

# **ATLAS OF CREATION**

**VOLUME - III**

**HARUN YAHYA**



**First English Edition published in July, 2007**

Translated by: Carl Rossini, and Ron Evans

Edited by: Tam Mossman

Published by: **GLOBAL PUBLISHING**

Talatpasa Mah. Emirgazi Caddesi  
İbrahim Elmas İş Merkezi A Blok Kat 4  
Okmeydani - İstanbul / Turkey  
Phone: (+90 212) 222 00 88

Printed and bound by: Entegre Matbaacilik in Istanbul

Sanayi Cd. No: 17 Yenibosna-Istanbul/Turkey

Phone: (+90 212) 451 70 70

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

Abbreviation used:

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

[www.harunyahya.com](http://www.harunyahya.com)

[www.harunyahya.net](http://www.harunyahya.net)

# **CONTENS**

## **INTRODUCTION**

## **EVOLUTIONISTS' INTERMEDIATE-FORM DILEMMA**

## **CAMBRIAN FOSSILS AND THE CREATION OF SPECIES**

## **"MISSING LINK DISCOVERED" HEADLINES ARE AN UNSCIENTIFIC DECEPTION**

## **DARWIN'S ILLOGICAL AND UNSCIENTIFIC FORMULA**

## **FOSSIL SPECIMENS OF LAND ANIMALS**

TIGER SKULL

HYENA SKULL

SPECTACLED BEAR

SABLE SKULL

ANTELOPE SKULL

SNOW LEOPARD SKULL

COYOTE SKULL

RABBIT SKULL

FOX SKULL

GIANT RACCOON SKULL

CROCODILE SKULL

HYENA SKULL

ZEBRA SKULL

ANTELOPE SKULL

TIGER SKULL

ANTELOPE SKULL

TIGER SKULL

TIGER SKULL

TIGER SKULL

WOLF SKULL

HYENA SKULL

HYENA SKULL

WEASEL SKULL

WOLVERINE SKULL

TIGER SKULL

WEASEL SKULL  
SPOTTED DEER SKULL  
FEMALE BINTURONG SKULL  
BOAR SKULL  
WOLVERINE SKULL  
ANTELOPE SKULL  
TIBETAN SAND FOX SKULL  
PANTHER SKULL  
MALE GIANT PANDA SKULL  
NORTHEAST TIGER SKULL  
MARBLED POLECAT SKULL  
NORTHEAST TIGER SKULL  
WOLVERINE SKULL  
CROCODILE  
FROG  
SALAMANDER LARVA  
CROCODILE  
AN ELEPHANT'S FRON TOOTH

### **FOSSIL SPECIMENS OF MARINE CREATURES**

MENE (Mene maculata)  
STARFISH  
CRINOID  
SQUID  
STURGEON  
NEEDLEFISH  
STARFISH  
SOLDIER FISH  
NEEDLEFISH  
COELACANTH  
VIPERFISH  
GUITARFISH  
NEEDLEFISH  
EEL  
SQUID (with its pair)  
CATSHARK  
LOBSTER and FLYING FISH  
GUITARFISH  
NEEDLEFISH  
SQUID (with its pair))

SHRIMP  
CATSHARK  
GUITARFISH  
SHRIMP  
COELACANTH  
STINGRAY  
CRAYFISH  
SEA URCHIN  
STINGRAY  
SEA BASS  
FLYING FISH  
SAND FISH  
EEL  
LADY FISH (Elopidae)  
PIPEFISH (Syngathodei)  
HORSESHOE CRAB  
SANDFISH  
LADYFISH (Elopidae) (with its pair)  
NEEDLEFISH  
BRITTLESTAR  
EEL  
SANDFISH  
CRAB  
SHRIMP  
SANDFISH  
STARFISH  
ANGELFISH (Cichlidae)  
RAZORFISH (Centriscus)  
SEA CUCUMBER (with its pair)  
STARFISH  
CORAL  
TROUTPERCH (Percopsidae)  
SCALLOP  
FLYING FISH  
CORAL  
STURGEON  
PIPEFISH  
SQUID  
STINGRAY  
SQUID

PLATED LOBSTER  
MANTIS SHRIMP  
PUFFER FISH  
LOBSTER  
SEAHORSE  
MANTIS SHRIMP  
PUFFER FISH  
STINGRAY (with its pair)  
SEA LILY  
MANTIS SHRIMP  
PUFFER FISH  
BOWFIN  
SEAHORSE  
COELACANTH  
STINGRAY (with its pair)  
GUITARFISH  
PIPEFISH  
PUFFER FISH  
NEEDLEFISH  
MANTIS SHRIMP  
PUFFER FISH  
SQUID  
SARDINE  
MANTIS SHRIMP AND EEL  
PUFFER FISH  
NEEDLEFISH (with its pair)  
MANTIS SHRIMP  
GUITARFISH  
MACKEREL (with its pair)  
NEEDLEFISH  
LADYFISH (with its pair)  
BONEFISH (with its pair)  
SAWFISH  
SEA URCHIN  
CATSHARK

### **FOSIL SPECIMENS OF PLANTS**

HACKBERRY SEEDS  
SEQUOIA PINE CONE  
LEAF OF CLIMBING FERN

ALLOPHYLUS LEAF  
POPLAR LEAF  
CEDAR LEAF  
SUMAC LEAF  
SPURGE LEAF  
BALLOON VINE  
POPLAR LEAF  
OAK LEAF  
WILLOW LEAF  
FERN (with its pair)  
BEECH LEAF  
FERN  
HONEYSUCKLE LEAF  
FERN  
BIRCH LEAF  
FERN  
HONEYSUCKLE LEAF  
BIRCH LEAF  
SOAPBERRY LEAF  
SOAPBERRY LEAF  
SOAPBERRY LEAF  
FERN

#### **FOSSIL SPECIMENS OF INSECTS**

ANT  
JUMPING SPIDER  
BUTTERFLY LARVA  
BRISTLETAILS  
JUMPING SPIDER  
LARGE JUMPING SPIDER  
ORB WEAVER SPIDER AND FLY  
GROUND SPIDER  
BARKLOUSE  
WASP  
GALL MIDGE  
ASSASSIN BUG  
SOFT-BODIED PLANT BEETLE  
COCKROACH AND MIDGE  
LONG-HORNED BEETLE  
TWO MEALWORM LARVAE



CATERPILLAR  
TRUE BUG  
SANDHOPPER  
MANTIS, PEDILID BEETLE, AND FUNGUS GNAT  
SCALY BARKLOUSE  
SAP BEETLE  
GRASSHOPPER  
SCUTTLE FLY  
DANCE FLY  
WORKER ANT  
DANCE FLY  
CLICK BEETLE  
MOTH FLY  
BRACONID WASP  
LONG-LEGGED FLY  
SPIDER  
MOTH  
BUTTERFLY CHRYSALIS  
RAPHIDIOPTERA (SNAKE FLY) LARVA  
PIRATE SPIDER  
BRISTLETAIL  
ICHNEUMON WASP  
WALKING STICK  
BUTTERFLY LARVA  
COBWEB SPIDER  
CLICK BEETLE  
CICADA NYMPH  
CICADA  
DRAGONFLY AND MAYFLY LARVA  
GROUND CRICKET  
GRASSHOPPER  
COCKROACH  
GRASSHOPPER  
PLANTHOPPER  
COCKROACH  
MARCH FLY (Bibionidae)  
DRAGONFLY  
DRAGONFLY (with its pair)  
CRICKET  
COCKROACH

CRICKET  
DRAGONFLY NYMPH  
MAYFLY  
MAYFLY  
WATER STRIDER (Gerridae)  
WINGED STINK BUG (Pentatomidae)  
GROUND CRICKET  
GROUND CRICKET  
WASP  
PLANTHOPPERS  
MAYFLY  
GROUND CRICKET  
MAYFLY  
SPIDER  
MAYFLY  
GROUND CRICKET  
GROUND CRICKET  
MAYFLY NYMPH  
GROUND CRICKET  
SPIDER  
DRAGONFLY  
WASP  
MAYFLY NYMPH  
MAYFLY NYMPH  
MAYFLY

## **ONCE UPON A TIME THERE WAS DARWINISM**

### INTRODUCTION

DARWINISM'S CRUMBLING MYTHS AND THE CORRECT DEFINITION OF SCIENCE

ONCE, LIFE WAS THOUGHT TO BE SIMPLE

ONCE, THE FOSSIL RECORD WAS THOUGHT TO PROVE EVOLUTION

ONCE, THERE WAS A SEARCH FOR THE MISSING LINK

ONCE, THERE WAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

ONCE, IT WAS BELIEVED THAT THERE WAS

"EMBRYOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION"

ONCE, THERE WAS THE MYTH OF FAULTY CHARACTERISTICS

ONCE, THERE WAS THE MYTH OF "JUNK" DNA

ONCE, THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES WAS THOUGHT TO LIE IN "SPECIATION"

ONCE, THERE WAS THE "HORSE SERIES" SCENARIO

ONCE, THERE WAS THE STORY OF PEPPERED MOTHS

UNTIL RECENTLY, THERE WERE STORIES OF THE DINO-BIRD  
CONCLUSION

## **SOCIAL WEAPON: DARWINISM**

INTRODUCTION

SOCIAL DARWINISM

THE HISTORY OF RUTHLESSNESS, FROM MALTHUS TO DARWIN

THE "ROBBER BARONS," DARWIN'S FOLLOWERS

SOCIAL DARWINISM AND THE FAVORED RACES MYTH

THE RESULT OF THE DARWINISM-NAZISM COALITION: 40 MILLION DEAD

SOCIAL DARWINISTS' STERILIZATION AND DEATH LAWS

A THEORY THAT BELITTLES WOMEN

DARWINISM AND MORAL COLLAPSE

THE "EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGY" ERROR

CONCLUSION

## **THE OTHER NAME FOR ILLUSION: MATTER**

FOREWORD

THE SECRET BEYOND MATTER IS NOT WAHDATUL WUJOOD

INTRODUCTION

IT IS A SCIENTIFIC FACT THAT THE WORLD COMES INTO

EXISTENCE IN OUR BRAINS

WHY IS THE TRUTH ABOUT MATTER SUCH AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT?

TIME IS A PERCEPTION TOO

ETERNITY IS HIDDEN IN GOD'S MEMORY

REPLIES TO OBJECTIONS REGARDING THE REALITY OF MATTER

CONCLUSION: THE TRUTH CANNOT BE AVOIDED

THOSE WHO LEARN THE TRUTH ABOUT MATTER FEEL GREAT EXCITEMENT

## **To the Reader**

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

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

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

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

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

## About the Author

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

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

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

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

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

Greatly appreciated all around the world, these works have been instrumental in many people recovering faith in God and gaining deeper insights into their faith. His books' wisdom and sincerity, together with a distinct style that's easy to understand, directly affect anyone who reads them. Those who seriously consider these books, can no longer advocate atheism or any other perverted ideology or materialistic philosophy, since these books are characterized by rapid effectiveness, definite results, and irrefutability. Even if they continue to do so, it will be only a senti-

mental insistence, since these books refute such ideologies from their very foundations. All contemporary movements of denial are now ideologically defeated, thanks to the books written by Harun Yahya.

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

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

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

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

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

# INTRODUCTION

A fossil is the name given to the remains or traces of a plant or animal preserved in geologic strata since prehistoric times—or in some cases, remains preserved encased in amber. Fossils collected from all over the world are one of our most important sources of information about the organisms that have existed on Earth since the very earliest times, even hundre

ds of millions of years ago. Research into fossils enables us to learn about extinct plants and animals, as well as earlier forms of species still in existence today. Thanks to this information, we learn which life forms existed at what epochs in time, what these life forms' features were, and whether they resembled present-day species.

According to Charles Darwin's theory of evolution—whose scientific invalidity has been revealed by subsequent scientific discoveries—all living things are descended from one single common ancestor. Darwin and his followers claimed that very different life forms developed from one another as the result of small changes over long periods of time.

According to the theory's unsupported claims, random coincidences gave rise to the first living cells. Subsequently, those cells that had formed by chance combined together and over the course of millions of years, became marine invertebrates. Later still, they developed spinal cords and became fish. These fish subsequently emerged onto dry land and gave rise to reptiles, from which birds and mammals then supposedly evolved separately.

If this claim were true, then a great many "intermediate" forms showing the transition between different species should have once existed—and at least a few should have been fossilized. For example, if reptiles really had evolved into birds, then literally billions of half-bird, half-reptile creatures must once have existed. Similarly, there should have been large numbers of life forms that were part invertebrate and part fish, and half-fish, half-reptile. And these intermediate life forms must have had incomplete, partly-developed organs and structures. In addition, if such transitional species had really existed, then their numbers must have run into the hundreds of millions, or even billions, and their fossilized remains should be found all over the world.

Darwin referred to these conjectural creatures as "intermediate forms." He knew perfectly well that if his theory were to be proven, it was absolutely vital that the remains of at least a few of these intermediate forms be discovered. He explained why there must have been a large number of intermediate forms:

By the theory of natural selection all living species have been connected with the parent-species of each genus, by differences not greater than we see between the natural and domestic varieties of the same species at the present day... <sup>1</sup>

Here, Darwin is saying that the differences between any "ancestor" and the "descendant" during the supposed process of evolution should be as small as the differences in the varieties of any particular living species (between a pedigreed spaniel and a mongrel, for instance). Therefore, if evolution had really taken place as Darwin claimed, it must have done so by way of very small, gradual changes.

Changes in any living thing subjected to mutation will be relatively small. In order for major changes to take place—such as forelegs developing into wings, gills into lungs, or fins into feet—millions of very small successive changes must have accumulated, again over millions of years. This process would necessarily give rise to millions of transitional intermediate forms.

Following his statement quoted above, Darwin arrived at this conclusion:

... the number of intermediate and transitional links, between all living and extinct species, must have been inconceivably great. <sup>2</sup>

Darwin expressed the same point in other parts of his book *On the Origin of Species*:

If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking most closely all of the species of the same group together must assuredly have existed... Consequently evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains. <sup>3</sup>

However, Darwin was well aware that no fossils of these intermediate forms had yet been found. He regarded this as a major difficulty for his theory. In one chapter of his book titled "Difficulties on Theory," he wrote:

Why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?... But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?... Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory. <sup>4</sup>

Darwin's only explanation for this major dilemma was lack of evidence—insufficient fossil remains had been discovered at that time. He maintained that later, when the fossil record was examined in detail, the missing intermediate links would inevitably be found. Over the last 150 years, however, research has shown that the hopes of Darwin and his successors were all empty: Not a single intermediate form fossil has ever been encountered.



There are now roughly 100 million fossils in thousands of museums and collections all over the world. All of them are identifiable as species with their own unique structures, distinguished from one another by major anatomical differences. No fossil remains of any half-fish, half-amphibian, or half-dinosaur, half-bird, or half-ape, half-human—forms so eagerly awaited by evolutionists—have ever been discovered.

The paleontologist Niles Eldredge and the anthropologist Ian Tattersall, both from the American Museum of Natural History, state that the fossil record is perfectly adequate in order to understand the history of life—, and that this record in no way supports the theory of evolution:

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.<sup>5</sup>

As these evolutionist scientists make clear, it is quite possible to see the true history of life in the fossil record—but there are no intermediate forms in that history.

Other scientists agree that no intermediate forms exist. For example, Rudolf A. Raff, director of the Indiana University Molecular Biology Institute, and the Indiana University researcher Thomas C. Kaufman have declared:

The lack of ancestral or intermediate forms between fossil species is not a bizarre peculiarity of early metazoan history. Gaps are general and prevalent throughout the fossil record<sup>6</sup>

The fossil record has even preserved the microscopic remains of bacteria that lived billions of years ago. Yet despite this, not a single fossil belonging to any of these fictitious transitional life forms have ever been found. There are fossils belonging to thousands of different life forms, from ants to bacteria, and from birds to flowering plants. Fossils belonging to extinct plants and animals have been preserved so perfectly that we can establish the structures of extinct life forms that we never see alive today. The absence of even one single intermediate-form specimen, despite the fossil record being so rich, does not indicate that the fossil record is lacking. Rather, it shows the invalidity of the theory of evolution.

# EVOLUTIONISTS' INTERMEDIATE-FORM DILEMMA

As you have seen, evolutionists appeal to the fossil record to confirm their claims that living species evolved gradually from one another. Yet even though 99% of the fossil record has been unearthed and catalogued, they still do not have a single piece of evidence to support the claim of evolution. For that reason, some evolutionists have attempted to manufacture their own fossils as alleged evidence for their theories, though subsequently these "remains" have been exposed as either hoaxes or distorted misinterpretations.

Fossils in the Earth's strata confirm the fact that all life forms have existed in their original perfect state ever since they were first created. The Glasgow University professor of palaeontology T. Neville George expressed this many years ago:

There is no need to apologize any longer for the poverty of the fossil record. In some ways it has become almost unmanageably rich, and discovery is outpacing integration ... The fossil record nevertheless continues to be composed mainly of gaps.<sup>7</sup>

The paleontologist Niles Eldredge describes the invalidity of Darwin's blaming the insufficient nature of the fossil record for why no intermediate forms had been found:

The record jumps, and all the evidence shows that the record is real: the gaps we see reflect real events in life's history—not the artifact of a poor fossil record.<sup>8</sup>

Many people have the mistaken impression that there is a positive correlation between the fossil record and Darwin's theory—a misconception that was explained 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, semi-popular 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.<sup>9</sup>

The American palaeontologist S. M. Stanley describes how the truth revealed by the fossil record is ignored by the Darwinist mind-set that dominates the scientific world, which causes others to ignore it, as well:

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. ... as the biological historian William Coleman has recently written, 'The majority of paleontologists felt their evidence simply contradicted Darwin's stress on minute, slow, and cumulative changes leading to species transformation.' ... their story has been suppressed.<sup>10</sup>

# **CAMBRIAN FOSSILS AND THE CREATION OF SPECIES**

The oldest of the Earth's strata in which the fossils of complex life forms appear were laid down in the Cambrian Period, estimated at between 543 and 490 million years ago. In strata older than the Cambrian, no fossils of living things are found, apart from single-celled organisms. In the Cambrian Period, however, a variety of distinctly different life forms suddenly appeared. More than 30 life forms, such as sea urchins, starfish, trilobites, snails and fish appeared in a single moment.

Furthermore, contrary to the assumptions of the theory of evolution, all of the life forms that appeared so suddenly possess highly complex physical structures, not simple "rudimentary" ones.

According to the erroneous theory of evolution, more sophisticated life forms must have evolved from other, more primitive ones. Yet there are no complex life forms at all prior to those of the Cambrian Period. These Cambrian life forms appeared all at once, with not a single earlier forerunner. The British zoologist Richard Dawkins, the best-known living proponent of the theory of evolution, admits that:

It is as though they [Cambrian creatures] were just planted there, without any evolutionary history.<sup>11</sup>

This fact definitively invalidates the theory of evolution. Because in *The Origin of Species*, 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.<sup>12</sup>

This lethal blow that Darwin so feared came from the Cambrian Period, at the very beginning of the fossil record.

New life forms also appeared suddenly and with complete, flawless structures in the ages after the Cambrian. Basic groups such as fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals each appeared on Earth in a single moment and in flawless forms. Not a single intermediate form of the kind hoped for by evolutionists exists among them.

This fact revealed by the fossil record proves that living things have not evolved from the simple to the more complex, neither functionally nor in terms of appearance, but were created by God. The evolutionist Mark Czarnecki admits as much:

A major problem in proving the theory has been the fossil record; the imprints of vanished species preserved in the Earth's geological formations. This record has never revealed traces of Darwin's hypothetical intermediate variants—instead species appear ... abruptly, and this anomaly has fueled the creationist argument that each species was created by God.<sup>13</sup>

## **"MISSING LINK DISCOVERED" HEADLINES ARE AN UNSCIENTIFIC DECEPTION**

If you've ever read a newspaper headline announcing the discovery of a "missing link," then you can be certain that the report has no scientific value. Serious scientists long ago abandoned the idea of "missing links" and accepted that it is unscientific to make evolutionary conjectures based on fossils.

Henry Gee, a paleontologist and editor of the scientific journal *Nature*, writes this on the subject in his 1999 book *In Search of Deep Time*:

Given the ubiquitous chatter of journalists and headline writers about the search for ancestors, and the discovery of missing links, it may come as a surprise to learn that most professional palaeontologists do not think of the history of life in terms of scenarios or narratives, and that they rejected the storytelling mode of evolutionary history as unscientific more than thirty years ago.<sup>14</sup>

These persistent reports about missing links aim to give the impression that simply making a discovery will confirm the hypothesis that one species develops into another. Yet excavations over the last century and more have left totally unfounded the expectations that intermediate forms between species would be discovered. The eminent palaeontologist A. S. Romer admitted this as far back as 1963:

"Links" are missing just where we most fervently desire them [to point to a transition between species] and it is all too probable that many "links" will continue to be missing.<sup>15</sup>

Paleontologists have kept their missing links on the "missing list." Yet their own admissions run contrary to the impression that certain media outlets seek to give. For example, Niles Eldredge, and Ian Tattersall lack the media's positive air of expectation:

One of the most pervasive myths in all of paleontology...is the myth that the evolutionary histories of living beings are essentially a matter of discovery. ... But if this were really so, 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. <sup>16</sup>

To sum up, the missing link is not a creature waiting to be discovered, but an idea that palaeontologists have long since abandoned, and which cannot be the subject of any truly scientific inquiry. Therefore, why is it the subject of so much insistent propaganda?

The answer to this question lies in the world-view espoused by the theory of evolution. Materialists and atheists have attempted to keep Darwin's theory alive

ever since he first put it forward in the mid-19th century. Because although the theory is based on a completely imaginary scenario, materialists seized on it as a supposedly scientific hypothesis.

The evolutionist thinker Mary Midgley expresses this:

It [the theory of evolution] is, and cannot help being, also a powerful folk-tale about human origins. ... Suggestions about how we were made and where we come from are bound to engage our imagination, to shape our views of what we now are, and so to affect our lives. <sup>17</sup>

At the end of his biology text book *Life on Earth*, the Darwinist biologist Edward O. Wilson makes this admission on the subject of evolutionist claims:

Every generation needs its own creation myths, and these are ours. <sup>18</sup>

"Missing link" propaganda is therefore a deception intended to keep the evolutionary myth about the origins alive and influential. Evolutionary propaganda is the most important vehicle materialists have for spreading their views. The concept of the "missing link" is key in terms of Darwin's fictitious idea of all species being traceable to common ancestors. Therefore, the more that evolutionists can keep their concept in the spotlight, the more support they hope to muster for their materialist views. That is behind all their efforts to distract the public from the collapse of Darwinism by means of "missing link" headlines.

Despite the evolutionist media's best endeavors, the fossils they describe are not missing links, and neither can anything about them confirm Darwin's theory. These "news" reports consist solely of unscientific speculation regarding newly discovered fossils of extinct species. Yet this unscientific propaganda will not alter the fact that evolutionist scientists themselves admit that there is no scientific basis to the concept of the missing link, nor is there any trace of intermediate forms in the fossil record. The reality that the fossil record reveals is that evolution never occurred.

As in the previous two volumes of the *Atlas of Creation* series, in the following pages of this book, Volume 3, you will see fossils belonging to life forms that existed tens, or even hundreds of millions of years ago, matched together with their present-day counterparts. You can see for yourself these "living fossils"—of which there are countless examples. Yet they are seldom reported in evolutionary publications, which instead resort to reports regarding "missing links," which are simply products of highly prejudiced propaganda. You will be able to understand that efforts to disguise various hoaxes and unscientific claims as scientific developments are the products of the materialist mindset.

At the same time, you will discover how life forms have existed for millions of years complete with all their perfect and complex features and have survived with no changes in structure or appearance—and how each one is indisputable proof of the fact of Creation.





# DARWIN'S ILLOGICAL AND UNSCIENTIFIC FORMULA

When the subject of evolution comes up, many people imagine that this is a scientific problem—and that for anyone less knowledgeable than scientists, Darwinism is impossible to understand. They assume it's pointless to argue the issue, one way or the other. Indeed, Darwinists employ Latin words and scientific terms generally unfamiliar to the public in order to encourage this mistaken idea. They engage in complicated descriptions and frequently resort to demagoguery and hollow slogans in order to give the impression they are discussing a highly scientific matter.

In fact, however, Darwinism's basic claim is completely unscientific, and its logical poverty is so obvious that even primary school age children can see it. According to Darwinism, in some unexplained manner, the first cell supposedly formed in the Earth's primeval environment, in a pool of muddy water. And out of that single cell, a literally endless series of coincidences later gave rise to animals, plants, human beings and civilizations. In other words, all of mankind, as well as the entire plant and animal kingdoms, are supposedly the work of an ideal quantity of mud, a long period of time and plentiful coincidences.

According to Darwinists, who are suffering from an obvious logical deficiency, these materials, each one of which is unconscious, gave rise to human beings possessed of reason and conscience, who think, love, feel compassion, possess sound judgment, produce paintings and statues, compose symphonies, write novels, build skyscrapers, construct nuclear reactors, discover the causes of diseases and manufacture drugs to cure them, or engage in politics. They claim that when sufficient time had passed, lions, tigers, rabbits, deer, elephants, cats, dogs, moths, flies, crocodiles and birds all evolved by chance from muddy water. A whole range of fruits and vegetables, with their own unique tastes and smells—oranges, strawberries, bananas, apples, grapes, tomatoes, peppers—flowers with their matchless appearances and other plants all emerged from that same mud.

In short, ever since Darwin's time, countless articles, papers, films, newspaper reports, magazine articles and television programs have repeated the evolutionist scenario in which all of life emerged by chance from mud. In other words, if you ask a Darwinist "How did our civilization arise?" or, "How did such a wide range of life forms come into being?" or, "How did mankind come into existence?" the essential answer you will receive is this: *Coincidences gave rise to all these things from mud, over the course of time.*

One would doubtless need to be devoid of reason or lack any facility for understanding in order to believe such a tale. Yet surprisingly, that very irrational

and illogical theory has had its adherents for many years and is still being propagated constantly under a scientific guise.

## **The Lies of Darwinism Have Been Unmasked**

The theory of evolution, first proposed under the primitive conditions of the 19th century, has been disproved by advances in science and technology. It has been recognized that Darwin's claims are totally unrealistic: Natural selection and mutations, cited as the mechanisms that drive the process of evolution, have no effects of the kind envisaged by Darwinists. In short, it is impossible for them to give rise to new species.

The final death blow to Darwinism was dealt by the fossil record. Darwin claimed that all the millions of different life forms had come into being through descent from a supposed single common ancestor. In order for his claim to be verified, there should be traces in the fossil record—an irrefutable document of natural history—of this supposed primitive ancestor and of the various life forms that developed from it. For example, if all mammals were descended from reptiles, as evolutionists maintain, then there would have to be fossil remains of a series of half-mammalian, half-reptilian life forms. To date, millions of fossils, belonging to a great many species, have been unearthed during excavations. Yet not a single one showing a transition between species has ever been found. Every fossil ever found shows that each living thing emerged suddenly, with all its characteristics complete. In other words, every species of plant and animal was created.

Confronted by this fact, evolutionists have resorted to various falsehoods. They have produced hoaxes—counterfeit, artificial fossils that have come to be regarded as disgraces to paleontology. They have tried to deceive the lay public by tampering with genuine fossils of extinct life forms and inventing a series of imaginary scenarios.

One of the best known of them is the so-called "evolution of the horse." Fossils belonging to entirely different species that once lived in India, South America, North America and Europe were arranged in order of size—from small to large—in the light of evolutionist imaginations. So far, different researchers have come up with more than 20 different equine evolution scenarios.

There is no agreement among them regarding all these completely different family trees. The one point they commonly agree upon is their belief that a dog-like creature known as *Eohippus* (or *Hyracotherium*) that lived in the Eocene epoch (54 to 37 million years ago) was the very first ancestor of today's horses. However, *Eohippus*—portrayed as the ancestor of the horse and that became extinct millions of years ago—is almost identical to the present-day animal known as the hyrax, which looks nothing like a horse and is totally unrelated to that species. <sup>19</sup>

Moreover, it has been established that breeds of horse living today have also been discovered in the same rock strata as *Eohippus*.<sup>20</sup> This means that the horse and its supposed ancestor were both living at the same time, which proves that the horse never underwent any such process as evolution.

The invalidity of the "equine series" proposed by evolutionists also applies to birds, fish, reptiles and mammals, in short, to all living things, to their supposedly common ancestors and supposed family trees. It has been determined that every fossil species suggested as being the ancestor of some other living thing either belongs to an independent extinct life form or is the result of evolutionists tampering with fossils of the species in question.

### **Satan's Game Has Been Exposed**

Darwinism has been exposed as the most wide-ranging and astonishing deception in the world's history. That millions have been taken in by this deception, as if hypnotized, and have been influenced by all of Darwinism's illogical claims, is truly miraculous. The support lent to the theory of evolution and the acceptance it has enjoyed up to now are the result of tricks played on mankind by satan, who urges vast numbers of people towards Darwinism.

Until recently, no one had the courage to unmask this ruse of satan's and to publicize the true facts. But in the present century, the response to this deception has finally been laid out in full detail, and the public has been made fully aware of the state of affairs. By the will of God, the collapse of Darwinism has advanced beyond any point of recovery. Indeed, that is the fundamental reason for the panic in the Darwinian global empire.

# FOSSIL SPECIMENS OF LAND ANIMALS

## **TIGER SKULL**

Age: 80 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Gui Zhou Area, China

Evolutionist efforts to portray the supposed evolutionary ancestor of the tiger are pointless. Fossils have proven that tigers are not descended from any other life form, but have always existed as tigers. The fossil pictured shows that tigers living 80 million years ago were identical to those alive today, effectively silencing all evolutionist claims to the contrary.

Living things did not emerge as the result of mutation and chance. Almighty God, Lord of sublime creative power, has created all life forms.

## **HYENA SKULL**

Age: 85 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Tai Lang Town, Gan Su, He Zheng, China

In the fossil record, there is no trace of living things gradually acquiring the characteristics they possess—which refutes the idea of evolution. For example, there is not a single hyena fossil with one eye socket formed and the other not, with a semi-developed jaw or with skull deformations and defects. All the hyena fossils discovered show that hyenas that lived tens of millions of years in the past had exactly the same features as those alive today. The obvious implication of this is that living things never evolved, but were created.

## **SPECTACLED BEAR**

Age: 85 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Zhou Kou Dian, Fang Shan County, Beijing, China

These members of the family *Ursidae* are carnivorous mammals. Today, spectacled bears survive only in South America. Like pandas, they are on the verge of becoming extinct.

This Andean bear fossil, in which all the details of the skull have been preserved, reveals that this species has remained the same at all times. The tooth structure, eye sockets, jaw structure etc. of this animal that lived 85 million years ago all reveal that spectacled bears have remained unchanged for tens of millions

of years, in other words, that they never evolved. The fact revealed by this and other fossil discoveries is that Creation, not blind coincidences, represents the origin of living things.

### **SABLE SKULL**

Age: 75 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Ma Ling Mountain, Yan Cheng County, China

Sables, a species of marten and members of the family *Mustelidae*, live mainly in North America. Specimens may also be found in certain North European countries, Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey. The fossil pictured reveals that sables living 75 million years ago were identical to present-day specimens, demolishing all evolutionist claims. Semi-educated adherents of the theory of evolution, who possess only a very superficial understanding of the subject and have not researched it in any great depth, never reflect on such fossil discoveries. Since Darwinists never think about them, they imagine that all the pictures, reports and interpretations produced are accurate.

The fact is, however, that the fossil illustrations regarding Darwinism are produced for the sake of moral propaganda and are either hoaxes—fabricated fossils—or else belong to extinct species with no intermediate forms. Millions of fossils all tell us that evolution never happened.

### **ANTELOPE SKULL**

Age: 83 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: He Zheng, Gan Su, China

If evolutionist claims were true, then there should once have been a very odd creature bearing features of both the antelope and some other life form. These animals, of which there is no trace in the fossil record, should immediately be identifiable, due to their sharing characteristics belonging to two different species, and should also exhibit an example of the supposed forebear-descendent relationship claimed by evolutionists. Yet not one single such intermediate form has ever been exhibited in evolutionist publications, which are filled with countless other myths and fictitious scenarios.

That is because no such fossil exists. And that is in turn because no such life form ever existed at any time.

Like the 83-million-year-old antelope in the picture, all living things have come down to the present day in exactly the same form in which they were first created. Natural history refutes evolutionist claims.

### **SNOW LEOPARD SKULL**

Age: 80 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Du Lan County, Qing Hai, China

Fossil findings are one of the countless proofs that Creation is a manifest truth. The 80-million-year-old snow leopard skull in the illustration, for example, is one of life forms that never changed over the course of millions of years. This is proof that it was created, and that evolution never happened.

Evolutionists, on the other hand, have no evidence to support their theories. One would expect evolutionists to display some three to five intermediate-form fossils that support their claims, if they actually possessed any. If they cannot do that, and never will be able to, then they have to explain why they have portrayed their illusions as reality for so many years.

The time has now come for Darwinists to stop fantasizing and see the truth in the face of the millions of fossils that prove Creation.

### **COYOTE SKULL**

Age: 5 million years

Period: Miocene

Location: China

As has already been made clear, the theory of evolution claims that various imaginary life forms emerged from the seas and by way of incremental changes, became reptiles; and that birds then evolved from reptiles. According to the same scenario, reptiles are the forerunners not only of birds, but also of mammals. But the hypothesis that reptiles evolved into mammals has no scientific basis, as the fossil record shows. Despite all the excavations carried out to date, not a single intermediate form linking reptiles to mammals has ever been found. Nor can any such transitional form be discovered in the future, because no such life form ever existed. That is why the evolutionist Roger Lewin was forced to write that "The transition to the first mammal, ... is still an enigma." (Roger Lewin, "Bones of Mammals' Ancestors Fleshed Out," *Science*, Volume 212, 26 June 1981, p. 1492)

### **RABBIT SKULL**

Age: 33 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: White River Formation, Converse County, Wyoming, USA

If Darwinists' claims were true, then an odd-looking rabbit fossil with a skull as yet partly developed, with only half ears and a half jaw, should have been found in the excavations carried out so far. But no such semi-developed rabbit fossil has ever been seen. Every rabbit fossil discovered has fully formed, and flawless characteristics, just like the 33-million-year fossil pictured. That being the case, it is meaningless for Darwinists to persist in their claims, since the fossil findings do not support them.

The fact revealed by science is not evolution, but Creation.

### **FOX SKULL**

Age: 5 to 1.8 million years

Period: Pliocene

Location: Asia

The fox is a species of mammal belonging to the family *Canidae* (canines). The fox skull in the illustration is around 5 million years old and possesses exactly the same features as modern-day foxes. Every new fossil discovery demolishes evolutionist beliefs and obliges evolutionists to come up with new scenarios, since all fossils unearthed to date are incompatible with their imaginings. But their new scenarios are immediately refuted, and evolutionists continue to strive in vain.

### **GIANT RACCOON SKULL**

Age: 12 to 7 million years

Period: Miocene

Location: China

With its teeth, skull and jaw structure, the raccoon fossil pictured is identical to present-day raccoons. This once again demonstrates that living things have remained in the exact state in which they first appear in the fossil record—in other words, that they have never evolved. Living fossils show that life forms did not evolve, but were created.

Species did not acquire their present bodily structures by undergoing the chance-based process of change, as maintained by evolutionists. They were all flawlessly created by Almighty God, and have persisted in exactly the same form as that in which they were first created throughout the course of their survival time on Earth.

### **CROCODILE SKULL**

Age: 100 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Guangdong, China

The jaw structure of this 100-million-year-old baby crocodile discovered in the Guangdong region of China has been very well preserved. There is clearly no difference between this fossil skull and those of crocodiles alive today.

If a life form has undergone not even the slightest change over the course of 100 million years, then it is impossible to support the myth of living things having evolved.

### **HYENA SKULL**

Age: 23 to 5 million years



Period: Miocene

Location: Gan Su, China

The 23- to 5-million-year-old hyena skull fossil pictured is one of the proofs that all life forms emerged suddenly and independently on this Earth. This well-preserved hyena fossil is identical to modern-day specimens in terms of its jaw, eye sockets, incisor teeth and all other anatomical details. Evolutionists despair in the face of such fossils as this, and every new fossil discovered merely adds to their despair many times over.

### **ZEBRA SKULL**

Age: 70 to 40 million years

Period: Cretaceous-Eocene

Location: Guang Xi, China

The intermediate-form fossils sought by evolutionists for so many years have never been found. Yet every day brings with it new fossils revealing the fact of Creation. One example of this is the fossilized zebra skull pictured, whose tooth and jaw structure is identical to those of zebras living today, once again confirming that the theory of evolution is a grave deception and that God has created all living things.

### **ANTELOPE SKULL**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Da Qing, Hei Longjiang, China

The 50-million-year-old fossil pictured is evidence that, like all other living things, antelopes did not undergo evolution. If evolutionists' claims were true, then antelopes should have developed various different features over the intervening 50 million years and be very different from today's antelopes. Yet antelopes today have exactly the same characteristics as they did the moment they were first created—which fact demolishes the idea of evolution.

