THE EVOLUTION IMPASSE 2

HARUN YAHYA

K

Kanapoi Elbow Fossil Fraud, *The*

The best example of how evolutionists interpret fossils according to their own preconceptions is a fossilized elbow bone found in the Kenyan region of Kanapoi. This fossil, displayed in the Kenya National Museum – East Rudolf under the number KP 271, consists of a part of the upper arm bone near the elbow. Unearthed in 1965 by Bryon Patterson of Harvard University, it has been exceedingly well preserved. The latest tests carried out by evolutionists have shown it to be around 4.5 million years old.[1] The fossil is therefore known as the oldest hominid fossil discovered to date.

In 1967, the researchers Bryan Patterson and W.W. Howells joined forces to describe KP 271. They suggested that the fossil's anatomy was similar to that of human beings and that it belonged to *Australopithecus*. Howells and his assistant Patterson announced the report regarding their research in the 7 April, 1967 edition of *Science* magazine, in which they stated:

In these diagnostic measurements, Kanapoi Hominoid 1 [the original name given to the fossil] is strikingly close to the means of the human sample.[2]

Though admitting the close resemblance to the bone of a present-day human, Howells and Patterson still maintained that the fossil belonged to *Australopithecus*, because to them, it was unacceptable that such an old fossil could belong to *Homo sapiens*.

But subsequently, studies performed by other researchers using computers again revealed that the fossil KP271 was identical to a human bone. As the result of his computer-assisted research, Henry M. McHenry of the University of California published an article in 1975:

The results show that the Kanapoi specimen, which is 4 to 4.5 million years old, is indistinguishable from modern *Homo sapiens*…[3]

After this, various other researchers (including David Pilbeam and Brigitte Senut) have also performed experiments and comparative studies proving that the bone is identical to H. sapiens. Yet despite all the evidence, even the evolutionists who carried out all this research were unable to admit, on account of their own preconceptions, that this fossil could belong to H. sapiens.

Kenyanthropus platyops

In Kenya, a team led by Meave Leakey discovered a fossilized skull that was referred to as "Flat-faced Man" because of the shape of its facial bones. The fossil was given the scientific name of *Kenyanthropus platyops*. This 3.5 million-year-old fossil overturned evolutionists' imaginary evolutionary scenarios because some extinct ape species (such as "Lucy") that lived after *Kenyanthropus platyops* were more primitive than it according to evolutionist criteria.[4] (*See* **Lucy Deceit, *The***.)

In fact, when one looks at all of the fossils discovered to date, it becomes clear that there is no evolutionary progression, beginning from a common ancestor and slowly turning into apes and present day man.

---

[1] Bryan Patterson, Anna K. Behrensmeyer, William D. Sill, "Geology and Fauna of a New Pliocene Locality in Northwestern Kenya," *Nature*, Vol. 226, June 6, 1970, pp. 918-921.
[2] Bryan Patterson, W. W. Howells, "Hominid Humeral Fragment from Early Pleistocene of Northwestern Kenya," *Science*, Vol. 156, April 7, 1967, p. 65.
[3] Henry M. McHenry, "Fossils and the Mosaic Nature of Human Evolution," *Science*, Vol. 190, October 31, 1975, p. 428.
[4] Bill Sardi, "Is 'Flat-Faced Man' Your Ancestor?," http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/sardi3.html

Daniel E. Lieberman of Harvard University's Anthropology Department commented on *Kenyanthropus platyops* in an article in *Nature* magazine:

The evolutionary history of humans is complex and unresolved. It now looks set to be thrown into further confusion by the discovery of another species and genus, dated to 3.5 million years ago. . . The nature of *Kenyanthropus platyops* raises all kinds of questions, about human evolution in general and the behaviour of this species in particular. Why, for example, does it have the unusual combination of small cheek teeth and a big flat face with an anteriorly positioned arch of the cheekbone? All other known hominin species with big faces and similarly positioned cheekbones have big teeth. I suspect the chief role of *K. platyops* in the next few years will be to act as a sort of party spoiler, highlighting the confusion that confronts research into evolutionary relationships among hominins.[5]

The BBC reported the story under such headlines as "Flat-Faced Man a Puzzle," "A Confusing Picture" and "A Scientific Contradiction" and went on to say that:

The discovery by Meave Leakey, of the National Museums of Kenya, and colleagues threatens to blur still further the already murky picture of man's evolution.[6]

Fred Spoor, the famous evolutionist in University College London said that "the fossil raises a lot of questions."[7]

As can be seen from these statements and admissions, the theory of evolution is facing a major dilemma. In particular, every new discovery in the field of paleontology presents a new contradiction for the theory of evolution to explain. Evolutionists who produce diagrams of the supposed evolution of mankind seek to incorporate new discoveries by setting the fossils out among extinct species of ape and to human races.

However, no fossil fits in with their diagrams, simply because human beings and apes did not evolve from any common ancestor. Human beings have always been human beings, and apes have always been apes. For that reason, the theory of evolution faces an ever greater dilemma with every new scientific discovery.

KNM-ER 1470 Fraud, *The*

In 1972, a fossil was discovered in East Rudolf that would lead to debates in paleoanthropology. This was a complete skull, lacking only the lower jaw, but broken into some 300 parts, which were assembled by Richard Leakey and his wife, Meave. It was later sent to the Kenya National Museum – East Rudolf and classified as *Homo habilis*. (*See* ***Homo habilis***.)

Homo habilis shares many features with the apes known as *Australopithecus*. Like them, *H. habilis* has a long-armed, short-legged and ape-like skeletal structure. Its hands and feet are well suited to climbing. These characteristics show that *H. habilis* spent most of its time in the trees.

The volume of the majority of skulls classified as *H. habilis* does not exceed 650 cubic centimeters. This brain size is very close to that of present-day gorillas. On the other hand, its jaw structure closely resembles that of present-day apes, definitely proving that it was an ape.

In terms of general skull features, it bears a closer resemblance to *Australopithecus africanus*. Like *A. africanus*, *H. habilis* has no eyebrow protrusions. Previously, this feature led to its being misinterpreted and depicted as a human-like creature.

---

[5] Daniel E. Lieberman, "Another face in our family tree," *Nature*, March 22, 2001, pp. 419-420.
[6] http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/1234006.stm
[7] http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/1234006.stm

KNM-ER 1470's long, broad forehead, its less obvious eyebrow protrusions, the lack of the structure in the gorilla skull known as the sagittal crest, and its 750 cubic centimeter brain volume show that it did not resemble human beings. J. E. Cronin describes why:

However its relatively robustly constructed face, flattish naso-alveolar clivus (recalling australopithecine dished faces), low maximum cranial width (on the temporals), strong canine juga and large molars (as indicated by remaining roots) are all relatively primitive traits which ally the specimen with members of the taxon *A. africanus* . . . KNM-ER 1470, like other early *Homo* specimens, shows many morphological characteristics in common with gracile australopithecines that are not shared with later specimens of the genus *Homo*.[8]

C. Loring Brace of the Museum of Anthropology, Michigan University says this on the same subject:

. . . from the size of the palate and the expansion of the area allotted to molar roots, it would appear that ER 1470 retained a fully *Australopithecus* -sized face and dentition.[9]

Another well known paleontologist, Bernard Wood, makes this comment:

There is no evidence that this cranium particularly resembles *H. sapiens* or *H. erectus* according to either phenetic or cladistic evidence. Phenetically, KNM-ER 1470 is closest to the remains from Olduvai [considered apes by creationists] referred to as *H. habilis*.[10]

The reason why the fossil KNM-ER 1470 was interpreted as human for a while lies in the biased and leading interpretation of its discoverer, Richard Leakey. He sought to give the impression that although the fossil had ape-like features, the skull was too large to be that of an ape. The aim was to describe the creature as an intermediate form.

Professor Tim G. Bromage, a researcher into the anatomy of the human face, summarizes the facts he revealed with computer-aided simulations in 1992:

When it [KNM-ER 1470] was first reconstructed, the face was fitted to the cranium in an almost vertical position, much like the flat faces of modern humans. But recent studies of anatomical relationships show that in life, the face must have jutted out considerably, creating an ape-like aspect, rather like the faces of *Australopithecus.*[11]

KNM-ER 1470's 750-cubic centimeter skull does not in any way make it a hominid and prevent it from being an ape species, because there are apes with just such a skull volume. In referring to ape skulls, evolutionists generally point to chimpanzees, with a smaller-sized brain, but never mention gorillas. Chimpanzees have an average brain volume of 400 cubic centimeters. Gorillas have an average brain size of 500 cubic centimeters, although in larger individuals, this may rise to 700 and even 750 cc centimeters.

Therefore, KNM-ER 1470's large brain size shows that it was a large ape (estimated to be a male), rather than a hominid. Indeed, the fact that KNM-ER 1470 has large teeth and a broad skull volume indicates that its body was correspondingly large.

From all this, it appears that structurally, KNM-ER 1470 was an ape resembling *Australopithecus.* Many features, such as its forward-looking face, abnormally large molars and brain volume too small to belong to a human being, reveal this clearly. In addition, KNM-ER 1470's teeth are identical to those of *Australopithecus.* [12]

This indicates that there is no significant difference between fossils of the *Homo habilis* class and those of the *Australopithecus* class. These all consist of different species of ape that were unable to walk on two feet and had smaller brains compared with those of man. All evolutionists do is to pick out certain features of these and use them as anatomical links in the myth of evolution from ape to man.

KNM-ER 1472 Lie, *The*

KNM-ER 1472 is the identifying "serial number" given to a thigh bone that is identical to one of modern man. That this bone was found in the same stratum as *Homo habilis* fossils, but a few kilometers away from them, led to the false interpretation that *H. habilis* was a two-legged creature. The fossil OH 62, discovered in 1987, showed that contrary to what had been thought *H. habilis* did not walk on two legs. KNM-ER 1472 was thus included under the classification *Homo erectus*. (*See* **Homo erectus**.)

KNM-WT 15000 (The oldest known human fossil)

KNM-WT 15000, otherwise known as the Turkana Boy skeleton, is perhaps the oldest and most fully preserved human remain found to date. (*See **The*** **Turkana Boy**.) Research into the fossil, said to be some 1.6 million years old, has shown that it belonged to an individual aged around 12, who would have been some 1.80 meters (5'11) tall on reaching adulthood. This fossil, which exhibits close similarities to the Neanderthal skeletons, is one of the most striking proofs to undermine the myth of human evolution. (*See* **Neanderthal Man: A Human Race**.)

Knuckle Walking —*See* Bipedalism

KP 271 (Kanapoi Hominid or Kanapoi Elbow Fossil) — *See* Kanapoi Elbow Bone Fossil Fraud, *The*

L

Laetoli Human Footprints, *The*

In 1978, Mary Leakey discovered a number of footprints in a layer of volcanic ash in Laetoli in Kenya. These prints were employed as an important part of the evolutionist propaganda regarding the well-known fossil "Lucy" (*See* ***The*** **Lucy Deceit,**). Evolutionists portrayed the Laetoli footprints as concrete proof that Lucy—which they regarded as the common ancestor of man and ape—walked on two legs. It was announced that the prints were the same age as Lucy, approximately 3.6 millions years, and that they represented evidence of bipedalism.

The footprints were indeed of the same age as Lucy, they had clearly been left by a creature that walked upright. Yet there was no evidence to show that the prints belonged to *Australopithecus afarensis*, a supposed intermediate-form classification, like Lucy. They had evidently been left by a true human being.

The famous paleoanthropologist Tim White, who worked with Mary Leakey, said this on the subject:

Make no mistake about it . . . They are like modern human footprints. If one were left in the sand of a California beach today, and a four-year-old were asked what it was, he would instantly say that somebody had walked there. He wouldn't be able to tell it from a hundred other prints on the beach, nor would you. [13]

After examining the prints, Louis Robins from University of California said:

The arch is raised—the smaller individual had a higher arch than I do . . . The toes grip the ground like human toes. You do not see this in other animal forms. [14]

In short, it was impossible for these 3.6-million-year-old prints to belong to Lucy. Lucy had curved hands and feet and used her forearms when walking. She could not have left behind such prints, which can only belong to a human being. The only reason why they were thought to have been left by *Australopithecus afarensis* was the volcanic layer in which they were found, estimated as being 3.6 million years old. They were ascribed to *A. afarensis* from the idea that human beings could not have lived so far back in the past.

Independent examinations defined that 20 of the fossilized prints belonged to a 10-year-old human being, and 27 prints belonging to a younger human. These were definitely normal human beings, just like us. In other words, modern humans were living at a time in which evolutionists claim that our oldest ancestors were alive. In other words, man's ancestor is man!

Lamarck, Jean B.

Though the theory of evolution's philosophical roots go back as far as Ancient Greece, it entered the agenda of the scientific world in the 19th century. In his book *Zoological Philosophy*, the French biologist Jean B. Lamarck hypothesized that living species had evolved from one another.

According to him, living things pass along the features they acquire during their lives, and evolve in this way. Giraffes, for example, had descended from antelope-like creatures; their necks had grown longer and longer over the generations as they sought to reach leaves from tall trees.

---

[13] Donald C. Johanson & M. A. Edey, *Lucy, The Beginnings of Humankind*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 250.

[14] "The Leakey Footprints: An Uncertain Path," *Science News*, Vol. 115, 1979, p. 196.

Darwin also made use of Lamarck's thesis of the transmission of acquired characteristics as a factor that impelled evolution.

This "transmission of acquired traits" model lost all validity with the discovery of the laws of inheritance. (*See* ***The*** **Laws of Inheritance**.) With the discovery of DNA in the mid-20th century, science realized that living things possess very special genetic information encoded in the cell's nucleus, and that this information cannot be altered by behavior or striving. (*See* **DNA**.) Therefore, even if a living animal's neck did elongate by a few centimeters (an inch or two) as a result of constantly stretching up into the trees, it would still give birth to young with the standard neck measurements for its species.

The theory proposed by Lamarck was refuted by the scientific findings, and went down in history as an incorrect hypothesis.

Lamarckism

Charles Darwin made use of Lamarck's thesis of the "transmission of acquired traits" as a factor giving rise to evolution. (*See* **Lamarck, Jean B**.)

Gordon Rattray Taylor, a researcher and proponent of evolution, described Lamarckism in his book *The Great Evolution Mystery*, and explained why Darwin was so heavily influenced by it:

Lamarckism is known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics . . . Darwin himself, as a matter of fact, was inclined to believe that such inheritance occurred and cited the reported case of a man who had lost his fingers and bred sons without fingers . . . [Darwin] had not, he said, gained a single idea from Lamarck. This was doubly ironical, for Darwin repeatedly toyed with the idea of the inheritance of acquired characteristics and, if it is so dreadful, it is Darwin who should be denigrated rather than Lamarck. . . In the 1859 edition of his work, Darwin refers to 'changes of external conditions' causing variation but subsequently these conditions are described as directing variation and cooperating with natural selection in directing it. . . Every year he attributed more and more to the agency of use or disuse. . . By 1868, when he published *Varieties of Animals and Plants under Domestication*, he gave a whole series of examples of supposed Lamarckian inheritance: such as a man losing part of his little finger and all his sons being born with deformed little fingers and boys born with foreskins much reduced in length as a result of generations of circumcision.[15]

Law of Biogenetics, *The* —*See* Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny
Laws of Inheritance, *The*

In the period during which Darwin developed the theory of evolution, the question of how living things transmitted their characteristics to later generations was unknown. Therefore, primitive conjectures such as traits being transmitted by way of the blood were widely accepted. This uncertainty about the mechanisms of heredity led Darwin to predicate his theory on a range of completely erroneous assumptions.

He pointed to natural selection as the basis of the evolutionary mechanism. Yet if beneficial attributes were chosen by means of natural selection (the survival of the fittest"), how could they be transmitted from one generation to another? At this point, Darwin embraced the thesis, which Lamarck had proposed, of "the transmission of acquired characteristics."

However, Lamarck's thesis was refuted when the laws of inheritance discovered by the Austrian botanist and also a priest Gregor Mendel. This meant that beneficial traits could not be passed along. Genetic laws demonstrated that acquired features were not handed on, and that

inheritance took place according to immutable rules—which by implication supported the idea of the immutability of species.

The laws of inheritance, determined by Gregor Mendel after lengthy experiments and observations, were published in 1865. However, these laws attracted the interest of the scientific world only towards the end of the century. Scientists accepted the validity of these laws in the early 20th century. This represented a serious impasse for Darwin's theory, which he had based on Lamarck's "beneficial traits."

For that reason, scientific adherents of Darwinism in the first quarter of the 20th century sought to develop a new model of evolution. Thus neo-Darwinism was born. (*See* ***The*** **Neo-Darwinism Comedy**.)

Le Chatelier's Principle

As amino acids chemically combine to form a protein, they build what is known as the *peptide bond.* In building this bond, a water molecule is released. This totally invalidates the evolutionist account of primitive life emerging in the sea. According to the law known as Le Chatelier's Principle, it is impossible for a so-called condensation reaction—a reaction that gives off water—to take place in an environment that contains water. The probability of a chemical reaction taking place in a watery environment is described as the lowest possible.

Therefore, the oceans—where evolutionists say life began and where amino acids had to form—are totally unsuited to the formation of proteins. The chemist Richard E. Dickinson explains why:

If polymeric chains of proteins and nucleic acids are to be forged out of their precursor monomers, a molecule of water must be removed at each link in the chain. It is therefore hard to see how polymerization could have proceeded in the aqueous environment of the primitive ocean, since the presence of water favors depolymerization rather than polymerization. [16]

But in the face of this, it is also impossible for evolutionists to alter their claim and to maintain that life began on land, because the seas were supposedly the only environment capable of protecting the amino acids from harmful ultraviolet rays. Amino acids formed in the primitive atmosphere on land would be broken down by ultraviolet rays.

Yet Le Chatelier's principle makes it impossible for amino acids to have emerged in the sea! This is yet another insoluble dilemma facing the theory of evolution.

Leakey, Richard

As well as being an anthropologist and paleontologist, Richard Leakey is also a well known evolutionist writer. He is best known for his fossil-hunting activities, having discovered a great many fossils, particularly along the shores of Lake Turkana in Northern Kenya. Yet more than once, his suggestions regarding these fossils have misled the world of paleoanthropology.

For example, he described a fossil skull he dated at 2.8 million years old as the greatest discovery in the history of anthropology, though it was later realized that this skull's human-like face was the result of a deliberately falsified reconstruction. (*See* ***Homo rudolfensis***.)

Leakey was strongly biased in favor of the theory of evolution, and never changed his attitude in the face of the evidence against it. One example of this was his statements regarding the Turkana Boy. In evolutionists' imaginary family tree, they advanced the concept of *Homo erectus*, meaning "upright-walking human," in order to suggest a transition from ape to man, though the skeleton of *Homo erectus* is identical to that of any modern man.

The best known fossil included under that classification is the Turkana Boy. Later it was determined that, contrary to evolutionist claims, the fossil belonged to a 12-year-old boy, who would have reached a height of some 1.83 meters when fully grown. In addition, shortly after the fossil was discovered, it was determined that its upright skeleton was identical to that of modern human beings.

In an article titled "Modern and Tall," Leakey described the inconsistencies between the Turkana Boy fossil and evolutionary theories:

. . . the boy from Turkana was surprisingly large compared with modern boys his age; . . . he would probably go unnoticed in a crowd today. This find combines with previous discoveries of *Homo erectus* to contradict a long-held idea that humans have grown larger over the millennia.[17]

Despite being an evolutionist, Leakey goes on to state that the differences between *Homo erectus* and modern man are not all that significant:

One would also see differences: in the shape of the skull, in the degree of protrusion of the face, the robustness of the brows and so on. These differences are probably no more pronounced than we see today between the separate geographical races of modern humans. Such biological variation arises when populations are geographically separated from each other for significant lengths of time. [18]

Left-Handed Amino Acids (Levo-Amino Acids)

The appropriate amino acids being arranged in the correct sequence is not sufficient to form a protein molecule in a living organism. In addition, each one of the 20 varieties of amino acid in a protein's structure must be *left-handed*.

In chemical terms, there are two different forms of any one amino acid; right-handed and left-handed. They differ in that their three-dimensional structures are mirror images of each another, just like the right and left hands on human beings.

Amino acids from either group can easily bind together with one another. However, research has revealed a most astonishing fact: The proteins in all living things, from the simplest to the most complex, are made up solely of left-handed amino acids. Even if just one right-handed amino acid is added to a protein's structure, that protein will become functionless.

In some experiments, bacteria have been given right-handed amino acids, but the bacteria have immediately broken down these amino acids—and in some cases, have reconstructed from these fragments left-handed amino acids that they can use.

Assume for a moment that life did come into existence by chance, as evolutionists maintain. If so, there should be equal amounts of right- and left-handed amino acids in nature, both being the results of chance. Therefore, there should be varying levels of right- and left-handed amino acids in the bodies of all living things, because chemically amino acids from either group can easily combine with one another.

The fact remains, however, that the proteins in living organisms consist solely of left-handed amino acids.

How do proteins select only left-handed amino acids? And why do no right-handed ones ever creep in? This is a question that evolutionists are unable to explain away, and cannot account for such a specialized, conscious selectivity.

The amino acids of all living organisms on Earth, and the building blocks of complex polymers such as proteins, all have the same left-handed asymmetry. This is tantamount to tossing a coin a million times and having it always come up heads. It is impossible to understand why

molecules become left-handed or right-handed, and that this choice is fascinatingly related to the origin of life on Earth.

In conclusion, it is totally impossible to account for the origin of life in terms of coincidences: If we calculate the probability of an average-sized protein consisting of 400 amino acids being made up only of left-handed amino acids, we obtain a figure of 1 in 2^{400}, or 1 in 10^{120}.

In order to grasp some idea about this astronomical figure, we can say that the total number of electrons in the universe is very much smaller than this, having been calculated at around 10^{79}. The chances of amino acids forming in the requisite sequence and functional form, give rise to a far larger number.

If we then add these probabilities and extend them to the formation of many more, and more varied proteins, then the calculations become truly unfathomable.

Lewontin, Richard

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

It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, so we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.[19]

The term *a priori* that Lewontin uses is particularly significant. This philosophical term expresses a given assumption, based on no experimental data. In the absence of any information regarding the truth of an idea, that idea is assumed to be true, "from the beginning." As openly stated by the evolutionist Lewontin, materialism is an *a priori* assumption for evolutionists, one into which they attempt to make science fit.

Since materialism necessitates the rejection of a Creator, they cling to the theory of evolution as the only remaining alternative. It makes no difference how much the scientific findings refute evolution, since the scientists in question already regard evolution as a fact, *a priori*. This biased attitude leads to the belief that "unconscious substances can regulate themselves," which is a violation of both science and reason.

Liaoningornis

The best-known of the claims regarding intermediate forms in the context of reptile-bird evolution is the fossil known as *Archaeopteryx*. However, it is now known that *Archaeopteryx* is not an intermediate form at all, but that it was a flying bird, not much different from birds alive today. (*See* ***Archaeopteryx***.)

Archaeopteryx, which has been proposed as "the forerunner of modern birds," lived approximately 150 million years ago. However, the discovery in China in November 1996 of a fossil known as *Liaoningornis* demolished evolutionists' claims concerning *Archaeopteryx*.

This bird, *Liaoningornis*, is around 130 million years old, possessed a breastbone to which the flight muscles are attached—a structure also found in present-day birds. The only difference is that it had teeth in its beak. This showed that, in contrast to evolutionist claims, that toothed birds did not have a primitive structure.[20] Indeed, in a text published in *Discover* magazine, Alan Feduccia says that this fossil invalidates the claim that the origin of birds can be found in dinosaurs.[21]

“Life Comes from Life” Thesis, *The* —*See* Biogenesis.

Linnaeus, Carolus

In 1735, the Swedish natural historian Carolus Linnaeus published his *Systema Naturae* (“System of Nature”), in which he classified all living species. He believed that species did not change, that the species he had classified possessed characteristics that they would preserve down through future generations. Linnaeus was a pathfinder in botany and zoology, and the classifications he made for plants and animals are still used by biologists today and constitute the basis of their nomenclature.[22]

Linnaeus first raised the matter of similar organs in animals, regarding them as an example of common creation. In his view, similar organs resembled one another not because they had evolved by chance from some common forerunner, but because they had been consciously designed to fulfill a specific purpose. Different living things having similar organs stems from their being the works of a single Creator. Why all birds have wings, for instance, is because wings have the ideal structure for flight, and therefore, this ideal structure must have been created separately for every species of bird. This view is clearly predicated on the assumption that Allah creates every living thing. (*See* **Creationism**.)

In fact, modern scientific findings show that with regard to similar organs, the claim of a common ancestor is not valid, and that the only possible explanation is one of common creation. (*See* ***The* “Common Ancestor” Lie**.)

Lucy Deceit (*Australopithecus afarensis*), *The*

“Lucy” is a fossil that Donald Johanson discovered in 1973. Its scientific name, *Australopithecus afarensis*, derives from the Afar region of Ethiopia, where it was discovered. For years, Lucy was portrayed as the missing link in the human evolution sequence. However, it no longer enjoys that earlier esteem in evolutionist sources, thanks to the latest scientific findings.

The fact *Australopithecus* can no longer be regarded as the ancestor of human beings was the cover story for the May 1999 edition of the well-known French scientific journal *Science et Vie*. Under the heading “Adieu Lucy [Goodbye to Lucy],” the text described why, based on a new *Australopithecus* finding known as St W573, *Australopithecus* apes needed to be removed from the human family tree:

A new theory states that the genus *Australopithecus* is not the root of the human race. . . The results arrived at by the only woman authorized to examine St W573 are different from the normal theories regarding mankind’s ancestors: this destroys the hominid family tree. Large primates, considered the ancestors of man, have been removed from the equation of this family tree . . . *Australopithecus* and *Homo* (human) species do not appear on the same branch. Man’s direct ancestors are still waiting to be discovered. [23]

M

Macro-Evolution Myth, *The*

Evolutionists refer to the variety or variation within species as "micro-evolution" and to the hypothesis of the formation of new species as "macro-evolution." Evolutionists seek to give the impression that micro-evolution is a scientific fact that which everyone agrees on, and that macro-evolution is a result of micro-evolution spread out over a longer time frame. Above all, the point that needs to be emphasized is that there is no such process as micro-evolution.

As we've already seen, evolutionists try to create the impression that variation within species is an evolutionary process by giving it the name of "micro-evolution." In fact, however, that this is an attempt to validate the concept of evolution by using an expression containing the word. Variation consists of the emergence of various dominant genetic combinations as a result of geographic isolation of individuals in a given species. But even with extreme variation, no new information is added to that species' gene pool. Therefore, no such process as evolution has taken place. (*See* ***The*** **Invalidity of Micro-evolution**.)

The second distortion is the claim that macro-evolution—in other words, development of one species into another—comes about as the accumulation of micro-evolutions over a long time. Yet when one realizes that there is no such thing as micro-evolution, the supposed basis for macro-evolution disappears. If no such process as micro-evolution ever takes place, macro-evolution must logically be eliminated too.

Many evolutionist biologists have admitted that such various hypotheses based on these fictitious concepts provide no explanation of the origin of species. The well- known evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin described his conclusions at a four-day symposium attended by 150 evolutionists held at the Chicago Natural History Museum in 1980:

The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution . . . the answer can be given as a clear, No. [24]

Macro-Mutation Myth, *The*

Evolutionists' inability to find any of the intermediate forms that they claim must once have existed led them to come up with new theses. One of these is the theory of punctuated evolution, which hypothesizes that the mutations necessary to form a new species took place, or that some individuals were exposed to intense, consecutive mutations.

One law revealed by Fisher, one of the century's best known geneticists, on the basis of experiment and observation clearly invalidates that hypothesis. In his book, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Fisher states that "the likelihood that a particular mutation will become fixed in a population is inversely proportional to its effect on the phenotype."[25] In other words, the greater the effect of a mutation, the less chance it has of becoming permanent in a population.

In addition, mutations cause random changes in living things' genetic data, and do not *improve* it. On the contrary, individuals exposed to mutations typically suffer serious diseases and deformities. Therefore, the more an individual is affected by a mutation, the less that individual's chances of survival.

---

[24] Roger Lewin, "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire," *Science*, Vol. 210, 21 November, 1980, p. 883.
[25] R. A. Fisher, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Professor Walter L. Starkey of Ohio University writes about these damaging effects of mutation:

Being bombarded by mutation-causing radiation, would be like shooting a new car with a 30-caliber rifle . . . Similarly, it would be highly unlikely that mutations would do anything other than damage you or an animal. Mutations caused by DNA copying errors would have a similar result . . . Mutations are harmful by a ratio of at least 10,000 to one. Radiation and copying errors do not produce new features that are beneficial. [26]

Clearly, mutations establish no evolutionary progress, and this fact represents a major dilemma for both neo-Darwinism and for the theory of punctuated evolution. Since mutation is a destructive mechanism, the macro-mutations that are the proponents of punctuated evolution must have a macro-destructive effect on living individuals.

The geneticist Lane Lester and the population geneticist Raymond Bohlin describe the mutation impasse as follows:

The overall factor that has come up again and again is that mutation remains the ultimate source of all genetic variation in any evolutionary model. Being unsatisfied with the prospects of accumulating small point mutations, many are turning to macromutations to explain the origin of evolutionary novelties. Goldschmidt's hopeful monsters have indeed returned. However, though macromutations of many varieties produce drastic changes, the vast majority will be incapable of survival, let alone show the marks of increasing complexity. If structural gene mutations are inadequate because of their inability to produce significant enough changes, then regulatory and developmental mutations appear even less useful because of the greater likelihood of nonadaptive or even destructive consequences. . . But one thing seems certain: at present, the thesis that mutations, whether great or small, are capable of producing limitless biological change is more an article of faith than fact. [27]

Experiment and observation show that mutations do not improve on genetic data but rather, damage living things. So it is clearly inconsistent for the proponents of punctuated evolution to expect great successes from mutations.

Malthus, Thomas Robert

The theories of the British statistician Thomas Robert Malthus were influential in shaping Darwin's ideas that in nature, there is a deadly struggle for survival and that every living thing strives only for itself. Malthus suggested that food resources increased arithmetically and the human population geometrically—for which reason, he maintained, human beings were necessarily in a fight for survival. Darwin adapted this concept of the struggle for survival to nature as a whole.

In the 19th century, Malthus' ideas were adopted by a fairly wide audience. Upper-class European intellectuals in particular supported his ideas. An article titled "The Scientific Background to the Nazi Racial Improvement Program" describes the importance that 19th-century Europe attached to Malthus' theories:

In the opening half of the nineteenth century, throughout Europe, members of the ruling classes gathered to discuss the newly discovered "Population problem" and to devise ways of implementing the Malthusian mandate, to increase the mortality rate of the poor: "Instead of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settlements in all marshy and unwholesome situations," and so forth and so on. [28]

Under the "oppression of the poor" program implemented in Britain in the 19th century, the strong crushed the weak in the struggle for survival, and the rapidly rising population would thus be kept in balance. The struggle for survival that Malthus regarded as theoretically necessary led to millions of poor people in Britain living wretched lives.

Marx, Karl

Karl Marx, the founder of Communism, described Charles Darwin's book *The Origin of Species*, which set forth the basis of the theory of evolution, as "a book which contains the basis of natural history for our views." [29]

Marx demonstrated his regard for Darwin by dedicating his own most important work, *Das Kapital*, to him. His own handwriting in the German edition of the book read, "*Mr. Charles Darwin / On the part of his sincere admirer / Karl Marx.*" [30]

The American researcher Conway Zirckle explains why Marx and Engels, the founders of Communism, so readily accepted the idea of evolution after Darwin published *The Origin of Species*:

Evolution, of course, was just what the founders of communism needed to explain how mankind could have come into being without the intervention of any supernatural force, and consequently it could be used to bolster the foundations of their materialistic philosophy. In addition, Darwin's interpretation of evolution—that evolution had come about through the operation of natural selection—gave them an alternative hypothesis to the prevailing teleological explanation of the observed fact that all forms of life are adapted to their conditions. [31]

The social scientist Tom Bethell, who works at the Hoover Institute in America, explains the fundamental reasons for the link between the two theories:

Marx admired Darwin's book not for economic reasons but for the more fundamental one that Darwin's universe was purely materialistic, and the explication of it no longer involved any reference to unobservable, nonmaterial causes outside or 'beyond' it. In that important respect, Darwin and Marx were truly comrades. [32]

The bond between Marxism and Darwinism is an evident fact on which everyone agrees. This link is set out in biographies of Marx, and is described in a biography of Marx brought out by a publishing house specializing in books with Marxist views:

Darwinism featured a series of facts that supported, proved the reality of and developed Marxist philosophy. The spread of Darwinist, evolutionist ideas created a suitable groundwork for Marxist thought to be understood by the working class in society as a whole. . . Marx, Engels and Lenin attached great value to Darwin's ideas and indicated the scientific importance of these, thus accelerating the spread of those ideas. [33]

On the other hand, Marx based historical progress on economics. In his view, society went through various historical phases, and the factor determining them was changes in the relationship between means of production and production itself. The economy determined everything else. This ideology described religion as a fairy tale invented for coercive economic purposes. In the eyes of this superstitious conception, religion was developed by the ruling classes to pacify those they ruled, and was "the opium of the masses."

In addition, Marx thought that societies followed a process of development. A slave-based society developed into a feudal society, and a feudal society turned into a capitalist one. Finally, thanks to a revolution, a socialist society would be constructed, whereupon the most advanced social stage in history would be attained.

Marx's views were evolutionist even before the publication of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*. However, Marx and Engels experienced difficulties in accounting for how living things came into being. That was because in the absence of a thesis accounting for living things on the basis of *non-creation*, it was impossible to maintain that religion was an invented falsehood and to base all of history on matter. For that reason, Marx immediately adopted Darwin's theory.

Today, all forms of materialist thinking—and Marx's ideas in particular— have been totally discredited, because in the face of scientific findings, the theory of evolution on which materialism based itself has been completely invalidated. Science refutes the materialist assumption that denies the existence of anything apart from matter, and shows that all living things are the work of a sublime creation.

Materialism

Materialist philosophy is one of the oldest ideas in history, whose essence is based on the existence of matter, and nothing else. According to this creed, matter has existed for ever, and everything that exists is composed of physical matter. This definition of course makes belief in a Creator impossible. As a requirement of this logic, materialist philosophy has opposed all forms of belief in Allah and the revealed religions.

The supposed "scientific" foundation of materialist philosophy, which maintains that nothing exists apart from matter, is the theory of evolution.

Since materialism seeks to explain nature in terms of material factors alone and rejects creation right from the outset, it maintains that everything—living or inanimate—emerged without creation but by chance and then later assumed order. Yet when the human mind perceives order, it immediately realizes that there must have been an entity that performed the ordering. Materialist philosophy is a violation of this most fundamental principle of human intelligence, and produced the evolution theory in the 19th century. (See ***The* Evolution Theory**.)

We may also question the truth of materialism's claim of using scientific methods. We can investigate whether or not matter has existed for ever, whether matter is capable of ordering itself in the absence of a Creator, and whether or not it can give rise to life. When we do so, we see that materialism is actually in a state of collapse.

The idea that matter has always existed collapsed with the Big Bang theory, which proved that the universe had come into being from nothing. (See ***The* Big Bang Theory.**) Therefore, the evolution theory—in other words, the claim that matter organized itself and gave rise to life—has also collapsed.

However, materialist scientists refuse to abandon their position, even though they clearly see that science has refuted the theory of evolution, since their devotion to this philosophy is so important to them. On the contrary, they seek to keep materialism alive by supporting the theory of evolution in whatever way possible.

Arthur Ernest Wilder-Smith, a professor of chemistry, sets out these facts in one of his books:

. . . however, [since] materialistic philosophy does not permit us to see concepts such as "mind" or nonmaterial intelligence behind the origin of material life, it automatically became necessary to search for the source of language, code, mind, and information in biological cells exclusively within matter and the laws of chance.

However, it is just this task which has turned up so many major difficulties . . . it exhibits in its raw primeval forms neither intelligence nor "mind." Yet the living cell is really just a bag full of projects, of teleonomy, and of concepts, and, therefore, of mind. The materialist is forced to seek the

origins of this programming and of these concepts of life in “nonmind,” i.e., in matter and chance, because he believes that matter and time represent the total reality of the universe. A considerable amount of “mental acrobatics” is required to obtain programs magically, to conjure up projects and concepts out of “nonmind,” “nonprojects,” and “nonprograms,” i.e., out of matter and chance. It is just these mental acrobatics which are carried out support materialism that we need to consider more closely, for they are the basis of much that is offered to our youngsters in our secondary and high schools and taught in universities as the sole scientific explanation of life and its codes.

If a reasonable materialistic view of biogenesis is to be taught as a fact, the problem of programming, simulation, language, code and translation of a code-obtained spontaneously from noncode-must be squarely faced. For matter, which is known to possess neither plans, intelligence, nor programming, alleged by the materialists to have conjured them all up like a rabbit out of a hat.[34]

The eminent biologist Hubert Yockey agrees:

Faith in the infallible and comprehensive doctrines of dialectic materialism plays a crucial role in origin of life scenarios. . . That life must exist somewhere in the solar system on ‘suitable planets elsewhere’ is widely and tenaciously believed in spite of lack of evidence or even abundant evidence to the contrary. [35]

Stanley Sobottka, a professor of physics from Virginia University, describes the distorted nature of materialism:

The widespread belief in materialism has profound effects in our lives and in our society. If we believe this way, we must conclude that everything, including ourselves and all of life, is governed completely by physical law. Physical law is the only law governing our desires, our hopes, our ethics, our goals, and our destinies. Matter and energy must be our primary focus, the object of all of our desires and ambitions. Specifically, this means that our lives must be focused on acquiring material goods (including bodies), or at least rearranging or exchanging them, in order to produce the maximum material satisfaction and pleasure. We must expend all of our energy in this quest, for there can be no other goal. And in all of this, we have no choice, because we are totally governed by physical law. We may feel trapped by these beliefs and desires, but we cannot shake them. They totally dominate us.

