁹

No subsequent assembly or conference would produce any consensus either because there was no evidence linking Ediacaran life forms to the Cambrian. Neither was there any evidence regarding the evolution of these organisms.

There has never been any evolution on Earth. Evolutionist scientists have spent years looking for something that never happened and for which there is not the slightest evidence, and have embarked on enterprises that could never produce any results.

Moreover, evolutionists who had spent a century and a half toiling to resolve the origin of Cambrian life forms now needed to account for the origin of the many complex forms that had emerged in the Ediacaran. All the strata they excavated with such high hopes—and all the fossils they found—produced evidence that constantly worked against them.

The Russian paleontologist Mikhail Fedonkin, head of the Moscow Paleontology Institute Precambrian Organisms Laboratory, said this on the subject:

We are now in the situation Charles Darwin found himself in about 150 years ago. He was puzzled by the absence of the ancestors of the Cambrian invertebrates, considering this fact

as a strong argument against his theory of gradualistic evolution of species. We do not know the ancestors of the Vendian [Ediacaran] fauna as well, and like the Cambrian biota, it appeared suddenly in a “complete state.”⁴⁰

What evolutionists refuse to understand is that living things feel no need to assume a *completed* state at the end of any particular process, because they were created in a single moment, with their special bodily structures, perfect metabolic systems, flawless functions and genetic compatibility bestowed upon them. Almighty Allah, Who created them with His infinite knowledge and intelligence, possesses a sublime creative artistry that produces infinite beauties. It is enough for Allah to so wish it for a being to come into existence. All things in heaven and Earth belong to Allah, and it is an easy matter for Him—Who created the universe, the planets and human beings, and Who constantly produces delights and blessings for us—to create all of them.

The Cambrian Explosion

Biologists classify organisms into various groups. In this systematic classification, known as taxonomy, hierarchical categories are set out according to the various characteristics of organisms.

The Systematics of Organisms

Under this system, life forms are first classified as kingdoms. They are then divided into phyla, which in turn are divided into other sub-categories. The hierarchical classification runs like this;

Kingdom

Phylum (plural phyla)

Class

Order

Family

Genus (plural genera)

Species

Scientists divide the animal world into five kingdoms,—which number has recently varied between six and three, depending on different classifications—and then divide these into 25 to 35 phyla.

The factors determining phyla are rather basic, including such details as the number and kinds of organs and tissues, body symmetry and the presence and nature of bodily cavities.⁴¹ Accordingly, you can see that the factors determining phyla are based more upon internal organization than external features. For example, the elongated shape of an earthworm is a feature shared by several phyla. Yet although different creatures share a similar worm-like appearance, because their internal structures are completely different they are viewed as independent species belonging to entirely different phyla.

Internal organization involves such things as the exchange of gasses like oxygen and carbon dioxide inside the tissues, food absorption and how reproduction takes place. The largest phylum is that of shelled organisms. The 35 or so animal phyla include such diverse phyla as the *Mollusca* which contains some soft-bodied creatures, and the *Nemotoda*, which includes roundworms.

Arthropods, for instance, (insects, spiders and other invertebrates with stiff exoskeletons) represent a completely separate phylum. *Chordata*, on the other hand, includes creatures with a notochord—a long rod in the embryo consisting of a string of cells that will constitute the creature's spinal cord—or more often, a spinal column. All vertebrates, such as birds, fish, reptiles and mammals, belong to this phylum. *Mollusca* is a separate phylum, including clams, oysters and slugs. *Annelids* are yet another phylum, to which earthworms belong.

The internal organization determining the phyla is controlled by a large number of genes. This means that in order for evolution to take place in such a way as for one organism to develop into another and for two distinct phyla to emerge, all the details of the first organism's internal structure need to change. To accomplish that, all its genes would have to undergo mutations at the same time. Each of these random mutations would also have to be beneficial. Such an accumulation of changes is scientifically impossible.

Mutations are 99% harmful. The other 1% have no effect at all. The internal characteristics of even the smallest organisms are too complex to come about in stages. Genes cannot change in such a way as to serve new functions, and cannot transform into different genes that give rise to new properties. In the same way, the genetics of any organism are very little influenced by external factors. It is impossible for two organisms to develop a similar, common internal characteristic under the pressure of external factors dependent on various conditions. The probability of this happening is the same as that of rolling a thousand dice and their all landing on a 6—in other words, 1 in 1,000,000,000,000,000,000, or 1 in a quintillion.⁴² (For details, see *Darwinism Refuted* by Harun Yahya.)

This information has been provided to demonstrate, in general terms, how life forms differ from one another. Living things cannot acquire an organ that did not previously exist by way of random factors. This applies even to the smallest taxonomical unit: One species cannot turn into another; this is impossible. And the variety of life that emerged in the Cambrian gave rise to different *phyla* more than simply new species!

Fifty separate phyla, including the 35 alive today, emerged suddenly in the Cambrian Period. Among the great many details regarding the Cambrian that evolutionists cannot account for, the sudden emergence of phyla exhibiting hundreds, perhaps even many more, of different anatomical features and characteristics—plus the fact that there were more of these phyla than exist today—is a phenomenon that evolutionists cannot possibly explain. The fossil record makes abundantly clear that the theory of evolution cannot be valid.

The famous French zoologist Pierre Grassé has this to say:

Naturalists must remember that the process of evolution is revealed only through fossil forms. . . . Only paleontology [the study of fossils] can provide them with the evidence of evolution and reveal its course or mechanisms.⁴³

The truth paleontology reveals is that evolution has no place in natural history. During the Cambrian explosion, the main living groups began suddenly and with flawless bodily structures. Despite evolutionists' best endeavors, no intermediate form between them has ever been found, and paleontology has undermined the tenets of Darwinism. This process of collapse began with an unpublicized discovery made in Canada in 1909.

Burgess Shale Fauna: Discovery of A Miracle

The differences between the creatures that suddenly appear in the Cambrian are enormous. In fact these differences are so large many of these animals are one of a kind. Nothing like them existed before and nothing like them has ever appeared again.⁴⁴

Charles Doolittle Walcott was a paleontologist and the secretary (1907-1927) of the Smithsonian Institution, America's national museum. He learned that railway workers in the Burgess region near the Canadian Rocky Mountains had discovered a number of fossils, and made visits to the area to see for himself and look for specimens of the fossils in question, beginning in July 1907.

On 31 August, 1909, this experienced paleontologist paid yet another research visit to Burgess. But this day was very different: At the beginning, the investigation he carried on that day appeared to be a very ordinary one. But it turned out to be one of the greatest discoveries in the history of paleontology.

The bedrock in Burgess Shale consists of schist—a rock consisting of thin strata, or layers. When struck at the appropriate angles, the rock can be easily split into thin plates, thus revealing the fossils inside them. Thus on that day, Walcott came by the first Cambrian fossil in Burgess Shale. He marked the location of the fossil in order to begin a detailed investigation later on. Upon resuming his research, he obtained findings that were invaluable in paleontological terms.

In the course of the investigations he carried out in those years, Walcott discovered the remains of certain soft-bodied organisms that at first sight appeared very mysterious. He tried to identify them and to understand why he had found them there, since according to the state of knowledge at the time, no such fossils should have been present. Realizing that his findings were extraordinarily important, Walcott immediately set to studying the exceedingly well preserved specimens he had uncovered.

The oldest Cambrian strata contained animal fossils that displayed a magnificent variety and complexity, opening a window onto a period hundreds of millions of years in the past. Although these fossils belonged to soft-bodied organisms, they were exceptionally well preserved. The fossils enclosed between the very thin layers of rock were like miniature X-rays, revealing details of even their soft tissues. He found fossils belonging to various known groups, of marine creatures, most of them soft-bodied, including brachiopods, worms and arthropods.

But what were fossils of creatures that had lived on the sea bed hundreds of millions of years ago doing some 3,000 meters (9,850 feet) high in the Rocky Mountains? It appeared that these creatures had been covered over in sand as the result of an underwater slide that had occurred hundreds of millions of years ago, and that this sediment-containing strata had risen up under the influence of geological pressures to form the Rocky Mountains. This made it possible for exceedingly well-preserved fossils of the ancient, yet complex living things to be to Walcott's gaze.

Inspired by the nearby Mount Burgess, Walcott named the region “Burgess Shale” and collected some 65,000 fossil specimens there between 1910 and 1917.⁴⁵

When he saw to which phyla these fossils belonged, Walcott was amazed. The fossil stratum he had discovered was very old, and no life forms worthy of note had been found in any older strata; yet this stratum contained organisms from almost all known phyla. Moreover, Walcott had discovered fossils belonging to unknown phyla as well. This showed that all the various body structures in the animal kingdom had appeared together during the same geological period.

This represented a lethal blow to Darwin’s theory, since Darwin had maintained that organisms must have developed as do the spreading branches of a tree. According to the tree of life Darwin had imagined, there must initially have been a single phylum on Earth, after which different phyla began to emerge or “branch off” from it over long periods of time. Yet Walcott was looking at evidence that demonstrated that over two dozen phyla had emerged together and suddenly. This meant a total refutation of the “evolutionary tree” idea. Phyla, represented by the most remote branches of the tree and which should have appeared last, after species had time to differentiate, actually emerged at the beginning of the history of life.

No doubt Walcott’s discovery was highly significant, yet it took another 70 years for the blow it had dealt to Darwinism to be revealed.

Instead of making the fossils he had obtained available to the world of science, Walcott decided to hide them. He was then the secretary of the famous Smithsonian Institution in Washington D.C., and also a dyed-in-the-wool Darwinist. According to the theory of evolution, relatively simple fossils should be expected in rocks of that age. Yet in terms of anatomical complexity, there was no difference between the fossils Walcott discovered and present-day creatures such as crabs, starfish and worms. For Darwinists, the alarming aspect about this was that in older rocks, no fossils had been encountered that could possibly be the forerunners of the creatures in this Burgess Shale formation.

Faced by this dilemma, Walcott felt sure that the fossils he had discovered would represent a major difficulty for the theory of evolution. So instead of announcing them, he sent them to the Smithsonian Institution, along with a few photographs he had taken and a series of notes.

The Burgess Shale fossils were locked away in drawers and forgotten for the next 70 years. They saw the light of day only in 1985, when the museum’s archives were being re-examined. 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.⁴⁶

Decades after Walcott’s death, the Burgess Shale fossils were re-examined. Harry Blackmore Whittington, Derek Briggs and Simon Conway-Morris, a team of scientists known

as the Cambridge Group, performed a detailed analysis of the fossils in the 1980s. They concluded that the fauna were even more varied and extraordinary than Walcott had stated, and reported that the fossils could not be classified under any known categories. All these organisms had emerged suddenly in the Cambrian Period, between 542 and 490 million years ago, in their exceedingly developed and complex forms.

The results that emerged were so unexpected that scientists referred to their sudden appearance as an “explosion.” The Cambrian explosion was one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of science, and for evolutionist scientists, one of the most inexplicable. Even Darwin, aware of the Cambrian findings from his own time, admitted that there would be doubts as to the validity of his theory until this significant phenomenon could be accounted for.⁴⁷ Thus it was that the scientific world’s knowledge of the Burgess Shale fossils was delayed. These very well preserved fossils were like opening a window onto pre-Cambrian ecosystems of hundreds of millions of years ago. Scientists therefore became ever more interested in what they might reveal. The unearthing of new Cambrian fossil zones in the 1980s further increased scientific interest in the Cambrian explosion. These new paleontological discoveries showed that the scope of the Cambrian explosion was even greater than had been imagined—which made matters even more difficult for evolutionists.

Ironically, Walcott’s concern had been completely justified. The flow of information about the Cambrian explosion had an *explosive* effect on Darwin’s theory. The greater our understanding of the Cambrian explosion, the clearer the hollowness of Darwin’s fundamental assumptions became.

So far, this book has examined the pre-Cambrian Period and its life forms. In the next part, we shall be examining the Cambrian, in which an even more dazzling variety of life appeared. For that purpose, we shall consider the course of biological diversity in the pre-Cambrian and later periods, to provide a general idea about the emergence of living categories. We shall then examine the Cambrian’s extraordinary complexity and see how these creatures’ superior systems and structures pose a major dilemma for evolutionists.

After the chapter on complexity, we will compare the facts revealed by the fossil record with the assumptions of Darwinism and see why Darwinism is now a bankrupt theory.

But at this point, we can summarize the emergence of phyla—the main categories of organisms:

1. For billions of years before the Cambrian, the Earth contained only single-celled organisms and a few multi-celled ones with no complex internal systems. The number of phyla constituted by these organisms was only three.

2. The many phyla alive during the Cambrian world appeared suddenly and with flawless physical systems in a space of a mere 5 to 10 millions years. At the end of the Cambrian, 50 phyla had emerged, and with one exception, all phyla had taken their places in the fossil record.

3. In terms of animals’ main bodily structures, stasis dominated the fossil record after the Cambrian. Contrary to Darwinist expectations, there was no increase in the numbers of phyla.

And when some of those phyla became extinct, there was even a corresponding reduction in their numbers. For that reason, on the level of basic physical structures alone, the Cambrian is more biologically complex than the present.

The Cambrian Explosion: A Dazzling Variety of Life

The Cambrian is the oldest known period containing multi-celled organisms with very different and complex structures. The first rock strata belonging to this period were discovered in North Wales by the British geologist Adam Sedgwick in 1835.

Inspired by the original Latin name for Wales, Cambria, Sedgwick named this period the Cambrian. According to dates published by the International Subcommission on Cambrian Stratigraphy in 2002, the Cambrian Period is regarded as having begun 545 million years ago and ended 490 million years ago. It is also sub-divided into three smaller periods, or epochs, the Early (542 to 513 million years ago), the Middle (513 to 501 million years ago) and the Late Cambrian (501 to 490 million years ago).⁴⁸

What makes the period so important in terms of natural history is the explosive proliferation of new life forms that took place in the transition from the pre-Cambrian to the Early Cambrian. In terms of biological variety and complexity, so great is the difference between the pre-Cambrian and the Cambrian that this phenomenon is described as an *explosion*, a reference to the sudden coming into existence of living things—the world-wide appearance of complex organisms with no forerunners behind them.

The evolutionist writer Richard Monastersky describes this phenomenon, known in the literature as the “Biological Big Bang”:

Prior to the start of the Cambrian period 544 million years ago, animals had extremely simple bodies capable of limited motion. A zoo at the close of Precambrian time would have displayed a relatively mundane array of creatures related to jellyfish and coral; the star attractions would have been wormlike animals, which distinguished themselves with their ability to slither across the seafloor.

At the beginning of the Cambrian, however, life took a sudden turn toward the complex. In a few million years—the equivalent of a geological instant—an ark’s worth of sophisticated body types filled the seas. This biological burst, dubbed the Cambrian explosion, produced the first skeletons and hard shells, antennae and legs, joints and jaws.⁴⁹

In this period there suddenly appeared some 50 separate phyla, including the 35 phyla existing today. This is most important, because all the features of today’s living things—and of even more extinct ones—first appeared quite suddenly around 530 million years ago. Formerly, it was claimed that 14 more small phyla emerged after the Cambrian. But based on the features they possessed, they were later included in the 35 phyla existing today.

This means that, contrary to Darwinist expectations, there has been no increase in the number of phyla between the Cambrian and the present—and that since some phyla have gone extinct, there has actually been a reduction.

Therefore, the Cambrian Period is more biologically complex than the present—in terms of the fundamental structures that determine phyla.

This conclusion faced by scientists is truly astonishing, because as we have already shown in some detail, organisms consisting of only soft tissues lived shortly before the Cambrian. At that time, all organisms constituted only three phyla. When we look a little further back, however, there was nothing on Earth apart from single-celled organisms. Yet the Cambrian is a period when completely new life forms, with complex anatomies and perfect internal and external features suddenly appeared.

In his book *This Is Biology*, the evolutionist Ernst Mayr describes the phenomenon this way:

There are indeed many phenomena in the history of life which suggest the actual existence of such an internal cohesion. How else can one explain the virtual explosion of different structural types at the end of the Precambrian and the Early Cambrian? Even in the utterly incomplete fossil record, one can distinguish at that time some 60 to 80 different morphotypes, compared with the 30 or so animal phyla now in existence. ... one might almost say experimentally, a high number of new types, some of which were not successful and became extinct, while the remaining ones, represented by the modern chordates, echinoderms, arthropods, and so on, became more and more inflexible. There has not been the production of a single major new body plan since the early Paleozoic. It seems as if the existing ones had “congealed”—that is, had acquired such a firm internal cohesion. . . .⁵⁰

In the framework of the basic anatomical designs of the Cambrian Period’s newly emerged forms, Stephen Jay Gould refers to the variety they exhibit:

The sweep of anatomical variety reached a maximum right after the initial diversification of multicellular animals. The later history of life proceeded by elimination, not expansion. The current earth may hold more species than ever before, but most are iterations upon a few basic anatomical designs. (Taxonomists have described more than a half million species of beetles, but nearly all are minimally altered Xeroxes of a single ground plan.) In fact, the probable increase in number of species through time merely underscores the puzzle and paradox. Compared with the Burgess seas, today’s oceans contain many more species based upon many fewer anatomical plans.⁵¹

The “elimination” to which Gould refers is the sudden appearance of phyla in the Cambrian and the gradual reduction in their numbers. This is a total contradiction of the theory of evolution’s claim that the number of phyla should increase as species increased.

To clarify this with an analogy: Wheeled vehicles, aircraft, and boats are the humans’ main means of transportation. Cars, tractors, hovercraft, and canoes are all subcategories of these. Over the years, there has been an increase in their number and variety. Yet the number of these basic categories—wheeled vehicles, boats, and aircraft—has remained fixed at three.

Snails, trilobites, sponges, worms, jellyfish, starfish, chambered nautilus and sea lilies, all of which have very different characteristics, left the remains in the fossil record of their bodies 530 million years ago. So perfect and complete are these that large parts of their internal

organs and even respiratory systems can be seen just as they were. Their soft tissues are so clear as to reveal their vital systems. The interesting point is that most of the creatures in these strata have structures and advanced physiological traits—eyes, gills, and circulation and excretory systems—that are almost identical to those of organisms today. These fossils in Cambrian rocks are exceedingly complex, with “skeletons for strengthening bodies and attaching muscles; shells for encasing feeding chambers ... and hardened devices for rasping and cutting food items.”⁵²

Richard Monastersky, a *Science News* writer, has this to say on the subject:

A half-billion years ago the remarkably complex forms of animals that we see today suddenly appeared. This moment, right at the start of Earth’s Cambrian Period, some 550 million years ago, marks the evolutionary explosion that filled the seas with the world’s first complex creatures. The large animal phyla of today were present already in the early Cambrian and they were as distinct from each other then as they are today.⁵³

The British biologist Richard Dawkins, one of the most determined proponents of Darwinism, was forced to admit the implications of the Cambrian:

... the Cambrian strata of rocks, vintage about 600 million years, are the oldest ones in which we find most of the major invertebrate groups. And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. **It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history** [*emphasis added*].⁵⁴

Cambrian rocks exhibit two-thirds of the basic body plans of the animal kingdom. These “stony blueprints” are so clear that the mineralized tissues of invertebrates have to a large extent been preserved. As you shall soon see in some detail, the now-extinct trilobites—members of the phylum *Arthropoda*—were exceedingly complex invertebrates.

Shelled creatures commonly leave more complete traces behind in the fossil record, thanks to their hard structures. In addition, however, remains of soft tissues, perfectly preserved, have also been discovered both in the Burgess Shale formation in Canada and in Chengjiang in China.

In fact, fossils from Chengjiang even reveal the remains of creatures consisting only of soft tissues. These Chengjiang fossils have made possible detailed studies of such important organs as eyes, intestines, stomachs, digestive organs, skin, scales, mouths and even nervous systems.

Evolutionists require evidence of—and time—for any transition between species. So for them, the Cambrian has led to some highly damaging conclusions that present a major challenge to their theory—as even they themselves have been forced to admit.

Because living things did not evolve, but were created, the more that organisms from the Cambrian are studied, the more apparent it becomes that the process of evolution did not actually take place, but is a deceptive 19th-century myth.

The Fossils Are Examined

In the 1980s, when the fossils obtained from Burgess Shale were finally subjected to examination by Harry Wittington, Derek Briggs and Simon Conway-Morris, evolutionists found themselves faced with a biological explosion had taken place 530 million years ago, and which could now no longer be ignored.

Stephen Jay Gould studied the structures exhibited by life forms in the Cambrian explosion and considered Burgess Shale in his award-winning book *Wonderful Life*. He described the fact revealed by this important discovery:

. . . we must understand that nothing happens most of the time—and we don’t because our stories don’t admit this theme. . . The Burgess Shale teaches us that, for the history of basic anatomical designs, almost **everything happened in the geological moment just before** [*emphasis added*], and almost nothing in more than 500 million years since.⁵⁵

Simon Conway-Morris described the difficulty that the Burgess Shale “problematica” represented for evolution:

How can we be so optimistic, when some paleontologists still argue that the existence of the Burgess Shale problematica threatens to undermine a significant portion of evolutionary theory?⁵⁶

Even while evolutionist scientists were struggling to account for the Burgess Shale beds, two other fossil locations similar to Burgess Shale were discovered in the 1980s: the Sirius Passet in northern Greenland and the Chengjiang in southern China. In these regions, the astonishing variety of animals that lived in the Cambrian revealed themselves in even greater detail. In particular, the fossil strata excavated in Chengjiang even contained the first vertebrates and were so well preserved that it was possible to distinguish all characteristics of the fossils.⁵⁷

Internal organs and even nerves could clearly be seen. In the Chengjiang fossils, details existing nowhere else in the world were crystal-clear. Even the water channels in the bodies of creatures resembling jellyfish had been preserved.

Of these fossils discovered in China, the number of species identified exceeded 100, and revealed the existence of 37 phyla. Together with fossils discovered in other locations, this number of phyla rose to 50. Dr. Paul Chien, head of the San Francisco University Biology department, who studied the Cambrian rock beds in China, remarked on their being:

. . . more phyla in the very, very beginning, where we found the first fossils [of animal life], than exist now.⁵⁸

By itself, the sudden emergence of phyla and other biological categories with no forerunners behind them is a fact that can reveal the invalidity of the theory of evolution. Yet another piece of evidence here also makes perfectly clear the invalidity of Darwinism: Compared with the present day, there are more basic physical structures and fewer species in the Cambrian. Organisms display fewer basic physical structures than they did in the Cambrian, even though there are more species. As you shall see in due course, this definitively

invalidates the Darwinist claim that the number of phyla should increase over time and reveals that the theory of the origin of species is groundless speculation.

Andrew Parker of Oxford University has conducted research into Cambrian fossils and wrote the book *In the Blink of an Eye*, dealing with the Cambrian explosion. During an interview, he described the variety at Chengjiang:

They represent many of the phyla, the major groups of animals that exist today. We have a whole range of crustaceans and worms and jellyfish, and even the very first chordates are known from the Chengjiang fossils. So we have this whole diversity of forms preserved at one moment in time so we can actually see them all living together and we know how they all interacted, we know they have all their hard parts and we can even guess at their ecology because they're all there in the same picture.⁵⁹

The evolutionary dilemma that Andrew Parker described in those veiled terms was admitted rather more clearly by the Darwinist paleontologist James Valentine of the University of California, Berkeley:

Many of the durably skeletonized phyla appearing in Cambrian rocks are represented by a number of distinctive subgroups, classes, or orders that **appear suddenly without known intermediates** [*emphasis added*].⁶⁰

The fossils discovered in Chengjiang confirm the wondrous variety of Cambrian life forms. And as Valentine stated, there are no signs of any intermediate forms. Not one single intermediate fossil, of the kind so confidently expected by evolutionists, showing that one species evolved from one another, has ever been found from among tens of thousands of fossils. Because evolution never happened on Earth, it is therefore impossible for non-existent intermediates to be found.