### **TIGER SKULL**

Age: 90 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Si Chuan, Gan Su, China

One of those subjects on which Darwinists are at a complete impasse is the origin of mammals. Evolutionists cannot offer any evidence for the origin of mammals and the supposed evolutionary family relationships between the animals in this class. Statements by George Gaylord Simpson, one of the 20th century's leading evolutionists, show the great predicament facing the theory of evolution is:

*"This is true of all thirty-two orders of mammals ... The earliest and [supposedly] most primitive known members of every order already have the basic ordinal characters, and in no case is an approximately continuous sequence from one order to another known. In most cases the break is so sharp and the gap so large that the origin of the order is speculative and much disputed ..."* (George G. Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. 105, 107)

### **ANTELOPE SKULL**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Da Qing, Hei long jiang, China

Antelopes, members of the family *Bovidae*, are some of the fastest-moving terrestrial life forms. There are around 90 species of antelope. According to the fossil record, the living things in this class all emerged suddenly. Moreover, the mammals that emerged in this way are all very different from one another. Very different life forms, such as bats, horses, rats and whales, are all mammals and all emerged during the same geological period.

It is impossible, by any stretch of the imagination, to establish any evolutionary connection between these living things. Yet in the theory of evolution, "experts" do attempt the impossible and mislead the public by portraying nonsense as scientific fact.

### **TIGER SKULL**

Age: 89 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Yun Nan, China

In claiming that mammals are descended from reptiles, Darwinists point to fossils of certain reptiles that are now extinct. The fact that these creatures are extinct lets Darwinists engage in whatever speculations they like. However, scientific research and investigation has revealed the invalidity of their claims. For example, as a result of the investigation of the brains of such reptiles, it was concluded that these life forms did not possess mammalian characteristics, but bore a complete resemblance to reptiles.

The fossil record has also revealed that the different mammal species emerged with all the characteristics they possess and never changed thereafter. The nearly 90-million-year-old tiger fossil pictured, identical to present-day specimens, is one of the proofs that evolution never happened.

### **TIGER SKULL**

Age: 89 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Gan Su, He Zheng Area, China

The so-called "mammal-like reptiles" that evolutionists point to as the supposed forerunners of mammals are separate life forms that are now extinct. But these have neither a common ancestor with mammals, nor did they change into any other life form.

Evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson admits how mammals appear suddenly in the fossil record:

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. (George Gaylord Simpson, *Life Before Man*, New York: Time-Life Books, 1972, p. 42)

### **TIGER SKULL**

Age: 89 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Gan Su, He Zheng, China

Mammals always appear as mammals in the fossil record, and reptiles always as reptiles. No concrete findings indicate that the one very different life form ever turned into the other. Evolutionists may dream to their hearts' content, but fossils will never make those dreams a reality. As revealed by the 90-million-year old tiger fossil in the picture, living things did not evolve. All things, living or inanimate, are the work of God, the Lord of all the worlds.

### **WOLF SKULL**

Age: 120 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Qing Hai, China

The claims made by evolutionists concerning the origin of mammals consist of a great many irrational and illogical scenarios. These, unsupported by any scientific findings, they use as propaganda materials. They may of course produce and use such hypotheses as they like, but it is wrong to portray them as scientific. In the words of the biologist Pierre Paul Grassé, "there is no law against daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it." (Pierre Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 103)

### **HYENA SKULL**

Age: 80 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Gui Zhou, China

Evolutionists who came after Darwin, who said, "*I cannot conceive any existing reptile being converted into a mammal*" (Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1888), have also been unable to provide any convincing scientific account of the origin of mammals, despite all the advances in science and technology.

Roger Lewin admits as much in the words "*The transition to the first mammal, ... is still an enigma.*" (Roger Lewin, "Bones of Mammals' Ancestors Fleshed Out," *Science*, Vol. 212, 26 June, 1981, p. 1492)

Like this 80-million-year-old hyena fossil pictured, countless fossil specimens have condemned Darwinists to the hopeless position they are in now.

### **HYENA SKULL**

Age: 9.5 million years

Period: Miocene

Location: Shan Dong Zi Bo City, China

One of greatest difficulties Darwinists face in accounting for the origin of mammals is the enormous diversity within that group. No findings support their imaginary family relations between mammals, which biologists now divide into very different groups—a fact admitted by the great majority of scientists.

For example, the evolutionist zoologist Eric Lombard admits: "*Those searching for specific information useful in constructing phylogenies of mammalian taxa will be disappointed.*" (R. Eric Lombard, "Review of Evolutionary Principles of the Mammalian Middle Ear, Gerald Fleischer," *Evolution*, Vol. 33, December 1979, p. 1230)

### **WEASEL SKULL**

Age: 60 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Shan Dong, China

In examining evolutionist publications, one reads a great many stories adorned with plentiful scientific terminology on the subject of how reptiles turned into mammals. But one never finds there any rational, scientific explanation of how cold-blooded reptiles began manufacturing their own body heat and thus changed into warm-blooded mammals, or how they managed to exchange their scales for fur, or how they managed to begin producing milk in the absence of the necessary glands.

That's because evolutionists have no answers to such questions. If you ask a Darwinist if there are any fossils that demonstrate such a change, you will receive a profound silence. Because despite all their endeavors, evolutionists have never discovered any such fossil.

### **WOLVERINE SKULL**

Age: 60 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Gan Su, China

Evolutionists' scenarios regarding the origin of mammals are nothing more than stretching of their imaginations. There is not the slightest evidence for any of their claims, and it is scientifically impossible for reptiles to turn into mammals. As revealed by the 60-million-year-old fossil pictured, no mammal with its own unique characteristics came into being from a common ancestor. All mammalian species have survived unchanged throughout their time on Earth.

### **TIGER SKULL**

Age: 80 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Gan Su, China

In his book *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, the science writer Richard Milton describes how Darwinists, despite all their misleading efforts, lack any scientific evidence to support their theory: "*It is impossible for the genuinely objective person to say, 'Here is the conclusive scientific proof that I have been looking for.'*" (Richard Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 14.)

As Milton states, anyone seeking hard evidence for the theory of evolution will return empty-handed. One subject that will cause such a person the greatest disappointment is the fossil record. Research over the last 150 years or so has

uneearthed not a single specimen to support the theory of evolution. All fossil findings unanimously declare that living things did not evolve, but were created.

### **WEASEL SKULL**

Age: 23 to 5 million years

Period: Miocene

Location: China

Weasels, members of the family *Mustelidae*, are another life form that, with their structures that have remained unchanged for millions of years, refutes the claims of evolution.

Like all branches of science, geological research reveals the invalidity of the theory of evolution and demonstrates the fact of Creation. Edmund J. Ambrose, a London University professor of cell biology, notes this state of affairs in these words:

"At the present stage of geological research, we have to admit that there is nothing in the geological records that runs contrary to the view of conservative creationists, that God created each species separately..." (Edmund J. Ambrose, *The Nature and Origin of the Biological World*, John Wiley & Sons, 1982, p. 164)

### **SPOTTED DEER SKULL**

Age: 78 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Xin Jiang, China

The idea that all of life is the product of an aimless, coincidental process is 19th -century nonsense. All the concrete findings obtained to date confirm that evolution is nonsense. One such finding is the fossil record itself. The process that only exists in evolutionists' imaginations has never been supported by fossils.

As can be seen in this 78-million-year-old spotted deer specimen, living things have remained the same over millions of years. This is one of the greatest proofs that evolution never occurred.

### **FEMALE BINTURONG SKULL**

Age: 88 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: South Yunnan, China

These creatures, members of the family *Viverridae*, belong to the class *Carnivora*. Evolutionists are unable to account for the origins of the binturong, as they are with all other living things. These animals have no supposed forerunner in the fossil record, and there are no fossils to show that they came into being gradually.

As revealed by the 88-million-year-old fossil illustrated here, these animals have had the same features ever since they first came into existence. They have never changed over millions of years—in other words, they have never evolved; they have created.

### **BOAR SKULL**

Age: 87 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Yunnan, China

There are three known different species of boars, members of the family *Suidae*. Like all other life forms, boars have always existed as wild pigs and are not descended from any other species. Nor have they ever developed into any "later" one.

Fossil findings prove this. Evolutionist demagoguery and propaganda are worthless in the face of the skull fossil pictured, which shows that wild pigs 88 million years ago had exactly the same features as their counterparts today. Evolutionists may have been able to deceive themselves, but they can no longer mislead rational, logical people by deceit.

### **WOLVERINE SKULL**

Age: 23 to 5 million years

Period: Miocene

Location: China

Darwinists' 150-year quest for an "intermediate" form fossil has so far proved fruitless. Modern-day evolutionists have no findings they can point to as evidence. The anthropologist Jeffrey H. Schwartz describes how the fossil record works against Darwinism:

"... Instead of filling the gaps in the fossil record with so-called missing links, most paleontologists found themselves facing a situation in which there were only gaps in the fossil record, with no evidence of transformational intermediates between documented fossil species." (Jeffrey H. Schwartz, *Sudden Origins*, 1999, p. 89)

### **ANTELOPE SKULL**

Age: 83 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: He Zheng, Gan Su, China

The fossil record deals a lethal blow to Darwinism, but evolutionists constantly seek to ignore this. Instead of talking about their fossil findings, evolutionists prefer



to conjure up imaginary scenarios and engage in demagoguery to maintain their own propaganda.

Yet no matter how much evolutionists flee from the facts, millions of fossils like the 83-million-year-old antelope skull pictured proclaim that evolution never happened.

### **TIBETAN SAND FOX SKULL**

Age: 86 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Du Lan County, Qing Hai, China

Tibetan sand foxes, members of the order *Carnivora*, are also known simply as sand foxes. They generally feed on flightless birds, rabbits and other rodents.

The fossil record proves that sand foxes have always existed as sand foxes and are not descended from any other life form. The 86-million-year-old sand fox skull fossil in the picture, being identical to that of sand foxes living today, is one of the proofs that evolutionists are simply giving tongue to their dreams. No process such as that claimed by Darwinists ever occurred, and evolutionist hypotheses are devoid of any supporting scientific evidence.

### **PANTHER SKULL**

Age: 89 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: China

Panthers, part of the family *Felidae*, are large carnivores. The 89-million-year-old panther skull fossil pictured reveals that these animals have never altered over tens of millions of years. If Darwinist claims were true, then one should encounter a great many fossils or "panther-like" animals resembling modern-day panthers, but lacking all the exact same characteristics.

There should be many features in the structures of their feet, skeletons, jaws or eyes that do not resemble those of contemporary panthers. Yet fossils reveal the exact opposite: There is not the slightest difference between the panthers of tens of millions of years ago and present-day counterparts. Under these circumstances, therefore, it is impossible to speak of panthers having evolved. Like all other living things, panthers are the creations of Almighty God.

### **MALE GIANT PANDA SKULL**

Age: 96 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Xi Zang, China

Pandas, which feed solely on bamboo shoots, are members of the family *Ailuridae*. Their homeland is the western regions of China.

Pandas that lived 96 million years ago have all the features of present-day pandas. This fact, proved by fossils and which refute evolution, is plainly obvious for anyone to see. The fact that Darwinists insist on ignoring the evidence changes nothing. Living things did not emerge as the result of any evolutionary process. All things, living or otherwise, are created by God.

### **NORTHEAST TIGER SKULL**

Age: 65 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: North East Ji Lin, China

One of the findings in the face of the fossil record that make Darwinists despair is the 65-million-year-old Northeast tiger fossil pictured. Evolutionists are unable to offer a single finding to support the imaginary evolutionary process by which these animals supposedly emerged, even though countless fossils prove that these tigers never evolved, but were created.

### **MARBLED POLECAT SKULL**

Age: 78 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: He Zheng, Gan Su, China

These animals, members of the family *Mustelidae* (martens), live in a wide area stretching from Europe as far as China, and also in various parts of Turkey. They attack game birds and poultry.

There is no difference between polecats that lived 78 million years ago and those living today. If evolutionists' claims were true, then polecats should have undergone distinct changes over these intervening tens of millions of years and gradually turned into other life forms. Yet such a change never happened. The fact that living things have remained the same for millions of years is a lethal blow to the theory of evolution.

### **NORTHEAST TIGER SKULL**

Age: 90 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Si Chuan, Gan Su, China

The theory of evolution, for years propped up by false intermediate forms and speculation regarding the fossils of extinct life forms, has now reached the end of its days. Fossils that represent proof of Creation, so carefully concealed by

Darwinists, have been placed before the public's gaze. Now, all evolutionists' lies regarding natural history have finally been exposed.

The 90-million-year-old fossilized Northeast tiger skull pictured is another such finding. No one who sees how this fossil is identical to specimens alive today can believe in the myth of evolution any longer.

### **WOLVERINE SKULL**

Age: 90 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Zhou Kou Dian, Beijing, China

Many Darwinists have led academic careers, read dozens of books, carried out countless pieces of research, and published many scientific papers. It is astonishing that they are still unable to see the most obvious truths. They are quite unable to understand, for instance, that the "living fossils"—living organisms that have never undergone the slightest change over the course of millions of years—represent a concrete refutation of Darwinism. They cannot bring themselves to admit the absence of any of the supposed "intermediate-form fossils" they need to confirm their theories.

Despite Darwinists' difficulties in admitting this truth, countless fossils such as the 90-million-year-old skull in the picture all demonstrate that evolution never occurred.

### **CROCODILE**

Age: 65 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Shang Dong, China

Darwinists maintain that marine life forms represent the ancestors of reptiles. According to this claim—which is uncorroborated by any scientific finding—fish left stranded without water were one day forced to emerge onto dry land, thus giving rise to reptiles. Yet not one single fossilized half-fish, half-reptile to support this scenario has ever been encountered. Among all the hundreds of thousands of fossils found so far, fish always appear as distinct fish, and reptiles as obvious reptiles. Every fossil discovered is identical to its counterparts alive today, or else belongs to a species that once existed, but has become extinct.

One example is the 65-million-year-old fossil crocodile pictured, a proof that crocodiles have always existed as crocodiles.

### **FROG**

Age: 40 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Shang Dong, China

The evolutionist scenario claims that fish, which evolved from invertebrates, later turned into amphibians capable of living on dry land. Yet as with all other evolutionary tales, there is no evidence for this scenario. Not a single fossil suggestive of any half-fish, half-amphibian has ever been found. On the contrary, all the fossils unearthed to date prove that fish have always existed as fish, and amphibians as amphibians.

The 40-million-year-old frog fossil pictured proves that frogs have never altered in all that time—in other words, that they never evolved.

### **SALAMANDER LARVA**

Age: 290 million years

Period: Permian

Location: Rheinpfalz, Germany

Evolutionists claim that fish are the supposed forerunners of amphibians like the salamander, even though they are completely unable to substantiate those claims.

There are three different types of fish that Darwinists point to as the ancestors of amphibians. One of these is the famous "living fossil," the coelacanth. However, when a living specimen was caught in the Indian Ocean in 1938, it was finally realized that all the evolutionists' speculations regarding this creature had been invalid.

Another fish group come from the class *Rhipidistia* which—like the coelacanth—have thick tissue and bones in their fins. On account of these different structures, evolutionists claimed that these appendages developed into feet. The fact is, however, that these structures bear not the slightest resemblance to the fore and hind legs of terrestrial animals.

Evolutionists' third candidate for the role of amphibian ancestor is the lungfish. In addition to breathing through gills, these fish can also come to the surface and breathe air. However, the structure of these fishes' lungs again bears no similarity to that of terrestrial life forms. The fish's skeletal structure is also completely different from that of amphibians.

No matter which species of fish evolutionists may choose to regard as the supposed forebear of amphibians, an enormous number of changes would be needed in order for that fish to be able to transform itself into an amphibian. Therefore, there should be an equally vast number of intermediate forms between the two: There must have been odd-looking creatures with half-formed feet and half-fins, with both half-gills and half-developed lungs, or with semi-developed kidneys etc, numbering in the millions.

However, not a single one has ever been encountered in the fossil record. Among the countless fossils in existence, there are fully formed fish and fully

formed amphibians, but no intermediate forms. This is something that evolutionists do admit from time to time, even though it totally refutes their theory.

## **CROCODILE**

Age: 65 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: China

Darwinists maintain that reptiles are descended from amphibians. Yet just as they cannot corroborate the claim that amphibians have a common forerunner, so are they unable to substantiate the claim that reptiles are descended from amphibians.

Many scientists are well aware of this. For example, Robert L. Carroll, author of the book *Problems of the Origins of Reptiles*, writes:

"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." (Robert L. Carroll, "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles," *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 44, No. 3, July 1969, p. 393)

The 90-million-year-old crocodile fossil pictured is proof that crocodiles are not descended from any supposed ancestor, but have always existed as crocodiles, remaining unchanged over tens of millions of years.

## **AN ELEPHANT'S FRONT TOOTH**

Age: 60 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Yun Nan, China

The fossil pictured is that of a 60-million-year-old elephant's tooth. This fossil reveals that elephants living 60 million years ago had the same dental features as those living today, and is one of the findings that refute evolution.

## **FOSSIL SPECIMENS OF MARINE CREATURES**

### **MENE (*Mene maculata*)**

Age: 54 to 37 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Monte Bolca, Italy

This species of fish, a member of the family *Menidae*, is most frequently found in the Pacific Ocean. Many fossils have been acquired of this vertebrate, dating back to the Cenozoic era (65 million years ago, down to the present). Fossils of the species *Mene maculata* from the Monte Bolca Formation in particular are important examples showing that these fish have never changed over millions of years.

Despite the presence of many fossils such as this, showing that mene fish have always remained the same, there are no fossils that show they are descended from other life forms, as evolutionists claim.

J. R. Norman, one of the administrators of the British Museum of Natural History, describes how Darwinists' claims regarding the emergence of fish are not based on any evidence:

"The geological record has so far provided no evidence as to the origin of the fishes . . ." (J. R. Norman, "Classification and Pedigrees: Fossils," in *A History of Fishes*, 3rd ed., ed. Dr. P. H. Greenwood, London: British Museum of Natural History, 1975, p. 343)

### **STARFISH**

Age: 490 to 443 million years

Period: Ordovician

Location: Kataoua Formation, Morocco

Starfish generally live on the sea floor, and some species live at depths of 7,000 meters. Evolutionists are in a hopeless position when faced with these echinoderms, which have survived unchanged for around half a *billion* years. These creatures have remained exactly the same, not for 10 million or 100 million years, nor even for 200 million, but for roughly 500 million years.

If evolutionists' claims were true, then starfish should long since have turned into different life forms over the course of 500 million years, and the remains of many odd-looking creatures, half-starfish and partly some other invertebrate, should be visible in the fossil record. Yet the fossil record contains no such evidence for evolutionists' claims.

As the 500-million-year-old starfish pictured here proves, starfish have always existed as starfish, are not descended from any other life form, and never turned into any other species.

### **CRINOID**

Age: 354 to 290 million years

Period: Carboniferous

Location: Edwardsville Formation, Indiana, USA

The earliest known specimens of crinoids, members of the order Echinodermata, lived during the Paleozoic era (543 to 251 million years ago). These animals, some 80 genera of which have survived down to the present, are one of those life forms that invalidate evolutionist claims. The fossil record shows that these organisms emerged suddenly, together with all their exceedingly complex structures.

There is not one single fossil specimen to show that crinoids descended gradually from any other life form. All the fossils unearthed have proved that crinoids have always existed as crinoids. This, in turn, invalidates evolutionists' claims and shows that the origin of life lies not in evolution, but in Creation.

## **SQUID**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

Squid, members of the sub-class *Coleoidea*, are mollusks with eight or ten arms. As with other living things, evolutionists maintain that mollusks are descended from a supposed common ancestor, even though they are unable to back these theses up with any scientific findings.

This fact is admitted by the Turkish evolutionist biologist Ali Demirsoy:

"At the beginning of this discussion, we considered a hypothetical mollusk forerunner and attempted to present these classes' stages of descent from it . . . . We were certainly unable to find the means of combining all these classes together in a common ancestor . . . . In essence, it seems impossible in the light of present-day knowledge to describe a mollusk forebear." (Ali Demirsoy, *Yasamin Temel Kurallari* [The Basic Rules of Life], Vol. II, Part I, pp. 623-624)

## **STURGEON**

Age: 206 to 144 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Volcanic Ash Beds, Liaoning, China

Sturgeon, members of the order *Acipenseriformes*, the remains of which species date back to very early periods, are frequently encountered in the fossil record. They generally live in the fresh waters and seas of the northern hemisphere. With their structures, which have remained unchanged for tens and even hundreds of millions of years, sturgeon are one of the living things that refute the Darwinist claim that life forms evolved from the primitive to the more complex.

The fossil record has revealed that even in very early geological periods, there were already living organisms possessed of complex systems such as eyes, gills and circulatory systems, as well as advanced physiological structures, identical to those in modern-day specimens.

New findings obtained in 1999, for instance, show that in the Cambrian Period (490 to 543 million years ago), there were two separate species of fish known as *Haikouichthys ercaicunensis* and *Mylokunmingia fengjiao*. These findings deal a lethal blow to the theory of evolution's claim that species develop from the primitive to the more complex.



## **NEEDLEFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Needlefish, which belong to the family *Belonidae*, have a long, thin body structure. They can leap from the surface of the water and return to it, tail-first—a method they employ to escape predators.

The fossil record shows that all species of fish have their own unique features; that there is no evolutionary link between different species; and that the concept of a "forerunner of fish" is nothing more than a fantasy. The Turkish evolutionist biologist Ali Demirsoy admits that claims that different fish species emerged from one another are based on an assumption:

"We have no more than assumptions on the subject of bony fish separating from the known early Paleozoic vertebrates with jaws." (Ali Demirsoy, *Yasamin Temel Kurallari* [The Basic Rules of Life], Vol. III, Part I, p. 248)

In fact, all Darwinist claims regarding the origin of life are based on assumptions, not just those concerning the origin of fish. And none of these is supported by scientific findings, which have revealed that life is the work not of blind coincidences, but of our Lord God.

## **STARFISH**

Age: 490 to 443 million years

Period: Ordovician

Location: Kataoua Formation, Morocco

Evolutionists claim that mollusks, echinodermata, arthropods, birds, insects, fish—and, in short, all living things—came into being from a single cell, as the result of blind chance, by undergoing small changes over millions of years. Yet they can never provide any scientific explanation of the stages by which these organisms, all with very different organs, structures and ways of feeding and totally different systems descended from one another. They have no fossils with which they can confirm this imaginary process.

The countless fossils discovered to date show that every living species came into being with its own particular characteristics and that it preserved these features for so long as it remained in existence (for tens or even hundreds of millions of years).

One example is the 500-million-year-old starfish fossil in the picture. Starfish, which have remained unchanged over the intervening 500 million years, have dealt a major blow to evolution.

### **SOLDIER FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The fact that soldier fish living 95 million years ago were identical to those in existence today shows that these fish have never changed over millions of years. This state of affairs, which refutes the Darwinist claim that living things evolved by changing, puts evolutionists in an impossible position. Concrete scientific findings such as the fossil record have proved that evolution never happened.

### **NEEDLEFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: en-Nammoura, Lebanon

If Darwinists' claims that living things descended from one another were true, then we should encounter a large number of fossil specimens bearing the characteristics of two different life forms (such as a half-needlefish and half-herring, or a half-whale and half-shark, or a half-trout and half-crocodile). But no such fossil has ever been found. In fact, Darwin saw that this absence of proof posed a major dilemma for him even when he first launched his theory. For that reason, he wrote the following in the chapter "Difficulties on Theory" in his book *The Origin of Species*:

"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?" (Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1998, pp. 140, 141)

Some 150 years after Darwin's time, the problem facing evolutionists is exactly the same. Although millions of fossils have been unearthed to date, why has not one intermediate-form fossil been found? The answer is obvious for anyone who does not think along the lines of Darwinist preconceptions: because no "intermediate forms" ever existed! Life forms did not come into being by descent from one another. Almighty God has created all living things, together with the magnificent characteristics they possess.

### **COELACANTH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Hjoula, Lebanon

Up to 1938, it was believed that coelacanth fossils represented the solution to a serious problem for evolutionists, who needed evidence documenting the imaginary emergence of living things from the sea onto dry land. They therefore took fossils of the coelacanth, which they believed was well suited to this scenario, and began making propaganda regarding them. They interpreted the animal's fins as "feet about to walk" and another unidentified organ as "a primitive lung."

Yet striking proof soon emerged that none of these interpretations had any validity at all. The capture by fisherman of a living coelacanth in 1938 came as a terrible disappointment to evolutionists. James Leonard Brierley Smith, a professor in the Rhodes University Chemistry Faculty, expressed his amazement in these words:

"Although I had come prepared, that first sight hit me like a white-hot blast and made me feel shaky and queer, my body tingled. I stood as if stricken to stone. Yes, there was not a shadow of doubt, scale by scale, bone by bone, fin by fin, it was a true Coelacanth." (Samantha Weinberg, *A Fish Caught in Time: The Search for the Coelacanth*, New York: Perennial Publishing, 2001, p. 20)

Detailed examinations were conducted of the coelacanth's structure and internal organs, which had no primitive features as had been imagined and bore no intermediate-form characteristics of any imaginary primitive forebear. The structure that evolutionists imagined to be a primitive lung was actually a swim bladder filled with fat in the creature's body. In addition, this creature, depicted as a prospective reptile preparing to emerge onto dry land, was actually a bottom-dwelling fish inhabiting deep waters and not rising above depths of 180 meters. Therefore, according to Dr. Millot, who conducted the investigation, this life form, which should have represented the "missing link," they were seeking, lacked the primitive features of the living thing they claimed had evolved. (S. Weinberg, *Op cit*, p. 102) Very simply, it was no intermediate form, but had existed with the same complex characteristics in deep waters for 400 million years.

## **VIPERFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Hjoula, Lebanon

No matter how much Darwinists today attempt to conceal or deny the fact, it has nevertheless been known since Darwin's day that the fossil record does not support the theory of evolution. That is why Charles Darwin sought to extricate himself from that dilemma by coming up with deliberate misinterpretations in his book. He devoted particular attention to this matter in his book in the chapter "Difficulties on Theory".

The fossils that so disquieted him at the time still constitute one of the main difficulties facing evolutionists today, because the fossil findings indisputably refute evolution and confirm the fact of Creation.

One proof of the fact of Creation is the 95-million-year-old viperfish pictured here, which is completely identical to specimens alive today.

This fossil is a mirror-image one that has left its imprint visible on both surfaces of the layered rock.

### **GUITARFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

No matter what period they may belong to, guitarfish fossils are all identical to one another. These fossils, which resemble present-day guitarfish in all respects, refute the claim that living things developed gradually by way of very small changes. God has created all living things from nothing, using no earlier models, together with all their perfect features.

Fossils, which are the physical traces of God's sublime creation, dramatize evolutionist falsehoods ever more strongly with every passing day.

Pictured here is a mirror-image fossil, leaving its imprint on both sides of the sedimentary rock.

### **NEEDLEFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The theory of evolution claims that in order for species to be able to evolve from one form to another, it must be in a constant state of change. In order for an invertebrate organism to turn into a fish—a needlefish, for example—it needs to undergo a succession of small changes over a very long period of time. Similar processes then have to take place in order for other species of fish to then emerge from the needlefish.

In the fossil record, however, there is not the slightest indication that such a process ever happened. As the 95-million-year-old needlefish fossil pictured here shows, life forms retain the same features they had when they first came into existence for as long as they survive.

### **EEL**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The fossil record shows that not just some, but all the fossil species that have been discovered have remained unchanged throughout the course of their existence. This fact was stated in the April 2003 of the magazine *Focus*, despite its being an evolutionist publication, which dealt with the subject of the coelacanth.

". . . the number of organisms which bear the closest of similarities to fossil specimens from millions of years ago is actually quite large. For instance, the shellfish known as neopilina has not changed for 500 million years, the scorpion for 430 million years, the limulus, an armored sea creature with a sword-like tail, for 225 million years, and the tuatara, a reptile found only in New Zealand, for 230 million years. Many arthropods, crocodiles, turtles and many species of plant can also be added to the list."

One of those living things that have remained unchanged for millions of years is the eel pictured here. Aged 95 million years, it is proof that living things do not change—in other words, that they do not evolve.

### **SQUID (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The 95-million-year-old fossil pictured here is proof that squid have always existed as squid throughout geologic history, defying evolutionist claims. Unable to provide the slightest evidence that squid evolved from an earlier life form or developed any further, evolutionists are completely undermined by the fossil record.

### **CATSHARK**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

According to Darwinists' unscientific claims, plants, animals, fungi and bacteria all share a common origin. The 100 or so different animal phyla (basic taxonomic categories, such as mollusks, arthropods, worms and sponges) have all descended from one imaginary common ancestor. According to the theory, invertebrate organisms gradually (and by chance) turned into fish by acquiring a backbone; fish then turned into amphibians, amphibians into reptiles, some reptiles into birds and others into mammals. Again according to the theory, this transition encompassed a long period of time—hundreds of millions of years—and was carried forward in

stages. That being the case, countless intermediate species should have emerged and existed during the long transition in question. Yet no sign of any such intermediate forms has ever been encountered in the fossil record.

Like that 95-million-year-old catshark fossil pictured here, the fossil record shows that living things came into being fully formed with all their features, and survived unchanged for millions of years.

The remains of living things can be seen on both surfaces of this double-sided fossil.

### **LOBSTER, FLYING FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

This specimen contains the remains of two creatures—a lobster alongside a flying fish.

These lobsters, members of the family *Nephropsidae*, have never changed since the first day they came into existence. The same applies to flying fish. This stasis in the fossil record represents a major quandary for Darwinists.

It is no longer possible for Darwinist propaganda to have any lasting effect in the face of these concrete findings from the fossil records. Darwinists must realize the impossibility of concealing the fact of Creation and stop insisting on their dogmas.

### **GUITARFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Having remained exactly the same for 95 million years, guitarfish clearly prove one very important point: the stasis in the structures of living things refutes evolution. The theory of evolution is a scenario unsupported by any scientific facts. Fossils make abundantly apparent the unrealistic nature of this scenario and have revealed that Creation can no longer be denied.

### **NEEDLEFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The eyes, fins, gills, digestive systems, reproductive systems—in short, all the features of all the guitar fish that have ever lived throughout the course of history—

have been fully formed, unique and ideally structured. In addition, these structures' present-day forms are identical to what they were tens of millions of years ago.

According to Darwinist claims, however, these fossils should present a diametrically opposite picture. The fossil record should be full of "half-needlefish." The fact that fossils do not fit the Darwinian picture, and actually exhibit structures that argue the exact opposite, is an expression of the dire straits into which the theory of evolution has fallen.

### **SQUID (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Darwin knew that his theory could be verified only by the fossil record, for which reason he pinned great hopes on paleontological research. In one part of his book he said:

". . . if my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking closely together all the species of the same group, must assuredly have existed. . . . Consequently evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains . . ." (Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, p. 179)

Yet no intermediate-form fossil has been found over the 150 or so years since Darwin's day. So his claims have never been verified and confirmed. Fossils have buried Darwin's theory of evolution, whose invalidity is now a proven fact. One such fossil is this 95-million-year-old fossil squid, identical to living present-day specimens.

### **SHRIMP**

Age: 206 to 144 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Solnhofen, Bavaria, Eichstatt, Germany

The shrimp pictured is some 200 million years old. Shrimps, having remained unchanged for all that time, tell us that no evolutionary process ever happened.

The fossil record deals one of the heaviest blows to the theory of evolution, because:

1. Evolutionists maintain that living things progress from the primitive to the more advanced by undergoing a constant succession of small changes. Fossil findings, however, prove that living things undergo not the slightest change over even hundreds of millions of years.

2. Evolutionists maintain that all living things are supposedly descended from a common ancestor. Yet to date, not a single fossil has been unearthed that can be regarded as the forebear of any other living thing.

3. Evolutionists say that life forms are descended from one another, via intermediate forms. Yet from among all the millions unearthed as the result of research over the last 150 years, not a single intermediate form fossil has ever been discovered to indicate this.

### **CATSHARK**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The fossil record reveals that living things do not change, as long as they remain in existence. The 95-million-year-old catshark pictured is one of those life forms that have not altered over millions of years. This means that evolution—which maintains that living things are in a constant state of change and progress from the primitive to the more developed—is invalid. In actuality, evolution's claims regarding the origin of life do not reflect the facts, as is expressed in the book *Integrated Principles of Zoology*, jointly authored by three evolutionist biologists:

"Many species remain virtually unchanged for millions of years, then suddenly disappear to be replaced by a quite different . . . form. Moreover, most major groups of animals appear abruptly in the fossil record, fully formed, and with no fossils yet discovered that form a transition from their parent group." (C.P. Hickman [Professor Emeritus of Biology at Washington and Lee University in Lexington], L.S. Roberts [Professor Emeritus of Biology at Texas Tech University], and F.M. Hickman, *Integrated Principles of Zoology*, St. Louis: Times Mirror/Moseby College Publishing, 1988, p. 866)

### **GUJARFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

One of the characteristics of guitarfish, members of the sub-order *Rhinobatoidei*, is their guitarlike body shape. They generally live at the bottom of tropical seas, close to the shoreline.

The fossil pictured shows that guitarfish have remained the same for 95 million years, condemning evolutionists to a profound silence. These creatures, which have survived unchanged for tens of millions of years, demonstrate that evolution never happened to them and that they were created by Almighty God.

### **SHRIMP**

Age: 150 million years

Period: Jurassic



Location: Solnhofen Formation, Bavaria, Germany

One common tactic that evolutionists employ is to distort or carefully conceal those fossils that represent indisputable proof of Creation. Although the fossil record shows that evolution never took place, they determinedly ignore this fact.

The American paleontologist S. M. Stanley describes how facts revealed by the fossil record are ignored by the Darwinist dogma that dominates most of scientific world:

"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. . . . as the biological historian William Coleman has recently written, "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." (S. M. Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable: Fossils, Genes and the Origin of Species*, N.Y.: Basic Books Inc., 1981, p. 71)

However, these Darwinist efforts to silence dissent are now of no avail. It is no longer possible to conceal the fact of Creation revealed by fossilized shrimp like this one pictured, some 200 million years old.

### **COELACANTH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The coelacanth is a large fish some 150 centimeters in length, whose body is all covered by thick scales reminiscent of armor. It is a member of the class of bony fishes (*Osteichthyes*), of which the earliest fossils are found in strata belonging to the Devonian Period (417 to 354 million years ago). For years, evolutionists portrayed fossils belonging to this vertebrate as belonging to an intermediate form, until the capture of a live coelacanth invalidated such claims. Research into the fish's anatomy again inflicted a major defeat on Darwinists.

In an article in *Nature* magazine, an evolutionist paleontologist named Peter Forey said this:

"The discovery of *Latimeria* [coelacanth] raised hopes of gathering direct information on the transition of fish to amphibians, for there was then a long-held belief that coelacanths were close to the ancestry of tetrapods. . . . But studies of the anatomy and physiology of *Latimeria* have found this theory of relationship to be wanting and the living coelacanth's reputation as a missing link seems unjustified." (P. L. Forey, *Nature*, Vol. 336, 1988, p. 727)

The latest information regarding the complex structure of the coelacanth continues to pose difficulties for evolutionists. This problem was expressed in *Focus* magazine:

"According to fossils, fish emerged some 470 million years ago. The coelacanth emerged 60 million years after that. It is astonishing that this creature, which would be expected to possess very primitive features, actually has a most complex structure." (*Focus*, April 2003)

For evolutionists insisting on a gradual process of evolution, the appearance of the coelacanth with its complex structure naturally came as a major surprise. Yet there is nothing surprising about this at all. Any rational person is able to understand that God creates all living things, together with their complex structures, in the form and at the time He so desires, and in a single moment. The entities flawlessly created by God are all means by which His might and power can be appreciated.

This is a fossil with both negative and positive slabs.

### **STINGRAY**

Age: 100 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Hjoula, Byblos, Lebanon

Evolutionists cannot point to even one of the countless stingray fossils unearthed as evidence for their claims. No stingray with supposedly primitive, semi-developed features belonging to two different life forms has ever been encountered. Every stingray fossil discovered belongs to a creature that was identical to stingray alive today and had exactly the same characteristics. This goes to show the invalidity of the claim that species are descended from one another and that life forms developed by way of small, gradual changes.

The 100-million-year-old stingray fossil pictured proves once again that living things did not evolve, but were created.

### **CRAYFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The crayfish pictured is 95 million years old, and there is no difference between it and crayfish living today. These invertebrates, which have undergone not the slightest change in the intervening 95 million years, show that evolutionists' claims are fantasies, products of the imagination, and that scientific data and findings do not support them in any way.

Due to their materialist perspectives, Darwinists have a habit of making various assumptions and adorning them with Latin words and scientific terms difficult for ordinary members of the public to understand, presenting them as if they were scientific facts. The fact is, however, that the evidence showing the invalidity of evolution is perfectly clear. Even by a child of primary school age can easily understand it. One of these pieces of evidence is the fossil record. The absence of any difference between living things that existed hundreds of millions of years ago and specimens alive today totally undermines the concept of evolution.