A succinct, personalized, summary statement of materialist philosophy is, “I am a body.” [36]

This materialist dogma underlies the evolutionist propaganda that one constantly encounters in some of the prominent media organizations and well-known journals, as a result of such ideological and philosophical requirements. Since evolution is crucial in ideological terms, it is accepted without any debate by the materialist circles that determine the standards of science.

Evolution is actually not a theory that emerged as a result of scientific research. On the contrary, the theory was produced in line with the requirements of materialist philosophy, and was then made into a sacred taboo that sought to impose itself despite the scientific facts. As is apparent from evolutionist writings, the clear objective behind all these endeavors is to deny the fact that living things were brought into being by a Creator.

Evolutionists refer to this aim as being “scientifically objective.” Yet they are referring not to science, but to materialist philosophy. Materialism rejects the non-material, or supernatural. Science, on the other hand, is not obliged to accept any such a dogma. Science has a duty to study nature, perform experiments, and duplicate results. If the results reveal the fact that nature was created, then science must accept that fact. A true scientist must not defend untenable scenarios by restricting himself to 19th century dogmas.

Mayr, Ernst

Ernst Mayr, a well-known evolutionist biologist, is also the founder of the Modern Synthetic Theory of evolution, which—proposed by adding concept of mutation to Darwin's natural-selection thesis—was given the name of neo-Darwinism. Therefore, Ernst Mayr and the other founders of the theory (Theodosius Dobzhansky and Julian Huxley) began being referred to as neo-Darwinists.

Ernst Mayr was one of the most significant adherents of the theory of evolution in the 20th century. He based his theory on mutation, and yet at the same time admitted the impossibility of this:

The occurrence of genetic monstrosities by mutation . . . is well substantiated, but they are such evident freaks that these monsters can be designated only as 'hopeless.' They are so utterly unbalanced that they would not have the slightest chance of escaping elimination through stabilizing selection . . . the more drastically a mutation affects the phenotype, the more likely it is to reduce fitness. To believe that such a drastic mutation would produce a viable new type, capable of occupying a new adaptive zone, is equivalent to believing in miracles . . . The finding of a suitable mate for the 'hopeless monster' and the establishment of reproductive isolation from the normal members of the parental population seem to me insurmountable difficulties.[37]

Mayr made another admission on the subject:

. . . it is a considerable strain on one's credulity to assume that finely balanced systems such as certain sense organs (the eye of vertebrates, or the bird's feather) could be improved by random mutations.[38]

---

[37] Ernst Mayr, *Populations, Species, and Evolution*, p. 235.
[8] J. E. Cronin, N. T. Boaz, C. B. Stringer, Y. Rak, "Tempo and Mode in Hominid Evolution," *Nature*, Vol. 292, 1981, pp. 113-122.
[9] C. L. Brace, H. Nelson, N. Korn, M. L. Brace, *Atlas of Human Evolution*, 2nd edition, New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
[10] B. A. Wood, "Koobi Fora Research Project," *Hominid Cranial Remains*, Vol. 4, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
[11] Tim Bromage, "Faces From the Past," *New Scientist*, Vol. 133, Issue 1803, 11 January 1992, p. 41.
[12] R. G. Klein, *The Human Career: Human Biological and Cultural Origins*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
[15] Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Abacus, 1984, pp. 36-41.
[16] Richard Dickerson, "Chemical Evolution," *Scientific American*, Vol. 239:3, 1978, p. 75,
[17] Richard Leakey and Alan Walker, "Unearthed,"*National Geographic*, November 1985, p. 629.
[18] Richard Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, London: Sphere Books, 1981, p. 116.
[19] Richard Lewontin, "Billions and billions of demons," *The New York Review*, January 9, 1997, p. 31.
[20] "Old Bird," *Discover*, March 21, 1997.
[21] *Ibid*.
[22] http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/history/linnaeus.html
[23] Isabelle Bourdial, "Adieu Lucy," *Science et Vie*, May 1999, No. 980, pp. 52-62.
[26] Walter L. Starkey, *The Cambrian Explosion*, WLS Publishing, , 1999, p. 158.
[27] Lane Lester, Raymond Bohlin, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Dallas: Probe Books, 1989, pp.141-142.
[28] http://www.trufax.org/avoid/nazi.html
[29] David Jorafsky, *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1961, p.12.
[30] Ralph Colp, Jr., "The Contacts Between Karl Marx and Charles Darwin," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Apr.-Jun., 1974), pp. 329-338.
[31] Conway Zirkle, *Evolution, Marxian Biology and the Social Scene*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959, pp. 85-86.
[32] Tom Bethell, "Burning Darwin to Save Marx," *Harper's Magazine*, December 1978, pp. 31-38.
[33] Karl Marx, *Biyografi* (Biography), Sorun Publishing, 1995, p. 368.
[34] A. E. Wilder-Smith, *The Natural Sciences: Know Nothing of Evolution*, T. W. F. T. Publishers, ABD, p. 77.
[35] Hubert Yockey, "Self-Organization, Origin of Life Scenarios and Information Theory," *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 91, 1981, pp. 27-28.
[36] Stanley Sobottka, A Course in Consciousness, http://faculty.virginia.edu/consciousness

Mayr, an adherent of Darwinism, sought to cover up the gaps that Darwinism never could by means of claiming mutation. Yet the scientific impossibility of this can still be seen in his own admissions.

Mendel, Gregor

In 1865, following the publication of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, the Austrian botanist and monk Gregor Mendel published his laws of inheritance, the result of long experiments and observations. (*See **The*** **Laws of Inheritance.**) However, these laws attracted the attention of the scientific world only toward the end of the century. Not until the early 20th century did the entire scientific world accept the accuracy of these laws. This represented a major dilemma for Darwin's theory, which sought to account for the concept of beneficial characteristics, based on Lamarck.

But Mendel opposed not only Lamarck's model of evolution, but also Darwin's model. As stated in an article titled "Mendel's Opposition to Evolution and to Darwin," published in the *Journal of Heredity*, Mendel was against the theory of evolution. Darwin suggested that all life had evolved from a common ancestor, while Mendel believed in creation.[39]

Menton, David

David Menton, a professor of anatomy from Washington University, gave a lecture at the 2nd international conference titled "The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution: The Fact of Creation," held by the Science Research Foundation on 5 July, 1998, in which he discussed the anatomical differences between bird feathers and reptile scales. He revealed the invalidity of the thesis that birds evolved from reptiles, and summarized the facts:

I have been investigating the anatomies of the living creatures since 30 years. The only fact I met during my researches is the flawless creation of God.[40]

Metamorphosis

Frogs are hatched in water, where they live for a while as tadpoles. They then emerge onto land, after growing limbs and losing their tails, in a process known as *metamorphosis*. Some people regard metamorphosis as evidence of evolution, but the fact is that metamorphosis has nothing whatsoever to do with evolution.

The only developmental mechanism that the theory of evolution proposes is mutations. Metamorphosis, however, does not take place through such chance events, but these changes are already programmed in the frog's genetic data. In other words, when a tadpole is first hatched, it is already determined that it will eventually undergo a process of change and come into possession of a frog's body suited to life on land.

Recent research has shown that metamorphosis is a very complex process controlled by different genes. In this process, for example, during the disappearance of the tail alone, "more than a dozen genes increase their activity," according to the journal *Science News*.[41]

Evolutionist claims of a "transition from water to land run along the lines that fish with the genetic data for total life in water evolved by chance into terrestrial amphibians as a result of random mutations. For that reason, metamorphosis represents evidence that actually *undermines* evolution, rather than supporting it. The slightest error in the process of metamorphosis will leave an animal crippled or dead, so there can be no question of a random change. Metamorphosis must be completed in a flawless manner.

It is impossible to maintain that such a complex process, one that allows no margin of error, emerged through random mutations, as the evolution theory claims.

Micro-Evolution Myth, *The*

Evolutionists seek to account for differentiation within species—in other words, the emergence of variations—by means of an imaginary mechanism they refer to as micro-evolution. By accumulating over a long period of time, they maintain that small changes can give rise to macro-evolution, in other words the emergence of an entirely new species. (*See **The*** **Macro-Evolution Myth**) In fact, however, there is nothing to do with evolution here. Variation within species occurs with the emergence of individuals with new and different physical characteristics as a result of different combinations of existing genes, through cross-breeding of individuals. However, no new gene is ever added to the gene pool here. All that happens is that genes combine in offspring in new combinations. Since the number and variety of genes in a given species is fixed, there is a limit to the number of combinations that these can give rise to. In addition, variation within a species never produces any new species. For example, no matter how many dogs of different breeds mate together in different combinations, the results will always be dogs, never horses or ferrets. This fixed biological law has been proven through experiment and observation.

Interestingly, Darwin constructed the backbone of his theory on variations he imagined to be micro-evolution. But the advances in biology that gradually undermined Darwin's claims also revealed that the variations he thought accounted for the origin of new species actually bore no such meaning.

For that reason, evolutionist biologists needed to distinguish between variations within a species and the formation of a whole new species, and present these as two distinct concepts.

---

[41] "A surprising tale of a frog's tail— research into a tadpole's metamorphosis into a frog," *Science News*, July 17, 1999, p. 43.

By using the concept of micro-evolution, evolutionists seek to give the deceptive impression that variations can eventually, gradually give rise to brand new species, families, and orders. Indeed, many people with not much knowledge of the subject become taken in by the superficial idea that when micro-evolution occurs over a long period of time, the result is macro-evolution.

One often encounters examples of this thinking. Some amateur evolutionists suggest that since human beings' average height has increased by 2 centimeters (0.78 of an inch) over a century, so all kinds of major evolutionary changes may take place over millions of years.

The fact is, though, that all variations such as a change in average height take place within specific genetic limits, and these biological variations entirely unrelated to evolution.

In fact, present-day evolutionist authorities admit that the variations they refer to as micro-evolution cannot create new genetic information and thus, cannot give rise to macro-evolution. The evolutionist biologists Scott Gilbert, John Opitz and Rudolf Raff describe this position in a 1996 article published in the journal *Developmental Biology*:

The Modern Synthesis [the neo-Darwinist theory] is a remarkable achievement. However, starting in the 1970s, many biologists began questioning its adequacy in explaining evolution. Genetics might be adequate for explaining microevolution, but microevolutionary changes in gene frequency were not seen as able to turn a reptile into a mammal or to convert a fish into an amphibian. Microevolution looks at adaptations that concern only the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fittest. As Goodwin (1995) points out, "the origin of species—Darwin's problem—remains unsolved." [42]

The variations that Darwinism has regarded for a century or so as proof of evolution actually have nothing to do with the origin of species. Horses may be crossbred in different combinations for millions of years and different strains of horse may be obtained. Yet horses will never turn into another species of mammal, such as giraffes or elephants. The different chaffinches that Darwin saw on the Galapagos Islands are, in the same way, examples of the variation that constitutes no evidence for evolution. Therefore, the origin of species will remain a question that can never be answered in terms of evolution.

Miller Experiment, *The*

Research into the origin of life to which evolutionists attach the greatest esteem is the Miller experiment, carried out by the American researcher Stanley Miller in 1953. (The experiment is also known as the **Urey-Miller Experiment**, due to the contribution made by Miller's Chicago University supervisor Harold Urey.)

Miller's aim was to establish an experimental environment to show that amino acids, the building blocks of proteins, could have formed by chance in the lifeless world of billions of years ago.

In his experiment, Miller used a combination of gasses that he assumed had existed in the Earth's primordial atmosphere (but which were later determined not to have existed in it), such as ammonia, methane, hydrogen and water vapor. Since under normal conditions, these gasses would not enter into reactions with one another, he added energy from the outside. The energy—which he thought might have stemmed from lightning in the primitive atmosphere—he provided by means of an artificial electrical charge.

Miller heated this mixture of gasses at 100°C for a week, while also providing an electrical current. At the end of the week, Miller measured the chemicals in the mixture at the bottom of the

jar and observed that he had synthesized three of the 20 amino acids constituting the building blocks of proteins.

The result of the experiment caused great joy among evolutionists and was announced as a great success. Indeed, some publications went so far as to produce headlines reading "Miller Creates Life." Yet all that he had actually synthesized was a few inanimate molecules.

With the courage they took from this experiment, evolutionists immediately produced new scenarios. There was immediate speculation about the stages that must have taken place after the amino acids' formation. According to the scenario, these came together in the appropriate order as the result of chance, and gave rise to proteins. Some of these proteins, the work of still more random coincidences, installed themselves inside structures resembling cell membranes—which also came into being in some way, and thus gave rise to the cell. Cells gradually lined up alongside one another and gave rise to living organisms.

The Miller experiment—the basis for this scenario, not one single stage of which is backed up by any evidence at all—was nothing more than a deception, whose invalidity in all regards was subsequently proven.

The experiment performed by Miller to prove that amino acids could give rise to living organisms under the conditions of the primordial Earth is invalid in several regards:

1. Miller used a mechanism known as the cold trap to isolate amino acids at the moment they formed. Otherwise, the very conditions in which the amino acids formed would have immediately destroyed them.

However, there was no such conscious arrangement in the primordial world atmosphere. Even if any amino acid had formed in the absence of any mechanism, that molecule would have been broken down under the conditions at the time. As the chemist Richard Bliss has stated, "Without this cold trap, the chemical products would be destroyed by the [experiment's] energy source (electrical sparking)."[43]

In fact, Miller had failed to obtain even a single amino acid in earlier experiments in which he did not use a cold trap.

2. The primordial atmosphere that Miller attempted to replicate in his experiment was not realistic. In 1982, scientists agreed that instead of methane and ammonia in the primitive atmosphere, there must have been nitrogen and carbon dioxide. Indeed, after a long silence, Miller himself admitted that the primitive atmosphere model he'd used was not realistic.[44]

The American scientists J.P. Ferris and C.T. Chen repeated Miller's experiment, using a mixture of carbon dioxide, hydrogen, nitrogen and water vapor, but failed to obtain even a single amino acid molecule.[45]

3. Another important point invalidates the Miller experiment: At the time when the amino acids were suggested to have formed, there was so much oxygen in the atmosphere that it would have destroyed any amino acids present. This important fact that Miller ignored was determined by means of uranium and oxidized iron deposits in rocks estimated to be around 3 billion years old.[46]

Other findings later emerged to show that the level of oxygen in that period was far higher than that claimed by evolutionists. And research showed that the level of ultraviolet rays reaching the Earth's surface was 10,000 times higher than evolutionists' estimates. That intense level would inevitably have given rise to oxygen by breaking down atmospheric water vapor and carbon dioxide.

This completely discredited the Miller experiment, which was carried out without considering oxygen. Had oxygen been used in the experiment, then the methane would have transformed into carbon dioxide and water, and the ammonia into nitrogen and water. On the other hand, in an

atmosphere with no oxygen—since no ozone layer had yet formed—the amino acids would have been directly exposed to ultraviolet rays and been immediately broken down. At the end of the day, the presence or absence of oxygen in the primordial atmosphere would still make for an environment deadly for amino acids.

4. At the end of the Miller experiment, a large quantity of organic acids also formed whose characteristics were damaging to the structures and functions of living things. In the event that amino acids are not isolated but are left together in the same environment as these chemical substances, they will inevitably react with them and form new compounds.

In addition, at the end of the experiment, a high level of right-handed amino acids also emerged.[47] (*See* **Right-Handed Amino Acids**.) The presence of these amino acids totally undermined the premise of evolution by means of its own logic. Right-handed amino acids are not used in living structures. Finally, the environment in which amino acids emerged in the experiment was not suited to life; but on the contrary, was a mixture that would have broken down and oxidized useful molecules.

All this points to the concrete fact that Miller's experiment —a conscious, controlled laboratory study aimed at synthesizing amino acids—does not prove that life could have emerged by chance under primordial world conditions. The types and levels of the gasses he used were determined at the ideal levels for amino acids to be able to form. The level of energy supplied was carefully regulated, neither too much nor too little, to ensure that the desired reactions would take place.

The experimental apparatus isolated so as not to harbor any element that might be harmful, or prevent the emergence of amino acids. No element, mineral or compound present in the primeval world that might have altered the course of the reactions was included in the experimental apparatus. Oxygen that would hinder the formation of amino acids is just one of these elements. Therefore, in the absence of the cold trap mechanism, even under those ideal laboratory conditions, amino acids could not have survived without being broken down.

With the Miller experiment, evolutionists actually invalidated evolution by their own efforts. Because the experiment demonstrated that amino acids could be obtained only in specially arranged laboratory conditions and with conscious intervention. In other words, the force giving rise to life is *creation*, not random coincidences.

The reason why evolutionists refuse to accept this stems from their preconceptions. Harold Urey, who organized the experiment together with his student Stanley Miller, made this admission:

All of us who study the origin of life find that the more we look into it, the more we feel it is too complex to have evolved anywhere. We all believe as an article of faith that life evolved from dead matter on this planet. It is just that its complexity is so great, it is hard for us to imagine that it did.[48]

This experiment is the sole proof that supposedly verifies the molecular evolution suggested as the first stage of the evolutionary process. Although half a century has gone by since, and great technological advances have been made, no new progress has been made on the subject. The Miller experiment is still taught in schoolbooks as an explanation of the first emergence of life. Evolutionists, aware that such endeavors will refute their claims rather than supporting them, carefully avoid embarking on any other such experiments.

Miller, Stanley

An American researcher, who attempted to synthesize amino acids—the fundamental building blocks of life—in a laboratory environment together with his supervisor, Harold Urey, at Chicago University in 1953. However, during the experiment, he distorted the primitive atmosphere hypothesized by evolutionists. This experiment, known as the Urey-Miller experiment, proved, contrary to what had been hoped, that life could not possibly come into existence spontaneously. (*See **The*** **Miller Experiment.**)

Missing Link in the Evolutionary Chain, *The* —*See* Evolutionary Gaps

"Mitochondrial Eve" Thesis's Inconsistencies, *The*

Popular scientific terminology is often used to apply an authoritative veneer to evolution. Evolutionists make use of "DNA" in just this way.

In addition to being present in the nucleus, DNA is also found in mitochondria, energy-production organelles in the cell. The DNA in the nucleus forms as a result of the combination of DNA from the mother and father, but the mother is the sole source of the mitochondrial DNA. Every human being's mitochondrial DNA is therefore identical to his or her mother's, and therefore, the origin of man can be researched by following this trail.

The "mitochondrial Eve" thesis distorts this fact by interpreting it according to the dogmas of the theory of evolution. A few evolutionist scientists have regarded the mitochondrial DNA of the first humanoid as the DNA of chimpanzees, by viewing as indisputable scientific fact the claim that the chimpanzee is man's ancestor. Over hundreds of thousands of years, according to this claim, random mutations turned chimpanzee DNA into our present mitochondrial DNA. Starting from that preconception, they then attempted to determine where and when the present evolutionary family tree began.

The Berkeley University biochemists Wilson, Cann and Stoneking, who first proposed the theory, set out with fundamental assumptions that were impossible to prove:

1. The origin of mitochondrial DNA lies in hominids, in other words ape-like creatures.
2. Mutations must have caused regular changes in mitochondrial DNA.
3. These mutations must have taken place constantly and at a fixed rate.

Taking these assumptions as their basis, the researchers believed that they could obtain a molecular clock to show how quickly a species changed within the alleged process of evolution. In fact, the writers of the computer program to calculate that clock directed their research towards the result they wished to achieve.

The assumptions they worked on were claims whose existence could not be proven, of which no examples had ever been obtained by experiment or observation. Mutations, caused by degeneration of DNA, have only been observed to cause deformity and death in living structures. Mutations can never impart progress by raising a living thing to a higher level. (*See* **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism**.)

The evolutionist researchers developed a computer program that they hoped would camouflage their prejudices. They created their program on the basis of evolution, following the most direct and effective path. This, however, is an imaginary picture that conflicts with even the basic assumptions of the theory of evolution.

Many scientists who supported the theory of evolution agreed that this thesis had no scientific value. Henry Gee, a member of *Nature* magazine's editorial board, described the results of the

MtDNA (mitochondrial DNA) study as garbage[49] in an article titled "Statistical Cloud over African Eden." In his article, Gee stated that when the current 136 MtDNA series were considered, the number of family trees exceeded 1 billion! In other words, in this study, these 1 billion chance family trees were ignored, and only that one tree compatible with the hypothesis of evolution between chimpanzees and human beings was selected.

Alan Templeton, the well-known Washington University biologist, stated that it was impossible to set out any date for the origin of man based on DNA series, because DNA was highly mixed up, even in present human societies.[50]

Considered in mathematical terms, it means that it is impossible to determine mtDNA as belonging to a single human being in the family tree.

The most significant admission came from the authors of the thesis themselves. Mark Stoneking, from the team that repeated the study in 1992, said in a letter to *Science* magazine that the "African Eve" thesis was untenable,[51] because it was clear that in all respects, the study had been aimed towards the desired result.

The mitochondrial DNA thesis was developed on the basis of mutations in DNA. But when the evolutionists looked at human DNA, it was unclear how they decided which DNA rungs had formed as the result of mutation, and which were original and unchanged. They had to start work from the original human DNA they claim must have existed. Yet the evolutionist deception here is crystal-clear: They assumed chimpanzee DNA as their basis.[52]

To put it another way, in a study looking for evidence that chimpanzee DNA turned into human DNA, the chimpanzee is taken as the starting point as the original prehistoric human. Right from the outset, the study is carried out on the assumption that evolution took place, and the result obtained is then depicted as proof of evolution. In these circumstances, the study is far from being scientific.

In addition, if an evolutionist researcher is to employ regular, useful mutations that he claims occurred in DNA in calculating the molecular clock, then he must also calculate the speed of these mutations. Yet there is not the slightest indication, in either the nucleus of the mitochondria, to show the frequency with which DNA was subjected to mutation.

In terms of its own logic, this thesis actually shows that once again, there has been an attempt to use evolution as evidence for evolution. Seeking evidence for evolution in DNA is biased research, based on the assumption that evolution took place in any case.

Why do evolutionists feel the need to pull the wool over people's eyes in this way? The answer is clear: Because there is no scientific evidence to support evolution.

Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution Myth, *The*

To the question of "What is the source of the beneficial changes that cause living things to develop?" scientists meeting at the American Geological Association gave the answer, "Random mutations." Darwin had given the same answer by adopting the concept of mutation, based on Lamarck. But with adding the concept of mutation to Darwin's natural selection, the new theory that emerged was given the name of the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution.

This new theory soon became known as neo-Darwinism and its proponents as neo-Darwinists. (*See* **Neo-Darwinism Comedy, *The***.)

Modifications

Modifications are differences in living things that are not inherited, but occur within limited bounds under the influence of external factors. Reproduction between members of the same animal or plant species will not give rise to other identical individuals. The differences between them that are not hereditary are known as *modifications*—differences that all biological entities exhibit due to external factors, but which still remain within specific boundaries.

Though identical twins have exactly the same hereditary material, they never resemble one another completely, because it is impossible for environmental conditions to affect them both to exactly the same degree. The external factors leading to modification in living things include food, temperature, moisture and mechanical effects. But since any impact exists in the body only and not the DNA, it remains limited to the individual in question and cannot be transmitted to offspring.

Darwin had claimed that living things could turn into other living things under the effect of environmental conditions, but Mendel proved experimentally that environmental influences could not change living species and showed that heredity took place only within specific bounds. Darwin's ideas remained a theory based on speculation, rather than on experimental evidence. But Mendel's laws of heredity which is the result of a long and patient study and based on experiment and observation, went down in the history of science. Although they were roughly contemporaries, Mendel's genetic studies were accepted by the scientific world only 35 years after Darwin. That was because the science of genetics, for which Mendel laid the groundwork, totally undermined the assumptions of Darwinism, but for a long time evolutionists refused to admit this.

However, scientific progress, obliged them to accept Mendel's findings, and they came to see making minor modifications to their theories as the only way of overcoming this. (See ***The* Neo-Darwinism Comedy**.)

Molecular Evolution Impasse, *The*

According to the theory of evolution, gas molecules such as water vapor, hydrogen, methane and ammonia that represented the atmosphere on the primordial world were combined out by ultraviolet rays from the Sun, electricity from lightning, radiation from radioactive rocks and thermal energy from volcanoes. According to this non scientific scenario, the atoms that then emerged in new sequences combined together and produced the building blocks that would form the first cell.

These compounds were later transported to lakes and seas by rain. Organic compounds thus combined together and the waters of the Earth gradually grew richer in terms of these substances. The amino acids and other organic substances in this mixture then combined to produce proteins, carbohydrate chains and other increasingly complex organic substances. Because of their tendency to grow, the first large bodies that developed tried to absorb new molecules from around them. Thus bodies with more complex structures and organization, and capable of growing and multiplying, gradually emerged.

Although there is no consensus among evolutionists at this point, according to what most of them maintain, nucleic acids that also came into being outside, by chance, settled inside these bodies, known as *coacervates*. And when the coacervates' organizational level had risen sufficiently, they turned into the first living cells.

In the above scenario, evolutionists admit of no conscious intervention in the formation of life from inanimate substances, and claim that everything happened as the result of blind coincidences. They point to the Miller experiment as the first step in the chance emergence of life from inorganic materials. Today, however, it is recognized that the Miller experiment's assumptions regarding the chemical make-up of the early atmosphere were incorrect, and Miller himself admitted as much.

Despite all evolutionist efforts, it is clear that the theory of evolution has no scientific support, neither on the molecular level nor in any other area.

Dr. Stephen C. Meyer, from Cambridge University, says that no credibility can be attached to any explanations of the origin of life that are based on chance:

While many outside origin-of-life biology may still invoke "chance" as a causal explanation for the origin of biological information, few serious researchers still do. Since molecular biologists began to appreciate the sequence specificity of proteins and nucleic acids in the 1950s and '60s, many calculations have been made to determine the probability of formulating functional proteins and nucleic acids at random. Even assuming extremely favorable prebiotic conditions (whether realistic or not) and theoretically maximal reaction rates, such calculations have invariably shown that the probability of obtaining functionally sequenced biomacromolecules at random is, in Prigogine's words, "vanishingly small . . . even on the scale of . . . billions of years. [53]

Thus the theory of evolution, which seeks to account for the origin of life in terms of chance, collapses at the very outset. Science clearly reveals that since chance cannot represent the origin of life, life must have been flawlessly created. Not only the first life form, but all the different life forms on Earth have been created separately. Indeed, the fossil record confirms this, showing that all the life forms on Earth emerged suddenly and with their own particular characteristics, and that they never underwent evolution.

Comparisons carried out at the molecular level show that living things did not evolve from one another, but were created independently. A great many other scientific facts besides the fossil record, the complex structures and systems in living things, and the lack of any evolutionary mechanism have in any case long since demolished the theory of evolution's claims.

Nonsensical Nature of the Molecular Homology Thesis, *The*

Evolutionists point to different living things having similar DNA codes or protein structures and interpret this as evidence that these species evolved from some common ancestor. For instance, evolutionist sources often say that there is a great similarity between the DNA of humans and apes, which they offer as evidence of an evolutionary link between the two. (*See* ***The*** **Ape-Human Genetic Similarity Lie**.)

First off, it's only to be expected that living things on Earth should have DNA structures similar to one another. Their basic vital functions are the same, and since they all—humans included—have physical bodies, one cannot expect human beings to have a DNA structure totally different from other living things. Like other organisms, our bodies develop by consuming proteins, blood flows through their bodies, and we produce energy at every moment by using of oxygen.

Therefore, the fact that living things are genetically similar cannot be used to argue that they evolved from a common ancestor. If evolutionists wish to verify the theory of evolution from a common ancestor, they have to demonstrate a line of descent on the molecular level. Yet evolutionists have no such concrete finding.

In fact, when the data obtained as a result of the analysis of DNA and chromosomes belonging to various species and classes are compared, it clearly emerges that any similarities or differences are incompatible with any evolutionary logic or link. According to the evolutionist thesis, there must be a gradual increase in species' complexity, and so is also to be expected that the number of chromosomes establishing this genetic information will gradually increase. However, the data actually obtained show that this is a mere fantasy.

For example, although a tomato has 24 chromosomes, the copepod crab—an organism with far more complex systems—has only six. The single-celled creature *Euglena* has 45 chromosomes, compared to the alligator, which has only 32. In addition, *Radiolaria*, microscopic organisms, have more than 800 chromosomes.

Theodosius Dobzhansky, a famous evolutionary theoretician, says that this unregulated relationship between living things and their DNAs is a major problem that evolution cannot explain:

More complex organisms generally have more DNA per cell than do simpler ones, but this rule has conspicuous exceptions. Man is nowhere near the top of the list, being exceeded by *Amphiuma* (an amphibian), *Protopterus* (a lungfish), and even ordinary frogs and toads. Why this should be so has long been a puzzle. [54]

Again according to the evolutionist homology thesis, the number of chromosomes should be expected to increase as living things grow—and to decrease as the organism becomes smaller. The fact is, however, that living things of very different sizes and with very different structures, between which no evolutionary relationship can possibly be claimed, having the same number of chromosomes totally undermines the superficial evolutionist logic built on chromosome similarities between organisms.

To give some examples: both oak trees and Macaques monkeys have 42 chromosomes. The deer mouse has 48 chromosomes, the same number as the gorilla, which is many times larger. Another interesting example is that of the gypsy moth and the donkey, both of which have 62 chromosomes.

Other comparisons at the molecular level also offer examples that make evolutionist interpretations quite meaningless. The more protein strings are analyzed in laboratories, the more unexpected and even astonishing results emerge. For instance, while the human cytochrome-C protein differs from that of a horse by 14 amino acids, it differs from that of a kangaroo by only eight. Analysis of cytochrome-C has shown that tortoises are much closer to human beings than they are to rattlesnakes, even though both are members of the reptile family.

Interpreted from the evolutionist perspective, this produces utterly meaningless results that not even evolutionists can accept, such as tortoises being more closely related to human beings than to snakes.

The difference of 21 amino acids between tortoises and rattlesnakes, which are both members of the reptile class, is significantly greater than that between representatives of very different classes. The above difference, for example, is greater than the difference of 17 amino acids between chickens and eels, the difference of 16 amino acids between horses and sharks, or even the difference of 15 amino acid between dogs and worm flies, which are members of two totally different phyla.

A similar state of affairs also applies to hemoglobin. The sequence of this protein in human beings differs from that in lemurs by 20 amino acids and from that in pigs by only 14. The position is more or less the same for other proteins.[55]

Evolutionists should therefore conclude that in evolutionary terms, a human being is closer to the kangaroo than the horse or to the pig than the lemur.

Dr. Christian Schwabe is a professor at department of biochemistry at Medical University of South Carolina and a scientist who has devoted many years to seeking evidence of evolution in the molecular sphere. In particular, he has carried out studies on the proteins insulin and relaxin in an attempt to construct evolutionary relationships between living things. Several times, however, he has been forced to admit that he hasn’t been able to obtain any evidence for evolution at any point. In one article in *Science* magazine, he writes:

Molecular evolution is about to be accepted as a method superior to paleontology for the discovery of evolutionary relationships. As a molecular evolutionist, I should be elated. Instead, it seems disconcerting that many exceptions exist to the orderly progression of species as determined by molecular homologies: so many in fact, that I think the exception, the quirks, may carry the more important message. [56]

Schwabe's research into relaxin produced most interesting results:

Against this background of high variability between relaxins from purportedly closely related species, the relaxins of pig and whale are all but identical. The molecules derived from rats, guinea-pigs, man and pigs are as distant from each other (approximately 55%) . . . Insulin, however, brings man and pig phylogenetically closer together than chimpanzee and man. [57]

Schwabe states that his comparison of lysozymes, cytochromes and many hormones and amino acid strings revealed unexpected results and abnormalities from the evolutionary point of view. Based on all this evidence, Schwabe maintains that all proteins possess their same, initial structures, without having undergone any evolution—and that, just as with fossils, no intermediate form among molecules has ever been found.

Michael Denton bases this comment on results obtained from the field of molecular biology:

Each class at a molecular level is unique, isolated and unlinked by intermediates. Thus molecules, like fossils have failed to provide the elusive intermediates so long sought by evolutionary biology.[58]

In short, the homological hypothesis that looks for anatomical or chemical similarities in living things and attempts to portray them as evidence for evolution has been invalidated by the scientific facts.

Morphology

This is the branch of science that studies the shape and structure of organisms as a whole. With plants, it investigates the structures and common organization of the root, stem, leaves and fruits; and with animals and human beings, compares and analyzes their physical structure.[59]

Sub-branches of morphology include *anatomy*, the study of the visible internal and external structures of organisms; *histology*, the study of the microscopic structure of the tissues that make up organs; *cytology*, the study of the microscopic structure of the cells that make up tissues; and *embryology*, the study of all the phases between the fertilized egg (zygote) and the emergence of an independent organism.[60]

Comparisons between the homologous or analogous organs of living things are performed on the basis of findings obtained from morphology. (*See* **Homologous Organs**; **Analogous Organs**.) All living things with similar morphologies are regarded as *homologous* in order to construct a supposed evolutionary relationship between them. However, there is no scientific basis for this. Indeed, there are many examples of species that resemble each other very closely, but between which no so-called evolutionary relationship can be constructed—and this represents a major inconsistency from the point of view of evolutionist claims.

The Morphological Homology Myth—*See* Homology

Morris, John

Professor John Morris is the director of the Institute for Creation Research and a well-known geologist. At the second international conference held by the Science Research Foundation on 5 July 1998, titled "The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution: The Fact of Creation," he described the

ideological and philosophical conditions behind evolution, the way this theory became a dogma, and how its proponents believe in Darwinism as if it were a religion.[61]

Mosaic Creatures

Using one-sided interpretations, evolutionists sometimes present living things as actually constituting intermediate forms. However, the fact that a species has features belonging to another living group does not make it an intermediate form.

For example, the Australian duck-billed platypus is a mammal, but lays eggs, just like reptiles. In addition, it has a beak just like a bird. However, its fur, milk glands and inner ear structure define it as a mammal. Scientists therefore refer to the platypus as a *mosaic* creature.

Such prominent evolutionist paleontologists as Stephen J. Gould and Niles Eldredge admit that mosaic creatures cannot be regarded as intermediate forms.[62]

With its exceedingly specialized structures, the platypus also refutes this claim. (*See* **Platypus, *The***.)

Mother Nature; An Irrational Concept

The intellectual movement that influenced Darwin—and encouraged him to look for an explanation for the living things he encountered other than one based on creation—was naturalism, one of the main philosophies of the 19th century's atheistic climate. Naturalism was a movement that recognized no other reality than nature and the world perceived by the five senses. According to this perverted view, nature was its own creator and ruler. Concepts such as *Mother Nature* or clichéd expressions such as "Nature gave humans this ability," or "Nature created this creature in this way" result from preconceptions placed in the mind of society by naturalism.

Evolutionists say that Mother Nature gave living things the features they possess. But nature consists of such familiar components as stone, soil, trees, and plants. It is impossible for these natural elements to perform conscious, intelligent actions or to program living things, because everything we see in nature has been created and therefore, cannot be their creator.

Since living things do not create the superior characteristics they possess through their own intelligence. Since they are born with these attributes, then there must be a creator who endows them with these features and who impels them to display such behavior. Almighty Allah is our Creator.

Mutagenic Factors

Breaks and shifts in the genetic data in living things are described as mutation. These affect and damage the DNA in the cell nucleus. Every cause giving rise to mutation—generally, some form of chemical effects or particle emissions—is known as a *mutagenic factor*.

Substances such as mustard gas and nitric acid may be given as examples of chemical mutagenic factors. X-rays or the radiation leaking from a nuclear power station are examples of radioactive mutagenic effects. Particles emitted from a radioactive element can cause damage to DNA. When high-energy particles strike DNA bases, they alter their structure, and usually cause changes of such dimensions that the cell cannot repair them. (*See* **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism**.)

Mutant

Mutant is the name given to any living thing, cell or gene that has undergone obvious changes in its DNA. Mutations are breaks and shifts that occur as a result of physical (for example, radiation) or chemical effects in the DNA molecule, found in the cell nucleus that carries genetic data.

Mutations damage the nucleotides that make up DNA. The components making up genetic information are either detached from their locations, damaged or else transported to different sites in the DNA. They cause damage and other changes that are usually too severe for the cell to repair. Cells or living things subjected to such mutations—99% of which are harmful and the other 1% neutral or silent— are known as mutants. (*See* **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism**)

Although mutations have clearly destructive effects, evolutionists regard random mutations occurring in living things' genetic structures as the source of the positive evolutionary changes that they assume took place. Yet mutations can never bestow a new organ or new characteristic on a living thing by adding new information to its DNA. They merely cause abnormalities, such as (on a fruit fly) a leg emerging from the back of the insect.