The Chengjiang discoveries were of particular importance because as we have just seen, the perfectly preserved Burgess Shale fossils were ignored for some 70 years. Dr. Paul Chien says:

[Against the fossils found in Chengjiang,] the scientists come out and say, "Oh yes, we've heard this before, and it's very similar to the Burgess Shale," and so forth. But the Burgess Shale story was not told for many years. The Burgess Shale was first found by Charles Walcott in 1909. Why was the story not reported to the public until the late 1980s? At the very beginning, I thought it was a problem for them; they couldn't figure out what was going on because they found something that bears no resemblance to the present animal groups and phyla. Walcott originally tried to shoehorn those groups into existing ones, but [his attempt] was never satisfactory. It was puzzling for a while because they refused to see that in the beginning there could be more complexity than we have now. What they are seeing are phyla that do not exist now. That's more than 50 phyla compared to the 38 we have now. (Actually, the number 50 was first quoted as over 100 for a while, but then the consensus became 50-plus.) But the point is, they saw something they didn't know what to do with; that's the scientifically honest position they're placed in. Later on, as they began to understand things are not the same as Darwinian expectations, they started shutting up.⁶¹

Dr. Chien is making clear that for 70 years, evolutionist scientists made an effort to conceal this extraordinary discovery that challenges evolution. They attempted to cover up the fact that evolution never happened and tried to ignore one of the greatest discoveries in the history of paleontology.

However, the Cambrian fossils were so widespread, and there were so many specimens of them, that it was impossible for them all to be kept out of sight. Over the next century or so, evolutionists did all they could to depict the phenomenon as insignificant, but finally had to admit the inescapable truth. At a time when, according to them, there should have been no complex life forms, representatives of present-day and other phyla existed and survived for centuries, until some disappeared as suddenly as they had emerged.

There was no evolution in their past, nor any in their subsequent periods. The fact that evolutionist scientists remained silent and never performed any detailed research on this subject once again demonstrates that the claim they espouse is unscientific, and based upon completely false grounds.

In the Blink of an Eye

The Cambrian—between 543 and 490 million years ago—was regarded as the period during which Cambrian life forms appeared. However, the more fossils were studied, the more it became clear that these species came into being over a much shorter period.

At first, scientists had imagined that Cambrian life forms existed over a period of some 70 million years. Estimates based on the mineral zircon in Early Cambrian fauna proved, however, that this explosion lasted for only around 5 million years, and certainly no longer than 10 million.

This calculation was explained in an article published in *Time* in 1995:

Zircon dating, which calculates a fossil's age by measuring the relative amounts of uranium and lead within the crystals, had been whittling away at the Cambrian for some time. By 1990, for example, new dates obtained from early Cambrian sites around the world were telescoping the start of biology's Big Bang from 600 million years ago to less than 560 million years ago. Now, with information based on the lead content of zircons from Siberia, virtually everyone agrees that the Cambrian started almost exactly 543 million years ago and, even more startling, that all but one of the phyla in the fossil record appeared within the first 5 million to 10 million years.⁶²

In geological terms, 5 million years is no more than the blink of an eye. This brief period made the fictitious process of evolution, already invalid in so many respects, totally impossible. This added the problem of an inexplicable time frame to that of the inexplicable variety of life that evolutionists were already unable to explain.

In an interview for *Time*, Samuel Bowring from M.I.T. said:

We now know how fast fast is. . . . And what I like to ask my biologist friends is, How fast can evolution get before they start feeling uncomfortable?⁶³

This is an astonishingly short space of time for some 50 separate phyla and a variety of species—part of which is known to us and part is not—to suddenly emerge with no warning.

Compared with a human being's life span, 5 million years is certainly a long time. Yet the time frame needed for the fictitious stages that evolutionists claim would allow organisms to diverge and acquire complex characteristics is millions or even billions of years long. Bearing in mind that the Earth is now regarded as being 4.6 billion years old, 5 million years represents just 0.001 of the total age of the Earth, and in relative terms, is just a single instant.⁶⁴

Jonathan Wells describes this rather brief period this way:

The major increase in animal fossils that marks the Cambrian explosion began about 530 million years ago, and lasted a maximum of 5 to 10 million years. (Although 10 million years is a long time in human terms, it is short in geological terms, amounting to less than 2 percent of the time elapsed since the beginning of the Cambrian.)⁶⁵

Stephen Jay Gould also commented on this extraordinary speed:

Fast is now a lot faster than we thought, and that is extraordinarily interesting.⁶⁶

In an article published in *Scientific American*, Gould described the truth about the Cambrian's 5-million-year "window" that all evolutionists have had to accept:

Even the most cautious opinion holds that 500 million subsequent years of opportunity have not expanded the Cambrian range, achieved in just five million years. The Cambrian explosion was the most remarkable and puzzling event in the history of life.⁶⁷

In addition to the complex features of the organisms that suddenly appear in Cambrian rocks, evolutionists must also explain how these creatures came into being in a space of time too short for the lengthy stages of the supposed evolutionary process to have taken place. In as short a space of time as 0.001 of the age of the Earth, could imaginary evolutionary stages have given rise to thousands of creatures, prey and predator, with various and different features, hard shells, perfect eyes and circulatory and digestive systems, in an environment that formerly held only a few, small multi-celled organisms? How might this imaginary process have worked and overcome so many impossibilities? That new life forms emerged in such a short space of time shows that evolution contradicts its own thesis.

As you shall see in a later chapter, evolutionists have attempted to explain this extraordinarily short period of time in various ways, although no account has been at all consistent with the facts.

Here, it will be useful to emphasize that though the various Cambrian life forms appeared within 5 million years, each individual species must have been created at a different time, but in a single moment over those 5 million years. There has been no evolutionary process in this 5-million-year period, just as there has been none in any stage in the history of life.

Allah created these living things for that limited period in history alone, brought them into being from nothing, and did away with them at a moment of His choosing. Indeed, each of the categories that appeared subsequently within the Cambrian phyla did so not by descending

from one another. The fossil record makes this crystal-clear. No fossil remains point to an evolutionary relationship among them.

The well-known evolutionist paleontologist George G. Simpson admits as much:

[Paleontologists recognize] that most new species, genera and families, and that nearly all categories above the level of families, appear in the record suddenly and are not led up to by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences.⁶⁸

In the same way that new species appeared suddenly, they also preserved all their own characteristics and remained completely unchanged, throughout their time on Earth. That is why Gould has written that after the Cambrian almost nothing happened:

The Burgess Shale teaches us that, for the history of basic anatomical designs, almost everything happened in the geological moment just before, and almost nothing in more than 500 million years since.⁶⁹

The post-Cambrian fossil record, as summarized above by Simpson and Gould, clearly conflicts with the Darwinist idea of gradual development and reveals the two characteristics of sudden appearance and stasis. Gould has explained these two concepts:

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

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

2. *Sudden appearance*. In any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and 'fully formed.'⁷⁰

In the post-Cambrian period, in short, there was no increase in anatomical variety at the phylum level. The categories that emerged subsequently consisted of repetitions of already existing basic body structures. Like the phyla, these new categories also emerged suddenly, complete with perfect structures. And they, too, underwent no evolutionary changes during their time on Earth, but maintained their physical characteristics for millions of years, exhibiting obvious stasis.

The emergence of Cambrian life forms with all their variety and complexity, across the globe and in a single moment, represents the clearest and absolute refutation of any evolution-based explanation of the origin of living things. Evolutionists have invalidated their own claims by means of the "gradual evolutionary development" thesis they have themselves imposed. There was no gradual development in the Cambrian, much less enough time for one to have taken place. Literally dozens of organisms appeared in a short period of time, each one in a fully formed, advanced state.

Allah created a miracle that would eventually demolish Darwinist claims, and act as a lesson to those looking for explanations other than Allah's creation leaving them with no alternative account to offer. The remains we see in the Cambrian strata are marvelous works of living art—the flawless work of Almighty Allah, and a manifestation of His omniscience and might.

In the creation of the heavens and Earth, and the alternation of the night and day, and the ships which sail the seas to people's benefit, and the water which Allah sends down from the sky—by which He brings the Earth to life when it was dead and scatters about in it creatures of every kind—and the varying direction of the winds, and the clouds subservient between heaven and Earth, there are signs for people who use their intellect. (Surat al-Baqara, 164)

Cambrian Life Forms

The Earth existed in emptiness and silence for billions of years. No creatures were walking around on it, hunting, making noises or eating. The only entities on the planet were bacteria and other single-celled organisms. After millions of years passed with only micro-organisms, small, soft-bodied multi-cellular invertebrates entered the equation.

A great activity then began manifesting itself on Earth. A large part of the globe was filled with marine organisms, each one very different from that rest, many of which possessed complex characteristics similar to those of organisms today. These walking, hunting, seeing, feeling creatures dominated the Earth. So different were they from one another that none had the same features as any other. The differences were so great that one could not be categorized with the others.

It took a mere 5 million years for this enormous variety to appear. Some of the species then disappeared, leaving only their fossilized remains under the sea.

It is a great miracle created by Allah for any organism to leave all its characteristics on a rock. On occasion, an organism that died and was swiftly buried in sand or silt would sometimes leave all its features mineralized, from its digestive system to its nerve endings. Proof of its existence remains in rocks millions of years old. Allah reveals His glorious creation and creative artistry in whatever manner He chooses. He has provided some of the greatest proofs of this flawless artistry in the fossils of Cambrian life forms.

Say: “Allah’s is the conclusive argument. If He had willed He could have guided every one of you.” (Surat al-An‘am, 149)

Some Preserved Fossils

This section deals with the characteristics of life forms found in Cambrian strata dating back some 530 million years. Latin names are cited in order to provide general information, but the important thing is to demonstrate that the creatures that appeared during this period possessed various complex systems and body parts resembling those of present-day organisms and were sometimes even more specialized. Their remains of around 530 million years ago show that they were created with immaculate details and beauty. They totally undermine the theory of evolution, in allowing us to see what extraordinary entities they were.

For people who believe in Almighty Allah, of course, it’s no surprise to see such sophisticated creatures living some 500 million years ago as well as today. Allah, the Omniscient and Almighty, has the power to create them when He wills, in the form He wills and where He wills.

Allah reveals it in one of the verses of the Qu’ran:

Allah created every animal from water. Some of them go on their bellies, some of them on two legs, and some on four. Allah creates whatever He wills. Allah has power over all things. (Surat an-Nur, 45)

Another reason for focusing on the existence of these life forms and describing their characteristics is to enable evolutionists, who are astonished by the emergence of such creatures in the Cambrian 500 million years ago, to see the truth and to enlighten others who blindly accept what they may have been taught. No process of evolution ever took place in the history of this planet. All the species we shall be examining appeared with no ancestors behind them and possessed complex forms exhibiting no previous developmental phases.

One characteristic of Cambrian fossils is that they've been so very well preserved. During fossilization under normal conditions, the hard part of the outer shells, consisting of chitin and calcium, should be decayed or dispersed. Yet in the great majority of specimens collected from Cambrian rocks, the exoskeletons maintain nearly all their original forms, and their owners' main internal systems can also be seen.

Research in various locations has revealed the different features of all Cambrian fossils. Their heads and bodies, and stomachs and intestinal systems consisting of various complex components have all been preserved. Some have four legs, and others a dozen. Some have shells, others antennae and others gills. In short, almost all body features of organisms in existence today, and even more extinct ones, reveal their presence in the Cambrian seas, with all their wide-ranging appearances and gloriously complex features. Some of these fossils include:

Marrella

Marrella, described as a "lace crab" by Charles Walcott, is one of the most abundant of Burgess Shale fossils. Some 15,000 specimens of *Marrella* have been collected from Walcott Quarry (named after Walcott) alone. We have a three-dimensional knowledge of just about all this invertebrate's features. *Marrella's* head shield had two pairs of rearward spines that were sufficiently long to extend right along its body. It had two pairs of antennae. One of these was an extension consisting of short segments. The other had a brush-like end.

Marrella's body was composed of increasingly small trunk segments, each of which had a pair of legs. The antennae of this creature, which is thought to have fed on organic matter and small organisms, were probably used to gather up these small elements from the sea floor. The feathery filaments on the outer branch of its legs were used for respiration.⁷¹

Canadaspis

Canadaspis fossils have been preserved with nearly all their features. The animal's carapace had two valves literally hinged together. The abdomen, thorax, and intestinal system are completely visible in the specimens. *Canadaspis's* legs were divided into two branches. The inner branch was segmented and was used for walking. It ended in small curved claws.

The flap-like outer gill branches extended forward of where the abdomen emerged from between the valves. These flap-like extensions were used for locomotion and also for exchanging oxygen. It is thought that it used its feet to dig in the mud in search of organic particles.⁷²

Hallucigenia

This creature's spines make it one of the most interesting Shale Burgess fossils. There were tentacles in various parts of its body. It had spines on bulges on the dorsal side of its body. All these tentacles were joined by a narrow tube to the main gut, which extended right along the trunk.

With its exceedingly complex structure, *Hallucigenia* is one of the best examples of how Cambrian life forms differ from those existing today.

The *Hallucigenia* specimens found in China led to new and even more interesting characteristics of this creature being discovered. The Chinese *Hallucigenia* fossils contained armored lobes. As can be seen in the illustration on the next page, *Hallucigenia* rather resembled a caterpillar with lobe-like appendages and isolated plates on its dorsal surface. Newly identified features confirm that the spines were used for defense. Underneath, it had seven pairs of legs, each ending in a claw.⁷³

Odaraia

Odaraia's structures make it one of the most remarkable Burgess Shale life forms. It had two rather large eyes and two valves meeting along the ventral margin. As an appendage to the abdomen, it had three blades.

The animal appears to have been an active swimmer and used its large eyes to seek out smaller organisms for feeding. *Odaraia* in all likelihood possessed the ability to swim upside down. This way the uneven drag that would otherwise have occurred because of the gap between the valves was minimized. Its appendages provided the power for swimming. The limbs of its head section were small, however there is some evidence of small antennae and a powerful mandible.⁷⁴

Anomalocaris

Anomalocaris, one of the largest Burgess Shale animals, averages 45 to 60 centimeters (17 to 23 inches) in length, although it can sometimes be as long as 1 or even 2 meters (3 to 6.5 feet). Its mouth section resembled a pineapple, and had appendages that helped catch its prey. The largest limbs were attached at the anterior part of the head, and were also probably used for capturing prey.

Anomalocaris had teeth in its powerful jaw. The largest known appendages were some 20 centimeters (7.8 inches) in size. It was able to open its jaw in order to admit its prey and possessed various means of drawing its prey into its mouth. Its body was flanked by a series of lobes, which were probably used in swimming.⁷⁵

Like present-day sharks, *Anomalocaris* was a hunter perfectly adapted to its surroundings. Scientists have worked hard to determine which phylum the animal can be ascribed to, but finally included *Anomalocaris* in a phylum of its own.⁷⁶

Pikaia

Pikaia was first described by Walcott as a marine worm. However, because of several of its features, it was included in the phylum *Chordata*, which also includes vertebrates. The first known Cambrian representative of this phylum, it had a pair of short tentacles on the front. The trunk consisted of solid blocks of muscle, curved in an S shape. The tail expanded in the form of a fin. *Pikaia* swam just above the sea bed. It propelled itself by using the muscles to undulate its body.⁷⁷

Opabinia

Opabinia is a creature found in the earliest Cambrian rock beds and possesses characteristics very different from other life forms. It had a segmented trunk and a soft shell. There were five eyes on its head. More interestingly, it had a proboscis on its head, which ended in spines. This was probably used for grasping preys.⁷⁸ Each of the trunk segments had a pair of gills. The hindmost three segments comprised the tail.

Thanks to *Opabinia*, scientists realized that the soft-bodied Burgess Shale fauna was more complex and diverse than they had previously imagined.

Insollicorypha

This single fossil specimen from the Burgess Shale formation has been astonishingly well preserved, despite being very tiny. The head part is divided into two sections; both these projections were used for sense perception. The trunk consisted of some 19 segments, and there were three projections on it resembling tentacles. Each of the extensions on *Insollicorypha*'s body was equipped with 30 to 40 fine hairs. The presence of fan-like hairy extensions on its body shows that the animal must have been an active swimmer. This also explains its rarity, because since active swimmers do not generally live on the sea floor, they may not leave many traces behind.

Since it cannot be linked to any present form of life, this creature comprises a family of its own—the *Insollicoryphidae*.⁷⁹

Branchiocaris

Branchiocaris had a hard shell consisting of two parts, covering the anterior part of its body. The trunk consisted of 40 divisions. The various appendages on its body were large structures resembling flaps. It had limbs. Its gut is also clearly visible in the fossil specimen.

Branchiocaris had appendages on its head. Short antennae were very strong and curved forward. Another pair of longer appendages was situated beside the antennae and ended in a claw. The trunk appendages are very evident in the specimens. The creature in all probability

swam near the sea floor. It probably scavenged on dead or sessile organisms. The claws were used to carry food to the mouth. Its characteristics led to its being classified with arthropods.⁸⁰

As you can see from these examples alone, Cambrian life forms were flawless creatures living in their own ecosystems and possessed features that were just as complex as those of organisms living today. *Phacops*, which lived in that period and is classified as a genus of trilobite—and which we shall be looking at in some detail in due course—had eyes with a very superior structure and are no different from those animals alive today.

These details concerning Cambrian life once again show that Darwinism is to be completely discounted. The various complex structures encountered in all kinds of invertebrate marine creatures appearing in this period are among the conundrums that evolutionists are unable to explain. The sudden emergence of vertebrates has made the situation confronting evolutionists even more difficult and problematic.

The Vertebrates That Evolutionists Never Expected!

Vertebrates are defined as organisms with a spinal column and spinal cord, a skeleton consisting of bone or cartilage, a brain protected inside a skull, a closed circulatory system and a heart consisting of two, three or four chambers. They are divided into five classes: fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals. Widely distributed across the world, their bodies contain a wide variety of highly developed and complex structures.

Vertebrates are a group included in the phylum *Chordata*. Some members of this phylum are vertebrate and others invertebrate, but all possess a nerve tube known as the notochord. For a great many years, the Cambrian fossil record lacked vertebrate, and for that reason, the earliest vertebrate specimens were thought to belong to the later Devonian.

Evolutionist paleontologists believed that vertebrates appeared relatively later than the other main groups, since vertebrates as a group—of which man is also a member—are exceedingly complex in their anatomy. Evolutionists claimed that this group must have appeared in stages and at a relatively late date, and for long used the lack of any vertebrate remains in Cambrian rocks to bolster their position. As the evolutionist paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould admits, Darwinist textbooks particularly stressed the fact that no evidence of vertebrates in the Cambrian had ever been found, seeking to portray this as evidence that Cambrian rocks confirmed the truth of Darwin's theory of evolution. In their scenarios regarding vertebrate evolution, evolutionists suggested that *Pikaia*, a Cambrian chordate, was the ancestor of all vertebrates.

Yet as they were soon to see, these claims were unjustified.

Excavations performed in Cambrian rock beds in China produced results that completely overturned evolutionist scenarios regarding vertebrates. The chordate now known as *Haikouella*, unearthed by the Nanjing Institute of Geology and Paleontology's Jun-Yuan Chen

and his team, possessed a brain, heart and circulatory system, gills, a notochord, a well developed musculature and—in all likelihood—a pair of eyes.

The science journalist Fred Heeren describes how the discovery of *Haikouella* produced results that were the exact opposite of evolutionist expectations regarding *Pikaia*:

Biologist had been expecting to see something that would like a primitive ancestor to the middle Cambrian animal called *Pikaia*, formerly promoted as the world's earliest chordate. Rather than finding evidence that *Pikaia* had a less-complex ancestor, Chen instead found a chordate that already displayed many vertebrate characteristics 15 million years earlier.⁸¹

Thus it was that evolutionists had to abandon *Pikaia*, which for decades they had depicted in textbooks as the ancestor of vertebrates. The fact that the first known chordate had a highly developed anatomy and—moreover, that it had lived 15 million years before *Pikaia*—totally overturned the claimed progression of the theory of evolution. The elimination of this fictitious ancestor thus dealt a severe blow to the scenario of vertebrate evolution.

Yet the real blow came with the discovery that vertebrates had also lived in the Cambrian! These findings were the remains of a fossilized fish, dating back 530 million years, found at Haikou, near Kunming, the regional capital of the Chinese province of Yunnan. These remains literally stunned evolutionist scientists.

Research by Chinese, British, French and Japanese scientists showed that this was indeed a vertebrate. All the details of the animal's head and backbone could be seen in the remains. Such key features as a lobate extension to the head, eyes and possible nasal sacs provided detailed information regarding the creature.⁸² Many of the vertebrate features were right before scientists' eyes, and, what is more, in a fossil dating back 530 million years old.⁸³

This fish was given the name of *Haikouichthys*. Scientists are agreed that it is a true fish because of its gills and the zigzag arrangement of the muscles known as myotomes—features unique to fish.⁸⁴

Besides, *Haikouichthys* is not the only fossil fish that belongs to Cambrian. Another fossil, known as *Myllokunmingia*, was unearthed in Chengjiang. Philippe Janvier of the National Museum of Natural History in Paris says that this, too, is definitely a vertebrate and describes its significance:

It's important because up to now the vertebrates were absent from the big bang of life, as we call it—that is, the great early Cambrian explosion, where all the major animal groups appeared suddenly in the fossil record. ... It is practically certain that these are vertebrates.⁸⁵

The theory of evolution maintains that organisms emerged gradually, and that their complex structures are expected to appear only toward the end of the fictitious evolutionary process. Given that point of view, the chordate *Haikouella* and the Cambrian fish *Haikouichthys* and *Myllokunmingia* represent major problems, because these animals have reduced by 15 million years the time necessary for the chordate evolution scenario and reduced the time necessary for the evolution of fish by a full 50 million.

Thus, the sudden appearance of these animals has reduced to nothing the time that these organisms supposedly need to evolve.

Naturally, these discoveries caused great astonishment among evolutionist circles, who needed to explain the sudden appearance of vertebrates in the Cambrian Period. This only added another problem to the Cambrian, which was in any case full of question marks. A great many evolutionists have finally had to abandon their previous scenarios regarding the evolution of vertebrates and to admit that on this subject, they have no answers at all.

The Fact Revealed by Fossils

For as long as they have been investigated, Cambrian rocks have continued to reveal the characteristics of brand new organisms, revealing important specimens that enriched the variety of life hitherto known to us and that totally eliminated the groundless idea of any “common ancestor.” For evolutionists seeking an answer to the question of how Cambrian life forms first emerged, the existence of these organisms with previously unknown structures and living habits constituted an enormous difficulty.

The evolutionist John Maynard Smith has described this variety:

But in the Burgess Shale, information about soft parts is beautifully preserved. These fossils have been known for over fifty years, but recently they have been re-examined. It is now clear that there existed in the Cambrian a very wide array of forms, some of which may differ in their basic body plan from anything alive today. It also seems likely that, with a few minor exceptions, all the body plans that exist today were already present in the Cambrian.⁸⁶

The evolutionist Niles Eldredge, an American Museum of Natural History paleontologist, described this perfect variety and was forced to confess the extraordinary nature of the phenomenon:

[After the Ediacaran] Then there was something of an explosion. Beginning about six hundred million years ago, and continuing for about ten to fifteen million years, the earliest known representatives of the major kinds of animals still populating today’s seas made a rather abrupt appearance. This rather protracted “event” shows up graphically in the rock record: all over the world, at roughly the same time, thick sequences of rocks, barren of any easily detected fossils, are overlain by sediments containing a gorgeous array of shelly invertebrates: trilobites..., brachiopods, mollusks. All of the typical forms of hard-shelled animals we see in the modern oceans appeared ... in the seas of six hundred million years ago.

After stating that rather than representing evidence for evolution, this is actually a finding in favor of creation, Eldredge went on:

Indeed, the sudden appearance of a varied, well-preserved array of fossils, which geologists have used to mark the beginnings of the Cambrian Period does pose a fascinating intellectual challenge.⁸⁷

Bob Holmes described the fact of the Cambrian in the 18 October, 1997, edition of *New Scientist* magazine:

Glass skyscrapers, Gothic cathedrals, yurts, Georgian terraces, Shinto shrines, wattle and daub, Victorian railway stations, Bauhaus, igloos, mock-Tudor. Imagine that all the architectural styles that human ingenuity could ever devise appeared during one 35-year period,

sometime in the middle of the 15th century. Imagine how today's historians would be trampling over each other in their eagerness to learn what made that window of profound creativity possible. That's roughly how palaeontologists feel about the Cambrian explosion.

In just 35 million years, the blinking of an eye for evolution, animal life erupted in an explosion of inventiveness that far outshines anything the planet has seen before or since.⁸⁸

"Anything the planet has seen before or since" is certainly a very accurate description for the Cambrian explosion because the most complex of the various ecosystems on Earth emerged suddenly, as a work of art revealing countless examples of intricate complexity. The Cambrian is a time when sophisticated creatures appeared suddenly at a time when there had been no life forms at all, apart from a few bacteria and other single-celled organisms. And the forms that emerged are indeed far more extraordinary than historic buildings or giant skyscrapers.