### **SEA URCHIN**

Age: 354 to 290 million years

Period: Carboniferous

Location: St. Louis Formation, St. Louis, Missouri, USA

Sea urchins are free-moving, spiny invertebrates. Their entire bodies are covered in spines. A roughly 300-million-year-old sea urchin defies all evolutionist claims regarding the origins of life.

But sea urchins are by no means the only living things to invalidate evolutionists' claims. The fossil record is full of fossils of plants and animals that have undergone no changes. There is no evidence of any half-developed or deficient forms, despite the passage of very lengthy geological ages. Evolutionists have no rational and scientific answer for how or why living things have remained unaltered for so long. Yet for people who have not been taken in by Darwinist preconceptions, the answer is clear: Living things never evolved, but were all created by our Lord, God.

### **STINGRAY**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Despite all the findings and evidence, Darwinists refuse to admit that Darwinism has been defeated by scientific findings. They still blindly espouse claims first put forward under the primitive level of scientific knowledge in the 19th century. They turn their backs on all the scientific data out of ideological concerns and various preconceptions, and resort to hoaxes, distortions and irrational and illogical explanations.

However, the millions of fossils unearthed over the last 150 years make it impossible for them to defend the theory of evolution any longer. Each and every fossil shows that living things have remained unchanged for millions of years—in other words that they never evolved, and that Creation is the origin of life. One such fossil is the 95-million-year-old stingray pictured here.

### **SEA BASS**

Age: 37 to 23 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Carpathian Mountains, Rowne, Poland

These fish, members of the *Perciformes* (perchlike fishes) order, are classified under the family *Serranidae*. This roughly 30-million-year-old fossilized sea bass, identical in terms of its appearance and structural characteristics to those fish living today, is one of the proofs that invalidate the theory of evolution.

Like all their other theses, Darwinists' claims regarding the "evolution" of fish are nothing more than fairy tales, with no scientific foundations. When we examine the evolutionist literature, we never encounter even a claim regarding any potential intermediate forms. Evolutionists have no fossil findings they can use to support the idea that invertebrate organisms developed into fish.

### **FLYING FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

According to the fossil record, life forms emerged independently of one another, each one in a single moment, and with no line of familial descent between them. Fish, for example, did not emerge from invertebrate life forms, as evolutionists maintain, and neither did they later turn into reptiles.

In his 1991 book *Beyond Natural Selection*, the American paleontologist R. Wesson describes what the fossil record tells us about the emergence of life:

"The gaps in the fossil record are real, however. The absence of a record of any important [evolutionary] branching is quite phenomenal. Species are usually static, or nearly so, for long periods . . ." (R. Wesson, *Beyond Natural Selection*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991, p. 45)

### **SAND FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Despite having been scientifically discredited, the theory of evolution is kept constantly on the agenda of certain circles. Accompanied by drawings of imaginary half-man, half-ape creatures of no scientific validity, reports headlined "Missing Link Found!" announce every new fossil discovery. Captions read, "Our ancestors were microbes," "We are no different from apes," "Did we come from space?" and

"Evolution in test tubes". The theory of evolution is constantly depicted as having solid evidence to support it, one that can explain every aspect of human life.

The fact is, however, that fossils demonstrate that such reports and the claims associated with them are mere nonsense. As with the 95-million-year-old sand fish fossil pictured, all fossils reveal that living species have not changed at all over millions of years—in other words, that they never evolved. Faced with this reality, evolutionist propaganda is seen as nothing more than helpless posturing.

The fossil in the illustration is a mirror-image one, traces of which can be seen on both surfaces of the split rock.

### **EEL**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

These fish, members of the order *Anguilliformes* (true eels), are classified under the family *Congeridae* (marine eels). The fossil in the picture proves that eels have not undergone the slightest alteration over 95 million years. It's just one of the other millions of fossil species that undermine Darwinism. Fossil research over the last 150 years or so has revealed not one single fossil to support evolutionists' theories. On the other hand, countless fossils prove that living things appeared suddenly, complete with all the features they possess, that they have not changed over millions of years—and that they were created, rather than having evolved.

### **LADY FISH (*Elopidae*)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The evolutionist fossil expert David Pilbeam admits that fossil findings invalidate the theory of evolution:

"If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meagre evidence we've got he'd surely say, 'forget it; there isn't enough to go on.'" (Richard E. Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, Barcelona: Sphere Books Limited, 1982, p. 43)

It is meaningless for Darwinists to refuse to see the groundlessness of their theory. Fossil discoveries have demolished the theory of evolution. The *Elopidae* fossil pictured, aged 95 million years, is one of these findings that defeat evolutionists' claims.

### **PIPEFISH (*Syngathodei*)**

Age: 5 to 1.8 million years

Period: Pliocene

Location: Marecchia River Formation, Poggio Berni, Rimini, Italy

One of the most important features of pipefish is the long, tubular structure on the end of their mouths. With their structures that have remained unchanged for millions of years, these marine fish, members of the suborder *Syngathodei*, are a challenge to the theory of evolution. Even if Darwinists continue to make every effort to distort the facts or resort to hoaxes, they can no longer conceal the facts revealed by the fossil records. Fossils state that living things did not evolve, but were created.

### **HORSESHOE CRAB**

Age: 150 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Solnhofen Formation, Germany

With their characteristics that have gone unaltered for millions of years, horseshoe crabs, members of the family *Chelicerata*, are among those life forms regarded as "living fossils," even by evolutionists. Horseshoe crabs living in the Jurassic Period, approximately 150 million years ago, are identical to those living along seacoasts today. This lack of differences demolishes evolutionist claims and once again proves that the thesis of living things' evolution of is a ridiculous myth.

Science irrefutably reveals that living things are the work of Almighty and All-Powerful God.

### **SANDFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

In claiming that all species multiplied by having evolved from one another over long periods of time, Darwinists never stop to consider that almost all the main categories of species known today emerged suddenly and at the same time in the geological age known as the Cambrian Period, 530 to 520 million years ago. They fail to understand that none of the living things whose remains are preserved in the fossil record underwent any change, and that this fundamentally demolished the theory of evolution.

Yet even if evolutionists refuse to think and understand, fossil findings such as the 95-million-year-old sand fish pictured here reveal the invalidity of evolution for all to see.

The fossil pictured has both positive and negative slabs.

### **LADY FISH (*Elopidae*) (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Michael Ruse sums up evolutionists' difficulties in the face of the fossil record in these terms:

"He [Darwin] had to show not only why he thought there would be few if any transitional forms but also why the fossil record starts so suddenly. The record does not go very gradually from the most primitive up to the most complex but starts off with a bang with really quite complex and sophisticated forms." (Michael Ruse, *The Evolution Wars: A Guide to the Debates*, Rutgers University Press, 2001, p. 49)

Darwinists insist on refusing to see this groundlessness. The theory of evolution has been defeated by fossil findings, which have in turn demolished evolution. The 95-million-year-old fossil *Elopidae* pictured here is one of these discoveries that invalidate evolution.

### **NEEDLEFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

All the needlefish fossils discovered to date are completely developed, together with all their structures. There is no fossil evidence to suggest that needlefish are descended from any other species or that they gradually assumed their present-day form. This is one finding that invalidates Darwinist claims and reveals that Creation is a manifest truth.

### **BRITTLESTAR**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Evolutionists constantly refer to hypotheses and engage in various forms of conjecture regarding the origin of life. Yet they are unable to support that conjecture with any scientific findings. When those findings are comprehensively examined, they reveal that all branches of science refute the idea of evolution.

Brittlestar fossils are one of these findings that refute evolution. Brittlestars have remained unchanged despite the enormously long passage of time. The brittlestar fossil pictured here is 95 million years old, but is identical to present-day brittlestars.

### **EEL**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Not a single example of a supposed forebear of any of the many different species in the fossil record has ever been encountered.

For instance, while countless fossils show that eels have always existed as eels, there are none that can be proposed as the ancestor of the eel. This fact represents a terrible predicament for evolutionists, and is openly stated by many scientists.

Professor Rudolf A. Raff, president of the Indiana Institute of Molecular Biology, and Thomas Kaufman from Indiana University say this on the subject:

"The lack of ancestral or intermediate forms between fossil species is not a bizarre peculiarity of early metazoan history. Gaps are general and prevalent throughout the fossil record." (R.A. Raff, and T.C. Kaufman, *Embryos, Genes, and Evolution: The Developmental-Genetic Basis of Evolutionary Change*, Indiana University Press, 1991, p. 34)

### **SANDFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

No fossil of a strange-looking sandfish with partial fins and gills, only a partly formed respiratory system and developing eyes has ever been encountered. Every sandfish fossil discovered possesses exactly the same appearance and structure as present-day sandfish. This invalidates Darwinism, which maintains that living things developed gradually through very small changes, evolving from the primitive to the more advanced.

### **CRAB**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Monte Baldo, Italy

Excavations over the last 150 years have revealed findings that have dealt a serious blow to evolution every single time. One of these is this fossil 50-million-year-old crab, showing that crabs have always existed as crabs.

The fact that not a single fossil specimen capable of supporting the myth of evolution has ever been found is doubtless one of evolutionists' worst nightmares. Moreover, this nightmare of theirs will never end. Because, as is they have been to date, all the fossils obtained in future will also show that evolution never happened and that God has created all living things.



In an article in *Nature* magazine, Edmund Leach, author of the book *Rethinking Anthropology*, stresses this:

"Missing links in the sequence of fossil evidence were a worry to Darwin. He felt sure they would eventually turn up, but they are still missing and seem likely to remain so." (E. R. Leach, "Men, bishops and apes," *Nature*, Vol. 293, September 3, 1981, p. 20)

### **SHRIMP**

Age: 150 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Solnhofen Formation, Germany

One of those issues that make the supposed evolution of crustaceans impossible is the eye structure in the lobster and shrimp. A great many life forms belonging to the class *Crustacea* have refractive-type lens structures. Only two—the lobster and the shrimp—have a reflective mirrored eye. According to the unscientific evolutionist hypothesis, all living things belonging to the *Crustacea* must have evolved from a common forebear. If this claim were true, then it needs to be proved that the reflective mirrored eye structure also evolved from the refractive type lens structure.

Yet such a transition is impossible, because both types function perfectly with their own entirely different systems, and there is no point in looking for any "intermediate" form.

For a crustacean to gradually lose the lens in its eyes and for mirrored surfaces to emerge where formerly there had been lenses would leave the invertebrate deprived of sight in the meantime, and it could never survive.

In addition, no example of a semi-reflective and semi-refractive eye has ever been encountered in any fossil of any other life form. Every fossil discovered to date had perfect eyes, systems and structures, just like the 150-million-year-old shrimp pictured here.

### **SANDFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Darwinists' worst predicament is their inability to find a single piece of evidence for a transition from invertebrates to fish, or from fish to reptiles, from reptiles to mammals and birds. The late evolutionist paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould describes the lack of evidence for these imaginary transitions as a disquieting problem:

"The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution." (Stephen Jay Gould, "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?", *Paleobiology* 6, 1980, pp. 119-130, reprinted in the collection *Evolution Now: A Century After Darwin*, ed. Maynard Smith, Freeman, 1982, p. 140)

### **STARFISH**

Age: 430 million years

Period: Silurian

Location: Humevale Formation, Cloninbane, Victoria, Australia

Paleontologists have failed to come up with any supposed forebears of starfish. Neither have starfish been seen to change into other life forms. Were Darwinists' claims valid, starfish—which have survived for hundreds of millions of years—should long since have developed into other marine creatures, or even terrestrial life forms.

Yet no such transition ever happened. These creatures, which have existed as starfish for the last 430 million years, have demolished all claims to the effect that evolution represents the origin of life.

### **ANGELFISH (*Cichlidae*)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

It has now been realized that most of the fossils evolutionists have pointed to as supposed evidence of evolution are hoaxes, or else evolutionists have advanced biased interpretations incompatible with scientific methodology. For example, the discovery of the fully-fledged bird *Longisquama* that lived 70 million years earlier than the fossil bird *Archaeopteryx*, depicted as "the leading intermediate form," made it clear that the latter was neither a "primitive bird" nor an "intermediate form," as had been claimed.

In short, evolutionists have not one single fossil specimen they can hold up as evidence for evolution. As can be seen from the 95-million-year-old angelfish fossil pictured here, the fossil record exhibits evident proofs of Creation.

### **RAZORFISH (*Centriscus*)**

Age: 23 to 5 million years

Period: Miocene

Location: Green River Formation, Colorado, USA

Fossils prove that fish have always existed as fish and never descended gradually from any other life form. No odd-looking fossil with semi-developed gills, an as-yet unformed digestive system, or with rudimentary fins has ever been seen. Every fish fossil discovered shows that that fish was in full and complete possession of all the features of the family to which it belongs. For example, the 235-million-year-old razorfish fossil pictured here reveals that these species have remained the same, and have never altered, for millions of years.

Faced by this evidence, Darwinists must stop blindly advocating the dogma of the myth of evolution and accept the truth indicated by science, which has proved that no evolutionary process ever took place, and has revealed that God has created living things.

### **SEA CUCUMBER (with its pair)**

Age: 300 million years

Period: Carboniferous

Location: Francis Creek Shale, Braidwood, Illinois, USA

Sea cucumbers generally live on the sea bottom in areas close to the shore, and are grouped under the class *Holothuroidea*. The earliest known fossil specimens date back to the Devonian Period (417 to 354 million years ago). A comparison of sea cucumbers that lived 400 or 300 million years ago, and those living today shows that there is no difference between them.

This lack of change demolishes the claim that living things evolved by developing gradually over very long periods of time. Contrary to what Darwinists maintain, living things did not come into existence as the result of any evolutionary process. Our Lord, God, Lord of the worlds, created all things, both living and inanimate.

### **STARFISH**

Age: 450 million years

Period: Ordovician

Location: Bromide Formation, Criner Hills, Carter County, Oklahoma, USA

The fossil record has revealed no life form that could possibly be the supposed ancestor of starfish. Neither has it shown that starfish developed into any other life form over the course of time.

This same dynamic applies to all living things. Darwinists have no fossil evidence through which they can maintain that life forms are descended from one another. The late evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould admitted how the accounts of the supposed evolution of marine invertebrates are nothing more than myths and are based upon no scientific evidence in the following terms:

". . . one feature stands out as most puzzling—the lack of clear order and progress through time among marine invertebrate faunas. We can tell tales of improvement for some groups, but in honest moments we must admit that the history of complex life is more a story of multifarious variation about a set of basic designs than a saga of accumulating excellence." (Stephen Jay Gould, "The Ediacaran Experiment," *Natural History* 2/84, p. 22)

## **CORAL**

Age: 3 million years

Period: Pliocene

Location: Caloosahatchee Formation, Manatee County, Florida, USA

Corals (*Antozoans*) are invertebrate organisms that are known to have lived since the Cambrian Period (543 to 490 million years ago), and of which there are many fossil specimens dating back to the Ordovician period (490 to 443 million years ago).

Corals come in various types; soft, horny, spiny and true corals. Coral beds form as a result of coral skeletons accumulating in a specific location over thousands of years. Corals live either alone or in colonies. They tend to live in warm seas, attached to large rocks on the sea bed, though free-moving, newly-hatched ones are rarely encountered.

Corals deal a severe blow to Darwinism, given their sophisticated structures that have remained unchanged for hundreds of millions of years. Like all other living things, they are the work of our Lord's sublime creation.

## **TROUTPERCH (*Percopsidae*)**

Age: 54 to 37 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Kemmerer, Wyoming, USA

These fish, which belong to the class *Percopsiformes*, generally live in fresh water in North America. Some evolutionists claim that fish belonging to this class possess primitive features. However, investigations have revealed that the vertebrates in question actually have very complex structures. Some families even amaze evolutionists through the extraordinary features they display in nest-building and caring for their offspring.

The fossil pictured here is around 50 million years old and shows that fish of this species have survived exactly the same over the last 50 million years.

## **SCALLOP**

Age: 300 million years old

Period: Carboniferous

Location: Francis Creek Shale, Braidwood, Illinois, USA

There are an estimated 15,000 extinct species of oysters, traces of which can still be seen in the fossil record, and some 11,000 species still alive today. The fossil pictured here, a member of the family *Pectinidae*, shows that the mollusks in question have remained unaltered for hundreds of millions of years.

Evolutionists are unable to account for this. In such cases, they prefer resorting to demagoguery, pretending not to understand the issue, and confusing the public with imaginary tales. The fact is, however, that if they were to honestly evaluate the information revealed by the scientific facts, they would see that the theory of evolution has collapsed under the weight of evidence in the fossil record.

### **FLYING FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Darwinist logic makes exceedingly ridiculous and unscientific claims. For example, were life to be in a constant state of change and transition, as evolutionists maintain, then flying fish should long since have grown full-developed wings and turned into strange, flying gilled creatures. Yet contrary to evolutionist claims, these fish have survived for tens of millions of years without undergoing any changes whatsoever.

The fact that flying fish that existed 95 million years ago are identical to those alive today demolishes all evolutionist logic.

Darwin hoped that excavations undertaken after his day would produce fossils representing proof of his theory of evolution. Yet even though digs were conducted for decades all over the world, no such evidence was forthcoming. All the fossils unearthed to date have proved that living things had not undergone evolution.

The photos to the left show fossil research being undertaken in Haqel and Nammoura in Lebanon, well-known for their rich fossil beds.

### **CORAL**

Age: 3 million years

Period: Pliocene

Location: Caloosahatchee Formation, Manatee County, Florida, USA

The coral pictured here is some 3 million years old. Corals that lived 300 million years ago, those that existed only 3 million years in the past and those still living today are all identical, in terms of both appearance and structure. While this uniformity invalidates the claim of evolution, it also once again demonstrates that Creation is an irrefutable fact.

Over time, coral skeletons accumulate and build themselves toward the surface of the ocean, in structures known as coral beds or coral reefs.

### **STURGEON**

Age: 150 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Peipiao, Liaoning , China

Like all other living things, sturgeon fish, which belong to the order *Acipenseriformes*, have no evolutionary forebears in the fossil record. Throughout geologic history, they have always existed as sturgeon. This fact once again dramatizes the "intermediate form" dilemma, one of the major problems facing Darwinists.

The paleontologist Colin Patterson revealed the absence of any intermediate forms that might be proposed by Darwinists, by not referring to such forms at all in his book *Evolution*. He made the following admission in a letter to those people wondering why this was so:

"I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them. As a paleontologist myself, I am much occupied with the philosophical problems of identifying ancestral forms in the fossil record. You say that I should at least 'show a photo of the fossil from which each type of organism was derived.' I will lay it on the line—there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument." (From a letter dated 10 April, 1979, quoted in L. D. Sunderland's *Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems*, 4th edition, Master Books, 1988)

### **RAZORFISH**

Age: 5 million years

Period: Pliocene

Location: Marecchia River Formation, Poggio Berni, Rimini, Italy

The late evolutionist paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould admitted how fossils have never supported the theory of evolution:

"The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. . . . We fancy ourselves as the only true students of life's history, yet to preserve our favored account of evolution by natural selection we view our data as so bad that we never see the very process we profess to study." (Stephen Jay Gould, "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History*, Vol. 86 (5), May 1977, p. 14)

Evolutionists refer to this as an enigma. But in fact, there is no enigma here at all, but a manifest truth: Fossils demonstrate the fact of Creation.

## **SQUID**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

If Darwinists maintain that living things are descended from one another, then they can prove these claims only by revealing fossils of intermediate forms that existed in the past. The intermediate forms they have to find must be life forms interposed between two fossil species, but with missing or half-developed organs.

If, for example, invertebrates such as squid evolved into fish, as evolutionists maintain, then a large number of "half-squid" and "half-fish" creatures must once have existed. And we should constantly be finding their remains in the fossil record.

Yet even though digs have been conducted all over world ever since Darwin's day and countless fossils have been unearthed, not one single intermediate form has ever been found. As this 95-million-year-old fossil shows, squid have always existed as squid.

## **STINGRAY**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

Like all other fish, stingrays have always existed as stingrays. Darwinist hypotheses, claims and theses are of no scientific worth, because all the scientific data, beginning with fossil findings, refute its assertions. The hoaxes, distortions and propaganda to which Darwinists resort in order to keep their theories alive are pointless.

As the 95-million-year-old stingray pictured here shows, living things tell us that they did not evolve, but were created, and this fact is impossible to be concealed.

## **SQUID**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The theory of evolution, which has been kept alive ever since Darwin's day through hoaxes and distortions, has been defeated in the face of 21st century science. The most important findings to demolish evolution are the hundreds of millions of fossils belonging to some 250,000 species. Each one of these fossils has revealed that living things emerged suddenly, with all the characteristics they

possess today, and that they have not undergone the slightest change over the course of millions of years.

One such fossil is the 95-million-year-old squid pictured here. Squid, that have remained unchanged for 95 million years, indicate one single truth: Life forms did not evolve, but were created.

### **PLATED LOBSTER**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The fossilized lobster pictured here, a member of the family *Palinuridae*, reveals that these crustaceans have remained exactly the same for the last 95 million years. The way that species undergo no changes over millions of years is referred to as "stasis," and this represents a major predicament for evolutionists.

Stephen Jay Gould, one of those evolutionists who has often stated that the fossil record does not support the theory of evolution, said this on the subject in an article in *Natural History* magazine in 1993:

"[S]tasis, or nonchange, of most fossil species during their lengthy geological lifespans was tacitly acknowledged by all paleontologists, but almost never studied explicitly . . . [T]he overwhelming prevalence of stasis became an embarrassing feature of the fossil record, best left ignored as a manifestation of nothing (that is, nonevolution)." (Stephen Jay Gould, "Cordelia's Dilemma," *Natural History*, February 1993, pp. 10-18)

There is only one reason why evolutionists describe the stasis in the fossil record as an embarrassment: That living things have never changed means the invalidation of the theory of evolution. This fact, which demonstrates that evolution never happened, confirms the fact of Creation.

### **MANTIS SHRIMP**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

Mantis shrimps, which have survived unchanged ever since the Carboniferous period (354 to 290 million years ago), are a life form that invalidates Darwinism. It is impossible to provide any evolutionary explanation for a creature that remains unaltered for 300 million years.

The mantis shrimp pictured here is 95 million years old, yet is completely identical to both those that lived 300 million years in the past and specimens alive today.



## **PUFFER FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

All the puffer fish fossils unearthed during the last 150 years are identical in every way to puffer fish alive today. If evolutionists' claims were true, then a great many fossils of semi-developed fish should have been excavated. Yet no such fossil ever has been, because no such intermediate form ever existed. The 95-million-year-old fossil pictured here is proof that puffer fish have always existed as puffer fish.

## **LOBSTER**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The fact that concrete evidence, such as fossils, argue against Darwinism cannot be concealed. Even evolutionists who have the ability to evaluate modern-day scientific findings in an unbiased manner admit it is plain to see that the fossil record opposes the theory of evolution.

In his book *In Search of Deep Time*, Henry Gee states that there is no accumulation of evidence to support the theory of evolution in the fossil record—and that, on the contrary, the evidence at hand is interpreted by evolutionists in the light of their own preconceptions:

"Many of the assumptions we make about evolution, especially concerning the history of life as understood from the fossil record, are, however, baseless." (Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999, pp. 1-2.)

## **SEAHORSE**

Age: 5 to 1.8 million years

Period: Pliocene

Location: Marecchia River Formation, Italy

Seahorses have always existed as seahorses, and are neither descended from nor turned into any other life form. This fossil, which is proof that these creatures have never changed over millions of years, also declares that evolution is a lie. The origin of life does not lie in evolution. God, the Almighty and Omniscient, created the universe and all things within it.

### **MANTIS SHRIMP**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

None of the research conducted to date has been able to discover a single life form that represents the supposed evolutionary forebear of the mantis shrimp. No findings indicate that mantis shrimp came into being through any process of evolution. Every fossil unearthed shows that mantis shrimp have always existed as mantis shrimp and have remained unchanged for millions of years.

One such fossil is the 95-million-year-old mantis shrimp specimen pictured here.

### **PUFFER FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

You read pro-evolutionary reports in magazines and newspapers and you see similar programs and documentaries on television, not because Darwinism is a scientific viewpoint, but rather, there are tireless efforts to support it out of ideological concerns. Darwinism is the supposed scientific foundation for materialism and atheism.

No one who accepts Darwinism's invalidity can support materialism and atheism. That is why, despite all scientific findings and evidence arguing against the theory of evolution, these facts are ignored, and Darwinism continues to be defended through lies and distortions.

One of the proofs that evolutionists refuse to acknowledge are the fossils, now numbering in the millions, each one of them clear proof of Creation. Like the 95-million-year-old puffer fish pictured, all fossils tell us that living things never evolved, and that God created them all.

This is a two-sided "mirror image" fossil, traces of which can be seen on either surface of the rock.

### **STINGRAY (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Science has proved that evolutionists' claims regarding the origin of life are mere nonsense, and the theory of evolution has collapsed in the face of many concrete findings.

One of the countless bits of evidence to demolish the theory of evolution is the lack of any imaginary intermediate forms in the fossil record. Every fossil unearthed shows that all living species came into being with all their characteristics fully present, and remained unchanged from then on. The 95-million-year-old stingray in the picture is one such specimen. There is no difference between this fossil and stingrays alive today; and all stingrays have been exactly the same ever since they first appeared in the fossil record.

### **SEA LILY**

Age: 150 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Solnhofen Formation, Germany

The wealth of the fossil record poses a serious dilemma for evolutionists. These fossils present those people unwilling to understand the origin of life with a fully detailed, complete picture. Living things emerged separately, each one in a single moment and with all its different structures, with no imaginary "intermediate evolutionary" forms preceding them.

The 150-million-year-old sea lily in the picture is one of the proofs in question.

### **MANTIS SHRIMP**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Darwin's hypotheses regarding the origin of life were based on no scientific findings or experiments. However, with the support and encouragement he received from materialist biologists of the time, Darwin constructed a theory out of these hypotheses. According to his theory, all living things were descended from a supposed single primitive ancestor, underwent minute changes over a very long period of time, and thus became different from one another.

This hypothesis has been confirmed by no concrete scientific findings, neither in Darwin's own time nor in the intervening 150 years. On the contrary, all the fossils unearthed have revealed that living things have remained unchanged, often for tens of millions of years and sometimes for hundreds. His theory has collapsed in the face of science. One of the proofs of that collapse is the 95-million-year-old mantis shrimp pictured.

### **PUFFER FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

In the fossil record, it is sometimes possible to come across remains of living things bearing features belonging to another species. Darwinists, interpreting these findings in a prejudiced manner, claim that these fossils confirm their theories. But that is a grave error, because one living thing having features similar to another's is not characteristic of any "intermediate form." The platypus, for example, lives in Australia, and despite being a mammal, lays eggs like reptiles. In addition, it has a beak resembling that of birds. Scientists describe the platypus as a "mosaic form."

Even leading evolutionists admit that these cannot be regarded as intermediate forms.

Instead of engaging in distorted interpretations regarding mosaic forms, Darwinists need to produce concrete evidence to prove that species descended from one another by way of minuscule changes. But this they can never do, because no such process ever took place.

### **BOWFIN**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Messel Quarry, Germany

The theory of evolution is not based on scientific fact, but is maintained by means of invented scenarios and propaganda, and it is impossible to find any fossils supporting this fictitious theory. Darwinists have written an imaginary natural history, and have attempted to find fossils to fit it. Yet the exact opposite actually happened: Every new fossil places the theory of evolution in an even worse predicament.

The bowfin fossil pictured dates back 50 million years. Its sharp teeth have been perfectly preserved, and its skeletal structure can be seen to be identical to that of specimens alive today.

### **SEA HORSE**

Age: 23 -5 million years

Period: Miocene

Location: Marecchia River Formation, Poggio, Rimini, Italy

Sea horses (*Hippocampus* sp.) generally cling onto plants with their tails, and swim upright with their dorsal fin because they lack tail fins. Their ability to swim upright is based on their being able to fill their flotation sacs with air very quickly.

Pictured is a fossilized sea horse discovered in rock beds in northern Italy. This sea horse, from Miocene period, is exactly the same in terms of all its organs and structures—its skeleton, flotation sac and gills—as present-day sea horses. Sea horses have remained unchanged since they first begin appearing in the fossil record, and fundamentally invalidate evolutionist claims.

### **COELACANTH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

In 1938, Darwinists suffered a terrible disappointment with the capture of a living coelacanth, a fish they had long depicted as so-called evidence of the

transition of vertebrates from the sea to dry land. In the years that followed, some 200 coelacanths were caught. In 1987, Professor Hans Fricke of the Max Planck Institute observed these creatures in their natural habitat by descending to a depth of 200 meters off the East African Comoro Islands, in a submarine named Geo. He observed that their bony fins had no functional link to the limbs that permit walking in tetrapods (four-footed animals).

The April 2003 issue of *Focus* magazine reported the findings from this research:

"The flexible fins had no similar functions to those in four-footed land vertebrates. These allowed the creature to swim head-down and in all directions, even backwards." (*Focus*, April 2003)

With its structures that have remained unchanged for 400 million years, the coelacanth places evolutionists in a highly difficult position. Bear in mind, too, that continental shifts have taken place over those 400 million years, during which the coelacanth never changed at all.

It can be seen that evolutionists are in an utterly hopeless position. Moreover, the coelacanth exhibits a profound gulf between the marine and terrestrial life forms, between which the theory of evolution presumes a transitional link.

### **STINGRAY (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The 95-million-year-old fossil stingray pictured reveals that these fish have undergone no change since they first came into being on Earth. This has gone down as yet another of the proofs demolishing the Darwinist thesis that "Fossils support the theory of evolution."

Countless scientific books and articles have revealed the invalidity of these illusory evolutionist claims. The fact that fossils have failed to produce the "intermediate forms" of which Darwin dreamed—and that, on the contrary, different living groups on Earth appear suddenly in the fossil record and with all their unique structures—is agreed by a great many scientists, including many present-day evolutionist paleontologists.

Niles Eldredge, for example, admits that evolutionist paleontologists are well aware of the lack of intermediate forms and the stasis in the fossil record (the fact that living species have remained unaltered), but this evidence goes ignored:

"Each new generation, it seems, produces a few young paleontologists eager to document examples of evolutionary change in their fossils. The changes they have always looked for have, of course, been of the gradual progressive sort. More often than not their efforts have gone unrewarded—their fossils, rather than

exhibiting the expected pattern, just seem to persist virtually unchanged. . . . This extraordinary conservatism looked, to the paleontologist keen on finding evolutionary change, as if no evolution had occurred. Thus studies documenting conservative persistence rather than gradual evolutionary change were considered failures, and, more often than not, were not even published. Most paleontologists were aware of the stability, the lack of change we call stasis." (an excerpt from Niles Eldredge, "Evolutionary Tempos and Modes: A Paleontological Perspective," in the anthology *What Darwin Began: Modern Darwinian and non-Darwinian Perspectives on Evolution* [ed. Godfrey, 1985], as quoted in the book *Darwin on Trial* by Phillip E. Johnson, Regnery Gateway, 1991, pp. 58-60)

This is a mirror-image fossil, traces of which can be seen on either side of the rock surface.

### **GUITAR FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The countless proofs revealed by paleontology over the years confirm that living things never evolved. The fossil pictured is one of the many proofs that evolutionists ignore. This 95-million-year-old fossil, popularly known as a guitar fish thanks to its appearance, has to a large extent preserved its skeletal structure. The head and fins can be made out in perfect detail.

Confronted by this fossil, which is identical to modern-day guitar fish, evolutionists have no explanation to offer, and no evidence to submit. All they can do is attempt to mislead and deceive people through demagoguery.

### **PIPEFISH**

Age: 40 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Wyoming, USA

Pipefish, members of the family *Syngnathidae*, are toothless, and their mouths are tube-shaped. Those that lived tens of millions of years ago had exactly the same features as pipefish alive today. Nonetheless, evolutionists still claim that pipefish came into existence by chance, as the result of a long process of evolution—as indeed they do with regard to all other life forms. They are completely lacking in any evidence to support their claims. Yet there are millions of proofs, like the one in the picture, that clearly show that the evolution hypothesis is not true.

### **PUFFER FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Darwinist publications contain no accounts based on concrete scientific evidence. The fundamental dilemmas that contradict the theory of evolution are glossed over in a few sentences, while on the other hand, a great many fantastical scenarios are dreamed up and presented as factual.

Evolutionists constantly claim that all living things developed by gradually evolving from one another, yet remain silent when firm evidence is demanded. For example, if you ask evolutionists who have offered a long explanation of how "Fish forced to emerge onto dry land as the seas dried up eventually turned into reptiles" whether they have any fossil evidence with which to support their claim, you will never receive an answer.

Despite all their searching over the last 150 years, Darwinists have failed to find one single example of an intermediate form. All the fossils they have unearthed show that life emerged suddenly—in other words, species were created, never changed, and never underwent evolution.

### **NEEDLEFISH**

Period: Cretaceous

Age: 95 million years

Location: Lebanon

Evolutionists, who persist in claiming that "species evolved from one another" at every available opportunity are helpless in the face of the fossil record because they possess not a single piece of evidence. The fossil needlefish in the picture, for instance, documents how these have remained unchanged for 95 million years. This slender fish, which belongs to the family Belonidae, is no different to specimens alive today.

### **MANTIS SHRIMP**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The theory of evolution consists of a hypothesis. In order for that hypothesis to be regarded as scientific it needs to be testable or else confirmed by findings. Yet evolutionist fantasies lack these criteria. There is no significance or scientific value in the tales that Darwinists have been relating for so long, about how invertebrates supposedly turned into vertebrates, how fish living in the seas moved to the dry land as the oceans dried up, or how dinosaurs chasing flies began to fly themselves. They need to point to a single fossil of a half-invertebrate and half-vertebrate, half-fish and half-reptile or half-dinosaur and half-bird—if any such exist.



Evolutionists are unable to point to any such fossils, yet there are a countless—and ever-increasing—number of fossils proving that evolution never happened at all. This 95-million-year-old fossilized mantis shrimp is one such example.

### **PUFFER FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

This fossilized puffer fish is another of the proofs that living things never evolved. The skeleton of this 95-million-year-old fish has been almost completely preserved, and there is no difference between its skeletal structure and that of button fish living today. Yet evolutionists ignore this fact and claim that fish evolved from invertebrate marine organisms—a claim devoid of any scientific basis.

The fossil record shows that evolution is a groundless claim, and throws this fact in Darwinists' faces on every occasion. Fossils show that living things did not evolve, but were created.

### **SQUID**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The squid is a marine-dwelling mollusk, a member of the class *Cephalopoda* (cephalopods). This photo shows a 95-million-year-old squid fossil. There is not the slightest difference between it and present-day specimens. The pigment sac beneath the skin can even be seen in this fossil, and its skeletal structure is identical to those in modern-day squid.

If evolutionists' claims were true, then squid should have undergone various changes over the course of millions of years, and by now, various fossil specimens documenting these stages should have been discovered. But every fossil found shows that squid have survived completely unchanged for millions of years.

### **SARDINE**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Nammoura, Lebanon

This 95-million-year-old fossilized sardine gives a clear response to evolutionists' fictitious claims. The fact that this fossil sardine has exactly the same appearance as specimens living today, with exactly the same skeleton and fins, demolishes the evolutionist tale of the evolution of fish. At the same time, it also proves that Almighty God has created all life forms, and that living things have not changed from that time to this.

### **MANTIS SHRIMP AND EEL**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Scientific data and findings show that eels have always existed as eels, and mantis shrimp as mantis shrimp. They have no supposed primitive forebears. They have undergone no intermediate stages ever since they first came into existence.

### **PUFFER FISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Lebanon

The puffer fish has survived unchanged for millions of years. The fact that puffer fish living 95 million years ago were identical to those still alive today is a state of affairs that evolutionists can never explain. The clear fact revealed by fossils is that God has created living things.

Despite being a proponent of the theory of evolution, the British paleontologist Derek W. Ager admits as such:

"The point emerges that, if we examine the fossil record in detail, whether at the level of orders or of species, we find—over and over again—not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another." (Derek W. Ager, "The Nature of the Fossil Record," *Proceedings of the British Geological Association*, Vol. 87, 1976, p. 133.)

### **NEEDLEFISH (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Nammoura, Lebanon

With its thin body and skeleton, long jaw resembling that of a swordfish and its sharp teeth, the needlefish has undergone not the slightest change in 95 million years. This unchanging nature, seen in all living species in the fossil record, is known as "stasis" and represents one of the main problems confronting Darwinists.

Peter Williamson from Harvard University sums up this state of affairs, which is a most unexpected one for Darwinists:

"The principal problem is morphological stasis. A theory is only as good as its predictions, and conventional neo-Darwinism, which claims to be a comprehensive explanation of evolutionary process, has failed to predict the widespread long-term morphological stasis now recognized as one of the most striking aspects of the fossil record." (Peter G. Williamson, "Morphological Stasis and Developmental Constraint: Real Problems for Neo-Darwinism," *Nature*, Vol. 294, 19 November 1981, p. 214.)

This fossil consists of a positive and a negative slab.