Can new information emerge as the result of mutations? Professor Werner Gitt responds to the question:

This idea is central in representations of evolution, but mutations can only cause changes in existing information. There can be no increase in information, and in general the results are injurious. New blueprints for new functions or new organs cannot arise; mutations cannot be the source of new (creative) information. [63]

Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism

Mutations are breaks and shifts that occur as a result of radioactive or chemical damage to the DNA molecule that carries genetic data. Mutations damage the nucleotides that make up DNA, or else cause them to change places, causing changes that are usually too severe for the cell to repair.

Therefore, contrary to what many people imagine, the mutations that evolutionists depend on are not, magic wands that lead living things to progress and perfection. Mutations' net effects are harmful. The only changes brought about by mutations are of the kind suffered by the offspring born to inhabitants of Hiroshima, Nagasaki or Chernobyl; in other words, death or deformity.

The reason for this is elementary: Any random impact on the very complex structure of the DNA molecule can only harm it.

The American geneticist B.G. Ranganathan explains:

First, genuine mutations are very rare in nature. Secondly, most mutations are harmful since they are random, rather than orderly changes in the structure of genes; any random change in a highly ordered system will be for the worse, not for the better. For 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. [64]

No examples of beneficial mutations have ever been observed. The evolutionist scientist Warren Weaver said the following about a report prepared by the Committee on Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation, set up to examine the mutations arising as a result of nuclear weapons in the wake of the Second World War:

Many will be puzzled about the statement that practically all known mutant genes are harmful. For mutations are a necessary part of the process of evolution. How can a good effect — evolution to higher forms of life — result from mutations, practically all of which are harmful? [65]

All the mutations observed in human beings are harmful. Medical textbooks describe physical or mental defects such as mongolism, Down Syndrome, albinism, dwarfism and sickle cell anemia, or diseases such as cancer as examples of mutation. A process that cripples or sickens cannot, of course, be any evolutionary mechanism.

In a scientific paper, David Demick, an American pathologist, wrote this to say about mutations:

Literally thousands of human diseases associated with genetic mutations have been catalogued in recent years, with more being described continually. A recent reference book of medical genetics listed some 4,500 different genetic diseases. Some of the inherited syndromes characterized clinically in the days before molecular genetic analysis (such as Marfan's syndrome) are now being shown to be heterogeneous; that is, associated with many different mutations.

With this array of human diseases that are caused by mutations, what of positive effects? With thousands of examples of harmful mutations readily available, surely it should be possible to describe some positive mutations if macroevolution is true. These would be needed not only for evolution to greater complexity, but also to offset the downward pull of the many harmful mutations. But, when it comes to identifying positive mutations, evolutionary scientists are strangely silent. [66]

The reasons why mutations cannot support evolutionist claims may be summarized under three main headings:

1. *Mutations are always harmful.* Since they occur at random, they always damage living things. Logically, any unconscious intervention in a perfect and complex structure will damage it, rather than causing it to develop. Indeed, no useful mutations have ever been observed.

2. *No information can be added to DNA as a result of mutation*. The components of the genetic information are removed and dismantled, damaged or carried to other locations in the DNA. Yet mutations can never cause a living thing to acquire a new organ or attribute.

3. For a mutation to be transmitted to a subsequent generation, it must take place in the reproductive germ cells. No change arising in any other cell of the body can be passed along to later generations. For example, an embryo's eye may depart from its original form by being subjected to radiation and other similar effects, but this mutation will not manifest itself in subsequent generations.

N

Narrow Population

One of the views held by the proponents of punctuated evolution is the concept of *narrow populations*. This postulates that new species form in communities consisting of very small numbers of animals or plants. According to this claim, populations containing large numbers of animals exhibit no evolutionary development, but remain in a state of *stasis*. However, small groups that separate from this population and become isolated (generally because of geographical conditions), will reproduce solely among themselves. Macro-mutations then occur in these groups and rapid *speciation* takes place.

Proponents of punctuated equilibrium insist on the concept of narrow populations simply because they cannot account for the lack of any evidence in the fossil records. That is why they imagine that evolutionary changes took place very rapidly and in narrow populations, for which reason no fossil traces have been left behind.

In recent years, however, scientific experiments and observations have revealed that narrow populations are a disadvantage rather than an advantage. Rather than developing and giving rise to new species, narrow populations actually cause severe genetic impairments, since individuals must constantly reproduce within a restricted gene pool. As result, normally *heterozygotic* individuals become increasingly *homozygotic*. Impaired or defective genes, normally recessive become dominant, and the population suffers increasing genetic diseases.[67]

In order to investigate this, one study on chickens was conducted over 35 years. Chickens kept in a narrow population were seen to become genetically weakened. Egg production fell from 100% to 80%, and reproduction levels from 93% to 74%.

However, this genetic regression was halted through conscious human intervention. When chickens were brought in from other regions and the augmented chicken population reassumed normal trends.[68]

This and similar findings show that the claim of punctuated evolution—that narrow populations are the source of evolutionary development—has no scientific validity. (*See* **The Punctuated Evolution Model**.)

Naturalism

In general terms, naturalism is a philosophy that recognizes no other reality aside from nature and the world perceived by the five senses. Naturalism, one of the most significant products of the 19th century atheistic atmosphere, influenced Darwin and drove him to offer an atheistic explanation for life. According to this way of thinking, nature itself was regarded as its own creator and arbiter. Concepts such as Mother Nature or clichés such as "Nature gave some people superior abilities; nature made humans what they are," are still widely employed today, but are the result of preconceptions imposed by naturalism.

Naturalists were great admirers of the perfection in the physical world, yet found it difficult to give a satisfactory answer to how this came into being. Since they adopted positivist dogma, and

---

[67] Michael E. Soulé, L. Scott Mills , "No need to isolate genetics," *Science* 282: 1998, p. 1658.
[68] Wetermeirer, R.L., J.D. Brawn, S.A. Simpson, T.L. Esker, R.W. Jansen, J.W. Walk, E.L. Kershner, J.L. Bouzat, and K.N. Paige, "Tracking the long-term decline and recovery of an isolated population," *Science* 282, 1998, p. 1695.

believed only in concepts whose existence could be established by means of experiment and observation, they fiercely rejected the fact that nature was created by Allah. In their view, nature created itself.

Darwin's theory served naturalist/materialist philosophy, or to be more accurate, the atheism that underlay it. It therefore received support and was imposed on society as if it were a major scientific truth. Otherwise, it would have been regarded as the speculation of an amateur biologist and quickly forgotten.

Natural Selection

Natural selection is based on the hypothesis that there is a constant struggle for survival among species and those living things that are strongest and best adapted to natural conditions survive that struggle and live to propagate themselves. For example, in a herd of deer, those animals that are naturally able to run fast will escape predators and survive. Naturally, this herd will soon consist of deer that are all able to run quickly.

But note that no matter how long this predator pressure lasts, the deer will never turn into any other species. Weak deer are eliminated and the fittest survive; but no "evolution" of species takes place, because there is no change in the deer's genetic information. No matter how much herds of deer are subjected to natural selection, they will still remain deer.

This example applies to all other species. Deformed or weak individuals in a population, or those unfitted to environmental conditions are eliminated by way of natural selection. But no new species, genetic information or organs will emerge as a result. In other words, living things cannot evolve by way of natural selection.

Darwin admitted as much when he wrote, "Natural selection can do nothing until favourable individual differences or variations occur."[69]

Natural selection was a natural phenomenon known to biologists before Darwin, but described as a mechanism that enables species to remain stable without being impaired. It was Darwin who first claimed that this process was an evolutionary force and thus constructed his whole theory on that basis. The name he gave his book—*The Origin of Species, By Way of Natural Selection*—shows that natural selection represented the foundation of Darwin's theory.

Stephen Jay Gould, one of the best-known contemporary evolutionists, says this about Darwinism's grave error:

The essence of Darwinism lies in a single phrase: natural selection is the creative force of evolutionary change. No one denies that selection will play a negative role in eliminating the unfit. Darwinian theories require that it create the fit as well. [70]

In an article published in *American Scientist* magazine, the evolutionist C. Loring Brace describes how Darwinism has been refuted by scientific discoveries and states that we cannot regard natural selection as an evolutionary mechanism:

Readers of American Scientist may not realize the extent to which a major part of the field of biology and almost all of paleontology has rejected Darwin's insights concerning organic evolution. Natural selection is dismissed as contributing nothing more than "fine-tuning," and adaptation is largely ignored in practice. [71]

Neanderthals: A Human Race

The Neanderthals emerged suddenly in Europe around 300,000 years ago, and disappeared, or else were assimilated by mixing with other human races, silently and just as quickly about 35,000

years ago. The only difference between them and present-day humans is that their skeletons are rather sturdier and their brain volumes slightly larger. Neanderthals were a well-built human race, as is now agreed by just about everyone.

Evolutionists, on the other hand, have made great efforts to portray these people as a "primitive" species, although all the facts show Neanderthal Man to be no different to a fairly stocky human walking around today. The New Mexico University paleoanthropologist Erik Trinkaus, regarded as an eminent authority on the subject, writes:

Detailed comparisons of Neanderthal skeletal remains with those of modern humans have shown that there is nothing in Neanderthal anatomy that conclusively indicates locomotor, manipulative, intellectual, or linguistic abilities inferior to those of modern humans. [72]

Therefore, many modern researchers describe Neanderthal Man as a sub-group of modern man and refer to him as *Homo sapiens neandertalensis.* Recent discoveries show that the Neanderthals buried their dead, made various musical instruments and shared a culture as developed as that of modern man, *Homo sapiens sapiens.*

"Nebraska Man" Fraud, *The*

In 1922, Henry Fairfield Osborn, director of the American Museum of Natural History, announced that near Snake Valley in Nebraska, he had found a molar tooth that bore common human and ape features, dating back to the Pliocene Period. Before long, a profound scientific debate on the subject had begun. Some people regarded this tooth as belonging to *Pithecanthropus erectus*, while others said it was closer to being fully human. This fossil was given the popular name of Nebraska Man and the scientific name of: *Hesperopithecus haroldcookii*.

Based on this single tooth, Nebraska Man's skull and body were reconstructed in artists' conceptions. Pictures were even published of Nebraska Man in his natural habitat, together with his wife and children. This whole scenario was spun out from a single tooth. Evolutionists so believed in this hominid made from whole cloth that when a researcher by the name of William Bryan cast doubt upon all these firmly held opinions based on a single tooth, he attracted the most terrible fury.

However, other parts of the skeleton were discovered in 1927. In the light of these remains, this tooth was found to belong neither to an ape nor to a human being, but to an extinct species of American wild boar known as prosthennops. *Science* magazine covered the story under the title "*Hesperopithecus* Apparently Not an Ape Nor a Man." [73]

As a result, all pictures of *Hesperopithecus haroldcookii* were swiftly removed from the literature.

Neo-Darwinism Comedy, *The*

With the genetic laws discovered in the first quarter of the 20th century, Darwin's theory reached a complete impasse. At this, a group of scientists determined to remain loyal to evolution theory came together at a meeting held by the American Geology Association in 1941. After lengthy discussions by geneticists such as G. Ledyard Stebbins and Theodosius Dobzhansky, zoologists such as Ernst Mayr and Julian Huxley, and paleontologists such as George Gaylord Gibson and Glen L. Jepsen, the decision was reached to patch up Darwinism.

To the question of "What is the source of beneficial changes that cause living things to develop?"—which Darwin had been unable to answer, but had sought to resolve based on Lamarck—these people replied, "Random mutations." They advanced a new theory by adding the concept of

mutation to Darwin's thesis of natural selection; which new theory began to be known as neo-Darwinism (or the **Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution**, which see).

The decades that followed saw hopeless attempts to prove neo-Darwinism. Mutations were well known to be breaks, shifts and defects occurring in living organisms' genes as the result of external factors, which give rise to serious damage on practically every occasion. Nevertheless, neo-Darwinists carried out thousands of experiments to try to establish an example of a *useful* mutation —endeavors that invariably ended in fiascos. (*See* **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism**.)

At the same time, neo-Darwinists also sought to prove that the first living organisms could have emerged by chance under the conditions of the primeval Earth—as required by the theory. The same fiascos were experienced in that field, too. All the experiments intended to prove that life emerged by chance ended in failures. Probability calculations showed that not a single protein, the basic building blocks of the cell, could form by chance. As for the cell itself, the smallest living unit, not a single one could be formed even in laboratories with the most highly advanced 20th century technology. Then how could a cell have come about as the result of chance in the primitive, uncontrolled conditions of the primeval world, as evolutionists claimed?

Neo-Darwinist theory was also dealt a fatal blow by the fossil record. In long years of excavations, no intermediate forms—that should, according to neo-Darwinist theory, have demonstrated that primitive species gradually evolved into more advanced ones—were found anywhere. Comparative anatomical studies showed that living things once assumed to have evolved from one another in fact possessed very different anatomical features and could never be one another's forerunners or later descendants.

Neo-Darwinism was not a scientific theory, but rather an ideological dogma. For that reason, evolution's adherents still continue to support the theory in the face of all the evidence against it. In their view, evolution is a belief that can never be abandoned.

O

Octopus's Eye, *The*

Evolutionists maintain that all living things with similar structures and organs share an evolutionary relationship. One of the perfectly clear examples that invalidate this claim, known as *homology*, is the octopus eye. (*See* **Homology**.) According to evolutionists' imaginary tree of life, octopi —being mollusks—are one of the life forms furthest removed from human beings. Although the octopus and man are very different life forms, between which no so called evolutionary relationship can exist, their eyes have exactly the same structure! This is a clear sign that similar structures do not constitute proof of evolution.

Confronted by this situation, evolutionists say that these organs are not *homologous* (that is, descended from a common ancestor) but rather *analogous*—similar, despite the absence of any evolutionary relationship. *See* **Homologous Organs** and **Analogous Organs**.) In their view, for instance, the human eye and the octopus eye are analogous organs.

However, the question of whether a particular organ should be included in the homologous or the analogous category is answered solely according to the preconceptions of the theory of evolution. This in turn shows that there is nothing scientific about the evolutionist claim based on similarities.

All evolutionists seek to do is to interpret the findings they discover against the terms of evolution dogma, which they assume to be true right from the outset. Yet the interpretations they come up with are highly inconsistent. Because sometimes organs they are forced to regard as analogous resemble one another so closely, despite their extraordinarily complex structures, that it is utterly illogical to suggest that such resemblances came about as the result of random mutations. If, as evolutionists claim, the octopus's eye emerged as the result of chance, then the vertebrate eye should have emerged by repeating those exact same coincidences.

The well-known evolutionist Frank Salisbury writes:

Even something as complex as the eye has appeared several times; for example, in the squid, the vertebrates, and the arthropods. It's bad enough accounting for the origin of such things once, but the thought of producing them several times according to the modern synthetic theory makes my head swim. [74]

According to the theory of evolution, completely independent mutations must have produced these life forms twice, by chance! This fact places evolutionists in an even worse dilemma. Extraordinary similarities like these, which conflict with the evolutionist thesis of homology, show that similar organs represent no evidence for having evolved from a common ancestor. Indeed, the exact opposite can be observed in some life forms: Some living things, despite being regarded by evolutionists as very closely related, have some organs that are completely different from one another.

OH 62: A Species of Ape

Evolutionists long suggested that the fossil creature to which they gave the name *Homo habilis* was capable of walking upright. They thus thought that they had found a link between ape and man. However, the new *H. habilis* fossils discovered by Tim White in 1986 and given the name

[74] Frank Salisbury, "Doubts About the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution," *American Biology Teacher*, September 1971, p. 338.

OH 62 demolished that claim. These fossil parts showed that, just like present-day apes, *H. habilis* had long arms and short legs. This fossil put an end to the claim that *H. habilis* was capable of walking upright. It was nothing more than a species of ape.

Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny Theory, *The*

(*See also* ***The,*** **Biogenetic Law** and **Theory of Recapitulation,**)

The evolutionist biologist Ernst Haeckel proposed this theory toward the end of the 19th century. The term *recapitulation* is used to summarize the theory.

Haeckel claimed that during their developmental phases, embryos repeated the evolutionary process that their alleged ancestors had undergone. For example, he maintained that during its development in the mother's womb the human embryo exhibited first fish-like gills and then reptile characteristics before finally "evolving" into a human baby. However, as time passed, it emerged that this scenario was totally imaginary.

Evolutionists also admit this. One article in *American Scientist* read:

Surely the biogenetic law [the recapitulation theory] is as dead as a doornail. It was finally exorcised from biology textbooks in the fifties. As a topic of serious theoretical inquiry it was extinct in the twenties. [75]

To support his theory of recapitulation, Ernst Haeckel produced faked drawings, attempting to portray fish and human embryos as resembling one another. When these frauds were exposed, he had no other defense other than to say that other evolutionists did exactly the same thing:

After this compromising confession of 'forgery' I should be obliged to consider myself condemned and annihilated if I had not the consolation of seeing side by side with me in the prisoner's dock hundreds of fellow-culprits, among them many of the most trusted observers and most esteemed biologists. The great majority of all the diagrams in the best biological textbooks, treatises and journals would incur in the same degree the charge of ''forgery,' for all of them are inexact, and are more or less doctored, schematised and constructed. [76]

Oparin, Alexander I.

The Russian biologist Alexander I. Oparin, founder of the concept of "chemical evolution," could not obtain any findings to shed light on the origins of life, despite all his theoretical research. In his 1936 book *The Origin of Life*, he wrote, "Unfortunately . . . the problem of the origin of the cell is perhaps the most obscure point in the whole study of the evolution of organisms." [77]

Ever since Oparin, evolutionists have carried out countless experiments, studies and observations to prove that the cell could have come into existence by chance. However, every study has undermined evolutionists' assumptions by revealing in ever-greater detail the complex creation in the cell.

Open System

The term "open system" refers to a thermodynamic system with an external energy source, into which matter enters and departs. Since the theory of evolution conflicts with the Second Law of Thermodynamics (the Law of Entropy), evolutionists maintain that this entropy applies only to *closed systems*. They resort to a deception, maintaining that open systems lie outside this law. They suggest, further, that the Earth's biosphere is an open system, being exposed to a constant flow of energy from the Sun; and that therefore, the Law of Entropy does not apply to the Earth, and that ordered, complex living things can indeed emerge from disordered, simple and inanimate structures.

Yet there is a very clear distortion of the facts here, because energy entering a system from outside is not sufficient to make that system into an ordered one. To make that energy capable of being used, special mechanisms are needed. For example, control mechanisms, an engine and transmission systems are needed to harness the energy generated from the fuel in an internal combustion engine. In the absence of such transformation systems, it will be impossible to use that fuel's energy.

The same applies to living things, which receive their energy from the Sun. This solar energy is turned into chemical energy thanks to extraordinarily complex energy-conversion systems such as photosynthesis in plants and the digestive systems in animals and human beings. In the absence of any of these conversion systems, no organism can survive. For a living thing with no energy-conversion system, the Sun will be simply a source of destructive heat and UV radiation.

Therefore, any system without an energy-conversion system be it open or closed, will offer no advantage for evolution. No one claims that any such complex and conscious mechanism existed in the conditions of the primeval Earth. At this point, evolutionists cannot account for how complex energy conversion systems, such as photosynthesis, which even modern technology cannot reproduce — emerged in the first place.

Whatever solar energy reached the primeval Earth had no way of giving rise to order. For one thing, the higher the temperature rises, the more amino acids—the building blocks of life—resist forming bonds in regular sequences. Energy alone is not sufficient for amino acids to form the far more complex molecules of proteins, and for proteins to give rise to cell organelles, which are more complex still. This manifest order is only possible through our omniscient Lord's creation.

In fact, many evolutionists openly admit that the claim about open systems is invalid and that it conflicts with thermodynamics. Although Professor John Ross of Harvard University holds evolutionist views, he writes in a paper in *Chemical and Engineering News* that this claim is unrealistic and unscientific:

. . . there are no known violations of the second law of thermodynamics. Ordinarily, the second law is stated for isolated systems, but the second law applies equally well to open systems. . . . there is somehow associated with the field of far-from-equilibrium phenomena the notion that the second law of thermodynamics fails for such systems. It is important to make sure that this error does not perpetuate itself. [78]

Ordered System

The theory of evolution clearly conflicts with the second law of thermodynamics (the law of entropy), one of the most basic laws of physics. (***See The* Second Law of Thermodynamics**)

According to this experimentally proven theory, all systems in the universe, left to their own devices, will suffer disorder, disruption and impairment in direct relation to the passage of time.

In order not to violate this scientific law, evolutionists use various concepts in a misleading manner. They maintain that specific order can arise in systems undergoing constant exchanges of matter and energy.

For example, when wind enters a dusty room, it may move all the dust that has settled and deposit it in one corner of the room. However, these dust particles can never order themselves by using the energy of the wind to produce a recognizable image of, say, a human being.

Similarly, when the *A* key on a keyboard is pressed repeatedly (with a corresponding flow of energy entering the system), the result is dozens of repetitions of the letter, as in

[78] John Ross, *Chemical and Engineering News*, 27 July, 1980, p. 40.

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa . . . However, this constant repetition contains no information, no complexity. For a sequence of letters to contain information in the form of a meaningful sentence, paragraph or book, an intelligent, ordering mind is absolutely essential.

As a result, no complex, organized system can ever arise through natural processes, although simple combinations of the kind described above may occur from time to time. These arrangements never go beyond specific limits, however.

Yet evolutionists depict examples of self-ordering that arise spontaneously in this way as significant evidence for evolution, portraying them as supposed examples of self-organization. As a result of this misconception, they suggest that living systems can emerge spontaneously as a result of natural chemical reactions.

However, ordered systems and organized systems have totally distinct structures. *Ordered* systems include simple arrangements and repetitions, while *organized* systems contain very complex and interconnected structures and functions. Knowledge and conscious design are essential if they are to emerge.

Ilya Prigogine resorted to this deliberate conceptual confusion and referred to molecules that arranged themselves as energy passed through them as "spontaneously self-organizing." In their book *The Mystery of Life's Origin*, the American scientists Thaxton, Bradley and Olsen describe the position in these terms:

In each case random movements of molecules in a fluid are spontaneously replaced by a highly ordered behaviour. Prigogine, Eigen, and others have suggested that a similar sort of self-organization may be intrinsic in organic chemistry and can potentially account for the highly complex macromolecules essential for living systems. But such analogies have scant relevance to the origin-of-life question. A major reason is that they fail to distinguish between order and complexity. . . .[79]

Those same scientists also describe the logical superficiality and distortion of some evolutionists' claim that water turning into ice is an analogy of biological ordering taking place spontaneously.

It has often been argued by analogy to water crystallizing to ice that simple monomers may polymerize into complex molecules such as protein and DNA. The analogy is clearly inappropriate, however . . . The atomic bonding forces draw water molecules into an orderly crystalline array when the thermal agitation (or entropy driving force) is made sufficiently small by lowering the temperature. Organic monomers such as amino acids resist combining at all at any temperature, however, much less [forming] some orderly arrangement. [80]

Prigione devoted his whole career to trying to square thermodynamics with the theory of evolution. But even he admitted that there was no resemblance between the crystallization of water and the emergence of complex biological structures:

The point is that in a non-isolated system there exists a possibility for formation of ordered, low-entropy structures at sufficiently low temperatures. This ordering principle is responsible for the appearance of ordered structures such as crystals, as well as for the phenomena of phase transitions. Unfortunately, this principle cannot explain the formation of biological structures. [81]

Organized Systems—*See* **Ordered System**

Orgel, Leslie

Probability calculations show that complex molecules such as proteins and nucleic acid (RNA and DNA) cannot possibly come into being separately and by chance.

Prominent evolutionists admit this. For example, Stanley Miller and Francis Crick's colleague from San Diego University, the well-known evolutionist Dr. Leslie Orgel, says:

It is extremely improbable that proteins and nucleic acids, both of which are structurally complex, arose spontaneously in the same place at the same time. Yet it also seems impossible to have one without the other. And so, at first glance, one might have to conclude that life could never, in fact, have originated by chemical means. [82]

Origin of the Avian Lung

Another factor that makes the scenario of evolution from dinosaur to bird impossible is the unique structure of the avian lung, which cannot be explained in evolutionary terms.

---

[82] Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on Earth," *Scientific American*, Vol. 271, October 1994, p. 78.
[39] B. E. Bishop, "Mendel's Opposition to Evolution and to Darwin," *Journal of Heredity*, Vol. 87, 1996, pp. 205-213.
[40] www.evrimaldatmacasi.com/bilimarastirmavakfi.html
[42] Scott Gilbert, John Opitz, and Rudolf Raff, "Resynthesizing Evolutionary and Developmental Biology," *Developmental Biology*, Vol. 173, article no. 0032, 1996, p. 361.
[43] Richard B. Bliss, Gary E. Parker, Duane T. Gish, *Origin of Life*, California, 1979, pp. 14-15.
[44] Stanley Miller, *Molecular Evolution of Life: Current Status of the Prebiotic Synthesis of Small Molecules*, 1986, p. 7.
[45] J. P Ferris, C. T. Chen, "Photochemistry of Methane, Nitrogen, and Water Mixture As a Model for the Atmosphere of the Primitive Earth," *Journal of American Chemical Society*, Vol. 97:11, 1975, p. 2964.
[46] "New Evidence on Evolution of Early Atmosphere and Life," *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, Vol. 63, November 1982, pp. 1328-1330.
[47] Richard B. Bliss & Gary E. Parker, Duane T. Gish, *Origin of Life*, p. 16.
[48] W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 325.
[49] Henry Gee, "Statistical Cloud over African Eden," *Nature*, Vol. 355, February 13, 1992, p. 583.
[50] Marcia Barinaga, " 'African Eve' Backers Beat a Retreat," *Science*, 255, February 7, 1992, p. 687.
[51] S. Blair Hedges, Sudhir Kumar, Koichiro Tamura, and Mark Stoneking, "Human Origins and Analysis of Mitochondrial DNA Sequences," *Science*, 255, 7 February 1992, pp. 737-739.
[52] Barinaga, "Choosing a Human Family Tree," *Science*, 255, 7 February 1992, p. 687.
[53] William A. Dembski, James M. Kushiner, *Signs of Intelligence*, Brazoss Press, ABD, 2001, p 109.
[54] Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Genetics of the Evolutionary Process*, New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1970, pp. 17-18.
[55] Pierre Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York Academic Press, 1977, p. 194.
[56] Christian Schwabe, "On the Validity of Molecular Evolution," *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, Vol. 11, July 1986, p. 280.
[57] Christian Schwabe, "Theoretical Limitations of Molecular Phylogenetics and the Evolution of Relaxins," *Comparative Biochemical Physiology*, Vol. 107B, 1974, pp. 171-172.
[58] Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp. 290-291.
[59] Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biyoloji 1*, Istanbul: Sürat Publishing, 1998, p. 10,
[60] Prof. Dr. Eşref Deniz, *Tıbbi Biyoloji(Medical Biology)*, 4th edition, Ankara, 1992, p. 6.
[61] http://www.evrimaldatmacasi.com/bilimarastirmavakfi.html
[62] S. J. Gould & N. Eldredge, *Paleobiology*, Vol. 3, 1977, p. 147.
[63] Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning was Information*, Master Books, 2006, p. 126.
[64] B. G. Ranganathan, *Origins?*, Pennsylvania: The Banner Of Truth Trust, , 1988.
[65] Warren Weaver, "Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation," *Science*, Vol. 123, June 29, 1956, p. 1159.
[66] David Demick, "The Blind Gunman," *Impact*, No. 308, February 1999.
[69] Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, New York: The Modern Library, p. 127.
[70] Stephen Jay Gould, "The Return of Hopeful Monsters," *Natural History*, vol. 86, June/July 1977, pp. 22-30.
[71] C. Loring Brace, *American Scientist*, Vol. 82, September/October 1994, p. 484-486.
[72] Erik Trinkaus, "Hard Times Among the Neanderthals," *Natural History*, Vol. 87, December 1978, p. 10.
[73] W. K. Gregory, "Hesperopithecus Apparently Not An Ape Nor A Man," *Science*, Vol. 66, p. 579.
[75] Keith S. Thompson, "Ontogeny and Phylogeny Recapitulated," *American Scientist*, Vol. 76, May/June 1988, p. 273.
[76] Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, p. 204.

The lungs of terrestrial animals have a two-way structure: During inhalation, air travels down into the lungs through increasingly narrower channels, halting at tiny air sacs, where the exchange of oxygen and carbon dioxide takes place. Later, this CO_2-laden air moves in the opposite direction, leaving the lung by the same path through which it entered, and is expelled through the main bronchial passage.

In birds, on the other hand, the air travels in one way only along the so-called pulmonary canal. The lungs' entry and exit canals are different from one another, and air always travels in the same direction, thanks to the special air sacs extending along the passages. This means a bird can absorb oxygen in the air non-stop, meeting its high energy requirements.

This unique respiratory system, known as the *avian lung*, is described in these terms by Michael Denton, a molecular biologist from Otega University in Australia:

In the case of birds, the major bronchi break down into tiny tubes which permeate the lung tissue. These so-called parabronchi eventually join up together again, forming a true circulatory system so that air flows in one direction through the lungs. . . [T]he structure of the lung in birds and the overall functioning of the respiratory system is quite unique. No lung in any other vertebrate species is known which in any way approaches the avian system. Moreover, it is identical in all essential details in birds as diverse as humming birds, ostriches and hawks. [83]

It is impossible for the reptilian lung, with its two-way air flow, to have evolved into the avian lung, with a one-way flow. No transitional stage between these two pulmonary structures is possible. Any vertebrate must breathe in order to survive, and the first step in any change of pulmonary structure would lead to the death of that intermediate stage.

Furthermore, the theory of evolution maintains that all changes took place gradually, over millions of years. Yet no creature whose lungs do not function can survive for more than a few minutes.

In his book *A Theory in Crisis*, Michael Denton sets out the impossibility of explaining the origin of the avian lung from an evolutionary perspective:

This one-directional flow of air is maintained in breathing in and breathing out by a complex system of interconnected air sacs in the bird's body, which expand and contract in such a way as to ensure a continuous delivery of air through the parabronchi . . . The structure of the lung in birds, and the overall functioning of the respiratory system, are quite unique. No lung in any other vertebrate species in any way approaches the avian system. Moreover, in its essential details, it is identical in [all] birds. [84]

In short, a transition from one type of lung to the other is not possible, because no "transitional" lung could function properly.

In addition, reptiles have a diaphragmatic respiratory system, while birds have no diaphragm. The differing structures also make evolution between the two types impossible. John Ruben, an authority on respiratory physiology, comments:

The earliest stages in the derivation of the avian abdominal air sac system from a diaphragm-ventilating ancestor would have necessitated selection for a diaphragmatic hernia in taxa transitional between theropods and birds. Such a debilitating condition would have immediately compromised

---

[77] Alexander I. Oparin, *Origin of Life*, 1936, New York: Dover Publications, 1953 (Reprint), p. 196.
[79] Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley and Roger L. Olsen, *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories*, 4th edition, Dallas, 1992, p. 151.
[80] *Ibid*., pp. 119-120.
[81] I. Prigogine, G. Nicolis ve A. Babloyants, "Thermodynamics of Evolution," *Physics Today*, November 1972, Vol. 25, p. 23.

the entire pulmonary ventilatory apparatus and seems unlikely to have been of any selective advantage. [85]

Still another feature refuting the evolution of the avian lung is that its structure leaves it never empty of air, and faces the danger of collapse if it should become empty. Michael Denton has this to say:

Just how such a different respiratory system could have evolved gradually from the standard vertebrate design without some sort of direction is, again, very difficult to envisage, especially bearing in mind that the maintenance of respiratory function is absolutely vital to the life of the organism. Moreover, the unique function and form of the avian lung necessitates a number of additional unique adaptations during avian development. As H. R. Dunker, one of the world's authorities in this field, explains, because first, the avian lung is fixed rigidly to the body wall and cannot therefore expand in volume and, second, because of the small diameter of the lung capillaries and the resulting high surface tension of any liquid within them, the avian lung cannot be inflated out of a collapsed state, as happens in all other vertebrates after birth. The air capillaries are never collapsed as are the alveoli of other vertebrate species; rather, as they grow into the lung tissue, the parabronchi are from the beginning open tu bes filled with either air or fluid.[86]

This system, totally different from the lungs of reptiles and other terrestrial vertebrates, cannot have formed gradually through unconscious mutations, as evolution maintains. Denton states that the avian lung's structure invalidates Darwinism:

The avian lung brings us very close to answering Darwin's challenge: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." [87]

Origin of the Bacteria

The oldest fossils are those of 3.5 billion year-old bacteria. From these remains, evolutionists claim that lifeless matter produced the first single-celled bacterium and claim, further that the first bacteria changed into multi-celled creatures over the course of time and became the ancestors of today's highly complex plants and animals. But with no scientific proof for these claims, evolutionists cannot explain how lifeless matter could have produced bacteria.

Until recently, many scientists regarded bacteria as a simple life form. But detailed research has shown that they are quite complex, even though they are minute, single-celled creatures.

Nearly all species of bacteria are surrounded by a protective wall that shapes their cells and allows them to thrive in quite different environments. Some species of bacteria possess a thin layer which surrounds the cell wall. Within the cell wall of all bacteria, there is an elastic cell membrane. Tiny nutrient molecules enter the cell through pores on the surface of this membrane, through which larger molecules cannot pass.

Inside the membrane is a soft, gelatin-like substance called cytoplasm, which contain proteins called *enzymes*. These provide the cell with the raw materials it needs by breaking down the absorbed nutrients.

Like all living cells, bacteria contain DNA that controls the growth, reproduction and other activities. In bacteria, DNA moves freely in the cell's cytoplasm. Apart from cells without nuclei (called prokaryotes), every cell contains DNA in its nucleus, separated from the cytoplasm by a membrane.

Within these cells occur vital bio-chemical activities that ensure the continuation of life on Earth. Bacteria perform essential functions in the planet's ecological system. For example, some

bacteria break down dead plant and animal matter, converting them into basic "raw" chemical compounds that living organisms can reuse. Some bacteria increase the fertility of the soil. Others convert milk into cheese, produce antibiotics for use against other harmful bacteria, and synthesize vitamins.

These are only a few of the countless purposes that bacteria serve. A close look at these bacteria's genetic structure shows that they are not simple life forms at all.

Besides all their hundreds of characteristics, bacteria contain the DNA that is evidence of creation. In theta-x-174, the smallest known bacteria, there are 5375 nucleotides—the building blocks of the nucleic acids that control all the hereditary characteristics of living creatures. A normal-sized bacterium contains as many as 3 million nucleotides.[88]

Since the beginning of the 1900s, various studies of the intestinal bacteria *Escherichia coli* have shown that one of its chromosomes contains 5,000 genes. (Genes are special areas formed by particles on the DNA determining the function of an organ or a protein.)

This information is encoded in the DNA of every bacterium and is vital for its survival; the slightest change in it would destroy the bacterium's whole functioning system. If stretched out, the length of the information-carrying chromosome inside a typical bacterial cell, which itself is only about 1 to 5 microns in size, is 1,400 microns[89] (A micron is 0.001 of a millimeter, or 0.000039 of an inch.) By special design, this wonderful chain of information is folded and packed to fit inside a tiny organism thousands of times smaller than itself.

As you can see, the slightest problem in the gene coding would result in the failure of its operational system. Bacteria would not survive, and their lineage would come to an end. As a result, the critical ecological balance would be broken, and the entire world of living things would be upset. Considering these complex characteristics, we understand—contrary to what evolutionists claim — that bacteria are not primitive at all.

Moreover, again contrary to the evolutionist claims, the evolution of bacteria into the so-called eukaryotic cells of plants and animals goes against every biological, physical and chemical law. Even though supporters of the evolutionary theory are completely aware of this, they do not abandon their untenable claims. For example, Dr. Ali Demirsoy, an evolutionist professor, admits that these bacteria cells, claimed to be primitive, cannot change into eukaryotic cells:

One of the most difficult stages of evolution to explain scientifically is how organelles and complex cells could develop from these primitive life forms. Actually, a transitional form between these two forms has not been found. Single-celled and multi-celled have this complex structure. No single life form or group of life forms has been found that is more primitive or has organelles with a simpler structure. That is, the carried organelles developed with all their characteristics. There is no simple or primitive form.[90]

Origin of the Bats

Bats, the only flying mammals, are without doubt one of the most interesting creatures in their class.

Heading the list of bats' fascinating characteristics is the complex sonar system they possess, thanks to which bats are able to fly and perform aerobatic maneuvers in pitch darkness, where they cannot see at all. They are able to detect and catch a tiny caterpillar on the floor of a pitch-black room.

The bat works this sonar by emitting a constant stream of high-frequency sounds, analyzing the echoes made by them, and thus obtaining a detailed perception of its surroundings. It does this at an extraordinary speed, non-stop and perfectly during the time it spends in flight.

Research into the sonar system in bats has revealed even more astonishing discoveries. The frequency range the bat can detect is very narrow, and since it can perceive sounds only within a specific range, a very important problem arises. According to the physical phenomenon known as the Doppler Effect, the frequency of a sound changes when it reflects off a moving body.

Therefore, when a bat emits sound waves in the direction of a moth flying away from it, the returning sound waves will be below the frequency that the bat can detect. For that reason, the bat should have enormous difficulty in detecting its moving prey.

Yet that is not actually the case, and bats continue to detect all kinds of moving object with no problem at all, because they raise the frequency of the sound waves they emit towards moving objects, just as if they were taking the Doppler Effect into account. For example, a bat will emit the highest frequency sounds in the direction of a fly moving away from it, so that when the sound echoes back, it will not fall below a detectable frequency.