Of course, this amazing variety is not the product of trial-and-error genetic coincidences, as Darwinists maintain. Each one is an example of the flawless creation of Allah, our Creator:

Allah, there is no deity but Him, the Living, the Self-Sustaining. He is not subject to drowsiness or sleep. Everything in the heavens and the Earth belongs to Him. Who can intercede with Him except by His permission? He knows what is before them and what is behind them, but they cannot grasp any of His knowledge save what He wills. His Footstool encompasses the heavens and the Earth and their preservation does not tire Him. He is the Most High, the Magnificent. (Surat al-Baqara, 255)

What Is a Complex System?

Many of the complex organs that first appeared in Cambrian life forms, such as eyes, antennae, limbs, mouth and gut are all complex systems that exhibit a number of basic features.

A complex system arises from a large number of smaller components that are all interrelated to one another. At the same time, this system is in a constant exchange and interface with surrounding structures. The parts comprising any complex system are constantly inter-reacting with one another, and it is not enough for a single component to be operating in order for the complete system to function. All of its components need to work together at the same time, in harmony, and in a flawless manner.

The eye is an example of one such complex structure, consisting of a large number of components, each of which is linked to others. Individually, the substructures of the eye cannot make vision possible. In order for the eye to see, all the components have to perform their own individual functions together, and flawlessly.

The complexity encapsulated within any single eye manifests itself similarly in a single cell of a living thing, or even at the fundamental level of a single protein within that cell. This interrelated sophistication is the greatest obstacle facing the Darwinist claim of "small, random changes" as an explanation for the development of species. As we know, random effects are almost always destructive. Any random mutation affecting a complex system will cause the collapse of that system, even if it affects only one of its components. Therefore, a mutation in

the optic nerve will cause blindness in the eye. Excessive current—as in a power surge—will damage a radio. No one can imagine that it could turn that radio into a television. Therefore, any random effect impacting on the eye will inevitably damage it.

Recall that it is Allah Who creates the effects we refer to as random. Therefore, all the phenomena that take place are wholly planned, determined in the destiny set out by Allah. However, some people interpret these as occurring randomly. What they refer to as chance is not independent of Allah. For example, if one throws a handful of dry leaves into the air, each leaf will fall in a specific place. The phenomenon may be referred to as chance. But in fact the place where every leaf will fall is determined in the Sight of Allah. Any random mutation is described as accidental, but it is Allah Who creates both the mutation and its harmful effects.

As the result of random factors, complex systems are condemned to collapse. The Darwinist philosopher Daniel C. Dennett admits as such:

We consist of billions of cells, and a single human cell contains within itself complex “machinery” that is still well beyond the artifactual powers of engineers.⁸⁹

Therefore, biological complex systems can emerge only by being created by Allah, not through coincidental changes. The molecular biologist Michael Denton describes the situation by using an analogy:

In complex systems like a watch or a living system, all the subsystems are intensely integrated. Engineering changes in such systems is complex because each change to any one subsystem must be compatible with the functioning of all the other subsystems. Any change beyond a trivial degree is bound to necessitate intelligently directed compensatory changes in many of the interacting subsystems. In this context, it is hard to understand how undirected evolution via a series of independent changes could ever produce a radical redesign in any sort of system as complex as a living organism. It is precisely this integrated complexity which provides a major barrier to engineering radical change in living things from viruses to mammals.⁹⁰

The principle that “all the subsystems comprising a complex system are intensely integrated” can also be seen in the early history of the animal kingdom.

The First Complex Life Forms

In terms of Darwinian theory, the Cambrian Period is very early for the high level of biological complexity it exhibits. Darwinists claim that the complex structures possessed by living things are acquired gradually, over long periods of time. Therefore, species must have possessed rudimentary, primitive characteristics at the start of their supposed evolutionary histories and acquired more complex features only at the end of a very lengthy evolutionary process.

In fact, however, the history of animals presents the exactly opposite picture. The first animals shared the same basic body structures as those living today; and the same complex organs such as eyes, antennae, limbs, mouths and guts. Therefore, complexity is a

characteristic that came early in animal history, rather than late. To be more accurate, it existed right from the start.

This, no doubt, is a great puzzle for evolutionists. The evolutionist researchers Marshall Kay and Edwin H. Colbert state that this state of affairs is highly baffling:

The introduction of a variety of organisms in the early Cambrian, including such complex forms of the arthropods as the trilobites, is surprising . . . The introduction of abundant organisms in the record would not be so surprising if they were simple. Why should such complex organic forms be in rocks about six hundred million years old and be absent or unrecognized in the records of the preceding two billion years? . . . If there has been evolution of life, the absence of the requisite fossils in the rocks older than the Cambrian is puzzling.⁹¹

By hiding behind the concept of a “puzzle,” these evolutionist researchers are trying to gloss over that all these systems emerged suddenly, hundreds of millions of years ago—a fact that is enough to completely repudiate Darwinism. To show why this early complexity has such a devastating effect on Darwinism, it will be useful to compare some examples from the Cambrian ecosystems with pre-Cambrian complexity—and to examine the trilobite, one of the early complex life forms, and the perfect and highly sophisticated structure of its eye.

Cambrian Ecology and Suddenly Appearing Predators

Among the most striking features of Cambrian species are the advanced organs they possess for attack and defense, in complex prey-predator relationships. That Cambrian life forms were equipped with such advanced weaponry, though there is no sign of such structures in the pre-Cambrian, demonstrates that this development of complexity was sudden and comprehensive.

The defense systems possessed by Cambrian creatures reveal that the Cambrian ecosystem was highly developed. Jun-Yuan Chen says that the Cambrian ecology, which emerged and grew very quickly, was just as developed as today's:

[In the Cambrian], there was a highly developed ecosystem. The food chain was as complicated as it is today.⁹²

The predators that appeared suddenly in the Cambrian reveal an evident conflict with Darwinism's concept of gradual development. Darwinism is based on the hypothesis of gradual development and countless intermediate forms in the fossil record and therefore, having incomplete, marginally functional structures. Similarly, it requires the remains of developing, but still half-formed complex attack and defense systems during the Cambrian Period. Yet these life forms were created suddenly, with completely functional and perfect structures for attack and defense.

The evolutionist writer Richard Monastersky describes the hollow nature of the hypothesis of gradual development:

People regarded the Cambrian as a rather early stage in the development of ecosystems. The assumption was that predation wouldn't have been a very well developed strategy.

According to this theory, the earliest predators would have started off as relatively simple creatures that then evolved more specialized features over many millions of years. As the predators added to their offensive weaponry, prey would evolve sophisticated defense systems.

But the fossils show that the arms race accelerated almost overnight during the Cambrian explosion. Creatures with hard shells and long spines abound in the Chengjiang fauna, displaying a broad sweep of protective armor. Likewise, *Anomalocaris* appeared on the scene with an array of formidable feeding tools.⁹³

The complexity that Cambrian fauna displays clearly and definitely repudiates the claims of the theory of evolution, because, in both fauna and on the species level, the theory demands considerable development from the simple to the more complex. Paleontologists who discover fauna that lived millions of years ago have to arrange them in terms of their relationships with one another and their environments, from the simple to the complex in order to demonstrate that any evolution occurred. However, Darwinism has been unable to provide any evidence for such evolution.

Species as complex as those of the Cambrian appeared not in the wake of simpler faunas extending in a vertical line up through geological strata, but in a unique and isolated manner. In the face of these facts, the only rational explanation that one can offer is that Allah created Cambrian fauna with all its complexity.

Genomic Complexity

The anatomical variety that suddenly appeared in the Cambrian spells out an explosion of the information in the DNA of those living things.

A single-celled eukaryote of the pre-Cambrian is an internally specialized and complex structure, with a nucleus and various organelles.⁹⁴ However, it ultimately represents just one type of cell. A trilobite or mollusk, on the other hand, contains dozens of different tissues, each of which is made up of a specialized cell type.⁹⁵ Based on the present-day specimens of some species that first appeared in the Cambrian phyla, we can conclude that they typically contain between 40 and 60 different cell types.

New cell types require the existence of several new, specialized proteins. For example, a cell on the inner surface of the intestine that secretes a digestive enzyme needs—at a bare minimum—structural proteins that modify its shape, regulatory enzymes that control digestive enzyme secretion, and the digestive enzyme itself.⁹⁶

New proteins require new genetic information encoded in the DNA. Therefore, any increase in the number of cell types means a significant increase in specialized genetic information. It is impossible for an organism to acquire by chance a gene that will produce a needed protein.

Frank Salisbury, an evolutionist biologist, says the following 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.⁹⁷

Molecular biologists estimate that a cell of only minimal complexity would require between 318 to 562 kilobase pairs of DNA (kilobase: 1,000 bases, in expressing the lengths of nucleic acid molecules) to produce the proteins necessary to maintain life.⁹⁸ More complex single-celled organisms require 1 million base pairs.

However, any complex animal requires thousands of times more coded instructions. In the genome of the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, for example, there are up to 120 million base pairs. Therefore, there must be an enormous increase in complexity of genetic information for any transition from a single-celled to multi-celled form.

Computer programs, to use an analogy, are written by thousands of people and then tested. The genomic complexity in multi-celled organisms is far more complex than any program written by human beings. No doubt that a program that cannot be produced by even the most highly advanced technology, and its sudden appearance in the DNA of Cambrian life forms millions of years ago, cannot be explained in terms of chance. That would be like claiming that the highest computer technologies achieved so far could result from a lightning strike on a pile of scrap metal.

In other words, it would be nonsensical. Therefore, it's completely irrational to resort to claims of aimless natural phenomena to explain the origins of Cambrian life forms.

A computer program requires an outside consciousness—in other words, a computer engineer—to bring it into being. It's certain that the complexity in Cambrian life forms, unmatched by the most advanced computer programs, can be explained only by the existence of an omniscient Creator. The genomic complexity of Cambrian life forms was created by Almighty Allah, Lord of the worlds, and not by chance.

The Trilobite: A Flawless Cambrian Life Form

Stephen Jay Gould has described this as “everyone’s favourite invertebrate fossil,”⁹⁹ because the trilobites were uniquely attractive creatures, the best preserved member of the marine arthropods, with a sculpted appearance and dazzling complexity. With their eyes consisting of many lenses and a perfect structure allowing them to see and hunt, and their ability to swim and feed in the silent seas of 530 million years ago, they were prolific and are commonly found in fossil beds. They also present one of the greatest disappointments facing Darwin and his supporters in later years, and one of the greatest problems they need to overcome.

As we mentioned before, with few exceptions, soft tissues are seldom preserved because they represent food for predators. Also bacteria are microscopic predators, ready to decay tissues as soon as organisms die, wherever they may be. They feed on such organic substances throughout their lives.¹⁰⁰

That is why we cannot obtain complete knowledge of how an extinct life form lived, which organs it used for what purpose, or the structure of those internal organs. Only the fossil remains they have left behind can give us any information to learn about them and understand the general systems they possessed.

Yet when it comes to Cambrian life forms, the picture is very different. In the great majority of cases, these creatures' soft tissues have been so well preserved that we can establish how they lived and fed, whether or not they were predators, and whether they were fast swimmers. Trilobites were invertebrates that lived in various parts of the world and have left behind the greatest number of traces from the Cambrian Period. For that reason, by comparing all these specimens, it has been possible to reconstruct their lives in considerable detail.

Trilobites represent a subphylum of the phylum *Arthropoda*. Their hindparts were divided longitudinally into three lobes (which is where the name trilobite comes from). A shell made of keratin covered their head and body. Like present-day arthropods, these creatures grew by molting, or shedding their shells. In sheer numbers, trilobites represent more than half of all Cambrian fossils, and their shells have been exceptionally well preserved. With their detailed body structure and their perfectly developed form, sensitive nervous system and compound eyes, they emerged together with many other similarly complex phyla at the beginning of the Cambrian explosion.

The longest section of a trilobite was its thorax. This region consisted of various segmented sections, all joined together. Each was connected to the adjoining ones with a hinge, forming a linked system like railway carriages. They were interconnected by a coupling, which allowed flexibility. Thanks to their segmented body, these creatures could easily move over obstacles, flex and turn.¹⁰¹

Looked at in close up, the trilobite's tail also consisted of a few segments, but these were not free but were fused together. In some trilobites, the tail section is longer than the head, consisting of a large number of segments.¹⁰²

Present-day species consisting of various segments are very similar to the trilobite. Beetles, shelled animals, centipedes and spiders all consist of a number of consecutive segments and also share another feature with trilobites: jointed legs. At first sight, it may be difficult to see much resemblance between the legs of a fly and those of a lobster, but both are actually jointed in the same way. Every joint can bend and turn around its own axis.

Animals with jointed legs are known as arthropods, for which reason trilobites are also classed as a form of arthropod.

From each section comprising the trilobite emerged a pair of appendages. Generally, that section containing the internal organs lay in the middle of the organism. Outside the legs were three other branches. The two outer ones were the branchial appendages—gills that the trilobite used to breathe and absorb oxygen in the sea water, just as all arthropods must do.¹⁰³

Examined under magnification, the antennae projecting from the trilobite's head were noticed. Again, they consisted of segments, and were the advance guard of the arthropod body. These antennae performed the tasks carried out by the fingers and nose, and permitted the

creature to acquire detailed knowledge of its surroundings. In the trilobite, these structures were incomparably more complex than in any pre-Cambrian life form.

One organ in particular had a structure that optic physicians dream of: The trilobite eye, which exhibits a flawless creation.

Amazing 530-Million-Year-Old Eyes

Large or small, just about every animal swimming in the sea, flying in the air or living on the land has been equipped with eyes. It comes as no surprise that a tiny fly or a crab has eyes letting it perceive its surroundings.

Yet the discovery of eyes on an arthropod 530 million years old is an extraordinary state of affairs that is difficult for evolutionists to believe. The eye, described by Darwin as an “organ of extreme perfection and complication”¹⁰⁴, existed in an astonishing and complex form at a time when—according to him and his followers, there should have existed no complex life forms at all. The trilobite’s eye has shown scientists a great many perfect details that appeared during the Cambrian.

The trilobite eye’s most important distinguishing feature is calcite, one of the commonest minerals on Earth. Limestones consist largely of calcite and are the raw materials for buildings that stand for long periods of time. Calcite is the building block of pyramids, amphitheaters and historic columns that have survived the centuries down to the present day. The floors of Renaissance churches in Italy were made out of calcite. In short, stones rich in calcite were used throughout history for almost everything that needed to be attractive and hard-wearing.

The trilobite eye was composed of transparent calcite crystals—a feature that makes them unique in the entire animal kingdom.¹⁰⁵ If you fracture a large piece of calcite crystal, you can see that it breaks along a regular plane, in line with its own atomic structure. What is left in your hand is a six-sided crystal, which allows light to pass through it. Calcite was specially created in order to perform this superior visual function in the trilobite.

The reason why the trilobite’s calcite structure makes its eye so unique is that other arthropods mostly have soft eyes. Since a trilobite’s calcite eyes have a structure similar to other hard parts of its body, they too have been well preserved. All the trilobite specimens obtained so far have provided comprehensive information about the eyes’ perfect and detailed structure.

The eyes were on top of the cheek of the animal and consisted of a large number of lenses.¹⁰⁶ Rather resembling a honeycomb, these lenses are just about as clear as a dragonfly’s. More interesting is the fact that they were fused together at the front of the animal.¹⁰⁷

Trilobites’ eyes had another arthropod trait: their compound structure. These eyes contained numerous sub-units, each of which was a lens. Just like those in a fly’s compound eyes, each hexagonal unit served as an independent lens. Each one perceived a different image, which image was then combined into a whole. The only difference between a fly’s and a trilobite’s compound eyes is that the trilobite’s was made up of calcite, a mineral.¹⁰⁸

A trilobite eye is a miraculous construction of small, slender prisms. Each wide, hemispherical eye may have hundreds or even thousands of lenses, each of which perceived an image from a different direction. Some faced straight forwards, others to the side, and some even faced backward. Each lens focused on an area determined for it. The trilobite was thus able to perceive danger approaching from any direction, and also possessed a great advantage when hunting.

The average trilobite lens was long and thin, a few tens of thousandths of a millimeter across and hexagonal in shape. With their special geometry, the hexagons exhibited a perfect structure on the eye's sloping convex surface. In order for that curve to be established and for a little space to be made around it, a few rare lenses had other shapes, and there were also variations in their arrangements.¹⁰⁹ It has been realized that the trilobite's eye worked in the same way as those of present-day arthropods.

Since every lens "saw" a particular pre-selected field, the trilobite perceived the world as a mosaic of small images. The shape of any object before it must have varied slightly from lens to lens, with a different image produced by each one. The resolution of the images perceived also depended on the number of these lenses. More lenses of course meant better vision.

Richard Fortey, an evolutionist paleontologist from London's Natural History Museum, comments on the extraordinary number of lenses possessed by some trilobites:

One of the most difficult jobs I ever attempted was to count the number of lenses in a large trilobite eye. I took several photographs of the eye from the different angles and then made enormous prints magnified large enough to see individual lenses. I started counting as one might, "One, two, three, four. . ." and so on, to a hundred or two. The trouble was that you had only to look away for an instant, or sneeze, to forget exactly where you were, so it was back again to "One, two, three..." ... I got to a total of more than three thousand before I vowed that, in future, I would simply estimate the number of lenses in a bit of an eye, and use my best arithmetic to estimate the whole number.¹¹⁰

More than 3,000 lenses means that the animal received more than 3,000 images. This clearly shows the degree of the complexity in the eye and brain structure of a creature that lived 530 million years ago.

This flawless structure cannot have come into existence through evolution, as is set out by David Raup, a professor of geology from Harvard, Rochester and Chicago universities:

Thus the trilobites 450 million years ago used an optimal design which would require a well trained and imaginative optical engineer to develop today—or one who was familiar with the seventeenth-century optical literature.¹¹¹

The Superior Complexity in *Phacops* Trilobites

Trilobites of the genus *Phacops* have a large number of lenses. Rather than being hexagonal, the shape of these lenses is more reminiscent of a marble's. If you gaze through a clear marble, you perceive an indistinct image that is reversed and blurred, showing objects to the sides elongated out of proportion. The reason for this is that light passing through a spherical structure is refracted at different angles. Therefore, it can be assumed that the problem of lack of focus in the marble should also be expected to arise in *Phacops*'s eye. But such is not the case!

In 1972, Kenneth M. Towe of Washington's Smithsonian Institution showed just how efficient the *Phacops* eye actually was. Towe managed to obtain an image from inside the trilobite's lenses and reflect it onto photographic paper. Contrary to his expectations, he encountered an exceedingly sharp image. It was as if the laws of physics no longer applied here.

The truth was only realized several years later. The trilobite eye did not actually ignore the laws of physics at all. On the contrary, it overcame any indistinctness thanks to a plan based on those same laws. Riccardo Levi-Setti solved the mystery of how this happened.

The trilobite was an ideal subject of research for Levi-Setti, a professor of physics at Chicago University and also a fossil hunter. He was familiar with fossil trilobites and, using his knowledge of physics, he made a most interesting scientific discovery. The trilobite lens had a similar structure to the optical constructions worked out by Descartes and Huygens in the 17th century.¹¹² Levi-Setti published his findings together with his paleontologist colleague Euan Clarkson from Edinburgh University. In later years, he turned his research into trilobites into a book.

René Descartes was a French philosopher and mathematician. Christiaan Huygens was a Dutch astronomer and physicist. Both carried out physical and mathematical investigations into the refraction of light, and investigated the ideal shape of telescope lenses. Thanks to two mathematical functions with four variables that each discovered independently of the other, they played a major role in the development of better telescopes, and thus advanced the science of optics. However, they were quite unaware that they were using lenses based on the same mathematical principle that trilobites had been employing, millions of years before the science of optics was ever dreamed of.

Niles Eldredge, a prominent evolutionist and curator of the Department of Invertebrates, American Museum of Natural History, summarized this astonishing state of affairs:

These lenses—technically termed aspherical, aplanatic lenses—optimize both light collecting and image formation better than any lens ever conceived. We can be justifiably amazed that these trilobites, very early in the history of life on Earth, hit upon the best possible lens design that optical physics has ever been able to formulate.¹¹³

Richard Fortey, a researcher at the Natural History Museum in London and a professor of palaeobiology at Oxford University, said this about the trilobite genus *Fallotaspis*:

We know that the first trilobites already had a well-developed visual system. Indeed, the large eyes found in the genus *Fallotaspis*, from Morocco, prove that sophisticated vision goes back at least 540 million years to the Cambrian period.¹¹⁴

The Problem and Its Solution

A spherical lens like a marble does not produce a clear image, because the rays reaching its rounded surface must travel different distances, and are thus refracted at different angles. The trilobite eye overcomes this problem by means of a special arrangement. As already mentioned, the trilobite eye lens is made of calcite, the same material, as the shell covering its body. Raw calcite crystals are transparent, allowing light to pass through. Each calcite lens in the trilobite eye is biconvex in shape, that is, convex on both sides.

At the bottom of the lenses, Levi-Setti and Clarkson encountered an extraordinary state of affairs. Every lens actually consisted of two units. The upper lens unit was made of calcite, and the bottom was chitin-based. Descartes and Huygens' mathematical designs and the actual intermediate surface where the two units came together in the trilobite eye lens were in remarkable accord with one another. Magnesium atoms were arranged along the length of this surface in the lens, in sufficient quantities to overcome the spherical aberration. Thanks to these atoms, every light beam curved to the left was balanced by one to the right, thus enabling light rays initially refracted at different angles to focus on the same spot. (See diagram opposite.)

Levi-Setti expressed his amazement at the situation:

In fact, this optical doublet is a device so typically associated with human invention that its discovery in trilobites comes as something of a shock. The realization that trilobites developed and used such devices half a billion years ago makes the shock even greater. And a final discovery—that the refracting interface between the two lens elements in a trilobite's eye was designed in accordance with optical constructions worked out by Descartes and Huygens in the mid-seventeenth century—borders on sheer science fiction.¹¹⁵

Extraordinary Sensitivity

The creation in the trilobite lens reveals an extraordinary sensitivity in terms of the calcite and chitin refractive indexes. (*Refractive index* is a measure for how much the speed of light is reduced when passing from one medium into another. For instance, the refractive index of air is 1, of glass 1.5, of water 1.33, and of diamond 2.42.) The refractive index of calcite is 1.6, and that of the chitin beneath it is 1.53.

Huygens and Descartes' lens designs provide an ideal eye structure, and the trilobite's eye is highly compatible with those designs. However, Huygens and Descartes' designs were based on the existence of just one unit. But one unit is not enough for the trilobite eye, because the refractive index of the water in which trilobites lived is different from that of the air.

This is where the usefulness of the bottom lens unit comes in. The deviation that occurs in a water environment is overcome by this second unit—which only goes to demonstrate the complexity in the structure in question.

Levi-Setti stated the following about this property of the trilobite lens:

There is in fact only one choice of indices for which the lens brings an incident parallel beam to a focus. This involves the upper lens being made of calcite ($n=1.66$) and the intralensar bowl being made of chitin ($n=1.53$).¹¹⁶

In addition, the mathematical solution in the trilobite lens is based upon several laws and principles. Levi-Setti says:

Trilobites had solved a very elegant physical problem and apparently knew about Fermat's principle, Abbé's sine law, Snell's laws of refraction and the optics of birefringent crystals.¹¹⁷

It would, of course, be irrational to claim that a prehistoric animal could possess any knowledge of the laws of optics as set out by Levi-Setti. It is impossible for a trilobite to have known anything on this subject nor, moreover, to produce a flawless structure in its own body in the light of that knowledge. It is Allah, the Creator of all living things, Who gave the trilobite these properties.