### **MANTIS SHRIMP**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Scientific findings reveal that evolution never happened. The mantis shrimp fossil illustrated is one proof of this fact, which evolutionists attempt to conceal. There is no difference between this fossil and mantis shrimp living today.

Mantis shrimp use arm-like appendages extending out of their chests in order to feed. Each of these is clawed. The second one is particularly large and is used for striking and holding prey. Since the second appendage closely resembles the claws of the mantis, these creatures are widely known as mantis shrimp. These appendages, which come in two types—speared and heeled—vary among species. A large mantis shrimp can strike as powerfully as a 22-caliber bullet. ("*Seeing the World in Many Colors*," *Maryland University Web Site*, [http://www.umbc.edu/gradschool/research/profile\\_11.html](http://www.umbc.edu/gradschool/research/profile_11.html))

### **GUJARFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

In his words "It is doubtful whether, in the absence of fossils, the idea of evolution would represent anything more than an outrageous hypothesis" (S. M. Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable Fossils, Genes and the Origins of Species*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1981, p. 72.), S. M. Stanley from Johns

Hopkins University reveals the significance of the fossil record for the theory of evolution.

As you have seen, leading evolutionists admit that the deficient nature of the fossil record poses a problem for their theory. The 95-million-year-old guitarfish pictured is one of the examples confirming Professor Stanley's confession. (*Ibid.*)

### **MACKEREL (with its pair)**

Age: 110 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Mackerel are members of the sub-order *Scombroidei*, are fast swimmers and generally live in schools. There is no difference between the 110-million-year-old fossil pictured and mackerel alive today. This applies to all other fish, plants, mammals and birds, fossil specimens of which have exactly the same features as their present-day counterparts.

### **NEEDLEFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Nammoura, Lebanon

Large numbers of needlefish can be found in the fossil record. Living specimens of these same species can also be seen today, and they are one of the proofs that living things never evolved.

The illustrations show fossil digs being conducted at the Hage Formation in Lebanon. As a result of such excavations over the last 150 years, millions of fossils belonging to hundreds of thousands of species have been unearthed. Not a single one of these points to the so-called evolutionary process of living things. Species appear in the fossil record with all their characteristics fully formed and developed. This shows that the Darwinist scenario of gradual development from the primitive to the more advanced never occurred.

### **LADY FISH (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Evolutionist claims that "Living things developed gradually, and that is how species emerged," are once again refuted by the 95-million-year-old ladyfish fossil in the picture. Fish of the family *Elopidae* had exactly the same skeletal structure

millions of years ago as they still exhibit today. The significance of this is obvious: Living things never evolved, but were created by our Lord.

### **BONEFISH (with its pair)**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Nammoura, Lebanon

The 95-million-year-old bonefish pictured is a member of the family *Albulidae*, of the suborder *Elipoidei*. It is identical to today's bonefish.

Fossil research has been going on all over the world for roughly the last 150 years. As a result, millions of fossils have been unearthed. Yet not a single specimen of a half-invertebrate/ half-fish, or a half-fish/ half-crocodile life form has ever been found. Evolutionist claims regarding "intermediate-form fossils" have never been anything more than dreams. Every fossil discovered has revealed that living things remain unchanged for as long as their species have survived. This means that God has created living things.

This fossil is a mirror-image one that appears on both sides of the split rock's surfaces.

### **SAWFISH**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

There are no differences between present-day specimens and the 95-million-year-old sawfish pictured. This, by itself, puts the theory of evolution in a severe quandary. Our Almighty Lord has created all living things as separate species, which have survived unchanged from the moment of their creation right down to today.

### **SEA URCHIN**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Nammoura, Lebanon

The sea urchin is only of the hundreds of millions of fossils that refute the theory of evolution. The 95-million-year-old sea urchin pictured here is by itself sufficient to invalidate the claims of evolutionists, who now find it impossible to mislead people with demagoguery, deceptions and speculation of various kinds—because all the scientific findings, and particularly the fossil record, are out in the open.

Evolutionary speculations are valueless in the face of the sea urchin that has remained unchanged for 95 million years.

### **CATSHARK**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

Cat sharks that lived millions of years ago possessed all the same fully formed features as those living today—as is confirmed by the 95-million-year-old cat shark pictured, which is identical to present-day specimens.

God has created cat shark to be fully formed and with nothing lacking, as He has all other living things. Like them, cat sharks never underwent evolution.

## **FOSIL SPECIMENS OF PLANTS**

### **HACKBERRY SEEDS**

Age: 54 to 37 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Hart Mountains, North Central Wyoming, USA

This tree, a member of the genus *Celtis*, grows in temperate climates.

The hackberry seeds pictured here, roughly 50 million years old are some of the proofs that evolution never occurred. This plant has always existed as the hackberry and, like all other plant species, it has never gone through any intermediate stages. It is not descended from any other plant, and never developed into any other plant.

In fact, evolutionists are well aware that there are no intermediate form fossils they can point to as evidence of plants' supposed evolution. George Gaylord Simpson, one of the founders of neo-Darwinism, states this fact thus:

"This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by paleontologists. It is true of almost all classes of animals, both vertebrate and invertebrate. . . it is true of the classes, and of the major animal phyla, and **it is apparently also true of analogous categories of plants.**" (George G. Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994, pp. 105, 107) (*emphasis added*)

### **SEQUOIA PINE CONE**

Age: 144 to 65 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Cannonball Formation, North Dakota, USA

Sequoias presently growing in North America can reach more than 100 meters in height; there are countless fossil specimens showing that these trees' foliage has remained the same for tens of millions of years. The fossil in the picture is around 140 million years old. These specimens once again condemn evolutionists, who cannot explain scientifically how plants first emerged and why there is such a variety of them, to a profound silence.

It is clear that each species of plant which appears suddenly in the fossil record, together with its own unique features and which has survived completely unchanged for millions of years, has been created by Almighty God.

### **LEAF OF CLIMBING FERN**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Wyoming, USA

Clearly, the hoaxes, distortions and fossils proposed for years as proof of evolution by Darwinists are actually evidence against the theory. David Berlinski, a Princeton University mathematician and opponent of evolution, describes how fossil findings refute evolution:

". . . [T]here are gaps in the fossil graveyard, places where there should be intermediate forms, but where there is nothing whatsoever instead. No paleontologist . . . denies that this is so. It is simply a fact. Darwin's theory and the fossil record are in conflict." (David Berlinski, "*Controversy: Denying Darwin*," Commentary, September 1996, p. 28)

One such fossil is the leaf of climbing fern pictured here. This fossil shows that climbing ferns that lived 50 million years ago were no different to present-day specimens, invalidating evolutionists' claims.

### **ALLOPHYLUS LEAF**

Age: 54 to 37 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Douglas Pass, Colorado, USA

These plants, members of the *Polemoniaceae* family, are among those living things that defy the theory of evolution, since their structures have remained unchanged for millions of years. The way that Darwinists persist in their theories stems from a failure to consider the significance of findings, in as much as countless fossil specimens show that evolution never happened.

Evolutionists never stop to consider that not a single intermediate form fossil has been unearthed among all the millions of fossils discovered to date, but continue to relate the same old theories. Though they used to find consolation in

these fables, evolutionists are now unable to continue telling falsehoods to a public who have gained a much more detailed knowledge of the subject.

### **POPLAR LEAF**

Age: 54 to 37 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Utah, USA

This fossil—which proves that poplars are not descended from any other plant, that they have no evolutionary forerunner and have always existed as poplars—is a proof of Creation. Poplars that lived around 50 million years ago are identical in every respect to present-day poplars, revealing that evolution is a figment of the imagination.

### **CEDAR LEAF**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Cache Creek Formation, Kamloops, British Columbia, Canada

The fossil pictured here shows that cedar trees, a kind of coniferous evergreen, have not changed over the last 50 million years—and tell us that evolutionists' claims are untrue. Charles Darwin claimed that there was an evolutionary process that caused all life forms to develop gradually from a single common ancestor without exception, however, the fossil record tells us the exact opposite. The countless remains of extinct or surviving life forms have no familial links between them required by Darwin's theory. Every known fossil has its own unique characteristics.

Natural history is divided into different groups, which, far from being very similar and having only minor differences, are very different and separated from one another by huge structural variations.

### **SUMAC LEAF**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Utah, USA

The fossil findings that most clearly refute the idea of plant evolution are those belonging to flowering plants. These angiosperms—to give them their biological definition—are divided into 43 separate families, each one of which emerges suddenly in the fossil record with no trace of any primitive "intermediate form" behind it.

This fact was realized in the 19th century, and Darwin described the origin of angiosperms as "an abominable mystery". In his book *Palaeobiology of Angiosperm*



*Origins*, the evolutionist paleobotanist Norman F. Hughes makes the following admission:

". . . the failure to find a satisfactory explanation has persisted, and many botanists have concluded that the problem is not capable of solution, by use of fossil evidence." (N. F. Hughes, *Palaeobiology of Angiosperm Origins: Problems of Mesozoic Seed-Plant Evolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, pp. 1-2))

This admission means that no fossil capable of being represented as proof of plant evolution has been found. And neither is it possible for any to be discovered in the future. As the 50-million-year-old sumac fossil pictured here shows, plants did not evolve, but were created.

### **SPURGE LEAF**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Utah, USA

In his article *The Evolution of Flowering Plants*, the paleobotanist Daniel Axelrod makes the following comment on the origin of flowering plants:

"The ancestral group that gave rise to angiosperms has not yet been identified in the fossil record, and no living angiosperm points to such an ancestral alliance." (D. I. Axelrod, "The Evolution of Flowering Plants," in *Evolution After Darwin: Vol. 1: The Evolution of Life*, ed. S. Tax, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960, pp. 264-274)

As you can see from his admission, fossil research over the last 150 years or so has failed to produce even a single fossil that can be construed as the ancestor of flowering plants. This refutes the Darwinist claim that plants descended from one another by undergoing very small changes over very lengthy periods of time.

As the 50-million-year-old spurge leaf pictured here shows, plants have never changed despite the intervening tens of millions of years. In other words, they never evolved.

### **BALLOON VINE**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Utah, USA

Darwin, 150 years ago, described one significant problem facing the theory of evolution:

"Nothing is more extraordinary in the history of the Vegetable Kingdom, as it seems to me, than the apparently very sudden or abrupt development of the

[taxonomically] higher plants." (Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, "From Charles Darwin to J. D. Hooker, August 6, 1881," p. 248)

The significance of Darwin's reference to plants developing suddenly is that plant species did not emerge gradually, as the result of incremental changes. In other words, there is no evidence that they ever evolved. Since even Darwin saw how plant fossils argued against evolution, it is illogical for contemporary evolutionists to insist on the myth of "the evolution of plants."

### **POPLAR LEAF**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Utah, USA

The most impassable dead end in which proponents of the scenario of plant evolution find themselves today is the question of how the first plant cell evolved. The questions of how the first plant could have emerged from a single cell and how thousands of species of plant emerged from that one original plant. There is not a single intermediate-form fossil to point to the fact of such a process. There are no primitive fossil plants with semi-developed organs and systems, and no evidence to indicate that one plant species is the ancestor of any other. On the contrary, fossils show that every plant species emerged individually and suddenly, each with its own particular characteristics, and that these countless plant species have remained unchanged for so long as they have survived.

An example of one such species is this 50-million-year-old poplar leaf fossil, identical to poplar leaves today.

### **OAK LEAF**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Utah, USA

As fossils prove, plant species have been created in their specific and original forms, each one completely different from one another, and have no evolutionary links between them. As the evolutionist paleontologist E. C. Olson admits: "Many new groups of plants and animals suddenly appear, apparently without any close ancestors." (E. C. Olson, *The Evolution of Life*, New York: The New American Library, 1965, p. 94)

One proof of this is the 50-million-year-old oak leaf pictured here. This fossil, which shows that oak leaves have existed as oak leaves for the last 50 million years, invalidates evolution.

### **WILLOW LEAF**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Green River Formation, Utah, USA

Willow trees have always existed as willow trees throughout the course of geologic time. They are not descended from any other plant and have never transformed into any other species throughout the course of their long existence. There is no trace of a "half-willow half-oak", or "half-willow half-maple" species in the fossil record—because such intermediate forms never existed.

The 50-million-willow leaf pictured here clearly shows that the evolutionists' idea that plants evolved is a figment of their imaginations. Fossils are proof that evolution never happened, and that the origin of life is Creation.

### **FERN (with its pair)**

Age: 300 million years

Period: Carboniferous

Location: Mazon Creek, Illinois, USA

Paleontological findings prove that ferns, like all other living things, did not emerge by way of evolution and that, on the contrary, they were created. Many contemporary scientists accept that the fossil record supports Creation rather than evolution, and that intermediate life forms exist only in evolutionists' imaginations. The evolutionist Hoimar von Ditfurth, author of the book *Im Anfang war der Wasserstoff*, says:

"When we look behind us we see that there is no need to be surprised by the way we have failed to find any of the intermediate forms sought for in an almost painful manner. Because in all probability, no such intermediate stage ever existed."

One of the findings confirming von Ditfurth's comment is the 300-million-year-old fern fossil pictured here.

### **Green River, Utah, USA**

### **BEECH LEAF**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Tranquille Shale, British Columbia, Canada

Despite all the research and enormous labor and means expended over the last 150 years, no findings of any kind have been unearthed that might support the theory of evolution. If such a thing as evolution had in fact taken place, then countless proofs have been discovered by now. Indeed, many scientists since Darwin's day have admitted there should be a large quantity of evidence, but that it has never been found.

On the other hand, countless findings and proofs reveal that Creation is a manifest truth. One of these is the fossil specimen pictured here, which proves that beech trees have not changed over 50 million years.

### **FERN**

Age: 58 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Sentinel Butte Formation, North Dakota, USA

There are around 250 species of fern, as the one pictured here, which is a member of the genus *Dryopteris*. Comparison reveals that there is no difference between this fossilized fern, approximately 58 million years old, and ferns living today.

This 58-million-year old fossil fern is one of the proofs that invalidates the myth of plant evolution. Like other living things, plants appeared suddenly and remained unchanged for millions of years. In other words, they did not evolve, but were created.

### **HONEYSUCKLE LEAF**

Age: 58 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Sentinel Butte Formation, North Dakota, USA

The absence of any differences between the 58-million-year-old honeysuckle leaf pictured here and those alive today is a sufficient response by itself to evolutionist claims.

One of the major predicaments that confronts scientists espousing the scenario of plant evolution is the lack of even a single intermediate-form fossil. There are no "primitive" plant fossils with half-developed systems. To date, no evidence has been produced that one plant is the ancestor of any other. Therefore, family trees purporting to show the supposed evolution of plants are entirely imaginary, with no scientific basis to them at all.

### **FERN**

Age: 58 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Sentinel Butte Formation, North Dakota, USA

Fern fossils demonstrate that no evolutionary process ever took place and that living things have remained unchanged since they first came into existence. The fern fossil in the picture has not changed over 58 million years, and never evolved.

Plant species emerged suddenly and independently of one another, and there are no so-called evolutionary links between them. It is of course impossible for an

infinite variety of plants to emerge from one single plant. All plants possess their own unique features. Their colors, tastes, shapes and methods of reproduction are all different, and they often exhibit exceedingly complex mechanisms, which cannot possibly have come into being by chance, as evolutionists maintain.

### **BIRCH LEAF**

Age: 58 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Sentinel Butte Formation, North Dakota, USA

"Birch" is the common name given to members of the *Betulaceae* family. Birch trees prefer temperate climates, and their smooth bark is generally white or silvery grey in color. The descendants of the birch tree that left this fossilized leaf pictured here have not changed over millions of years, never evolved, and have preserved the original form in which they were created by Almighty God.

## **FERN**

Age: 58 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Sentinel Butte Formation, North Dakota, USA

One of the proofs that plants never underwent evolution in any form is the fossil fern pictured here. Many scientists state that plants have no common ancestor, and that all plant species appeared suddenly on Earth in the absence of any evolutionary process. If there were such a supposed "forerunner" species of the kind evolutionists claim, then evidence of this should be revealed by now. Moreover, it should be possible to explain through what stages plants diverged from this supposed ancestor. So far, however, no evolutionist has come forward able to offer any explanation in the light of concrete scientific findings. And none will do so in the future, either—because, contrary to what Darwinists maintain, plants never underwent such a process. Almighty and Omniscient God has created all plant species.

## **HONEYSUCKLE LEAF**

Age: 58 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Sentinel Butte Formation, North Dakota, USA

The theory of evolution is not supported by scientific findings and goes no further than being a fantasy, as is stated by a great many scientists. In an article published in the journal *Developmental Biology* in 1996, the evolutionist biologists Gilbert, Opitz and Raff describe how Darwin's theory of evolution is incapable of resolution:

"As Goodwin (1995) points out, 'the origin of species—Darwin's problem—remains unsolved.'" (Scott F. Gilbert, John M. Opitz and Rudolf A. Raff, "Resynthesizing Evolutionary and Developmental Biology," *Developmental Biology*, Vol. 173, article no. 0032, 1996, p. 361)

These words are an admission of the defeat suffered by the theory of evolution in the face of the scientific facts. The 58-million-year-old honeysuckle leaf pictured here once again makes this defeat plain for all to see.

## **BIRCH LEAF**

Age: 58 million years

Period: Paleocene

Location: Sentinel Butte Formation, North Dakota, USA

There are more than 500,000 known species of plant currently alive on Earth. Fossils of these same species are being unearthed one by one, and it is thus being

proved that these plants never underwent evolution in any way. Since they first came into existence, they have remained the same right up to the present day.

A significant number of scientists have realized this fact and admit that the theory of evolution is now discredited. One of these is Paul Lemoine, a former president of the French Geological Society. He admits that evolutionist accounts are insufficient for both zoologists and botanists. Or to put it another way, these branches of science deny evolution:

"Our young people who enjoyed engaging in research regarding the theory of evolution have been deceived. A dogma was established which the whole world is still learning. **Zoologists or botanists have determined that no account offered is satisfactory . . . The conclusion from this summary is that it is impossible for evolution to have taken place.**" (Introduction: De l'Evolution, *Encyclopedie Francaise*, Vol. 5, 1937, p. 6.)

### **SOAPBERRY LEAF**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

The 95-million-year-old fossilized soapberry tree leaf pictured here is another of the proofs of Creation that evolutionists cannot explain. Every new fossil unearthed further confirms the fact of Creation and makes even more insoluble the dilemma in which evolutionists find themselves.

This is a "two-faced" fossil whose traces can be seen on both surfaces of the split rock layers.

### **SOAPBERRY LEAF**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Haqel, Lebanon

No fossil unearthed to date shows that soapberry leaves ever underwent evolution. All soapberry fossils have exactly the same characteristics as those living today. Evolutionists are unable to indicate any supposed evolutionary process or any supposed common ancestor for any living thing, not only for soapberries.

Fossil discoveries show that originally, all living species appeared suddenly on Earth. In other words, they were created. The evolutionist Douglas Futuyma admits this evidence as demonstrated by the fossil record in these words:

"The majority of major groups appear suddenly in the rocks, with virtually no evidence of transition from their ancestors. . . . Hence, the fossil record would be most inadequate exactly where we need it most—at the origin of major new groups

of organisms." (D. Futuyma, *Science on Trial: The Case for Evolution*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1983, pp. 82-83)

### **SOAPBERRY LEAF**

Age: 95 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Nammoura, Lebanon

In the same way as all other plants, soapberries have always existed as soapberries. Specimens obtained during fossil excavations prove as such. The many soapberry fossils discovered show that there is no difference between soapberries living 95 million years ago and those still alive today. This correspondence entirely does away with any claims of plant evolution.

### **FERN**

Age: 354 to 290 million years

Period: Carboniferous

Location: Llewellyn Formation, Pennsylvania, USA

Some of the proofs that plants never evolved are the ferns that are so frequently encountered in the fossil record. No fossilized plant that can be regarded as the forerunner of ferns has so far been found. One of the facts revealed by the fossil record is that ferns emerged suddenly. In other words, they were created.

Another fact that has emerged is that these ferns have never changed over the course of 300 million years, nor have they turned into any other species. Ferns that have remained the same for some 300 million years, clearly demonstrating that evolution is only a figment of the imagination.

## **FOSSIL SPECIMENS OF INSECTS**

### **ANT**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

Evolutionists claim that ants evolved from wild bees some 80 million years ago; that they suddenly began socializing, supposedly "of their own will," 65 to 40 million years ago; and that they represent the highest rung of insect evolution.

If these claims were true, then the 50-million-year-old ant in the photograph should be markedly different from present-day ants, and there should be some very odd-looking creature somewhere between the ants we know and another insect. Or else many of their organs should either be missing or half-formed. Yet there is no



difference between this ant in amber and present-day ants—which invalidates evolutionists' claims.

### **JUMPING SPIDER**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

The distinguishing feature of jumping spiders is that instead of spinning a web and waiting for their prey, they leap to capture it. So perfect are these spiders' ability that they can leap and catch an insect flying in the air half a meter away. The spider is able to make these astonishing leaps thanks to its eight legs that function according to hydraulic principles.

All jumping spiders have possessed this astonishing ability ever since the first day of their existence. None could acquire it gradually, but all were created in full possession of it. The 50-million-year-old jumping spider in the picture, identical to present-day specimens, is proof of this.

### **BUTTERFLY LARVA**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

When butterfly larvae, known as caterpillars, hatch from the egg, their first food is the egg case they emerged from. The larval stage varies from species to species. All butterflies, and their larvae, have shared the same characteristics throughout history. The 50-million-year-old butterfly larva in the picture, identical to larvae alive today, confirms this fact.

### **BRISTLETAILS**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

These insects, members of the sub-order *Archaeognatha* of the order *Thysanura* (bristletails), generally inhabit rocky areas. They have survived for millions of years without changing any of their features.

Every new fossil discovery only increases the predicament in which Darwinists find themselves—and also reveal, yet again, that Creation is an evident truth. Countless life forms such as the *Archaeognatha* refute the theory of evolution and testify that they were created.

### **JUMPING SPIDER**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

Some species of jumping spider are at the same time masters of camouflage. The *Myrmarachne* species of jumping spider, for instance, imitates ants—and not only their appearance, but also their behavior. The spider, having two more legs than an ant's six, raises its two front legs in such a way as to resemble antennae, thus mimicking the ant's six-legged appearance.

But how did this spider compare its own appearance to that of ants? And with what intelligence did it work out how to minimize the differences between the two species?

Moreover, spiders that lived millions of years ago possessed exactly the same ability. It is impossible for Darwinists to account for this in terms of any evolutionary mechanism. No doubt that, like all other living things, spiders act under the inspiration of God and use the characteristics and abilities that He bestowed on them.

Only the two insects on the sides are ants, the one in the middle being a jumping spider, which has one more pair of legs than ants.

### **LARGE JUMPING SPIDER**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

With their appearances, structures, abilities and organs, all jumping spider species have been exactly the same since the day they first came into existence. Not a single fossil specimen indicates that jumping spiders assumed their present status by going through a large number of different stages. Instead, countless fossils showing that they have remained the same for millions of years. One of these is the 50-million-year-old jumping spider preserved in amber in this photograph.

### **ORB WEAVER SPIDER AND FLY**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

These spiders, members of the family *Araneidae*, have white spots on their backs. Another important feature of theirs is that they weave round webs. The spider and the fly here preserved in amber are 50 million years old. With their structures that have remained unchanged for tens of millions of years, these creatures defy the theory of evolution.

### **GROUND SPIDER**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

The fossil spider pictured, a member of the family *Gnaphosidae*, is 50 million years old. There is no difference between it and specimens alive today. This lack of difference cannot be explained with Darwinian logic. If that Darwinian thesis were valid, then over the last 50 million years, the arachnids in question should have changed into very different life forms. Yet no such transformation occurred. Neither could it have, because no evolutionary process among living things ever took place.

### **BARKLOUSE**

Age: 100 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Myanmar

Barklice belong to the order *Psocoptera*. The earliest known fossils date back to the Permian Period (290 to 248 million years ago). The bark louse pictured lived 100 million years earlier, in the Cretaceous Period (144 to 65 million years ago). With their wings, eyes and other organs, barklice have remained unchanged for hundreds of millions of years and invalidate scenarios stemming from evolutionists' imaginations.

## **WASP**

Age: 100 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Myanmar

Despite all their expectations and endeavors, Darwinists have been unable to obtain the evidence they hoped for from the fossil records. Every specimen unearthed reveals that living things have never changed throughout their time on Earth, and no evolutionary transition between living species has been observed.

David M. Raup, former president of the Chicago Museum of Natural History Geology Department, expresses this fact as follows:

"[Darwin] was embarrassed by the fossil record. . . . Well, we are now about 120 years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation hasn't changed much. The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky . . ." (David M. Raup, "Conflicts between Darwin and Paleontology," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Vol. 50, no. 1, January 1979, p. 25)

## **GALL MIDGE**

Age: 100 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Myanmar

With their superior flight techniques and eye structure, flies represent a major dilemma for evolutionists. It is impossible to account for such complex structures as wings and eyes in terms of gradual formation. No fossil fly with only partly developed wings has so far been encountered. All fossil flies are complete, with fully formed wings, visual systems and other structures.

These findings condemn evolutionists to a profound silence, because they mean that living things did not evolve, but were created by God.

## **ASSASSIN BUG**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

Insect species belonging to the order *Hemiptera* include bedbugs, true bugs and other hemipterous insects. The assassin bug pictured is another member of this order. When examined, these modern-day insects can be seen to be identical to this 25-million-year-old fossil.

This completely invalidates the myth of insect evolution. Insects never evolved, as Darwinists maintain. Our Almighty Lord has created all living things in

the form of different species. Insects are one of these different forms and, as can be seen in this specimen, have remained unchanged for millions of years.

### **SOFT-BODIED PLANT BEETLE**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

The plant beetle pictured is a member of the family *Dascillidae*. It is estimated that this family contains 15 genera and some 80 species. The insect pictured possesses exactly the same features as its present-day counterparts, despite being 25 million years old. This example totally does away with the nonsense of "insect evolution" espoused by evolutionists.

### **COCKROACH AND MIDGE**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

These two insects fossilized together in amber have come down to us from 25 million years ago. Close examination shows that the cockroach is identical to its modern-day counterparts. The fossil records show that cockroaches emerged suddenly, without having undergone any form of evolution. The fact that these creatures, which possess highly complex systems and characteristics, came into being without passing through any intermediate stages is one of the proofs of God's Creation.

Despite its being an evolutionist publication, *Focus* magazine cited cockroaches as an example when it admitted the lethal blow that fossils deal to the theory of evolution:

". . . In theory, various elements of pressure such as changing environmental conditions, hostile species and competition between species should lead to natural selection, the selection of species advantaged by mutation, and for these species to undergo greater change over such a long period of time. YET THE FACTS ARE OTHERWISE. Let us consider cockroaches, for example. These reproduce very quickly and have short life spans, yet they have remained the same for approximately 250 million years.

Archaeobacteria are an even more striking example. These emerged 3.5 billion years ago, when the Earth was still very hot, and are still alive today in the boiling waters in Yellowstone National Park." (*Focus* magazine, April 2000.)

### **LONG-HORNED BEETLE**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

One of the most important characteristics of these insects, members of the family *Cerambycidae*, is their antennae, many times longer than their bodies and reminiscent of stag antlers. The antennae of some species living in Asia are known to reach as long as 22 centimeters (8.7 in) in length.

These creatures, fossilized in amber, have come down from millions of years in the past and openly declare the invalidity of the theory of evolution. Today, the fossil record is just about complete; and this fact comes as a terrible disappointment to evolutionist paleontologists. Although countless fossils have been discovered, not a single one constitutes any evidence for Darwinism.

Moreover, the fossils unearthed not only provide no proof of evolution, but they also eliminate the false proofs submitted. In other words, fossil research has revealed a truth far from the expectations of Darwin and the evolutionists who came after him—the fact of Creation.

## **TWO MEALWORM LARVAE**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

This life form, a member of the family *Tenebrionidae* (darkling beetles), is actually a kind of larva. The larvae of beetles in this family are agricultural pests, of which the fossil mealworm pictured is one of the best known.

The larva in amber, pictured here, reveals that there is no difference between mealworms that lived 25 million years ago and those living today, and is one of the findings that refute the theory of evolution. It is important proof that living things never evolved, and that all living things, in the form of different species and complex organisms, were created with the same features they have today.

## **CATERPILLAR**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

Darwin had great hopes for the fossil excavations that would be undertaken in the future. Yet despite the intervening 150 years between his day and the present, none of the intermediate forms he expected has ever been encountered. All fossils unearthed during this time are indications, not of a chaotic process stemming from chance, but of a perfect order that is proof of God's Creation.

Fossils dealt the most severe blow to the theory of evolution. The 25-million-year-old caterpillar in amber is identical to present-day caterpillars and one of the exemplary fossils that invalidates Darwinism.



### **TRUE BUG**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

Evolutionists claim that all forms of life are descended from one another, and they assume that changes constantly took place among living things. The fact is, however, that such a state of constant change would require countless intermediate forms to have existed. For that reason, the supposed evolutionary development that is hypothesized to have taken place should be visible in the fossil record.

Yet there are no such intermediate forms, and no supposed evolutionary development can be seen in the fossil record. For example, the *Encophalid* insect in the picture, a member of the order *Heteroptera*, is exactly the same as those living today. These insects have survived unchanged for 25 million years, meaning that it is impossible to speak of these insects having evolved.

### **SANDHOPPER**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

Amphipods, reminiscent of wood lice in terms of their general appearance, are represented by two sub-orders. They mainly live in deep seas and fresh water, while some species also live in warm, humid locations on dry land.

One of the most important features of those living by the shore is their very powerful sense of direction.

It is God Who creates, knows and Who at every moment keeps under control the universe, the galaxies with their extraordinary balances, life on Earth, all the known and unknown varieties of living things, their life styles, and human beings—as well as a single enzyme in the DNA possessed by every living thing, a single leaf that falls from just one of all the billions of trees in the world, a single micro-organism on the surface of that leaf, and the organelles in that micro-organism responsible for photosynthesis.

It is certainly an easy for Almighty God to create countless living things, all very different to one another at the time He chooses, and all in a single moment. The 25-million-year-old sandhopper pictured is one of the proofs of God's sublime creation.

### **MANTIS, PEDILID BEETLE, AND FUNGUS GNAT**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

This piece of amber contains three different insects that were fossilized at the same time, and are all 25 million years old. Like all living things, these insects have exactly the same features as their counterparts of today, proving that evolution is an imaginary process.

All the structures in living things are without doubt marvels of Creation and the work of an incomparable artistry. These works belong to Almighty God, the Creator of all things and Lord of the Worlds. Whenever our Lord wills a thing, He merely commands it to "Be!"

### **SCALY BARKLOUSE**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

Scaly barklice are members of the order *Psocoptera*. The 25-million-year-old fossil illustrated proves that barklice have been the same throughout the eons, have never evolved, and are not descended from any primitive forerunner. So long as evolutionists insist on ignoring this fact, they will continue looking for non-existent intermediate forms, deceiving people by the use of fraud and spending their entire lives chasing an illusion.

Yet all their endeavors will not alter the fact that living things are the work of Almighty God, and every day, more and more people will stop listening to the myths of Darwinism.

### **SAP BEETLE**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

Of those insects belonging to the family *Nitidulidae* (*Coleoptera*), only those living on flowers are regarded as pests. The great majority of species feed on pollen and sap.

*Coleoptera* alive today have exactly the same characteristics as those that lived millions of years ago. This fact, confirmed by fossil discoveries, is an indication that the insects in question did not form in stages, in other words that they did not evolve.

### **GRASSHOPPER**

Age: 25 million years

Period: Oligocene

Location: Dominican Republic

During his lifetime, Darwin was aware that the existing fossil findings did not confirm his theory. However, he thought that the number of fossils would increase in the future and that discoveries to support his theory would sooner or later be obtained. Darwinists unconditionally shared his view. However, every new fossil unearthed both refuted Darwin's predictions and also dashed all Darwinists' hopes.

No fossils showing that evolution had taken place were found. Every fossil discovered revealed that Creation was an indisputable fact. One such fossil is the 25-million-year-old grasshopper pictured.

### **SCUTTLE FLY**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

The scuttle fly pictured, which lived 45 million years ago, exhibits exactly the same characteristics as other members of its species living in various parts of the world today. This is one of the most important proofs that evolution never happened.

No doubt it is an easy matter for God to recreate or destroy all the living things on Earth, the universe and the galaxies and more, at the moment of His choosing. This is a most important truth that evolutionists are unable to comprehend.

### **DANCE FLY**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

Dance flies are another member of the order *Diptera*, of the family *Empididae*. This insect fossilized in amber has been preserved together with all its features, and shows no difference between it and its counterparts alive today. Concrete findings like this have revealed that evolution is the product of the imagination, and have completely invalidated the theory.

### **WORKER ANT**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

The worker ant pictured belongs to the order *Hymenoptera*, of the family *Formicidae*. As can clearly be seen, it is no different to worker ants living today.

The truth is plain to see for anyone looking at matters objectively and thinking logically: there is no room for evolution in the latest point reached by science. Darwinists are chasing a dream they have invented in their own minds, and refuse to abandon these wraiths, despite scientific evidence of all kinds.

### **DANCEFLY**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

This photograph shows a dance fly from 45 million years ago, fossilized in amber and discovered in Russia. Like other living species, this insect has survived down to the present day together with all its features. It therefore represents yet another defeat suffered by evolutionists in the face of God's impeccable Creation.

### **CLICK BEETLE**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Russia

Evolution never happened in any period in history, and fossils prove this in the most powerful way. Preserved examples of living things that existed millions of years ago show that they were all marvels of Creation, brought into being in a single moment and in perfect form by the sublime might of God.

Paleontology, which evolutionists hoped would come to supply one of the main foundations of their theory, supports the fact of Creation and invalidates the theory of evolution. The 45-million-year-old click beetle fossil pictured emphasizes this fact once again.

### **MOTH FLY**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

Despite all their searching and hard work, evolutionists have failed to find the slightest evidence in the fossil record that any species emerged by way of evolution. This 45-million-year-old moth fly preserved in amber is manifest proof that evolutionists are at a dead end and that their efforts have proved a waste of time. Like all other living things, moth flies have always existed as moth flies, have not descended from any other species, and have never undergone evolution for as long as they've been in existence.

### **BRACONID WASP**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

The examples of intermediate forms that Darwin expected—and hoped—would be discovered in the future have still not been found, despite the passage of 150 years since his time. Full scientific evidence has proved that countless life forms emerged without any evolutionary process.

Ignorantly insisting on defending a theory in the face of so much evidence to the contrary is a sign of intense prejudice. One of the pieces of evidence that can be shown to evolutionists on this subject is this wasp, a member of the family *Braconidae*, that lived 50 million years ago. With its structure that has remained unchanged for all that length of time, this creature tells us that evolutionists are on the wrong track.

### **LONG-LEGGED FLY**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

Like this long-legged fly pictured, the hundreds of fossils in this book (and the billions on Earth) are clear proofs that no such thing as evolution ever took place, and that living things emerged on Earth perfectly formed and in a single moment. In other words, they were created. Almighty God, Lord of the Earth and sky and all that lies between, created the entire universe and all the infinite number of entities, living and non-living, within it.

Led astray by a preconception, evolutionists defend this theory in terrible ignorance. One of the best responses to them is given by fossils, which clearly and indisputable reveal that evolution is a myth.

### **SPIDER**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

The fossil record is one of the clearest evidence by which it can be seen whether the claim of evolution is valid. By now, a large part of the world's sedimentary strata have been excavated and examined, and millions of fossils have been found. Yet not a single specimen has emerged from among them to show that evolution ever happened.

In all respects, the fossil record shows the almighty existence of God, and His sublime creative artistry and might. This 45-million-year-old spider preserved in amber is one of the proofs of the fact of Creation.

### **MOTH**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Kaliningrad, Russia

Not one branch of science supports the theory of evolution. On the contrary, they all produce constant proofs that invalidate it.

Living things did not evolve. This moth that has remained fossilized in amber for the last 45 million years is proof of this fact. Examined close up, it shows no difference from present-day moths. In other words that, like other living things, it never evolved. It is God Who has flawlessly created both those moths that lived 45 million years ago and those alive today, in their present unchanged form.

### **BUTTERFLY CHRYSALIS**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

The "process of evolution" that Darwinists have been recounting for the last 150 years or so is a fantasy. Evolution never happened. Living things did not develop by way of evolution, nor did they give rise to new species by diverging from one another.

Not one single claim of the theory of evolution has been scientifically proven. Not one piece of evidence has been obtained from the fossil record, which should provide Darwinism's greatest and most important support. On the contrary, like this 50-million-year-old butterfly chrysalis, all fossils completely disprove evolution.

### **RAPHIDIOPTERA (SNAKE FLY) LARVA**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

Snake flies, of which there are around 100 species known, live in the shady parts of forested areas. *Raphidioptera* larvae are carnivorous. They feed on small invertebrates, particularly harmful leaf mites. The development of the larvae lasts for approximately two years, during which they go through a number of stages.