Two types of neurons or nerve cells in the bat's brain supervise the sonar system; one of these perceives the ultrasound emitted, and the other adjusts the bat's squeaks by issuing commands to particular muscles. These two types of neuron work together, so that when the frequency of the echoes changes, the first neuron detects this and causes the other neuron to adapt to the echo's frequency, either by suppressing or stimulating it. As a result, the bat changes its frequency according to its surroundings, using it in the most efficient manner.

It is easy to realize the lethal blow that this system deals to the theory of evolution's explanation of gradual improvements by way of random mutations. The sonar system in bats has an exceedingly complex structure, and can never be accounted for in terms of random mutations. In order for the system to function, it must exist fully formed and complete, right down to the smallest details. The sonar will work only if the bat has the proper structure for emitting high-frequency sounds, the organs with which to detect and analyze these, and a system capable of varying the frequency, depending of changes in movement. Such sophistication cannot, of course, be explained in terms of random chance, but actually shows that the bat was created in the most perfect manner.

In addition, the fossil record also shows that bats appeared suddenly on Earth, and with all their present-day characteristics. The evolutionist paleontologists John Hill and James Smith make the following confession:

The fossil record of bats extends back to the early Eocene . . . and has been documented . . . on five continents . . . [A]ll fossil bats, even the oldest, are clearly fully developed bats and so they shed little light on the transition from their terrestrial ancestor.[91]

On the same subject, the evolutionist paleontologist L. R. Godfrey writes:

---

[91] John E. Hill, James D Smith, *Bats: A Natural History*, London: British Museum of Natural History, 1984, p. 33.

There are some remarkably well preserved early Tertiary fossil bats, such as *Icaronycteris index*, but *Icaronycteris* tells us nothing about the evolution of flight in bats because it was a perfectly good flying bat.[92]

It is impossible for the bat's complex bodily systems to have emerged through evolution, and the fossil records confirm that no such evolution ever took place. On the contrary, the first bats that came into being on Earth were exactly the same as their present-day counterparts. Bats have always existed as bats.

Origin of Behavior

Evolutionists regard all animal and human behavior as having specific evolutionary origins, believing that the present characteristics they possess have been passed down from their supposed ancestors, from the first cell through to their present-day forms.

Again according to evolutionists, the oldest form of behavior in animals is food-gathering, which behavior is common to all living things, from the first cells up to human beings. Impulses to survive (self-preservation) and to reproduce and preserve the race or species emerged later.. According to evolutionists, all behavior has one origin and one single cause, and underwent appropriate changes during adaptation to various environmental conditions.

However, nothing about behavior squares with an evolutionary scenario. Because living things lack the reasoning abilities to learn by trial and error, and then record these lessons as "instinct" in the genes, and transmit them to subsequent generations. Right from birth, they possess such innate forms of behavior as defending themselves and nest -building..

Allah creates all living things with their own unique attributes and forms of behavior. It is impossible, for instance, for a butterfly to decide to assume the appearance of a dead leaf in order to camouflage itself and increase its chances of survival, and then refine the changes in its wings with that goal in mind. There can be no question of a beaver learning to build a dam, requiring highly advanced engineering calculations, across a river in order to stop the flow of water. It possesses the ability to do this from the moment of its birth.

Evolutionists sometimes claim that animals acquire some forms of behavior through experience, and the most effective behaviors become "fixed" by way of natural selection. These effective forms of behavior are subsequently passed on to later generations through genetic inheritance.

However, living things cannot survive in the *absence* of these instinctive forms of behavior. And therefore, they have no time in which to learn them. A living thing has to possess this behavior from the moment it is born. The idea that such behavior can "evolve" is therefore inconsistent right from the start, because evolutionist hypotheses allow for no consciousness to make any such selection. Living things are born possessing of various characteristics and instinctive forms of behavior that allow them to survive.

Origin of the Birds

The theory of evolution maintains that birds descended from small, carnivorous theropod dinosaurs—in other words, from reptiles. In fact, however, comparison of birds and reptiles reveals that these classes are very different from one another, and that no evolution between them is possible.

---

[92] L. R. Godfrey, "Creationism and Gaps in the Fossil Record," *Scientists Confront Creationism*, W. W. Norton and Company, 1983, p. 199.

There are many structural differences between birds and reptiles, one of the most important of which is bone structure. The bones of dinosaurs are thick and solid. In contrast, the bones of both living and extinct species of birds are hollow, which makes them very light. Reptiles have the slowest metabolism in the living world, while birds hold the record for the fastest. For example, due to its rapid metabolism, a sparrow's body temperature may sometimes reach 48 degrees Celsius. But reptiles are unable to produce their own body heat, warming themselves by means of the Sun's rays. Reptiles consume the least energy, and birds the most.

Despite being an evolutionist, North Carolina University's Professor Alan Feduccia opposes the theory that birds are related to dinosaurs. His opposition to the dino-bird claims is based on scientific findings:

"All in all, I find the whole dino-bird business a total hoax." [93]

Larry Martin, a Kansas University authority on ancient birds, also opposes the theory that birds are descended from dinosaurs. In reference to the dilemma in which evolution finds itself, Martin says:

To tell you the truth, if I had to support the dinosaur origin of birds with those characters, I'd be embarrassed every time I had to get up and talk about it. [94]

In the face of all the scientific findings, however, the dinosaur-bird evolution scenario, based on no concrete evidence whatsoever, is still stubbornly defended. Certain concepts that represent no evidence for this scenario are superficially portrayed as "evidence" for the link between birds and dinosaurs.

Some evolutionist publications, for instance, suggest that, based on differences in dinosaurs' hip bones, birds evolved from dinosaurs. The hip bone difference in question is that between the *Saurischian* (reptile-type hip-boned) and *Ornithischian* (bird-type hip-boned) groups. This concept of dinosaurs with bird-type hips is sometimes perceived as evidence for dinosaur-to-bird evolution.

In fact, however, this provides no support for the claim that dinosaurs are the forerunners of birds. Certain dinosaurs belonging to the Ornithischian group do not resemble birds at all in their other anatomical features. *Ankylosaurus*, for instance, had short legs, an enormous body and skin covered in armor-like scales, but is a bird-type hip-boned dinosaur belonging to the Ornithischian group. On the other hand, *Struthiomimus*, some of whose anatomical features may be compared to birds, was thin with long back legs and short forearms, and belongs to the Saurischian group, with reptile-type hip bones.

Hip bone structure, therefore, represents no apparent evidence that dinosaurs and birds are related. The definition of "bird-type" hip-boned dinosaurs is one based solely on similarities, and other major anatomical gulfs between the two groups make it impossible to interpret that one similarity from an evolutionist perspective.

Origin of the Bird Feathers

The theory of evolution maintains that birds evolved from reptiles, but is totally unable to account for the enormous differences between these two separate living classes. One feature that widens the unbridgeable gulf between birds and reptiles is feathers, which are unique to birds.

The structure of bird feathers is far too complex to be explained by means of any evolutionary process. The well known ornithologist Alan Feduccia does not consider it probable that a tissue so well suited for flight could have emerged initially to serve another purpose (for example, insulation, as is claimed by evolutionists). As he says: "Everything about them indicates an aerodynamic

function... They're lightweight, they're excellent airfoils, they produce high lift at low speeds, and they have a Velcro-like quality that lets them be reassembled."[95]

In addition, a long, stiff tube runs along the center of the feather. From both sides of this tube emerge hundreds of barbs. These barbs, which have differing lengths and degrees of softness, give the feather its aerodynamic properties. Even more interestingly, on each barb are even smaller structures known as barbules, too small to be seen with the naked eye. On all of these barbules are tiny hooks, thanks to which the barbules are held together tightly, as if by zippers.

There are 650 barbs on either side of a stork feather's stem. Each one has 600 contraposed barbules, attached to one another by 390 hooks which, again, cling together like the two sides of a zipper. If the hooks become detached from one another, the bird has only to shake itself or groom its feathers with its beak for them to reattach.

To maintain that such a complex structure evolved as the result of random mutations from reptile scales is simply a dogmatic belief, based on no scientific foundation at all.

A. H. Brush, a Connecticut University professor of physiology and neurobiology, described the profound differences between reptile scales and bird feathers:

Every feature from gene structure and organization, to development, morphogenesis and tissue organization is different [in feathers and scales. . . the protein structure of bird feathers and are unique among vertebrates . . . Feathers appear suddenly in the fossil record. . . . [96]

This superior creation in feathers gave Charles Darwin considerable pause for thought. The magnificent beauty in peacock feathers actually made him "cold all over," as he put it. In a letter to his friend Asa Gray dated 3 April, 1860, he wrote:

. . . I remember well the time when the thought of the eye made me cold all over. [97]

Origin of the Fish

Evolutionists maintain that invertebrate marine creatures that arose during the Cambrian Period developed into fish over the course of tens of millions of years. However, in the same way that Cambrian Period invertebrates had no ancestors neither are there any intermediate form to indicate any evolution between these same invertebrates and fish. (*See **The*** **Cambrian Period**.) Yet the very considerable transition between invertebrates—lacking skeletons and the hard parts of whose bodies are on the outside—and fish, whose hard parts act as supports in the middle of their bodies, should have left behind a vast number of fossilized intermediate forms. Yet all the different categories of fish appear suddenly in the fossil record, with no forerunners or "primitive" versions.

For 140 years, evolutionists have been combing the fossil strata in their search for these imaginary intermediate forms. Although millions of invertebrate fossils and millions of fish fossils have been discovered, no one has found even a single intermediate form. In an article titled "Evolution of the Lung and the Origin of Bony Fishes: A Casual Relationship," the evolutionist paleontologist Gerald T. Todd sets out the following questions that demonstrate evolutionists' despair:

All three subdivisions of the bony fishes first appear in the fossil record at approximately the same time . . . How did they originate? What allowed them to diverge so widely? How did they all come to have heavy armor? And why is there no trace of earlier, intermediate forms?[98]

The fossil record shows that just like other living classes, fish emerged suddenly and with all their different structures intact. Fish were created in a single moment, with no evolutionary process behind them. Allah is the All-Powerful Creator.

Origin of the Flies

One explanation offered for the origin of birds is the cursorial theory, according to which reptiles' forearms developed into wings as they needed speed in their attempts to catch insects. This theory lacks any scientific evidence. Moreover, insects are definitely able to fly, which means that evolutionists face the problem of the origin of insects. (*See **The*** **Cursorial Theory**.)

Flies emerge also suddenly and with their own unique structures in the fossil record. For example, a great many dragonfly fossils from the Pennsylvanian period have been discovered, all identical to present-day specimens.

The interesting fact here is that both dragonflies and flies appear at the same time as species of wingless insects. This invalidates the hypothesis that wingless insects gradually developed wings.

R. Wootton and C. Ellington write on the subject in an article in the book *Biomechanics in Evolution*:

When insect fossils first appear, in the Middle and Upper Carboniferous, they are diverse and for the most part fully winged. There are a few primitively wingless forms, but no convincing intermediates are known.[99]

One important feature of those flies that emerge suddenly in the fossil record is their extraordinary flight techniques. Human beings cannot raise and lower their arms ten times a second, yet the average fly can flap its wings 500 times a second. Moreover, both wings beat simultaneously. The slightest irregularity in wing beats will upset the insect's balance, but this never occurs.

In an article titled "The Mechanical Design in Fly Wings," R. Wootton writes:

The better we understand the functioning of insect wings, the more subtle and beautiful their designs appear . . . Insect wings combine both in one, using components with a wide range of elastic properties, elegantly assembled to allow appropriate deformations in response to appropriate forces and to make the best possible use of the air. They have few if any technological parallels--yet.[100]

Origin of Flight—*See **The*** **Arboreal Theory**, ***The*** **Cursorial Theory**, and ***The*** **Transition from Land to the Air Myth**.

Origin of the Horses

---

[99] R. J. Wootton, C. P. Ellington, "Biomechanics & the Origin of Insect Flight," *Biomechanics in Evolution*, ed. J. M. V. Rayner & R. J. Wootton, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 99.
[100] J. Robin Wootton, "The Mechanical Design of Insect Wings," *Scientific American*, vol. 263, November 1990, p. 120.
[83] Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp. 210-211.
[84] *Ibid.*, pp. 211-212.
[85] J. A. Ruben, T. D. Jones, N. R. Geist, and W. J. Hillenius, "Lung Structure And Ventilation in Theropod Dinosaurs and Early Birds," *Science*, Vol. 278, p. 1267.
[86] Michael J. Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, New York: Free Press, 1998, p. 361.
[87] *Ibid.*, pp. 361-362.
[88] http://www.pathlights.com/ce_encyclopedia/Encyclopedia/08dna02.htm
[89] http://www.microbiologytext.com/index.php?module=Book&func=displayarticle&art_id=53
[90] Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim* ("Heredity and Evolution"), Ankara:, Meteksan Publishing, p.79.
[9396] Feduccia, A., email to J. David, 26 October, 1999; permission to share this email given 3 November 1999.
[94] Pat Shipman, "Birds Do It . . . Did Dinosaurs?", *New Scientist*, February 1, 1997, p. 28.
[95] Pat Shipman, *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[96] A. H. Brush, "On the Origin of Feathers," *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, Vol. 9, 1996, pp. 131-132.
[97] Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, Harvard Common Press, 1971, p. 131.
[98] Gerald T. Todd, "Evolution of the Lung and the Origin of Bony Fishes: A Casual Relationship." *American Zoologist*, Vol 26, No. 4, 1980, p. 757.

Until recently, schematic illustrations of the evolution of horses have been a prominent proof of the theory of evolution. Today, however, many evolutionists have openly refuted the validity of this scenario. In 1980, 150 evolutionists attended a four-day meeting at the Chicago Museum of Natural History in which the problems associated with stage-by-stage evolution were discussed. At that meeting, Boyce Rensberger stated that there was no support in the fossil record for the stage-by-stage evolution of horses:

The popularly told example of horse evolution, suggesting a gradual sequence of changes from four-toed fox-sized creatures living nearly 50 million years ago to today's much larger one-toed horse, has long been known to be wrong. Instead of gradual change, fossils of each intermediate species appear fully distinct, persist unchanged, and then become extinct. Transitional forms are unknown.[101]

About the "evolution of the horse" diagrams, the noted paleontologist Niles Eldredge said :

There have been an awful lot of stories, some more imaginative than others, about what the nature of that history [of life] really is. The most famous example, still on exhibit downstairs, is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps fifty years ago. That has been presented as the literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now I think that that is lamentable, particularly when the people who propose those kinds of stories may themselves be aware of the speculative nature of some of that stuff. [102]

In spite of the lack of any scientific support, to create this horse-evolution scenario, fossils from different species were arranged in a series from the smallest to the largest. Evolutionists claimed that this evolution occurred at different times in India, South America, North America and Europe. Various evolutionists proposed more than 20 different horse-evolution scenarios, but there is no agreement among them on the different proposed family trees. The only point they agreed on is that the 55-million-year-old dog-like creature called *Eohippus* (*Hyracotherium*) was the first so-called ancestor of horses. (*See* ***Eohippus***.) However, this so-called ancestor of horses—supposed to have become extinct millions of years ago—is almost identical to a creature called the hyrax that still lives in Africa, but is no relation to a horse.[103]

Every day that passes, a new fossil is discovered that clearly demonstrates the discrepancy of these claims about the evolution of horses especially since *Eohippus* fossils have been found in the same stratum as two modern horse species, *Equus nevadensis* and *E. occidentalis*.[104] This shows that horses living today lived at the same time as their supposed ancestors, proving that the so-called evolution of horses never occurred.

In his book *The Great Evolution Mystery*, the evolutionist writer Gordon R. Taylor examined topics that Darwinism could not explain. About the mythical horse series, he writes:

But perhaps the most serious weakness of Darwinism is the failure of paleontologists to find convincing phylogenies or sequences of organisms demonstrating major evolutionary change. . . The horse is often cited as the only fully worked-out example. But the fact is that the line from *Eohippus* to *Equus* is very erratic. It is alleged to show a continual increase in size, but the truth is that some variants were smaller than *Eohippus* [the first in the sequence], not larger. Specimens from different sources can be brought together in a convincing-looking sequence, but there is no evidence that they were actually ranged in this order in time.[105]

All these facts show that one of the basic proofs for the series schema of horse evolution is totally imaginary. Like other species, horses also come into existence without leaving any evolutionary ancestor in the fossil record.

Origin of the Insects

With regard to the origin of birds, evolutionist biologists claim that certain reptiles that used their front legs developed wings to catch insects and evolved into birds. According to this speculative thesis, known as the *cursorial theory*, the forearms of the reptiles in question gradually elongated into wings as they attempted to catch flies. (*See **The*** **Cursorial Theory**.) The most important question regarding this theory, which is based on no scientific findings at all, is how insects, which were already able to fly, developed *their* wings. Insects, flies included, represent yet another dilemma for evolutionists.

In the classification of living things, insects represent a sub-phylum, Insecta, within the arthropod phylum (organisms with jointed legs). The oldest fossil insects belong to the Devonian Period. In the subsequent period, the Pennsylvanian, a large number of different insect species emerge suddenly. Fossilized cockroaches, for instance, appear suddenly and with the same structures they have now. Betty Faber of the American Museum of Natural History says that the cockroaches of 350 million years ago are exactly the same as those of today.[106]

Spiders, ticks and centipedes are not really insects, although they are generally referred to as such. At the 1983 annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, exceedingly important fossil findings regarding these organisms were presented. The 380-million-year-old spider, tick and centipede fossils were identical to specimens alive today. One scientist who examined these findings commented that they "looked like they might have died yesterday." [107]

Of course, the way that these creatures, possessing flawless designs, appeared suddenly on Earth cannot be explained in terms of evolution. (*See,* **Origin of the Flies**.) For that reason, evolutionist scientist Paul Pierre Grassé, says that "We are in the dark concerning the origin of insects." [108] In conclusion, the sudden appearance of insects clearly confirms the fact of creation.

Origin of Instinct

Evolutionist scientists use the word *instinct* is to describe certain behavior that animals possess from birth. However questions such as "How did they acquire these instincts?" "How did instinctive behavior first emerge? "how is such behavior transmitted from one generation to another?" always go unanswered.

The evolutionist geneticist Gordon Rattray Taylor makes this admission regarding the dilemma represented by instincts: "When we ask ourselves how an instinctive pattern of behaviour arose in the first place and became hereditarily fixed, we are given no answer." [109]

Certain other evolutionists do not make such admissions. They try to gloss over these questions with veiled answers that do not actually mean anything at all. According to evolutionists, instincts are behaviors programmed in living things' genes. According to this explanation, a honeybee, for example, instinctively builds its marvelous hexagonal combs that are marvels of mathematics. To put it another way, the genes of all the honeybees in the world are programmed with the instinct to construct perfect hexagonal combs. If living things perform the majority of their behaviors because they are programmed to do so, then who programmed them? Since no program can come into being of its own accord, this program must have a programmer. What evolutionists attempt to explain in terms of "instinct" or by saying "Animals have been programmed to do this," is actually the inspiration of Allah.

Charles Darwin, who first proposed the theory of evolution, realized that animal behavior and instinct represented major threats to his theory. In *The Origin of Species*, he openly admitted as

much, several times:

Many instincts are so wonderful that their development will probably appear to the reader a difficulty sufficient to overthrow my whole theory.[110]

The difficulty that he experienced with regard to instincts is described in the book *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, a collection of his correspondence collected by his son, Francis Darwin:

Chapter III. of the Sketch, which concludes the first part, treats of the variations which occur in the instincts and habits of animals . . . It seems to have been placed thus early in the Essay to prevent the hasty rejection of the whole theory by a reader to whom the idea of natural selection acting on instincts might seem impossible. This is the more probable, as the Chapter on Instinct in the Origin is specially mentioned (Introduction, page 5) as one of the "most apparent and gravest difficulties on the theory." [111]

When left without an answer, evolutionists sometimes claim that animals learn some behavior by way of experience, and the best of that behavior is favored by natural selection. This good behavior is later handed on to subsequent generations by way of heredity.

The logical flaws and unscientific thinking in this claim are quite clear:

1. The erroneous claim that "useful behavior is favored by natural selection."

This thesis implies that Nature is a conscious force able to distinguish between useful and harmful behaviors and of making decisions. No consciousness or force in nature is capable of this distinction. An animal itself may decide what behavior is useful, but it cannot pass this insight along through its genes alone. Only an Entity possessed of consciousness and reason—namely, the Creator of nature and the life form in question—can make that selection.

Darwin himself admitted the impossibility of complex and beneficial behavior being acquired through natural selection, although he stated that he persisted in that claim despite it being nonsensical:

Finally it may not be a logical deduction, but to my imagination it is far more satisfactory to look at such instincts as the young cuckoo ejecting its foster-brothers, ants making slaves . . . not as specially endowed or created instincts, but as small consequences of one general law leading to the advancement of all organic beings—namely, multiply, vary, let the strongest live and the weakest die.[112]

Professor Cemal Yıldırım, one of Turkey's leading evolutionists, admits that behavior such as a mother's love for her young cannot be explained by natural selection:

Is there any possibility of accounting for a mother's love for her young through any "blind" order [natural selection] not including a spiritual element? It is certainly hard to say that biologists [at this point Darwinists] have given a satisfactory reply to this question. [113]

Since these organisms, lacking any reason and foresight, have a number of miraculous features; and since it is not possible for them to have acquired these features of their own will, some power must have bestowed these features on them. The mechanism of natural selection and nature itself has no consciousness and no such spiritual features, for which reason these cannot be the source of the characteristics these creatures possess. The obvious truth is this: all living things exist by the will and under the control of Allah. For this reason, we frequently see exceedingly conscious and astonishing behavior in nature, inhabited by unconscious entities, of the kind that makes people ask. "How does this animal know how to do that?" or "How did this creature ever think of doing that?"

2. It is impossible for behavior acquired through natural selection to be transmitted genetically to subsequent generations.

In the second phase of evolutionists' claims, behavior acquired through natural selection must be genetically handed on to subsequent generations. However, such claims are full of various inconsistencies. First, , even if animals learned behavior through experience, it is impossible for subsequently acquired behavior to be passed on genetically. Learned behavior belongs uniquely to the animal that learned it. It is absolutely impossible for any learned behavior to be encoded into a living thing's genes.

Evolutionists today are still unable to resolve that same contradiction posed by Darwin 150 years ago:

[I]t would be a serious error to suppose that the greater number of instincts have been acquired by habit in one generation, and then transmitted by inheritance to succeeding generations. It can be clearly shown that the most wonderful instincts with which we are acquainted, namely, those of the hive-bee and of many ants, could not possibly have been acquired by habit.[114]

If a working ant or other neuter insect had been an ordinary animal, I should have unhesitatingly assumed that all its characters had been slowly acquired through natural selection; namely, by individuals having been born with slight profitable modifications, which were inherited by the off-spring; and that these again varied and again were selected, and so onwards. But with the working ant we have an insect differing greatly from its parents, yet absolutely sterile; so that it could never have transmitted successively acquired modifications of structure or instinct to its progeny. It may well be asked how is it possible to reconcile this case with the theory of natural selection?[115]

3. The invalidity of the claim that instincts evolve together with living things

Darwin was aware of the inconsistencies and impossibilities regarding evolutionary explanations for instincts and questioned the claim that instincts, following their acquisition, changed through natural selection:

[C]an instincts be acquired and modified through natural selection? What shall we say to the instinct which leads the bee to make cells, and which has practically anticipated the discoveries of profound mathematicians? [116]

This inconsistency can be made clearer by citing examples of fish, which have their own unique ways of reproducing, hunting, defense and nest-building. These characteristics have been perfectly regulated according to underwater conditions. In their mating season, some fish adhere their eggs to an undersea rock and provide them with oxygen by fanning their fins.

In that case, according to evolution theory, as these fish evolved their instincts must also have undergone great changes. Indeed, their instincts would have to change almost entirely for these fish to start clearing perfect round nests, in much the same way terrestrial animals do for the protection of their eggs.

In *The Origin of Species*, Darwin devoted some space to this criticism of his own theory:

It has been objected to the foregoing view of the origin of instincts that the variations of structure and of instinct must have been simultaneous and accurately adjusted to each other, as a modification in the one without an immediate corresponding change in the other would have been fatal." [117]

As you have seen, instinctive behavior in animals cannot be explained in terms of any evolutionary process, chance, or "Mother nature". The source of animals' behavior lies neither in

their own bodies nor in nature. Under the inspiration of Allah, all living things behave in the manner most suited to their own structures and to their surroundings.

Origin of the Language

Regarding the origin of language, there are two different views.. The first is that a human is born with a "blank slate" mind and merely learns to speak from observing those around him. However, the famous linguist Noam Chomsky has put forward a very different conclusion based on scientific facts, statistics and observations. In his view, the human mind has an innate propensity to learn language and to speak. Human beings are programmed in advance for language—in other words, they have a special built-in ability.[118]

The way that all babies in the world produce similar sounds shows that they are all born with a special inspiration toward speech. That human beings are created with this feature, not found in any other living thing, is Allah's sublime artistry.

Origin of the Mammals

The theory of evolution maintains that a number of living things evolved by emerging from the sea, turning into amphibians and then into reptiles, and that birds evolved from those reptiles. According to the same scenario, reptiles are the ancestors not only of birds but also of mammals. Yet there are vast structural gulfs between cold-blooded reptiles, whose bodies are covered in scales and which reproduce by laying eggs, and warm-blooded mammals, which are covered in fur and give birth to live young.

One example of these gulfs involves the jaw structures of reptiles and mammals. The mammalian lower jaw consists of a single arc of bone, in which the teeth are set. A reptile's lower jaw, on the other hand, consists of three small bones on each side. Another fundamental difference is that in the middle ears of all mammals, there are three small bones: the so-called anvil, hammer and stirrup. In contrast, in the middle ear of all reptiles, there is but a single bone.

Evolutionists maintain that the reptiles' jaw and ear gradually evolved into the mammalian jaw and ear. Of course, the question of how this came about goes unanswered. How did an ear consisting of one bone turn into one consisting of three? And how did the sense of hearing continue during this process? These other questions also go unanswered.

Indeed, no intermediate form that could link reptiles to mammals has ever been found. That explains why the evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin was forced to say, "The transition to the first mammal . . . is still an enigma." [119]

George Gaylord Simpson, one of the 20th century's most eminent authorities on evolution and one of the founders of neo-Darwinist theory, makes an astonishing confession from the evolutionist point of view:

The most puzzling event in the history of life on earth is the change from the Mesozoic, the Age of Reptiles, to the Age of Mammals. It is as if the curtain were rung down suddenly on the stage where all the leading roles were taken by reptiles, especially dinosaurs, in great numbers and bewildering variety, and rose again immediately to reveal the same setting but an entirely new cast, a cast in which the dinosaurs do not appear at all, other reptiles are supernumeraries, and all the leading parts are played by mammals of sorts barely hinted at in the preceding acts.[120]

In addition, the mammals that suddenly appeared are very different from one another. The bat, horse, mouse and whale all emerged in the same geological period. It is impossible, even with the

most powerful imagination, to construct an evolutionary relationship between these mammals. The evolutionist zoologist Eric Lombard writes in the journal *Evolution*:

Those searching for specific information useful in constructing phylogenies of mammalian taxa will be disappointed. [121]

All this goes to show that living things emerged on Earth suddenly and perfectly formed, as the result of no evolutionary process,. This is concrete evidence that they were created. Evolutionists, however, seek to interpret the fact that living species appeared in a particular order as an indication that they evolved. In fact, since no evolution ever took place, the order in which living things emerged is the order of *creation*. Fossils show that by means of a sublime and flawless creation, the Earth was filled first with marine animals and then with terrestrial ones, and that human beings came into existence after all these.

Human life on Earth began suddenly and in a perfect form, contrary to the "ape-man" myth that evolutionists seek to impose on the public.

Origin of the Marine Mammals

Whales and dolphins are classified as mammals because, just like terrestrial mammals, they give live birth, suckle their young, breathe with lungs and are warm-blooded. But the origin of marine mammals is one of the most difficult questions facing evolutionists.

Most evolutionist sources describe how the land-dwelling ancestors of seagoing mammals evolved in such a way as to move over to a marine environment as the result of a lengthy evolutionary process. According to this claim, marine mammals followed a path diametrically opposed to the transition from water to dry land, returning to a marine environment as the result of a second process of evolution. However, this theory is based on no paleontological evidence—and is also logically inconsistent.

Mammals are regarded as the top rung of the evolutionary ladder. That being so, the question arises of how these creatures moved back to a marine environment. A subsequent question is that of how they adapted to that environment even better than fish. Dolphins, which are mammals and thus possess lungs, are even better adapted to their environment than fish, which breathe in water.

It is perfectly obvious that the imaginary evolution of marine mammals cannot be explained in terms of mutations and natural selection. One article published in *GEO* magazine refers to the origin of the blue whale, stating the despairing position of Darwinism on the subject:

Like blue whales, the bodily structures and organs of other mammals living in the sea also resemble those of fish. Their skeletons also bear similarities to those of fish. In whales, the rear limbs that we can refer to as legs exhibited a reverse development and did not reach full growth Yet there is not the slightest information about these animals' form changes. We have to assume that the return to the sea took place not through a long-term, slow transition as claimed by Darwinism, but in momentary leaps. Paleontologists today lack sufficient information as regards which mammal species whales are evolved from.[122]

It's difficult indeed to imagine how, as the result of any evolutionary process, a small terrestrial mammal could become a whale 30 meters (98 feet) long and weighing 60 tons.. On this subject, all that Darwinists are able to do is, as in the account published in *National Geographic* magazine cited below, to exercise their imaginations:

The whale's ascendancy to sovereign size apparently began sixty million years ago when hairy, four-legged mammals, in search of food or sanctuary, ventured into water. As eons passed, changes slowly occurred. Hind legs disappeared, front legs changed into flippers, hair gave way to a

thick smooth blanket of blubber, nostrils moved to the top of the head, the tail broadened into flukes, and in the buoyant water world the body became enormous. [123]

Bearing in mind the adaptations that a mammal, using lungs to breathe with, would have to undergo in order to thrive in a marine environment, it can be seen that even the word *impossible* fails to do justice to the situation. The absence of even one rung of the ladder in such an evolutionary transition would deny the animal the ability to survive, and bring the evolutionary process to an end.

Marine Mammals and Their Unique Structures

The adaptations that marine animals would have to undergo during a transition to a water environment can be enumerated as follows:

1. Water Conservation. Marine mammals are unable to meet their water requirements in the same way as fish do, by using salt water. They need *fresh* water in order to live. Although the water sources of marine animals are not well known, it is thought that they meet a large part of their water requirements by eating creatures that contain up to one-third as much salt as exists in the ocean. For marine mammals, it is of great importance to conserve as much fresh water as possible. For that reason, they possess water conservation mechanisms like that seen in camels.

Like camels, marine mammals do not sweat. Their kidneys provide water for them by concentrating urine in a much better way than in humans, thus reducing water loss to a minimum. Water conservation reveals itself in even the smallest details. For example, the mother whale feeds her young with milk of a dense consistency like that of cottage cheese, and which is some tens of times more fatty than human milk. There are number of chemical reasons why the milk should have such a high fat content. As the young processes the fat it releases water as a byproduct. In this way, the mother is able to meet her young's water requirements with a minimal water loss of her own.

2. Sight and Communication. The differences between the eyes of marine mammals and those of terrestrial life forms are surprising. On land, physical blows and dust represent threats to the eye, and for that reason, terrestrial animals have eyelids. In a marine environment, however, the main dangers are salt level, the increasing pressure when diving down to great depths, and marine currents. The creature's eyes are positioned on the sides of the head in order to avoid direct contact with the current.

In addition, marine mammals have a hard layer to protect the eye during deep dives. Since there is increasing darkness beneath a depth of 9 meters (29 feet), the mammals' eyes have been equipped with a number of features that enable them to adapt to such a dark environment. The lens is spherical. There are many more light-sensitive rod cells than cone cells, which are sensitive to color and detail. Moreover, the eye has a special layer containing phosphorus. For these reasons, marine mammals can see very well in dark environments.

Then again, sight is not marine mammals' primary sense. Unlike land mammals, hearing is much more important to them. Vision requires light, but many whales and dolphins hunt in dark regions under the sea thanks to a kind of natural sonar. Toothed whales in particular are able to "see" by means of the sound waves returning to them, much as a bat can. Sound waves are focused and sent to one point. The returning waves are then analyzed and interpreted in the animal's brain. This analysis quite clearly gives the shape, size, speed and position of an object. These animals' sonar system is exceedingly sensitive. Dolphins, for example, can detect a person's inside diving into the water. They use sound waves for communication as well as for direction-finding. Two whales hundreds of kilometers apart can communicate by the use of sound.

How do these animals produce sounds for communication and direction finding? That question is still unanswered. Among other things, however, we do know one very surprising detail: The dolphin's skull is especially sound-proofed to protect its brain from being damaged by sound waves it emits so constantly and powerfully.

There is absolutely no possibility of all these astonishing characteristics of marine mammals having arisen by way of mutation and natural selection—the theory of evolution's only two mechanisms. Those who suggest that fish appeared in water by chance, and then later—again by chance— emerged onto dry land and evolved into amphibians, reptiles and mammals; and that these mammals then returned to the water and acquired the anatomy necessary for life there, cannot account for even one of these stages.

Indeed, the fossil record shows that whales and other marine mammals appeared in the seas in a single moment and with no ancestors behind them. Edwin Colbert, an authority in the field of paleontology, describes this fact:

These mammals must have had an ancient origin, for no intermediate forms are apparent in the fossil record between the whales and the ancestral Cretaceous placentals. Like the bats, the whales (using the term in a general and inclusive sense) appear suddenly in early Tertiary times, fully adapted by profound modifications of the basic mammalian structure for a highly specialized mode of life. Indeed, the whales are even more isolated with relation to other mammals than the bats; they stand quite alone. [124]

As with all other fundamental living groups, no findings support the claim of marine mammals' so-called evolution. It is impossible for them to have evolved from the land mammals that supposedly constitute their ancestors, but also, there are no transitional forms to show that such evolution ever took place.

Origin of the Marine Reptiles

The great majority of marine reptiles are now extinct, though turtles still survive as representatives of this group. The origin of these creatures cannot be explained through any evolutionist approach. The most significant known marine reptile is *Ichthyosaurus.* Edwin Colbert and Michael Morales admit that there can be no evolutionary explanation for these creatures' origin:

The Ichthyosaurs, in many respects the most highly specialized of the marine reptiles, appeared in early Triassic times. Their advent into the geologic history of the reptiles was sudden and dramatic; there are no clues in pre-Triassic sediments as to the possible ancestors of the Ichthyosaurs . . . The basic problem of Ichthyosaur relationships is that no conclusive evidence can be found for linking these reptiles with any other reptilian order. [125]

Alfred Romer, another expert on vertebrate history, writes:

No earlier forms [of ichthyosaurs] are known. The peculiarities of ichthyosaur structure would seemingly require a long time for their development and hence a very early origin for the group, but there are no known Permian reptiles antecedent to them. [126]

In short, all the different marine reptiles appeared on Earth separately, with no evolutionary relationship among them. This constitutes manifest scientific proof that all living things are created.

Origin of the Quadrupeds

Quadrupeds (or tetrapods) is the name given to four-footed land-dwelling vertebrates. This general classification includes amphibians, reptiles and mammals. The Darwinists' explanation is

that quadrupeds evolved from fish. However, this claim is physiologically and anatomically untenable—and also, has no foundation in the fossil record.

In order for a fish to adapt to life on dry land, it would have to undergo tremendous changes in its respiratory system, excretory system and skeletal structure. Its gills would have to be supplemented by lungs; its fins would have to acquire sturdiness capable of bearing the weight of its body. Kidneys to dispose of bodily wastes would need to form, and its skin would have to acquire a structure to prevent loss of moisture.

So long as *all* these changes fail to take place, a fish could survive on dry land for only a few minutes. (*See* also ***The*** **Transition from Water to Land Thesis**.)

Origin of Photosynthesis

Photosynthesis is a major factor in sustaining life on Earth. Were it not for photosynthesis, there would be no plants, and if there were no plants there would be little oxygen—and no animals and human beings. This chemical reaction, which cannot be replicated in any laboratory, represents one of the basic conditions for life.

In addition, there is a total balance between the photosynthesis performed by plants and the energy consumed by animals and human beings. Plants provide us with glucose and oxygen. In our cells, we combine that glucose with oxygen and oxidize it, thus releasing and using the solar energy that plants originally used to form glucose.

What we're actually doing is reversing the process of photosynthesis. As a result, carbon dioxide is given off as a waste product, which we release into the atmosphere through our lungs. This carbon dioxide is then used again by plants in further photosynthesis. And so this immaculate cycle continues.

As you see, photosynthesis is one of the most fundamental processes of life on Earth. Thanks to the chloroplasts inside them, plant cells produce starch by combining water and carbon dioxide, with the energy from sunlight. Animals, unable to produce their own nutrients, use the starch that comes from plants. For that reason, photosynthesis is essential for any complex life forms—yet photosynthesis's highly complex process is not yet fully understood. Modern technology has not even unraveled its details, let alone been able to replicate it.