As you have seen, the trilobite's lens structure, the material of which its lens units were made and the connecting interfaces were just as they needed to be. Moreover, these features were made possible by their being in complete agreement with the laws of physics and optics, and being applied in a perfect fashion. In his article *Conflicts between Darwin and Paleontology*, the paleontologist David M. Raup writes:

But if we look at the individual elements of the trilobite eye, we find that the lens systems were very different from what we now have. Riccardo Levi-Setti has recently done some spectacular work on the optics of these lens systems . . . The shape is nearly identical to designs published independently by Descartes and Huygens in the seventeenth century. The Descartes and Huygens designs had the purpose of avoiding spherical aberration and were what is known as splenetic lenses. The only significant difference between them and the trilobite lens is that the Descartes and Huygens lenses were not doublets—that is, they did not have the lower lens. But, as Levi-Setti has shown, for these designs to work underwater where the trilobite lived, the lower lens was necessary.¹¹⁸

The Trilobite Eye Is a Marvel of Creation

The trilobite eye's exceedingly complex structure exhibits the most perfect details. Its components are linked to one another with the most sensitive arrangements, which makes the eye a fully functioning whole. These arrangements reveal a whole chain of miracles: The lenses are specially made out of calcite and chitin, and the refractive indexes of the two substances are perfectly compatible. Had there been some other substance besides chitin beneath the lens, then this perfect focusing would not be possible. Or if the calcite were in another form than crystalline, the lenses would not be transparent. Were it not for the double lens structure, if there were only the upper lens unit composed of calcite, the trilobite would be unable to see under water, and its eyes would serve no purpose. If the intermediate surface between the

calcite and chitin units were different from that calculated by Huygens and Descartes, then light could not be focused so accurately. Or if there were any more or fewer magnesium atoms set out along the course of that surface, then the lenses could not correct the light refraction. Even if all the other conditions had been met, the eye would still be unable to serve any useful purpose.

This sequence of miracles inevitably raises a number of important questions:

How did the trilobite acquire this optic system? How did calcite come to form lenses so perfectly installed in the animal's eyes? How did the chitin and magnesium atoms come to be arranged in the right combinations beneath these lenses? How did the designs by Huygens and Descartes—among an infinite number of possible mathematical variables, the only ones that could give rise to such sensitive vision—come to be integrated in the eye?

Could all this have taken place by chance? Or could a trilobite have realized that it needed such an eye and have developed it by itself, by performing the requisite mathematical calculations?

Of course, the trilobite eye is not the product of the trilobite's own doing or of chance mutations. Clearly, lightning striking an observatory will damage the telescopes inside rather than turning them into more advanced devices.

The trilobite can only be the bearer, the exhibitor of all these flawless features. No doubt this sublime creation belongs to Allah, Lord of the worlds. The trilobite eye is a work in which Allah exhibits His sublime artistry in all its magnificence. Allah is the flawless Creator, and brought trilobites and all other living things into being out of nothing.

Evolutionists Cannot Account for the Trilobite

The compound eye structure that first appeared in trilobites, 530 million years ago, has remained unchanged and still exists in such arthropods as the dragonfly and the bee ever since.¹¹⁹ This non-evolution displayed by arthropods throughout history constitutes a total repudiation of Darwinism.

The discovery of the trilobite and the subsequent emergence of its highly amazing structures led to considerable unease among evolutionists. As with the newly discovered Cambrian life forms, they first resorted to ignoring this important structure for a long time. They were reluctant to accept that eye's complex structure, which they have great difficulty accounting for, came into being 530 million years ago. Ignoring that fact, however, did not do away with the fact of how trilobites saw millions of years ago and how similar structures are still exhibited today in various insects.

Luther Sunderland said this on the subject:

I find it odd that a leading evolutionist who is also a specialist in trilobites, Niles Eldredge of the American Museum in Natural History, never even mentions these problems of the eye. He has a recent book directed at the Creationists . . . He has several pages on the trilobite there, but he never mentions this eye which is really the hardest part of the problem. I

think he does it because he simply can't see the significance of all these things when he is utterly convinced that there must have been a slow build-up, but we just don't have any fossils for it.¹²⁰

Ignoring the subject altogether was evolutionists' first choice. The astonishing thing was that Eldredge, who sought to ignore the trilobite eye that refuted evolution, had analyzed in the 1960s the Devonian fossils of *Phacops rana*, a species of trilobite which he had collected all over America. His analyses established that no slow and gradual development among trilobites had ever taken place, and that trilobites in the fossil record exhibited stasis.¹²¹

Another paleontologist who drew similar conclusions was R. A. Robison. In his study of fossil trilobites of the order *Agnostida* that had lived in Midwest America during the Cambrian, Robison found "a conspicuous lack of intergradation in species-specific characters."¹²² In short, the fossil record exhibited stasis. The countless trilobite fossils revealed a fact too obvious to be ignored.

At this, evolutionists resorted to various suppositions. Different circles engaged in a number of initiatives to explain the cause of this complex arthropod that lived 530 million years ago and how it came to acquire these features. Each one came up with a different theory, details of which we shall review in due course. For some reason, no one explanation supported any of the others, and these evolutionists could arrive at no consensus.

The evolutionist Richard Fortey described the disagreement among evolutionists:

How then to account for their sudden appearance? Charles Darwin was unusually confident in the *Origin of Species*: "I cannot doubt that all the {Cambrian} trilobites have descended from some one crustacean which must have lived long before the {Cambrian}," he wrote, thirteen years before Thomas Hardy confronted his hero with another such "primitive crustacean." The attribution of trilobites to the arthropods may be almost instinctive. The anthropologist Kenneth Oakley made known a perforated specimen, a pendant probably, recovered from the Grotte du Trilobite in Yonne (France). This is a late Paleolithic cave . . . In the same cave there was found a beautiful carving of a beetle. "It does seem reasonable," says Oakley in 1965, "to infer that the trilobite would have appeared to the untutored yet observant and thoughtful Magdalenian as a kind of insect in stone. Quite so. The Magdalenian saw an insect, Darwin a crustacean, Walcott (eventually) an arachnid, that is, a relative of the spiders and scorpions—they cannot all be right."¹²³

One evolutionist source described the question of the origin of trilobites in these terms:

The big problem with the earliest known trilobites, is that they are trilobites. That is to say, their earliest representatives are distinctly and emphatically trilobites, and they do not look like anything else.¹²⁴

Of course trilobites *were* trilobites ever since the day they first came into existence, just as fish are fish, birds are birds, and reptiles are reptiles. All these groups came into being with their characteristics fully developed and maintained these properties throughout their existence on Earth, without evolving into other life form.

For that reason, there is no scientific problem here. Scientific findings prove, very clearly and definitely, that living things came into being through a superior creation. The only reason why evolutionists regard trilobites as a “problem” is the total lack of similar life forms preceding them—the lack of any animals they can propose as the trilobites’ evolutionary ancestors. Fossil record has provided tens of thousands of specimens of trilobites’ existence on Earth over hundreds of millions of years. So the problem is not that insufficient specimens have been fossilized. Tens of thousands of fossil trilobites date back to between 530 and 200 millions years ago, but scientists have failed to find one single fossil trilobite from any rocks immediately pre-dating the period.

The reason for this is clear; Almighty Allah flawlessly brought trilobites into existence 530 million years ago. Their supposed ancestral forms exist not in the pre-Cambrian, but only in evolutionists’ imaginations.

Evolutionists will likely face still more difficulty on this subject. In seeking for evidence in favor of evolution, they constantly encounter facts that totally repudiate it. Indeed, the evolutionist Norman Macbeth openly stated so in an address he gave at Harvard University:

One example of this is the little animal called the trilobite. There are a great many fossils of the trilobite right there at the beginning, with no build-up to it. And, if you examine them closely, you will find that they are not simple animals. They are small, but they have an eye that has been discussed a great deal in recent years—an eye that is simply incredible.

It is made up of dozens of little tubes which are all at slightly different angles so that it covers the entire field of vision, with a different tube pointing at each spot on the horizon. But these tubes are all more complicated than that, by far. They have a lens on them that is optically arranged in a very complicated way, and it is bound into another layer that has to be just exactly right for them to see anything. . . . But the more complicated it is, the less likely it is simply to have grown up out of nothing.

And this situation has troubled everybody from the beginning—to have everything at the very opening of the drama. The curtain goes up, and you have the players on the stage already, entirely in modern costumes.¹²⁵

Of course, the way that evolutionists ignore this situation does not alter the fact that there clearly was an exceedingly complex life form on Earth during the Cambrian. It was able to view the underwater world of that time through perfect eyes, and with its perfect structure, became widespread across the entire world. Its eye, one of living things’ most complex organs, appeared suddenly, having undergone no intermediate stages and with no imaginary primitive forms. There is no evolutionary origin of the perfect eyes possessed by this or any other creature, because they, and their eyes, never underwent evolution. This creature was created 530 million years ago, with all its perfect features, all its complex structures, its amazing eyes and the colors which we are unable to perceive today.

It was created from nothing by Allah, Who knows the exact properties it possessed, how it lived, how it saw and what it looked like. Allah reveals this fact in a verse:

There is no creature on the Earth which is not dependent upon Allah for its provision. He knows where it lives and where it dies. They are all in a Clear Book. (Surah Hud, 6)

Whether or not evolutionists admit it, this evident fact applies all over the world, right before their very eyes:

Is it other than the religion of Allah that you desire, when everything in the heavens and Earth, willingly or unwillingly, submits to Him and to Him you will be returned? (Surah Al 'Imran, 83)

Evolutionists Seek a Way Out, Inventing Imaginary Scenarios for the Cambrian

When the scale and importance of the Cambrian explosion was realized, it confronted evolutionists with a major puzzle. The February 1999 edition of the famous scientific journal *Trends in Genetics (TIG)* admitted that the Burgess Shale fossils could not be explained in terms of the theory of evolution:

It might seem odd that fossils from one small locality, no matter how exciting, should lie at the center of a fierce debate about such broad issues in evolutionary biology. The reason is that **animals burst into the fossil record in astonishing profusion during the Cambrian, seemingly from nowhere.** Increasingly precise radiometric dating and new fossil discoveries have only sharpened the suddenness and scope of this biological revolution. The magnitude of this change in Earth's biota demands an explanation. **Although many hypotheses have been proposed, the general consensus is that none is wholly convincing** [*emphasis added*].¹²⁶

The organisms that appear in Cambrian strata, and the research into them by scientists, clearly reveal in every detail that no process of evolution ever took place. This fact led to terrible panic among all evolutionists, Darwin included, and obliged them to review all the claims they had made so far.

Some Darwinists who hadn't expected this sudden appearance in the Cambrian Period began to doubt the very theory they had advocated. Others attempted to keep alive the theory, which had now been definitively repudiated by the evidence. As the result of these endeavors, they produced highly exaggerated and nonsensical theories, totally inconsistent and all very different from one another, based on no scientific evidence, and incompatible with logic and reason. Their objective was to be able to introduce some factor of evolution into the Cambrian explosion, which they had ignored for many years but which the overwhelming weight of the evidence had finally forced them to accept.

Dr. Raymond G. Bohlin, a scientist and an expert in the fields of zoology, population genetics, and molecular and cellular biology—and who espouses creation—describes these astonishing and fruitless efforts:

So, where is the documentation for the long history of the evolution of these creatures? The usual answer is that the necessary fossil layers prior to the Cambrian period have not been discovered yet. The fossils are just missing! How convenient! This, after all, was Darwin's excuse and many evolutionists after him followed suit. Well, recent discoveries from Canada, Greenland, China, Siberia, and Namibia document quite clearly that this period of biological creativity occurred in a geological instant virtually all around the globe. So, the usual excuse no longer holds water. While evolutionists are not exactly joining a creationist wave of conversion, they are being forced to ask tough questions concerning the nature of evolutionary change . . . Darwinism has always been characterized by slow gradual change that is

imperceptible in our time frame. Major evolutionary change was only visible as we looked to the fossils to reveal the number and type of intermediates between species and major groups. But **the Cambrian explosion is anything but gradual, and identifiable intermediates are totally absent** *[emphasis added]*.¹²⁷

In fact, evolutionists did express all the imaginary probabilities regarding this subject. But in producing their theories, they were making a grave mistake by allowing no possibility that these creatures had never evolved. (Or they may have recognized that possibility, but were reluctant to accept it.) They did not consider that these creatures were created, brought into being at that moment at Allah's command. They were unable to see that Allah, Who creates all things in a flawless manner and order, also created complexity and order in these arthropods' system. They failed to calculate that systems too perfect to permit any other explanation and too ordered to permit any debate had actually been created.

However, Allah revealed this in the Qur'an, sent down by Him 1,400 years ago:

He is Allah—the Creator, the Maker, the Giver of Form. To Him belong the Most Beautiful Names. Everything in the heavens and Earth glorifies Him. He is the Almighty, the All-Wise. (Surat al-Hashr, 24)

The theories put forward in order to provide an evolutionary explanation of the Cambrian explosion were actually objections to the fact of creation. The reason we are examining these theories here is to demonstrate the difficult position evolutionists are in regarding this great marvel of creation, and to describe how they lack any other answers. It is to show how nonsensical is the theory they developed. As ever, evolutionists once again reveal that in the face of Allah's flawless creation, they are facing a complete dead-end.

No matter how much they may strive, evolutionists will always confront the fact that Allah has created the universe and all living things. And since there is constant perfection in the order that Allah has established, their scientific findings will always refute all explanations opposed to this fact. Their theories will always remain groundless and unsupported and, like all the theories produced for the purpose of keeping the theory of evolution alive, they too will inevitably be refuted.

The “Snowball Earth” Hypothesis

This conjectural theory is like a cloak used to conceal the irreparable damage inflicted on the theory of evolution by the Cambrian explosion and to distract attention away from it.

Basically, the hypothesis maintains that the Earth experienced intense ice ages during very early geological periods. Scientists supporting this hypothesis claim that between 750 and 590 million years ago, there were a number of ice ages, each lasting up to 10 million years. During these periods, glaciers up to 1 kilometer (0.621 mile) thick descended as far as the equator, turning the Earth into a ball coated with ice.

This hypothesis, which has been debated since the 1960s, was once again raised by the Harvard University geologist Paul F. Hoffman and Daniel P. Schrag in the 1990s. According to this claim, in the pre-Cambrian, the entire world, without exception—from the Poles to the equator—was covered in a layer of ice. The average surface temperature on Earth was -40 degrees Celsius (-40 degrees Fahrenheit). Again according to this hypothesis, the last of these ice ages lasted for 10 to 20 million years.

The claim that evolutionists use to cloak for the supposed evolutionary appearance of species in the Cambrian Period lies basically in what came next. They suggest that at the end of this ice age, a sudden global warming took place and all the ice melted. Life forms that had existed before the Earth entered this glacial period consisted of single-celled organisms. Afterwards, in some way, matchless, perfect and complex multi-celled organisms evolved among the melting ice caps!

Of course, it is easy to come up with fairy tales. On one evolutionist website, for instance, this allegedly scientific theory is described as follows:

And when that ice started melting in the heat, models show the melting process would have been rapid, taking perhaps as little as 100 years to complete the process. As the heat worked into the ocean, it would have produced hyper-hurricanes and enormous mega-typhoons, unlike anything we see today in scope and severity. The weather would have gone crazy. Storms could have lasted for centuries. Photosynthetic cyano-bacteria rapidly radiated into the now vast swaths of open water and into new coastal shallows which were free of thick ice, and carried the entire ecosystem along with it, producing a burst of evolutionary adaptation we see in the record as the Cambrian Explosion.¹²⁸

The supposed freeze proposed in the snowball Earth hypothesis caused great excitement among evolutionist scientists, although they were all aware that it was only a hypothesis. Even if such severe freezing did take place, there could have been no possible thaw from it. The freezing's aftereffects would have left the Earth a barren planet for all eternity. All life would have been eliminated, and it would have been impossible for new species, human beings included, to develop. An article by Kevin Peterson of Dartmouth University in New Hampshire in the 12 April, 2003, edition of *New Scientist* magazine tackled the question of whether bacteria or algae could have survived in such a great freeze:

I don't say it's impossible. You never say "impossible" when you're talking about life, because there are always some bacteria out there that will prove you wrong. But it's highly unlikely. **You just can't freeze the whole world over and expect life to survive it** [emphasis added].¹²⁹

The words "a burst of evolutionary adaptation" are actually completely empty. There is no scientific basis for linking changing climatic conditions with the scenario of a transition from single-celled to multi-celled organisms. For that reason, evolutionists have never touched on which fictitious evolutionary mechanisms might have entered the equation to give rise to 50 entirely different phyla.

How, for instance, did melting glaciers add new genetic information to the DNA of single-celled organisms? What climatic factors could have endowed the DNA of a single-celled organism with new genetic information for such complex organs as eyes, limbs and antennae? What experimental evidence supports such a scenario? For example, have bacteria kept at very low temperatures in laboratory conditions ever been observed to acquire new genes and develop into multi-celled organisms?

Evolutionists cannot answer these questions, which is why they try to gloss over the subject with far-fetched explanations such as “It happened somehow. Much more complex life forms suddenly evolved as climatic conditions improved.”

There is no cause-and-effect relationship between the Snowball Earth hypothesis and the Cambrian explosion, merely a chronological link between the two. The explosion took place after—as evolutionists claim—the hypothetical ice ages ended.

In short, any attempt to link the Snowball Earth hypothesis and the origin of multi-celled organisms has no scientific foundation. Evolutionist advocates of the hypothesis are following an empty belief. This article on the subject, published on the BBC’s website, is an indication:

There are some tantalising geological clues that show this theory may be true but the problem is, the clues and the Snowball Earth theory defy the laws of nature.¹³⁰

It is of course irrational to accept so-called clues opposed to the laws of nature and to subscribe to the Snowball Earth hypothesis. The rational response is to recognize that this theory is bereft of any scientific foundation and is supported for ideological reasons alone; and to accept that the true origin of living things is Allah’s flawless creation.

Gabrielle Walker is a Princeton University science writer and an adherent of evolution. She sought to muster support for the hypothesis in her book *Snowball Earth*. In an article she wrote for *New Scientist*, she said the following:

Not a single alternative theory exists to explain one of the most dramatic evolutionary innovations—the leap from single to multicellular organisms. . . . The problem for the Snowball idea is that this explosion happened around 545 million years ago, a good 45 million years after the Snowballs ended. That’s far too long to sit around with a lighted fuse, waiting for the bang. Even Paul [Hoffman] admits this.¹³¹

Time is not the only problem, of course. Andrew Parker of the Oxford University Zoology Department declares the invalidity of the Snowball Earth hypothesis in his book *In the Blink of an Eye*:

[This idea] assumes the course of evolution was predetermined from the beginning. We are given a situation where the Precambrian worm-like bodies of all animal phyla are just itching to take on their Cambrian forms, but ice puts everything on hold. Then, when the ice has gone, it is time for evolution again. This is not an objective view. As we have considered before, why should a convenient worm shape *have* to change? If the course of evolution was predetermined, why did it not continue in the water under the ice? The second major doubt cast over this laboured explanation for the *why* of the Cambrian explosion is that the figures simply do not balance. The Cambrian explosion took place between 543 and 538 million years ago.

The last Snowball Earth event ended 575 million years ago at the latest. So there is a difference of at least 32 million years between these two events. This is fact. So a Precambrian Snowball Earth event cannot explain the *Cambrian* explosion, although it could have played a role in the Precambrian “surge.”¹³²

Despite his being an evolutionist, Parker’s words clearly demonstrate the contradictions and logical flaws in the Snowball claim, emphasizing with considerable detail that it is inconsistent in many regards. In fact, many evolutionists have now accepted the Snowball Earth hypothesis as invalid.

To resolve the many uncertainties of that hypothesis, a new theory was put forward. Certain evolutionists regarded the oxygen theory as a lifebelt in order to account for the imaginary evolutionary origin of life.

The Oxygen Theory

Complex life forms need to convert food into energy by various ways and means, and aerobic respiration, which requires oxygen, is one of the best and most efficient. Therefore, evolutionists had to include oxygen in some way in their fictitious Snowball Earth hypothesis. They thus came up with the following scenario:

For millions of years, life would have been restricted to a few small refuges so nutrients would have accumulated in the oceans, turning them into a tasty chemical soup. As soon as the ice receded, the oceans would have become green with massive colonies of bacteria and algae, which may have injected a pulse of oxygen into the post-Snowball oceans.¹³³

This theory, again based on no scientific evidence, consists, as can be seen from the above account, of a fairy tale. There is absolutely no evidence of any sudden increase in oxygen in the period concerned.

Dr. Paul Chien of the San Francisco University Biology department, who is well known for his research into Cambrian life forms in the Chengjiang formation in China, said this:

The first idea put out was the oxygen theory. They say that maybe in Cambrian times, the oxygen level in the atmosphere and in the oceans suddenly arose to a critical level which could support larger-sized animals. **That theory is pretty much shut down because there should be geological evidence for a sudden increase in oxygen** *[emphasis added]*.¹³⁴

The lack of evidence of any sudden increase in oxygen is, of course, a major problem for the theory. Yet for the evolutionists who advance this theory, the real problem is whether a sudden rise in oxygen could bring living things into existence from nothing. In order for an organism to form and survive, a great many conditions need to be met at the molecular level. All the countless balances essential for life on Earth have to be just right.

In addition, all of these conditions must be met at one and the same time. The presence of oxygen is only one of millions of conditions essential to the survival of living things, and is certainly not sufficient on its own. The Darwinists who make such a claim need to answer how the countless amino acids and, a single protein in a living cell, came together in the correct

order, how they were copied in the DNA in the absence of enzymes, how the cell acquired a variety of complex functions, and many other such questions.

Darwinists are well aware that oxygen alone has no meaning in the sudden emergence of a complex life form and for the full and perfect survival of complex systems. How were the other necessary conditions met by way of alleged evolution? Darwinists have no answers.

Even if, during the history of the Earth, oxygen did appear in the quantities and at the time hoped for by evolutionists, this would still avail nothing. Even if all the possibilities for life are established, even if all the elements comprising the basis of life—amino acids included, are brought together—even if oxygen is added in the desired amounts, this will still contribute nothing to the development of life. Such conditions will be unable to produce a single protein, and will be unable to turn one pre-existing cell into another. Therefore, the evolutionist claim that there was a sudden change of gasses at one point in the Earth's history is an empty explanation, yet another technique they employ to gain time and keep people's attention occupied.

Those who lack sufficient information on the subject may believe that a sudden rise in oxygen levels was sufficient to bring about a greater variety of life forms. Yet Darwinists should not forget one important point: The more people are made aware of the scientific facts, the less effective such tactics are. People now see that all living things are the matchless works of Almighty Allah, and this is confirmed every passing day by the scientific facts. And evolutionists must know that this awareness is increasing rapidly all the time.

The Modern Evolutionary Synthesis (Neo-Darwinism)

Some evolutionists were quick to see the invalidity of Darwin's claim of fossils as yet undiscovered in pre-Cambrian strata. They had to admit that nothing could be achieved by means of the natural selection that Darwin had proposed as evolution's fundamental mechanism. However, this meant that evolutionists had to explain, using their own assumptions, the origins of Cambrian life forms that fundamentally refuted evolution. Therefore, they came up with another claim, based on no evidence but on a complete lack thereof.

This theory accepted the hopeless nature of the gradual evolution model that Darwin had put forward, and proposed an alternative to it—neo-Darwinism, otherwise known as the modern evolutionary synthesis.

In 1941, a group of scientists at a meeting organized by the Geological Society of America sought a way to reconcile Darwinian logic with genetic science. The result of lengthy debates among geneticists like G. Ledyard Stebbins and Theodosius Dobzhansky, zoologists like Ernst Mayr and Julian Huxley, and paleontologists like George Gaylord Simpson and Glen L. Jepsen was to use the concept of mutation, proposed by the Dutch botanist Hugo de Vries at the beginning of the century, against the genetic stability revealed by genetic laws.

Mutations are defects occurring in the hereditary mechanisms of living things due to such external influences as radiation.

The scientists gathered at the Geological Society of America gave the answer, “Random mutations,” to the question, “What is the origin of the beneficial changes that develop in living things?”—which question Darwin had attempted to answer on the basis of Lamarck.

The point that these evolutionist scientists either ignored or preferred to ignore was this: It is true that mutations alter organisms’ genetic information, but this change was always a negative one. Mutations do not develop new organs or structures, as evolutionists claim, but typically harm pre-existing tissues. There was no evidence of any benefit produced by a mutation, for which reason all the speculation on mutations’ *evolutionary* or *developmental* effect was false. Mutations are usually harmful, and occasionally only neutral events, and this fact by itself is sufficient to invalidate the fictitious mechanisms of evolution as a whole.

However, this fact did not stop neo-Darwinists. They proposed a scenario in which life developed into the extraordinary complexity we see and know today, and assumed its present perfect appearance by way of random mutations, that were generally beneficial, and all from an original single cell. They hid behind this explanation, saying that Cambrian life forms, which they had for long been unable to account for and which totally demolished the theory of evolution, had developed by undergoing an infinite number of mutations.