It's easy to see that the 50-million-year-old *Raphidioptera* larva pictured is identical to present-day *Raphidioptera* larvae. This declares a fact that Darwinists cannot conceal through distortion and deception: Living things never evolved in any way.

### **PIRATE SPIDER**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

These spiders are members of the family *Mimetidae*. One of their chief distinguishing features is the way they neutralize predators and capture prey through secretions they squirt out. There are some 200 known species. With their physical structures, modes of web-spinning and hunting techniques, every species that lived millions of years ago has exactly the same characteristics as modern-day spiders. This is one of the most important proofs that living things never evolved.

### **BRISTLETAIL**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

Different families of these insects, members of the sub-order *Archaeognata*, live in the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. When one of their legs, antennae or similar appendage is severed, the organ grows back. This fossil shows that *Archaeognatas* living 50 million years ago were the same as present-day specimens in terms of structure and appearance—and is further proof that evolution never occurred. Like all living things, *Archaeognatas* were created by Almighty God.

### **ICHNEUMON WASP**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

The common feature of members of the family *Ichneumonidea* is that they are parasites. Various species can be found across the world, though they generally inhabit the northern hemisphere.

With structures and appearance that have remained unchanged for tens of millions of years, ichneumon wasps refute the theory of evolution. There is no life form that evolutionists can propose as these wasps' supposed common ancestor. Neither can they explain through which stages these insects acquired their present features. No trace of any such ancestor can be found in the fossil record, nor any stage through which they might have passed. As with all other living things, stasis is the common feature of all ichneumon wasp fossils.

### **WALKING STICK**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

One of the important features of these creatures, members of the family *Phasmatidae*, is their ability to change color, depending on light, temperature, humidity and even the abundance of food. This change comes about through an alteration in the density and location of pigment, or else through the formation of new pigment.\* The 50-million-year-old fossil walking stick pictured was also able to change colors, just like specimens living today.

Whatever characteristics present-day *Phasmatidae* have, those that lived 50 million years ago also possessed. In the face of this truth, evolutionist claims are utterly meaningless.

\* Ali Demirsoy, *Yasamin Temel Kuramlari (The Fundamental Theories of Life)*, Vol. II, Part II, p. 406.

### **BUTTERFLY LARVA**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

The larval phase is one of a butterfly's four developmental stages. Larvae mature by going through metamorphosis, then after a period of pupation, emerge as beautiful butterflies. Evidently, this metamorphosis has been taking place in exactly the same way for millions of years, and the process has not changed in any way. The 50-million-year-old butterfly larva in the picture never evolved, and is identical to butterfly larvae in our own day.

The evolutionary claim regarding the origin of life is an atheistic and materialistic account, and not based on any scientific facts. Darwinism is mere conjecture, consisting of imaginary scenarios, false evidence and confused myths. The true origin of life is Creation, as verified by countless proofs.

### **COBWEB SPIDER**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

These spiders, members of the family *Theridiidae*, are a long-legged arachnid that weaves webs with irregular threads and wide spaces. The spiderweb is a great work of art that evolutionists can never account for. All the spiders that have ever lived over millions of years have come into existence with this extraordinary ability bestowed on them by God. This goes to show that, like other living things, spiders never underwent evolution. This 50-million-year-old fossil is clear proof of this.

### **CLICK BEETLE**



Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

These insects, members of the *Elatiderae* family, are able to launch themselves as high as 20 to 30 centimeters (8 to 12 in) in the air and to emit a clicking sound in the process. They are generally found in grasslands and meadows. At moments of danger, they retract their legs and antennae and wait on the ground for the threat to recede. The fossil record has revealed that these life forms have remained unchanged for tens of millions of years.

Evolutionists have tried to mislead people over the years by producing false evidence, but they have never been successful in this. Scientific research has invalidated all such false evidence by revealing the real proof that living things never evolved.

### **CICADA NYMPH**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

Every new discovery shows that living things are not descended from one another and did not evolve in gradual stages, and also once more reveals that they were created in perfect form by God.

This 50-million-year-old cicada larva is identical to those alive today. No physical change of any kind has taken place in their physical structure over the last 50 million years. This once again reminds us of the invalidity of the theory of evolution's myths regarding insect evolution—as well as setting the fact of Creation plainly before our eyes.

### **CICADA**

Age: 50 million years

Period: Eocene

Location: Poland

Cicadas have a pair of membranes located above the air sacs in their abdomens. The cicada produces its familiar shrill by means of these two membranes. When contracted and released by the muscle to which they are attached, the membranes makes a loud cackling sound. This contraction and expansion process carried out by the insect takes place an average of 500 times a second. The sound increases or decreases with the opening or closing of the extension on the abdominal side of the thorax.

Since the human ear is unable to detect individual sounds coming any faster than ten times a second, it is unable to determine the individual segments of a

cicada's call. And so, the noise emitted by cicadas sounds to us like a constant buzzing.

From the fossil record, it appears that all the cicadas that have ever lived have possessed this same characteristic.

Close inspection of the cicada pictured shows that there is no difference between it and present-day specimens. Over the last 50 million years, not the slightest change has taken place in its head, skeletal and wing structure, nor in the plates it uses to emit sounds.

### **DRAGONFLY AND MAYFLY LARVA**

Age: 128 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Yixian Formation, Shang Yuan, Liaoning, China

One of the most important abilities of dragonflies is their enormous maneuverability. No matter at what speed or which direction it may be flying, the dragonfly can suddenly stop and head off again in the opposite direction. Alternatively, it can hover in the air and wait for a suitable position from which to attack its prey. From that position it can make a sharp turn and approach the prey.

In a very short space of time, it can attain 40 kilometers/hour (25 mph), an astonishing speed for an insect. (Olympic 100-meter sprinters manage only 39 kilometers/hour [24.2 mph].) It is impossible to account for the magnificent way in which the dragonfly uses its wings by any model of gradual evolution. The wing represents a complete impasse for evolutionists.

There is no difference between the oldest dragonfly fossils yet discovered and specimens alive today. There is no trace of any "semi-dragonfly" or a dragonfly whose wings were just developing that lived before the earliest known dragonfly. Like other living things, these insects emerged suddenly and have survived unchanged down to the present day. In other words, they were created by God and never evolved at all.

### **GROUND CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Araripe Basin, Brazil

This fossil shows that there is no difference between present-day ground crickets and those that lived 125 million years in the past—proof that no evolutionary process ever took place. The countless fossils unearthed to date have proven that living things did not evolve.

Darwinists are well aware that the fossil record does not support their theory of evolution. That is why hundreds of thousands of fossils are carefully hidden away

from the public eye. However, there is no longer any point in concealing them. It is no longer possible to hide the defeat that the fossil record and scientific findings have inflicted on the theory of evolution.

### **GRASSHOPPER**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Araripe Basin, Brazil

Some grasshopper fossils date back to the Carboniferous Period (354 to 290 million years ago). Yet despite all the hundreds of millions of years that have passed since, grasshoppers have remained grasshoppers and never turned into any other life form. If Darwinists' claims were true, then grasshoppers should have developed and grown ever-stronger due to all their jumping and have turned into some form of bird. But of course, that never actually came about. Yet so severe is the logical collapse among Darwinists that they are even able to sign up to such irrational claims.

The fact revealed by reason, common sense and science is that living things did not evolve, but were created. Every new fossil reveals the truth of this once again.

### **COCKROACH**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Araripe Basin, Brazil

Cockroaches are one of the many living things that challenge evolutionist claims. The fossil cockroach pictured is 125 million years old, and cockroaches have undergone not the slightest change in all that time.

In the same way that all fossil excavations carried out to date have failed to produce any supposed forerunners of the cockroach, it has also failed to show what stages cockroaches might have gone through before assuming their present forms. No matter what its age, every fossil unearthed is identical to all others of its species and to specimens alive today. This is one of the clear proofs that evolution never happened.

### **GRASSHOPPER**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Araripe Basin, Brazil

In the classification of living things, arthropods represent a sub-phylum within the phylum *Insecta*. The earliest insect fossils date back to the Devonian Period

(417 to 354 million years ago). One major dilemma for evolutionists is the way that species that existed 400 million years ago are no different from their counterparts alive today.

The same applies to grasshoppers, which have remained unchanged from the time they first appeared in the fossil record. The grasshopper pictured confirms that 100-million-year-old grasshoppers were identical in every way to present-day grasshoppers, thus refuting evolution.

### **PLANTHOPPER**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Araripe Basin, Brazil

From the structure of their wings to their eyes, from their legs to their internal organs, planthoppers have been the same for tens of millions of years. The 125-million-year-old fossil pictured is confirmation of this. There are no fossil findings of a planthopper with half-developed wings or legs, only one eye or some distinctive organs not yet formed—in short, there is no sign of the intermediate stages claimed by evolutionists.

All the fossil planthoppers unearthed have the same forms as planthoppers today, with all the same organs and limbs, just as if they had died only yesterday. This fact alone is sufficient to invalidate Darwinists' theories.

### **COCKROACH**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Araripe Basin, Brazil

". . . Cockroaches, which are one of the most venerable living insect groups, have remained more or less unchanged since the Permian, yet they have undergone as many mutations as *Drosophila*, a Tertiary insect." (Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 87)

The Permian Period comprises the era of time between 290 and 248 million years ago. In the above extract, Paul Grassé states that on the one hand, mutations—one of the imaginary mechanisms of evolution—do not actually exert the effects of which evolutionists dream. On the other hand, he notes that cockroaches have not undergone the slightest alteration over hundreds of millions of years. Cockroaches that existed 290 million years ago, those like the one pictured that lived 100 million years ago, and those still alive today are all identical to one another. Faced with this fact, evolutionists have no alternative but to retreat into silence.

### **MARCHFLY (*Bibionidae*)**

Age: 45 million years

Period: Middle Eocene

Location: Cache Creek Formation, Canada

No marchfly fossil with wings partly developed and other features missing, with an as yet undeveloped eye or proboscis has to date been found. All fossilized marchflies are fully formed, just like those living today. If an insect alive today has exactly the same characteristics as its counterparts did 45 million years ago—and if it has remained unaltered over all that intervening period of time—then it is impossible to refer to it as having evolved. Along with revealing the invalidity of Darwinism, this stasis also confirms that Creation is an evident fact.

### **DRAGONFLY**

Age: 100 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: China

Not one single incompletely developed, half-winged, rudimentary-eyed dragonfly fossil has ever been found to indicate that an evolutionary process took place. Every dragonfly fossil unearthed shows that the insect was been complete and flawless since it first came into existence, and that it has never changed at all so long as dragonflies have been around.

The 100-million-year-old dragonfly fossil pictured here is one of the discoveries that verify this. Dragonflies living 100 million years ago possessed all the features that their present-day counterparts have.

Scientific evidence, especially the fossil record, has proved the invalidity of the theory of evolution. The significance of this is that living things are created by an infinitely powerful Mind. No doubt that this mind is that of God, the Creator of all things.

### **DRAGONFLY (with its pair)**

Age: 150 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Solnhofen Formation, Germany

With their complex structures, dragonflies have constituted a model for new types of Sikorsky helicopters. Research showed that this insect possesses an ideal flying system. This dragonfly, which lived 150 million years ago, is identical to the perfectly formed dragonflies alive today. There are no traces of a "half dragonfly" or a dragonfly whose wings are just becoming established among all the fossils unearthed so far. Like other species of animals and plants alike, these creatures emerged suddenly and have remained unchanged down to the present day.

This is a fossil that has left positive and negative impressions on the two layers of stone.

### **CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

From Darwin's day down to the present, evolutionist geologists and paleontologists have been looking for fossils to support the theory of evolution. They have sought to come up with any discovery that will show that living things constantly change and develop into other species. Yet their endeavors have served no purpose, because among all the countless fossils unearthed, not one has indicated that living things change, whereas countless specimens prove that species after species has remained unaltered over hundreds of millions of years. This means that evolution never occurred.

The paleontologist David Raup expresses this fact revealed by the fossil record, which has completely routed Darwinism:

"Instead of finding the gradual unfolding of life, what geologists of Darwin's time, and geologists of the present day actually find is a highly uneven or jerky record; that is, species appear in the sequence very suddenly, show little or no change during their existence in the record, then abruptly go out of the record..." (David M. Raup, "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Chicago, Vol. 50, January 1979, p. 23)

### **COCKROACH**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

The lack of any difference between the 125-million-year-old cockroach fossil pictured here and specimens alive today very clearly and distinctly re-emphasizes that the claim that distinct species descended gradually from one another is a myth, in conflict with the scientific facts.

The fossil record invalidates the claim of "gradual evolution," and this fact is admitted by a large number of scientists. Historian of science Peter Bowler has this to say:

"The record certainly did not reveal gradual transformations of structure in the course of time. On the contrary, it showed that species generally remained constant throughout their history and were replaced quite suddenly by significantly different forms. New types or classes seemed to appear fully formed, with no sign of an

evolutionary trend by which they could have emerged from an earlier type." (Peter J. Bowler, *Evolution: The History of an Idea*, 1984, p. 187)

### **CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

These crickets, members of the class *Saltatoria*, are among the countless living things that have survived unchanged over the course of tens of millions of years. Crickets alive 125 million years ago were identical to those living today.

This "sameness" revealed by the fossil record has inflicted a grave disappointment on evolutionists. Stephen Jay Gould, one of the 20th century's most prominent evolutionists, expressed this disappointment in these terms:

"Indeed, it is the chief frustration of the fossil record that we do not have empirical evidence for sustained trends in the evolution of most complex morphological adaptations." (Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge, "*Species Selection: Its Range and Power*," Scientific correspondence in *Nature*, Vol. 334, 07 July 1988, p. 19)

### **DRAGONFLY NYMPH**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Dragonflies are known to have been in existence for some 300 million years. And with their extraordinary wing structures and flying systems, they inflict a heavy blow on Darwinism. Three hundred million years ago, at a time when it is claimed that only primitive life forms and a primitive environment supposedly existed, dragonflies already possessed a flawless flying system that's now used as a model for the most advanced helicopters. And those insects' system has undergone not the slightest change right down to the present. Dragonfly larvae have also had exactly the same anatomy for hundreds of millions of years, and have used the exact same structural mechanisms to catch prey. It is impossible to account for this state of affairs in evolutionary terms.

### **MAYFLY**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Mayflies have remained unaltered over the course of some 100 million years, and are yet another of the many life forms that challenge evolution. All mayfly

fossils show that these insects did not develop in stages, but that they emerged suddenly on the Earth, together with all their characteristics. Furthermore, they have never changed throughout all the time they appear in the fossil record. This demonstrates that, like all other living things, mayflies did not evolve, but were created.

#### **MAYFLY**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

If all living things acquired the characteristics they now possess gradually, as evolutionists maintain, there should be a great many fossil specimens displaying these intermediate phases. For example, a large number of fossils proving that mayflies developed their wings in stages should have been unearthed. But as with the 125-million-year-old mayfly fossil pictured here, in all the fossil specimens so far obtained, these insects appear together with all the same characteristics they possess today.

This situation renders claims of evolution utterly meaningless. Concrete scientific findings reveal that in fact, evolution never happened, and that God is the Creator of all living things.

#### **WATER STRIDER (*Gerridae*)**

Age: 150 million years

Period: Jurassic

Location: Solnhofen Formation, Germany

Like many other creatures, fossilized and still living, insects belonging to the family *Gerridae* present evidence that invalidates Darwinism. This *Gerridae* fossil, 150 million years old and dating back to the Jurassic Period, makes the invalidity of evolution. All these fossils indicate these evident truths: God has created all living things, these creatures have survived unchanged right down to the present day, and living things have never evolved.

#### **WINGED STINK BUG (*Pentatomidae*)**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Darwinists claim that atoms such as phosphorus and carbon combined together by chance and organized themselves as the result of natural phenomena such as lightning, volcanoes, ultraviolet rays and radiation and gave rise to proteins, cells, insects, fish, cats, rabbits, lions, birds, human beings and all of life.



But they never stop to think that atoms are merely unconscious, inanimate units of matter with no intelligence or abilities.

In addition, they fail to appreciate that they have not a single piece of evidence to prove that this imaginary process ever took place.

As evolutionists founder from a lack of evidence, there are countless proofs showing that living things never evolved, but were created by Almighty God. One such proof is this 125-million-year-old fossil pictured here.

### **GROUND CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Darwinists make a great many baseless claims about the origin of life, and there are hundreds of questions they need to answer. Heading the list of these questions is this:

- Are there any intermediate forms that can be proposed as evidence for the theory of evolution?

The obvious answer to this question—to which Darwinists constantly avoid responding, in order to avoid having to face the facts, is No! Not one single intermediate form fossil has ever been found in excavations conducted over the last 150 years.

The fossil record is filled with examples of animals and plants that have survived with all their structures, never undergoing the least alteration, for hundreds of millions of years. One such specimen is the 125-million-year-old cricket pictured here. When confronted by these specimens, Darwinists are condemned to silence.

### **GROUND CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Asked about the origin of insects, Darwinists relate a series of hypotheses totally devoid of any logic. Asked to prove these stories with some scientific findings or concrete evidence, they enter into a profound silence—because all the theoretical studies to date, and findings such as fossils, completely invalidate these claims.

One of the pieces of evidence invalidating evolutionists' claims is the 125-million-year-old ground cricket fossil illustrated here. This fossilized insect, identical in every respect to ground crickets alive today, refutes evolutionist claims that

living things are in a constant state of change. Fossils show that living things tell us, "We never changed or evolved. We were created."

### **WASP**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Darwinists believe in the myth that imaginary mechanisms constantly transform living things into new species. The findings that most strongly demolish the evolutionist dream of living things being in a state of change come from the fossil record. As the 125-million-year-old wasp fossil pictured here shows, living things do not change. In other words, they do not evolve.

The paleontologist David Raup expresses how the geologic record contradicts Darwinism in these words:

"He [Darwin] was embarrassed by the fossil record because it didn't look the way he predicted it would and, as a result, he devoted a long section of his *Origin of Species* to an attempt to explain and rationalize the differences. There were several problems, but the principle one was that the geologic record did not then and still does not yield a finely graduated chain of slow and progressive evolution." (David M. Raup, "Conflicts between Darwin and Paleontology," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Chicago, Vol. 50, January 1979, pp. 22-23)

### **PLANTHOPPER**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

There are some 1,000,000 known insect species living on Earth, and some 15,000 fossil species. Every year, several thousand more species of insect are discovered. Each of them has entirely different systems, metabolisms and habitats.

Evolutionists maintain that all these species gradually developed from one another by way of very small changes. However, they cannot pinpoint the first supposed ancestor of insects, nor any imaginary family relationship between species. They desperately look for fossils that could indicate these. Yet every new fossil acquired reveals that this insect species came into being out of nothing, with all its particular characteristics. In other words, it was created, and that has remained unchanged for tens or even hundreds of millions of years—meaning that it never underwent evolution.

One of the proofs of this state of affairs is the 125-million-year-old fossilized planthopper pictured here. Identical in every way to planthoppers alive today, this fossil refutes evolution.

### **MAYFLY**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

If, as claimed, all living things evolved, then signs of this should be visible in the fossil record. Fossil discoveries should reveal the traces of entities in a constant state of progression, with incompletely developed systems and organs, slowly turning from one species into another.

For example, there should be many peculiar fossils of half-crickets and half-flies, or half flies and half-butterflies, or whose wings had only partly formed, with a single eye on their abdomens, with feet protruding from their heads or whose antennae had not appeared.

Yet the fossil record provides no examples of any such strange, rudimentary creatures. On the contrary, countless fossils show that living things emerged with all their limbs and systems complete, and that they never changed so long as their species continued to exist. D. S. Woodroff from California University says this on the subject:

"But fossil species remain unchanged throughout most of their history and the record fails to contain a single example of a significant transition." (D. S. Woodroff, *Science*, vol. 208, 1980, p. 716)

### **GROUND CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

The "lines of descent" among living things that frequently appear in evolutionist publications are no more than an imaginary concept. No concrete finding of any evolutionary link between living things has so far been discovered.

Scientists state that the fossil record and other findings indicate no such relationship:

"It is, however, very difficult to establish the precise lines of descent, termed phylogenies, for most organisms." (F. J. Ayala and J. W. Valentine, *Evolving: The Theory and Process of Organic Evolution*, 1978, p. 230)

The 125-million-year-old ground cricket pictured here is not descended from any forerunner, and has remained unchanged throughout the course of its species' existence.

## **MAYFLY**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Mayflies spend much of their life spans as larvae or nymphs. They live as adults only for a few hours or days. They are therefore also known as "one-day flies," or in French, *éphémères*, for "ephemerals." The mayfly fossil pictured here is 125 million years old, and is identical to mayflies living in the present day.

Darwinists are in a despairing position when faced with mayflies like this one, which has remained the same for 125 million years and has never undergone even the slightest alteration.

## **SPIDER**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

The theory of evolution is entirely conjectural, devoid of any scientific criteria and based on no valid evidence. Moreover, it bases its entire claim on the illogical and unrealistic thesis that all living things in existence formed as the result of a succession of countless coincidences—something quite impossible.

Scientific research and investigations confirm this state of affairs. For example, examination of the fossil record shows that no process of the kind maintained by evolutionists ever happened. It can be seen that living things did not develop by way of a succession of changes, but that each one appeared suddenly with all its characteristics complete. This means that living things did not evolve, but were created.

## **MAYFLY**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Fossils are one of the most striking proofs that evolution never occurred. When the fossil record is examined, it reveals that all living species have remained the same over millions of years, and that they never changed until and unless their species became extinct. Joel Cracraft from the American Museum of Natural History states how, according to the fossil record, there is no transition between species:

". . . [I]t should come as no surprise that it would be extremely difficult to find a specific fossil species that is both intermediate in morphology between two other taxa and is also in the appropriate stratigraphic position." (Joel Cracraft,

"Systematics, Comparative Biology, and the Case against Creationism," in *Scientists Confront Creationism*, ed. L. R. Godfrey, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1983, p. 180)

Cracraft's reference to the finding of intermediate form fossils as something "extraordinarily difficult" stems from an unwillingness to come out and say, "There are no such fossils." Although he is reluctant to state this openly, the fact is that the fossils in question have never been found, and it is impossible that they will ever be unearthed in the future.

### **GROUND CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

The 125-million-year-old ground cricket fossil pictured here is one of the proofs that deal a lethal blow to Darwinism. The theory of evolution's claims regarding the origins of life have been invalidated, and the theory has been revealed to be built upon gaps that cannot possibly be filled by realistic and scientific data.

C. McGowan, an expert on vertebrate paleontology, refers to these significant gaps as follows:

". . . [W]e have so many gaps in the evolutionary history of life, gaps in such key areas as the origin of the multicellular organisms, the origin of the vertebrates, not to mention the origins of most invertebrate groups." (Christopher McGowan, *In the Beginning: A Scientist Shows Why the Creationists Are Wrong*, New York: Prometheus Books, 1984, p. 95)

### **GROUND CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

If, as evolutionists maintain, ground crickets are descended from other insects, then a great many fossil specimens of "semi-ground crickets" insects that had just been in the process of turning into their final form should have been found. Yet all the cricket fossils unearthed to date have complete and flawless structures and are identical to those living today. The thesis that living things are descended from a common forebear remains just a dream.

Steven Stanley, a professor of paleontology, expresses this state of affairs thus:

"Species that were once thought to have turned into others have been found to overlap in time with these alleged descendants. In fact, the fossil record does not convincingly document a single transition from one species to another." (S. M.

Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable: Fossils, Genes and the Origin of Species*, New York: Basic Books, 1981, p. 95)

### **MAYFLY NYMPH**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Larvae such as those of the mayfly have remained just the same for as long as they have been in existence. The 125-million-year-old mayfly nymph pictured here is proof of this. Both mayflies and their larvae, stages of insects that have remained unchanged over tens of millions of years, silence evolutionists.

### **GROUND CRICKET**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Although there are countless questions that Darwinists cannot answer, they continue to defend their theories with blind devotion. For example, they leave unanswered the question of, "What was the supposed forerunner of the ground cricket?" So do they the question of, "Through what stages did ground crickets pass in their descent from this supposed forebear?" And also, the question, "If these creatures developed in stages, how can we account for the fact that ground crickets that lived 125 million years ago are identical to those alive today?"

The list of such questions can be lengthened enormously. All these unanswered questions are an indication of the scale of the predicament in which Darwinism finds itself.

### **SPIDER**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

It is astonishing that people who claim to speak in the name of science can defend such an outdated theory as evolution in the face of evidence from that same scientific discipline. Countless fossils have proved the invalidity of evolution, and it is illogical to attempt to hide from the facts by distorting them. Like this 125-million-year-old fossilized spider, fossil specimens belonging to countless different life forms have all clearly revealed that evolution never happened.

What scientists need to do is not to ignore this state of affairs, but to concur with what scientific evidence shows. And what it shows is Creation.

### **DRAGONFLY**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

The superior nature of the dragonfly wing structure and its sophisticated flying mechanism can still not be fully replicated by present-day technology. Dragonflies use the same systems today as they did 125 million years ago, and fly with the same perfection and maneuverability.

The fossil pictured here proves this, refutes Darwinism, and once again reveals that all living things are the work of God.

### **WASP**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

A. Brouwer, author of the book *General Paleontology*, summarizes the defeat suffered by Darwinism at the hands of fossils:

"One of the most surprising negative results of paleontological research in the last century is that such transitional forms seem to be inordinately scarce. In Darwin's time this could perhaps be ascribed with some justification to the incompleteness of the paleontological record and to lack of knowledge, but with the enormous number of fossil species which have been discovered since then, other causes must be found for the almost complete absence of transitional forms." (A. Brouwer, *General Paleontology* [translated by R. H. Kaye], Edinburgh & London: Oliver & Boyd, 1967, pp. 162-163)

Evolutionists do not need to "look for excuses," as Brouwer puts it, but to see the facts. Countless fossils, such as the 125-million-year-old wasp fossil pictured here, show that evolution never took place, and that living things are created.

### **MAYFLY NYMPH**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

The 2,500 known species of mayfly belong to the class *Ephemeroptera*. The appearances, structures and systems of all mayfly fossils discovered to date are exactly the same. The lack of any structural differences between mayflies that lived in different eras, despite the intervening millions of years, demolishes the hypotheses put forward by evolutionists. Clearly, that living things are not the product of successive coincidences and in a state of constant change. Almighty and All-Powerful God has created all living things.

**MAYFLY NYMPH**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

The earliest known mayfly fossils date back some 200 million years. Mayflies that lived 200 million or 125 million years ago, as well as those alive today, are all identical. This is one of the proofs that living things never evolved.



**MAYFLY**

Age: 125 million years

Period: Cretaceous

Location: Santana Formation, Brazil

Evolutionists are unable to explain how mayflies have remained unchanged for around 100 million years. To confirm their theories that living things have undergone evolution, they need to be able to observe species in constant change, or else support their claims with fossil discoveries. Yet no such changes, and no such fossil findings have ever been encountered. It is thus impossible to speak in terms of an evolutionary process. The structures and features of living things and the fossil record both prove that evolution never happened.

# Dipnotlari

1. C. Darwin, *The Origin Of Species*, Chapter X, "On the Imperfection of the Geological Record."
2. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter X, p. 234.
3. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter I, p. 179.
4. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter I, p. 172.
5. N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982, pp. 45-46.
6. R. A. Raff and T. C. Kaufman, *Embryos, Genes and Evolution: The Developmental Genetic Basis of Evolutionary Change*, Indiana University Press, 1991, p. 34.
7. T. N. George, "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *Science Progress*, Vol. 48, January 1960, p. 1.
8. N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, p. 59.
9. *Science*, July 17, 1981, p. 289.
10. S. M. Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable: Fossils, Genes, and the Origin of Species*, Basic Books Inc. Publishers, N.Y., 1981, p. 71.
11. R. Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, 1986, p. 229.
12. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 1st ed., p. 302.
13. M. Czarnecki, *McLean's*, 19 January 1981, p. 56.
14. H. Gee, *In Search of Deep Time, Beyond the Fossil Record to a New History of Life*, The Free Press, A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1999, p. 5.
15. A. S. Romer, *Chapter in Genetics, Paleontology and Evolution* (1963), p. 114
16. N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, p. 127.
17. M. Midgley, *Evolution as a Religion*, London: Routledge Classics, 2002, p. 1.
18. E. O. Wilson, et al., *Life on Earth*, [1973], Sinauer Associates: Sunderland MA, 1975, reprint, p. 624.
19. F. Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1982, pp. 30-31.
20. F. Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, pp. 30-31.

# ONCE UPON A TIME THERE WAS DARWINISM

## INTRODUCTION

Throughout the years, people have observed their universe and tried to uncover its secrets. To answer some thorny questions, many scientists have made important discoveries, considering the restrictions of the age they lived in; and others have been noteworthy in their own times, yet the claims they made later came to be regarded as scientific errors.

Claudius Ptolemy was a scientist and philosopher of the second century CE, who lived in Alexandria when it was the center of scientific research. He observed the skies in order to learn about the universe and the world's place in it and pondered the movements of the Sun, Moon and stars. Finally, he concluded that the Earth must be the center of the universe. According to his theory, the Earth was motionless, and the Sun, Moon and the stars all rotated around it. His writings attracted much attention, were translated into many languages, and had a great influence, especially on European culture. The Catholic Church based its theology on Ptolemy's Earth-centered model. Within a short time, some people noticed discrepancies in his theory, but were forced into silence because of the wide popularity that Ptolemy enjoyed. Once noticed, however, these discrepancies could not be easily ignored. By the 15th century, Copernicus had shown the errors in Ptolemy's ideas and came out firmly against the idea of an Earth-centered universe. As the centuries went on, it became known that the Earth was a planet revolving around the Sun, which was only one star among millions of others in the Milky Way, and that the Milky Way was just one example of countless other galaxies composed of stars.

Humans had always been fascinated by fire and the flames it gives off, but its secret had not yet been discovered. Towards the end of the 1600s, a German scientist, G.E. Stahl, tried to discover the source of fire. As a result of his experiments, he proposed that fire was caused by an invisible substance called *phlogiston*, which he believed could penetrate and emerge from objects. Any object that contained phlogiston burned quickly, while substances lacking phlogiston did not burn at all. The smoke coming from a burning object was thought to be expulsion of phlogiston from it, as the burning material shrank and weakened. It was also believed that when burning material was smothered, it hindered the expulsion of phlogiston, and so the fire went out. But in time it was observed that

metals did not shrink or weaken as they burned, and so certain doubts grew up about phlogiston's reality.

Towards the end of the 18th century, the atmosphere was found to be composed of several different gasses. While some tried to explain the different ways in which these gasses burned in terms of the phlogiston theory, experiments performed with oxygen showed the theory to be invalid. As a result of his observing metal burning in oxygen, Antoine Lavoisier, a French scientist, discovered that the weight of the burning metal increased, while the amount of oxygen decreased. His experiments demonstrated the source of fire. Objects burn when they absorb oxygen. The hypothetical substance called phlogiston had never existed!

Another example of an historic scientific error is the "explanation" for the origin of electricity. In the 1780s, Italian physician Luigi Galvani performed experiments with animals and suddenly came across a new source of electricity—or so he believed. In his experiments with frogs, he saw the frog's leg muscles contract when in contact with metal. As a result, he concluded that metal extracts electricity from the muscles and nerves of animals.

Galvani had performed this experiment on one single leg with one piece of metal. However, Alessandro Volta, a colleague of his who suspected the real explanation behind this experiment, began his own work on the subject. He attached two ends of a wire to a frog's leg and observed no muscular contraction. After this, Volta went on to refute the proposal that electricity came from a frog or any other animal. Electricity is produced by a stream of electrons, and metal conducts the electrons more easily. The theory of "animal electricity" was simply an error of a particular moment in history.

These examples clearly show that in the past, some totally wrong claims have been made about processes that are very well known today. Scientists have been caught up in various errors either because of the unsophisticated research equipment of their time, their limited understanding, or because of their own prejudices. Among such scientific errors, the greatest—and most enduring—historic example is one theory put forward concerning the origins of life. This theory's illogical claims have exerted a much greater influence than any of the examples given above. This error, called Darwinism, unites a materialist world view with a belief in evolution.

At one time, with insufficient evidence at hand, some people regarded this theory as scientific. Charles Darwin's book *The Origin of Species* was known to be inconsistent, even at the time of its publication in 1859, but it awakened interest in some circles. Darwin made his assumptions without the benefit of genetics or biochemistry. But the mistaken claims he made, based on the then-insufficient fossil record, were avidly welcomed by those inclined to accept them for philosophical reasons. There was a clear affinity between Darwin's theory and

materialist philosophy. Darwin tried to explain the origins of all living things in terms of chance and material factors, and therefore his theory rejected the existence of a Creator. It would take a series of discoveries made in the 20th century to show his theory to be wrong, completely irrational and illogical.

In a few scientific circles, Darwinism is still a widespread obsession, but this does not preclude the knowledge that its days have come to an end. All the scientific suppositions that once supported the theory have crumbled, one by one. The only reason why Darwinism is still alive is because in some scientific circles, a few fanatics still passionately espouse the materialist philosophy it's based on. The world of Darwinism resembles the Soviet Union in the second half of the 1980s, when the Communist ideology had collapsed and its suppositions had been proved wrong, but the institutions of the communist system remained in existence. The generations who had been brainwashed by communist ideology still espoused it blindly. Because of their dogmatism, the Communist system that for all practical purposes had collapsed was kept alive for a while longer. It was hoped that policies such as Glasnost and Perestroika could reform and revive it. Yet the inevitable collapse eventually took place.

Long before this collapse, however, some perceived that communism was basically exhausted. Many Western observers wrote that the Soviet establishment could do no more than slow down the inevitable collapse for a little while.

In this book, we describe how Darwinism, too, has long been defunct from the scientific point of view. It convinced some individuals for a while, but it finally became clear that it never had any real scientific foundation. The claims used in support of Darwinism over the past 150 years have all been rendered invalid. All the alleged "proofs" of evolution have been refuted, one by one. Soon, all those in the scientific community who are laboring under the delusion of such a theory will realize the truth and be astonished at how they could have been taken in. As the Swedish scientist Søren Løvtrup said, *"I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science."*<sup>1</sup> For this realization to come about, all the necessary scientific data are there. All that remains is for some scientific circles to accept the fact.

In the following pages, we'll examine some scientific data that have invalidated the theory of evolution; and show that this great error was based on the inadequate level of 19th-century science.

# **DARWINISM'S CRUMBLING MYTHS AND THE CORRECT DEFINITION OF SCIENCE**

If today's journalists, writers, philosophers, scientists, academics or university students were surveyed as to why they believe in the theory of evolution and what the evidence for it is, most of their answers would be unscientific myths. We can list the most common of these myths, together with why they are erroneous:

1. Proponents of evolution claim that scientific experiments have shown that life came into being spontaneously, as the result of chemical reactions. But in fact, no scientific experiment supports this claim and, moreover, it has been shown to be theoretically impossible.

2. They think that the fossil record proves that there has been a process of evolution on Earth. On the contrary, however, all fossils reveal a natural history completely at odds with Darwin's theory: Species did not come into existence by stages through any process of evolution, but were created in all their perfection in one instant.

3. They think that the celebrated Archaeopteryx fossil proves their thesis that birds evolved from reptiles. But it is now known that Archaeopteryx was a true bird, capable of flight, and no reptile ancestor has ever been found. Not a single piece of evidence remains to support the evolutionists' claim that birds evolved from reptiles.

4. For years, "the evolution of the horse" was portrayed as one of the best documented proofs of the theory of evolution. Four-legged mammals that had lived in different periods were set out in order of size, from small to large, and this "horse series" was exhibited in museums of natural history. Research in recent years, however, has shown that the creatures in the sequence are not one another's ancestors, that the sequencing is seriously flawed, and that creatures depicted as the ancestor of the horse actually emerged after it.

5. They believe that England's famous Industrial Revolution moths offer a proof of evolution by natural selection. However, the color change that occurred in moths during the Industrial Revolution has been proven not to be the result of natural selection. These butterflies did not change color; it was only that there were more pale moths at first but environmental conditions diminished their numbers, while the number of dark-colored moths increased. After this claim was realized to be a scientific fraud, evolutionists lost one more of their so-called proofs.

6. They claim that in fossil remains, there are traces of "ape men" proving that human beings are descended from a common ancestor with apes. However, all claims in this regard rest only on prejudiced assumptions, and even evolutionists

are forced to admit that there is no fossil evidence for human evolution. For example, Richard Leakey, an evolutionist paleoanthropologist, writes:

David Pilbeam comments wryly, 'If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meagre evidence we've got, he'd surely say, "Forget it: there isn't enough to go on".' Neither David nor others involved in the search for mankind can take this advice, of course, but we remain fully aware of the dangers of drawing conclusions from evidence that is so incomplete.<sup>2</sup>

David Pilbeam, whom Leakey quotes above, is also an evolutionist paleontologist. As he admits:

My reservations concern not so much this book [Richard Leakey's *Origins*] but the whole subject and methodology of paleoanthropology. . . . Perhaps generations of students of human evolution, including myself, have been flailing about in the dark; . . . our data base is too sparse, too slippery, for it to be able to mold our theories.<sup>3</sup>

The fossils claimed to be those of human beings' so-called ancestors have been shown to belong to either an extinct species of ape, or a different race of human being. As a result, evolutionists are left without a single proof to substantiate their thesis that human beings and apes evolved from a single ancestor.