According to the theory of evolution, this complex process is a result of natural events. The evolutionist hypothesis is that in order to perform photosynthesis, plant cells swallowed photosynthesizing bacteria and turned them into chloroplasts, much as modern-day lichens are a symbiotic combination of algae and fungi. However, the question of how bacteria learned to carry out such a complex process as photosynthesis heads the list of those that the evolutionary scenario leaves unanswered.

Evolutionist sources say that this process, which humans even with all their advanced technology and knowledge cannot perform, was in some way discovered by bacteria. These accounts are no different from fairy tales and are of absolutely no scientific worth. Those who look at the subject in any great detail have to admit that photosynthesis constitutes a major dilemma for the theory of evolution.

For instance, evolutionist Professor Ali Demirsoy makes the following admission: "Photosynthesis is a highly complex process, and it would appear impossible for it to appear in an organelle inside a cell—because it is impossible for all the phases to appear at once, and meaningless for them to do so one by one." [127]

The German biologist Hoimar von Ditfurth states that photosynthesis is a process that could not be learned by a cell that lacked such ability in the first place:

No cell possesses the literal ability to "learn" a biological process. A cell is not in the position to function during the birth of a process such as respiration or photosynthesis and to discharge this during a subsequent vital process, and it is impossible for it to acquire the ability to do so. [128]

Since photosynthesis cannot develop as the result of chance and cannot be learned by any cell, then the first plant cell on Earth must have already possessed this ability. In other words, Allah created plants together with their ability to make photosynthesis.

Origin of the Plant Cells

Plant and animals are composed of a type of cell known as *eukaryotic*. Eukaryotic cells' main distinguishing features are that they possess a nucleus, inside which is found the DNA molecule that encodes genetic information. Some single-celled organisms such as bacteria, on the other hand, have no cell nuclei, and their DNA molecules are in a free state inside the cell. (*See* **Bacteria**.)

This second cell type is known as *prokaryotic*—an ideal cell structure for bacteria, because plasmid transfer (the transfer of DNA from cell to cell)— an exceedingly important process from the point of view of bacteria populations—is made possible thanks to DNA being free within the prokaryotic cell.

Since the theory of evolution is obliged to arrange life from the primitive to the complex, it assumes that prokaryotes are primitive cells, and that eukaryotes evolved from them.

Before addressing the invalidity of this claim, it's useful to state that prokaryotic cells are not primitive at all. A bacterium has almost 2,000 genes, and each gene contains up to 1,000 letters of genetic code. This means that the information in a bacterium's DNA is at least 2 million "letters" long. Accordingly, the information contained in the DNA of a single bacterium is equivalent to 20 volumes of 100,000 words each.[129]

Any change in this encoded information may damage the bacterium's entire operating system, spelling death for the bacterium.

In addition to DNA's sensitive structure that withstands random changes, the lack of any intermediate form between bacteria and eukaryotic cells totally invalidates any claim of evolution. The Turkish evolutionist Professor Ali Demirsoy admits that the scenario of bacteria cells evolving into eukaryotic cells—from which more complex life forms then emerged—is invalid:

One of the most difficult phases to account for in evolution is the scientific explanation of how complex cells with organelles came into being from these primitive organisms. In fact, no transitional form between these two forms has ever been found. Single-celled and multi-celled organisms fully possess this complex structure, and no group or organism with simpler organelles or which is more primitive than either of these has ever been encountered. In other words, the organelles they possess emerged fully developed. There *are* no simple and primitive forms.[130]

Bearing in mind the enormous structural differences between the bacterium cell and plant cells, the impossibility of any such transition becomes crystal-clear:

- The bacterium cell wall consists of polysaccharide and protein, whereas the plant cell wall is made of cellulose, which has a completely different structure.
- In a plant cell, there are various organelles with highly complex structures and surrounded by a membrane, but no organelles in the bacterium cell. The bacterium cell contains only very small ribosomes in a free state. In the plant cell, the ribosomes are much larger and connected to the membrane. In addition, each type of ribosome performs protein synthesis in a different way.[131]

- The structures of the DNA in the plant and bacterium cells are totally different.
- The DNA molecule in plant cells is protected by a double-layered membrane, while the DNA in the bacterium cell is free within it.
- In terms of appearance the bacterium's DNA molecule resembles a closed loop. The DNA molecule in a plant cell is linear.
- The DNA molecule in the bacterium cell contains information regarding only that single cell, while the plant cell's DNA carries information about the entire plant. All the information concerning a fruit tree's roots, trunk, leaves, flowers and fruit exists separately in the DNA in each cell nucleus.
- Some species of bacteria are photosynthetic, performing photosynthesis. In contrast to plants, however, bacteria break down the compounds and do not emit oxygen. Moreover, inside the chloroplasts in photosynthetic bacteria (cyanobacteria, for instance), chlorophyll and pigments do not exist. These are distributed throughout the cell, concealed in various membranes.
- The messenger RNAs in the bacterium and in the larger plant and animal cells are very different from one another in terms of biochemical structure.[132]

Messenger RNA performs a function that is vital to the cell's survival. However, although messenger RNA plays the same essential role in both eukaryotic and prokaryotic cells, it has a different biochemical structure in each. Darnell writes on this subject in an article in *Science* magazine:

The differences in the biochemistry of messenger RNA formation in eukaryotes compared to prokaryotes are so profound as to suggest that sequential prokaryotic to eukaryotic cell evolution seems unlikely.[133]

The enormous structural differences between bacteria and plant cells, of which we have listed a few examples, represent a major impasse for evolutionist biologists. Some bacteria and plant cells do have some features in common, but these structures are generally very different from one another. These differences, and the impossibility of any functional intermediate form, make it impossible for the plant cell to have evolved from a bacterium.

Professor Demirsoy actually admits this: "Complex cells never developed from primitive cells by a process of evolution." [134]

Origin of Reptiles

Creatures such as dinosaurs, lizards, tortoises and crocodiles all belong to the reptile family. Reptiles possess unique characteristics: They are all covered in scales. They are cold-blooded and cannot produce their own body heat, for which reason they need to warm their bodies in the Sun every day. Their young hatch from eggs.

Evolution theory faces another major dilemma in explaining the origin of these creatures. Darwinists claim that reptiles evolved from amphibians, yet no concrete evidence supports this. On the contrary, a comparison of reptiles and amphibians shows enormous physiological differences between the two groups, and that any half-reptile, half-amphibian would stand no chance of survival.

One reason concerns the two groups' different egg structures. Amphibians deposit their eggs in water, and they are ideally suited to aqueous development. These eggs are highly porous, they have a transparent membrane and a jelly-like consistency. Reptiles, on the other hand, lay their eggs on land, and their eggs are ideally suited to dry conditions. The hard shell of the reptile egg, known as an amniotic egg, contains an air sac, and is impermeable to water. The water needed by the young is contained inside the egg until it hatches.

Were amphibians to deposit their eggs on land, they would soon dry out and the embryos inside would die. This is a point that the evolution theory, which maintains that reptiles gradually evolved from amphibians, cannot explain. To begin life on dry land, the amphibian's egg would have to become an amniotic one within a single generation. This could hardly occur through mutation and natural selection, the two suggested mechanisms of evolution.

On the other hand, the fossil record also removes the possibility of an evolutionary origin for reptiles. In an article, "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," the well-known evolutionist paleontologist Lewis L. Carroll admits as much:

Unfortunately, not a single specimen of an appropriate reptilian ancestor is known prior to the appearance of true reptiles. The absence of such ancestral forms leaves many problems of the amphibian-reptilian transition unanswered. [135]

Robert L. Carroll, regarded as an authority on vertebrate paleontology, accepts that "The early amniotes are sufficiently distinct from all Paleozoic amphibians that their specific ancestry has not been established."[136] Carroll also makes these comments in his book:

When they first appear in the fossil record, both frogs and salamanders appear essentially modern in their skeletal anatomy. . . Despite these similarities, frogs, salamanders, and caecilians are very different from one another in skeletal structure and ways of life, both now and throughout their known fossil record . . . we have found no fossil evidence of any possible antecedents that possessed the specialized features common to all three modern orders.[137]

The most important creature that evolutionists have so far sought to portray as the "ancestor of reptiles" is the fossil amphibian *Seymouria*. Yet the discovery that reptiles were alive 30 million years before *Seymouria*'s appearance revealed that this cannot be an intermediate species. (See ***Seymouria***.)

It is of course impossible for "the forerunner of reptiles" to have first appeared long after them. The scientific facts show that reptiles emerged on Earth not through the gradual change maintained by the theory of evolution, but suddenly, with no antecedents.

Origin of Species, The

In 1859, Charles Darwin published a book called *The Origin of Species, By Means of Natural Selection or, The Preservation of Favored Races in The Struggle for Life*. In this book, Darwin added his own errors of logic to Lamarck's theory and advanced his thesis of natural selection. (*See* **Natural Selection** and **Lamarckism**.)

In his book, which he described as a "long argument," Darwin claimed that all living things on Earth shared a common origin and that living things descended from one another by way of natural selection.

In addition, Darwin said that only those best able to adapt to their environment handed on their characteristics to subsequent generations. Over the course of time, these beneficial changes would accumulate, and living things would turn into other forms of life very different from their ancestral species. Man was the most advanced product of so-called natural selection. Darwin thought he had found the origin of species: The origin of any one species was another, earlier species.

Darwin's greatest difficulty was that paleontology, the science he hoped would provide answers to the problems facing his theory, would in fact only make them worse.

To be fair, he was aware of at least some of these problems. In the appendix to his book, titled "Difficulties of the Theory," he even admitted them. However, the answers he supplied to these

problems lacked any scientific validity. The American physicist Lipson comments on Darwin's "difficulties":

On reading *The Origin of Species,* I found that Darwin was much less sure of himself than he is often represented to be; the chapter entitled "Difficulties of the Theory," for example, shows considerable self-doubt. As a physicist, I was particularly intrigued by his comments on how the eye would have arisen. [138]

Darwin hoped that as scientific research progressed, these difficulties would be resolved. On the contrary, however, later scientific findings only worsened them.

Origin of Turtles

Turtles, members of the reptile family, emerge suddenly in the fossil record together with their unique shells. As evolutionist sources put it, "Unfortunately, the origin of this highly successful order is obscured by the lack of early fossils, although turtles leave more and better fossil remains than do other vertebrates. By the middle of the Triassic Period (about 200,000,000 years ago), turtles were numerous and in possession of basic turtle characteristics. . . Intermediates between turtles and cotylosaurs, the primitive reptiles from which turtles probably sprang, are entirely lacking." [139]

Robert Carroll, an expert on vertebrate paleontology, states that "important transitions and radiations [are] still poorly known."[140]

This living class appeared suddenly on Earth, which represents evidence that they were created by Allah.

Origin of Vertebrates

One of the phyla that emerged suddenly in the Cambrian period is the phylum Chordata, These are a sub-class of vertebrates, with a central nervous system. Vertebrates are divided into such basic classes as fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals.

Since evolutionist paleontologists regard every living phylum as the evolutionary continuation of another, they claim that the Chordata evolved from another, invertebrate phylum. However, like all phyla, members of the phylum Chordata appeared suddenly in the Cambrian Period, which invalidates that theory right from the outset. The oldest member of the phylum, a sea creature with a long body rather resembling a worm's at first glance is, known as *Pikaia.* [141] It emerged at exactly the same time as species in all the other phyla that could be proposed as its ancestor, and with no previous intermediate form.

In his book *Vertebrate Animals*, the evolutionist biologist Professor Mustafa Kuru refers to the absence of such an intermediate form: "There is no doubt that the Chordata formed from invertebrate animals. However, the absence of any fossil that might shed light on the passage between invertebrates and Chordata has caused many hypotheses on this subject to be jettisoned." [142]

If there is no intermediate form, how can one say that there is "no doubt" about this evolution? Blindly accepting a hypothesis with no evidence to support it is dogmatic rather than scientific. Indeed, after going into a lengthy account of evolutionist assumptions regarding the origin of vertebrates, Professor Kuru once again has to admit that no evidence is available at all: "The views regarding the origin and evolution of the Chordata expressed above have always been treated with suspicion, since they are not based on a fossil record." [143]

Evolutionist biologists sometimes offer the following sort of rationale: There is no fossil record regarding the origin of the Chordata and other vertebrates because invertebrates are soft-tissued and therefore leave no fossil traces behind. But in fact, there are many fossil invertebrate

remains. All the living things from the Cambrian Period are invertebrates, and they have left tens of thousands of fossils behind them. Many fossils of soft-tissued creatures have been found in the Burgess Shale bed in Canada; scientists think that in regions such as Burgess Shale living things were quickly covered in layers of mud with low oxygen content and thus fossilized without their soft tissues having broken down.[144]

The theory of evolution hypothesizes that Chordata such as *Pikaia* gradually turned into fish. However, just as there is no intermediate form to support the idea of the evolution of Chordata, so there are none to support that of the evolution of fish. On the contrary, all the different categories of fish appear suddenly in the fossil record and with no ancestors preceding them. There are millions of invertebrate fossils, but nobody has ever found a single intermediate-form fossil. Fish dating back to the Cambrian Period, especially those discovered in China such as *Haikouichthys* and *Myllokunmingia*, invalidate evolutionist claims of gradual development. Philippe Janvier, a palaeontologist from the Museum of Natural History in Paris, states that these life forms found in China were "definitely vertebrates" and sets out their importance:

It's important because up to now the vertebrates were absent from the big bang of life, as we call it—that is, the great early Cambrian explosion, where all the major animal groups appeared suddenly in the fossil record . . . It is practically certain that these are vertebrates.[145]

Origin of Viruses

Some evolutionists maintain that viruses represent the biological beginning of life:

When we look at the pre-cellular stages of life, we see evolution here, too. The first, most primitive forms of biological organisms are not cells, but viruses.[146]

On the one hand, while evolutionists seek to account for the origin of life in terms of viruses, they also say that viruses cannot represent the foundation of life. This impossibility is mentioned in a number of evolutionist sources:

Viruses were initially regarded as very small organisms. It was later established in detailed studies conducted under the electron microscope that these were structurally very different and that they lived solely as parasites in the cell.

No matter how many virions one or a few enzymes contain, this enzyme series is still insufficient for establishing a virion. (virion, the state in which viruses have the capacity to cause infection). [147]

Viruses multiply as parasites in the cells of a foreign organism. They have no metabolisms beyond those of the host cells. Since viruses have no metabolisms and ability to be stimulated they do not possess the features of independence unique to life, and are therefore not truly alive, in the usual sense.

Viruses are known as *virions* when they are still outside the cell. Virions are not alive. Only two of the key processes in living things are found in viruses: replication and mutation. Viruses cannot perform these functions independently outside the cell, in their form as virions. They need complete organisms in order to "come to life.".[148]

As you can see, viruses cannot be regarded as a pre-life stage, because they can perform such key stages as replication and mutation only in the cells of the organisms they inhabit. Viruses are unable to survive in the absence of a complete organism. For that reason, there can be no question of their constituting a preliminary stage for bacteria, for example.

Professor Ali Demirsoy, a Turkish expert on evolution, refers to the invalidity of the claims regarding the origins of viruses:

Our accumulated knowledge is far from telling us about the origin of viruses and their development to date. At the same time, the existence of three very different physical stages, and the inability of any one of these to provide a fully satisfactory account regarding viruses, makes any comment even more difficult. The comments summarized below are based more on fiction than on scientific foundations.

Once upon a time, the origins of viruses were cellular organisms. These vital cells entered other cells as parasites and gradually lost all their organelles.

The origins of viruses were a free-living pre-cell. Later, with the emergence of cellular organisms, these primitive forms began living inside them as parasites.

Viruses are descended neither from pre-cells nor form cellular organisms. They emerged from fragments released from the genetic material of other organisms.

Although the first concept was for long favored by microbiologists, it is now regarded as the least likely. Because there are such profound differences between the two groups that one cannot be hypothesized as the origin of the other. Although the second possibility appears rather more attractive, it also appears impossible for the reasons cited above. No intermediate form between organisms and viruses has ever been found. The last possibility appears more reasonable.[149]

As you can see from these comments, viruses do not represent the beginning of life. Even evolutionist biologists point the living organisms as the origin of viruses.

Origins of Bipedalism (Walking Upright)

Human beings walk upright on two legs in a way not encountered in any other life form. (*See* **Bipedalism**,) Some other animals possess a limited ability to walk on two legs. Mammals such as the bear and monkey can move on their hind legs for short periods of time, such as when they're reaching for something to eat). However, they have stooped skeletons and normally walk on four legs.

According to the classifications made in the imaginary human family tree, it is claimed that apes classified under the names *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis* walked upright. However, through research into their fossil skeletons in question by a great number of scientists, the invalidity of these claims has been revealed.

The claim of bipedalism is one that evolutionist paleontologists such as Richard Leakey and Donald Johanson have supported for decades. Wide-ranging research into *Australopithecus* specimens by two world famous anatomists, Lord Solly Zuckerman of Britain and Professor Charles

---

[101] Boyce Rensberger, *Houston Chronicle*, 5 November 1980, Part 4, p. 15.
[102] Niles Eldredge, quoted in *Darwin's Enigma* by Luther D. Sunderland, Santee, CA: Master Books, 1988, p. 78.
[103] Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, pp. 30-31.
[104] *Ibid.*.
[105] Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Sphere Books, 1984, p. 230.
[106] M. Kusinitz, *Science World*, 4 February 1983, p. 19.
[107] New York Times Press Service, San Diego Union, 29 May 1983; W. A. Shear, *Science*, Vol. 224, 1984, p. 494.
[108] Pierre-P Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 30.
[109] Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, London: Martin Secker & Warburg Ltd, 1983, p. 222.
[110] Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species and The Descent of Man*, The Modern Library, Random House, p. 184.
[111] Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1888, p. 374.
[112] Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species and The Descent of Man*, The Modern Library, Random House, p. 208.
[113] Cemal Yıldırım, *Evrim Kuramı ve Bağnazlık, (Evolution Theory and Bigotry)*, p. 185.
[114] Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, Elibron Classics, 2005, p. 206.
[115] *Ibid.*, p. 229.
[116] *Ibid.*, p. 133.
[117] *Ibid.*
[118] Noam Chomsky, *Language and Responsibility*, p. 60.
[119] Roger Lewin, "Bones of Mammals' Ancestors Fleshed Out," *Science*, vol. 212, June 26, 1981, p. 1492.
[120] George Gaylord Simpson, *Life Before Man*, New York: Time-Life Books, 1972, p. 42.
[121] R. Eric Lombard, "Review of Evolutionary Principles of the Mammalian Middle Ear, Gerald Fleischer," *Evolution*, Vol. 33, December 1979, p. 1230
[122] Uwe George, "Darwinismus der Irrtum des Jahrhunderts," *Geo*, January 1984, pp. 100-102.
[123] Victor B. Scheffer, "Exploring the Lives of Whales," *National Geographic*, Vol. 50, December 1976, p. 752.
[124] E.H. Colbert, M. Morales, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1955, p. 303.
[125] E.H. Colbert, M. Morales, Eli C. Minkoff, *Evolution of the Vertebrates*, Wiley-Liss; 5 Sub edition, p.193.
[126] A. S. Romer, *Vertebrate Paleontology*, 3rd ed., Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1966, p. 120.
[127] Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, p. 80.
[128] Hoimar Von Ditfurth, *Dinozorların Sessiz Gecesi 2*, Alan Yayıncılık, Nov 1996, Istanbul: Çev: Veysel Atayman, pp. 60-61.
[129] Mahlon B. Hoagland, *Hayatın Kökleri*, Tübitak Publishing, 8th edition, p. 25.
[130] Prof.Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, Ankara: Meteksan Publishing, p. 79.
[131] Prof. Dr. İlhami Kiziroğlu, *Genel Biyoloji*, (General Biology) Istanbul:.Desen Publications,
[132] Robert A. Wallace, Gerald P. Sanders, Robert J. Ferl, *Biology, The Science of Life*, Harper Collins College Publishers, p. 283.
[133] Darnell, "Implications of RNA-RNA Splicing in Evolution of Eukaryotic Cells," *Science*, Vol. 202, 1978, p. 1257.
[134] Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, p. 79.

Oxnard of the USA, showed that these beings were not bipedal, but moved in the same way as present-day apes. Despite being an evolutionist himself, Lord Zuckerman, who for 15 years examined the bones of these creatures with a team consisting of five experts, backed by the British government, concluded that *Australopithecus* was an ordinary species of ape and very definitely did not walk upright.[150]

Professor Oxnard, another evolutionist anatomist well known for his research on this subject, compares the *Australopithecus* skeleton to that of modern orangutans.[151]

Finally in 1994, Liverpool University's Fred Spoor and his team carried out wide-ranging studies in order to arrive at a definitive conclusion regarding the *Australopithecus* skeleton. During that research, the inner ear structures of *Australopithecus* fossils were examined. An organ known as the cochlea determines the body's position relative to the ground in the inner ears of human beings and other complex life forms. That organ's function is similar to the bubble level used to maintain level surfaces by carpenters.. In order to determine whether the creatures portrayed as ancestors of man walked upright, Fred Spoor investigated this particular organ. The comparison analyses made on the balance centers revealed that apes classified as *Homo habilis* did not walk upright, but were bent forward.[152]

Origin of Whales

Whales and dolphins comprise a group known as *marine mammals* Just like mammals on land, they give birth to their young, suckle them, use lungs to breathe and warm their own bodies. The origin of marine mammals is one of the most difficult subjects for evolutionists to account for. Most evolutionist sources suggest that their forerunners lived on dry land, evolved as the result of a lengthy evolutionary process, in such a way as to return to a marine environment. According to this claim, marine mammals followed a path which was the exact opposite of the supposed transition from water to land, via a second process of evolution. However, this theory is based upon no paleontological findings, and is also logically inconsistent.

---

[135] Lewis L. Carroll, "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 44, p. 393.
[136] Robert L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1988, p. 198.
[137] *Ibid.*, pp. 180-182.
[138] H. S. Lipson, "A Physicist's View of Darwin's Theory," *Evolution Trends in Plants*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1988, p. 6.
[139] *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*, "Turtle--Origin and Evolution."
[140] Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 296-97.
[141] Douglas Palmer, *The Atlas of the Prehistoric World*, Discovery Channel, London: Marshall Publishing, 1999, p. 66.
[142] Mustafa Kuru, *Omurgalı Hayvanlar*, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Yayınları, , 1996, p. 21.
[143] *Ibid*., p. 27.
[144] Douglas Palmer, *The Atlas of the Prehistoric World*, Discovery Channel, p. 6.
[145] Richard Monastersky, "Waking Up to the Dawn of Vertebrates," *Science News*, Vol. 156, No. 19, 6 November 1999, p. 292
[146] Prof. Dr. Muammer Bilge, *Hücre Bilimi*, p. 59.
[147] Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, pp.65, 72.
[148] M. Yılmaz Öner, *Canlıların Diyalektiği ve Yeni Evrim Teorisi*, pp. 84-89
[149] Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim*, p. 73.
[150] Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, New York: Toplinger Publications, 1970, pp.75-94.
[151] Charles E. Oxnard, "The Place of Australopithecines in Human Evolution: Grounds for Doubt," *Nature*, Vol 258, p. 389.
[152] Fred Spoor, Bernard Wood, Frans Zonneveld, "Implication of Early Hominid Labryntine Morphology for Evolution of Human Bipedal Locomotion," *Nature*, Vol. 369, June 23, 1994, pp. 645-648.

Mammals are regarded as the creatures at the top of the evolutionary ladder. That being so, it is very hard to explain why these animals reverted to a marine environment. The next question is, how did these animals adapt to the marine environment even better than fish? Because creatures such as killer whales, which are mammals and therefore have lungs, exhibit an even more perfect adaptation to their environment than fish, which actually do breathe in water.

In recent years, various fossils have been suggested as solution to this dilemma, but in fact benefit the theory of evolution not at all.

The first of these fossils is *Pakicetus inachus*, extinct mammal first discovered in 1983. The finder of the first specimen, Philip D. Gingerich and his colleagues had no qualms about claiming it to be a primitive whale, even though they had discovered only a skull. However, the fossil had not the slightest connection to whales in any shape or form. The skeleton had a four-footed structure, resembling that of modern wolves. The region where the fossil was discovered contained seams of oxidized iron as well as fossils of such terrestrial animals as snails, tortoises and crocodiles. In other words, its environment had been dry land, not a marine bed.

So why was this quadruped land dweller deemed to be a primitive whale? The answer is supplied in *National Geographic* magazine, an evolutionist publication:

Subtle clues in combination—the arrangement of cusps on the molar teeth, a folding in a bone of the middle ear, and the positioning of the ear bones within the skull—are absent in other land mammals.[153]

However, these features represent no evidence for constructing a relationship between *Pakicetus* and fish:

First, as *National Geographic* indirectly makes clear by employing the words "subtle clues in combination," some of these features also exist in other land-dwelling mammals.

In addition, none of the characteristics in question constitutes evidence for an evolutionary relationship. Most of the theoretical relationships between species that evolutionists seek to establish on the basis of anatomical similarities are exceedingly flawed— as evolutionists themselves admit. *Pakicetus* is a unique species with different anatomical features in its body. Robert Carroll, an authority on invertebrate paleontology, states that the family of Mesonychids, in which *Pakicetus* should be included, displays a combination of peculiar characteristics. Prominent evolutionists such as Gould admit that such mosaic life forms cannot be regarded as intermediate forms.

In an article titled "The Overselling of Whale Evolution," the science writer Ashby L. Camp describes the invalidity of the claim that the Mesonychids, of which land mammals such as *Pakicetus* are a part, are the ancestors of *Archaeocetes*, the extinct whales:

The reason evolutionists are confident that mesonychids gave rise to archaeocetes, despite the inability to identify any species in the actual lineage, is that known mesonychids and archaeocetes have some similarities. These similarities, however, are not sufficient to make the case for ancestry, especially in light of the vast differences. The subjective nature of such comparisons is evident from the fact so many groups of mammals and even reptiles have been suggested as ancestral to whales.[154]

Pakicetus is followed in the evolutionary tree by *Ambulocetus natans*. This fossil, first announced in an article published in *Science* magazine in 1994, is a terrestrial animal that evolutionists have attempted to force into a whale mould.

The name *Ambulocetus natans* is a combination of the Latin words *ambulare* (to walk), *cetus* (whale) and *natans* (swimming), and thus means "a swimming and walking whale." Obviously, this animal walked, because like all terrestrial mammals, it had four feet, and even wide claws on its feet

and paws on its hind legs. Apart from evolutionist preconceptions, however, there is absolutely no foundation, for the idea that the animal swam in water or that it lived both on land and in water, as hippos and alligators do. In fact, there is no evidence that either *Pakicetus* or *Ambulocetus* were related to whales in any way. They are merely potential ancestors which evolutionists, obliged to find a terrestrial ancestor for marine mammals as required by their theory, have suggested on the basis of various limited similarities. No evidence shows that these creatures were related to the marine mammals that emerge in the fossil record in a geological period very soon after..

A number of true marine mammals are listed in the fictitious evolutionary tree after *Pakicetus* and *Ambulocetus*: Archaeocetes ("ancient whale") *species* such as *Procetus* and *Rhodcetus*. These creatures are extinct mammals that genuinely did live in water, as you shall see in subsequent sections. However, there are considerable anatomical differences between *Pakicetus* and *Ambulocetus* and these marine animals:

- In *Ambulocetus*, a four-footed land mammal, the backbone ends in the pelvic bone, from which powerful leg bones extend. This is the typical anatomy for land mammals. In whales, on the other hand, the backbone continues right down to the tail and there is no pelvic bone at all. *Basilosaurus*, thought to have lived up to 10 million years after *Ambulocetus*, possesses just such an anatomy—in other words, it is a typical whale. There is no intermediate form between *Ambulocetus*, a typical terrestrial animal, and *Basilosaurus*, a typical whale.
- *Basilosaurus* and sperm whales (cachalots) have small bones independent of the backbone in their lower bodies. Some evolutionists claim that these are shrunken leg bones. However, the bones in question assist with assuming the mating position in *Basilosaurus*, whereas in cachalot they support the reproductive organs.[155] To describe skeleton components that perform a very important function as the vestigial organs of another function is simply evolutionist prejudice.

In conclusion, it is clear that marine mammals appeared with all their unique structures and with no intermediate form between them and terrestrial mammals. Robert Carroll admits this, albeit reluctantly and in evolutionist language, that there is no chain of evolution here.:

It is not possible to identify a sequence of mesonychids leading directly to whales. [156]

Some rather more unbiased scientists, on the other hand, openly admit that the animals that evolutionist sources refer to as "walking whales" are actually a completely separate group and have nothing to do with true whales.

The Russian scientist G. A. Mchedlidze, a well-known expert on whales, disagrees with the description of *Pakicetus*, *Ambulocetus natans* and similar quadrupeds as possible ancestors of the whale, and regards them as a completely isolated group.[157]

This summarizes the invalidity of the evolutionist claim that marine mammals evolved from terrestrial life forms. Scientific findings show no link between marine mammals and the two land mammals (*Pakicetus* and *Ambulocetus natans*) that evolutionists place right at the beginning of this scenario.

In the remaining part of the scenario, the theory of evolution is also at an impasse. The theory seeks to establish a family relationship between the extinct, genuine marine mammal known as *Archaeocetes* ("archaic whale") and living dolphins and whales.

The fact is that experts in the field think differently. The evolutionist paleontologist Barbara J. Stahl writes:

The serpentine form of the body and the peculiar serrated cheek teeth make it plain that these archaeocetes [*i.e., Basilosaurus* and related creatures] could not possibly have been ancestral to any

of the modern whales. [158]

With regard to the origin of marine mammals, the evolutionist scenario is also contradicted by molecular biology's findings.

The classic evolutionist scenario hypothesizes that the two major whale groups, in order words toothed whales (*Odontoceti*) and baleen whales (*Mysticeti*), evolved from a common ancestor. However, Michel C. Milinkovitch of Brussels University opposed this view with a new theory, emphasizing that that hypothesis, constructed on anatomical similarities, and was invalidated by molecular discoveries:

Evolutionary relationships among the major groups of cetaceans is more problematic since morphological and molecular analyses reach very different conclusions. Indeed, based on the conventional interpretation of the morphological and behavioral data set, the echolocating toothed whales (about 67 species) and the filter-feeding baleen whales (10 species) are considered as two distinct monophyletic groups . . . On the other hand, phylogenetic analysis of DNA... and amino acid. . . sequences contradict this long-accepted taxonomic division. One group of toothed whales, the sperm whales, appears to be more closely related to the morphologically highly divergent baleen whales than to other odontocetes.[159]

In short, marine mammals all refute the imaginary family tree in which evolutionists seek to locate them.

Origin of the Wings

How could the immaculate structure of wings have emerged as the result of consecutive random mutations? That question is one that evolutionists are unable to answer. They are totally unable to explain how a reptile's front legs could have turned into a flawless wings as the result of successive defects (mutations) arising in its genes.

The Turkish evolutionist and scientist Engin Korur describes the impossibility of wings evolving:

The common feature of eyes and wings is that they can only fulfill their tasks in the event that they are fully formed. To put it another way, one cannot see with a deficient eye, nor fly with half a wing. How these organs came into being has remained as one of the secrets of nature that has not yet been unraveled.[160]

Orthogenesis Muddle, *The* (Directed Selection)

Orthogenesis is an old thesis that is no longer accepted even by theory of evolution's own adherents. This thesis assumes that living things evolved not according to environmental conditions, but solely according to their own genetic structures.

According to the orthogenetic view, a kind of internal program leads living things to evolve in a particular way. This view also led to orthogenesis being known as *the predetermination theory*. This hypothesis, based on no scientific evidence whatsoever, lost all credence in the second half of the 20th century.

Ota Benga

After Darwin claimed that human beings evolved from ape-like creatures in his book *The Descent of Man*, a search began for fossils to back up his theory. Some evolutionists, however, believed that half-man, half-ape creatures could be found not only in the fossil record, but still living

in various parts of the world. In the early part of the 20th century, this search for living intermediate forms led to various shameful actions. One of these involved the pygmy Ota Benga.

He was captured in Congo in 1904 by an evolutionist researcher named Samuel Verner. Ota Benga, whose name meant *friend* in his own language, was married with two children. Yet he was chained, placed in a cage like an animal and transported to the U.S.A. There, evolutionist scientists put him in a cage with various apes at the St. Louis World Fair and exhibited him as the closest intermediate form to man. Two years later they took him to the Bronx Zoo in New York and exhibited him together with a few chimpanzees, a gorilla named Dinah and an orangutan called Dohung as man's oldest ancestors.

The evolutionist director of the zoo, Dr. William T. Hornaday, made long speeches about how honored he was to own this intermediate form, and visitors to the zoo treated Ota Benga like any other animal.

Unable to withstand the treatment he was subjected to, Ota Benga committed suicide.[161]

An article published in *The New York Times* at the time described visitors' behavior:

40,000 visitors roamed the New York Zoological Park… the sudden surge of interest… was entirely attributable to Ota Benga. The crowds were so enormous that a police officer was assigned full-time to guard Ota (the zoo claimed this was to protect him) as he was "always in danger of being grabbed, yanked, poked, and pulled to pieces by the mob." [162]

The 17 September 1906 edition of *The New York Times* emphasized that although this was all done in order to prove evolution; it was actually a great injustice and act of cruelty:

Further, many of the ministers opposed the theory of evolution, concluding that "the exhibition evidently aims to be a demonstration of the Darwinian theory of evolution."

These men, without thought and intelligence have been exhibiting in a cage of monkeys, a small human dwarf from Africa. Their idea, probably, was to inculcate some profound lesson in evolution.

As a matter of fact, the only result achieved has been to hold up to scorn the African race, which deserves at least sympathy and kindness from the whites of this country, after all the brutality it has suffered here …

It is shameful and disgusting that the misfortune, the physical deficiency, of a human being, created by the same Force that puts us all here and endowed with the same feelings and the same soul, should be locked in a cage with monkeys and be made a public mockery. [163]

The New York Times also covered the way in which Ota Benga was put on display in the zoo in order to demonstrate evolution. The defense issued by the Darwinist zoo director was lacking in all conscience:

The exhibition of an African pygmy in the same cage with an orang outang at the New York Zoological Park last week stirred up considerable criticism. Some persons declared it was an attempt on the part of Director Hornaday to demonstrate a close relationship between Negroes and monkeys. Dr. Hornaday denied this. "If the little fellow is in a cage," said Dr. Hornaday, "it is because he is most comfortable there, and because we are at a loss to know what else to do with him. He is in no sense a prisoner, except that no one would say it was wise to allow him to wander around the city without some one having an eye on him." [164]

Ota Benga's being put on show in the zoo alongside gorillas, just like an animal, made many people uneasy. Some organizations declared that Ota Benga was a human being and that such

treatment was very cruel, and applied to the authorities to put an end to the situation. One of these applications appeared in the 12 September 1906 edition of the *New York Globe*:

Sir— I lived in the south several years, and consequently am not overfond of negro, but believe him human. I think it a shame that the authorities of this great city should allow such a sight as that witnessed at the Bronx Park— a negro boy, on exhibition in a monkey cage . . .

This whole pygmy business needs investigation . . . [165]

P

Paleontology

Paleontology is a branch of science that investigates fossils of organisms that lived in various geological periods and helps provide information about species living in those eras.[166] Another definition of paleontology is the branch of science that studies the fossils and biology of extinct organisms. The first paleontological research began in the 19th century, studying plant and animal fossils to determine the life forms that existed in the geological past, as well as their morphology, structure, taxonomic relations with present-day species, geographical distribution and environmental relationships. Information obtained from paleontology is used to determine the age of geological strata.

The theory of evolution most commonly manifests itself in paleontological research, because fossil findings have been highly prone to evolutionists' distortions and biased interpretations. History is full of forgeries perpetrated in the search for supposed evidence for the theory of evolution. (*See* ***The*** **Piltdown Man Fraud**, ***The*** **Nebraska Man Fraud**, and ***The*** **Neanderthal Man Fraud**.)

The false impression that paleontology supports the theory of evolution is described in an article in *Science* magazine:

A large number of well-trained scientists outside of evolutionary biology and paleontology have unfortunately gotten the idea that the fossil record is far more Darwinian than it is. This probably comes from the oversimplification inevitable in secondary sources: low-level textbooks, semipopular articles, and so on. Also, there is probably some wishful thinking involved. In the years after Darwin, his advocates hoped to find predictable progressions. In general these have not been found yet the optimism has died hard, and some pure fantasy has crept into textbooks. [167]

The leading evolutionists N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall make an important comment:

That individual kinds of fossils remain recognizably the same throughout the length of their occurrence in the fossil record had been known to paleontologists long before Darwin published his Origin. Darwin himself, . . . prophesied that future generations of paleontologists would fill in these gaps by diligent search . . . One hundred and twenty years of paleontological research later, it has become abundantly clear that the fossil record will not confirm this part of Darwin's predictions. Nor is the problem a miserably poor record. The fossil record simply shows that this prediction is wrong. [168]

The observation that species remain amazingly stable, and for very long periods of time, contains all the features of the story of "The Emperor's New Clothes." Everyone saw the truth, but all chose to ignore it. Paleontologists were faced by a fossil record that definitively refutes the picture that Darwin imagined, but openly turned their backs on the truth.

The American paleontologist S.M. Stanley describes how this fact, revealed by the fossil record, is completely ignored by the Darwinist dogma that dominates the world of science:

---

[166] Prof. Dr. Eşref Deniz, *Tıbbi Biyoloji*, 4th Edition, Ankara, 1992, p. 354.
[167] *Science*, July 17, 1981, p. 289.
[168] N. Eldredge, and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982, pp. 45-46.