First of all, the lengths of time regarded as necessary for the mechanisms employed by the neo-Darwinists to account for the origin of species are very long. Neo-Darwinism maintains that small changes have accumulated in the gene sequences of organisms as the result of random mutations, and that after generations, these accumulated changes eventually led to entirely new species. But as we’ve seen, the fact that mutations do not improve an organism’s genetic information invalidates this claim right from the start.

However, even if for the sake of argument we accept the entirely speculative claim that mutations could have an evolutionary effect, evolutionists are still in a hopeless position in the face of the Cambrian explosion. It is totally impossible for the life forms that appeared in the Cambrian to have developed through such minute incremental changes in such a short time. This illogical claim, devoid of any evidence, does nothing for the supposed evolution of the variety of incomparable species that appeared in the Cambrian.

Yet moreover, the modern synthesis’ own claim that organisms evolved into complex life forms by always adding positive new features invalidates the theory itself. The Neo-Darwinist scenario was dreamed up on the basis of the idea that mutations can be beneficial. The science of genetics, however, has never observed a mutation turning one organism into another with largely different but still flawless characteristics. In fact, there is not even a single example of a mutation benefiting or developing any single cell. For that reason, the theory is based on no grounds whatsoever, and the invalidity of the theory has eliminated its claim regarding Cambrian life forms.

Faced With the Cambrian Fauna, Neo-Darwinism Is at a Complete Dead End

The worst impasse facing neo-Darwinism with regard to Cambrian life forms is the great cellular variety that suddenly emerged. Studies on present-day organisms reveal that the sponges that appeared in the pre-Cambrian would have required five different types of cell.¹³⁵ Accordingly, the even more complex life forms that appeared in the Cambrian must have possessed even greater number and variety of cells, because the different characteristics and functions in organisms always require the different functions of different cell types.

New proteins also need new genetic information. Neo-Darwinism has to account for the formation of each one of these new cell types and proteins that appeared.

As we have seen earlier in the book, in order to maintain life, the minimally complex single-celled organism requires between 318 to 562 kilobase pairs of DNA. More complex single-celled organisms require 1 million base pairs. Therefore, ever-increasing coding instructions are needed for the production of the proteins necessary to give rise to any arthropod as complex as the trilobite.

For example, the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, a present-day arthropod, requires around 180 million base pairs of DNA. For a single cell to develop into a colony requires a very serious increase in cellular variety and an enormous, error-free genetic variety.¹³⁶

In order for multi-celled organisms to emerge from a single cell, therefore, enormous increases in specified genetic information are needed. At the same time, proteins—the product of the genes—must be arranged into high levels of organization. New types of cell require new proteins, which have to be organized into new systems within the cell. And these new cell types must be arranged into new tissues, organs and body systems, which, in turn, must be organized to form body plans and give rise to an organism—a trilobite, an elephant or a human being. Different components with different functions must be organized in the most perfect manner if that organism is to survive, much less thrive. For that reason, each of the new life forms that evolutionists expect to have appeared in these stages in the Cambrian must have exhibited a hierarchical organization in all respects, from the smallest component to all their fully functional features. An extraordinarily superior, functional and specified arrangement of all components must occur.

The appearance of multi-celled Cambrian life forms represents a problem for neo-Darwinists, who cannot explain any positive changes, functional differentiation and perfect organization of structure and functions in a single cell. Every detail of the complex body plans that emerged in the Cambrian explosion requires a separate explanation, but neo-Darwinists have no scientific explanation for any of them.

Stephen C. Meyer, who earned his Ph.D. in the History and Philosophy of Science from Cambridge University, sets out the emptiness and failure of neo-Darwinist claims:

In the second scenario, neo-Darwinists envisioned novel genes and proteins arising by numerous successive mutations in the preexisting genetic text that codes for proteins. To adapt Dawkins's metaphor, this scenario envisions gradually climbing down one functional peak and

then ascending another. Yet mutagenesis experiments again suggest a difficulty. Recent experiments show that, even when exploring a region of sequence space populated by proteins of a single fold and function, most multiple-position changes quickly lead to loss of function. Yet to turn one protein into another with a completely novel structure and function requires specified changes at many sites. Indeed, the number of changes necessary to produce a new protein greatly exceeds the number of changes that will typically produce functional losses. Given this, the probability of escaping total functional loss during a random search for the changes needed to produce a new function is extremely small—and this probability diminishes exponentially with each additional requisite change. Thus, Axe's results imply that, in all probability, random searches for novel proteins (through sequence space) will result in functional loss long before any novel functional protein will emerge.¹³⁷

Experiments performed in the early 1990s revealed that the probability of any short protein consisting of 100 amino acids forming at random is 1 in 10^{65} .¹³⁸ The structures that appeared in the Cambrian require the existence of much more complex functional proteins, resulting from the combination of a much higher number of amino acids. Neo-Darwinists should be able to explain the formation of different proteins shaping the different cell types in all the species within the 50 phyla that appeared. Yet they are unable to account for even a single different cell type.

The evolutionist paleontologist Richard Fortey of London's Natural History Museum expresses this fact in these words:

Even if evidence for an earlier origin is discovered, it remains a challenge to explain why so many animals should have increased in size and acquired shells within so short a time at the base of the Cambrian.¹³⁹

Even assuming that these imaginary beneficial mutations did take place, another difficulty arises regarding natural selection—the second supposed evolutionary mechanism proposed by evolutionists. In order for new cell types to be functional, they must be closely coordinated with one another. This requires that all the systems giving rise to an organ must exist in perfect, efficient form at the same moment. According to the theory of evolution, functional advantages will be favored and passed along by the mechanism of natural selection, while non-functional proteins will not. Therefore, any given cell will be eliminated long before it has time to perform its task in a functional manner together with other cells. All this clearly shows that if both mechanisms—mutation and natural selection—are operative, then evolution cannot possibly come about.

The Japanese scientist Susumo Ohno elucidates this with various calculations in the journal *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*:

Assuming the spontaneous mutation rate to be generous 10^{-9} per base pair per year and also assuming no negative interference by natural selection, it still takes 10 million years to undergo 1% change in DNA base sequences. It follows that 6-10 million years in the evolutionary time scale is but a blink of an eye. The Cambrian explosion denoting the almost simultaneous emergence of nearly all the extant phyla of the Kingdom Animalia within the

time span of 6-10 million years can't possibly be explained by mutational divergence of individual gene functions.¹⁴⁰

Stasis—in other words, stability in the fossil record—also refutes the gradual-evolution-through-mutations model propagated by neo-Darwinists. Specimens of organisms in the fossil record that existed millions of years ago are identical to their descendants alive today. According to stasis, living things emerge with the traces they have left behind in the fossil record with the same features they possess today or possessed in the recent past. The fossil record shows no intermediate forms and no change over the course of millions of years. This confirms that living things never undergo evolution and also constitutes one of the most serious blows to neo-Darwinism.

The evolutionist Peter G. Williamson, of the Harvard University Geology Department, sets this out in a paper in *Nature* magazine:

The principal problem is morphological stasis. A theory is only as good as its predictions, and conventional neo-Darwinism, which claims to be a comprehensive explanation of evolutionary process, has failed to predict the widespread long-term morphological stasis now recognized as one of the most striking aspects of the fossil record.¹⁴¹

After admitting that neo-Darwinism is not supported up by the fossil record, Stephen Jay Gould's description of the theory's position reads like an obituary notice:

[Neo-Darwinism] is effectively dead, despite its persistence as textbook orthodoxy.¹⁴²

Neo-Darwinism, or the modern evolutionary synthesis, has been put forward simply to satisfy evolutionist requirements and to excuse their lack of evidence. It is another claim, another fairy tale, invented to account for the Cambrian explosion and keep alive the theory of evolution. In fact, a number of evolutionists are in complete agreement on this.

Dr. David Raup, a University of Chicago paleontologist and an evolutionist, sets out this fact:

"All of the authors of the neo-Darwinian theory which they formulated back in the thirties and forties are losing their influence. ... I predict that that whole concept will be thrown out in the next ten years, and a new theory will be devised to take its place. A new wave of thinking is sweeping the field."

What will be the new theory? Dr. Raup confessed, "I have no idea."¹⁴³

Hox Genes

Evolutionists, unable to explain the imaginary evolutionary origin of the Cambrian explosion, realized that the new findings in genetics totally invalidated the claim that life forms so very different to one another could have descended from some common ancestor. They therefore felt the need to adapt their claims to these new discoveries. As a result, the idea of Hox genes was proposed.

So-called Hox genes, a particular subgroup of homeobox genes, are a group of genes shared by a number of animal groups. What distinguishes these from other genes is their central task in regulating the body development. Hox genes are managers that control the

development of all life, from a fertilized egg cell to maturity, instructing the genes that will construct a particular organ when and where to go into action. For example, the cells that will comprise the spinal cord settle in the region of the back from the moment the embryo first forms. The cells that constitute the eye take their place in the cranial section. This order or placement is encoded in the Hox genes.

Instructions issued by the Hox genes are forwarded to an initiator protein with a sequence of 60 amino acids, again produced by Hox genes. This protein binds to and activates the relevant genes. However, Hox genes contain no information about any given organ, the eye for instance. They are merely charged with switching the genes that do bear these data on or off. In short, Hox genes are like buttons that activate or deactivate the gene group concerned with a particular production. For example, the body plan, appearance and development of mammals are controlled by some forty Hox genes.¹⁴⁴

One important feature of Hox genes is that they line up on the chromosome in the same sequence as the regions with which they are concerned. For example, if we examine a fly, we see that its body consists of a number of sections: its head, thorax, and abdomen. The first gene in the fly's Hox gene series is the one that regulates the development of the head. The next one regulates the development of the thorax, and so forth.

When scientists discovered this arrangement, they wondered if they tampered with the sequence of Hox genes in organisms, what the effects would be. To that end, they carried out a number of experimental mutations. Changing the position of these genes in *Drosophila* fruit flies led to the emergence of monstrous insects, such as those with legs emerging from their heads.¹⁴⁵

These results make it clear how complex the genetic codes in living things are, and that any random changes to that complexity will have inevitably harmful effects. The idea that Hox mutations could cause living things to evolve into other species was thus shown to be illusory.

Dr. Christian Schwabe from the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Medical University of South Carolina describes these results:

Control genes like homeotic genes may be the target of mutations that would conceivably change phenotypes*, but one must remember that, the more central one makes changes in a complex system, the more severe the peripheral consequences become. . . . Homeotic changes induced in *Drosophila* [fruitfly] genes have led only to monstrosities, and most experimenters do not expect to see a bee arise from their *Drosophila* constructs.¹⁴⁶

As you have seen, the development of any living thing is an exceedingly complex process. The Hox genes that regulate such processes definitively refute scenarios based on random change. Even so, some evolutionists still ignore this scientifically demonstrated fact and continue to defend evolutionary scenarios concerning Hox genes.

James Valentine of University of California at Berkeley, David Jablonski from University of Chicago and Douglas Erwin of the National Museum of Natural History in Washington D.C. relate Hox genes to the sudden emergence of Cambrian life forms, suggesting that many phyla that arose in that period differentiated from another as a result of

mutations taking place in these Hox genes. In order to protect their scenario from the known harmful effects of Hox mutations, they resort to the entirely artificial claim, based on no scientific observation, that the Hox genes at that time were highly flexible and permitted change.

Simon Conway-Morris of Cambridge University says that this hypothetical “flexibility” rests on no scientific grounds:

Just as spoken language (also modular) is flexible enough to support the whole of human culture, says Valentine, this genetic language is so basic, so powerful, and so adaptable that it could underlie the whole amazing diversity of animal life.

Sounds great, but making bold claims is the easy bit—to convince your colleagues, you usually need some evidence. Valentine, Jablonski and Erwin needed to show that these mapmaking genes actually existed in the Cambrian. That posed a problem— . . . genes don’t fossilise, least of all for half a billion years and more.¹⁴⁷

Dr. Raymond G. Bohlin, a zoologist and molecular biologist, describes the unscientific aspect of the assumption regarding Hox genes in the Cambrian:

Some evolutionists have gone so far as to suggest that the mechanisms of evolution operating in the Cambrian were probably radically different from what has taken place ever since. This raises the possibility that we may never be able to study these mechanisms because animals with the proper genetic structure no longer exist. We are left only with the products of the Cambrian explosion and none of the precursors. The speculations will therefore be wild and uncontrollable since there will be no way to test these theories. Fossils leave no trace of their genetic organization.¹⁴⁸

The absence of Hox genes in the fossil record represents a problem for evolutionists. However, even if they had found the genes in question in fossilized Cambrian life forms, they would still not have overcome this difficulty, because the structure and functions of Hox genes do not support the theory of evolution.

These genes control structures that have *already* been encoded. These genes cannot code for a new structure and cannot endow an organism with any new organ that does not already exist. They don’t produce new genetic information for the development of structures. They are merely regulators. They use the information given to them, and organize it in such a way—by the will and with the permission of Allah—to establish an order within the body. Therefore, they cannot be the cause of the emergence of new information, new structures and new organs needed for a completely different life form.

Dr. Paul Chien, chairman of the Department of Biology at the University of San Francisco, who discovered the Cambrian fauna in the Chinese Chengjiang formation and carried out lengthy research into them, has this to say:

There are other theories, too, like that of Berkeley professor James Valentine . . . In developmental biology, the study of embryo development, there’s been a big discovery of something called Hox genes. They are regulatory genes, and they turn on and off sequences, the development of the eye and so on.

Valentine infers that primitive organisms accumulated enough Hox genes to suddenly make a different body plan. So he's trying to correlate Cambrian explosion with the development or accumulation of Hox genes. But I think there are many theoretical difficulties he's facing.

John Wells has the idea that Hox genes won't do it. He claims that Hox genes are only switches. You can put the switch on different systems and it just turns on and off. You're not getting new information out of Hox genes.¹⁴⁹

Another point that evolutionists are unable to explain is how the first Hox gene could have emerged. Evolutionists maintain that the accumulations formed by Hox genes led to the Cambrian variety, yet they are silent on the subject of how these regulatory genes—with an exceedingly complex structure, perfect sequence and functioning—came into existence. Further, they claim that the different genes that regulate the development of different characteristics evolved from one another, which is a scientific impossibility.

The question of how the *first* Hox gene, which supposedly constitutes the ancestor of all the rest, emerged by chance still awaits an explanation.

Those who claim that Hox genes had the potential to give rise to a biological Big Bang like the Cambrian explosion must account for why this did not occur yet again, in the subsequent 540 million years of natural history. If Hox genes do pack such potential, then why did species that existed after the Cambrian give rise to no subsequent explosions? And why did other phyla not emerge?

These questions also apply to the present day. Why do present-day scientists not witness such changes? Such observations should constantly be reported in journals such as *Nature* and *Science*, yet not a single example has ever been published!

In addition, as you have already seen in the example of the fruit fly, Hox mutations produce defective entities. The theory that Cambrian phyla evolved from earlier single-celled organisms requires countless deformed organisms to bridge the gap. Therefore, if Cambrian phyla did emerge through Hox mutations, where are all the countless intermediate fossils? For example, why are there no trilobite fossils with limbs coming out their heads? Why do living things in the fossil record always display flawless structures?

The theory of evolution has no answers.

In his book, Simon Conway-Morris admits this lack of response:

If we can explain how an animal develops from the fertilized egg through a series of embryonic stages in which features such as segmentation and limbs are formed, then there is a fascinating possibility of applying this knowledge to the Cambrian explosion. Do different animals have very different sets of genetic instructions? If so, how might they have evolved, and were there special mechanisms operating in the Cambrian evolutionary burst that no longer apply today? Is it necessary to hypothesize a set of genetic instructions that were exceptionally labile, that is, unusually flexible, in order to explain the apparent plethora of animal body plans that irrupted in the Cambrian seas? We are still some way from providing definitive answers,

but at the moment, and somewhat surprisingly, the answer to all these questions seems to be ‘No.’¹⁵⁰

Evolutionists’ lack of an answer to how evolutionary development could be supposedly brought about with Hox genes clearly demonstrates that this scenario is completely invalid and consists merely of blind hope. The idea that Hox genes caused the evolution and variety of Cambrian life forms is totally unscientific and completely speculative. An article titled “When Life Exploded” in *Time* magazine dealt with the Cambrian explosion, and clearly stated that the evolutionist claim regarding the Hox gene is a fantasy:

Of course, understanding what made the Cambrian explosion possible doesn’t address the larger question of what made it happen so fast. Here scientists delicately slide across data—thin ice, **suggesting scenarios that are based on intuition rather than solid evidence** [*emphasis added*].¹⁵¹

Every theory put forward regarding how Cambrian life forms emerged is an assumption, a story that evolutionists wish had actually happened. Evolutionists are perfectly aware that scientifically, there is no possibility of this actually having happened, but they refuse to abandon their claims, and when one becomes untenable, they produce another.

A powerful imagination is no challenge for evolutionists. They have invented a whole history of life on Earth, and have no qualms about making up new details within that scenario. However, no matter what they do, still there are still Cambrian life forms they cannot explain.

In one verse Allah tells us:

They plotted and Allah plotted. But Allah is the best of plotters. (Surah Al ‘Imran, 54)

Deniers are unaware of the truth revealed in this verse. Those who deny Allah, who persist in striving against Him, are unaware that they will be confronted by His plot. Since they refuse to believe that Allah has created all things, they are unable to understand that all things on the Earth and in the heavens—and everything they do themselves—is under His control.

Those who oppose Him fail to comprehend in what ways Allah’s flawless creation will appear before them. They fail to see and understand that all claims brought up in opposition to Allah are invalid right from the outset. For that reason, their efforts to keep on producing theories in opposition to the fact of creation are empty. They turn down a road where they can never obtain any results and spend their lives to that end.

Yet it is Allah Who created them as well as the Cambrian life forms of 530 million years ago, and Allah sees and knows their every deed. We are told in one verse that they will be rewarded for all these deeds in the Hereafter:

Everything in the heavens and the Earth belongs to Allah. He knows what you are engaged upon. On the Day when they are returned to Him, He will inform them of what they did. Allah has knowledge of all things. (Surat an-Nur, 64)

The Fossil Record Reveals an Important Fact: Evolution Never Happened

These words from Stephen Jay Gould's *Book of Life* provide an important summary regarding the present glorious variety of life on Earth:

Animal life today is phenomenally diverse, more so than any other of life's six kingdoms. Over the past three centuries, scientists have described an estimated 1.5 million species of living animals, but so many more species have not yet been studied—particularly small ones in the tropics—that true totals of 5 or even 50 million have been guessed at. Most of these species (mostly arthropods and parasites, 75 percent of all species) live on the land. Far fewer species live in the oceans (about 295,000 have been recognized). Yet it is the ocean that contains more of the main divisions of the animal kingdom, the phyla—almost every one of them . . . ¹⁵²

With the theory they propose, evolutionists must explain this extraordinary variety and what happened before it. They must show how a one-celled bacterium could eventually develop into a whale as well as give rise to millions of other animal species. Evolutionists must produce an evolutionary scenario for each one of these species, and prove it by pointing to signs in the fossil record that this process actually took place.

But in the fossil record, there is no trace of such a process. Not a single fossil shows the change from any one of the millions of different species to another. According to evolutionists, a bacterium must have turned into a whale through stages, and that fictitious gradual process must have lasted billions of years. Yet there's not a single intermediate form to show that such a change took place over that long time frame. Although even bacteria have left traces of themselves in rocks, and although there are countless fossil fish perfectly preserved in rock strata, there is no trace of any intermediate- stage "pre-fish" creatures.

That is because evolution never happened. Living things did not develop through evolution and did not give rise to other species by changing into one another. The evolution stories that evolutionists have been spinning for the last 150 years are just imaginary. Not a single claim of the theory of evolution has ever been proved scientifically. The theory of evolution has been unable to come up with a single piece of evidence from the fossil record, which should be its most important foundation and witness.

Not a single mechanism has ever been observed to bring evolution about. No branch of science supports the theory of evolution in any way whatsoever, but rather, they all produce evidence that totally refutes it.

In essence, living things did not evolve.

Cambrian life forms, which leave evolutionists in a state of shock, are a striking proof of all this. This era from 530 million years ago, in which some 50 phyla containing all the basic structures of the animal world were alive, has radically undermined the theory of evolution.

Evolutionists are still trying to recover from this surprise and to gloss over this extraordinary phenomenon. Yet the Cambrian explosion remains a fact, in the face of which evolution has melted away.

Duane Gish, a well-known biochemist and at the same time, an adherent of the fact of creation, expresses this important truth:

These anti-creationists have enshrouded this profound discontinuity in the history of life in an enormous fog of silence. They not only make no attempt to offer “just-so stories” how this may have occurred, they completely ignore it. It is too embarrassing to evolutionary theory even to discuss in their anti-creation polemics.¹⁵³

The evolutionist biologist Douglas Futuyma sets out this clearly:

Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed, or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence.¹⁵⁴

As Futuyma puts it, the Cambrian explosion shows that living things on Earth emerged “fully developed.” Jeffrey S. Levinton, a New York State University professor of ecology and evolution, accepts this in “The Big Bang of Animal Evolution,” an article he wrote for *Scientific American*: “Therefore, something special and very mysterious—some highly creative ‘force’—existed...”¹⁵⁵

It is now pointless for evolutionists to debate evolution and seek to provide evidence for it, because in the presence of Cambrian life forms, it is meaningless to tell tales about how evolution has perfect mechanisms and set out exaggerated scenarios of the fictitious transition from water to land and from land to the air. Paleontologists have proof dating back 530 million years, an astonishing phenomenon that needs to be accounted for. Yet evolution is unable to explain how this perfection came into being.

What this shows is that 530 million years ago, a miracle of creation took place, as many other times since the Earth was first created. Countless individual members of thousands of different species comprising 50 very different phyla were created out of nothing, together with their such unique characteristics as eyes, nervous systems, gills, appendages for hunting, limbs for locomotion and magnificent shells.

All amazing forms of life, including those which appeared in the Cambrian, are the work of Omniscient and Almighty Allah. Whether or not evolutionists choose to accept this, this truth is right before their eyes, and falsehood is doomed to disappear in the face of it.

We did not create heaven and Earth and everything in between them as a game. If We had desired to have some amusement, We would have derived it from Our Presence, but We did not do that. Rather We hurl the truth against falsehood and it cuts right through it and it vanishes clean away! Woe without end for you for what you portray! Everyone in the heavens and the Earth belongs to Him. Those in His presence do not

consider themselves too great to worship Him and do not grow tired of it. (Surat al-Anbiya', 16-19)

Darwin's Tree of Life Has Been Chopped Down

Darwinism maintains that life emerged from a single common ancestor and branched out by way of small changes. That being so, life must first have appeared in simple forms, all very similar. According to this same claim, the way that organisms grew different from one another, increasing in complexity, must have taken place over long periods of time. Therefore, according to Darwinism, life must have grown like a tree, starting from a single root and then spreading into various branches.

Indeed, this hypothesis is stressed in Darwinist sources, where the term “tree of life” is frequently employed. According to this metaphor, there must have been just one phylum initially, because the first imaginary cell also constituted the first basic body plan of life, or phylum. This hypothetical first species must later—and over an infinitely long period of time—have branched out into others.

The farther the new forms departed from their illusory evolutionary ancestors, the greater the differences in their appearances must have been. There must also have been a gradual increase in the number of phyla comprising these species.

Darwin depicted this imaginary tree of life in his *The Origin of Species*. He claimed that species (A) in the diagram branched out, like a tree, over a long period he divided into 14 time frames, and that differences between varieties would increase over the course of time. As an amateur biologist, Charles Darwin expressed his flights of fantasy on this subject: “I see no reason to limit the process of modification, as now explained, to the formation of genera alone... These two groups of genera will thus form two distinct families, or orders.”¹⁵⁶

Darwin's unrealistic expectation imposes certain conditions: According to him, first of all species must have diverged, followed by the emergence of higher taxa and eventually, phyla. Therefore, the number of phyla should increase with time. Therefore, taxa should follow a “bottom-up” course in their appearance in the fossil record. If we think of the tree of life as a cone, then the course of biological variation over time should be one of “increasing diversity.” Therefore, the cone of diversity should assume a V shape. However, the fossil record shows that these expectations of Darwinism are fundamentally incorrect:

Refutation of Darwin No. 1: Taxa follow a *top-down* course in the fossil record, not a *bottom-up* one. And *phyla* emerged first!