7. They claim that the embryos of human beings and other creatures undergo the same "process of evolution" in their mothers' womb or in the egg. They even say that a human embryo has gills that subsequently disappear. These claims have been shown to be completely unfounded and to rest on a major scientific fabrication. An evolutionist biologist by the name of Ernst Haeckel first made this claim; he deliberately made changes in his drawings to suggest that the embryos were similar to one another. Later, even evolutionist scientists came to accept that his claim was based on an unscientific fabrication.

8. They think that human beings and other living things have vestigial organs that have lost their function; and even believe that a great deal of DNA is "junk" with no particular function. But all these claims are known to be the result of scientific ignorance. Over time, as science advanced, it was discovered that all organs and genes are indeed functional. This shows that living creatures do not have organs that have ceased to function, through the so-called process of evolution, as a result of not being used. Rather, it shows that these creatures, with all their organs and component parts, are not the work of chance but of a perfect creation.

9. They think that the variation in a single species—for example, the differences in the size and shape of the bills of the Galapagos Islands' finches—is a strong proof of evolution. But this is known to be no proof of evolution: Micro-changes in the structure of a bird's bill cannot create new biological data, in the

form of new organs, and so do not constitute evolution. As a result, even neo-Darwinists today realize that some variations within a species cannot result in evolution.

10. They believe that mutations in experiments with fruit flies have been able to produce new species. But these experiments produced only physically impaired or sterile individuals, and no "beneficial" mutation was observed. Even in the case of mutations produced under the control of knowledgeable scientists, no new species were formed; this proves that there is no such thing as evolution. Therefore, it is impossible to point to mutations as proof of evolution.

A large number of those interviewed, if asked why they believe in evolution, would actually know very few of the examples mentioned above, or know them only superficially. These myths they read about a few times or heard about from their high-school teachers have convinced them of evolution, and they see no reason to investigate further.

However, every one of the supposed proofs above is completely invalid. This is no groundless claim, but a fact proven with solid evidence by scientists critical of the theory of evolution—as we'll explore in the following pages.

In his criticism of Darwinism, a well-known American biologist, Jonathan Wells,<sup>4</sup> refers to the myths of evolution as "the icons of evolution." By "icons," he means false and superstitious beliefs that every supporter of evolution knows by heart. The word "icon" describes objects of veneration that some false religions use to remind their members of what they regard as sacred. Some of the iconic symbols used to support the theory of evolution (which is actually an atheistic religion)<sup>5</sup> for its devotees are drawings of the "ape man," "gills on a human embryo," and other such scientific fabrications. But each one of these depicts a groundless myth. Wells' book, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong?*, lists ten icons that correspond to the list we have given here and explains in detail why all have been rendered invalid.

Today these myths are all discredited, and evolutionists have proposed no new proofs to replace them. As a theory, Darwinism convinced some people in the 19th century, when scientific conditions were unsophisticated. But in the 21st century, Darwinism has been revealed as defunct, outmoded and invalid.

## **Religion and Science Never Conflict**

Before we proceed to trace the demise of Darwinism's myths in the following pages, we must show the invalidity of another idea that binds supporters of evolutionary theory.

This is the false assumption that there exists a conflict between religion and science. Those who defend this assumption claim that the theory of evolution must be true because "scientists" unanimously accepted it as scientifically proven. They



propose that Creation is a theory for "faith" only, but not for science. However, such assertions are not based on the facts. As an example, take the ongoing argument about how the theory of evolution should be taught in United States schools. This argument is carried on solely on a scientific level, but there are attempts to show it as the "disagreement between the churches and scientists." News broadcast by some media organizations, and articles in some newspapers on the matter, all suffer from the same superficial assumptions, which are wrong for the following reasons:

First, Creation is supported by scientific evidence. The present evolution-versus-Creation debate is not between scientists and the churches, but between scientists who stubbornly believe in the theory of evolution and other scientists who see that this theory is invalid. All the available evidence argues against evolution. On the strength of this evidence, the theory of evolution in the USA has declined since the second half of the 20th century, which decline has influenced the decision taken in states like Kansas, Georgia and Ohio that schools must also teach the evidence for the theory of evolution's invalidity. In the USA, a powerful opposition arose against the theory of evolution. All members of this movement are scientists from the country's notable universities. In the 1970s Professor Dean Kenyon wrote a thesis on the origin of life and chemical evolution that made him one of evolution's well-known proponents. Today, he is a representative of the opposition movement against the theory of evolution and believes that the origins of life cannot be explained by evolution, only by creation.

### **The Legacy of Dogmatism, from Epicurus to Darwinism**

Benjamin Wiker teaches science and theology at Franciscan University. His book *Moral Darwinism: How We Became Hedonists* gives a detailed account of Darwin's "theory of evolution" as a latter-day version of the materialist philosophy of the Greek thinker Epicurus and his Roman counterpart, Lucretius.

Darwin followed these two philosophers in writing in detail about such unscientific ideas as:

- 1 Nature is a system that regulates itself.
- 2 Among living creatures, there is a merciless struggle for life and this leads to evolution by means of natural selection.
- 3 It should be avoided to give a "teleological" (the idea that they came into being for a purpose) account of nature and living things.

What is striking is that these ideas are not scientific. Neither Epicurus nor Lucretius conducted scientific experiments or made observations; they just used logic completely in line with their own wishes. Moreover, their logic had an interesting starting point. Epicurus rejected the existence of a Creator, saying that it entailed belief in an afterlife, for which reason he felt himself circumscribed. He

clearly stated that his whole philosophy developed from his unwillingness to accept this proposition. In other words, Epicurus chose atheism for his own psychological comfort and later, undertook to construct a worldview based on this choice. For this reason he endeavored to explain the order of the universe and the origins of life in terms of an atheist system and with this purpose in mind, adopted ideas that would later prove basic to evolution.

Benjamin Wiker gives this detailed interpretation of the relation between Epicurus and Darwin:

The first Darwinian was not Darwin, but a rather notorious Greek, Epicurus, born on the Island of Samos about 341 B.C. It was he who provided the philosophical underpinnings of Darwinism, because it was he who fashioned an entirely materialistic, [atheistic] cosmology, where the purposeless jostling of brute matter over infinite time yielded, by a series of fortunate accidents, not only the Earth, but all the myriad forms of life thereon. . . .

After stating that Epicurus fashioned the cosmology, not out of evidence but from his desire to abstract the world from the idea of a Creator, Wiker goes on to say:

. . . This common disdain for religion unites Epicureanism and modernity because we moderns [Darwinists] are the heirs of Epicurus. Through a long and winding path, a revived form of Epicurean materialism became the founding creed of modern scientific materialism—the very materialist cosmology that Darwin assumed in the *Origin* and that still grounds the materialist dismissal of design in nature.<sup>6</sup>

Today, those motivated to stubbornly defend the theory of evolution are not on the side of science, but on the side of atheism. Like their precursor Epicurus, their attachment to atheism stems from the awareness that accepting the existence of God would clash with their own selfish desires.

There is a verse in the Qur'an in which God completely describes the situation of non-believers: **"And they repudiated them wrongly and haughtily, in spite of their own certainty about them."** (Surat an-Naml: 14) And in another verse, He reveals, **"Have you seen him who has taken his whims and desires to be his deity?"** (Surat al-Furqan: 43)

The Epicurus-Darwinist "clan" rejects the existence of God only because His existence conflicts with their personal desires and passions; in this, they are very much like those described in the verse above. Therefore, it is very deceptive to regard the evolution-Creation argument as a conflict between science and religion.

Evolution and Creation, two different explanations of the origins of life and the universe, have existed from ancient times. In order to understand which of these explanations is scientifically correct, we have to consider the discoveries of science.

Here, as in our other books, we will once again see how all findings prove that the theory of evolution is erroneous, and that Creation is true.

### **It is False that Science Must Be Atheistic**

There is no compulsion for science to be atheistic, that is, to believe in and to maintain the dogma that the universe is composed of matter only, and that there is no consciousness apart from matter. Science must investigate its discoveries and go wherever true discoveries may lead.

Today various branches of science such as astrophysics, physics and biology clearly demonstrate the examples of creation in the universe and in nature, which are impossible to explain in terms of random events. All proofs point towards a Creator. This Creator is God Whose eternal power and intelligence has created the heavens, the Earth and all things animate and inanimate that lie between.

The unproven "faith" is atheism. The following pages will show that atheism's most important support—that is, Darwinism—has collapsed.

## **ONCE, LIFE WAS THOUGHT TO BE SIMPLE**

Darwinism claims that all living things on Earth came into being not through any purpose or plan, but as a result of random events. The first link in this chain of events is that the first living thing appeared within inanimate matter. To discuss whether or not there is a natural process of evolution, first it must be demonstrated that life could actually have arisen by chance from inanimate matter.

So, when we compare this "link" with scientific data, what comes to light? That is, can chance form a living organism from inanimate matter?

Once, it was thought that observation and experiment gave an affirmative answer to the above questions. That is, it was believed that living creatures could evolve spontaneously within inanimate matter. But these observations and experiments that seemed to prove those assertions were extremely primitive.

The ancient Egyptians living along the River Nile thought that the number of frogs increased during the rainy season because the river generated them out of the mud. They believed that not only frogs, but snakes, worms and mice were formed from the mud when the Nile flooded each summer. Superficial observations led the Egyptians into this superstition.

The boundary between animate and inanimate things was unclear not only in ancient Egypt. Many early pagan societies believed that this boundary could be easily crossed. In Hindu mythology, the world came into being out of a huge, round blob of matter called *prakriti*. From this material, all animate and inanimate things evolved and will return to it again. Anaximander, the ancient Greek philosopher

Thales' pupil, wrote in his book *On Nature* that animals came to be from some mud steaming in the heat of the Sun.

The basis of all these superstitions was the belief that living things were simple structures. This belief was long maintained in Europe, where modern science began to develop in the 16th century. But the idea that the structure of life was simple held sway for at least another three hundred years, because scientists did not have the means to observe the minute details of living things, especially microscopic cells and tiny molecules.

A few superficial observations and experiments convinced scientists that life was simple. For example, the Belgian chemist Jan Baptista van Helmont (1577-1644), spread some wheat on a soiled shirt and, after a while, observed mice scurrying around the shirt. He concluded that the mice were produced from the combination of the wheat and the shirt. The German scientist Athanasius Kircher (1601-1680) did a similar experiment. He poured some honey over some dead flies and later saw other flies were zooming around the honey; he assumed that combining honey with dead flies produced living ones.

More careful scientists were able to see that all these ideas were wrong. The Italian scientist Francisco Redi (1626-1697) was the first to do controlled experiments in this regard. Using the isolation method, he discovered that maggots on meat did not come into being spontaneously, but developed from eggs deposited by flies. Redi proved that life could not come from inanimate matter, but only from other life—a view that came to be known as *biogenesis*. The name given to the spontaneous generation of life was *abiogenesis*.

The scientific argument between supporters of biogenesis and abiogenesis was continued into the 18th century by John Needham (1713-1781) and Lazzaro Spallanzani (1729-1799). Each of them boiled a piece of meat, then isolated it. Needham observed that maggots appeared on the meat and took this as proof for abiogenesis. Spallanzani repeated the same experiment, but boiled the meat for a longer time. In this way, all organic life forms on the meat were destroyed and as a result, no maggots appeared on it. So even though Spallanzani had invalidated the theory of abiogenesis, many people did not believe him; saying that Spallanzani had boiled the meat so long that he killed the "vital power" within it.

As Charles Darwin was developing his theory, the question of the origins of life was obfuscated by debates like these. Many people believed that inanimate matter could generate bacteria and other germs, if not visible creatures like maggots. In 1860, the famous French chemist Louis Pasteur disproved the age-old assertions of abiogenesis, though it continued to hold its place in the minds of many.

Darwin almost never considered how the first cell came into being. He never mentions this subject in his book *The Origin of Species* published in 1859. Even after Pasteur's experiments posed a major problem for him in this regard, he hardly

dealt with the topic. His only explanation for the origin of life was that the first cell could have come into being in a "warm little pond."

In a letter to Joseph Hooker in 1871, Darwin wrote:

It is often said that all the conditions for the first production of a living organism are now present, which could ever have been present. But if we could conceive in some warm little pond, with all sorts of ammonia and phosphoric salts, light, heat, electricity, etc., present, that a protein compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes, at the present day such matter would be instantly devoured or absorbed, which would not have been the case before living creatures were formed.<sup>7</sup>

In short, Darwin maintained that if a small, warm pond contained the chemical raw materials for life, they could form proteins which could then multiply, and combine to form a cell. Moreover, he asserted that such a formation was impossible under present world conditions, but could have occurred in an earlier period.

Both of Darwin's claims are pure speculation, without scientific foundation.

But they would inspire those evolutionists who came after him and launch them on a fruitless labor that would last for more than a century.

This hopeless effort rested on an error defended for centuries, and which also misled Darwin, that life is of pure chance and natural law.

**Since that time, more than a century has passed, and thousands of scientists have tried to explain the origins of life in terms of evolution. Two scientists who cleared a new path in this search were Alexander Oparin and J.B.S. Haldane—one Russian, the other English, but both Marxists. They advanced the theory known as "chemical evolution," and proposed, as Darwin had dreamed of doing, that molecules—the raw material of life—could, with the addition of energy, evolve spontaneously and form a living cell.**

In the middle of the 20th century, Oparin's and Haldane's theory gained ground because the true complexity of life wasn't yet understood. And a young chemist by the name of Stanley Miller gave apparent scientific support for the "chemical evolution" thesis.

## **Once, There Was Miller's Experiment**

If you were to look at today's evolutionist literature dealing with the origins of life, you would likely see evolution's proponents offering the "Miller experiment" as the greatest proof for their theses. Many biology textbooks in many countries tell students how important this experiment was, and how it cast light on the problem of the origins of life. Most often, the details of the experiment are disregarded. What it produced and to what extent the experiment "casts light" on the origins of life are also ignored.

To shed some light on this experiment, let us sum up the relevant facts that we have detailed in another book. In 1953, Stanley Miller, a graduate student in the Department of Chemistry at the University of Chicago under the supervision of his teacher, Harold Urey, composed a mixture of gasses that, he supposed, resembled the atmosphere of the primordial Earth. Afterwards, he exposed this mixture to an electrical discharge for more than a week and, as a result, observed that some amino acids that are used in living things were synthesized, along with others that are not.

Amino acids are the building blocks of proteins, which in turn are the basic material of the body. Hundreds of amino acids join in a particular series within a cell to produce proteins. Cells are produced from a few thousand different kinds of proteins. In other words, amino acids are the smallest components of any living thing.

For this reason, Stanley Miller's synthesizing of amino acids caused great excitement among evolutionists. And so the legend of the "Miller Experiment" was born and was to last for decades.

However, it slowly emerged that the experiment was invalid. In the 1970s it was proved that the primordial Earth's atmosphere was mainly composed of nitrogen and carbon dioxide and did not contain the methane and ammonia gasses that Miller used in his experiment. This showed that Miller's scenario was untenable, since N and CO<sub>2</sub> are not suitable for the formation of amino acids. A 1998 article in the geological magazine *Earth*, summed up the matter:

Today Miller's scenario is regarded with misgivings. One reason is that 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.<sup>8</sup>

That same year, National Geographic, another well-known scientific magazine, wrote as follows:

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.<sup>9</sup>

In 1995, Jon Cohen gave an enlightening interpretation in an historic article in Science magazine, saying that scientists researching the origins of life did not take the "Miller Experiment" into account. He outlines the reasons for this as follows: "the early atmosphere looked nothing like the Miller-Urey simulation."<sup>10</sup>

Another fact that invalidated the Miller experiment was that the primordial atmosphere was ascertained to be rich in oxygen. This totally undermined both the Miller experiment and other chemical evolutionist scenarios, because oxygen has

the special ability to oxidize—that is, burn—all organic molecules. In the body, this danger is averted by very special enzyme systems. In nature, it is impossible for a free organic molecule not to be oxidized.

For decades, despite all these facts, the Miller experiment, as we said, was touted as a very important explanation of the origins of life. In their textbooks, students were told that "Miller showed how organic compounds can be synthesized," or, "Miller showed how the first cells were formed."

As a result, many educated people are in error in this regard. For example, in some articles dealing with the theory of evolution, one can read such statements as, "Combining and boiling such organic matter as amino acids or proteins produce life." This is probably the superstition that the Miller experiment left in the minds of some. The truth is, such a thing has never been observed. As explained above, the Miller Experiment, which tried to explain the formation of amino acids, let alone the origin of life, is now shown to be outmoded and invalid. It has suffered the same fate as Jan Baptista van Helmont's so-called proof for abiogenesis on the basis of maggots in meat or Athanasius Kircher's experiment.

In his book *Algeny: A New World—A New World*, Jeremy Rifkin makes the same comparison saying that if scientists had taken the trouble to feel even the slightest suspicion, they would at once have seen that the Miller experiment consisted merely of a scientific fantasy tale, just like those scientists who previously claimed, on the basis of observations of maggots emerging from rubbish, that life emerged from inanimate matter.<sup>11</sup>

Those who believe that Miller's experiment produced important results fail to understand the important point that Miller conducted his experiment under artificial conditions produced by himself, having nothing to do with the atmosphere of the early Earth; so the experiment was carried out under invalid conditions. And most importantly, this experiment only synthesized amino acids. Formation of amino acids by some means does not indicate creation of life.

If we compare a living cell to a huge factory, amino acids are the factory's bricks. It's vitally important how these bricks are designed and arranged. So far, no experiment has shown how amino acids came into being spontaneously, or organized themselves by chance to produce a functional protein. To form a living cell, a complex mechanism must be wholly in place: hundreds of different proteins, DNA codes and the enzymes to read them, and a selectively permeable cell membrane. However, such a "chemical evolution" has never been shown to be possible. Moreover, to believe in such a possibility is to believe in the impossible. Paul Davies, the well-known physicist and science writer, makes an important comment on this matter:

Some scientists say, "Just throw energy at it, and it [life] will happen spontaneously." That is a little bit like saying: "Put a stick of dynamite under the

pile of bricks, and bang, you've got a house!" Of course you won't have a house, you'll just have a mess. The difficulty in trying to explain the origin of life is in accounting for how the elaborate organizational structure of these complex molecules came into existence spontaneously from a random input of energy. How did these very specific complex molecules assemble themselves?<sup>12</sup>

Actually, Davies' example contains the correct solution to the problem of the origins of life. Is it reasonable to first suppose that a given house was formed by an explosion, and then theorize as to how it was possible? Or is it more reasonable to believe that the house was the result of a superior creation and organization? The answer is obvious.

Over the past 20 years, during which the complex details of life have been understood, many scientists have rejected the myth of chemical evolution and begun to give a new answer for the origins of life—the fact of Creation.

## **The Amazing Complexity of Life**

The most important starting point that caused the fact of Creation to be clearly known by everyone is the complexity of life that could not even have been imagined in Darwin's time. In his 1996 book *Darwin's Black Box*, Michael Behe, a professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University, writes about the discovery of the complexity of living things:

Since the mid-1950s biochemistry has painstakingly elucidated the workings of life at the molecular level. . . . Nineteenth century science could not even guess at the mechanism of vision, immunity, or movement, but modern biochemistry has identified the molecules that allow those and other functions. It was once expected that the basis of life would be exceedingly simple. That expectation has been smashed. Vision, motion and other biological functions have proven to be no less sophisticated than television cameras and automobiles. Science has made enormous progress in understanding how the chemistry of life works, but the elegance and complexity of biological systems at the molecular level have paralyzed science's attempt to explain their origins. . . Many scientists have gamely asserted that explanations are already in hand, or will be sooner or later, but no support for such assertions can be found in the professional science literature. More importantly, there are compelling reasons—based on the structure of the systems themselves—to think that a Darwinian explanation for the mechanisms of life will forever prove elusive. <sup>13</sup>

So, what is so complex in a cell? Behe answers:

Shortly after 1950, science advanced to the point where it could determine the shapes and properties of a few of the molecules that make up living organisms. Slowly, painstakingly, the structures of more and more biological molecules were elucidated, and the way they work inferred from countless experiments. The



cumulative results show with piercing clarity that life is based on machines—machines made of molecules! Molecular machines haul cargo from one place in the cell to another along "highways" made of other molecules, while still others act as cables, ropes, and pulleys to hold the cell in shape. Machines turn cellular switches on and off, sometimes killing the cell or causing it to grow. Solar-powered machines capture the energy of photons and store it in chemicals. Electrical machines allow current to flow through nerves. Manufacturing machines build other molecular machines, as well as themselves. Cells swim using machines, copy themselves with machinery, ingest food with machinery. In short, highly sophisticated molecular machines control every cellular process. Thus the details of life are finely calibrated, and the machinery of life enormously complex.<sup>14</sup>

Gerald Schroeder, an Israeli physicist and molecular biologist, emphasizes this extraordinary complexity:

. . . On average, each cell in your body, at this second and every second, is forming two thousand proteins. Every second! In every cell. Continuously. And they do it so modestly. For all that activity, we can't feel a bit of it. A protein is a string of several hundred amino acids, and an amino acid is a molecule having twenty or so atoms. Each cell, every cell in your body, is selecting right now approximately five hundred thousand amino acids, consisting of some ten million atoms, organizing them into pre-selected strings, joining them together, checking to be certain each string is folded into specific shapes, and then shipping each protein off to a site, some inside the cell, some outside, sites that somehow have signaled a need for these specific proteins. Every second. Every cell. Your body, and mine too, is a living wonder.<sup>15</sup>

As Paul Davies wrote, to claim that this extraordinarily complex system is a product of chance or natural laws is like asserting that a house could be built by blowing up bricks with dynamite. It is for these reasons that the complexity of life disarms Darwinists. Behe says that none of their scientific publications gives any evolutionist explanation for the origins of life:

If you search the scientific literature on evolution, and if you focus your search on the question of how molecular machines—the basis of life—developed, you find an eerie and complete silence. The complexity of life's foundation has paralyzed science's attempt to account for it; molecular machines raise an as-yet-impenetrable barrier to Darwinism's universal reach.<sup>16</sup>

In short, investigations into the origins of life have been one major development that has helped bring about the demise of the theory of evolution. So, why do evolutionists still cling to Darwinism?

Harold Urey, one of the authors of the Miller experiment, admits:

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.<sup>17</sup>

Urey states that he and many of his colleagues "believe" that the origin of life was a random event. So, actually, it was not science at the basis of this experiment, but faith. And the idea that nothing exists besides matter, that everything must be explained in terms of physical effects, is materialist philosophy.

Darwinism has collapsed scientifically and only blind belief in its philosophy is keeping it alive, but it can never revive it as a theory.

## **ONCE, THE FOSSIL RECORD WAS THOUGHT TO PROVE EVOLUTION**

Paleontology, the study of fossils, developed long before Darwin. The founder of this science was the French naturalist, Baron Georges Cuvier (1769-1832). According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, he introduced fossils into zoological classification, showed the progressive relation between rock strata and their fossil remains, and demonstrated, in his comparative anatomy and reconstructions of fossil skeletons, the importance of functional and anatomical relationships.<sup>18</sup>

Cuvier was opposed to the theory of evolution proposed in his time by Lamarck. He insisted that genera of living things were created separately, stressed the detail and delicacy in animal anatomy and explained that its characteristics ruled out any idea of random alteration. Cuvier also argued that "each species is so well coordinated, functionally and structurally, that it could not survive significant change. He further maintained that each species was created for its own special purpose and each organ for its special function."<sup>19</sup>

But Charles Darwin interpreted fossils differently. He believed that various species descended in stages from a single, common ancestor in a process of evolution and that fossils were proof of this process.

But Darwin's interpretation rests on no proof. On the contrary, in his day, no extant fossils demonstrated evolution. The fossil remains of extinct creatures did not share the kind of family relationship and resemblance that Darwin's theory required. Every known fossil, like every known living thing, possessed its own unique features. As is the case with natural history today, species of the past have not been very similar and close to one another, but rather divided into groups that are very different from one another, with major structural differences between them.

For this reason, Darwin could not use fossils to prove his theory. On the contrary, his book proposed "fabricated explanations" to misrepresent this matter that posed such a serious problem for him. He dealt with this matter in the chapter entitled "Difficulties on Theory" and appended to the book another chapter titled "On the Imperfection of the Geological Record," that dealt with the absence of intermediate fossil forms.

But in both these chapters, Darwin's problem could be seen clearly. His theory was based on the claim that species came into being by a long series of incremental changes. If it were so, intermediate forms must have existed to link one species to another; but no trace of such creatures has been found in the fossil record.

Darwin was finally forced to leave this problem for future researchers. He thought the problem lay in the insufficiency of the fossil record; he was certain that,

as new fossils were unearthed, specimens would come to light to prove his theory. He wrote:

Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely-graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record.<sup>20</sup>

Darwin's prediction persuaded a growing number to carry out excavations in search of the supposed "lost" intermediate forms to extend the fossil record. They made some exciting finds, but over time, it was realized that their excitement was unfounded.

One of these "breakthroughs," discovered in 1860 near the German town of Solnhofen, was the fossil to which they gave the name *Archaeopteryx*, the Greek for "ancient wing." Despite the fact that it was clearly a bird, it had some peculiar features which were considered reptilian: teeth, a long tail and claws on its wings. This gave Darwinists a rare opportunity. One of Darwin's most avid defenders, Thomas Huxley, announced that *Archaeopteryx* was half-bird and half-reptile. The assumption that its wings weren't suitable for flying led to the conclusion that it was a primitive bird; this generated a lot of popular excitement and thus was born the *Archaeopteryx* myth that was to hold sway throughout the 20th century.

In time, it was realized that this creature was not a primitive bird; in fact, its skeleton and feather structure made it well adapted to flying. Its reptile-like features were also possessed by some birds of the past and of today.

As a result of these discoveries, evolutionist speculations about *Archaeopteryx* as the best candidate for an intermediate form are largely silenced today. Alan Feduccia, an expert ornithologist and professor from the Biology Department of the University of North Carolina, said that "*most recent workers who have studied various anatomical features of Archaeopteryx have found the creature to be much more birdlike than previously imagined.*" Again according to Feduccia, "*the resemblance of Archaeopteryx to theropod dinosaurs has been grossly overestimated.*"<sup>21</sup> In short, it is now known that there is no vast difference between *Archaeopteryx* and other birds.

In the century and a half since Darwin, no intermediate forms—including *Archaeopteryx*—have been found. This fact has become undisputable, especially since the 1970s but it is still ignored by a few paleontologists who espouse the theory of evolution. Among these paleontologists, the best known are Stephen J. Gould and Niles Eldridge. These two have proposed a different model of evolution under the name of "punctuated equilibrium," in which they insist that the fossil record has refuted Darwinism's "gradualism." They have shown in detail that various genera of living things appeared suddenly in the fossil record and remained unchanged for hundreds of millions of years.

In a book written with Ian Tattersall, another evolutionist paleontologist, Eldredge made this important assessment:

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

The observation that species are amazingly conservative and static entities throughout long periods of time has all the qualities of **the emperor's new clothes: everyone knew it but preferred to ignore it. Paleontologists**, faced with a recalcitrant record obstinately refusing to yield Darwin's predicted pattern, **simply looked the other way.**<sup>22</sup>

In a book written jointly in 1988 entitled *Integrated Principles of Biology*, three evolutionist biologists developed the same point:

Many species remain virtually unchanged for millions of years, then suddenly disappear to be replaced by a quite different . . . form. Moreover, most major groups of animals appear abruptly in the fossil record, fully formed, and with no fossils yet discovered that form a transition from their parent group.<sup>23</sup>

New discoveries have not changed the situation in favor of Darwinism; on the contrary, they've made it worse. In 1999 Tom Kemp, curator of the zoological collections of the Oxford University, wrote a book entitled, *Fossils and Evolution* in which he described the situation:

In virtually all cases, a new taxon appears for the first time in the fossil record with most definitive features already present, and practically no known stem-group forms.<sup>24</sup>

So, the fossil record which was once thought to corroborate Darwin's theory has become evidence against it. David Berlinsky, a mathematician from the Princeton University and an opponent of evolution, sums up the situation:

There are gaps in the fossil graveyard, places where there should be intermediate forms, but where there is nothing whatsoever instead. No paleontologist writing in English, French or German denies that this is so. It is simply a fact. Darwin's theory and the fossil record are in conflict.<sup>25</sup>

One of the most striking examples of this contradiction is the collapse of Darwin's "tree of life."

## **Once, There was Thought to be an "Evolution Tree"**

The most punishing blow that the fossil record dealt Darwinism was the scenario revealed by the fossils from the Cambrian period. Darwin imagined that the history of life on Earth could be represented as a tree starting from one trunk and slowly, gradually separating into various branches. A diagram in *The Origin of the Species* reflected this view. With the aid of this chart, the concept of the evolutionary "tree" was planted in people's minds, to finally become one of Darwinism's most important myths. Various versions of the evolutionary tree were published in textbooks, scientific treatises, magazines and newspapers. These diagrams etched in people's minds the idea that living things evolved by small chance changes from one common root of the evolutionary tree.

The truth was quite different, however. This was most clearly dramatized with the discovery of the Cambrian explosion at the beginning of the 20th century. In the year 1909, the paleontologist Charles D. Walcott began investigations in the Canadian Rocky Mountains. In the area of the Burgess Pass, he discovered very well-preserved strata of shale rock. He quickly realized that the Burgess Shale contained many fossils belonging to the Cambrian period. For the next four years, Walcott carefully collected between 60,000 and 80,000 fossils from the shale and made a note of the most subtle differences he discovered among them.

The most amazing thing about the Burgess Shale fossils was that they contained the remains of creatures belonging to all the phyla alive today. (A phylum is the largest taxonomic category used to classify creatures in the animal kingdom. Animals are divided into more than 50 phyla, and each phylum has its own body design. Among the best known phyla are the *Chordata* including the vertebrates, the *Arthropoda* containing all insects, and *Mollusca* containing all soft-bodied invertebrates with shells.)

Walcott was very surprised to see what phyla these fossils belonged to. No significant life had been discovered in much older strata; but the layer he discovered contained creatures belonging to nearly all known phyla, and fossils of hitherto unknown phyla as well. This showed that all the bodily characteristics in the animal kingdom came about at the same time, in the same geological period.

This dealt a fatal blow to Darwin's theory. He had proposed that creatures had developed slowly and gradually, like the twigs of a tree. According to Darwin's speculations, at first there must have been one single phylum in the world, and different phyla developed slowly, over the course of time. Now, however, this theory had to contend with Walcott's proof that all phyla came into being suddenly, at the same time.

But it would be 70 years before this blow turned the theory of the evolutionary tree upside down, because Walcott, at the end of four years of meticulous study, decided to keep his fossils a secret instead of revealing them to the scientific world. He was the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington D.C. and a

staunch Darwinist. Thinking—correctly—that the fossils he had discovered would pose a major problem for the theory of evolution, he kept them in the museum's archives rather than releasing them. The Burgess Shale fossils came to light only during an examination of the museum's archives in 1985. The Israeli scientist Gerald Schroeder makes the following comment:

Had Walcott wanted, he could have hired a phalanx of graduate students to work on the fossils. But he chose not to rock the boat of evolution. Today fossil representatives of the Cambrian era have been found in China, Africa, the British Isles, Sweden, Greenland. The explosion was worldwide. But before it became proper to discuss the extraordinary nature of the explosion, the data were simply not reported.<sup>26</sup>

For more than 70 years, these fossils had remained hidden until they were found and analyzed by paleontologists Harry Whittington, Derek Briggs and Simon Conway Morris. These three scientists revealed that the fossils Walcott had found dated back to the Cambrian period, one of the oldest geological periods. The sudden appearance of such a wide variety of creatures during this period was termed the *Cambrian explosion*. In the 1980s, two new areas of fossil remains similar to the Burgess Shale fossils were discovered: one in Sirius Passet in northern Greenland, and the other in Chengjiang in southern China. In both these areas were found fossils of very different creatures that came into being during the Cambrian period. Among these the oldest and best preserved fossils were those found in Chengjiang, which also contained the first vertebrates. In addition, two 530-million-year-old fish fossils discovered in 1999 proved that all body structures, including the vertebrates, were already in existence during the Cambrian. Investigations showed that the Cambrian explosion occurred within a 10-million-year period, which in geological terms is quite a short time. And the creatures that suddenly appeared in this period all had very complicated organs and had no resemblance with the one-celled and a few multi-celled organisms that preceded them. Stephen J. Gould describes the Cambrian explosion as follows:

The most famous such burst, the Cambrian explosion, marks the inception of modern multicellular life. Within just a few million years, nearly every major kind of animal anatomy appears in the fossil record for the first time.<sup>27</sup>

Evolutionists have tried to explain away the Cambrian explosion in various ways, none of them convincing. All the theses put forward against the Cambrian problem are flawed, which is demonstrated by the arguments that evolutionists have among themselves. The February 1999 edition of the noted science magazine *Trends in Genetics* (TIG) says that the Burgess Shale fossil finds cannot at all be explained in terms of the theory of evolution, and that the theses proposed are not convincing:

It might seem odd that fossils from one small locality, no matter how exciting, should lie at the center of a fierce debate about such broad issues in evolutionary biology. The reason is that animals burst into the fossil record in astonishing profusion during the Cambrian, seemingly from nowhere. Increasingly precise radiometric dating and new fossil discoveries have only sharpened the suddenness and scope of this biological revolution. The magnitude of this change in Earth's biota demands an explanation. Although many hypotheses have been proposed, the general consensus is that none is wholly convincing.<sup>28</sup>

In *Icons of Evolution*, the American biologist Jonathan Wells sums up the matter in these words:

Of all the icons of evolution, the tree of life is the most pervasive, because descent from a common ancestor is the foundation of Darwin's theory. . . . Yet Darwin knew—and scientists have recently confirmed—that the early fossil record turns the evolutionary tree of life upside down. Ten years ago it was hoped that molecular evidence might save the tree, but recent discoveries have dashed that hope. Although you would not learn it from reading biology textbooks, Darwin's tree of life has been uprooted.<sup>29</sup>

For this reason, we can safely say that once upon a time, there was a theory called Darwinism, which some people thought was supported by fossils. But the fossil record indicates just the opposite. Now, Darwinism is no more. Fossils—as we now understand—show that life appeared on Earth suddenly, not by evolution.

This sudden appearance implies Creation. God has created all living things perfectly from nothing.

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

## **ONCE, THERE WAS A SEARCH FOR THE MISSING LINK**

The last chapter showed how the fossil record removed all of Darwinism's underpinnings. In *The Origin of the Species*, Darwin did not touch on the fossil record as it relates to human origins. But in *The Descent of Man*, published 12 years later, he proposed that human beings were the highest rung on the so-called evolutionary ladder, and that their nearest ancestors were primates resembling modern-day apes.

In proposing that human beings and apes were descended from a common ancestor, Darwin had no proof to back up these claims; he just imagined that there was a family relationship between human beings and apes, animals that, he



thought, were physically best suited to being compared to human beings. In his book, he developed his racial arguments, claiming that some of the world's supposedly "primitive races" were proof of evolution. (However, modern genetics has disproved these racial views shared by Darwin and other evolutionists of the time.)

From the last quarter of the 19th century, almost a whole science of paleoanthropology devoted itself to the task of finding fossils to prove this imaginary theory of evolution, and many who accepted Darwinism started digging to find the "missing link" between apes and human beings.

The great discovery they had hoped for was made in England in 1910. For the next 43 years, the skull of "Piltdown Man" was presented to the world as a major evidence of human evolution. The fossil was discovered by Charles Dawson, an amateur paleontologist who gave it the name *Eoanthropus dawsoni*. It was an odd fossil: the upper part was totally human in structure, while the lower jaw and teeth were like those of an ape. Within a short time, this discovery became famous; and the English were very proud that this fossil, discovered in their native soil, was an ancestor of their race. The considerable size of the cranium was interpreted as an indication that "English intelligence" had evolved very early. In the following years, hundreds of theses were written on *Eoanthropus dawsoni*, and the fossil was displayed in the British Museum, where hundreds of thousands of visitors were persuaded as to the "truth of human evolution."

They did not know that the "fossil" was a fake. Tests applied in 1953 showed that Piltdown Man was a combination of bones from a human being and an orangutan. The public was amazed when this fossil, once supposed to be the greatest proof of evolution, was removed from the British Museum exhibit where it had been highlighted for decades.

In 1922, another scandal occurred in the United States, smaller in scope but just as serious. A molar tooth found in the state of Nebraska was alleged to be an intermediate form between man and ape; and on the basis of this discovery, Nebraska Man was concocted. In 1927, however, it was determined that this tooth belonged neither to a human being nor to an ape, but to a wild pig.

In spite of fiascos like this, evolutionists continued their search for human origins. Later, they came to think that extinct apes of the genus *Australopithecus* were the oldest human ancestors. It became an evolutionist cliché that, after *Australopithecus*, came species called *Homo habilis*, *Homo rudolfensis* and *Homo erectus*, with the series finally ending with *Homo sapiens*, modern-day man. This cliché, with its picture of apes gradually walking on two feet, was officially adopted by textbooks, science periodicals, magazines, daily newspapers, films and even commercials, and was used uncritically for decades.