The known fossil record is not, and never has been, in accord with gradualism. What is remarkable is that, through a variety of historical circumstances, even the history of opposition has been obscured… "The majority of paleontologists felt their evidence simply contradicted Darwin's stress on minute, slow, and cumulative changes leading to species transformation." . . . [but] their story has been suppressed. [169]

Paleoanthropology

Paleoanthropology is a branch of science that studies the origin and developmental process of man. Studies in this field are backed up by many other branches of science, but the greatest use is made of information obtained from fossils.

However, as in many other branches of science, fossils are interpreted in the light of the assumptions of the theory of evolution. Findings obtained from the fields of archaeology and ethnology are interpreted in a biased manner so as to demonstrate the physical and mental development of man's supposed forerunners, who must have existed according to the claims of the theory of evolution.

Despite being an evolutionist, the Arizona State University anthropologist Geoffrey Clark admitted as much in a text published in 1997:

We select among alternative sets of research conclusions in accordance with our biases and preconceptions—a process that is, at once, both political and subjective.… paleoanthropology has the form but not the substance of a science.[170]

Niles Eldredge of Harvard University and Ian Tattersall of the American Museum of Natural History, two of the USA's leading paleontologists, comment on paleontological findings:

It is a myth that the evolutionary histories of living things are essentially a matter of discovery. If this were true, one could confidently expect that as more hominid fossils were found the story of human evolution would become clearer. Whereas if anything, the opposite has occurred.[171]

Many other evolutionist experts on the subject also harbor pessimistic ideas about the very theory they support. Henry Gee, *Nature* magazine's best-known writer, says that "between about 10 and 5 million years ago—several thousand generations of living creatures—can be fitted into a small box." The conclusion Gee draws from this is very interesting:

To take a line of fossils and claim that they represent a lineage is not a scientific hypothesis that can be tested, but an assertion that carries the same validity as a bedtime story—amusing, perhaps even instructive, but not scientific.[172]

Why is this branch of science, offering no evidence for the theory of evolution, regarded as so important by evolutionists? Why is every fossil discovery interpreted in such a biased, exaggerated manner? At a meeting held at the Biology Teachers' Association, the evolutionist Greg Kirby described this mentality:

If you were to spend your life picking up bones and finding little fragments of head and little fragments of jaw, there is a very strong desire there to exaggerate the importance of those fragments.[173]

No scientific paleoanthropological findings provide any support for evolution. All the "proofs" that evolutionists offer are fossils one-sidedly interpreted in order to deny the existence of Allah, the supreme Creator.

"Panda's Thumb" Error, *The*

One of the classic evolutionist arguments is that of the Panda's thumb, made famous by Stephen Jay Gould. Along with its five fingers, the panda also has a bony protrusion on its wrist known as the radial sesamoid bone.

In evolutionists' view, the panda—originally a carnivore like dogs and cats—began feeding on bamboo. According to the evolutionist scenario, the sixth finger emerged so that the panda could grasp bamboo more easily. A different evolutionist claim is that though this sixth finger is not perfect, it's as good as natural selection could make it. But in fact, these are claims made entirely in line with evolutionist preconceptions, devoid of proof and explain nothing.

Of pandas being descended from carnivorous ancestors:

Evolutionists include the panda among the carnivores because it has wide jaws, teeth and strong claws. They claim that the panda's alleged ancestors used these features against other animals. Yet the panda's only enemy is man; among other animals, it has no enemies. Its powerful teeth and jaws are for breaking off and chewing bamboo stems. Its strong claws serve for climbing up bamboo stems. Therefore, there is not the slightest evidence that pandas—which generally eat bamboo and fruit and other plants from time to time—evolved from carnivorous forerunners.

Evolutionists have been unable to agree on which animal the panda might have evolved from. Some evolutionists place the panda in the same category as bears; others in the same category as raccoons, because no findings suggest that these animals have evolved from any other class. Evolutionists speculate on the basis of similarities alone, and disagree with one another because their conjectures are sheer fantasy.

Of the panda's thumb not being perfect, being the work of chance:

Evolutionists say that the panda's thumb is not perfect, but still serves a purpose.

In fact, this sixth finger is a kind of bone known as the *radial sesamoid bone*, which generally facilitates movement at the joints and prevents the tendons from tearing. This structure, emerging

---

[153] "Evolution of Whales," *National Geographic*, November 2001, pp. 64-77.
[154] Ashby L. Camp, "The Overselling of Whale Evolution," *Creation Matters*, May/June 1998, http://www.trueorigin.org/whales.asp
[155]"Evolution of Whales," *National Geographic*, pp. 64-77.
[156] Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 329.
[157] G. A. Mchedlidze, *General Features of the Paleobiological Evolution of Cetacea*, Translated from the Russian, Rotterdam: A.A. Balkema, 1986, p. 91.
[158] B.J. Stahl, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, Dover Publications, Inc., 1985, p. 489.
[159] Michel C. Milinkovitch, "Molecular phylogeny of cetaceans prompts revision of morphological transformations," *Trends in Ecology and Evolution 10* (August 1995): pp. 328-334.
[160] Engin Korur, "Gözlerin ve Kanatların Sırrı," *Bilim ve Teknik*, No: 203, October 1984, p. 25.
[161] Philips Verner Bradford, Harvey Blume, *Ota Benga: The Pygmy in The Zoo*, New York: Delta Books, , 1992.
[162] *Ibid.*, p. 269.
[163] *Ibid.*, p. 267.
[164] Ibid., p. 266.
[165] Geoffrey C. Ward, "The Man in the Zoo," *American Heritage* magazine, October 1992, Vol: 43, Issue 6.
[169] S. M. Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable: Fossils, Genes, and the Origin of Species*, New York: Basic Books Inc. Publishers, 1981, p. 71.
[170] G. A. Clark, C. M. Willermet, *Conceptual Issues in Modern Human Origins Research*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1997, p. 76.
[171] Niles Eldredge, Ian Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, pp. 126-127.
[172] Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time*, New York: The Free Press, 1999, pp. 116-117.
[173] http://www.catholicintl.com/noncatholicissues/devolution.htm

from the wrist, is actually no finger at all, but a support that helps the other fingers grip onto bamboo stalks.[174]

Evolutionists maintain that this bone developed in place of a finger, but does not serve as one —saying, for example, that it cannot strip shoots. However, they also say that it is sufficiently developed for grasping. That is in any case the job of this sixth finger, and the panda has enough other fingers to perform other tasks perfectly.[175] The idea that this structure's ideal shape would be that of a complete finger is a groundless, based on evolutionist prejudices. The bone is perfectly suitable in its present state.

One study published in *Nature* magazine in 1999 shows that in the panda's natural habitat, its thumb is highly efficient. The study, carried out by four Japanese researchers and performed using computerized tomography and magnetic resonance imaging, concluded that the panda's thumb is "one of the most extraordinary manipulation systems in mammalia." [176]

Evolutionists look for incompatibility or flaws in nature only to find evidence for denying Allah's immaculate creation. Yet these efforts have always proved fruitless. The panda's thumb is yet another instance of this.

Pangenesis Theory, *The*

The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle maintained that one part of all the cells in the body came together to form the egg and sperm. He also suggested that all the changes taking place in the body throughout an organism's life could be passed along to later generations.

This idea was taken up by Lamarck and Darwin in the 19th century, although it was eventually shown to be false. Reproductive cells are not a product of the body's cells, and changes in them do not affect the ovum and spermatazoa. (*See* **Lamarck's Evolution Scenario**.)

Panspermia Theory, *The*

Faced by the fact that amino acids cannot form by chance, evolutionists looked for a new explanation of how life might have arisen spontaneously under the conditions of the primeval world. According to their new claims, amino acids in meteors falling to Earth reacted with organic substances and thus gave rise to life.

According to this view, the first organic substance originated beyond the Earth, on another planet. The spores or seeds of these organisms were then carried to Earth by meteors, and life thus began. In the light of our current knowledge, however, it doesn't appear possible for spores or seeds to withstand such outer-space conditions as cold, utter vacuum, and harmful radiation on their way to Earth—not to mention the intense heat and impact of passing through the atmosphere.[177]

Conditions in space make it impossible for life to survive. The well-known Russian scientist George Gamow says:

. . . there is a still more serious threat awaiting spores traveling through space than freezing to death. The Sun is well known to emit a significant level of ultraviolet rays. These rays, only a small proportion of which are permitted to pass through the atmospheric layer surrounding the Earth, represent the most serious danger to these micro-organism spores with no defensive mechanisms with which to protect themselves, and are sufficiently powerful to kill them instantaneously. For that reason, even a fictitious journey by these bacteria to the nearest planet will still result in death. Another study conducted in 1966 led to the "out of space" hypothesis being totally abandoned. The most highly resistant micro-organisms were installed on the outer surface of the spacecraft *Gemini-9* and this was then launched into space. Examinations revealed that these micro-organisms all died within seven hours. Yet according to this hypothesis, the bacteria that supposedly gave rise to life must have traveled for many years. [178]

The crystal-clear fact that emerges is that it is impossible for micro-organisms to reach Earth from outer space. However, even if large quantities of amino acids had come from space, and even if the entire surface of the primitive Earth world was covered with them, this would still not account for the origin of life. It would be impossible for amino acids to combine randomly and haphazardly and form an exceedingly complex, three-dimensional protein; for proteins to form the organelles in cells; and then for these organelles to produce the miraculous structure of the cell itself.

Parallel Evolution Impasse, *The*

One of the subjects that pose the worst dilemmas for evolutionists is those organs with exceedingly complex structures. Evolutionists claim that living things with very complex organs in common but with no common ancestor must have undergone evolution independently of one another.

---

[177] Özer Bulut, Davut Sağdıç, Selim Korkmaz, *Biyoloji Lise 3*, MEB Basımevi, Istanbul, 2000, p. 182.
[178] Musa Özet, Osman Arpacı, Ali Uslu, *Biyoloji 3*, Sürat Yayınları, August 1999, p. 254.

According to evolutionists, these living things developed in parallel to one another and came to possess similar organs; however this might have come about. To cite one example, the structure of the eye in squid and vertebrates is identical, though no attempt is made to construct an evolutionary relationship among these creatures. Evolutionists claimed parallel evolution to account for the origin of these organs. However hard it is to explain how such developed organs came into existence once, it's quite impossible to account for how they might have come into being twice, and independently.

Briefly, the only difference between parallel evolution and other forms of evolution is that the former needs even more chances to come about. The more flawless structures appear in living things, the less scientific appear evolutionists' scenarios.

Pasteur, Louis

As a result of lengthy research and experiments, the famous French biologist Louis Pasteur concluded that: "Never will the doctrine of spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow struck by this simple experiment." [179]

With his view that life comes only from life, also known as *biogenesis*, Pasteur totally invalidated the belief in spontaneous generation that constituted the essence of Darwin's evolution. (*See* **Abiogenesis** and **Biogenesis**.)

Proponents of the theory of evolution long resisted Pasteur's findings. However, as scientific advances revealed the complex structure of the living cell, their claim that life could form spontaneously found itself in an ever- deeper impasse.

Peking Man Fraud, *The*

In 1921, Dr. Davidson Black discovered two molar teeth in a depression near the village of Choukoutien, attached to the Chinese city of Pekin (Beijing). These two teeth were given the name *Sinanthropus pekinensis* and were suggested to belong to a hominid, or human-like creature. Dr. W.C. Pei found a third tooth in 1927, and several skull fragments and two pieces from the jaw in 1928. Black claimed that these belonged to *S. pekinensis* and announced that its skull volume was 900 cubic centimeters. Its age was estimated at 500,000 years.

In 1936 three skulls were discovered in the same place by Pei and the American Professor Franz Weidenreich. These skulls, too, were declared to belong to *S. pekinensis,* and the skull volume was enlarged to 1,200 cubic centimeters. Apart from the two molars, all the materials found as evidence disappeared between 1941 and 1945. All that remains is Weindenreich's plaster models of them.

Professor Duane Gish, known for his many years of research into the invalidity of the theory of evolution, says this:

Of most critical importance to an evaluation of this material is . . . that all of this material except two teeth disappeared sometime during the period 1941-1945, and none of it has ever been recovered. Many stories concerning the disappearance of this material have circulated, the most popular being that it was either lost or seized by the Japanese during an attempt to move it from Peking to a U.S. Marine detachment that was evacuating China. None of these stories has been verified. No living person apparently knows what happened to the material.

As a result, we are totally dependent on models and descriptions of this material left by a few investigators, all of whom were totally committed to the idea that man had evolved from animal ancestors. Even is a scientist is a completely objective as humanly possible, the model of description he fashions on the basis of scanty and incomplete material with reflect to a critical degree what he

thinks the evidence ought to show. Furthermore, there is ample evidence that objectivity was seriously lacking in the treatment and evaluation of the material recovered at Choukoutien.

All we have available are the models fashioned by Weidenreich. How reliable are these models? Are they accurate casts of the originals, or do they reflect what Weidenreich thought they should look like? [180]

Increasing discoveries in the years that followed, and particularly after the 1990s, made it clear that no such evolutionary process as the tree of descent, proposed by evolutionists, ever took place. In terms of their age, geographical regions and anatomical features, the fossils discovered could not be placed in any evolutionary sequence. Increasingly, therefore, the idea that Peking Man was to the missing link lost support, and evolutionists abandoned hope of having found any missing link.

In the present day, there are no longer frequent claims of intermediate forms imputed to *Homo erectus*, under which Peking Man had been classified. Many anthropologists emphasise that *H. erectus* (and therefore Peking Man) was no different from modern humans. *H. erectus* is not an intermediate form, but an extinct human race.

This view was generally accepted at a conference attended by well-known palaeontologists and anthropologists in Germany. *American Scientist* magazine reported the developments at the conference:

. . . most of the participants at the Senckenberg conference got drawn into a flaming debate over the taxonomic status of *Homo erectus* started by Milford Wolpoff of the University of Michigan, Alan Thorne of the University of Canberra and their colleagues. They argued forcefully that *Homo erectus* had no validity as a species and should be eliminated altogether. [186]

The latest developments with regard to *H. erectus*, under which Peking Man is classified, forced the *National Geographic*'s TV channel to make an important admission. The program quoted the physical anthropologist Gary Sawyer of the American Museum of Natural History as saying that Peking Man, in terms of his physical characteristics, was a genuine human being. This retreat once again shows that the scenario of the human line of descent has collapsed. The crystal reality is that humans and apes are life forms created separately by Allah.

Pentadactyl Homology - *see* **Five-Digit Homology**.

Peptide Bond

It's not enough for the varieties of amino acid necessary to form a protein to be in the appropriate number and sequence and to have the needed three-dimensional structure. They must also bond to one another by specific amino acid molecules with more than one arm. The bond formed in this way is known as a *peptide bond.*

Amino acids may attach to one another by a variety of different bonds, but proteins can emerge only from amino acids attached to one another by peptide bonds.

To use analogy, imagine that all the components of an automobile are present, and in just the right place. However, let one of the wheels be attached by a coil of wire rather than by bolts. No matter how powerful or how technologically advanced that car's engine may be, that car will still be unable to cover any distance. Everything else appears to be in order, yet one of the wheels being attached in a wrong way makes the whole car functionless. In the same way, if just a single amino acid in a protein molecule is attached by some other bond than a peptide bond, the entire molecule will be useless.

Research has revealed that random bonding of amino acids results in 50% peptide bonds at most, the rest being attached by bonds that are not found in proteins. Therefore, in calculating the probability of a protein coming into being by chance, we must include the requirement that all amino acids be left-handed, and the fact that every amino acid can only be attached to the others by a peptide bond. If we consider a 400-amino acid protein, the chances of all the amino acids being attached to one another by peptide bonds alone is 1 in 2^{399} —a figure that cannot possibly be achieved by random factors.

Phylogeny

Phylogeny is the term used to describe the supposed evolutionary history of any group of living things. Phylogeny is evolutionists' attempts to ascribe degrees of relatedness among living things, to reveal all the possible similarities and differences of a species or group and set out the stages they underwent from their supposed ancestors. (*See* **Phylum**, and **Taxonomy**.)

By such means, evolutionists hope to indicate the lines of descent they assume occurred among living things. In addition, based on various similarities in species, they try to place all living things on certain branches of the evolutionary family tree. But this is all based on their preconceptions. These are all fictitious studies, devoid of any scientific evidence.

Phylum (Plural: Phyla)

Biologists classify living things into various separate groups. This classification, known as *taxonomy* or *systematic biology*, consists of hierarchical categories.

Living things are first divided into *kingdoms*, such as the plant and animal kingdoms, which are then subdivided into phyla.

In determining these phyla, each of all the different basic body types has been considered. For instance, arthropods (jointed legs) are one separate phylum, and all the species in it have a similar body plan. The phylum known as Chordata contains all those species with a central nervous system. All the animals familiar to us, such as fish, birds, reptiles and mammals represent a subdivision—vertebrates—of the phylum Chordata.

Among the different animal phyla there are very different categories, such as Mollusca, which include soft-bodied creatures such as octopus, and the phylum Nematode, which includes roundworms. The categories beneath phyla have basically similar body plans, but phyla are altogether different from one another.

Piltdown Man Fraud, *The*

In 1912, Charles Dawson, a famous doctor and also an amateur paleontologist, claimed to have discovered a jawbone and part of a skull in a gravel pit near the village of Piltdown in England. Although the jawbone resembled that of an ape, the teeth and skull resembled those of human beings. These specimens were given the name of Piltdown Man, an age of 500,000 was estimated for them, and they were exhibited in various museums as incontrovertible proof of evolution. For some 40 years, they were the subject of many scientific papers, analyses and reconstructions. Some 500 academics from various universities all over the world prepared doctoral theses on the subject of Piltdown Man.[181]

On a visit to the British Museum in 1935, the famous American paleoanthropologist H.F. Osborn proclaimed Piltdown "a discovery of transcendent importance to the prehistory of man," and added, "We have to be reminded over and over again that nature is full of paradoxes …" [182]

In 1949, Kenneth Oakley of the British Museum's Paleoanthropology Department sought permission to perform a new dating technique, the fluoride test, on some old fossils. When it was carried out on the Piltdown Man fossil, it was revealed that the jawbone contained no fluoride. This showed that it had been underground for no more than a few years. The skull contained a low level of fluoride, making it only a few thousand years old.

Subsequent chronological investigations based on the fluoride method confirmed that the skull was only a few thousand years old. It was also realized that the teeth had been artificially abraded, and that the primitive artifacts found alongside the fossils were mere reproductions, made with modern steel implements.[183]

With the detailed analyses performed by Weiner, this fraud was definitively revealed in 1953. The skull was 500 years old and human, and the jaw belonged to a newly dead orangutan! The teeth had been added later, and their joints abraded to give the impression they were human. Later, all the parts had been stained with potassium dichromate to give them an aged appearance. When the bones were placed in acid, the stains disappeared.

Le Gros Clark, a member of the team that uncovered the fraud, was unable to mask his astonishment: "the evidences of artificial abrasion immediately sprang to the eye. Indeed so obvious did they seem it may well be asked—- how was it that they had escaped notice before?" [184]

Piltdown Man, which had been exhibited for the previous 40 years or so, was then hurriedly removed from the British Museum.

Pithecanthropus erectus —*see* **Nebraska Man Fraud, *The*.**

Plasmid Transfer

Bacteria contain a small DNA molecule known as a plasmid in addition to the main DNA strands, or chromosomes. A plasmid is a small DNA ring found outside the chromosomes in many species of bacteria. A rounded DNA molecule of no fundamental importance to the bacterium, a plasmid—according to evolutionists—provides selective benefits. This plasmid DNA's round shape enables it to enter or leave the bacterium with ease. This feature of plasmids led to DNA combination research.

Plasmid transfer is one of the techniques that scientists discovered for the purpose of combining DNA. Research into newly combined (recombinant) DNA is performed by combining the DNAs of different organisms to obtain large enough quantities of specific genes to be able to study them. Many biologists regard this method as one of the most valuable means of biological research yet discovered.[185]

One of the discoveries revealed by this technique is bacteria's antibiotic resistance. The genes of bacteria that have proved resistant in the past are transmitted to other bacteria by way of plasmids. Resistant genes are generally found in plasmids. In this way, a resistant gene acquired by a non-resistant bacterium can easily be added onto its own DNA. This means that from a single resistant bacterium, a resistant bacterial colony can emerge in a very short time.

However, nothing about this mechanism provides evidence for evolution, because the genes that endow resistance in bacteria are not formed as the result of mutations. All that occurs is the transmission of genes already existing among bacteria.

Platypus

The platypus, a member of the marsupial family that lives in Australia, is an excellent example that invalidates evolutionist claims. Despite being a mammal, covered in fur and possessing milk glands, the platypus also lays eggs. More interestingly, it has a bill like a duck.

Since this creature has mammalian, avian and reptilian features, evolutionists point to it as a simple animal and as an intermediate form. Yet the truth is very different.

So highly developed is the platypus that it possesses a literal sixth sense. Since it lives in muddy waters, it has been equipped with a mechanism that allows it to move by use of electrical signals. This electroreceptor system bears no similarity to the systems found in certain fish, but is far more complex. With its own unique movements, the platypus sets up an electrical current in the river waters and uses this to determine the river surface.

The platypus is a mosaic animal. However, if it became extinct and if traces of it were later found in the fossil record, evolutionists would not hesitate to suggest that it was an intermediate form between reptiles and mammals. All the supposed intermediate forms cited today are in fact the result of such distortions.

Pleiotropic Effect, *The*

One of the proofs that mutations inflict only harm on living things is the coding of the genetic code. In developed animals, almost all the known genes contain more than one piece of information about that organism. For example, a single gene may control both height and eye color.

The molecular biologist Michael Denton describes this feature, known as genes' pleiotropic effect:

> The effects of genes on development are often surprisingly diverse. In the house mouse, nearly every coat-colour gene has some effect on body size. Out of seventeen X-ray-induced eye colour mutations in the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, fourteen affected the shape of the sex organs of the female, a characteristic that one would have thought was quite unrelated to eye colour. Almost every gene that has been studied in higher organisms has been found to effect more than one organ system, a multiple effect which is known as pleiotropy. As Mayr argues in *Population, Species and Evolution*: "It is doubtful whether any genes that are not pleiotropic exist in higher organisms." [186]

Due to this characteristic in living things' genes, any defect occurring in any gene in the DNA as a result of a chance mutation will affect more than one organ. Thus the mutation will have more than one destructive effect. Even if one of these effects is hypothesized to be beneficial, as the result of an extremely rare coincidence, the other effects' inevitable damage will cancel out any advantage. (*See* **Mutation: An Imaginary Mechanism**.)

Therefore, it is impossible for living things to have undergone evolution, because no mechanism exists that can cause them to evolve.

Population

Populations are aggregations of a single species whose members often display considerable genetic variety. The individuals in any population determine that population's genetic structure. In ecological terms, a population is defined as a society consisting of members of the same species, spread over a specific area.

The realization that hereditary features affected populations more than individuals—and that individuals within that population were nothing more than gene-carrying vehicles—brought population genetics to the fore.

Pre-Adaptation Myth, *The*

Evolutionists' efforts to account for the origin of species in terms of transition from water to land, and from land to the air, require wide-ranging changes. Consider, for instance, how a fish emerging from water might adapt to dry land. Unless it undergoes rapid changes in its respiratory system, excretory mechanism and skeletal structure, it will inevitably die. A series of mutations must immediately endow the fish with lungs, elongate its fins into feet, bestow kidneys on it, and give its skin a water-retaining property. It is essential that this entire string of mutations takes place within the lifespan of only a single animal.

No evolutionist biologist proposes such a chain of mutations, since the idea is too nonsensical and illogical. Instead, they refer to the concept of *pre-adaptation*. By this, they mean is that fish underwent changes necessary for them to live on land while they were still living in water. According to this theory, a fish acquired features that would permit it to live on land while it had no need of them. Then when it was ready, it emerged onto dry land to begin living there.

Yet even within the theory of evolution's own hypotheses, there is no logic to such a scenario. A sea creature acquiring features suitable for dry land gives it no advantage. Therefore, there is no logic for claiming that these "just in case" features emerged by means of natural selection. On the contrary, a living thing undergoing pre-adaptation should be eliminated by means of natural selection, since as it acquires features appropriate to the land, it will be progressively disadvantaged.

Primeval Atmosphere, *The*

The term "primeval atmosphere" is used to describe the atmosphere when the Earth was first formed. For a long time, adherents of the theory of evolution maintained that the primitive atmosphere consisted of a mixture of gasses that permitted the spontaneous appearance of organic compounds that would form the building blocks of life. Evolutionists hypothesized that these primeval gasses consisted of ammonia, methane, hydrogen and water vapor. On that assumption, they carried out a large number of experiments aimed at synthesizing amino acid molecules, the building blocks of life. These experiments' objective was to simulate those primeval atmospheric conditions in a laboratory environment.

Nothing about these experiments (apart from the fact they pulled the wool over people's eyes) provided any backing for evolution. First of all, the laboratory environment was controlled in every way. Such an environment bore no resemblance to the spontaneous, uncontrolled, disordered and destructive atmosphere of the primeval world.

The best-known of this series of primitive atmosphere experiments was the **Miller Experiment**. In that experiment, Stanley Miller prepared an artificial environment similar to the primeval atmosphere in order to show that amino acids could have been synthesized by chance. To that end, he reacted ammonia, methane, hydrogen and water vapor—gasses he assumed were present in the primeval atmosphere, but which subsequently, were realized to not be present at all. As a result, he did indeed synthesize a few amino acid forms. Yet research in later years revealed that the mixture of gasses that Miller has assumed to have constituted the primeval atmosphere did not reflect the actual state of affairs. It was realized that carbon dioxide and nitrogen, present in the primitive atmosphere, were not chemically suited to forming amino acids and other organic

compounds. An article titled “Life’s Crucible” in the February 1998 edition of the well-known evolutionist publication *Earth* admitted this:

Geologists now think that the primordial atmosphere consisted mainly of carbon dioxide and nitrogen, gases that are less reactive than those used in the 1953 experiment. And even if Miller’s atmosphere could have existed, how do you get simple molecules such as amino acids to go through the necessary chemical changes that will convert them into more complicated compounds, or polymers, such as proteins? Miller himself throws up his hands at that part of the puzzle. “It's a problem,” he sighs with exasperation. “How do you make polymers? That's not so easy.” [187]

Miller was now aware that his experiment was meaningless in terms of accounting for the origin of life. Another article, titled “The Rise of Life on Earth,” in the March 1998 edition of *National Geographic*, contained the following lines:

Many scientists now suspect that the early atmosphere was different from what Miller first supposed. They think it consisted of carbon dioxide and nitrogen rather than hydrogen, methane, and ammonia.

That’s bad news for chemists. When they try sparking carbon dioxide and nitrogen, they get a paltry amount of organic molecules—the equivalent of dissolving a drop of food coloring in a swimming pool of water. Scientists find it hard to imagine life emerging from such a diluted soup. [188]

In short, neither the Miller experiment nor any other evolutionist endeavors have answered the question of the origin of life on Earth. All the research reveals the impossibility of life’s coming into being by chance, and thus shows that life was created.

Primeval Earth, *The*

Evolutionists claim that the amino acids, the building blocks of life, came into being spontaneously in the environment of the primeval Earth. However, apart from a few chemical syntheses carried out consciously in regulated, controlled laboratory conditions, there is no scientific proof that amino acids can form spontaneously.

Evolutionists then face an even greater problem than amino acids in the form of *proteins*—hundreds of different amino acids, the building blocks of life, being added onto one another in a specific sequence.

It’s even more illogical to claim that proteins form spontaneously under natural conditions than to suggest that amino acids can do so. It is mathematically impossible for amino acids to spontaneously assume the necessary sequences to form proteins. In addition, protein formation is chemically impossible under the conditions of the primeval Earth. (*See* ***The*** **Primeval Atmosphere,** and ***The*** **Chemical Evolution Deception**.)

Primeval Soup, *The* —*See* ***The*** Chemical Evolution Deception and ***The*** Primordial Soup Fantasy.

Theory of Favored Races, *The* —*See* Darwinism and Racism.

Primordial Soup Fantasy, *The*

According to the theory of evolution, life emerged in the oceans between 3.5 and 4 billion years ago in an environment known as the “primordial soup.” According to the myth of evolution,

primitive life began with proteins and subsequently with single-celled organisms, and continued in the oceans for some 2 billion years, reaching its final point with the evolution of fish with backbones.

After that point, according to the tale, some of the fish felt the need to progress to a dry land environment. And thus it was that life on dry land began.

This entirely fictional tale, based on no evidence, actually faces a separate dilemma at every different stage. First of all, how did the first protein come into being? And how, even before that, did the amino acids that comprise proteins come into being and manage to add on to one another in an ordered manner? These questions completely undermine the theory of evolution from the outset. Because as even evolutionists admit, the structure of proteins is so complex that the chances of their forming by chance is practically zero.

One of the most important figures in this area, the geochemist Jeffrey Bada from the San Diego Scripps Institute, wrote in the February 1998 edition of *Earth* magazine:

Today as we leave the twentieth century, we still face the biggest unsolved problem that we had when we entered the twentieth century: How did life originate on earth? [189]

Professor Klaus Dose, head of the Johannes Gutenberg University Biochemistry Department in Germany, stated in the Journal *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*:

More than 30 years of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on earth rather than to its solution. At present all discussions on principal theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance. [190]

The claim put forward by Darwinism, the result of the primitive level of science in the 19th century, that a cell will spontaneously occur if organic substances combine together, is totally unscientific. Science manifests the fact that Allah has flawlessly created living things.

Protein

Proteins are giant molecules consisting of specific numbers and types of smaller molecules, known as *amino acids*, set out in particular sequences. The simplest proteins consist of around 50 amino acids, while others may contain thousands.

The absence of even a single amino acid in the protein structure or one amino acid changing place, or the addition of one amino acid too many to the chain will make that protein a useless collection of molecules. For that reason, every amino acid must be in exactly the right place and in exactly the right order. The theory of evolution, however, suggests that life came into being by chance. In the face of this regularity, it's in a hopeless position. So extraordinary is this regularity that it cannot possibly be explained in terms of chance. Simple probability calculations easily show that proteins' functional structure can never come into being as the result of coincidences.

For instance, the 288 amino acids of 12 different kinds contained in an average-sized protein molecule, may be set out in 10^{300} ways. (This is the astronomical figure of 1 followed by 300 zeros.) However, only one of all these sequences can gives rise to the protein. All the remaining sequences are meaningless strings of amino acids that are either useless, or may even be harmful.

Therefore, the chances of just the "right" protein molecule forming by chance are 1 in 10^{300}. In practical terms, this cannot happen. (In mathematics, any probability smaller than 10^{50} is regarded as zero probability.)

Moreover, a protein consisting of 288 amino acids can be regarded as a rather humble structure, compared with giant proteins consisting of thousands of amino acids found in many living

things. When the same probability calculations are applied to these giant molecules, even the word *impossible* fails to do justice to the situation.

Moving up one rung in the development of living things, we see that a protein on its own means nothing. *Mycoplasma hominis H39*, one of the smallest known bacteria, has been observed to possess 600 kinds of proteins. Therefore, we need to square the probability calculation we carried out on just one protein by 600. The figure that emerges goes way beyond the concept of merely impossible.

Nor can evolutionists object to these figures. They also accept that the chances of a single protein coming into being by chance are as slim as those of "a monkey writing the history of mankind by randomly striking the keys of a typewriter." [191] Yet rather than accept the true explanation—creation—they prefer this utter impossibility.

Many evolutionists admit this. The evolutionist scientist Harold Bloom, for instance, says, "The spontaneous formation of a polypeptide of the size of the smallest known proteins seems beyond all probability." [192]

Evolutionists claim that molecular evolution took a very long time and that this time frame made the impossible possible. But no matter how much time is allowed, it is still impossible for amino acids to randomly give rise to proteins. In his book *Essentials of Earth History*, the American geologist William Stokes admits that "it would not occur during billions of years on billions of planets, each covered by a blanket of concentrated watery solution of the necessary amino acids." [193]

Professor of Chemistry Perry Reeves describes what all this actually means:

When one examines the vast number of possible structures that could result from a simple random combination of amino acids in an evaporating primordial pond, it is mind-boggling to believe that life could have originated in this way. It is more plausible that a Great Builder with a master plan would be required for such a task.[194]

Prokaryotic Cells—*See* **Origin of the Bacteria**.)

Protoavis

In pointing to *Archaeopteryx* as an intermediate form, evolutionists began with the assumption that it was the earliest bird-like creature on Earth. However, the discovery of certain far older bird fossils displaced *Archaeopteryx* from its perch as the ancestor of birds. In addition, these creatures were flawless birds with none of the supposed reptilian features attributed to *Archaeopteryx*.

The most significant of them was *Protoavis*, estimated at 225 million years old. The fossil, whose existence was announced in a paper in the August 1986 edition of the magazine *Nature*, demolished the idea that *Archaeopteryx*, 75 million years younger was the forerunner of all birds. Its bodily structure, with hollow bones as in all other birds, long wings and traces of feathers on those wings showed that *Protoavis* was capable of perfect flight.

N. Hotton of the Smithsonian institute describes the fossil thus: "*Protoavis* has a well-developed furcula bone and chest bone, assisting flight, hollow bones and extended wing bones . . . Their ears indicate that they communicate with sound, while dinosaurs are silent." [195]

The German biologists Reinhard Junker and Siefried Scherer describe the blow dealt to evolutionist theses: "Because Archaeopteryx is 75 million years younger than *Protoavis*, it emerged that this was a dead end for evolution. Therefore, the idea put forward by the proponents of creation that there are no intermediate forms, only mosaic forms, has been strengthened. The fact that

Protoavis resembles modern birds in many ways makes the gap between bird and reptile even more apparent." [196]

Furthermore, the age calculated for *Protoavis* is so great that this bird—again according to dating provided by evolutionist sources—is even older than the first dinosaurs on Earth. This means the absolute collapse of the theory that birds evolved from dinosaurs!

Punctuated Equilibrium —*See* Punctuated Model of Evolution Myth, *The* below.

Punctuated Model of Evolution Myth, *The*

When the *theory of evolution* is mentioned, the neo-Darwinist model is still the first theory that comes to mind. (*See* ***The*** **Neo-Darwinist Comedy**.) However, in the last few decades, a different model was born: punctuated evolution.

This model began with great fanfare by two American paleontologists, Niles Eldredge and Stephen Jay Gould, in the 1970s. These two evolutionist scientists were aware that the claims of neo-Darwinian theory were totally refuted by the fossil record. Fossils proved that living things had not appeared on Earth through gradual evolution, but had appeared suddenly and perfectly formed. Neo-Darwinists were living with the hope that the fossils they sought would one day be found—which indeed is still the case today. But Eldredge and Gould realized that this hope was unfounded. Since they were unwilling to abandon the dogma of evolution, they therefore proposed a new model; punctuated evolution, the claim that evolution occurred not with small, gradual changes, but in very large sudden ones.

This was actually a fantasy model. For example, Otto Schindewolf who had preceded Eldredge and Gould, had given a conjectural example of punctuated evolution, claiming that the first bird in history emerged from a reptile egg through a gross mutation—some giant, random mutation in its genetic structure.[197] (*See* ***The*** **Macro-Mutation Deception**.) According to the theory, certain terrestrial animals might have turned into giant whales as a result of sudden and comprehensive changes, within a single generation. These claims conflict with all known genetic, biophysical and biochemical laws, and were about as scientific as tales of princes turning into frogs. But some evolutionist paleontologists, troubled by the crisis facing the claims of neo-Darwinism, clung to this theory even though it was even more nonsensical than neo-Darwinism itself.

This theory's sole aim of was to account for the fossil gaps that the neo-Darwinist model was unable to explain. However, it is completely irrational to explain away the fossil gaps by claims along the lines that "Birds suddenly emerged from reptile eggs." For any species to evolve into another, there must be a very large and beneficial change in its genetic data. Yet no mutation can *develop* genetic information or add any new data to it. Mutations lead solely to a loss of, or damage to, existing data. The wholesale mutations imagined by the adherents of punctuated evolution would actually represent reductions and defects in genetic information.

Like the neo-Darwinist model, the punctuated evolution model collapses at the outset when faced with the question of how the first living thing came into existence. Since a single protein cannot come into being by chance, organisms composed of trillions of proteins cannot emerge in a punctuated or gradual manner.

At present, the punctuated evolution theory maintains that living populations exhibit no changes for long periods of time, remaining in a kind of equilibrium. According to the claim, evolutionary changes take place in very brief spaces of time among very narrow populations.

(Equilibrium is thus interrupted, or “punctuated.”) Since the population is so very small, mutations are quickly chosen by way of natural selection, and the emergence of new species is thus made possible.

According to this theory, a reptile species can survive for millions of years without undergoing any changes. However, one small group of reptiles that somehow separates away from the others is subjected, in a manner that is not explained, to a series of intense mutations. The group evolves rapidly and soon turns into a new reptile species, or maybe even into mammals. Since this process takes place very quickly within a narrow population, very few fossil traces, if any, are left behind.

Close inspection shows that this theory was proposed to answer the question, of “How can evolution progress so fast as to leave no fossil trace behind?” In developing an answer, two fundamental assumptions are made:

1. That *macro-mutations*, wide-raging mutations that cause major changes in genetic data, provided advantages for living things and produced new genetic information. (*See **The*** **Macro-Evolution Deceit**.)