The fact revealed by the fossil record is that first phyla came into being, followed by the emergence of lower taxa such as species.

The conclusions drawn by the researchers Douglas H. Erwin, James W. Valentine and J. J. Sepkowski from their comparison of the variation in life confirm this:

The fossil record suggests that the major pulse of diversification of phyla occurs before that of classes, classes before that of orders, orders before that of families. . . the higher taxa do not seem to have diverged through an accumulation of lower taxa.¹⁵⁷

By claiming that lower taxa, such as classes and families, would diverge and vary over time and that species varied from a single phylum would in turn give rise to other phyla, Darwin assumed a “bottom-up” development.

Yet the Cambrian explosion reveals the exact opposite, as described by the science writer Roger Lewin:

Several possible patterns exist for the establishment of higher taxa, the two most obvious of which are the bottom-up and the top-down approaches. In the first, evolutionary novelties emerge, bit by bit... The Cambrian explosion appears to conform to the second pattern, the top-down effect.¹⁵⁸

The course of appearance of taxa in the fossil record is top-down. Moreover, the number of phyla, which should increase by stages over long periods of time, actually reduces. Fifty different phyla appeared in the Cambrian, but today there are only around 35. (See “The Fossils Are Examined” section earlier in this book.) Darwin’s assumptions have been literally overturned in the face of the fossil record, and paleontology has definitely and clearly invalidated his theory.

Refutation of Darwinism No. 2: The cone of diversity is the exact opposite of what Darwin claimed.

While branching the tree of life, Darwin hypothesized that life would diversify in the form of a cone of increasing diversity. Yet life does not increasingly expand and diversify; on the contrary, it began with great variety and then narrowed.

Philip Johnson, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley, describes the contradiction between Darwinism and this fact revealed by paleontology:

Darwinian theory predicts a “cone of increasing diversity,” as the first living organism, or first animal species, gradually and continually diversified to create the higher levels of taxonomic order. The animal fossil record more resembles such a cone turned upside down, with the phyla present at the start and thereafter decreasing.¹⁵⁹

Darwin has thus been refuted. The variety assumed by Darwin to be a cone shaped “V” is now in the form of a line “_”.

The fact that Darwin’s famous tree of life is actually a falsehood is a major disappointment for the theory itself and for its proponents. In his book *Icons of Evolution*, the American biologist Jonathan Wells describes this fact:

Since higher levels of the biological hierarchy appear first, one could even say that the Cambrian explosion stands Darwin’s tree of life on its head. If any botanical analogy were appropriate, it would be a lawn rather than a tree. Nevertheless, evolutionary biologists have been reluctant to abandon Darwin’s theory. Many of them discount the Cambrian fossil evidence instead.¹⁶⁰

Life appeared suddenly, and with a great variety, with the Cambrian explosion. Clearly there was no process of evolution, beginning with a single bacterium and extending eventually as far as human beings, of the sort Darwinists still believe in. Darwin's tree of life has been chopped down in a single moment.

According to Darwin Himself, the Cambrian Explosion Deals His Theory a Deadly Blow

As Stephen Jay Gould says:

The fossil record had caused Darwin more grief than joy. Nothing distressed him more than the Cambrian explosion, the coincident appearance of almost all complex organic designs...¹⁶¹

In Darwin's time, the Cambrian explosion was a newly discovered fact. For a biologist who claimed that organisms emerged by chance in slow stages, this phenomenon was unexpected and surprising. Darwin admitted this severe difficulty in his book *The Origin of Species*:

There is another and allied difficulty, which is much more serious. I allude to the manner in which species belonging to several of the main divisions of the animal kingdom suddenly appear in the lowest known fossiliferous rocks.¹⁶²

Elsewhere, Darwin openly admitted that he was unable to come up with an explanation appropriate to his theory:

To the question why we do not find rich fossiliferous deposits belonging to these assumed earliest periods prior to the Cambrian system, I can give no satisfactory answer.¹⁶³

Under normal circumstances, one would expect such a great fact to consign the theory of evolution to the shelf and to silence its supporters. Yet that is not what happened. Darwin hoped that in the future, an explanation would be provided for this extraordinary variety of life that emerged in the Cambrian. Yet he did recognize that if no explanation were forthcoming—in other words, if the fossil record failed to produce the expected intermediate forms—this would be a lethal blow for his theory:

The abrupt manner in which whole groups of species suddenly appear in certain formations, has been urged by several paleontologists—for instance, by Agassiz, Pictet, and Sedgwick—as a fatal objection to the belief in the transmutation of species. **If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have really started into life at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of evolution through natural selection** [*emphasis added*].¹⁶⁴

This admission of Darwin's expresses in his own words the persistent flaw in the theory of evolution. No examples of the intermediate forms have turned up that Darwin expected would be found in the future. It is increasingly obvious that the countless numbers of species began life immediately, with no foregoing process of evolution. The fact that 50 separate phyla existed all together in an era when there should have been only single-celled organisms, is sufficient to constitute that *coup de grâce*..

The Idea of Ascent from the Simple to the Complex is a Deception

Darwin's theory claimed that all the complexity in present-day forms of life emerged as the result of an imaginary evolutionary process that allegedly has continued over millions of years. Complex structures such as a dolphin's sonar system, a chameleon's tongue, the wing of a hummingbird or an octopus's tentacles must—according to this hypothesis—have developed gradually from inferior, rudimentary systems.

Darwin's hypothesis placed an imaginary first cell, with none of these complex systems, at the start of the fictitious evolutionary process. Therefore, according to Darwinism, the supposed natural evolution of life forms must have followed a developmental course from the simple to the complex. But the Cambrian explosion irrefutably demolished that claim.

First of all, the living things that appeared in the Cambrian already had very complex structures. University of London biochemist D. B. Gower states this fact in clear terms:

In the oldest rocks we did not find a series of fossils covering the gradual changes from the most primitive creatures to developed forms, but rather in the oldest rocks developed species suddenly appeared.¹⁶⁵

Second, both the fossil record and the species that lived in the period after the Cambrian suggest the exact opposite of Darwin's gradual-development model. They indicate no gradualism. George Gaylord Simpson, one of the 20th century's foremost paleontologists, expresses this:

It is a feature of the known fossil record that most taxa appear abruptly. They are not, as a rule, led up to by a sequence of almost imperceptibly changing forerunners such as Darwin believed should be usual in evolution.¹⁶⁶

Third, despite all the searching by evolutionists, there is not the slightest evidence that any biological complexity ever emerged by way of evolution. Ernst Mayr, a Harvard University biologist and one of the 20th century's most influential proponents of Darwinism, admitted evolutionists' despair on this point:

[Research reveals that there is] no clear evidence ... for the gradual origin of an evolutionary novelty.¹⁶⁷

Kevin Kelly, a researcher into complexity, makes a similar confession:

No one has yet witnessed, in the fossil record, in real life, or in computer life, the exact transitional moments when natural selection pumps its complexity up to the next level.¹⁶⁸

Life began with already complex creatures. There is no evidence that complexity increased through evolution. Therefore, the idea of an increasing scale of complexity throughout natural history was a deception, since the true course that complexity followed was totally at odds with the Darwinist scenario.

A pamphlet of the American Geological Institute, an authority on fossil strata, makes this admission:

The old Darwinian view of evolution as a ladder of more and more efficient forms leading up to the present is not borne out by the evidence.¹⁶⁹

Scientists seeking to gather evidence that complexity could have developed out of simpler structures encountered the exact opposite. The vertebrate jaw, for example, is a complex structure whose every component functions in a very sensitive manner. According to Darwinism, this complex structure must have been simpler in fish, at the lower branches of the imaginary tree of life, and then have evolved further in later vertebrates. Yet the facts reveal the very opposite; the jaw is more highly developed in fish, in the supposedly lower section of the vertebrate tree of life. John G. Maisey from the Department of Vertebrate Paleontology at the American Museum of Natural History expresses this fact:

As we move back down our evolutionary ladder, jaw structure becomes more instead of less complex, and in fishes the jaws are very elaborate indeed.¹⁷⁰

Another important example in this regard is the eye of the extinct trilobite. The complexity of this organ in one of the most ancient animals was not passed on to any subsequent arthropod. The counterexamples are not confined to trilobites. No life form possesses any fossil record of such a kind as to confirm the kind of development hypothesized by Darwinism.

Stephen Jay Gould writes:

The eyes of early trilobites, for example, have never been exceeded for complexity or acuity by later arthropods . . . I regard the failure to find a clear “vector of progress” in life’s history as the most puzzling fact of the fossil record.¹⁷¹

The fossil record has always reminded paleontologists just how much Darwin’s theory is at odds with the scientific facts. As Ernst Mayr admits:

Paleontologists had long been aware of a seeming contradiction between Darwin’s postulate of gradualism . . . and the actual findings of paleontology.¹⁷²

As you can see from these statements, the natural history of life forms cannot be explained in terms of Darwinism. The complexity displayed in the Cambrian explosion was already at an exceedingly high level. In later periods, species did not progress from the simple to the complex, but remained exactly as they were when first created by Almighty Allah.

The Imaginary Mechanisms of Evolution Are Bankrupt

When Darwin proposed genetic variation and natural selection as the mechanisms of the imaginary process of evolution, he assumed that life was based on very simple foundations. He was unable to even imagine the complexity inside the cell, given the primitive scientific climate of his day. In the second half of the 20th century, however, advances in the field of molecular biology illuminated the cell’s complex structure, and it emerged that the cell contained features that could not be imitated even using the most advanced technologies. Life, even at the most basic level, refuted claims based on chance.

This totally eliminated the claim of evolution by way of natural selection. Professor of biochemistry Garret Vanderkooi describes this process:

In the past, evolutionists were confident that the problem of the origin of life would be solved by the new science of biochemistry. To their dismay, the converse has occurred. The more that is learned about the chemical structure and organization of living matter, the more difficult it becomes even to speculate on how it could have developed from lower forms by natural processes. From the scientific point of view, **evolution may have been a plausible hypothesis in Darwin's day, but it has now become untenable, as a result of fairly recent developments in molecular biology** [*emphasis added*].¹⁷³

Developments in molecular biology on the one hand and advances in the understanding of the Cambrian explosion on the other led to a fundamental realization that the combination of natural selection and mutation could not cause supposed evolution. Long before the 1980s, when the facts regarding the Cambrian explosion began to emerge, molecular biology had already revealed that mutation and natural selection had no evolutionary impact.

Darwinists claimed that mutations were the mechanism for genetic variation in the living world, before it emerged that their effect on an organism were always destructive.

To recapitulate briefly, mutations are random changes in the base sequences of genes. An organism's body is constructed according to its DNA's genetic blueprint. This blueprint, in turn, is encoded through nucleotides arranged in the DNA, which contains sufficient information to fill volumes of encyclopedias.

Each protein structure is based upon a very particular nucleotide sequence, and every cell contains tens of thousands of proteins. Mutations consisting of random changes have no ability to bring about such large amounts of information.

Pierre Paul Grassé, former president of the French Academy of Sciences, compared mutations to spelling mistakes in the copying of a written text, which comment is particularly illuminating. Spelling mistakes cannot represent information, only damage information that already exists. As Grassé explains:

Mutations, in time, occur incoherently. They are not complementary to one another, nor are they cumulative in successive generations toward a given direction. They modify what preexists, but they do so in disorder, no matter how. . . . As soon as some disorder, even slight, appears in an organized being, sickness, then death follow. There is no possible compromise between the phenomenon of life and anarchy.¹⁷⁴

For that reason, "No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution," to quote from another statement by Grassé.¹⁷⁵

Even in 1977, when Grassé published this statement, it was perfectly well known that natural selection was not a mechanism that caused organisms to evolve. In 1982, Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at London's Natural History Museum, said:

No one has ever produced a species by the mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever got near it, and most of the current argument in neo-Darwinism is about this question.¹⁷⁶

In the 1980s, in short, although Darwinism's mechanisms of natural selection and random mutation served no purpose and were of no use, they were on display for want of a better alternative, like junk in an antique shop.

The emergence of the facts regarding Burgess Shale and the later discovery of new Cambrian beds created a wave of information contradicting Darwinism. Darwinists, already reeling from the findings of molecular biology, were now under fire from paleontology. Cambrian animals had emerged with already highly complex structures. All the phyla existing today appeared at that period. Their numbers had decreased up to the present, rather than increasing. Phyla had diversified before species did.

All these facts about the Cambrian explosion definitively revealed the invalidity of Darwinist interpretations of natural history.

In the 1990s, another fact about the Cambrian struck Darwinism from yet another direction, striking its mechanisms. This was the “great complexity in little time” paradox, confirmed by the use of zircon dating.

All the phyla in the animal world emerged within a mere 5 million years. Indeed, James Valentine estimated that the phylum *Brachiopoda* appeared in much less than 5 million years, probably in less than 1 million years.¹⁷⁷ He even spoke of a time span of just hundreds of thousands of years in some cases.¹⁷⁸

The pre-Cambrian had single-celled organisms and Ediacaran life forms with no complex organs. These constituted three phyla. To these were added more than 45 more, in the 5 million years between 530 and 525 million years ago. In that interval were added organs and structures such as eyes, antennae, limbs and guts, with no previous examples pre-dating them, as well as immune systems, nervous systems, physiological and developmental systems. In addition, this happened not locally but on a world-wide ecological basis.

Since Darwin was aware of the damaging effect of wide-ranging random changes on complex systems, he allowed for only very small changes and fantasized that this evolutionary process could produce new species only over long periods of time, in a large portion of the history of the Earth. The establishment of all the phyla in the animal world in as brief a time as roughly one thousandth of the history of the Earth was not something that the slow workings of natural selection and mutation could explain.

Darwinists were perfectly aware that mutations had yet to produce a single new protein and always had damaging effects on genetic information. Discoveries regarding the complexity in life made it increasingly difficult to defend the mutation scenario. In addition, the Cambrian explosion added the problem of time, and reducing its duration to 5 million years narrowed the window still further.

It was already realized that the mechanism of natural selection could not bring about evolution. Now, the Cambrian’s increase in genetic information through mutations alone emerged as a mathematical impossibility. In other words, the scenario of evolution through its illusory mechanisms consisted of a deception.

Today, no evolutionist claims to explain the Cambrian explosion in terms of the Darwinian combination of natural selection and mutation. On the contrary, evolutionist experts openly state that the mechanisms of Darwinism are invalid in light of the Cambrian explosion. Darwinists who still hope for assistance from these mechanisms are in dire straits, and all their

endeavors consist of stumbling around in the dark. As Almighty Allah states in Surat al-An'am:

Those who deny Our signs are deaf and dumb in utter darkness. Allah misguides whoever He wills, and puts whoever He wills on a straight path. (Surat al-An'am, 39)

Evolution is a Deception, As the Cambrian Explosion Makes Clear

A person may choose any group of animals or plants, large or small, or pick one at random. He may then go to a library and with some patience he will be able to find a qualified author who says that the evolutionary origin of that form is not known.¹⁷⁹

The theory of evolution depends entirely on an ideological belief that was put forward as an objection to the fact of creation. No matter how much it was disseminated all over the world as a speculation, gradually it has been realized that the theory is not based on facts or supported by any scientific evidence. For that reason, Darwinists resort to fraudulent methods in order to keep the theory alive and deceive people into thinking that it's true. Recent history is full of examples of fake fossils being assembled for display; of feathers being added to dinosaur fossils; of reconstructions of imaginary intermediate forms being produced on the basis of sometimes, only a single tooth; of fake "evolutionary" equine sequences being invented and fake embryo drawings prepared. However, the extraordinary life that appeared with the Cambrian explosion is so major a phenomenon that it eliminates all forms of speculation and fraud. The evidence is so clear, so complete, and so copious that evolutionists have been unable to cover it up or explain the gaps in the fossil record.

The evolutionists James Valentine and Douglas Erwin attempted to account for the Cambrian explosion for many years, and for that reason, they proposed the unsuccessful Hox gene theory. Now, they openly admit:

The sections of Cambrian rocks that we do have (and we have many) are essentially as complete as sections of equivalent time duration from similar depositional environments. . . explosion is real; it is too big to be masked by flaws in the fossil record.¹⁸⁰

In fact, evolutionists are aware that life forms did not evolve. That is why they must come up with false and deceptive proofs, in order to keep an incorrect theory alive. But they do this in a highly comprehensive manner, covering up the significance of every new discovery that refutes evolution by using false evidence. However, in the face of such extraordinary facts as the Cambrian explosion, they are helpless and unable to come up with even unrealistic claims.

Cambrian Facts Yet Again Reveal the Darwinists' Dogmatism

An article in *Scientific American*, known for its devotion to Darwinism, has described the Cambrian explosion as "Evolutionary biology's deepest paradox."¹⁸¹ The Cambrian

explosion has totally overturned the basic assumptions—development from the simple to the complex, the transitional form claim, the claim that species diversified first, the assumptions regarding mechanisms—on which the evolutionist perspective is based. However, Darwinists have adopted their theories as a dogma, as laws of nature. Because of their stubborn beliefs, they have grown accustomed to questioning the evidence wherever it conflicts with the theory, rather than the theory itself.

The theory of evolution that they have so blindly adopted has so dominated their world views that they find it almost impossible to feel the slightest doubt about the idea. The only doubt they experience concerning Darwinism concerns those who doubt the theory itself!

Marjorie Grene, a historian of science, describes this closed mindset:

It is as a religion of science that Darwinism chiefly held, and holds, men's minds. . . The modified, but still characteristically Darwinian theory has itself become an orthodoxy preached by its adherents with religious fervor, and doubted, they feel, only by a few meddlers imperfect in scientific faith.¹⁸²

Darwinists maintain this mindset and never question their blind beliefs when dealing with a phenomenon such as the Cambrian explosion that loudly contradicts evolution in all respects. The Cambrian fossils are scientific fact. Therefore, any mindset that rejects their implications is dogmatic and totally illogical. This mindset inevitably compels Darwinists to engage in unscientific behavior.

The most telling example of this is certainly Walcott's covering up of the evidence. Academically, Walcott was a knowledgeable and talented scientist who worked for the United States Geological Survey for 27 years, serving as its director for 12 of them. Later, he became the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and held this post for 20 years, and rose to the position of president of the US National Academy of Sciences. His career made him one of the most important figures in American scientific history.

But despite his knowledge and experience, his blindness in the face of the Burgess Shale fossils was seldom to be equaled. Many Burgess Shale life forms told science of the existence of brand new phyla. It was clear to him that these needed to be considered and added alongside other known phyla. Yet Walcott completely ignored the Cambrian explosion, described by paleontologists as "the most remarkable and puzzling event in the history of life."¹⁸³

Instead of naming these new phyla, he tried to fit the fossils into already existing phyla—a most superficial and contrived approach. The world of paleontology realized how rottenly distorted Walcott's analyses were thanks to Stephen Jay Gould's award-winning book *Wonderful Life* (1989), and studies by Morris *et al.*

Gould examined Walcott's notes and photographs and subjected them to fierce criticism in his book. He wrote that Walcott had ignored the extraordinary nature of the Burgess Shale fossils because of his Darwinist preconceptions. Because of his devotion to Darwin's scenario, Walcott had described a story of his own invention, rather than the facts before him.

In fact, Walcott was only the first of scientists in denial. In the face of the Cambrian explosion, present-day evolutionists have also adopted a far from scientific approach. This

dogmatism displayed by Darwinists did not change even in the face of the zircon dating that reduced the time span of the Cambrian explosion to a mere 5 million years.

Darwinists have failed to accept such powerful evidence, something which is an easy requirement of both science and logic. When it comes to their own world view, they immediately set to one side any scientific doubts.

Scientific progress is only possible by way of skepticism. If skepticism is the basis of science, then in the same way that Darwinists believe that chance can give rise to all things, so should they also admit the possibility that everything was created by Allah. Since science requires skepticism, they should allow a 50% possibility that species did not evolve, but were created. But they insistently deny that, assuming evolutionary origins for the Cambrian explosion right from the outset, because they reject the possibility of deliberate creation. And they insistently ignore the facts obtained about the Cambrian explosion as the result of a great deal of research and hard work. Although science gives them the answer, they prefer to ignore it. What a blindly held belief Darwinism is!

Cambrian Life Forms: Marvels of Creation

What you have seen this far regarding the Cambrian clearly reveals that new species came into existence suddenly and flawlessly in their final forms, some 530 million years ago, with no forerunners behind them, without evolving from one another. As the Swedish scientist Jan Bergstrom stated, the Cambrian explosion was "a revolution perhaps more than evolution."¹⁸⁴

The Cambrian evidence reveals that a miracle of creation took place on Earth 530 million years ago. Countless individuals belonging to different species comprising 50 distinct phyla were brought into being, together with hundreds of features such as eyes, nervous systems, gills, appendages for hunting, limbs for locomotion, and magnificent exoskeletons. The structures of these life forms are all marvels of creation, matchless works of art whose extraordinary details originated millions of years ago in the past.

These works belong to Almighty Allah, Lord of the worlds and Creator of all things. It is sufficient for Him to issue the command "Be!" at a time of His choosing. That is the fact that evolutionists have misunderstood and failed to comprehend for so many years. And as long as they fail to realize it, their search for non-existent intermediate forms will continue. They will continue to try to deceive people with their frauds, and they will spend their entire lives chasing an empty hope.

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

That all living things on Earth appeared suddenly and in a perfect form 530 million years ago is a miracle of Allah. The Cambrian explosion is such a great, astonishing and

extraordinary phenomenon that no matter how much evolutionists seek to come up with their own explanation, even if they spend hundreds of years on research, so long as they refuse to see the fact of creation exhibited, they will never obtain any results.

The Swedish evolutionist scientist Stefan Bengtson set out the despairing position of evolutionists in the face of this great phenomenon exhibited millions of years ago:

If any event in life's history resembles man's creation myths, it is the sudden diversification of marine life when multicellular organisms took over as the dominant actors Baffling (and embarrassing) to Darwin, this event still dazzles us and stands as a major biological revolution on a par with the invention of self-replication and the origin of the eukaryotic cell. The animal phyla emerged out of the Precambrian mists with most of the attributes of their modern descendants.¹⁸⁵

The Cambrian explosion was described as the “major mystery of the history of life” by the Harvard University evolutionist paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson.¹⁸⁶ But it's actually just one example of the greatness, might and matchless creative artistry of Allah. It is He Who creates, knows and controls at every moment the universe; the galaxies and their extraordinary balances; life on Earth; all the different forms of life, both familiar and unknown to us; the destiny of mankind and of everyone who has ever lived; every single enzyme that functions in the cell possessed by each one of them; a single leaf falling from just one of the billions of trees on Earth; a single micro-organism on that leaf; and the organelles of these micro-organisms that make photosynthesis possible.

No doubt it is a very easy matter for Almighty Allah, Who constantly brings these into being and Who knows all secrets, the most hidden things, to create countless varieties of life forms whenever He wills.

The Cambrian explosion is described as “the major mystery” because it occurred when evolutionists least expected it, in an entirely unexpected manner. Yet in fact, the existence of the matchless, flawless, extraordinarily complex and amazing life that currently exists on Earth is the greatest of all mysteries for evolutionists. They seek to portray the Cambrian explosion as the greatest difficulty facing them, as if they were perfectly able to account for life's present magnificent variety.

The Cambrian explosion is indeed a major problem and a great secret that evolutionists are unable to explain. But the real problem facing them grows every time they look at their own bodies, when they examine any living thing and obtain a new piece of information regarding the complexity in a single cell:

It is Allah Who created the heavens with no support—you can see them—and cast firmly embedded mountains on the Earth so that it would not move under you, and scattered about in it creatures of every kind. And We send down water from the sky and make every generous species grow in it. This is Allah's creation. Show me then what those besides Him have created! The wrongdoers are clearly misguided. (Surah Luqman, 10-11)

Conclusion

Allah creates all things out of nothing, determines their destiny, bestows their ways of life on them, imparts blessings on them, and maintains them under His control at all times. A human being with extraordinary, flawless anatomical, cellular, and molecular structure; a tortoise with its glorious protective carapace; a plant seeding itself with ease without moving; a flower with its delightful perfume, the like of which can never be manufactured; and the existence of a fruit, which stores all kinds of vitamins and minerals inside itself, its flawless protective covering, its dazzling color and enticing flavor—all are proofs of this.