In short, for a long period in the 20th century, the idea was widely accepted that the theory of evolution explained human origins.

However, the reality was quite different. Extant fossils do not harmonize with the evolutionist scheme. And the problem won't be solved by the discovery of more fossils; on the contrary, it will be complicated even further. Some authorities have begun to accept these facts. Among America's most prominent paleontologists, Niles Eldredge and Ian Tattersall of the American Museum of Natural History, make this important comment:

[It is a] . . . myth that the evolutionary histories of living things are essentially a matter of discovery. . . . But if this were really so, 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.<sup>30</sup>

In his 1995 article, one of the well-known names in the theory of evolution, Harvard University professor Richard Lewontin, admits that Darwinism has fallen into a hopeless situation:

When we consider the remote past, before the origin of the actual species *Homo sapiens*, we are faced with a fragmentary and disconnected fossil record. Despite the excited and optimistic claims that have been made by some paleontologists, no fossil hominid species can be established as our direct ancestor.<sup>31</sup>

Many other evolutionist experts in this matter recently stated their pessimism about their theory. Henry Gee, for example, editor of the well-known magazine *Nature*, points out:

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.

<sup>32</sup>

The classic "human family tree" is being seriously criticized today. Scientists investigating the evidence without preconceptions assert that the line of descent from *Australopithecus* to *Homo sapiens* that evolutionists put forth is a total concoction, and the in-between species called *Homo habilis* and *Homo erectus* are imaginary.

In a 1999 article published in *Science* magazine, evolutionist paleontologists Bernard Wood and Mark Collard present their view that the *H. habilis* and *H. rudolfensis* are concocted categories and that fossils included in these categories should be transferred to the genus *Australopithecus*.<sup>33</sup>

Milford Wolpoff of the University of Michigan and the University of Canberra's Alan Thorne share the opinion that *H. erectus* is a fabricated category and fossils included in this classification are all variations of *H. sapiens*.<sup>34</sup>

This means that the fossils that evolutionists suggest represent the supposed evolutionary forebears of man belong either to extinct species of ape or else to human beings with different racial characteristics. None of these are half-human and half-ape; they are either ape or human.

According to some experts who acknowledge this reality, the myth of human evolution is nothing more than creative writing by a group of individuals who believe in materialist philosophy and represent natural history in terms of their own dogmatic ideas. At a meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Oxford historian John Durant commented on the matter:

Could it be that, like "primitive" myths, theories of human evolution reinforce the value-systems of their creators by reflecting historically their image of themselves and of the society in which they live?<sup>35</sup>

In a later publication, Durant says that it is worth asking whether ideas of so-called human evolution assumed similar functions both in pre-scientific and scientific societies, and goes on to say:

. . . Time and again, ideas about human origins turn out on closer examination to tell us as much about the present as about the past, as much about our own experiences as about those of our remote ancestors. . . [W]e are in urgent need of the de-mythologisation of science.<sup>36</sup>

In short, theories about human origins do nothing else than reflect the prejudices and philosophical beliefs of their authors. Another evolutionist who accepts this is Arizona State University anthropologist Geoffrey Clark, who wrote in a 1997 publication:

. . . paleoanthropology has the form but not the substance of a science . . . 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.<sup>37</sup>

## **Inside Media Propaganda**

As you see, claims about human evolution have been found to be baseless, even by those who played personal roles in their elaboration. The claims are not founded on science, but on the belief and prejudice that shaped the theory. Interestingly, none of these "admissions" from the world of paleontology has been reported in the media. On the contrary, a few media organizations carefully hide the dilemma that Darwinism has come up against and instill the deception that new proofs for evolution are discovered every day. Jonathan Wells, an American biologist, received two Ph.D.s, one from Yale University, and one from the University of California at Berkeley. In his 2000 book, *Icons of Evolution*, he outlines this propaganda mechanism:

The general public is rarely informed of the deep-seated uncertainty about human origins that is reflected in these statements by scientific experts. Instead,

we are simply fed the latest version of somebody's theory, without being told that paleoanthropologists themselves cannot agree over it. And typically, the theory is illustrated with fanciful drawings of cave men, or human actors wearing heavy makeup... It seems that never in the field of science have so many based so much on so little.<sup>38</sup>

Media organizations defending Darwinism claim in their headlines that "human evolution is now a proven fact." But who are the scientists writing in newspapers and appearing on television to make these groundless claims? Why do they disagree with those scientists who think that paleoanthropology is unfounded?

In a speech given at a meeting of the Biology Teachers Association of South Australia, evolutionist Greg Kirby explained their psychology:

If you were to spend your life picking up bones and finding little fragments of head and little fragments of jaw, there's a very strong desire there to exaggerate the importance of those fragments. . . .<sup>39</sup>

These are some of the factors that keep the myth of human evolution alive, even though it has evidently found no scientific support. And every new fossil discovered thrusts the evolutionist thesis about human origins deeper into doubt.

## **The Admission that There is no "Missing Link"**

The latest example showing the impasse confronting evolutionist theses was a fossil skull discovered in the Central African country of Chad by the French scientist Michel Brunet, who called it *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*.

In the world of Darwinism, this fossil caused a division of opinion. The well-known magazine *Nature* admitted that "new-found skull could sink our current ideas about human evolution."<sup>40</sup>

Daniel Lieberman of Harvard University said that "this [discovery] will have the impact of a small nuclear bomb."<sup>41</sup> The reason was that, although this fossil was 7 million years old, it had a more "human" structure (according to the evolutionist criteria) than *Australopithecus*, which lived only 5 million years ago and was claimed to be the "oldest human ancestor." This showed once again that the already battered human evolution scenario was untenable.

Bernard Wood, an evolutionist anthropologist from George Washington University in Washington, made an important explanation of the newly-discovered fossil. He said that the "ladder of evolution" myth impressed on people's minds throughout the 20th century had no validity, and that evolution could be compared to a bush:

When I went to medical school in 1963, human evolution looked like a ladder [that] stepped from monkey to man through a progression of intermediates, each slightly less ape-like than the last. Now human evolution looks like a bush. . . . How

they are related to each other and which, if any of them, are human forebears is still debated.<sup>42</sup>

In an article for *The Guardian* newspaper, Henry Gee said this about arguments caused by the newly-found ape fossil:

Whatever the outcome, the skull shows, once and for all, that the old idea of a "missing link" [between apes and humans] is bunk. . . It should now be quite plain that the very idea of the missing link, always shaky, is now completely untenable.<sup>43</sup>

His important book *In Search of Deep Time*, published in 1999, explains that the myth of how human beings evolved, discussed for decades in the media and in so-called scientific evolutionist literature, was of no value:

. . . the evolution of Man is said to have been driven by improvements in posture, brain size, and the coordination between hand and eye, which led to technological achievements such as fire, the manufacture of tools, and the use of language. But such scenarios are subjective. They can never be tested by experiment, and so they are unscientific. They rely for their currency not on scientific test, but on assertion and the authority of their presentation. Given the ubiquitous chatter of journalists and headline writers about the search for ancestors, and the discovery of missing links, it may come as a surprise to learn that most professional palaeontologists do not think of the history of life in terms of scenarios or narratives, and that they rejected the storytelling mode of evolutionary history as unscientific more than thirty years ago.<sup>44</sup>

Gee states that no pattern of evolution can be extracted from the fossil record, and that there is only a number of unrelated fossils "floating around in an overwhelming sea of gaps":

New fossil discoveries are fitted into this preexisting story. We call these new discoveries "missing links", as if the chain of ancestry and descent were a real object for our contemplation, and not what it really is: a completely human invention created after the fact, shaped to accord with human prejudices. . . . Each fossil represents an isolated point, with no knowable connection to any other given fossil, and all float around in an overwhelming sea of gaps.<sup>45</sup>

These very important admissions say that the theory of evolution, which for 150 years pretended to give a scientific answer to the question of our origins, was only a scenario imposed on science by a particular worldview. Gee refers to this saying "*from our vantage point in the present, we arrange fossils in an order that reflects gradual acquisition of what we see in ourselves. We do not seek the truth; we create it after the fact, to suit our own prejudices.*"

Evolutionists have finally come to accept that the myth of the "tree of human evolution," impressed on people's minds for the past 150 years, was a human invention. In a 1996 article, the evolutionist biologist F. Clark Howell of UC Berkeley

wrote: "*There is no encompassing theory of [human] evolution. . . Alas, there never really has been.*"<sup>46</sup>

Evolutionists themselves explain that the "missing link," a popular theme for newspaper headlines, will always remain "missing" because there is no such thing. So, like other Darwinist myths, the myth of human evolution has been exposed.

As we will see in the next chapter, it has been replaced by "information" that proves that human beings were created.

## **ONCE, THERE WAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION**

One of the most popular films of all time is the "Matrix." Those who have seen the second in the series, *The Matrix Reloaded*, will remember the sequence where all the characters were shown to be units of software, in an environment where every object was a unit of software. One scene shows a woman being given some pill, and in order to make the audience better understand that both she and the pill are software, her body and the pill are shown in silhouette composed of green digital numbers and letters. This visual effect, repeated in several scenes of the film, was designed to get the audience to understand that the characters they were seeing were actually the products of software.

Most of those watching *The Matrix Reloaded* were unaware that all the bodies in the real world are actually, in a sense, very complex pieces of software.

If you wanted to transpose its information to paper, you would have to build a library large enough to cover whole walls of a big room. If you compared it to other computer operating systems like Windows or Mac OS, you would see that your "software" is incomparably more complex and superior. Besides, the operating system in your computer often shuts down or freezes and you have to restart it. It even crashes, so that you lose all your information. However, nothing happens to your body's software as long as you are alive. If there is an error in this software, another part of the program corrects it and eliminates the problem.

But the software in your body is not composed of green digital numbers and letters as in *The Matrix Reloaded*, but is made up of molecules—parts of a gigantic chain of molecules called DNA in the nucleus of each cell of the trillions that comprise your body.

Your DNA data bank contains all of your body's characteristics. This gigantic molecule is composed of a series of four different chemical units called bases. Like a four-letter alphabet, these bases store the information about all the organic molecules that will construct your body. That is, these chemical building blocks are not arranged randomly, but according to particular information, divided into

"sentences" and "paragraphs" that scientists call genes. Each gene describes various details of your body—for example, the structure of your eye's transparent cornea, or the formula of the insulin hormone that lets your cells make use of the sugar you eat.

The discovery of DNA is acknowledged to be one of the most important in the history of science. In 1953, two young scientists by the name of Francis Crick and James Watson determined this molecule's existence and structure. In the half century since then, a significant part of the scientific world has tried to understand, decode, and read DNA, and put it to use. One of the greatest strides in this effort, the Human Genome Project, was begun in the 1990s and completed in 2001. The scientists directing this project sequenced the human genome—that is, the totality of all human genes—and took its flawless "inventory."

Of course, the Human Genome Project was to benefit not only medical and genetic engineers, but various professionals in all fields. But an equally, if not more important result was the insight it provided about the origins of DNA. In a news item headlined "Human Genome Map Has Scientists Talking About the Divine" in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, this was explained by Gene Myers, who worked for Celera Genomics, the producer company of the project:

We're deliciously complex at the molecular level. We don't understand ourselves yet, which is cool. There's still a metaphysical . . . element. What really astounds me is the architecture of life. The system is extremely complex. It's like it was designed. There's a huge intelligence there.<sup>47</sup>

The information contained in DNA invalidates Darwinism's view of life as the product of random chance and destroys its materialist "reductionist" foundation.

## **The End of Reductionism**

As we know, materialist philosophy claims that everything is just matter; that matter always has been and always will be; and apart from it, there is nothing. In order to solidify their claims, materialists use a kind of logic they call "reductionism," which states that things that seem to be immaterial can be explained in terms of material influences.

For example, take the example of the human mind, which is not something that can be seen or touched. Moreover, there is no "mind center" in the brain. Inevitably, this leads us to conceive of the mind as something beyond matter. That is, what we call "I"—the thinking, loving personality able to feel pleasure and pain, that gets upset or happy is not a material object like a table or a stone.

However, materialists claim that mind can be reduced to matter. They claim that our ability to think, love, feel regret and all other mental activities are actually products of chemical reactions among the atoms in our brain. When we love someone, it is the influence of neurochemicals in certain cells in our brain; if we

fear anything, that is due to another chemical reaction. Of this logic, the materialist philosopher Karl Vogt said, "*the brain secretes thought just as the liver secretes bile*."<sup>48</sup> Bile is a material substance, but there is no proof that a thought is material.

Reductionism is a strictly logical operation. But any logical operation may rest on false foundations. One of the important methods in determining if this is so is by appealing to science. For this reason, we must pose the following question: Can reductionism—the basis of materialist logic—be substantiated in the light of scientific data?

In the 20th century, all scientific investigations, all observations, and the results of all experiments have given a resounding "No" to this question.

Dr. Werner Gitt, director at the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology, says this:

A coding system always entails a nonmaterial intellectual process. A physical matter cannot produce an information code. All experiences show that every piece of creative information represents some mental effort and can be traced to a personal idea-giver who exercised his own free will, and who is endowed with an intelligent mind. . . There is no known law of nature, no known process and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter. . . <sup>49</sup>

Gitt's words state the same conclusions arrived at by the so-called Information Theory, developed within the last few decades to investigate the origin and structure of information in the universe, and accepted as part of thermodynamics. After long research, it arrived at the conclusion that information is different from matter, that it can never be reduced to matter, and that the sources of information and matter must be investigated separately.

As we saw earlier, scientists who have investigated DNA's structure have stated that it contains a "magnificent" information. Since this information cannot be reduced to matter, it must originate in a source beyond matter.

George C. Williams, one of the proponents of the theory of evolution, admits that most materialists and evolutionists do not want to accept this result. Williams had been a strong advocate of materialism for many years, but states in an article written in 1995 that the materialist (reductionist) outlook that supposes that everything is matter is wrong:

Evolutionary biologists have failed to realize that they work with two more or less incommensurable domains: that of information and that of matter. . . These two domains will never be brought together in any kind of the sense usually implied by the term "reductionism." . . . The gene is a package of information, not an object. . . In biology, when you're talking about things like genes and genotypes and gene pools, you're talking about information, not physical objective reality. . .



This dearth of shared descriptors makes matter and information two separate domains of existence, which have to be discussed separately, in their own terms.<sup>50</sup>

Reductionism is the product of the 18th and 19th centuries' unsophisticated science. This fundamental deception of Darwinism presupposed that life is so simple that its origins can be explained in terms of random occurrences. But 20th-century biology has shown that exactly the opposite is the case. Phillip Johnson, retired professor of the University of California at Berkeley and one of Darwinism's contemporary critics, explains that Darwinism has neglected information as the foundation of life and this has led it into error:

Post-Darwinian biology has been dominated by materialist dogma, the biologists have had to pretend that organisms are a lot simpler than they are. [According to them] Life itself must be merely chemistry. Assemble the right chemicals, and life emerges. DNA must likewise be a product of chemistry alone. As an exhibit in the New Mexico Museum of Natural History puts it, "volcanic gasses plus lightning equal DNA equals LIFE!" When queried about this fable, the museum spokesman acknowledged that it was simplified, but said it was basically true.<sup>51</sup>

However, these primitive and superficial suppositions all turned out to be without substance. As pointed out in this book's first chapter, even the cell, the most basic and the smallest form of life, is more complex than could ever have been imagined previously, and has been acknowledged to contain magnificent "information." It has been demonstrated how uninformed were the efforts to reduce information to matter (for example, the formula: volcanic gasses+lightening=DNA=life). Johnson explains the situation of those "reductionist" scientists who worked to reduce information to matter:

Reductionist biologists are not looking at reality, but only at life as it would have to be if the reductionist program is to succeed. It's the old story of the drunk who lost his car keys in the bushes, but was looking for them under the street lamp instead because "there's enough light to see them over here."<sup>52</sup>

Today, more and more scientists have stopped looking for the key in the wrong place and chosen to go to the right address. Instead of vainly searching in random occurrences for the origins of life (and the magnificent information that constitutes it), they have accepted the evident truth that life is the result of a superior Creation. This knowledge has come to light especially in the 21st century, where computers and the Internet have become an important part of our lives. The outmoded 19th-century Darwinist idea that life is simple, with its lack of awareness of biological data, is an idea doomed to pass into the depths of history.

The truth is, God has created every creature on the face of the Earth and ordered everything perfectly in the flawless artistry of His Creation. He created the human body wonderfully and afterwards breathed His spirit into it. All the characteristics of human consciousness—the senses of sight and hearing, thought,

feeling and emotion—did not result from the interaction of unconscious atoms, but are faculties of the spirit that God has given to human beings. In the Qur'an, He reminds people of the faculties He has given them:

**Say: "It is He Who brought you into being and gave you hearing, sight and hearts. What little thanks you show!" (Surat al-Mulk: 23)**

Everyone has the spirit given to him by God; and every individual is responsible to our Lord Who has created everything from nothing. In the Qur'an, God reveals the creation to those who think they have no purpose and tells them that after they die, they will rise again:

**Does man reckon he will be left to go on unchecked? Was he not a drop of ejaculated sperm, then a blood-clot which He created and shaped, making from it both sexes, male and female? Is He Who does this not able to bring the dead to life? (Surat al-Qiyama: 36-40)**

## **ONCE, IT WAS BELIEVED THAT THERE WAS "EMBRYOLOGICAL EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION"**

In his book *The Descent of Man*, Charles Darwin explained the proofs he thought he had found to support his theory of human origins. The only illustration in this book, right in the first chapter, is a drawing of two embryos: one of a human being and the other of a dog. In the chapter, "The Evidence of the Descent of Man from Some Lower Form," Darwin writes:

Embryonic Development: Man is developed from an ovule, about the 125th of an inch in diameter, which differs in no respect from the ovules of other animals. The embryo itself at a very early period can hardly be distinguished from that of other members of the vertebrate kingdom. At this period . . . the slits on the sides of the neck [of human's embryo] still remain. . . <sup>53</sup>

After this, he states that his observations indicate that a human embryo closely resembles that of an ape, a dog or another vertebrate but that, in later stages of development in the womb, a differentiation occurs. In a letter to his friend, Asa Gray, Darwin considered the evidence from embryology to be "by far the strongest single class of facts in favor of" his theory.<sup>54</sup>

But Darwin was no embryologist. Never once did he investigate embryos in a comprehensive way. Therefore, in developing his arguments, he quoted individuals whom he regarded as authorities on this matter. In his footnotes, one name was

particularly noticeable: the German biologist, Ernst Haeckel, whose book *Naturliche Schopfungsgeschichte* (The Natural History of Creation) contained various drawings of embryos, together with his comments on them.

A short time later, Haeckel was to go down in history as the original author of evolutionist interpretation of embryology. He read *The Origin of the Species* (1859) with great excitement, accepted what Darwin wrote, and became a more avid evolutionist than Darwin himself. To make his own contribution to the theory, he conducted a series of experiments and published *Naturliche Schopfungsgeschichte* in 1868. In it, he advanced his theory of embryology that was to win him fame. From the beginning, he proposed that the embryos of human beings and certain animals developed in the same way. The drawings of the embryos of a human being, an ape and a dog on page 242 were proof of this. The drawings were apparently identical and, according to Haeckel, these creatures came from a common root.

In fact, it was the drawings, not these creatures, that came from a common root. Haeckel made a drawing of one embryo and then, after making slight changes to it, presented them together as embryos of a human being, an ape and a dog. When the same drawings were printed side by side, naturally they looked the same.<sup>55</sup>

This was the "work" that Darwin used as a source in *The Descent of Man*. However, even before Darwin wrote his book, some noticed a major distortion in Haeckel's "work" and wrote about it. In 1868, L. Rutimeyer published an article in the science periodical *Archiv für Anthropologie* (Archives of Anthropology) that revealed Haeckel's falsifications. Rutimeyer, professor of zoology and comparative anatomy at Basle University, examined the embryo drawings in *Naturlische Schopfungsgeschichte* and *Über die Entstehung und den Stammbaum des Menschengeschlechts* and demonstrated that the drawings in both books had nothing to do with reality. As Rutimeyer wrote:

Haeckel claims these works to be easy for the scientific layman to follow, as well as scientific and scholarly. No one will quarrel with the first evaluation of the author, but the second quality is not one that he seriously can claim. These works are clothed in medieval formalistic garb. There is considerable manufacturing of scientific evidence. Yet the author has been very careful not to let the reader become aware of this state of affairs.<sup>56</sup>

Despite this, Darwin and other biologists who supported him continued to accept Haeckel's drawings as a reference. And this encouraged Haeckel to try to make embryology a strong support for Darwinism. His observations produced no such support, but he regarded his drawings as more important than his observations. In following years, he made a series of comparative drawings of embryos and composed charts comparing the embryos of fish, salamanders, frogs,

chickens, rabbits and human beings. The interesting thing about these side-by-side charts was that the embryos of these various creatures closely resembled one another, at first, but slowly began to differentiate in the course of their development. Particularly striking was the similarity between the embryos of a fish and a human being; so much so that in the drawings, the human embryo had what looked like gills. On the so-called scientific basis of these drawings, Haeckel proclaimed his theory that "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny." This slogan represented his belief that in the course of its development, either in the egg or in its mother's womb, every creature repeats the history of its own species, from the beginning. For example, a human embryo first resembles a fish, in later weeks a salamander, then it passes through the reptilian and mammalian stages before "evolving" into a recognizable human being.

The concept conveyed in the slogan "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" quickly became known as the "recapitulation theory," and in a very short time this myth became one of the most important proofs for evolution. Throughout the 20th century, countless students saw the chart of the human embryo's imaginary progress from fish, through salamander, chicken and rabbit; and the myth that the human embryo had gills for a while became an accepted fact. Even today, many supporters of the theory of evolution, if asked, would cite this as one of its proofs.

However, this is pure fabrication. In fact, the embryos of various creatures did not at all resemble one another. Haeckel's drawings made all sorts of misrepresentations. To some embryos, he added imaginary organs, removed organs from others, and showed larger and smaller embryos as all the same size.

In the human embryo, the slits that Haeckel represented as gills were really the beginning of the middle ear canal, the parathyroid, and the thymus glands. Haeckel's other comparisons are also now known to be deceptions; what he made look like a "yolk sac" in the embryo is actually a sac that produces blood for the baby. The structure that Haeckel and his followers called the "tail" was actually the human spine, which resembled a tail only because it formed before the legs did.

At the beginning of the 20th century, it came to light that Haeckel had falsified his drawings and he openly confessed to this, saying:

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, schematized and constructed. <sup>57</sup>

But despite his avowal, Darwinists liked his propaganda material and refused to give up using it. They ignored the fact that the drawings were false and for decades, textbooks and much evolutionist literature presented them as authentic.

The fact that Haeckel's drawings were falsifications was loudly expressed only in the second half of the 1990s. The September 5, 1997 edition of the *Science* magazine published "Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered," an article by Elizabeth Pennisi explaining that his drawings were fabrications. As she wrote:

The impression they [Haeckel's drawings] give, that the embryos are exactly alike, is wrong, says Michael Richardson, an embryologist at St. George's Hospital Medical School in London. . . So he and his colleagues did their own comparative study, reexamining and photographing embryos roughly matched by species and age with those Haeckel drew. Lo and behold, the **embryos "often looked surprisingly different,"** Richardson reports in the August issue of *Anatomy and Embryology*.<sup>58</sup>

*Science* reported that, in order to show the similarity among the embryos, Haeckel deliberately removed some organs from the drawings or added imaginary ones. The article continues:

Not only did Haeckel add or omit features, Richardson and his colleagues report, but he also fudged the scale to exaggerate similarities among species, even when there were 10-fold differences in size. Haeckel further blurred differences by neglecting to name the species in most cases, as if one representative was accurate for an entire group of animals. **In reality, Richardson and his colleagues note, even closely related embryos such as those of fish vary quite a bit in their appearance and developmental pathway.** "It looks like it's turning out to be one of the most famous fakes in biology," Richardson concludes.<sup>59</sup>

The article says that somehow, Haeckel's admissions were kept under cover since the beginning of this century and his drawings continued to be studied in textbooks as if they were authentic. The magazine says:

Haeckel's confession got lost after his drawings were subsequently used in a 1901 book called *Darwin and After Darwin* and reproduced widely in English-language biology texts.<sup>60</sup>

An article in the October 16, 1999 edition of *New Scientist* brought Haeckel's embryology myth completely out into the open:

[Haeckel] called this the biogenetic law, and the idea became popularly known as recapitulation. In fact Haeckel's strict law was soon shown to be incorrect. For instance, **the early human embryo never has functioning gills like a fish, and never passes through stages that look like an adult reptile or monkey.**<sup>61</sup>

Thus, what could be called the most popular supposed proof of all time for evolution—the "recapitulation" theory—was invalidated.

But even while Haeckel's fabrications came to light, another falsification close to that of Haeckel continued to go unnoticed: namely, Darwinism.

As we saw earlier, Darwin discounted other scientists' negative views of Haeckel's interpretative drawings at the time and used them to bolster his own theory. But this was not the only point where Darwinism diverged from the truth. Much more striking is that he presented the views of Karl Ernst von Baer—reputedly the most noted embryologist of the time—as distorted. Jonathan Wells' *Icons of Evolution* explains in detail that von Baer did not accept Darwin's theory and harshly refuted it. He was also firmly against evolutionist interpretations of embryology, formulating the rule that "*the embryo of a higher form never resembles any other form, but only its embryo.*"<sup>62</sup> He also said that Darwinists dogmatically "*accepted the Darwinian evolutionary hypothesis as true before they set to the task of observing embryos.*"<sup>63</sup> But, after the third edition of *The Origin of the Species*, Darwin distorted von Baer's interpretations and conclusions and used them to bolster his own theory. As Wells explains:

Darwin cited von Baer as the source of his embryological evidence, but at the crucial point, Darwin distorted that evidence to make it fit his theory. Von Baer lived long enough to object to Darwin's misuse of his observations, and he was a strong critic of Darwinian evolution until his death in 1876. But Darwin persisted in citing him anyway, making him look like a supporter of the very doctrine of evolutionary parallelism he explicitly rejected.<sup>64</sup>

In short, Darwin exploited his time's primitive scientific conditions to make false and prejudiced deductions; and took advantage of the limitations in communications in order to distort other scientists' findings.

This fact's coming to light—late though it is—is doubtlessly a major blow to Darwinism. Darwin received help from Haeckel's falsifications and portrayed embryology as in favor of his theory.<sup>65</sup> Many people were deceived by this myth and in their naïve ignorance, accepted that they once had gills.

But that was then. Now it is known that embryology does not prove Darwinism. Now the same slogan must be reiterated in the field of embryology.

Once upon a time, there was Darwinism!

## **ONCE, THERE WAS THE MYTH OF FAULTY CHARACTERISTICS**

Oxford University zoology professor Richard Dawkins is one of the well-known evolutionists in the world today. He is known not by his work on zoology, but by his avid championing of Darwinism and atheism.

In 1986, he published his book entitled *The Blind Watchmaker*, in which he tried to persuade readers that living creatures' complex characteristics were the result of natural selection. His attempts were mostly based on speculation, faulty comparisons and wrong calculations that various scientists and writers have since exposed in detail.<sup>66</sup>

One of Dawkins' arguments was that of "faulty" or "bad" characteristics in living things. He stated that some structures in living creatures were useless and that, therefore, they were faulty, trying to do away with the fact that a flawless creation reigns. The foremost example he gave was the inverted retina in the vertebrate eyes, including the human eye.

An inverted retina in the vertebrate eye means that photoreceptors are located in the eye backwards, not frontwards where the light enters. The sensory ends of these light-perceiving cells face the back, and the retinal nerves coming out from them form a layer between light and the cells. These nerves converge to a certain point on the retina where they exit the eye. Because there are no photoreceptors at this point, it is the eye's "blind spot," where there is no vision.

Darwinists have adopted this inversion and the blind point as flaws; that the eye came to be through natural selection and that such oddities are to be expected. As said earlier, Richard Dawkins is the well-known proponent of this argument. In *The Blind Watchmaker* he writes:

Any engineer would naturally assume that the photocells would point towards the light, with their wires leading backwards towards the brain. He would laugh at any suggestion that the photocells might point away from the light, with their wires departing on the side nearest the light. Yet this is exactly what happens in all vertebrate eyes.<sup>67</sup>

However, Dawkins and those who accept what he says are wrong because of Dawkins's ignorance of the eye's anatomy and physiology.

A scientist who gives a detailed account of this matter is molecular biologist Michael Denton of the University of Otago who is also one of the most prominent critics of Darwinism today. In "The Inverted Retina: Maladaptation or Pre-adaptation?," published in *Origins and Design* magazine, he explains how the inverted retina that Dawkins presented as faulty is actually created in the most efficient manner possible for the vertebrate eye:

. . . consideration of the very high energy demands of the photoreceptor cells in the vertebrate retina suggests that rather than being a challenge to teleology, the curious inverted design of the vertebrate retina may in fact represent a unique

solution to the problem of providing the highly active photoreceptor cells of higher vertebrates with copious quantities of oxygen and nutrients.<sup>68</sup>

To understand this fact stressed by Professor Denton but unnoticed by Dawkins, we must first recognize that the retina's photoreceptor cells need a high level of energy and oxygen. While our eyes are open to perceive light, these cells are the locus of very complex chemical reactions every second. Photons, the smallest particles of light, are perceived by the cells and, as a result of the highly detailed chemical reactions begun by the photons, perception occurs and is repeated every instant. This reaction is so complex and rapid that, in Denton's words, "*the photoreceptor layer has one of the highest metabolic rates of any known tissue.*"<sup>69</sup>

To keep up this high rate of metabolism, of course, the retina cells need a great deal of energy. A human being's retinal cells consume 150% as much oxygen as renal cells, three times as much as ones in the cerebral cortex and six times as much as the cells that make up the cardiac muscle. Moreover, this comparison is made on the basis of the entire retina layer; the photoreceptor cells, which make up less than half of this layer, actually need more energy than the whole layer estimates. In his encyclopedic book, *The Vertebrate Eye*, G. L. Walls, describes the photoreceptors as "greedy" for both nutrients and oxygen.<sup>70</sup>

How do these cells, that enable us to see, meet their extraordinary need for nourishment and oxygen?

Through the blood, of course, like the rest of the body.

Where, then, does the blood come from?

At this point, we see why the inverted retina is a perfect sign of Creation. Right external to the retina layer lies a very important tissue of veins that envelop it like a net. Denton writes:

The oxygen and nutrients for the voracious metabolic appetite of the photoreceptors are provided by a unique capillary bed, called the choriocapillaris, which is an anatomizing network of large and flattened capillaries which form a rich vascular layer situated immediately external to the photoreceptors, separated from them only by the retinal cell epithelial cell layer (RPE) and a special membrane—Bruch's membrane—which together form a highly selective barrier which only allows passage into the retina of metabolites and nutrients required for the function of the RPE and photoreceptor cells. These capillaries are much larger than standard capillaries being between 18–50 microns in diameter. This unique network of blood channels gives every impression of being specially adapted to provide the photoreceptor layer with copious quantities of blood.<sup>71</sup>

In his book, *An Introduction to the Biology of Vision*, Professor James T. McIlwain writes, "*Because of the great metabolic needs of the photoreceptors, the*



*eye seems to have adopted the strategy of 'swamping' the choroid with blood to ensure that supply is never a problem.*"<sup>72</sup>

It is for this reason that the photoreceptors are "inverted." Clearly, there is a strategy here. The inverted arrangement of the retina is not faulty as Dawkins claimed, but is proof of Creation for a specific purpose.

In a relevant article, Denton examines whether the retina could have been formed in a different way. His conclusion was that it could not. Dawkins' suggestion that the retina should be flat, with the receptor cells facing the light, would distance them from the capillaries that nourish them and in great measure, would rob them of oxygen and nutrients they need. Extending the capillaries into the retina layer would not solve the problem, because this would produce many blind spots and reduce the eye's ability to see.

Denton comments:

The more deeply the design of the vertebrate retina is considered, the more it appears that virtually every feature is necessary and that in redesigning from first principles an eye capable of the highest possible resolution and of the highest possible sensitivity (capable of detecting an individual photon of light) we would end up recreating the vertebrate eye—complete with an inverted retina. . . <sup>73</sup>

In short, the arguments of Dawkins and other evolutionists that "the vertebrate retina is faulty" derive from ignorance. Their conclusions have been vitiated by more informed and knowledgeable investigations of the minutiae of living creatures. Actually, in the history of Darwinism there have been many other arguments arising from ignorance. One is the myth of the "vestigial" organs.

## **The Myth of Vestigial Organs**

You may have read that the human appendix and coccyx, or tail bone, are vestigial organs that once had important functions in our supposed evolutionary ancestors, but lost those functions over the course of time.

Lots of people have, because ever since Darwin, the myth of the vestigial organs has been the evolutionists' favorite propaganda material.

The myth started with *The Origin of the Species*' mention of organs whose functions were lost or reduced. Darwin described these organs as "rudimentary" and compared them with "*the letters in a word, still retained in the spelling, but become useless in the pronunciation.*"<sup>74</sup> In 1895, the German anatomist R. Wiedersheim proposed a list of about 100 human "vestigial organs," including the appendix and the tail bone.

But like other Darwinist claims, this too was a myth that thrived because of the unsophisticated level of science at the time. As research advanced, slowly it came to light that the organs that Darwin and his followers thought to be vestigial actually had important functions, as yet not been determined. With the

development of science, it was discovered that Wiedersheim's list of organs had very important functions in the body. As their functions were discovered, the long list of "vestigial" organs grew steadily shorter. For example, it was discovered that the appendix, long regarded as vestigial, was a very important part of the lymphatic system that fights germs when they enter the body. An article titled "Examples of Bad Design Gone Bad," referring to some of the basic literature on anatomy, explains:

An examination of the appendix microscopically, shows that it contains a significant amount of lymphoid tissue. Similar aggregates of lymphoid tissue (known as gut-associated lymphoid tissues, GALT) occur in other areas of the gastrointestinal system. The GALT are involved in the body's ability to recognize foreign antigens in ingested material. My own research, in particular, is focused on examining the immunological functions of the intestine.

Experiments in rabbits demonstrate that neonatal appendectomy impairs the development of mucosal immunity. Morphological and functional studies of the rabbit appendix indicate that it is probably the equivalent of the avian bursa in mammals. The bursa plays a critical role in the development of humoral immunity in birds. The histological and immunohistochemical similarity of the rabbit and human appendix suggest that the human appendix has a similar function to that of the rabbit appendix. The human appendix may be particularly important early in life because it achieves its greatest development shortly after birth and then regresses with age, eventually resembling such other regions of GALT as the Peyer's patches in the small intestine. These recent studies demonstrate that the human appendix is not a vestigial organ, as originally claimed.<sup>75</sup>

In short, the reason why the appendix was famously thought to be vestigial was the dogmatism of Darwin and his followers, thanks in turn to the unsophisticated level of science of their time. With the primitive microscopes at their disposal, they could not observe the lymphatic tissue of the appendix; and because they could not understand its structure, they regarded it as useless and included it on their list of functionless vestigial organs. Once more, Darwinism was abetted by the unsophisticated level of 19th-century science.

This situation also pertained to all the other organs on Wiedersheim's list. As years went on, the tonsils that were thought to be vestigial were discovered to have an important role in protecting the throat from infection, especially before adulthood. It became known that the tail bone at the base of the spinal column supported the bones around the pelvis and therefore, if it were not for it, an individual could not sit comfortably. In addition, this bone was understood to be the point at which the organs and muscles of the pelvic region were held together.

In subsequent years, it was found that the thymus, thought to be vestigial, activates the T-cells and sets the body's immune system into operation; that the

pineal gland is responsible for the secretion of essential hormones such as melatonin that controls production of the luteinizing hormone; that the thyroid gland ensures a balanced development of the infant and plays a role in setting the body's metabolic rate; and that the pituitary gland ensures the correct functioning of several hormonal glands such as the thyroid, the adrenals and the reproductive glands, as well as controlling the skeletal development.

The semi-lunar fold in the corner of the eye that Darwin called vestigial was shown to help clean and lubricate the eye.

Today, it has been determined that the organs claimed to be vestigial in past years all have definite functions. In their book titled "*Vestigial Organs" Are Fully Functional*, Dr. Jerry Bergman and Dr. George Howe set out this fact in detail.

Accordingly, it is accepted that the myth of vestigial organs subscribed to by so many evolutionists is an argument based on ignorance. In "Do 'Vestigial Organs' Provide Evidence for Evolution?," an article in the magazine *Evolutionary Theory*, the evolutionist biologist S.R. Scadding writes:

As our knowledge has increased, the list of vestigial structures has decreased. . . 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.<sup>76</sup>

Even though it has taken evolutionists about one and a half century to reach this conclusion, another myth of Darwinism has evaporated.