2. That narrow animal populations are genetically advantaged. (*See* **Narrow Population**.)

Yet both assumptions conflict with the scientific facts.

R

Ramapithecus* Error, *The

Evolutionists who suggested that the *Ramapithecus* fossils discovered in India go back some 15 million years also proposed that these fossils were a definite intermediate form in the scenario of human evolution. However, it was realized that these fossils actually belonged to an extinct species of ape, and *Ramapithecus* was quietly removed from the imaginary human family tree.[198]

The first *Ramapithecus* fossil discovered consisted of an old jaw made up of two parts. Yet on the basis of these parts, evolutionist artists somehow managed to draw pictures of *Ramapithecus* in his natural habitat, together with his family.

Recapitulation Theory — *See* **Ontogeny Recapitulates Phylogeny Theory, *The***.

Recombination

Recombination means a new genotype (or hereditary structure) being produced by the genetic characters of the two genders combining. However, recombinations must not be confused with mutations. In mutation, in order for changes taking place in the individual's genotype to be effective, they must take place in the reproduction genes.

Recombination, on the other hand, is a constant process that gives rise to new combinations of genes in every offspring, as a result of natural sexual reproduction. Recombination results from the regrouping of genes from the mother and father during the formation of their reproductive cells. Before cell division, the fertilized egg always takes half its genetic material from the mother and half from the father, but recombination plays a definitive and influential role in the formation of variety. (*See* **Variation**.) Thus except in the case of identical twins, two offspring are never identical to one another, and neither are their genetic contents exactly the same as their parents'.

Some evolutionists interpret variation through recombination as an evolutionary factor. [199] However, this is not scientifically valid. Variation is a natural process arising from genetic mixing during reproduction. Yet there is no question of a new species emerging through recombination, or of new information being added beyond that already recorded in the genes.

Studies on recombination occupy a very important place in the understanding of genetic mechanisms. Recombination has guided scientists' production of the chromosome map, identification of genetic abnormalities, and in genetic transplants of one chromosome to another.

Reconstruction (Imaginary Pictures)

Using various propaganda techniques, evolutionists seek to camouflage their lack of any evidence to support their theories. The most important of these techniques is reconstruction, which involves an "artist's conception" of what a living thing might have looked like, based on a piece of bone that has been unearthed. All the ape-men one sees in newspaper and magazine illustrations are reconstructions.

---

[198] Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2nd edition, 1997, p. 86.

[199] Prof. Dr. Yalçın Şahin, *Genel Biyoloji*, Bilim Teknik Yayınevi, Eskişehir, 1995, p .349.

However, since the fossil records regarding the origin of man are generally scattered and deficient, any estimations based on them depend largely on imagination. Accordingly, reconstructions of the fossils are designed totally in line with the requirements of the ideology of evolution. The Harvard University anthropologist David Pilbeam emphasizes this: "At least in paleoanthropology, data are still so sparse that theory heavily influences interpretations. Theories have, in the past, clearly reflected our current ideologies instead of the actual data."[200]

Only the very general features of a creature can be produced based on bone remains alone. The really distinguishing features are the soft tissues, which soon disappear over the course of fossilization. It is easy for an evolutionist to come up with an imaginary being by shaping those soft tissues however he sees fit. As Earnst A. Hooten says:

To attempt to restore the soft parts is an even more hazardous undertaking. The lips, the eyes, the ears, and the nasal tip leave no clues on the underlying bony parts. You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthaloid skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely only to mislead the public… So put not your trust in reconstructions. [201]

The biased interpretation of fossils and the production of fantastic drawings are evidence of how intensively evolutionists resort to deception. Yet compared with the various concrete frauds that have been perpetrated over the past 150 years, these pale into insignificance.

No concrete fossil evidence supports the picture of the ape-man constantly propagated in the media and in academic sources. Evolutionists may draw and paint imaginary beings, but the lack of any fossils belonging to those creatures is a major stumbling block for them. One of the methods often used to resolve this problem has been to manufacture whatever fossils they have been unable to find. Piltdown Man, a major scandal in the history of science, is one instance. (*See* **Piltdown Man Fraud, *The***.)

Reductionism

Reductionism is the idea that things that do not appear material can be explained in terms of material effects. The materialist philosophy underlying the theory of evolution assumes that everything that exists consists solely of matter. (*See* **Materialism**.) According to this philosophy, matter has existed for all time, and nothing exists apart from matter. Materialists employ a logic known as reductionism to support these claims.

For example, the human mind cannot be touched or seen. In addition, the mind is not centered anywhere in the human brain. This inevitably leads us to conclude that the mind is a super-material concept. In other words, the entity you refer to as "me," which thinks, loves, feels anger and sadness, and that experiences pleasure or pain, is not a material entity in the same way as a table or a stone is.

But materialists say that the mind can be reduced to matter. According to their claim, the way we think, love, feel sadness and all our other mental activities actually consist of chemical reactions taking place among the neurons in our brains. Our love for another person is a chemical reaction produced by certain cells in the brain, and our feeling fear in the face of an appropriate event is still another chemical reaction. The well-known materialist philosopher Karl Vogt described this logic in the famous words, "Just as liver secretes gall, so do our brains secrete thought." [202]

Gall is a material fluid, of course, but there is no evidence to suggest that thought is also just matter.

Regulatory Gene

It is evident that mutations give rise to no evolutionary development, which places both neo-Darwinism and the punctuated model of evolution in a very severe predicament. (*See* **Mutation** and ***The* Punctuated Model of Evolution**.) Since mutations have a destructive effect, then the macro-mutations referred to by the proponents of punctuated evolution would lead to major damage in living things. Some evolutionists place their hopes in mutations occurring in regulatory genes. However, the destructive character that applies to other mutations also applies to these. The problem is that any mutation is a random change, and any random change in such a structure as complex as DNA gives rise to damaging consequences.

The geneticist Lane Lester and the population geneticist Raymond Bohlin describe the mutation predicament:

However though macro-mutations of many varieties produce drastic changes, the vast majority will be incapable of survival, let alone show the marks of increasing complexity. If structural gene mutations are inadequate because of their inability to produce significant enough changes, then regulatory and developmental mutations appear even less useful because of the greater likelihood of nonadaptive or even destructive consequences. [203]

Experiments and observations show that mutations develop no new genetic information, but only damage the mutated individual, and that it is clearly inconsistent for the proponents of punctuated evolution to expect any such great successes from mutations.

Ribosome

Proteins are produced as the result of highly detailed processes inside the cell, with the assistance of many enzymes, in an organelle called the *ribosome.* The ribosome itself consists of proteins. This therefore brings with it an unrealistic hypothesis that the ribosome came into being by chance. Even Jacques Monod, a Nobel prize-winner and well-known advocate of the theory of evolution, describes how protein synthesis cannot be reduced solely to information in nucleic acids:

The code [in DNA or RNA] is meaningless unless translated. The modern cell's translating machinery consists of at least 50 macromolecular components, which are themselves coded in DNA: the code cannot be translated otherwise than by products of translation themselves… When and how did this circle become closed? It is exceedingly difficult to imagine. [204]

The genetic system requires the enzymes to read this code from the DNA, the mRNA to be manufactured through the reading of these codes, the ribosome to which the mRNA with the code will go and bind to for production, a transporter RNA that carries the amino acids to be used in production to the ribosome, and the exceedingly complex enzymes that ensure the countless other intermediate processes in the same environment. Bear in mind that such a controlled environment needs to be completely isolated and also to contain all the requisite energy sources and raw materials, and the invalidity of the claims of chance can be seen only too clearly.

Right-Handed (Dextro) Amino Acids — *See* Left-Handed Amino Acids

RNA World Scenario, *The*

Asked how the first cell came into being, evolutionists since the early 20th century have offered various theories. The Russian biologist Alexander Oparin proposed the first evolutionist thesis on this subject, suggesting that proteins formed first with a number of random chemical reactions on the primeval Earth, and that these then combined together to give rise to the cell. In the

1970s, it was realized that even Oparin's most basic assumptions, which he made in the 1930s were false: In the *primitive world atmosphere* scenario, he had included the gasses methane and ammonia that would permit the emergence of organic molecules. Yet it was realized that the atmosphere at the time was not rich in methane and ammonia, but contained high levels of oxygen that would break down organic molecules. (*See **The*** **Primitive Earth**.)

This dealt a serious blow to the theory of molecular evolution. It meant that all the "primitive atmosphere" experiments, carried by evolutionists such as Miller, Fox and Ponnamperuma, were invalid. For that reason, other evolutionist quests were launched in the 1980s, and the RNA World scenario was put forward. This suggested that rather than proteins, the RNA molecule containing protein information emerged first. According to this scenario—proposed in 1986 by the Harvard chemist Walter Gilbert—billions of years ago, an RNA molecule somehow capable of copying itself came into existence by chance. Later, under the influence of environmental conditions, this RNA molecule suddenly began producing proteins. Later, when the need was felt to hide their information in a second molecule, the DNA molecule somehow emerged.

Instead of accounting for the beginning of life, this scenario—every stage of which is distinctly impossible and which is difficult to even imagine—made the problem even worse. It raised a number of insoluble questions:

1- Not even one of the nucleotides that comprise RNA can be accounted for in terms of chance. Then how did nucleotides come together in the appropriate sequence to give rise to DNA?

The evolutionist biologist John Horgan admits the impossibility of RNA forming by chance:

As researchers continue to examine the RNA-World concept closely, more problems emerge. How did RNA initially arise? RNA and its components are difficult to synthesize in a laboratory under the best of conditions, much less under really plausible ones. [205]

2- Even if we assume that RNA, consisting solely of a chain of nucleotides, did come into being by chance, how did it decide to copy itself? By what mechanism did it succeed in doing so? Where did it find the nucleotides it would use while copying itself?

The evolutionist biologists Gerald Joyce and Leslie Orgel state the hopelessness of the situation:

Our discussion has focused on a straw man: the myth of a small RNA molecule that arises *de novo* and can replicate efficiently and with high fidelity under plausible prebiotic conditions. Not only is such a notion unrealistic in light of our current understanding of prebiotic chemistry, but it should strain the credulity of even an optimist's view of RNA's catalytic potential. [206]

3- Even assuming that an RNA capable of copying itself did appear in the primeval world, and infinite amounts of all varieties of amino acids that the RNA needed were available in the environment—if all these impossibilities were somehow overcome, this is still not enough to form a single protein molecule. Because RNA is solely information about protein structure. Amino acids, on the other hand, are raw materials. Yet there is no mechanism here to produce protein. Viewing the existence of RNA as sufficient for protein production is as nonsensical as throwing the thousands of components of a car onto a blueprint and expecting a car to assemble itself. This production cannot take place in the absence of a factory and workers.

Dr. Leslie Orgel, a well-known evolutionist biochemist and also known as one of the founding fathers of the 'RNA world' hypothesis, uses the term *scenario* for the chances of life beginning with RNA. Orgel sets out the features this RNA would need to possess, and the impossibility thereof, in an article titled "The Origin of Life on Earth," in the October 1994 edition of *American Scientist*:

This scenario could have occurred, we noted, if prebiotic RNA had two properties not evident today: A capacity to replicate without the help of proteins and an ability to catalyze every step of protein synthesis. [207]

As you can plainly see, only evolutionist imagination and prejudice could expect these two complex processes, which Orgel describes as indispensable, from a molecule like RNA. Scientific facts reveal that the RNA World thesis, a new version of the claim that life was born by chance, could never come true.

S

Schindewolf, Otto

Otto Schindewolf, a European paleontologist, is known for the "Hopeful Monster" theory he proposed in the 1930s. [208] (*See **The*** **Hopeful Monster Fantasy**.)

Schindewolf suggested that living things evolved through sudden and giant mutations, rather than by the small step-by-step mutations advocated by neo-Darwinists. As an example of his theory, Schindewolf claimed that the first bird in history emerged from a reptile egg through a gross mutation—a giant, random mutation in its genetic structure.

According to the theory, certain large terrestrial animals might have suddenly turned into whales as a result of sudden and comprehensive changes. Schindewolf's fantastical theory was later adopted in the 1940s by the geneticist Richard Goldschmidt of Berkeley University. Yet so inconsistent was the theory that it was swiftly abandoned.[209]

The Second Law of Thermodynamics (The Law of Entropy)

---

[208] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Heinrich_Schindewolf
[209] http://www.revelationwebsite.co.uk/index1/menton/b8.htm
[174] Paul J. Morris, and Susan F. Morris, "The Panda's Thumb," Jan 2000 http://www.athro.com/evo/pthumb.html
[175] "The Panda's Thumb . . . No Evidence For Evolution" http://www.users.bigpond.com/rdoolan/panda.html
[176] Endo, H., Yamagiwa, D., Hayashi, Y. H., Koie, H., Yamaya, Y., and Kimura, J., "Role of the giant panda's 'pseudo-thumb'", *Nature*, Vol. 397, 1999, p. 309.
[179] Sidney Fox, Klaus Dose, *Molecular Evolution and The Origin of Life*, San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1972, p. 4.
[180] Gish, D. T., Evolution: *The Fossils Say "No,"* San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1979.
[181] Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, p. 59.
[183] Kenneth Oakley, William Le Gros Clark & J. S, "Piltdown," *Meydan Larousse*, Vol. 10, p. 133.
[184] Stephen Jay Gould, "Smith Woodward's Folly," *New Scientist*, p. 444.
[185] Mahlon B. Hoagland, *Hayatın Kökleri* ("The Roots of Life"), pp.78-79.
[186] *Ibid*, p. 149.
[187] Peter Radetsky, "Life's Crucible," *Earth*, February 1998, p. 34.
[188] "The Rise of Life on Earth," *National Geographic*, March 1998.
[189] Jeffrey Bada, *Earth*, February 1998, p. 40.
[190] Klaus Dose, "The Origin of Life: More Questions Than Answers," *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1988, p. 348.
[191] Prof. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim* ("Heredity and Evolution"), p. 61.
[192] W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 304.
[193] *Ibid*., p.305.
[194] J. D. Thomas, *Evolution and Faith*, Abilene, TX: ACU Press, , 1988, pp. 81-82.
[195] Reinhard Junker, Siefried Scherer, Enstehung und Geschichte der Lebewesen, Wegel Biologie, Brühlsche Universitatsdruckerei, Giessen, 1986, p.175.
[196] *ibid.*
[197] Stephen M. Stanley, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process*, San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1979, pp. 35, 159.
[200] David R. Pilbeam, "Rearranging Our Family Tree," *Human Nature*, June 1978, p. 45.
[201] Earnest A. Hooton, *Up From The Ape*, New York: McMillan, 1931, p. 332.
[202] *Encylopedia Britannica*, "Modern Materialism"
[203] Lane Lester, Raymond Bohlin, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Dallas: Probe Books, 1989, 9.141.
[204] Monod, Jaques, *Chance and Necessity: An Essay on the Natural Philosophy of Modern Biology*, 1971, London Penguin:1997, reprint, p. 143.
[205] John Horgan, "In the Beginning," *Scientific American*, Vol. 264, February 1991, p. 119.
[206] Gerald F. Joyce and Leslie E. Orgel, "Prospects for Understanding the Origin of the RNA World," in *The RNA World*, edited by Raymond F. Gesteland, Thomas R. Cech, John F. Atkins, 2nd ed., Cold Spring Harbor, New York: Laboratory Press, 2000, p. 62.
[207] Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on the Earth," *Scientific American*, October 1994, Vol. 271, p. 78.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics states that left to themselves and abandoned to natural conditions, all systems in the universe will move towards irregularity, disorder and corruption in direct relation to the passage of time. This is also known as the Law of Entropy. In physics, *entropy* is a measurement of the irregularity within a system. A system's passage from a regular organized and planned state to an irregular, disordered and unplanned one increases that system's entropy. This means that the more irregularity in a system, the higher its level of entropy.

This is something we all observe during the course of our daily lives. For example, if you leave a car in the desert and go back to it some months later, of course you can't expect it to have become more advanced and better maintained. On the contrary, you will find the tires have gone flat, the windows are cracked, the metalwork has rusted and the battery is dead.. Or if you leave your home to its own devices, you will see that it becomes untidier and dustier with every passing day. That process can be reversed only by conscious intervention—by your tidying and dusting it.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics, or the Law of Entropy, has been definitively proven by theory and experiment. Albert Einstein, described it as the first law of all the sciences. In his book *Entropy: A World View*, the American scientist Jeremy Rifkin says:

The Entropy Law will preside as the ruling paradigm over the next period of history. Albert Einstein said that it is the premier law of all science: Sir Arthur Eddington referred to it as the supreme metaphysical law of the entire universe. [210]

The Law of Entropy definitively invalidates the materialist view that the universe is an assembly of matter closed to all forms of supernatural intervention. There is evident order in the universe, although the universe's own laws should work to corrupt that order. From this, two conclusions emerge:

1) The universe has not, as materialists suggest, existed for all time. Were that the case, the Second Law of Thermodynamics would long ago have done its work, and the universe would have become a homogeneous collection of matter with no order to it at all.

2) The claim that after the Big Bang, the universe took shape with no supernatural intervention or control is also invalid. In the universe that initially emerged in the wake of the Big Bang, only chaos ruled. Yet the level of order in the universe increased, and the universe eventually attained its present state. Since this took place in violation of the law of entropy, the universe must have been ordered by way of a supernatural creation.

The order in the universe reveals the existence of Allah, sublime ruler of the universe. The Nobel Prize-winning German physicist Max Planck describes this order:

At all events we should say, in summing up, that, according to everything taught by the exact sciences about the immense realm of nature in which our tiny planet plays an insignificant role, a certain order prevails—one independent of the human mind. Yet, in so far as we are able to ascertain through our senses, this order can be formulated in terms of purposeful activity. There is evidence of an intelligent order of the universe. [211]

Materialism, which maintains that the universe has existed for ever and has never been ordered in any way, is today in an impasse in the face of the universe's great equilibrium. The well-known British physicist Paul Davies says:

Everywhere we look in the Universe, from the far-flung galaxies to the deepest recesses of the atom, we encounter order. . . Central to the idea of a very special, orderly Universe is the concept of information. A highly structured system, displaying a great deal of organised activity, needs a lot of information to describe it. Alternatively, we may say that it contains much information.

We are therefore presented with a curious question. If information and order always has a natural tendency to disappear, where did all the information that makes the world such a special place come from originally? The Universe is like a clock slowly running down. How did it get wound up in the first place? [212]

Einstein said that the order in the universe was something unexpected and stated that it needed to be regarded as a miracle:

Well, *a priori* one should expect that the world would be rendered lawful [obedient to law and order] only to the extent that we [human beings] intervene with our ordering intelligence... [But instead we find] in the objective world a high degree of order that we were *a priori* in no way authorized to expect. This is the "miracle" that is strengthened more and more with the development of our knowledge.[213]

The order in the universe, which contains such enormous information, was brought into being by a supreme Creator and Lord of the universe. To put it another way, Allah has created and ordered the entire universe.

"Selfish Gene" Theory, *The*

The altruistic behavior seen in living things cannot be explained by evolutionists. *(See* **Altruism**.) For example, male and female penguins defend their offspring literally to the death. The male penguin keeps its young chick between its feet for an uninterrupted period of four months, eating nothing during that time. Meanwhile, the female penguin swims through the sea hunting for food for her offspring, and carries what she finds in her craw. Such altruistic behavior, of which a great many examples can be seen in nature, undermines the fundamental premise of the theory of evolution.

Indeed, the well-known evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould describes "the vexatious problem of altruism"[214] in nature. The evolutionist Gordon Rattray Taylor writes that the altruistic behavior in living things "has long presented a challenge for Darwinism," [215] making it clear what a dilemma evolutionists face in the area. Nature contains instances of altruism and affection, which are completely non-material values, which deals a mortal blow to the materialist view that sees all of nature as random interactions of matter.

However, unwilling to admit the invalidity of evolutionary scenarios, some evolutionists came up with the so-called Selfish Gene Theory. According to this claim, whose leading proponent was Richard Dawkins, one of the most avid present-day proponents of evolution, behavior that appears to be altruistic actually stems from selfishness, in exhibiting altruistic behavior, animals are actually thinking of preserving their genes rather than of helping another living thing. In sacrificing her own life for that of her offspring, a mother is actually protecting her own genes. If her offspring survive, there will be a greater chance of her genes being handed on to the subsequent generations.

According to this perspective, all living things, human beings included, are gene machines. And every living thing's most important task is to be able to hand on its genes to later generations.

Evolutionists say that living things are programmed to continue their own bloodlines and to wish to pass on their genes, and so behave in a manner appropriate to that programming. The following quote is an example of the classic evolutionist account of animal behavior:

What could account for potentially self-destructive behavior? At least some altruistic acts are reputed to stem from so-called selfish genes. Parents that work themselves ragged to feed insatiable offspring or go without food as long as a predator is near are probably carrying out genetically programmed behavior—behavior that increases the chances of parental genes within the offspring

being passed on to yet another generation. These innate, instinctive responses to predators may seem "purposeful" to the human observer, but in fact they are behavioral programs triggered by sights, sounds, odors, and other cues. [216]

Consequently, evolutionists say that at first sight, the behavior of living things may appear to be deliberate. But in fact, living things engage in such behavior unconsciously, not in a manner directed towards a particular objective, but because they are programmed to do so. Yet the genes proposed as the source of this programming consist of coded packages of information, with no ability to think. Therefore, if an animal's genes possess an instruction that predisposes it to altruistic behavior, then the source of that instruction cannot be the gene itself. That a living thing is programmed to engage in altruistic behavior to transmit its genes on to subsequent generations clearly shows the existence of a Power possessed of reason and knowledge to program those genes in such a way, and therefore clearly demonstrates the existence of Allah.

Self-Ordering Error, *The*

Evolutionist claims and concepts are generally employed in a deceptive manner. One of these misrepresentations is the deliberate confusion of the concepts of "ordered" and "organized."

To clarify this, imagine a long, straight stretch of sand along the seaside. The wind produces sand dunes large and small. This is an *ordering* process. Yet that same wind cannot make a sandcastle. If you see a sandcastle, you can be are sure that somebody has made it, because a castle is an *organized* system, possessing information organized in a specific form. It has been made by someone with advanced planning.

Complex and organized systems can never come about through natural processes. Even if simple ordering does occur from time to time, this never exceeds certain specific bounds.

Yet evolutionists say that self-ordering phenomena emerging spontaneously as a result of natural process are significant evidence of evolution and are examples of *self-organization*. (*See* ***The* Self-Organization Nonsense**.) They then suggest that living systems can come into being as a result of natural phenomena and chemical reactions.

But while ordered systems feature simple sequences and repeated structures, organized systems contain exceedingly complex and inter-related structures and processes. Consciousness, information and organization are essential for them to emerge. This important difference is described by the evolutionist scientist Jeffrey Wicken:

"Organized" systems are to be carefully distinguished from "ordered" systems. Neither kind of system is "random," but whereas ordered systems are generated according to simple algorithms and therefore lack complexity, organized systems must be assembled element by element according to an external "wiring diagram" with a high information content . . . Organization, then, is functional complexity and carries information. [217]

In their book The Mystery of Life's Origin, the American scientists Thaxton, Bradley and Olsen clarify the issue:

The widespread recognition of the severe improbability that self-replicating organisms could have formed from purely random interactions has led to a great deal of speculation—speculation that some organizing principle must have been involved. In the company of many others, Crick has considered that the neo-Darwinian mechanism of natural selection might provide the answer. An entity capable of self-replication is necessary, however, before natural selection can operate. Only then could changes result via mutations and environmental pressures which might in turn bring about the dominance of entities with the greatest probabilities of survival and reproduction.

The weakest point in this explanation of life's origin is the great complexity of the initial entity which must form, apparently by random fluctuations, before natural selection can take over. [218]

"Self-Organization" Nonsense, *The*

Evolutionists use the concept of *self-organization* to claim that inanimate matter can so organize itself as to produce a living entity. This belief flagrantly ignores all experiments and observations that have shown that matter possesses no such ability. Sir Fred Hoyle, the famous British astronomer and mathematician, describes how matter cannot spontaneously give rise to life with an example:

To press the matter further, if there were a basic principle of matter which somehow drove organic systems toward life, its existence should easily be demonstrable in the laboratory. One could, for instance, take a swimming [pool] to represent the primordial soup. Fill it with any chemicals of a non-biological nature you please. Pump any gases over it, or through it, you please, and shine any kind of radiation on it that takes your fancy. Let the experiment proceed for a year and see how many of those [vital] 2,000 enzymes have appeared … I will give the answer, and so save the time and trouble and expense of actually doing the experiment. You would find nothing at all, except possibly for a tarry sludge composed of amino acids and other simple organic chemicals.[219]

The evolutionist biologist Andrew Scott admits the same thing:

Take some matter, heat while stirring and wait. That is the modern version of Genesis. The "fundamental" forces of gravity, electromagnetism and the strong and weak nuclear forces are presumed to have done the rest . . . But how much of this neat tale is firmly established, and how much remains hopeful speculation? In truth, the mechanism of almost every major step, from chemical precursors up to the first recognizable cells, is the subject of either controversy or complete bewilderment. [220]

Yet evolutionists insist on advocating such an unscientific scenario as the self-organization of matter. Their motive for this lies hidden in materialist philosophy, the basis of the theory of evolution. Materialist philosophy, accepting only the existence of matter, therefore must produce an explanation for life based on matter alone. The theory of evolution was born of that need and, no matter how much it may violate scientific findings, it is advocated solely for the sake of that requirement.

Robert Shapiro, a professor of chemistry and DNA expert from New York University, describes the materialist dogma underpinning evolutionists' belief in matter organizing itself it:

Another evolutionary principle is therefore needed to take us across the gap from mixtures of simple natural chemicals to the first effective replicator [DNA or RNA]. This principle has not yet been described in detail or demonstrated, but it is anticipated, and given names such as "chemical evolution" and "self-organization of matter." The existence of the principle is taken for granted in the philosophy of dialectical materialism, as applied to the origin of life by Alexander Oparin. [221]

Seymouria

The creature that was long proposed as the ancestor of reptiles was the extinct amphibian species *Seymouria*. However, it then emerged that *Seymouria* could not be an intermediate form, since reptiles were living on Earth 30 million years before *Seymouria* first appeared. The oldest *Seymouria* fossils date back to the Lower Permian stratum of 280 million years ago. Yet *Hylonomus*, the oldest known reptile species (310 million years old) and *Paleothyris* (300 million years old) have both been found in Early Pennsylvanian strata, dating back 330 to 315 million years.[222]

It is of course impossible for the ancestor of reptiles to have lived long after reptiles themselves.

Shapiro, Robert

Robert Shapiro, a New York University professor of chemistry and DNA expert, calculated the probability of the 2,000 types of proteins in a simple bacterium coming into existence by chance. (The human cell contains around 200,000 different types of proteins. .) The figure obtained is a probability of 1 in $10^{40,000}$.[223] (This is the astronomical figure of 1 followed by 40,000 zeroes.)

A bacterium's complexity refutes chance and clearly points to the existence of a Creator. But this evident truth is still denied because of blind devotion to the materialist world view. Robert Shapiro, a researcher into the origin of life, reveals this irrational materialist stance in these words:

Similarly, the existence of bacteria and other living beings, all of which are much more complex than a watch, implies the existence of a creator, as only a higher being could design creatures so fit for their function. We will not take this escape route in our book, for we are committed to seeking an answer within the realm of science . . . We must look for another solution if we wish to remain within science. [224]

Sickle Cell Anemia

The sole example of a "useful mutation" that evolutionist biologists refer to is the disease sickle cell anemia, in which the hemoglobin molecule responsible for transporting oxygen becomes deformed and changes shape. As a result, its ability to transport oxygen is seriously impaired.

Victims of sickle cell anemia suffer increasing respiratory difficulties. Yet this example of mutation, discussed under blood diseases in medical textbooks, is regarded as advantageous by some evolutionist biologists.

Sufferers from this disease enjoy a partial immunity to malaria, and this is described as an evolutionary adaptation. Using that kind of inconsistent logic, one could say that the genetically lame were spared being killed in traffic accidents since they could not walk, and that lameness is a useful genetic trait..

It is clear that mutations have only destructive effects. Pierre Paul Grassé, former president of the French Academy of Sciences, compares mutations to spelling mistakes during the copying of a written text. Like spelling mistakes, mutations add no further information, but rather damage what is already there. Grassé goes on to say:

Mutations, in time, occur incoherently. They are not complementary to one another, nor are they cumulative in successive generations toward a given direction. They modify what preexists, but they do so in disorder, no matter how . . As soon as some disorder, even slight, appears in an organized being, sickness, then death follow. There is no possible compromise between the phenomenon of life and anarchy [disorder]. [225]

Single Cell to Multi-Cell Transition Myth, *The*

According to the evolutionist scenario, primitive single-celled organisms that came into existence by chance were the original ancestors of all living things. Over the course of time, these organisms that formed multiplied and gave rise to multi-celled organisms.

According to evolutionists, this was the first step in the passage from one cell to many. Organisms at this stage of development became genuinely multi-cellular with the division of labor

among cells in their colony. Cells lost the ability to exist independently once they gave rise to multi-cellular organisms.

The scenario continues thus: . At this stage of the evolutionary process, as the need to act independently decreased—or as their chances of survival improved by living as a group—, the differences between cells grew more distinct. For whatever reason, cells continued differentiating and increasing their division of labor, giving rise to increasingly multicellular organisms.

At the beginning of this fantastical view lie single-celled organisms that are regarded as primitive and simple. Yet single-celled organisms are not simple life forms, as evolutionists suggest, but neither do they have the consciousness with which to make decisions and assume new duties. Single-celled organisms may have a simpler structure than multicellular ones, but by itself is not evidence that they are primitive. Indeed, although a single-celled bacterium still possesses a complexity that amazes those who investigate it.

Sir James Gray, the well-known British zoologist, says this about the bacteria that Darwinists described as "simple":

A bacterium is far more complex than any inanimate system known to man. There is not a laboratory in the world which can compete with the biochemical activity of the smallest living organism. [226]

The evolutionist James A. Shapiro admits that these highly detailed characteristics features make bacteria a complex form of life:

Although bacteria are tiny, they display biochemical, structural and behavioral complexities that outstrip scientific description. In keeping with the current microelectronics revolution, it may make more sense to equate their size with sophistication rather than with simplicity. . . [227]

Social Darwinism

One of the theory of evolution's most basic claims is that the development of living things is based on a struggle for survival. According to Darwin, there was a ruthless eternal conflict in nature. The strong always vanquished the weak, thanks to which progress became possible. The subtitle to his book *On The Origin of Species* summed up his view: *By Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life.*

Darwin's source of inspiration on this subject was the British economist Thomas Malthus's book *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, which implied a rather gloomy future for the human race. Malthus calculated that, left to itself, the human population would grow very fast, doubling every 25 years. However, food resources could not increase at nearly that quickly. The human race would therefore face a constant shortage of food. The main factors keeping population under control were such disasters as war, famine and disease. In short, some people would have to die while others lived. Survival meant constant war.

Darwin admitted that he had drawn the idea of the struggle for survival in nature from Malthus:

In October, 1838, that is, fifteen months after I had begun my systematic inquiry, I happened to read for amusement Malthus on population, and being well prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence which everywhere goes on from long continuous observation of the habits of animals and plants, it at once struck me that under these circumstances, favourable variations would tend to be preserved and unfavourable ones to be destroyed. The result of this would be the formation of new species. Here, then, I had at last got a theory by which to work. [228]

Influenced by Malthus, Darwin applied this view to the whole of nature and suggested that in this conflict, the strongest and fittest would survive. Darwin's claim covered all plants, animals and human beings. Moreover, he particularly emphasized that the struggle for survival was a legitimate, unchanging law. He encouraged people to abandon their religious believes by denying creation, and thus targeted all those moral criteria that might stand in the way of the ruthless struggle for survival.

For that reason, Darwin's theory acquired a great deal of support from the moment he announced it—first from the established order in Britain, and then from that in the wider Western world. The imperialists, capitalists and other materialists delighted in a theory that scientifically justified the political and social order they had established, and lost no time in supporting it.

In a very short time, the theory of evolution became the sole criterion in every field of concern to human societies, from sociology to history and from psychology to politics. The basic idea in all spheres was the slogan "survival of the fittest," and nations, political parties, administrations, businesses and individuals all began behaving in light of them. Since the ideologies that dominated society had lined up behind Darwinism, open and covert Darwinist propaganda appeared in all fields, from education to art and from politics to history.

Attempts were made to link everything to Darwinism and to account for everything in Darwinian terms. As a result, even if people were ignorant of Darwinism, societies that lived the kind of life it foresaw began to emerge.

Darwin himself approved moral conceptions based on evolution and their application to the social sciences. In a letter to H. Thiel written in 1869, he wrote:

You will readily believe how much interested I am in observing that you apply to moral and social questions analogous views to those which I have used in regard to the modification of species. It did not occur to me formerly that my views could be extended to such widely different, and most important, subjects.[229]

With the adoption of the idea that the conflicts in nature also existed in human societies, in the forms of racism, fascism, communism and imperialism, the powerful nations' attempts to crush those they regarded as weaker acquired a supposedly scientific justification. Those who carried out barbaric slaughter, who began wars, who denigrated others because of their race, who caused businesses to close due to unfair competition, and those who refused help the poor were now not to be criticized or restrained—because they acted in conformity with a law of nature.

This new, supposedly scientific theory assumed the name of Social Darwinism.

The American paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould, one of the leading present-day advocates of the theory of evolution, admits as much:

Subsequent arguments for slavery, colonialism, racial differences, class struggles, and sex roles would go forth primarily under the banner of science. [230]

In his book *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, the professor of history Jacques Barzun analyzes the scientific, sociological, and cultural reasons for the terrible moral collapse in the modern world. These comments in Barzun's book are noteworthy in terms of Darwinism's impact on the world:

. . . in every European country between 1870 and 1914 there was a war party demanding armaments, an individualist party demanding ruthless competition, an imperialist party demanding a free hand over backward peoples, a socialist party demanding the conquest of power, and a racialist party demanding internal purges against aliens—all of them, when appeals to greed and glory failed, or even before, invoked Spencer and Darwin, which was to say, science incarnate . . . Race was biological, it was sociological, it was Darwinian. [231]

Despite being an evolutionist, Robert Wright, author of *The Moral Animal*, summarizes the disasters that the theory of evolution inflicted on the mankind:

Evolutionary theory, after all, has a long and largely sordid history of application to human affairs. After being mingled with political philosophy around the turn of the century to form the vague ideology known as "social Darwinism," it played into the hands of racists, fascists, and the most heartless sort of capitalists. [232]

Speciation —*See* Allopatric Isolation.

Spencer, Herbert

Herbert Spencer was the main theoretician of Social Darwinism, who adapted Darwin's principles to the life of society. He wrote that if someone was poor, that was his own fault: No one should help anyone else to improve themselves. If someone is rich, even if he had acquired that wealth immorally, that was due to his own talent. Therefore, while the poor are eliminated, the rich live on. This view dominates just about all modern societies, and is the essence of capitalist morality. (*See* **Social Darwinism**.)

Spencer, an advocate of that morality, completed his study entitled *Social Statistics* in 1850. In this he opposed all forms of state assistance, health-protection measures, state schools and compulsory vaccinations. That was because, in the view of Social Darwinism, the social order was based on the principle of the survival of the fittest. Supporting the weak and keeping them alive to propagate was a violation of that principle. The rich were rich because they were more fit, and some nations governed others because they were superior. Some nations had come under the yoke of others because the latter were more intelligent.

Spencer strongly advocated the adaptation of this thesis to human societies, summing up the Social Darwinist view in these words:

If they are sufficiently complete to live, they do live, and it is well they should live. If they are not sufficiently complete to live, they die, and it is best they should die. [233]

Spontaneous Generation—*See* **Abiogenesis**.

Stasis

The fossil record shows that living species emerged in a single moment with all their different structures fully formed, and that they remained unchanged over very long geological periods of time.

Had any evolution actually taken place, then living things would have appeared on Earth through gradual changes and should have continued to change. Yet the fossil records demonstrate the exact opposite. Different living classes emerged suddenly with no ancestors even remotely resembling them and remained in a state of stasis, undergoing no change at all, for hundreds of millions of years.

Struggle For Survival, *The*

The fundamental assumption of the theory of natural selection is that every living thing thinks only of itself in the struggle to the death. In proposing this idea, Darwin was influenced by the theories of Thomas Robert Malthus, a British economist. Malthus said that food resources increased arithmetically, while the human population increased geometrically—for which reason it was inevitable that humans should wage a constant fight for survival. Darwin applied this concept to nature and claimed that the result of this struggle was natural selection.

Subsequent research, however, showed that there was no such struggle for survival of the kind that Darwin had postulated. Lengthy studies on animal populations in the 1960s and ’70s by the British zoologist Wynne-Edwards showed that animal communities balanced their populations in very interesting ways, to prevent competition for food.