The Earth, on which we live so easily despite the fact it is constantly revolving, the atmosphere with its protective layers, giant galaxies with their giant stars, the enormous forces operating between them, and the way countless dynamics are brought together to make life possible—these on their own are sufficient for us to comprehend Allah's infinite might.

Allah enfolds all places with His presence. He is the Lord of all things. He knows and creates all things that existed millions of years ago, and all that will exist in the future. All things have submitted to Him. They live as He wills and obey His commands. Allah tells us in one verse:

Is it other than the religion of Allah that you desire, when everything in the heavens and Earth, willingly or unwillingly, submits to Him and to Him you will be returned? (Surah Al 'Imran, 83)

Yet even these facts are not enough for some people. They ignore the extraordinary magnificence in every square millimeter on Earth. They turn their backs on the proofs of Allah's existence. But why do they do this? How is it that, despite the countless proofs of creation, they do not believe? Why are they so devoted to irrational claims and look for evidence to support them? Why, when the facts are so crystal clear, do they follow a false belief that can never produce any results?

The answer is plain to see: They are struggling against belief in Allah.

They are reluctant to accept His Almighty power and greatness.

They have become proud before Allah.

The proofs set out in this book are intended to turn some insistent advocates of evolution away from their errors and to reverse the struggles they wage against the absolute existence of Allah. This book sets out a proof that eliminates almost all the claims and foundations of those who insist on denying Allah's existence.

The Cambrian explosion has buried claims regarding evolution. No matter how much evolutionists try to rescue their theory, they will never achieve any results, as is confirmed by every new scientific discovery. These people fail to accept that evolution never took place and

to admit the fact of creation. The only reason why they do so is their pride before Allah, Who has described this in a verse:

Certainly those who argue about the signs of Allah without any authority having come to them have nothing in their breasts except for pride, which they will never be able to vindicate. Therefore, seek refuge with Allah. He is the All-Hearing, the All-Seeing. (Surah Ghafir, 56)

There is one fact of which these people are unaware: Allah is the Lord of all the worlds. He is the Mightiest and the Greatest. In claiming to be great, a human being deceives only himself. A human being possesses only as much knowledge and ability as is given him by Allah, can only do what He teaches him, and lives by the destiny determined by Him. Human beings are very weak and helpless in the face of Allah's infinite intelligence, knowledge and power. It is certainly an easy matter for Allah to destroy and recreate all the life on Earth, the planets, the universe and more, at the moment He so chooses.

Of course Allah can also recreate the Cambrian explosion, which the evolutionists watch in amazement, when and how He so wills.

This is an evident fact evolutionists ignore and are unwilling to understand. A person needs to admit that he is helpless before Allah, to open his eyes to the fact that all things are the work of Allah, and to appreciate His greatness. Having spent years subscribing to a false theory is no obstacle to seeing and understanding this truth. A scientist may have spent years on the wrong path, but he can still change his mind in light of the fact that science has invalidated the theory of evolution. That's what he should do if he views evolution solely as a theory waiting to be proved, because science refutes evolution rather than confirming it.

The theory is a failure. And the fact of the Cambrian explosion is one of the proofs making this crystal clear.

The Deception of Evolution

Darwinism, in other words the theory of evolution, was put forward with the aim of denying the fact of creation, but is in truth nothing but failed, unscientific nonsense. This theory, which claims that life emerged by chance from inanimate matter, was invalidated by the scientific evidence of miraculous order in the universe and in living things. In this way, science confirmed the fact that Allah created the universe and the living things in it. The propaganda carried out today in order to keep the theory of evolution alive is based solely on the distortion of the scientific facts, biased interpretation, and lies and falsehoods disguised as science.

Yet this propaganda cannot conceal the truth. The fact that the theory of evolution is the greatest deception in the history of science has been expressed more and more in the scientific world over the last 20-30 years. Research carried out after the 1980s in particular has revealed that the claims of Darwinism are totally unfounded, something that has been stated by a large number of scientists. In the United States in particular, many scientists from such different fields as biology, biochemistry and paleontology recognize the invalidity of Darwinism and employ the fact of creation to account for the origin of life.

We have examined the collapse of the theory of evolution and the proofs of creation in great scientific detail in many of our works, and are still continuing to do so. Given the enormous importance of this subject, it will be of great benefit to summarize it here.

The Scientific Collapse of Darwinism

Although this doctrine goes back as far as ancient Greece, the theory of evolution was advanced extensively in the nineteenth century. The most important development that made it the top topic of the world of science was Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, published in 1859. In this book, he denied that Allah created different living species on Earth separately, for he claimed that all living beings had a common ancestor and had diversified over time through small changes. Darwin's theory was not based on any concrete scientific finding; as he also accepted, it was just an "assumption." Moreover, as Darwin confessed in the long chapter of his book titled "Difficulties on Theory," the theory failed in the face of many critical questions.

Darwin invested all of his hopes in new scientific discoveries, which he expected to solve these difficulties. However, contrary to his expectations, scientific findings expanded the dimensions of these difficulties. The defeat of Darwinism in the face of science can be reviewed under three basic topics:

- 1) The theory cannot explain how life originated on Earth.
- 2) No scientific finding shows that the "evolutionary mechanisms" proposed by the theory have any evolutionary power at all.
- 3) The fossil record proves the exact opposite of what the theory suggests.

In this section, we will examine these three basic points in general outlines:

The First Insurmountable Step: The Origin of Life

The theory of evolution posits that all living species evolved from a single living cell that emerged on the primitive Earth 3.8 billion years ago. How a single cell could generate millions of complex living species and, if such an evolution really occurred, why traces of it cannot be observed in the fossil record are some of the questions that the theory cannot answer. However, first and foremost, we need to ask: How did this "first cell" originate?

Since the theory of evolution denies creation and any kind of supernatural intervention, it maintains that the "first cell" originated coincidentally within the laws of nature, without any design, plan or arrangement. According to the theory, inanimate matter must have produced a living cell as a result of coincidences. Such a claim, however, is inconsistent with the most unassailable rules of biology.

"Life Comes From Life"

In his book, Darwin never referred to the origin of life. The primitive understanding of science in his time rested on the assumption that living beings had a very simple structure. Since medieval times, spontaneous generation, which asserts that non-living materials came together to form living organisms, had been widely accepted. It was commonly believed that insects came into being from food leftovers, and mice from wheat. Interesting experiments were conducted to prove this theory. Some wheat was placed on a dirty piece of cloth, and it was believed that mice would originate from it after a while.

Similarly, maggots developing in rotting meat was assumed to be evidence of spontaneous generation. However, it was later understood that worms did not appear on meat spontaneously, but were carried there by flies in the form of larvae, invisible to the naked eye.

Even when Darwin wrote *The Origin of Species*, the belief that bacteria could come into existence from non-living matter was widely accepted in the world of science.

However, five years after the publication of Darwin's book, Louis Pasteur announced his results after long studies and experiments, that disproved spontaneous generation, a cornerstone of Darwin's theory. In his triumphal lecture at the Sorbonne in 1864, Pasteur said: "Never will the doctrine of spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow struck by this simple experiment."¹⁸⁷

For a long time, advocates of the theory of evolution resisted these findings. However, as the development of science unraveled the complex structure of the cell of a living being, the idea that life could come into being coincidentally faced an even greater impasse.

Inconclusive Efforts of the Twentieth Century

The first evolutionist who took up the subject of the origin of life in the twentieth century was the renowned Russian biologist Alexander Oparin. With various theses he advanced in the 1930s, he tried to prove that a living cell could originate by coincidence. These studies, however, were doomed to failure, and Oparin had to make the following confession:

Unfortunately, however, the problem of the origin of the cell is perhaps the most obscure point in the whole study of the evolution of organisms.¹⁸⁸

Evolutionist followers of Oparin tried to carry out experiments to solve this problem. The best known experiment was carried out by the American chemist Stanley Miller in 1953. Combining the gases he alleged to have existed in the primordial Earth's atmosphere in an experiment set-up, and adding energy to the mixture, Miller synthesized several organic molecules (amino acids) present in the structure of proteins.

Barely a few years had passed before it was revealed that this experiment, which was then presented as an important step in the name of evolution, was invalid, for the atmosphere used in the experiment was very different from the real Earth conditions.¹⁸⁹

After a long silence, Miller confessed that the atmosphere medium he used was unrealistic.¹⁹⁰

All the evolutionists' efforts throughout the twentieth century to explain the origin of life ended in failure. The geochemist Jeffrey Bada, from the San Diego Scripps Institute accepts this fact in an article published in *Earth* magazine in 1998:

Today as we leave the twentieth century, we still face the biggest unsolved problem that we had when we entered the twentieth century: How did life originate on Earth?¹⁹¹

The Complex Structure of Life

The primary reason why the theory of evolution ended up in such a great impasse regarding the origin of life is that even those living organisms deemed to be the simplest have incredibly complex structures. 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, a living cell cannot 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. The probability of proteins, the building blocks of a cell, being synthesized coincidentally, is 1 in 10^{950} for an average protein made up of 500 amino acids. In mathematics, a probability smaller than 1 over 10^{50} is considered to be impossible in practical terms.

The DNA molecule, which is located in the nucleus of a cell and which stores genetic information, is an incredible 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.¹⁹²

No doubt, if it is impossible for life to have originated from natural causes, then it has to be accepted that life was "created" in a supernatural way. This fact explicitly invalidates the theory of evolution, whose main purpose is to deny creation.

Imaginary Mechanism of Evolution

The second important point that negates Darwin's theory is that both concepts put forward by the theory as "evolutionary mechanisms" were understood to have, in reality, no evolutionary power.

Darwin based his evolution allegation entirely on the mechanism of "natural selection." The importance he placed on this mechanism was evident in the name of his book: *The Origin of Species, By Means of Natural Selection...*

Natural selection holds that those living things that are stronger and more suited to the natural conditions of their habitats will survive in the struggle for life. For example, in a deer herd under the threat of attack by wild animals, those that can run faster will survive. Therefore, the deer herd will be comprised of faster and stronger individuals. However, unquestionably, this mechanism will not cause deer to evolve and transform themselves into another living species, for instance, horses.

Therefore, the mechanism of natural selection has no evolutionary power. Darwin was also aware of this fact and had to state this in his book *The Origin of Species*:

Natural selection can do nothing until favourable individual differences or variations occur.¹⁹³

Lamarck's Impact

So, how could these "favorable variations" occur? Darwin tried to answer this question from the standpoint of the primitive understanding of science at that time. According to the French biologist Chevalier de Lamarck (1744-1829), who lived before Darwin, living creatures passed on the traits they acquired during their lifetime to the next generation. He asserted that these traits, which accumulated from one generation to another, caused new species to be formed. For instance, he claimed that giraffes evolved from antelopes; as they struggled to eat the leaves of high trees, their necks were extended from generation to generation.

Darwin also gave similar examples. In his book *The Origin of Species*, for instance, he said that some bears going into water to find food transformed themselves into whales over time.¹⁹⁴

However, the laws of inheritance discovered by Gregor Mendel (1822-84) and verified by the science of genetics, which flourished in the twentieth century, utterly demolished the

legend that acquired traits were passed on to subsequent generations. Thus, natural selection fell out of favor as an evolutionary mechanism.

Neo-Darwinism and Mutations

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 stands for evolution in the world 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.¹⁹⁵

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 any imaginary process called "evolution" could have taken place.

The Fossil Record: No Sign of Intermediate Forms

The clearest evidence that the scenario suggested by the theory of evolution did not take place is the fossil record.

According to this theory, every living species has sprung from a predecessor. A previously existing species turned into something else over time and all species have come into

being in this way. In other words, this transformation proceeds gradually over millions of years.

Had this been the case, numerous intermediary species should have existed and lived within this long transformation period.

For instance, some half-fish/half-reptiles should have lived in the past which had acquired some reptilian traits in addition to the fish traits they already had. Or there should have existed some reptile-birds, which acquired some bird traits in addition to the reptilian traits they already had. Since these would be in a transitional phase, they should be disabled, defective, crippled living beings. Evolutionists refer to these imaginary creatures, which they believe to have lived in the past, as "transitional forms."

If such animals ever really existed, there should be millions and even billions of them in number and variety. More importantly, the remains of these strange creatures should be present in the fossil record. In *The Origin of Species*, Darwin explained:

If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking most closely all of the species of the same group together must assuredly have existed... Consequently, evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains.¹⁹⁶

Darwin's Hopes Shattered

However, although evolutionists have been making strenuous efforts to find fossils since the middle of the nineteenth century all over the world, no transitional forms have yet been uncovered. All of the fossils, contrary to the evolutionists' expectations, show that life appeared on Earth all of a sudden and fully-formed.

One famous British paleontologist, Derek V. Ager, admits this fact, even though he is an evolutionist:

The point emerges that if we examine the fossil record in detail, whether at the level of orders or of species, we find – over and over again – not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another.¹⁹⁷

This means that in the fossil record, all living species suddenly emerge as fully formed, without any intermediate forms in between. This is just the opposite of Darwin's assumptions. Also, this is very strong evidence that all living things are created. The only explanation of a living species emerging suddenly and complete in every detail without any evolutionary ancestor is that it was created. This fact is admitted also by the widely known evolutionist biologist Douglas Futuyma:

Creation and evolution, between them, exhaust the possible explanations for the origin of living things. Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence.¹⁹⁸

Fossils show that living beings emerged fully developed and in a perfect state on the Earth. That means that "the origin of species," contrary to Darwin's supposition, is not evolution, but creation.

The Tale of Human Evolution

The subject most often brought up by advocates of the theory of evolution is the subject of the origin of man. The Darwinist claim holds that modern man evolved from ape-like creatures. During this alleged evolutionary process, which is supposed to have started 4-5 million years ago, some "transitional forms" between modern man and his ancestors are supposed to have existed. According to this completely imaginary scenario, four basic "categories" are listed:

1. *Australopithecus*
2. *Homo habilis*
3. *Homo erectus*
4. *Homo sapiens*

Evolutionists call man's so-called first ape-like ancestors *Australopithecus*, which means "South African ape." These living beings are actually nothing but an old ape species that has become extinct. Extensive research done on various *Australopithecus* specimens by two world famous anatomists from England and the USA, namely, Lord Solly Zuckerman and Prof. Charles Oxnard, shows that these apes belonged to an ordinary ape species that became extinct and bore no resemblance to humans.¹⁹⁹

Evolutionists classify the next stage of human evolution as "homo," that is "man." According to their claim, the living beings in the *Homo* series are more developed than *Australopithecus*. Evolutionists devise a fanciful evolution scheme by arranging different fossils of these creatures in a particular order. This scheme is imaginary because it has never been proved that there is an evolutionary relation between these different classes. Ernst Mayr, one of the twentieth century's most important evolutionists, contends in his book *One Long Argument* that "particularly historical [puzzles] such as the origin of life or of *Homo sapiens*, are extremely difficult and may even resist a final, satisfying explanation."²⁰⁰

By outlining the link chain as *Australopithecus* > *Homo habilis* > *Homo erectus* > *Homo sapiens*, evolutionists imply that each of these species is one another's ancestor. However, recent findings of paleoanthropologists have revealed that *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis*, and *Homo erectus* lived at different parts of the world at the same time.²⁰¹

Moreover, a certain segment of humans classified as *Homo erectus* have lived up until very modern times. *Homo sapiens neandarthalensis* and *Homo sapiens sapiens* (modern man) co-existed in the same region.²⁰²

This situation apparently indicates the invalidity of the claim that they are ancestors of one another. Stephen Jay Gould explained this deadlock of the theory of evolution, although he was himself one of the leading advocates of evolution in the twentieth century:

What has become of our ladder if there are three coexisting lineages of hominids (*A. africanus*, the robust australopithecines, and *H. habilis*), none clearly derived from another? Moreover, none of the three display any evolutionary trends during their tenure on earth.²⁰³

Put briefly, the scenario of human evolution, which is "upheld" with the help of various drawings of some "half ape, half human" creatures appearing in the media and course books, that is, frankly, by means of propaganda, is nothing but a tale with no scientific foundation.

Lord Solly Zuckerman, one of the most famous and respected scientists in the U.K., who carried out research on this subject for years and studied *Australopithecus* fossils for 15 years, finally concluded, despite being an evolutionist himself, that there is, in fact, no such family tree branching out from ape-like creatures to man.

Zuckerman also made an interesting "spectrum of science" ranging from those he considered scientific to those he considered unscientific. According to Zuckerman's spectrum, the most "scientific" – that is, depending on concrete data – fields of science are chemistry and physics. After them come the biological sciences and then the social sciences. At the far end of the spectrum, which is the part considered to be most "unscientific," are "extra-sensory perception" – concepts such as telepathy and sixth sense – and finally "human evolution." Zuckerman explains his reasoning:

We then move right off the register of objective truth into those fields of presumed biological science, like extrasensory perception or the interpretation of man's fossil history, where to the faithful [evolutionist] anything is possible – and where the ardent believer [in evolution] is sometimes able to believe several contradictory things at the same time.²⁰⁴

The tale of human evolution boils down to nothing but the prejudiced interpretations of some fossils unearthed by certain people, who blindly adhere to their theory.

Darwinian Formula!

Besides all the technical evidence we have dealt with so far, let us now for once, examine what kind of a superstition the evolutionists have with an example so simple as to be understood even by children:

The theory of evolution asserts that life is formed by chance. According to this claim, lifeless and unconscious atoms came together to form the cell and then they somehow formed other living things, including man. Let us think about that. When we bring together the elements that are the building-blocks of life such as carbon, phosphorus, nitrogen and potassium, only a heap is formed. No matter what treatments it undergoes, this atomic heap cannot form even a single living being. If you like, let us formulate an "experiment" on this subject and let us examine on the behalf of evolutionists what they really claim without pronouncing loudly under the name "Darwinian formula":

Let evolutionists put plenty of materials present in the composition of living things such as phosphorus, nitrogen, carbon, oxygen, iron, and magnesium into big barrels. Moreover, let them add in these barrels any material that does not exist under normal conditions, but they think as necessary. Let them add in this mixture as many amino acids and as many proteins – a

single one of which has a formation probability of 10^{-950} – as they like. Let them expose these mixtures to as much heat and moisture as they like. Let them stir these with whatever technologically developed device they like. Let them put the foremost scientists beside these barrels. Let these experts wait in turn beside these barrels for billions, and even trillions of years. Let them be free to use all kinds of conditions they believe to be necessary for a human's formation. No matter what they do, they cannot produce from these barrels a human, say a professor that examines his cell structure under the electron microscope. They cannot produce giraffes, lions, bees, canaries, horses, dolphins, roses, orchids, lilies, carnations, bananas, oranges, apples, dates, tomatoes, melons, watermelons, figs, olives, grapes, peaches, peafowls, pheasants, multicoloured butterflies, or millions of other living beings such as these. Indeed, they could not obtain even a single cell of any one of them.

Briefly, unconscious atoms cannot form the cell by coming together. They cannot take a new decision and divide this cell into two, then take other decisions and create the professors who first invent the electron microscope and then examine their own cell structure under that microscope. Matter is an unconscious, lifeless heap, and it comes to life with Allah's superior creation.

The theory of evolution, which claims the opposite, is a total fallacy completely contrary to reason. Thinking even a little bit on the claims of evolutionists discloses this reality, just as in the above example.

Technology in the Eye and the Ear

Another subject that remains unanswered by evolutionary theory is the excellent quality of perception in the eye and the ear.

Before passing on to the subject of the eye, let us briefly answer the question of how we see. Light rays coming from an object fall oppositely on the eye's retina. Here, these light rays are transmitted into electric signals by cells and reach a tiny spot at the back of the brain, the "center of vision." These electric signals are perceived in this center as an image after a series of processes. With this technical background, let us do some thinking.

The brain is insulated from light. That means that its inside is completely dark, and that no light reaches the place where it is located. Thus, the "center of vision" is never touched by light and may even be the darkest place you have ever known. However, you observe a luminous, bright world in this pitch darkness.

The image formed in the eye is so sharp and distinct that even the technology of the twentieth century has not been able to attain it. For instance, look at the book you are reading, your hands with which you are holding it, and then lift your head and look around you. Have you ever seen such a sharp and distinct image as this one at any other place? Even the most developed television screen produced by the greatest television producer in the world cannot provide such a sharp image for you. This is a three-dimensional, colored, and extremely sharp image. For more than 100 years, thousands of engineers have been trying to achieve this sharpness. Factories, huge premises were established, much research has been done, plans and

designs have been made for this purpose. Again, look at a TV screen and the book you hold in your hands. You will see that there is a big difference in sharpness and distinction. Moreover, the TV screen shows you a two-dimensional image, whereas with your eyes, you watch a three-dimensional perspective with depth.

For many years, tens of thousands of engineers have tried to make a three-dimensional TV and achieve the vision quality of the eye. Yes, they have made a three-dimensional television system, but it is not possible to watch it without putting on special 3-D glasses; moreover, it is only an artificial three-dimension. The background is more blurred, the foreground appears like a paper setting. Never has it been possible to produce a sharp and distinct vision like that of the eye. In both the camera and the television, there is a loss of image quality.

Evolutionists claim that the mechanism producing this sharp and distinct image has been formed by chance. Now, if somebody told you that the television in your room was formed as a result of chance, that all of its atoms just happened to come together and make up this device that produces an image, what would you think? How can atoms do what thousands of people cannot?

If a device producing a more primitive image than the eye could not have been formed by chance, then it is very evident that the eye and the image seen by the eye could not have been formed by chance. The same situation applies to the ear. The outer ear picks up the available sounds by the auricle and directs them to the middle ear, the middle ear transmits the sound vibrations by intensifying them, and the inner ear sends these vibrations to the brain by translating them into electric signals. Just as with the eye, the act of hearing finalizes in the center of hearing in the brain.

The situation in the eye is also true for the ear. That is, the brain is insulated from sound just as it is from light. It does not let any sound in. Therefore, no matter how noisy is the outside, the inside of the brain is completely silent. Nevertheless, the sharpest sounds are perceived in the brain. In your completely silent brain, you listen to symphonies, and hear all of the noises in a crowded place. However, were the sound level in your brain measured by a precise device at that moment, complete silence would be found to be prevailing there.

As is the case with imagery, decades of effort have been spent in trying to generate and reproduce sound that is faithful to the original. The results of these efforts are sound recorders, high-fidelity systems, and systems for sensing sound. Despite all of this technology and the thousands of engineers and experts who have been working on this endeavor, no sound has yet been obtained that has the same sharpness and clarity as the sound perceived by the ear. Think of the highest-quality hi-fi systems produced by the largest company in the music industry. Even in these devices, when sound is recorded some of it is lost; or when you turn on a hi-fi you always hear a hissing sound before the music starts. However, the sounds that are the products of the human body's technology are extremely sharp and clear. A human ear never perceives a sound accompanied by a hissing sound or with atmospherics as does a hi-fi; rather,

it perceives sound exactly as it is, sharp and clear. This is the way it has been since the creation of man.

So far, no man-made visual or recording apparatus has been as sensitive and successful in perceiving sensory data as are the eye and the ear. However, as far as seeing and hearing are concerned, a far greater truth lies beyond all this.

To Whom Does the Consciousness that Sees and Hears within the Brain Belong?

Who watches an alluring world in the brain, listens to symphonies and the twittering of birds, and smells the rose?

The stimulations coming from a person's eyes, ears, and nose travel to the brain as electro-chemical nerve impulses. In biology, physiology, and biochemistry books, you can find many details about how this image forms in the brain. However, you will never come across the most important fact: Who perceives these electro-chemical nerve impulses as images, sounds, odors, and sensory events in the brain? There is a consciousness in the brain that perceives all this without feeling any need for an eye, an ear, and a nose. To whom does this consciousness belong? Of course it does not belong to the nerves, the fat layer, and neurons comprising the brain. This is why Darwinist-materialists, who believe that everything is comprised of matter, cannot answer these questions.

For this consciousness is the spirit created by Allah, which needs neither the eye to watch the images nor the ear to hear the sounds. Furthermore, it does not need the brain to think.

Everyone who reads this explicit and scientific fact should ponder on Almighty Allah, and fear and seek refuge in Him, for He squeezes the entire universe in a pitch-dark place of a few cubic centimeters in a three-dimensional, colored, shadowy, and luminous form.

A Materialist Faith

The information we have presented so far shows us that the theory of evolution is incompatible with scientific findings. The theory's claim regarding the origin of life is inconsistent with science, the evolutionary mechanisms it proposes have no evolutionary power, and fossils demonstrate that the required intermediate forms have never existed. So, it certainly follows that the theory of evolution should be pushed aside as an unscientific idea. This is how many ideas, such as the Earth-centered universe model, have been taken out of the agenda of science throughout history.