Animal communities generally regulate their populations in accordance with the available food supplies. Population is controlled not by such “eliminators of the unfit” as starvation and epidemic diseases, but by control mechanisms instinctively present in animals. In other words, animals stabilized their populations not by the life-or-death competition to the death postulated by Darwin, but by restricting their own reproduction.[234]

Even plants exhibited signs of self-regulation, rather than competition through natural selection as proposed by Darwin. Observations by the botanist A.D. Bradshaw proved that as plants multiplied, they behaved according to their density in the area they grew in—and that as plant numbers increased, reproduced declined.[235]

In addition, the examples of altruism encountered in such communities as ants and bees represent a model that is the exact opposite of Darwin’s concept of a struggle for survival. (*See* **Altruism**.)

Some recent research has revealed that altruistic behavior can be found even in bacteria. These organisms have no brain or nervous system, and thus lack any ability to think. Yet when invaded by viruses, they commit suicide in order to protect other bacteria. [236]

These examples invalidate the concept of the struggle for survival, which is the fundamental hypothesis of natural selection. (*See* **Malthus, Thomas** and **Social Darwinism**.)

Synthetic Evolution Theory, *The* —*See* **Neo-Darwinism Comedy, *The***.

Systematic—*See* **Taxonomy**.

T

Taung Child Fossil, *The*

All *Australopithecus* fossils have been unearthed in the southern part of the African continent. The reason why this species has been given the name *Australopithecus*, meaning "South African ape," is that these animals have features very similar to those of present-day apes.

The first fossils claimed to belong to this species were found in a coal mine in the Taung region of South Africa in 1924. The first fossil described as *Australopithecus* consisted of a young ape's face and lower jaw bones, and a skull of 410 cubic centimeters in volume. The discoverers of the fossil took it to Raymond Dart, an anthropologist.

Based on the skull's fine structure and thinking that its teeth resembled human teeth, Dr. Dart suggested that the fossil belonged to a hominid. Shortly afterwards, he published an article in *Nature* magazine titled "*Australopithecus*: Ape-Man in South Africa." Scientists who said that the fossil actually belonged to a chimpanzee did not take Dart seriously. Yet he persisted with the idea that the fossil was a hominid and convinced Dr. Robert Bloom, a famous physicist, of this, devoting the rest of his life to finding support for the new species he had found. Even then, scientific circles began jokingly referring to the fossil he had found as "Dart's baby." Evolutionists then lined up behind the fossil, inventing a new species to which they had given the name *Australopithecus*. The first fossil discovered was given the full name *Australopithecus africanus*.

Following the discovery of this fossil, which was given the nickname of "the Taung Child" because it was thought to belong to a young individual, other paleontologists—especially the Leakey family—stepped up their own research. In the 1950s, other fossils regarded as belonging to *Australopithecus* were found in digs financed by *National Geographic* magazine in Kromdraai, Swartkrans and Makapansgat in South Africa. Some of these ape fossils had a coarser structure, while others were smaller and finer. The coarser ones were bulkier and heavier than the others, with a larger bottom jaw and bony protrusions over the eyebrows being their most distinguishing features.

Although these are all typical examples of gender differences between modern-day male and female monkeys, scientists persisted in regarding them as separate species.

After Dart presented the fossil given the name *Australopithecus africanus*, he received substantial criticism from scientists. Arthur Keith, one of the most prominent anatomists to comment on the fossil, said:

> [Dart's] claim is preposterous, the skull is that of a young anthropoid ape . . . and showing so many points of affinity with the two living African anthropoids, the gorilla and chimpanzee, that there cannot be a moment's hesitation in placing the fossil form in this living group. [237]

According to evolutionists, what Australopithecines shared with human beings was they had left the trees and adapted to bipedalism (walking upright). Dart concluded that the Taung Child he had found was able to walk on two legs, since according to him, that part of the spinal cord known as the magnum was further back than that in humans, but further forward than in monkeys. On the basis of this, Dart then claimed that the animal was capable of standing on its two hind legs. This theory was not accepted by scientists at the time, but was supported until the 1950s. However, no part of the skeleton that might permit an estimation of bipedalism was available. The only specimens consisted of the skull and a few fragmented thigh, hip and foot bones. Yet evolutionists still insisted on their claims regarding bipedalism.

Lord Solly Zuckerman had carried out perhaps the most detailed studies of the Australopithecines family. Despite being an evolutionist, Zuckerman thought that *Australopithecus* was nothing more than an ape. Together with a four-member team, Zuckerman used the most advanced methods of anatomical investigation, which began in 1954 and lasted for several years. In the wake of these investigations, he declared that these creatures had not walked on two legs and were not an intermediate form between humans and apes. The concluding report by Zuckerman and his team read:

For my own part, the anatomical basis for the claim that the Australopithecines walked and ran upright like man is so much more flimsy than the evidence which points to the conclusion that their gait was some variant of what one sees in subhuman Primates, that it remains unacceptable. [238]

These judgments, published by Zuckerman in the mid-1950s, were confirmed by subsequent researchers. Dean Falk, a specialist in neuroanatomy, declared that the Taung skull belonged to a young monkey. "In his 1975 article, Dart had claimed that the brain of Taung was humanlike. As it turned out, he was wrong about that. . . . Taung's humanlike features were overemphasized," claimed Falk, who went on to say:

Like humans, [apes and monkeys] go through stages as they grow up. In his analysis of Taung, Dart did not fully appreciate that infant apes have not had time to develop features of the skull, such as thickened eyebrow ridges or attachment areas for heavy neck muscles, that set adult apes apart from human. Apparently he did not carefully consider the possibility that Taung's rounded forehead or the inferred position of the spinal cord might be due to the immaturity of the apelike specimen rather than to its resemblance to humans. [239]

The protrusions over the eyebrows, the most important feature that led to *Australopithecus africanus* being described as a hominid, can be seen in young gorillas today. From all this, it appears that the skull ascribed to *Australopithecus africanus* by evolutionists did not belong to an ancestor of man but in all probability, to a young ape.

Taxonomy

Biologists divide living things into specific classes. This classification, known as *taxonomy*, dates back to Carolus Linnaeus in the 18th century. The classification system that Linnaeus constructed has been expanded and revised, but is still in use today.

This system of classification contains hierarchical categories. Living things are first divided into kingdoms, such as the animal and plant kingdoms. Kingdoms are then subdivided into phyla, which are then further subdivided. Classification takes the following form, in descending order:

kingdom
phylum (*plural* phyla)
class
order
family
genus (*plural* genera)
species

Most biologists today accept the existence of five separate kingdoms. In addition to the plant and animal kingdoms, they regard fungi, monera (single-celled organisms with no cell nucleus, such as bacteria) and protista (cells with a nucleus, such as algae) as separate kingdoms.

The most important of these is without doubt that animal kingdom. The major divisions within the animal kingdom are its various phyla. In the classification of these phyla, their differing bodily

structures are considered. Arthropods, for example, constitute a separate phylum, and all the creatures within that phylum have a similar body plan. The phylum known as Chordata consists of creatures with a central nervous system. All the animals familiar to us such as fish, birds, reptiles and mammals are included in the vertebrate category, a subdivision of the Chordata.

Tetrapod Finger Structure, *The* —See, **Five Finger Homology**.

Theory

A hypothesis that can be supported with large numbers of observations and experiments is known as a *theory*. To put it another way, a theory is a deep-rooted hypothesis. However, although a theory is proven with experiments, it may also be disproved.

For example, the claim that "The atom is the smallest known component of matter," known as Dalton's atomic theory, today has lost all validity.[240] Advances in science and technology have revealed the existence of much smaller particles than the atom and even the proton, such as the quark.

A scientific theory is an attempt to explain certain phenomena occurring in nature. A frequently occurring phenomenon may be explained in terms of a theory, a fact, or a law. Gravity, example, is a fact. Even if we cannot perceive gravity directly, we can still see its effect when we drop something. There is also a *theory* of gravity that answers the question of how this takes place. Even if we do not know exactly how gravity works, there are theories that seek to account for it. The *law of gravity* formulated by Isaac Newton is one such.

In summary, a scientific fact is an observable natural law, and a scientific theory is a mathematical description of how a scientific law works.

The first and most important requirement of empirical (experimental) science is that the object or phenomenon we wish to investigate should be observable. The second condition is that the object or phenomenon should be repeatable. Any observable and repeatable event must be capable of being tested. This enables us to determine whether or not an experiment validates a theory. If the explanation that someone postulates regarding a phenomenon is one that cannot be tested or validated, then this is not a theory, but a belief.[241]

Evolutionists say that the main evolutionary changes take place very slowly, or so rarely that people cannot observe them during their lifetimes. According to the evolutionist Theodosius Dobzhansky, even when evolutionary changes occur, they are events that by nature are rare, unrepeated and irreversible. Paul Ehrlich, a well-know evolutionist, maintains that the theory of evolution cannot be refuted by any observation, for which reason it needs to be regarded as being outside the scope of empirical science.[242]

On the other hand, by suggesting that evolution takes place in two ways—observable micro-evolution and unobservable macro-evolution—evolutionists attempt to portray this imaginary evolutionary process as a scientific fact. (*See **The*** **Invalidity of Micro-Evolution** and ***The*** **Macro-Evolution Myth**.) According to evolutionists, macro-evolution is the process of infinite variation necessary for reptiles to turn into birds, or apes into human beings. Yet nobody has ever observed this happening.[243]

Micro-evolution, on the other hand, again according to evolutionists, is a limited process of variation of a specific species that we can observe and that produces divergence. However, the changes postulated as micro-evolution cannot produce a new species or a new characteristic. Therefore, they are not, as is claimed, mechanisms with any evolutionary power. In addition, micro-

evolution is raised in order to imply that it is a dorm of variation that gives rise to macro-evolution. (*See* **Variation**.) This is mere conjecture regarding a phenomenon that cannot be observed and which lacks any evidence.

Evolution cannot be observed and cannot be repeated, and for these reasons, is therefore not a scientific fact or theory. Neither is it an evident scientific fact, as some circles imagine or as they seek to portray it.[244] On the contrary, when the theory of evolution is compared with scientific findings, a great contradiction emerges. In terms of the origin of life, population genetics, comparative anatomy, paleontology and biochemical systems, the theory of evolution is in a state of crisis, as the famous biochemist Michael Denton puts it.[245]

Theropod Dinosaurs

The theory of evolution claims that birds evolved from a small, carnivorous reptile known as the theropod dinosaur. In fact, however, a comparison of birds and reptiles shows that these classes are very different from one another and that no evolution can have taken place between them. (See ***The* Origin of Birds**.)

An examination of the anatomies and fossil records of birds and reptiles also shows no evidence that evolution ever happened. In an article titled "Demise of the 'Birds Are Dinosaurs' Theory," the American biologist Richard L. Deem writes:

The results of the recent studies show that the hands of the theropod dinosaurs are derived from digits I, II, and III, whereas the wings of birds, although they look alike in terms of structure, are derived from digits II, III, and IV . . . The second study shows that the theropod dinosaurs did not possess the correct skeletal structure or lung structure to have evolved into birds. The evolution of theropods into birds would have required the introduction of a serious handicap (a hole in their diaphragm), which would have severely limited their ability to breathe. As Dr. Ruben said, such a debilitating mutation "seems unlikely to have been of any selective advantage." [246]

There are other problems regarding the "Birds Are Dinosaurs" theory. In comparison with *Archaeopteryx*, theropods' front legs are very small in relation to their bodies. (*See* ***Archaeopteryx***.) Bearing in mind the body weight of these animals, the development of any *proto-wing* appears impossible. The majority of theropod dinosaurs have no semilunatic wrist bone (which is found in birds), and possess other wrist components that are absent in *Archaeopteryx*. In all theropods, the VI nerves leave the skull from the side, together with various other nerves. In birds, however, the same nerves leave the skull through a hole, which is unique to them, in the front of the skull. Another problem is that a great many theropods emerged after *Archaeopteryx.* [247]

Another major distinguishing feature between theropod dinosaurs and birds is the structure of these dinosaurs' hip bones. Dinosaurs are divided into two kinds, depending on their hip bone structure: *Saurischian* (with reptile-like hip bones) and *Ornithischian* (with bird-like hip bones). In members of the Ornithischian group, the hip bones really do closely resemble those of birds, hence their name. However, in other respects they bear no resemblance to birds whatsoever. For that reason, evolutionists are forced to regard Saurischian dinosaurs (those with reptile-like hip bones), which include the theropods, as the ancestors of birds. Yet as can be seen from their description, the hip bone structure in these dinosaurs bears absolutely no resemblance to that in birds. [248]

In short, it is impossible for birds to have evolved from theropod dinosaurs, because no mechanism exists that could possibly overcome the enormous differences between the two classes.

Transition From Jungle to Open Savanna Myth, *The*

Since the science of genetics and the laws of heredity were not fully known in the 19th century, Darwin and the early evolutionists who followed him regarded bipedalism as something easy to account for. The most popular theory was that apes living in the African savanna grew more upright in order to be able to see over the surrounding grasses.[249] However, it did not take long to realize that this Lamarckist theory was completely wrong.

Modern-day evolutionists have only a single thesis with which they seek to account for the origin of bipedalism. According to the theory of transition from jungle to open spaces,, the ancestors of humans and apes once lived together in the jungle. Due to jungle shrinking or for some other reason, some of them moved over to open plains, and bipedalism was born as a result of adaptation. Both the apes in the trees and the bipedal human beings began evolving in their own separate directions.

When examined, however, this thesis, dreamed up under the logic of "making the best of a bad job," is seen to be just like its predecessors, very far from being able to account for bipedalism. It is impossible at the molecular level for there to be such an adaptation. Even if such a thing is assumed to have taken place, there is no evidence of it in the fossil record. Moreover, according to this theory, the East African jungles must have begun shrinking 10 to 15 million years ago. Yet research carried out proves the exact opposite, and no such development ever took place in East Africa. [250] The plants observed in the region have remained unchanged for millions of years. In short, the transition from jungle to the open plains never happened.

Even when considered in logical terms, the theory in question about the origin of bipedalism is unacceptable. In the event of trees disappearing, the most natural course would be for apes to migrate to another region, or be wiped out with the elimination of their natural habitat. There is no basis for the theory that monkeys adapted to living on the ground.

Uluğ Nutku, who holds evolutionist views, describes why the account based on the shrinking of the jungles is insufficient:

It may be suggested that the shrinking of the jungles was the factor that initiated the phenomenon of humanization. This is a palaeontological fact. Napier's thesis is compatible with this, but it leaves out the following question: While one animal species was leaving the jungle and setting out on the path to becoming human, why did its closest relative, the ape, remain in the jungle? The less speculation, the harder it is to find an answer. The answer given by Hermann Klaatsch, in the early part of the century, when anthropology was in its infancy, was very interesting. According to Klaatsch, hominid apes also attempted to become human, but theirs was 'an unfortunate endeavour.' They were unable to rise up in the process of evolution, and withdrew into the 'protective darkness of the jungles.' But then the question of 'Why were apes unsuccessful?' comes to mind. [251]

There were a great many other questions apart from "Why were apes unsuccessful?", and they are all unanswered

Transition from Land to Air Myth, *The*

Since evolutionists believe that birds evolved in some way, they claim that they are descended from reptiles. One of the theories they propose to account for the origin of flight is that reptiles developed wings while attempting to catch flies. In fact, however, birds have totally different structures from those in terrestrial animals. No physical mechanism can be accounted for in terms of gradual evolution.

First of all, the flawless structure of the wing, the evolutionary main distinguishing feature of birds, represents a major dilemma for evolutionists. The question of how the wing could have developed as the result of consecutive random mutations is one that evolutionists cannot answer. Evolution is unable to explain how a reptile's front legs could have turned into wings as the result of some mutation arising in its genes. No new organ can form as the result of mutations, and any reptile would be naturally disadvantaged if its forelegs lost functionality. (*See* ***The*** **Origin of Wings** and ***The*** **Origin of Flight**.)

In addition, simply possessing wings is not enough to turn a terrestrial animal into a bird. Land dwellers lack many of the structural mechanisms that birds use to fly. For example, avian bones are much lighter than those of terrestrial creatures. Their lungs have a wholly different structure and function. Birds have different muscular and skeletal structures, as well as far more specialized heart and circulatory systems—mechanisms that cannot form gradually, being added to one another.

Evolutionists who maintain that dinosaurs developed wings while chasing flies cannot explain how those flies developed wings in the first place. Yet according to their own claims, the flies' wings in their most complex forms must have come into being through various mutations. This clearly demonstrates that the claims of evolutionists are simply fictional. In addition, no fossil record confirms this unscientific tale. There are thousands of perfectly formed bird fossils, but not a single example of bird-like creatures, with half-developed wings, has ever been found.

Transition from Sea to Land Thesis, *The* —*See* Transition from Water to Land Dilemma, *The*.

Transition from Water to Land Dilemma, *The*

According to the theory of evolution, life began in the seas, and the first advanced vertebrate animals were fish. Again according to the theory, these fish began to move toward dry land and in some way, came to use feet instead of fins and lungs instead of gills!

Many books on evolution never consider the *how* of this major claim, whose baselessness is glossed over in most scientific textbooks in some summary like ". . . and living things moved from the water to dry land."

If one fish that moved out of the water onto dry land couldn't survive for longer than a minute or two, then any of the other fish that did so would also die within a few minutes. Even if fish kept making the same attempts for millions of years, the end result would always be the same: All the fish would die. No organ as complex as the lung can emerge suddenly, by way of mutation. Yet a half-lung would serve no purpose at all.

Both fossil findings and physiological studies totally disprove the claim that fish are the ancestors of terrestrial animals. The huge anatomical and physiological differences between marine and terrestrial animals cannot possibly be bridged by gradual evolution based on chance. Among the most evident of these differences:

1) *Weight bearing:* Marine creatures do not face the problem of having to support their own weight, so their bodily structures are not directed towards such a function. Those living on land, however, expend 40% of their energy just in moving around. Any water dweller about to pass onto dry land needs to develop new muscles and a new skeletal structure to meet that need—but it is impossible for such complex structures to form through random mutations.

Evolutionists imagine the coelacanth and other similar fish to be the ancestors of terrestrial animals because of the bony nature of their fins. They assume that these bones gradually developed into weight-bearing feet. Yet unlike the feet of land dwellers, the bones in a fish's fins are not connected directly to their backbone. This means they cannot perform a weight- bearing function, as do the leg bones in terrestrial animals. Therefore, the claim that these fins slowly evolved into feet is groundless.

2) *Heat protection*: On land, temperatures can change very fast and within a wide range. A terrestrial animal's metabolism allows it to adapt to these temperature changes in. In the sea, however, temperatures change very slowly, and do not range as widely as on land. A creature accustomed to the sea's even temperatures therefore needs to acquire a protective system appropriate to the temperature swings on land. It would be ridiculous to claim that fish acquired such a system through random mutations as soon as they emerged onto dry land.

3) *Use of water:* Water is an essential requirement for living things, and on land, its availability is limited. For that reason water, and even moisture, must be used economically. For example, skin must prevent water loss and evaporation, and land dwellers must be able to feel thirst when they need water. Yet underwater creatures have no sense of thirst and their skins are not suited to a dry environment.

4) *Kidneys:* Due to the abundant water in their environment, marine creatures can immediately filter and expel their bodies' waste products, particularly ammonia. On land, however, water must be used at minimum levels. For that reason these living things have kidneys, thanks to which ammonia is filtered out as urea and stored in the bladder, and the minimum amount of water is used when it is expelled. In addition, there is a need for new systems that enable the kidneys to function. In order for a transition from water to land, creatures without kidneys will need to develop them immediately.

5*) Respiratory system*: Fish breathe the oxygen dissolved in water through their gills. Out of the water, however, they are unable to survive for more than a few minutes. In order to live on dry land, they need to acquire a pulmonary system.

It is of course impossible for all these physiological changes to take place by chance and all at the same time.

According to the evolutionist scenario, fish first evolved into amphibians. Yet there is no evidence for that scenario: Not a single fossil has been found to show that half-fish, half-amphibian creatures ever existed.

Robert L. Carroll, the well-known evolutionist and author of *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, admits this, albeit reluctantly: "We have no intermediate fossils between rhipidistian fish and early amphibians." [252] (*See* **Amphibians**.)

The evolutionist paleontologist Barbara J. Stahl wrote a book, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, in which she says:

Although the relationship of the rhipidistians to the amphibians will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter, it should be said here that none of the known fishes is thought to be directly ancestral to the earliest land vertebrates. Most of them lived after the first amphibians appeared, and those that came before show no evidence of developing the stout limbs and ribs that characterized the primitive tetrapods. [253]

Transitional Forms, *The* (The Transitional Species)

The theory of evolution claims that all living species on Earth, past and present evolved from one another. The transformation from one species to another, according to this theory, occurred

slowly and in stages. Therefore, there must have been at least several transitional forms between two successive species, exhibiting characteristics of each. For example, there must have been creatures with both gills and lungs, fins and feet, alive during the millions of years between the time that fish first left the water and became amphibians. Evolutionists call these imaginary creatures *"transitional forms."*

If this theory were true, there would have to be millions, even billions of such creatures that lived in the past, and some of these monstrosities must have left remains in the fossil record. But so far, the fossil record has revealed not one single transitional form. In his book *The Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin writes these words in his chapter entitled "Difficulties on Theory":

Why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined? . . . But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth? . . . Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory. [254]

Taking their lead from these words, evolutionist paleontologists since the 19th century have been scouring the globe in search of these transitional forms. In spite of all their efforts, they have not found any. All the findings from their research and excavations have revealed, contrary to their expectations, that living creatures appeared on Earth all at once and fully formed.

The evolutionist Gordon R. Taylor, points out in his book, *The Great Evolution Mystery:*

Professor G. G. Simpson is an ardent Darwinist, but he goes so far as to say: 'The absence of transitional forms is an almost universal phenomenon.' This is true of invertebrates as well as vertebrates and also of plants. He adds: 'The line making connection with common ancestry is not known even in one instance.' The rodents, he notes, appear suddenly, already equipped with their specialized gnawing teeth. As to the mammals, 'In all 32 orders of mammals, the break is so sharp and the gap so large that the origin of the order is speculative and much disputed.' [255]

Today, there are more than 100 million fossils in thousands of museums and collections all over the world. All these are divided from the others by definite demarcations, and all have their own unique structures. No fossils of semi-fish/semi-amphibian, semi-dinosaur/semi-bird, semi-ape/semi-human and similar life forms of the kind so optimistically expected by evolutionists have ever been unearthed. The absence of a single intermediate form among such a rich fossil record shows, not that the fossil record is lacking, but that the theory of evolution is untrue.

As the noted biologist, Francis Hitching, writes this in his book, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*:

If we find fossils, and if Darwin's theory was right, we can predict what the rock should contain; finely graduated fossils leading from one group of creatures to another group of creatures at a higher level of complexity. The 'minor improvements' in successive generations should be as readily preserved as the species themselves. But this is hardly ever the case. In fact, the opposite holds true, as Darwin himself complained; "innumerable transitional forms must have existed, but why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?" Darwin felt though that the "extreme imperfection" of the fossil record was simply a matter of digging up more fossils. But as more and more fossils were dug up, it was found that almost all of them, without exception, were very close to current living animals. [256]

The fossil record shows that living species came into being all at once, fully formed in all their variety, and remained unchanged throughout long geological periods. A noted evolutionist paleontologist at Harvard University, Stephen Jay Gould, acknowledges this fact:

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

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

2) Sudden appearance—in any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and "fully formed." [257]

In general, evolutionists deliberately use the concept of transitional forms to mislead. The term "transitional form" refers to a developing creature midway between two species with insufficient and partly formed organs. Sometimes, because they misunderstand the idea of a transitional form, Darwinists impute transitional-form characteristics to a creature that is not transitional at all. For example, the fact that one group of living creatures exhibits characteristics commonly found in another group, does not imply that the first group is a transitional form.

A fine example is the Australian platypus. This creature is a mammal but lays eggs like a reptile, and also has a beak like a duck's. Scientists call the platypus and other such animals "mosaic creatures." Noted paleontologists such as Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge state that evolutionist paleontologists do not count the platypus as an example of a transitional form.[258] (*See* **Platypus**.)

Tree of Life

According to Darwinism, the course of evolution resembles a tree, starting from a single stem and then diverging into branches. Indeed, this hypothesis is strongly emphasized in Darwinist sources, where the concept of the tree of life is frequently used. According to this imaginary metaphor, phyla, one of the basic classifications into which living things are divided, must have "branched out" in stages.

According to Darwinism, a single phylum must first have appeared, and other phyla must then have emerged slowly through small changes and over very long periods of time. (*See* **Phylum**.) According to this hypothesis, there must have been a gradual rise in the number of animal phyla. Illustrations made on this subject show a gradual rise in the number of phyla, in conformity with Darwinist expectations that the living things should have developed this way. But the fossils refuse this imaginary tree of life. The true picture that emerges from the fossil record is that species have been thoroughly different and very complex, ever since the period when they first appeared.

All the animal phyla known today appeared suddenly on Earth in a geological age known as the Cambrian Period.

Berkeley University's professor Phillip Johnson, one of the world's major critics of Darwinism, states that this fact revealed by paleontology is in clear conflict with the theory of evolution:

Darwinian Theory predicts a "cone of increasing diversity," as the first living organism, or first animal species, gradually and continually diversified to create the higher levels of taxonomic order. The animal fossil record more resembles such a cone turned upside down, with the phyla present at the start and thereafter decreasing. [259]

In the Pre-Cambrian Period, there were three phyla consisting of single-celled organisms. In the Cambrian Period, however, nearly 60 animal phyla emerged all at once. Some of these phyla then became extinct in the period that followed, and only a few phyla have survived down to the present day.

The well-known evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin refers to this extraordinary state of affairs that demolishes all the assumptions of Darwinism:

The most important evolutionary event during the entire history of the Metazoa, the Cambrian explosion established virtually all the major animal body forms—Bauplane or phyla—that would exist thereafter, including many that were "weeded out" and became extinct. Compared with the 30 or so extant phyla, some people estimate that the Cambrian explosion may have generated as many as 100. [260]

Trilobites

Trilobites are one of the most interesting living groups that suddenly emerged in the Cambrian Period and subsequently became extinct. They belong to the phylum Arthropoda, and are very complex creatures with hard shells, segmented bodies and complex organs. The fossil records have allowed a great deal of information to be obtained regarding the trilobite eye. It consisted of scores of tiny cells, each of which contains a pair of lenses. This eye structure is a marvel of creation.

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

One of the most difficult jobs I ever attempted was to count the number of lenses in a large trilobite eye. I took several photographs of the eye from the different angles and then made enormous prints magnified large enough to see individual lenses. I started counting as one might "one, two, three, four" . . . and so on to a hundred or two. The trouble was that you had only to look away for an instant, or sneeze, to forget exactly where you were, so it was back again to "one, two, three."[261]

More than 3,000 lenses means the animal received more than 3,000 images. This clearly shows the scale of the complexity in the eye and brain structure of a creature that lived 530 million years ago, and displays a flawless structure that cannot have come into existence through evolution.

David Raup, a professor of geology from Harvard, Rochester and Chicago universities, says: "the trilobites 450 million years ago used an optimal design which would require a well trained and imaginative optical engineer to develop today." [262]

This extraordinarily complex structure in trilobites is by itself sufficient to invalidate Darwinism. No comparable complex creature existed in earlier geological periods, which shows that trilobites emerged with no evolutionary stages behind them.

This extraordinary state of affairs in the Cambrian period was more or less known when Charles Darwin wrote his book *The Origin of Species.* It had been observed in the fossils from that period that life emerged suddenly in the Cambrian, and that trilobites and certain other invertebrates made a spontaneous appearance. That is why Darwin had to refer to the situation in his book. At that time, the Cambrian Period was known as the *Silurian Period*. Darwin touched on the subject under the heading, "On the sudden appearance of groups of allied species in the lowest known fossiliferous strata," and wrote the following about the Silurian Period:

. . . I cannot doubt that all the Silurian trilobites have descended from some one crustacean, which must have lived long before the Silurian age, and which probably differed greatly from any known animal . . . Consequently, if my theory be true, it is indisputable that before the lowest

Silurian stratum was deposited, long periods elapsed, as long as, or probably far longer than, the whole interval from the Silurian age to the present day; and that during these vast, yet quite unknown, periods of time, the world swarmed with living creatures. To the question why we do not find records of these vast primordial periods, I can give no satisfactory answer. [263]

Fossils from the Cambrian Period show that both trilobites, with their complex bodies, and other living things with very different anatomy all emerged suddenly, thus demolishing Darwin's conjectures. In his book, Darwin wrote: "If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have really started into life all at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of descent with slow modification through natural selection." [264] Some 60 different classes began life suddenly and simultaneously in the Cambrian Period. This confirms the picture described by Darwin as a "fatal" blow.

Turkana Boy Fossil, *The*

The most famous *Homo erectus* fossil discovered in Africa is the *Nariokotome homo erectus* or Turkana Boy fossil found near lake Turkana in Kenya. It has been determined that this fossil belonged to a 12-year-old male who would have reached around 1.83 meters (5'6" feet) in height when fully grown. Its upright skeleton is identical to that of any modern human. The American paleoanthropologist Alan Walker says that he doubted that the average pathologist could tell the difference between the fossil skeleton and that of a modern human[265], because *Homo erectus* is in fact a modern human race.

Professor William Laughlin of Connecticut University spent years researching Eskimos and the inhabitants of the Aleut islands and observed a striking level of similarity between them and *Homo erectus*. Laughlin's conclusion was that all these different races in fact belonged to *Homo sapiens* (human):

When we consider the vast differences that exist between remote groups such as Eskimos and Bushmen, who are known to belong to the single species of Homo sapiens, it seems justifiable to conclude that Sinanthropus [an erectus specimen] belongs within this same diverse species. [266]

U

Urey, Harold

Harold Urey was the teacher of the American researcher Stanley Miler at Chicago University. Because of Urey's contribution to Miller's 1953 experiment on the origin of life, this is also known as the Urey-Miller Experiment. This experiment is the only "proof" used to supposedly confirm the molecular evolution thesis, which is put forward as the first stage in the evolutionary process. However, the experiment was never able to offer any findings to support evolutionist claims regarding the origin of life. (*See* ***The*** **Miller Experiment**.)

Urey-Miller Experiment, *The* —*See* Miller Experiment, *The*.

V

Variation

Variation is a term used in genetic science, and concerns the emergence of different varieties, or species. This genetic phenomenon causes individuals or groups within a given species to possess different features from others. For example, all human beings on Earth possess essentially the same genetic information. But thanks to the variation potential permitted by that genetic information, some people have round eyes, or red hair, or a long nose, or are short and stocky in stature.

Darwinists, however, seek to portray variation within a species as evidence for evolution. The fact is, however, that variations constitute no such thing, because variation consists of the emergence of different combinations of genetic information that *already* exists, and cannot endow individuals with any new genetic information or characteristics.

Variation is always restricted by existing genetic information. These boundaries are known as the *gene pool* in genetic science. (*See **The*** **Gene Pool**.) Darwin, however, thought that variation had no limits when he proposed his theory[267], and he depicted various examples of variation as the most important evidence for evolution in his book *The Origin of Species*.

According to Darwin, for example, farmers mating different variations of cow in order to obtain breeds with better yields of milk would eventually turn cows into another species altogether. Darwin's idea of limitless change stemmed from the primitive level of science in his day. As a result of similar experiments on living things in the 20th century, however, science revealed a principle known as *genetic homeostasis*. This principle revealed that all attempts to change a living species by means of interbreeding (forming different variations) were in vain, and that between species, there were unbreachable walls. In other words, it was absolutely impossible for cattle to evolve into another species as the result of farmers mating different breeds to produce different variations, as Darwin had claimed would happen.

Luther Burbank, one of the world's foremost authorities on the subject of genetic hybrids, expresses a similar truth: "there are limits to the development possible, and these limits follow a law." [268] Thousands of years of collective experience have shown that the amount of biological change obtained using cross-breeding is always limited, and that there is a limit to the variations that any one species can undergo.

Indeed, in the introduction to their book *Natural Limits to Biological Change* Professor of Biology Lane P. Lester and the molecular biologist Raymond G. Bohlin wrote:

That populations of living organisms may change in their anatomy, physiology, genetic structure, etc., over a period of time is beyond question. What remains elusive is the answer to the question, How much change is possible, and by what genetic mechanism will these changes take place? Plant and animal breeders can marshal an impressive array of examples to demonstrate the extent to which living systems can be altered. But when a breeder begins with a dog, he ends up with a dog—a rather strange looking one, perhaps, but a dog nonetheless. A fruit fly remains a fruit fly; a rose, a rose, and so on.[269]

Variations and their various changes are restricted inside the bounds of a species' genetic information, and they can never add *new* genetic information to species. For that reason, no variation can be regarded as an example of evolution.

The Danish scientist W. L. Johannsen summarizes the situation:

The variations upon which Darwin and Wallace placed their emphasis cannot be selectively pushed beyond a certain point, that such variability does not contain the secret of "indefinite departure." [270]

The fact that there are different human races in the world or the differences between parents and children can be explained in terms of variation. Yet there is no question of any new component being added to their gene pool. For example, no matter how much you seek to enrich their species, cats will always remain cats, and will never evolve into any other mammal. It is impossible for the sophisticated sonar system in a marine mammal to emerge through recombination. (*See* **Recombination**.) Variation may account for the differences between human races, but it can never provide any basis for the claim that apes developed into human beings.

Vestigial Organs Thesis, *The*

One claim that long occupied a place in the literature of evolution but was quietly abandoned once it was realized to be false is the concept of *vestigial organs*. Some evolutionists, however, still imagine that such organs represent major evidence for evolution and seek to portray them as such.

A century or so ago, the claim was put forward that some living things had organs that were inherited from their ancestors, but which had gradually become smaller and even functionless from lack of use.

Those organs were in fact ones whose functions had not yet been identified. And so, the long list of organs believed by evolutionists to be vestigial grew ever shorter. The list of originally proposed by the German anatomist R. Wiedersheim in 1895 contain approximately 100 organs, including the human appendix and the coccyx. But the appendix was eventually realized to be a part of the lymph system that combats microbes entering the body, as was stated in one medical reference source in 1997:

Other bodily organs and tissues—-the thymus, liver, spleen, appendix, bone marrow, and small collections of lymphatic tissue such as the tonsils in the throat and Peyer's patch in the small intestine—are also part of the lymphatic system. They too help the body fight infection. [271]

The tonsils, which also appeared on that same list of vestigial organs, were likewise discovered to play an important role against infections, especially up until adulthood. (Like the appendix, tonsils sometimes become infected by the very bacteria they seek to combat, and so must be surgically removed.) The coccyx, the end of the backbone, was seen to provide support for the bones around the pelvic bone and to be a point of fixation for certain small muscles.

In the years that followed, other organs regarded as vestigial were shown to serve specific purposes: The thymus gland activates the body's defense system by setting the T cells into action. The pineal gland is responsible for the production of important hormones. The thyroid establishes balanced growth in babies and children. The pituitary ensures that various hormone glands are functioning correctly.

Today, many evolutionists accept that the myth of vestigial organs stemmed from sheer ignorance. The evolutionist biologist S.R. Scadding expresses this in an article published in the magazine *Evolutionary Theory:*

Since it is not possible to unambiguously identify useless structures, and since the structure of the argument used is not scientifically valid, I conclude that 'vestigial organs' provide no special evidence for the theory of evolution.[272]

Evolutionists also make a significant logical error in their claim that vestigial organs in living things are a legacy from their ancestors: Some organs referred to as "vestigial" are *not present* in the species claimed to be the forerunners of man.

For example, some apes have no appendix. The zoologist Professor Hannington Enoch, an opponent of the vestigial organ thesis, sets out this error of logic:

Apes possess an appendix, whereas their less immediate relatives, the lower apes, do not; but it appears again among the still lower mammals such as the opossum. How can the evolutionists account for this? [273]

The scenario of vestigial organs put forward by evolutionists contains its own internal inconsistencies, besides being scientifically erroneous. We humans have no vestigial organs inherited from our supposed ancestors, because humans did not evolve randomly from other living things, but were fully and perfectly created in the form we have today.

W

Wallace, Alfred Russell

The British natural historian Alfred Russell Wallace (1823-1913) is known for the idea that species emerged through natural selection. In a paper he wrote in 1855 titled “On the Law Which Has Regulated the Introduction of New Species,” Wallace maintained that all species were extensions of other species to which they were closely related.

Despite developing his thesis at approximately the same time as Darwin, Wallace held different views on a number of points. As a believer in the human soul, Wallace believed that Allah had created by means of evolution, and maintained that human mental capacities could not be explained in terms of natural selection and similar naturalistic mechanisms. In contrast to Darwin, he believed that non-biological factors outside natural selection were responsible for the emergence of human physical traits and mental capabilities.[274]

Watson, James

The famous American biologist James Watson is best known for his work in the field of molecular biology. He and Francis Crick revealed the extraordinarily complex structure in DNA as a result of their joint work in 1955.

Watson and Crick’s discovery of nucleic acids—DNA and RNA, for short—gave birth to new problems for the theory of evolution. With their discovery of the structure of DNA, they also revealed that life was far more complex than had previously been imagined.

The theory of evolution seeks to account for the origin of life in terms of coincidences, but cannot provide any consistent explanation regarding the existence of the most basic molecules. And these advances in genetic science represented a major impasse facing evolutionists.

Z

Zinjanthropus

So far have evolutionists gone in their adoption of evolution as a dogma that they can even ascribe very different faces to the same skull to provide supposed evidence for their theories.

The three totally different reconstructions produced for the fossil known as *Australopithecus robustus* (*Zinjanthropus*) are a well-known example of this attitude. (*See* ***Australopithecus***.)