However, the theory of evolution is kept on the agenda of science. Some people even try to represent criticisms directed against it as an "attack on science." Why?

The reason is that this theory is an indispensable dogmatic belief for some circles. These circles are blindly devoted to materialist philosophy and adopt Darwinism because it is the only materialist explanation that can be put forward to explain the workings of nature.

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

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]...²⁰⁵

These are explicit statements that Darwinism is a dogma kept alive just for the sake of adherence to materialism. This dogma maintains that there is no being save matter. Therefore, it argues that inanimate, unconscious matter created life. It insists that millions of different living species (e.g., birds, fish, giraffes, tigers, insects, trees, flowers, whales, and human beings) originated as a result of the interactions between matter such as pouring rain, lightning flashes, and so on, out of inanimate matter. This is a precept contrary both to reason and science. Yet Darwinists continue to defend it just so as "not to allow a Divine intervention."

Anyone who does not look at the origin of living beings with a materialist prejudice will see this evident truth: All living beings are works of a Creator, Who is All-Powerful, All-Wise, and All-Knowing. This Creator is Allah, Who created the whole universe from non-existence, designed it in the most perfect form, and fashioned all living beings.

The Theory of Evolution: The Most Potent Spell in the World

Anyone free of prejudice and the influence of any particular ideology, who uses only his or her reason and logic, will clearly understand that belief in the theory of evolution, which brings to mind the superstitions of societies with no knowledge of science or civilization, is quite impossible.

As explained above, those who believe in the theory of evolution think that a few atoms and molecules thrown into a huge vat could produce thinking, reasoning professors and university students; such scientists as Einstein and Galileo; such artists as Humphrey Bogart, Frank Sinatra and Luciano Pavarotti; as well as antelopes, lemon trees, and carnations. Moreover, as the scientists and professors who believe in this nonsense are educated people, it is quite justifiable to speak of this theory as "the most potent spell in history." Never before has any other belief or idea so taken away peoples' powers of reason, refused to allow them to think intelligently and logically, and hidden the truth from them as if they had been blindfolded. This is an even worse and unbelievable blindness than the totem worship in some parts of Africa, the people of Saba worshipping the Sun, the tribe of Abraham (pbuh) worshipping idols they had made with their own hands, or the people of Moses (pbuh) worshipping the Golden Calf.

In fact, Allah has pointed to this lack of reason in the Qur'an. In many verses, He reveals that some peoples' minds will be closed and that they will be powerless to see the truth. Some of these verses are as follows:

As for those who do not believe, it makes no difference to them whether you warn them or do not warn them, they will not believe. Allah has sealed up their hearts and hearing and over their eyes is a blindfold. They will have a terrible punishment. (Surat al-Baqara, 6-7)

... They have hearts with which they do not understand. They have eyes with which they do not see. They have ears with which they do not hear. Such people are like cattle. No, they are even further astray! They are the unaware. (Surat al-A'raf, 179)

Even if We opened up to them a door into heaven, and they spent the day ascending through it, they would only say: "Our eyesight is befuddled! Or rather we have been put under a spell!" (Surat al-Hijr, 14-15)

Words cannot express just how astonishing it is that this spell should hold such a wide community in thrall, keep people from the truth, and not be broken for 150 years. It is understandable that one or a few people might believe in impossible scenarios and claims full of stupidity and illogicality. However, "magic" is the only possible explanation for people from all over the world believing that unconscious and lifeless atoms suddenly decided to come together and form a universe that functions with a flawless system of organization, discipline, reason, and consciousness; a planet named Earth with all of its features so perfectly suited to life; and living things full of countless complex systems.

In fact, the Qur'an relates the incident of Moses (pbuh) and Pharaoh to show that some people who support atheistic philosophies actually influence others by magic. When Pharaoh was told about the true religion, he told Prophet Moses (pbuh) to meet with his own magicians. When Moses (pbuh) did so, he told them to demonstrate their abilities first. The verses continue:

He said: "You throw." And when they threw, they cast a spell on the people's eyes and caused them to feel great fear of them. They produced an extremely powerful magic. (Surat al-A'raf, 116)

As we have seen, Pharaoh's magicians were able to deceive everyone, apart from Moses (pbuh) and those who believed in him. However, his evidence broke the spell, or "swallowed up what they had forged," as the verse puts it:

We revealed to Moses: "Throw down your staff." And it immediately swallowed up what they had forged. So the Truth took place and what they did was shown to be false. (Surat al-A'raf, 117-118)

As we can see, when people realized that a spell had been cast upon them and that what they saw was just an illusion, Pharaoh's magicians lost all credibility. In the present day too, unless those who, under the influence of a similar spell, believe in these ridiculous claims under their scientific disguise and spend their lives defending them, abandon their superstitious beliefs, they also will be humiliated when the full truth emerges and the spell is broken. In fact, world-renowned British writer and philosopher Malcolm Muggeridge also stated this:

I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books in the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has.²⁰⁶

That future is not far off: On the contrary, people will soon see that "chance" is not a deity, and will look back on the theory of evolution as the worst deceit and the most terrible spell in the world. That spell is already rapidly beginning to be lifted from the shoulders of people all over the world. Many people who see its true face are wondering with amazement how they could ever have been taken in by it.

**They said, "Glory be to You!
We have no knowledge except what
You have taught us. You are
the All-Knowing, the All-Wise."
(Surat al-Baqara, 32)**

NOTES

1. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 234.
2. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998, p. 146.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 140, 141, 227.
4. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, pp. 313-314.
5. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 351.
6. Charles Darwin, *Evrin Kuramı - Secme Yazılar, Eleştiriler* (Charles Darwin, The Theory of Evolution - Selected Writings, Critiques), Hurriyet Vakfı Yayınları, p. 124.
7. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth?*, Washington, DC, Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2002, p. 37.
8. *Ibid.*
9. Peter Douglas Ward, "Living Fossils and Great Extinctions," in *On Methuselah's Trail*, W. H. Freeman and Company, 1992, p. 30.
10. *Discover*, October 1989, p. 65.
11. Walter Starkey, "Evolution's Big Bang? Or Darwin's Dilemma?", in *The Cambrian Explosion*, WLS Publishing, 1999, p. 233.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Andrew Parker, *In the Blink of an Eye*, Perseus Publishing, April 2003, pp. 15-18.
14. Duane T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!*, Institute of Creation Research, California, 1985, p. 58.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69.
16. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Book of Life*, W.W. Norton & Company, p. 46.
17. I. Axelrod, "Early Cambrian Marine Fauna," *Science*, No. 128, 4 July 1958, p. 7.
18. Robert G. Wesson, *Beyond Natural Selection*, MIT Press: Cambridge MA, 1994, p. 45.
19. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!*, p. 67.
20. Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, Master Books, 2002, p. 53.
21. Stephen Jay Gould, "The Ediacaran Experiment," *Natural History*, No. 93, February 1984, p. 23.
22. T. Neville George, "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *Science Progress*, Vol. 48, No. 189, January 1960, p. 5.
23. Duane T. Gish, *Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics*, Institute for Creation Research: El Cajon CA, 1993, pp. 115-116.
24. Parker, *In the Blink of an Eye*, pp. 15-22.
25. Gould, *The Book of Life*, pp. 46-47.
26. John Woodmorappe, "The Cambrian Explosion Remains an Enigma for Organic Evolution: The Ediacaran Fauna: Much Ado About Ancient Lichens?"; <http://www.rae.org/cambrian.html>

27. University of California at Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology,
<http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/vendian/critters.html>
28. Douglas J. Futuyma, *Evolutionary Biology*, 1985, p. 325.
29. Bob Holmes, "When we were worms," *New Scientist*, issue 2104, 18 October 1997, p. 30.
30. Gabrielle Walker, "Ice magic," *New Scientist*, issue 2390, 12 April 2003, p. 30.
31. <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/305/5687/1115/F1>
32. Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 38.
33. Simon Conway-Morris, *The Crucible of Creation: The Burgess Shale and the Rise of Animals*, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 145-146.
34. Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 44.
35. Simon Conway-Morris, "Palaeontology's hidden agenda: Spectacular fossils from the time when animals began to build skeletons suggest that the fossil record is not a perfect guide to the way life evolved. The fossils we cannot find are just as important as those we can," *New Scientist*, issue 1729, 11 August 1990.
36. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 56.
37. Gould, "The Ediacaran Experiment," *Natural History*, p. 22
38. Morris, *The Crucible of Creation*, p. 30.
39. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 59.
40. Mikhail Fedonkin, "Vendian body fossils and trace fossils," *Early Life on Earth*, Nobel Symposium No. 84, New York, Columbia University Press, 1993, pp. 370-388.
41. Gould, *The Book of Life*, p. 52.
42. Parker, *In the Blink of an Eye*, p. 6.
43. Pierre P. Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 82.
44. Ray Bohlin, "Evolution's Big Bang," <http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/bigbang.html>
45. Parker, *In the Blink of an Eye*, p. 30.
46. Gerald Schroeder, "Evolution: Rationality vs. Randomness,"
<http://www.geraldschroeder.com/evolution.html>
47. "Cambrian Explosion Disproves Evolution,"http://www.learnthebible.org/creation_science_cambrian_explosion_disproves_evolution.htm
48. "The Cambrian," <http://www.palaeos.com/Paleozoic/Cambrian/Cambrian.htm>
49. Richard Monastersky, "The first monsters: long before sharks, *Anomalocaris* ruled the seas - oldest known large predators," *Science News*, 27 August 1994.
50. Ernst Mayr, "The Science of the Living World," in *This is Biology*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997, p. 196.
51. Stephen Jay Gould, *Wonderful Life: The Burgess Shale and the Nature of History*, pp. 46-47.

52. Gould, *The Book of Life*, p. 51.
53. Richard Monastersky, "Mysteries of the Orient," *Discover*, April 1993, p. 40.
54. Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, London: W. W. Norton, 1986, p. 229.
55. Art Battson, "On the Origin of Stasis," www.arn.org/docs/abstasis.htm.
56. Morris, *The Crucible of Creation*, p. 171.
57. Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 39.
58. "Explosion of Life: A scientist reveals details of the Cambrian explosion," http://www.origins.org/articles/chien_explosionoflife.html
59. "Cambrian Explosion Explained," <http://www.abc.net.au/science/ss/stories/s1375551.htm>
60. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!*, p. 58.
61. "Explosion of Life: A scientist reveals details of the Cambrian explosion," http://www.origins.org/articles/chien_explosionoflife.html
62. J. Madeleine Nash, "When Life Exploded," *Time*, 4 December 1995, p. 74.
63. "The Cambrian Explosion," <http://www.angelfire.com/tn/tifni/misc/cambrianexplosion.html>
64. Starkey, "The Cambrian Explosion, Evolution's Big Bang? Or Darwin's Dilemma?," p. 281.
65. Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 39.
66. Bohlin, "Evolution's Big Bang," <http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/bigbang.html>
67. Stephen Jay Gould, "The Evolution of Life on the Earth," *Scientific American*, October 1994, p. 67.
68. George G. Simpson, *The Major Features of Evolution*, p. 360.
69. Stephen Jay Gould, "A Web of Tales," *Natural History*, October 1988, pp. 16-23.
70. Stephen J. Gould, "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History*, No. 86, No. 5, May 1977, p. 14.
71. Derek E. G. Briggs, Douglas H. Erwin, Frederick J. Collier, *The Fossils of the Burgess Shale*, 1994, Smithsonian Books, pp. 142-143.
72. *Ibid.*, pp. 145-147.
73. *Ibid.*, p.138.
74. *Ibid.*, p.150.
75. *Ibid.* pp. 201-202.
76. "The Cambrian," <http://www.palaeos.com/Paleozoic/Cambrian/Cambrian.htm>
77. Briggs, Erwin, Collier, *The Fossils of the Burgess Shale*, p. 199.
78. <http://www.sizinti.com.tr/konu.sizinti?SIN=554355b924&k=293&1331833302>
79. Briggs, Erwin, Collier, *The Fossils of the Burgess Shale*, p. 131.

80. *Ibid.*, pp. 140-141.
81. Fred Heeren, "A little fish challenges a giant of science," *The Boston Globe*, 30 May 2000, p. E1.
82. D.-G. Shu et al., "Head and backbone of the Early Cambrian vertebrate *Haikouichthys*," *Nature* 421, 526-529, 30 January 2003.
83. "Primitive Fish May Be Ancestor of Man,"
<http://www.china.org.cn/english/culture/54836.htm>
84. "Oldest fossil fish caught," BBC News Sci/Tech, November 4, 1999;
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/504776.stm>
85. Richard Monastersky, "Waking Up to the Dawn of Vertebrates," *Science News*, Vol. 156, No. 19, 6 November 1999, p. 292.
86. John Maynard Smith, *The Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 19.
87. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!*, p. 66.
88. Holmes, "When we were worms," *New Scientist*.
89. Masao Ito, Yasushi Miyashita, Edmund T. Rolls, *Cognition, Computation and Consciousness*, Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 21.
90. Michael Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, Free Press, 1998, p. 321.
91. Marshall Kay and Edwin H. Colbert, *Stratigraphy and Life History*, 1965, No. 736, pp. 102-103.
92. Monastersky, "The first monsters: long before sharks, Anomalocaris ruled the seas - oldest known large predators," *Science News*.
93. *Ibid.*
94. The complexity in this structure is enough to refute the evolutionary theory. For detailed information please see *Darwinism Refuted* by Harun Yahya.
95. Stephen C. Meyer, Paul A. Nelson, Paul Chien, "The Cambrian Explosion: Biology's Big Bang", <http://www.discovery.org/articlefiles/pdfs/cambrian.pdf>
96. *Ibid.*
97. Frank B. Salisbury, "Doubts about the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution," *American Biology Teacher*, September 1971, p. 336.
98. Meyer, Nelson, Chien, "The Cambrian Explosion: Biology's Big Bang"
99. R. Levi-Setti, *Trilobites: A Photographic Atlas*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1975
100. Richard Fortey, *Trilobite, Eyewitness to Evolution*, Vintage Books, 2000, pp. 27-28.
101. *Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.
102. *Ibid.*
103. *Ibid.* pp. 62-63.
104. Parker, *In the Blink of an Eye*, p. 188.
105. Fortey, *Trilobite, Eyewitness to Evolution*, p. 92.
106. *Ibid.*, pp. 92-94.

107. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
108. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
109. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
110. *Ibid.*, p. 98.
111. David Raup, "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology", *Bulletin*, Field Museum of Natural History, Vol. 50, January 1979, p. 24.
112. Levi-Setti, *Trilobites: A Photographic Atlas*, p. 54.
113. Richard Ellis, *Aquagenesis*, New York, Viking Publishing, 2001, p. 49.
114. Richard Fortey, "Crystal Eyes," *Natural History*, 2000, Vol. 109, No. 8, pp. 68-72.
115. Levi-Setti, *Trilobites: A Photographic Atlas*, p. 54.
116. Rudolf Prokop, *Fossils*, Hamlyn Colour Guide, Hamlyn, London, 1981.
117. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
118. Raup, "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology," *Bulletin*, pp. 22, 24.
119. R. L. Gregory, *Eye and Brain: The Physiology of Seeing*, Oxford University Press, 1995, p. 31.
120. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 168.
121. Niles Eldredge and Stephen Jay Gould, "Punctuated Equilibria: An Alternative to Phyletic Gradualism," in *Models in Paleobiology*, ed. T. J. Schopf, San Francisco, Freeman, Cooper, and Company, 1972, pp. 82-115.
122. Stephen J. Gould, *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*, Belknap Press, 2002, p. 754.
123. Fortey, *Trilobite: Eyewitness to Evolution*, p. 128.
124. "Trilobite Origins," <http://www.peripatus.gen.nz/Taxa/Arthropoda/Trilobita/TriOri.html>
125. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 150.
126. *Trends in Genetics*, February 1999, Vol. 15, No. 2.
127. Bohlin, "Evolution's Big Bang"
128. Steven Darksyde, *The Cambrian Explosion and Creationism*, <http://politics.humanbeams.com/p405darksyde-cambrianexplosion.php>
129. Walker, "Ice magic," *New Scientist*, p. 30.
130. BBC Science and Nature, Horizon: "Snowball Earth," <http://www.bbc.co.uk/science/horizon/2000/snowballearth.shtml>
131. Walker, "Ice magic," *New Scientist*, p. 30.
132. Parker, *In the Blink of an Eye*, p. 42.
133. Walker, "Ice magic," *New Scientist*, p. 30.
134. "Explosion of Life: A scientist reveals details of the Cambrian explosion," www.origins.org/articles/chien_explosionoflife.html
135. Stephen C. Meyer, "The origin of biological information and the higher taxonomic categories," *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*, May 18, 2007
136. *Ibid.*
137. *Ibid.*
138. *Ibid.*

139. Richard Fortey, "Cambrian Explosion Exploded?," *Science*, 20 July 2001
140. Susumo Ohno, "The notion of the Cambrian pananimalia genome," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA* 93 (August 1996): pp. 8475-78.
141. Peter G. Williamson, "Morphological stasis and developmental constraint: real problems for neo-Darwinism," *Nature*, Vol. 294, 19 November 1981, p. 214.
142. Battson, "On the Origin of Stasis."
143. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 114.
144. http://www.biltek.tubitak.gov.tr/merak_etikleriniz/index.php?kategori_id=7&soru_id=1088
145. Holmes, "When we were worms," *New Scientist*.
146. Mini Review: C. Schwabe, 1994. "Theoretical limitations of molecular phylogenetics and the evolution of relaxins," *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 107B:167-177; Don Batten, "Hox (homeobox) Genes—Evolution's Saviour?," <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4205.asp>
147. Holmes, "When we were worms," *New Scientist*.
148. Bohlin, "Evolution's Big Bang."
149. "Explosion of Life: A scientist reveals details of the Cambrian explosion," http://www.origins.org/articles/chien_explosionoflife.html
150. Morris, *The Crucible of Creation*, p. 148.
151. Nash, "When Life Exploded," *Time*, p. 74.
152. Gould, *The Book of Life*, pp. 51-52.
153. Curt Sewell, "The Cambrian Explosion -- A Strong Argument Favoring Creation," 1999, <http://www.rae.org/bits05.htm>
154. Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1983, p. 197.
155. Jeffrey S. Levinton, "The Big Bang of Animal Evolution," *Scientific American*, vol. 267, no. 84, November 1992.
156. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, London, 6th edition, 1872, Everyman's Library, 1958, p. 115.
157. D. H. Erwin, J. W. Valentine, and J. J. Sepkowski, "A Comparative Study of Diversification Events: The Early Paleozoic versus the Mesozoic," *Evolution* 41, 1987: 1183.
158. R. Lewin, "A Lopsided Look at Evolution," *Science*, Vol 241, 15 July 1988, p. 292.
159. Phillip E. Johnson, "Darwinism's Rules of Reasoning," *Darwinism: Science or Philosophy*, Foundation for Thought and Ethics, 1994, p. 12.
160. Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 42.
161. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Panda's Thumb*, 1980, pp. 238-239.
162. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 348.
163. *Ibid.*, p. 350.
164. *Ibid.*, p. 344.
165. D.B. Gower, "Scientist Rejects Evolution," *Kentish Times*, England, 11 December 1975, p. 4.

166. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*, Belknap Press, 2002, p. 755.
167. Ernst Mayr, *Toward a New Philosophy of Biology: Observations of an Evolutionist*, Harvard University Press: Cambridge MA, 1988, pp. 529-530.
168. Kevin Kelly, *Out of Control: The New Biology of Machines*, 1994, Fourth Estate: London, 1995, p. 475.
169. N. D. Newell, "Why Scientists Believe in Evolution," 1984, American Geological Institute pamphlet, p. 10.
170. John G. Maisey, *Discovering Fossil Fishes*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2000, p. 61.
171. Gould, "The Ediacaran Experiment," *Natural History*, pp. 22-23
172. Ernst Mayr, *One Long Argument: Charles Darwin and Genesis of Modern Evolutionary Thought*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991, p. 138.
173. Garret Vanderkooi, "Evolution as a Scientific Theory," In *Christianity Today*, May 7, 1971, p. 13.
174. Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, p. 97.
175. *Ibid.*, p. 88.
176. Colin Patterson, "Cladistics, Interview with Brian Leek and Peter Franz," BBC, 4 March 1982.
177. J. W. Valentine and D. H. Erwin, "Interpreting Great Developmental Experiments: the Fossil Record," In *Development as an Evolutionary Process*, R. A. Raff and E. C. Raff, eds., New York, Liss Publishing, 1987, p. 88.
178. J. W. Valentine, "Fossil Record of the Origin of Baupläne and its Implications," In *Patterns and Processes in the History of Life*, M. Raup and D. Jablonski, eds., Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1986, p. 89.
179. Walt Brown, *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, 7th ed.; <http://www.creationscience.com/onlinebook/ReferencesandNotes23.html>
180. Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 42-44.
181. Levinton, "The Big Bang of Animal Evolution," *Scientific American*, p. 84.
182. M. Grene, *Encounter*, November 1959, pp. 48-50.
183. Gould, "The Evolution of Life on Earth," *Scientific American*, p. 89.
184. John Noble Wilford, "Spectacular Fossils Record Early Riot of Creation," *The New York Times*, April 23, 1991.
185. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!*, p. 60.
186. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, p. 53.
187. Sidney Fox, Klaus Dose, *Molecular Evolution and The Origin of Life*, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1972, p. 4.
188. Alexander I. Oparin, *Origin of Life*, Dover Publications, NewYork, 1936, 1953 (reprint), p. 196.
189. "New Evidence on Evolution of Early Atmosphere and Life", *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, vol 63, November 1982, 1328-1330.

190. Stanley Miller, *Molecular Evolution of Life: Current Status of the Prebiotic Synthesis of Small Molecules*, 1986, p. 7.
191. Jeffrey Bada, *Earth*, February 1998, p. 40.
192. Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on Earth", *Scientific American*, vol. 271, October 1994, p. 78.
193. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, The Modern Library, New York, p. 127.
194. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 184.
195. B. G. Ranganathan, *Origins?*, Pennsylvania: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1988, p. 7.
196. Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, p. 179.
197. Derek A. Ager, "The Nature of the Fossil Record," *Proceedings of the British Geological Association*, vol. 87, 1976, p. 133.
198. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, p. 197.
199. Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond the Ivory Tower*, Toplinger Publications, New York, 1970, pp. 75-14; Charles E. Oxnard, "The Place of Australopithecines in Human Evolution: Grounds for Doubt," *Nature*, vol. 258, p. 389.
200. "Could science be brought to an end by scientists' belief that they have final answers or by society's reluctance to pay the bills?" *Scientific American*, December 1992, p. 20.
201. Alan Walker, *Science*, vol. 207, 7 March 1980, p. 1103; A. J. Kelso, *Physical Anthropology*, 1st ed., J. B. Lipincott Co., New York, 1970, p. 221; M. D. Leakey, *Olduvai Gorge*, vol. 3, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1971, p. 272.
202. Jeffrey Kluger, "Not So Extinct After All: The Primitive Homo Erectus May Have Survived Long Enough To Coexist With Modern Humans", *Time*, 23 December 1996.
203. S. J. Gould, *Natural History*, vol. 85, 1976, p. 30.
204. Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, p. 19.
205. Richard Lewontin, "The Demon-Haunted World," *The New York Review of Books*, January 9, 1997, p. 28.
206. Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids:Eerdmans, 1980, p. 43.

In the light of recent scientific discoveries, the theory of evolution is in a state of utter collapse. But just one event that Darwinists are unable to explain demolishes the very foundations of their theory—the variety and complexity of life all over the world, exhibited with such magnificence, some 530 million years ago, now known as the Cambrian Explosion. In an environment where only single-celled organisms existed before, large numbers of highly complex living species suddenly came into being, with no trace of any supposed forerunners, as if to firmly refute the invalidity of the theory of evolution.

So persuasive is the fossil record, and so dramatic this phenomenon from a scientific viewpoint, that scientists refer to the Cambrian Explosion as “the Biological Big Bang.” They continue to search for as yet undiscovered pre-Cambrian fossils that might be the ancestors of these startling life forms. Yet all their efforts keep pointing to one single explanation:

A sudden, flawless, widely differing and complex creation.

This book has compiled details of this incomparable era, and its compelling evidence that refutes the theory of evolution.

About the Author

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