## **The Panda's Thumb**

The beginning of this chapter invalidated Richard Dawkins' claim that the vertebrate retina is faulty. Another evolutionist, supporting the same ideas, is the late Stephen J. Gould, a paleontologist at Harvard University. Before his death in 2002, he had become one of America's leading evolutionists.

Like Dawkins, Gould also wrote about an example of "faulty" characteristics—the thumb of the panda.

Unlike a human hand, a panda does not have an opposable thumb apart from its other four fingers that lets it hold objects easily. Its five digits extend out side by side. But besides these five parallel digits, there is also a projection in its wrist called the "radial sesamoid bone." The panda sometimes uses this bone as a finger, and so biologists call it the panda's thumb.

Gould claimed that this bone in the panda's hand was non-functional. Gould was so convinced of the importance of his thesis that in 1980, he published a book on the subject.

Like Dawkins' claim, however, Gould's thesis of faulty characteristic was also wrong. Gould's error lay in comparing the panda's hand with that of a human,

assuming that the panda's thumb had the same function. On this matter, Paul Nelson makes the following comment:

Although the panda's thumb may be suboptimal for many tasks (such as typing), it does seem suited for what appears to be its usual function, stripping bamboo.<sup>77</sup>

The authors of *The Giant Pandas of Wolong* comment as follows:

The panda can handle bamboo stems with great precision, by holding them as if with forceps in the hairless groove connecting the pad of the first digit and pseud thumb. . . When watching a panda eat leaves. . . we were always impressed by its dexterity. Forepaws and mouth work together with great precision, with great economy of motion. . .<sup>78</sup>

In a research published in 1999 by the magazine *Nature* showed that in its natural environment, the panda's thumb was extremely useful. This joint project conducted by four Japanese researchers employed computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging techniques and found that the panda's thumb is "*one of the most extraordinary manipulation systems*"<sup>79</sup> in the world of mammals. This following comment comes from the same article, titled "Role of the Giant Panda's Pseudo-thumb":

We have shown that the hand of the giant panda has a much more refined grasping mechanism than has been suggested in previous morphological models.<sup>80</sup>

In short, the claims made by evolutionists over the past 150 years of "vestigial organs" and "faulty" biological characteristics have all been proved false by closer investigations of the structures in question.

Evolutionists cannot account for the origins of any biological structure in nature, and their objections to explaining these structures in terms of the fact of Creation have been shown to be invalid.

For that reason we can say that there was once such a thing as Darwinism, which claimed that living things were full of "faulty" or "vestigial" organs.

Today, this theory has been discredited by scientific evidence.

## **ONCE, THERE WAS THE MYTH OF "JUNK" DNA**

The last support for faulty or vestigial structures discussed in the last chapter is the new—but recently discredited—concept of "junk" DNA.

In the second half of the 20th century, as we saw in the last chapter, the myth of vestigial organs began to collapse. Organs formerly thought to be useless turned out to have important functions, and the myth became untenable. But evolutionists, not wanting to do without the propaganda this myth afforded, embraced a new

version of it, which claimed that some of the genes containing the organs' genetic code but not the organs themselves—were vestigial. The new concept that replaced "vestigial" organs was "junk" DNA.

This term "junk" referred to some sections of the huge DNA molecule in which is encoded all of a living creature's genetic data. According to evolutionist claims, a large part of DNA is now non-functional. These parts did have a function in the so-called past, but in time, after the alleged evolutionary changes, they became vestigial—in short, "junk." The parallel with Darwinism was quite clear, and in a short time, the concept of junk DNA became one of the most repeated terms in scientific literature. But this new version of the myth did not have a long lifespan. Especially with the announcement of the results of the Human Genome Project in 2001, it was more and more loudly proclaimed in the scientific world that the whole concept was wrong, because the functions of so-called junk DNA were slowly being understood. Evan Eichler, an evolutionist scientist from the University of Washington, admitted that "The term 'junk DNA' is a reflection of our ignorance."<sup>81</sup>

Now, let's examine how the myth of junk DNA was born and how it was discredited.

## **The Misconception that Non-Coding DNA is Useless**

To better understand this evolutionist error, we must know something about the structure of the DNA molecule.

This giant molecular chain within the cells of living creatures is often referred to as a data bank, because of the genetic information it contains. At the same time, this molecule contains a genetic code that directs how this data is employed in the body's activities. As detailed in the previous chapters, every evolutionist's attempt to explain the origin of the DNA molecule has been unsuccessful, and it's been established that the data it contains could not have come into existence at random. The DNA molecule is clearly an example of a superior Creation.

The special parts of DNA encoding our physical characteristics and physiological activities are called genes, which play a role in the synthesis of various proteins and ensure that we survive. But the totality of our genes makes up only about 10% of our DNA. The remaining 90% is known as "non-coding DNA" because it does not direct the production of any proteins.

Non-coding DNA can be categorized into some sub-groups. Sometimes, it's found squeezed between genes and is called an intron. Another kind, called repetitive DNA, is formed by repeated nucleotide sequences extending the length of the chain. If the nucleotides on non-coding DNA were arranged in a way similar

to the complex series in a gene, instead of in a repetitive series, they would be called a pseudogene.

Evolutionists have lumped these non-protein-coding segments of DNA under the general heading of "junk DNA" and asserted that they are unnecessary leftovers in the so-called process of evolution. However, this endeavor has clearly been illogical: Just because these DNA segments do not code for proteins does not imply that they have no function. In order to determine these functions, we have to await the results of scientific experiments to be done on them. But evolutionist prejudice, with its longstanding misleading claims about junk DNA, has kept this logic from becoming disseminated in the public domain. In the past 10 years especially, research has shown that evolutionists are wrong and their claims imaginary. The non-coding part of DNA is not "junk" as the evolutionists claim, but on the contrary, is now accepted as a "genomic treasure."<sup>82</sup>

Paul Nelson, who received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, is one of the leading exponents of the anti-evolutionist movement. In an article titled "The Junk Dealer Ain't Selling That No More," he describes the collapse of the evolutionists' theory of junk DNA:

Carl Sagan [one of the proponents of atheism] argued that "genetic junk," the "redundancies, stutters, [and] untranscribable nonsense" in DNA, proved that there are "deep imperfections at the heart of life". Such comments are commonplace in the biological literature—although perhaps less common than they were a few years ago. The reason? Geneticists are discovering functions for what used to be apparent genetic debris.<sup>83</sup>

But how did they discover that "junk DNA" is not junk after all?

### **1. Coding criteria relative to linguistic ability were discovered in the non-coding nucleotide sequence.**

In 1994, the joint experiments on non-coding DNA carried out by molecular biologists of Harvard Medical School and physicists of Boston University revealed some striking results. Researchers studied 37 DNA sequences from various organisms and having at least 50,000 base pairs, to determine if there were any particular patterns in the nucleotide arrangement. This study showed that 90% of human DNA, which was previously supposed to be junk, actually possessed structural similarities to natural languages!<sup>84</sup> That is, a common coding criterion found in every spoken language in the world was discovered to exist in the arrangement of nucleotides in DNA. This discovery provided no support for the thesis that the data in the so-called junk DNA was assembled by chance; on the contrary, it supported a superior Creation as the basis of life.

## **2. Repetitive heterochromatin shows an amazing functionality: Nucleotides that appear meaningless by themselves perform important functions together and play a role in the meiotic division.**

Recently, scientists have discovered the functions of heterochromatin, one of the chromosome materials formerly thought to be junk. This code is often repeated in DNA, and since its role in the production of any protein could not be determined, it was long defined as meaningless.

Hubert Renauld and Susan Gasser of the Swiss Institute for Experimental Cancer Research comment that despite heterochromatin's significant representation in the genome (up to 15% in human cells and roughly 30% in flies), it has often been considered as "junk DNA," of no utility to the cell.<sup>85</sup>

But the latest studies have revealed that heterochromatin has some important functions. Emile Zuckerkandl of the Institute of Molecular Medical Sciences has this to say:

. . . [I]f one adds together nucleotides [DNA base pairs] that are individually nonfunctional, one may end up with a sum of nucleotides that are collectively functional. Nucleotides belonging to chromatin are an example. Despite all arguments made in the past in favor of considering heterochromatin as junk, many people active in the field **no longer doubt that it plays functional roles. . . . Nucleotides may individually be junk, and collectively, gold.**<sup>86</sup>

One of these "collective" functions of heterochromatin can be seen in meiotic pairing. At the same time, studies of artificial chromosomes show that these segments of DNA have various functions.<sup>87</sup>

## **3. Researchers have shown a relationship between non-coding DNA and the cell nucleus—a development that spells the end of the "junk DNA" concept.**

A 1999 study examining the genomes of the single-celled photosynthetic organisms known as Cryptomonads discovered that eukaryotic non-coding DNA (also called secondary DNA) was functional in the nucleus.

Characteristically, these organisms show a wide variation in size. But even if they are of varying dimensions, there always remains a direct proportion between the size of their nucleus and that of the overall cell.

Seeing the proportion between the amount of non-coding DNA and the size of the nucleus, researchers concluded that more non-coding DNA was a structural necessity required in larger nuclei. This new research was a major blow to such concepts as junk DNA and Dawkins' "selfish" DNA that dismiss the fact of Creation.<sup>88</sup> The researchers concluded their report by saying:

Furthermore, the present lack of significant amounts of nucleomorph secondary DNA . . . refut[es] "selfish" and "junk" theories of secondary DNA.<sup>89</sup>

#### **4. Non-coding DNA was discovered to be necessary for the chromosome structure.**

In the past few years, another important role played by non-coding DNA has been discovered: It is absolutely necessary for the structure and functioning of chromosomes. Studies have shown that non-coding DNA provides the structure that lets DNA perform various functions—which it cannot in the absence of a formed structure. Scientists observed that elimination of a telomere (the DNA-protein complexes at both ends of chromosomes that grow smaller after cell division) from a yeast chromosome caused a cell cycle arrest.<sup>90</sup> This indicates that telomeres help the cell distinguish between intact chromosomes and damaged DNA. In those cells which recovered from the arrest without repairing the damaged chromosome, the chromosome was eventually lost. This also demonstrates that telomeres belonging to non-coding DNA are necessary to maintain chromosome stability.

#### **5. The discovery of non-coding DNA's role in the development of an embryo**

There is proof that during development, non-coding DNA plays a major role in regulating the gene expression (the process by which a gene's coded information is converted into the structures present and operating in the cell).<sup>91</sup> Various studies have shown that non-coding DNA plays a role in the development of photoreceptor cells<sup>92</sup>, of the reproductive tract<sup>93</sup>, and the central nervous system.<sup>94</sup> All this shows that non-coding DNA plays vital roles in embryogenesis, or embryonic development.

#### **6. Introns (considered as junk DNA segments) have been shown to play a vital role in cell functioning.**

For years, evolutionists thought introns, which are squeezed between functional genes and are spliced out in the process of producing proteins, to be junk DNA, but only later discovered their importance.

At first, evolutionists thought that introns had no role in the production of proteins and regarded them as merely junk. However, research has proven that they play a vitally important role and today, introns are recognized as "*a complex mix of different DNA, much of which are vital to the life of the cell.*"<sup>95</sup>

A short but interesting article in the science column of *The New York Times* exposed the errors of evolutionists with regard to introns. In "DNA: Junk or Not?," C. Claiborne Ray sums up the results of research on introns:

For years, more and more research has, in fact, suggested that introns are not junk but influence how genes work. . . introns do have active roles. <sup>96</sup>



This article emphasizes that in the light of the latest scientific developments, supposedly "junk DNA" like introns really do play a useful role in the life of organisms.

All these developments not only reveal new information about non-coding DNA, but also clearly point to the very important fact that the evolutionist concept of junk DNA was based on lack of knowledge and "ignorance" as Evan Eichler admitted.<sup>97</sup>

The Last Support for the Myth of Junk DNA has Fallen:

### **A Pseudogene has been Shown to be Functional**

Since the 1990s, important developments have all shown that the concept of junk DNA was an evolutionist error based on lack of knowledge. Non-coding DNA, like introns interrupting the sequence of genes and repetitive DNA found as longer sequences, have been shown to be functional. There was only one kind of non-coding DNA left whose functionality was unknown: pseudogenes.

The prefix *pseudo* means "false, deceptive." Evolutionists gave the name "pseudogene" to a DNA segment produced by a functional gene that had apparently undergone a mutation and lost its functionality. Pseudogenes have a special significance for evolutionists, who covertly acknowledge that mutations cannot bring about evolution and have resorted to pseudogenes as a means to deceive people.

Countless experiments on living things have shown that mutations always result in a loss of genetic data. Just as a few random blows with a hammer will not lead to improvements in the running of a clock, mutations have never led to the development of new organisms, or cause existing ones to evolve. Although the theory of evolution requires an increase in genetic data, mutations always reduce and destroy them.

Evolutionists, lacking even a single demonstrable mechanism to support their theory, presented pseudogenes as by-products of a phantom mechanism functioning in an imaginary evolutionary process. They claimed that these allegedly useless DNA segments were molecular "fossils" of so-called evolution. Their only support for this claim was the lack of knowledge as to whether these genes had any real function.

That is, up until May 1, 2003.

That was when *Nature* magazine published a study showing the functionality of pseudogenes. In a letter titled "An expressed pseudogene regulates the messenger-RNA stability of its homologous coding gene," researchers told of their observations in mice prepared for an experiment.<sup>98</sup> According to the information they gave, fatal mutations occurred in a line of transgenic mice as a result of

genetic changes in pseudogenes called Makorin1-p1. They observed in the mice polycystic kidneys and bone deformity.

It became evident why a change in the arrangement of the pseudogene would have such a disastrous effect on the mice's organs: A pseudogene is not just functional, but necessary.

An article in *Nature* evaluating this research stated that this discovery challenged the popular belief of evolutionists that pseudogenes were simply "molecular fossils."<sup>99</sup> And so, one more evolutionist myth collapsed.

Just three weeks after pseudogenes were revealed to have a biological function after all, a study in the May 23, 2003 issue of *Science* dealt another severe blow to the idea of junk DNA<sup>100</sup> revealing yet another function of the non-coding DNA. Evolutionists apprised of all these developments had no other choice but to accept that the time had come to "junk" their concept of junk DNA. The title of an article by Wojciech Makalowski of Pennsylvania State University shows the change: "Not Junk After All." Makalowski sums up the situation in these words:

. . . [T]he view of junk DNA, especially repetitive elements, began to change in the early 1990s. Now, more and more biologists regard repetitive elements as a genomic treasure. . . These two papers demonstrate that repetitive elements are not useless junk DNA but rather are important, integral components of eukaryotic genomes. . . Therefore, repetitive DNA should be called not junk DNA. . . <sup>101</sup>

Once upon a time, you may have heard a lot about the idea of junk DNA and the evolutionist speculations connected with it.

But as outlined here, Darwinism's last assertion of "vestigiality"—junk DNA—has passed into history, and this last flutter of Darwinism has also been discredited.

## **ONCE, THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES WAS THOUGHT TO LIE IN "SPECIATION"**

On June 14, 2003, an article entitled "How Are New Species Formed?" appeared in *New Scientist*, noted for its avid support of Darwinism. The author, George Turner, made this important admission:

Not long ago, we thought we knew how species formed. We believed that the process almost always started with complete isolation of populations. It often occurred after a population had gone through a severe "genetic bottleneck", as might happen after a pregnant female was swept off to a remote island and her offspring mated with each other. The beauty of this so-called "founder effect" model was that it could be tested in the lab. In reality, it just didn't hold up. Despite evolutionary biologists' best efforts, nobody has even got close to creating a new species from a founder population. What's more, as far as we know, no new species has formed as a result of humans releasing small numbers of organisms into alien environments.<sup>102</sup>

Actually, this admission is not new. In the century and a half since Darwin, no speciation such as he proposed has ever been observed, and no satisfactory explanation has ever been provided for the origin of species.

To explain this, it will be useful to examine what sort of "speciation" Darwin envisioned.

His theory depended on the observation of variations in the animal populations. Some of these observations were made by individuals who bred animals, raising quality breeds of dogs, cows or pigeons. From among the population, they selected ones with a desirable characteristic (for example, dogs that could run fast, cows that produced good milk or "smart" pigeons), and bred them. Within a few generations, their resulting offspring had a high proportion of the selected qualities. For example, the cows produced much more milk than ordinary cows.

This kind of "limited variation" made Darwin think that modification is continual in nature, and when it is extended over a long enough period of time, it produces a radical change, that is, evolution.

Darwin's second observation along these lines was that the various breeds of finches he saw in the Galapagos Islands had differently-shaped bills than finches on the mainland. In the islands, long-billed, short-billed, curved-billed and straight-billed strains of finches developed in the same population. Darwin concluded that these varieties turned into separate species by mating among themselves.

When Darwin assembled all these instances of variation, he was led to think that unlimited modification occurred in nature and that to develop brand-new species, orders and classes, only a long period of time was required. But Darwin was wrong.

When individuals with a given dominant characteristic are selected and bred, only better and stronger members of that species are produced. But this selective breeding can't possibly produce a different species. For example, a horse cannot descend from a cat, nor a giraffe from a gazelle, or a plum from a pear. Peaches do not turn into bananas nor do carnations turn into roses. In short, under no conditions can one species arise from another. The following pages will detail how Darwin was wrong on this matter.

## **The Natural Limits of Biological Change**

Darwin supposed that the variations he observed in nature were never-ending. He thought that if only a few generations could show a change in cows, dogs and pigeons, then their entire structure could undergo alteration if given enough time. But in the 150 years that have passed since then, countless different experiments and observations have proven this supposition to be utterly false.

All 20th-century attempts to breed animals and produce hybrid plants have revealed limits that can never be crossed in the processes of natural variation. One of the most famous names in this field is Luther Burbank, who believed that there is a hidden law in species that limits their variation:

I know from my experience that I can develop a plum half an inch long or one two and a half inches long, with every possible length in between, but I am willing to admit that it is hopeless to try to get a plum the size of a small pea, or one as big as a grapefruit. . . In short, there are limits to the development possible, and these limits follow a law. . . Experiments carried on extensively have given us scientific proof of what we had already guessed by observation; namely that plants and animals all tend to revert, in successive generations, toward a given mean or average. . . In short, there is undoubtedly a pull toward the mean which keeps all living things within some more or less fixed limitations.<sup>103</sup>

Today, artificial means can make a few genetic changes in the biological structure of animals and agricultural products. Stronger horses and bigger cabbages can be produced. But Darwin clearly drew the wrong deductions from these instances. Loren Eiseley, one of the world's most prominent anthropologists, explains:

It would appear that careful domestic breeding, whatever it may do to improve the quality of race horses or cabbages, is not actually in itself the road to the endless biological deviation which is evolution. There is great irony in this situation, for more than almost any other single factor, domestic breeding has been used as an argument for . . . evolution.<sup>104</sup>

And Edward S. Deevey, a biologist and ecologist at the University of Florida, points out that there is a limitation to variation in nature: "*Wheat is still wheat, and not, for instance, grapefruit; and we can no more grow wings on pigs than hens can make cylindrical eggs.*"<sup>105</sup>

Experiments conducted on fruit flies also struck the wall of "genetic limitation." In all of these experiments, fruit flies underwent changes to a certain extent, but beyond that limit, no change was observed. Ernst Mayr, a well-known neo-Darwinist, reports from two experiments done on fruit flies:

In the starting stock, the combined average bristle number of males and females on these segments was about 36. Selection for low bristle number was able to lower this average after 30 generations to 25 chaetae, after which the line soon died out owing to sterility. . . In the "high line" (selection for high bristle number), progress was at first rapid and steady. Within 20 generations bristle number had risen from 36 to an average 56, without marked spurts or plateaus. At this stage sterility became severe.<sup>106</sup>

After these experiments, Mayr reached the following conclusion:

Obviously any drastic improvement under selection must seriously deplete the store of genetic variability. . . The most frequent correlated response of one-sided selection is a drop in general fitness. This plagues virtually every breeding experiment.<sup>107</sup>

One of the most important texts dealing with this subject is *Natural Limits to Biological Change* written by biology professor Lane P. Lester and molecular biologist Raymond G. Bohlin. In their book's introduction, they write:

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.<sup>108</sup>

The authors studied this subject with scientific observations and experiments and arrived at two basic conclusions:

1) No new genetic data can be obtained without external interference in the genes of organisms. Without such interference, new biological data cannot appear in nature. That is, new species, new organs, and new structures cannot come into being. It is only "genetic variation" that occurs naturally in a given species. These limited alterations include the development of, for example, shorter, larger, short-haired or long-haired breeds of dogs. Even given a million years, these variations will never produce new species or higher taxa (genera, families, orders, classes, phyla).

2) In nature, external interference with the genes of organisms comes about only through mutations. But these mutations are never beneficial nor produce new genetic data; they only destroy the existing one.

Therefore, it is impossible to explain the "origin of species" in terms of natural selection, as Darwin thought to do. No matter how much "selection" dogs are subjected to, they will always remain dogs; there is no sense in asserting that they were actually fish or bacteria in the past.

So, what of the "external interference" in the genes, or mutations?

Since the 1930s the Darwinist theory has relied on this alternative, and for this reason, the theory's name was changed to "neo-Darwinism." However, mutations were not able to rescue the theory—an important topic to examine separately.

## **Galapagos Creatures Refute Evolution**

The various finches that Darwin observed in the Galapagos were an example of variation and, as with other examples, offered no definite proof for evolution.

Observations made in the last few years have shown that finches have not undergone the kind of limitless alteration that Darwin's theory supposed. Moreover, most of the different types of finches, which Darwin thought to represent 14 separate species, were actually variations of the same species, able to mate with one another. Scientific observations have shown that the example of the finch's bill, cited by almost all evolutionist literature, is actually an example of variation which affords no proof for the theory of evolution. Peter and Rosemary Grant went to the Galapagos to look for proof for the so-called Darwinian evolution and spent years observing the finches on the islands; in their well-known study, they managed only to document the fact that evolution had not occurred.<sup>109</sup>

## What Good are Mutations?

The data contained in the gene is highly complex, as are the molecular "machines" that code it, read it and perform their productive functions accordingly. No random event that can affect this system, and no "accident" can bring about any increase in the amount of genetic data.

Imagine a computer programmer engaged in writing a software when on computer and a book falls on his keyboard, striking a few keys and inserting random letters and numbers into the text. A mutation is something like this. Just as such an accident would contribute nothing to the computer program—in fact, it would ruin it—so mutations vandalize the genetic code. In *Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Lester and Bohlin write that "mutations are mistakes, errors in the precise machinery of DNA replication" which means "*mutations, genetic variation, and recombination by themselves will not generate major evolutionary change.*" <sup>110</sup>

This logically expected result was proven by observations and experiments in the 20th century. No mutation was observed to improve the genetic data of an organism so as to cause a radical change.

For this reason, despite the fact that he accepts the theory of evolution, Pierre-Paul Grassé, former president of the French Academy of Sciences, says that mutations are "*merely hereditary fluctuations around a median position; a swing to the right, a swing to the left, but no final evolutionary effect. . . They modify what preexists.*" <sup>111</sup>

Dr. Grassé says that in the case of evolution, the problem is that "*some contemporary biologists, as soon as they observe a mutation, talk about evolution.*" In his view, this opinion does not agree with the facts because "no matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution." <sup>112</sup>

The best evidence that mutations do not produce new genetic data is that of the fruit fly. Mutations done to fruit flies show that in nature, balance, not change, dominates organisms. Thanks to the fast gestation period of fruit flies, which lasts only 12 days, for years they have been the favorite subject of mutation experiments. In order to increase the mutation rate by 15,000 percent, X-rays were used in these experiments. Scientists could observe fruit flies that, in a short time, were subjected to the number of mutations they would be exposed to for millions of years under natural conditions. But even such rapid mutations produced no new species. Scientists were not able to obtain any new genetic data.

In fruit flies, the classic case of supposed "beneficial mutation" is the instance of the four-winged mutant. Normally, fruit flies have two wings, but some with four wings have hatched occasionally. Darwinist literature offers this example as a "development," but as Jonathan Wells has shown in detail in his *Icons of Evolution*, this interpretation is wrong. These extra wings have no muscles for flying and so

are actually disadvantages to the fruit fly. And not one of these mutants has survived outside a laboratory.<sup>113</sup>

Despite all this, evolutionists assert that beneficial instances of mutation do occur, even if rarely; and that through natural selection, new biological structures come into being. However, this is a major error. A mutation certainly brings about no increase in genetic data and, therefore, does not foster evolution. As Lester and Bohlin explain:

Mutations will be capable only of modifying what already exists, usually in a meaningless or deleterious way. That is not to say that beneficial mutation is prohibited; unexpected maybe, but not impossible. A beneficial mutation is simply one that makes it possible for its possessors to contribute more offspring to future generations than do those creatures that lack the mutation. . . But these mutations have nothing to do with changing one kind of organism into another. . .

In this regard, Darwin called attention to the wingless beetles of Madeira. For a beetle living on a windy island, wings can be a definite disadvantage. Mutations causing the loss of flight are definitely beneficial. Similar would be the case of sightless cavefish. Eyes are quite vulnerable to injury, and a creature that lives in total darkness would benefit from mutations reducing their vulnerability. While these mutations produce a drastic and beneficial change, it is important to notice that they always involve loss, never gain. One never observes wings or eyes being produced in species that did not previously possess them.<sup>114</sup>

Therefore, Lester and Bohlin conclude that overall, mutations are always a cause of genetic impairment and degeneration.

Mutations always cause a loss of genetic data; to believe that they produced the extraordinarily complex genetic codes of the millions of different species is like believing that books falling randomly onto a computer keyboard have written millions of encyclopedias. It is unthinkable nonsense. Dr. Merle d'Aubigne, head of the Orthopedic Department at the University of Paris, makes this important comment:

I cannot be satisfied by the idea that fortuitous mutation . . . can explain the complex and rational organization of the brain, but also of lungs, heart, kidneys, and even joints and muscles. How is it possible to escape the idea of some intelligent and organizing force?<sup>115</sup>

In short, mutations do not explain Darwin's "origin of species." The Austrian evolutionist biologist Gerhard Müller, in a book review he wrote for the winter 2006 issue of the *Biological Theory* journal, admits the inability of the neo-Darwinian synthetic theory to account for the origin of morphological novelty.

Neo-Darwinism cannot explain the origin of living creatures in terms of its two mechanisms, natural selection and mutation. No genetic data can be yielded through natural selection; only the existing data is selected. Nor do mutations



produce new genetic data; they rarely do not affect the existing data but usually destroy it. Clearly the origins of genetic data—and therefore, life—have none of these mindless natural mechanisms.

As Dr. Merle d'Aubigne stated, this origin is an "intelligent and organizing force." This power is Almighty God with His endless intelligence, knowledge and might. In the Qur'an, God says:

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

Darwinism has tried to deny this reality, but has not succeeded; it has become an outmoded theory buried in history.

### **The End of "Just-So Stories"**

The attempt to explain the origin of species in terms of evolution has come to an impasse, as has been openly admitted by evolutionists over the past few years. The situation is summed up in a 1996 article by evolutionist biologists Gilbert, Opitz and Raff in the magazine, *Developmental Biology*. They write: "*the origin of species—Darwin's problem—remains unsolved.*"<sup>116</sup>

But the man in the street is not aware of this situation. The Darwinist system prefers not to let the public know that in Darwin's terms, the question of the origin of species is unanswerable. Instead, through media and textbooks, it repeats the myths of evolution. In the world of science, these myths are called "just-so stories" and constitute the main source of motivation for those who accept the theory.

You will find one of the most familiar of these stories—about how humans came to walk on two feet—in almost every evolutionist text, with slight variations: Humanoid primates that were the ancestors of human beings lived among the trees in the African jungles. Their spines were stooped, and their hands and feet ideally shaped for clinging onto branches. Africa's jungle expanses later shrank, and humanoids migrated to the savannah. In order to be able to see above the savannah's tall grasses, they needed to stand upright, in other words on their feet. Thus it was that our ancestors came to stand and walk erect. Their hands were now off the ground; and as a result they began using their hands to make tools. The more they used their hands, the more their intelligence grew. They thus turned into human beings.

You can often find stories like this in evolutionist newspapers and magazines. Reporters who accept the theory of evolution, or whose knowledge of it is limited or superficial, relate these stories to their readers as if they were factual. However, more and more scientists proclaim that they have no scientific value. Dr. Collin

Patterson, for years the senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History in London, writes:

It is easy enough to make up stories of how one form gave rise to another, and to find reasons why the stages should be favored by natural selection. But such stories are not part of science, for there is no way of putting them to the test.<sup>117</sup>

And in his book *Fossils and Evolution* (1999), the evolutionist paleontologist T.S. Kemp takes up the lack of scientific value in what has been written about the supposed evolution of birds:

A scenario for the origin of birds might be that during the Late Jurassic there was a selection pressure favouring the adoption of increasingly arboreal [tree-dwelling] habits acting on a group of small, lightly built bipedal dinosaurs. Arboreality increased their ability to escape predators and find new food sources. Subsequent selection forces promoted leaping, then gliding, and eventually powered flight from branch to branch and tree to tree. Absolutely none of these suppositions about the intermediate forms, the ecological conditions they lived in, or the selective forces to which they were subjected could be tested empirically. The outcome is the evolutionary scenario or, rather more pejoratively, the "Just-so Story".<sup>118</sup>

The subject that Patterson and Kemp deal with—that "just-so stories" cannot be tested and therefore have no scientific value—is only one aspect of the problem. A second, perhaps more important, aspect is that apart from the fact that these stories have no scientific support, they are impossible nonsense.

To explain why, let us return to the story of the "hominoids that started to walk on two feet."

Jean Baptiste Lamarck invented this myth in the unsophisticated scientific world of 150 years ago. However, modern genetics has shown that a characteristic acquired over a lifetime is not passed down to the next generation. The relevance of this lies in the supposition that the so-called ancestors of human beings evolved with characteristics they had acquired during their lifetime. This scenario claims that hominoids stood up on their hind feet to see above the vegetation, freeing their hands for use, and as a result, their intelligence developed. Nothing of this sort ever happened. Besides, it is not possible for a creature to acquire characteristics simply by trying to stand up straight and by using hand tools. Even if we accept the possibility of such acquisition (which is scientifically impossible), these skills cannot be passed on to the next generation. Therefore, even if the impossible did take place and one ape could force its skeleton into an upright position, it could not pass on this habit to its offspring, and evolution would not occur.

So, why is this Lamarckian idea, discredited for more than a century, still trying to impose itself on society?

Evolutionists say that these "just-so stories" encapsulate an actual process of biological evolution. They do not believe that necessity gives birth to evolution, but that necessity guides natural selection in a particular direction. They also believe that it causes the selection of the mutations that will bring about results in that direction. That is, when they maintain that hominoids stood up on two feet, they are actually saying that it would have been advantageous for them to stand on two feet. Some stood up straight, with a skeleton that had mutated at just the right time; and those that stood up straight were chosen by natural selection.

In other words, the scientific explanations relevant to the mutation are completely ignored, because if these details are examined, it will appear that they are merely unscientific superstitions.

The evolutionists' just-so stories suppose that mutations will appear to supply whatever an organism needs and to ensure whatever advantages would suit it best.

Moreover, no mutation has been observed so far that develops genetic data.

To believe in this scenario is like believing in a magic wand that supplies a creature's every need. It is superstition.

Even though the French zoologist Pierre-Paul Grassé theoretically accepts evolution, he is aware of the reality of the situation and has come out strongly against Darwinism in describing its strange belief about mutations:

The opportune appearance of mutations permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding. A single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of . . . appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with an infinitesimal probability could not fail to occur. . . There is no law against daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it.<sup>119</sup>

In short, Darwinism is a figment of the imagination with nothing to do with science. And the just-so stories presented as scientific fact have not the slightest scientific support.

All these myths have in common the supposition that living things' special needs are first determined and then supplied by mutations. Evolutionists call this need "evolutionary pressure." (For example, the need to stand up on two feet in the high grass of the savannah is a so-called "evolutionary pressure.")

Only those who blindly accept Darwinism can possibly suppose that the necessary mutations are ready at hand. Everyone not caught up in such blind dogmatism can see that just-so stories are inventions with no relation to science.

Indeed, the nature of such conjectures is now openly admitted by evolutionist scientists. A new example is the comment by Ian Tattersall, curator in the Division of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History, on an article in *The New York Times*, titled "Why Humans and Their Fur Parted Ways." The answer proposed was the scenario of having various advantages. Tattersall said, "*There are*

*all kinds of notions as to the advantage of hair loss, but they are all just-so stories."*

120

In his 1999 book, evolutionist Henry Gee, science editor of *Nature* magazine, wrote that it is wrong to attempt to explain an organ's origin in terms of what is advantageous for it:

. . . our noses were made to carry spectacles, so we have spectacles. Yet evolutionary biologists do much the same thing when they interpret any structure in terms of adaptation to current utility while failing to acknowledge that current utility needs tell us nothing about how structure evolved, or indeed how the evolutionary history of a structure might itself have influenced the shape and properties of that structure.<sup>121</sup>

These statements are very important because in future, you will probably encounter such "just-so stories" in evolutionist literature and especially in the media. Remember, these vain stories rest on no scientific proof. The same method is always used in their production. First, the advantage of a creature's particular characteristic or aspect is described, then a scenario is invented to show how this advantage could have evolved. In practice, of course, there's no limit to the evolutionist theses that could be produced in this way: "The trunk gives the elephant the ability to gather food from the ground, so it must have evolved for that purpose," or "The giraffe's neck enables it to reach higher branches so it must have evolved to let the animal do so." To accept this is to believe that nature looks after the needs of its every creature. That is, it is the same as believing a myth.

The nature of this myth is becoming clearer and clearer every day.

Reviewing what we've examined since the beginning of this chapter, claiming that the origin of species is a random evolutionary process was the result of wrong deductions Darwin made in the scientifically unsophisticated 19th century. Every 20th-century observation and experiment shows that no mechanism in nature produces new species, much less higher taxa of living things.

Now that science has destroyed the Darwinist error, it has come to light that the true origin of species lies in Creation. Almighty God, with His supreme knowledge, has created every living creature.

## **ONCE, THERE WAS THE "HORSE SERIES" SCENARIO**

When Darwin was proposing his theory, there were no intermediate forms to support it, but he hoped that some would be discovered in the future. To remedy this vital deficiency, paleontologists who believed in Darwinism put together a set of horse fossils found in North America to form a sequence. Despite the fact that

there appeared to be no intermediate forms in the fossil record, the Darwinists thought that they had come up with a great success.

One of the most important pieces of this sequence had already been discovered before Darwinism. In 1841, the English paleontologist Sir Richard Owen found a fossil belonging to a small mammal and, inspired by its similarity to the hyrax, a small fox-like creature found in Africa, he called it *Hyracotherium*. The hyrax's skeleton was almost identical to Owen's finding, except for its skull and the tail.

As they did with other fossils, paleontologists who adopted Darwinism began to evaluate *Hyracotherium* from an evolutionist point of view. In 1874, the Russian paleontologist Vladimir Kovalevsky tried to establish a relationship between *Hyracotherium* and horses. In 1879, two well-known evolutionists of the time carried this enterprise further and compiled the horse series which was to remain on the Darwinist agenda for years to come. The American paleontologist Othniel Charles Marsh, together with Thomas Huxley (known as Darwin's bulldog), devised a chart by arranging some hoofed fossils according to tooth structure and the number of toes in foreleg and hind leg. In the process, to stress the idea of evolution, Owen's *Hyracotherium* was renamed *eohippus* which means "dawn horse." Their claims together with their charts were published in the *American Journal of Science* and laid the foundation of the sequence that would be displayed for years in museums and textbooks as supposed proof of the evolution of today's horse.<sup>122</sup> Some of the genera displayed as the stages of this sequence included *Eohippus*, *Orohippus*, *Miohippus*, *Hipparion* and finally the modern-day horse, *Equus*.

In the next century, this sequence was taken to be proof for the so-called evolution of the horse. The decrease in the number of toes and the animal's gradual increase in size were enough to convince evolutionists, who for some decades hoped to assemble similar fossil sequences for other creatures. But their hopes were never fulfilled: They were never able to assemble a sequence for other creatures, as they supposedly had for the horse.

Moreover, some contradictions became evident, with the attempt to insert newly-excavated fossils into the horse series. Characteristics of the new finds—where they were discovered, their age, the number of toes—were incompatible with the sequence and began to undo it. They were inconsistent with the horse series and turned it into a meaningless assortment of fossils.

Gordon Rattray Taylor, former chief science advisor to BBC Television described the situation:

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 of the variants were smaller than *Eohippus*, not larger. Specimens from different sources can be brought together in a convincing-looking sequence, but there is no evidence that they were actually ranged in this order in time.<sup>123</sup>

He openly admitted that the horse series was based on no proof. Heribert Nilsson, another researcher, made the same statement, writing that the horse series was "very artificial":

The family tree of the horse is beautiful and continuous only in the textbooks. In the reality provided by the results of research it is put together from three parts, of which only the last can be described as including horses. The forms of the first part are just as much little horses as the present day damans are horses. The construction of the horse is therefore a very artificial one, since it is put together from non-equivalent parts, and cannot therefore be a continuous transformation series.<sup>124</sup>

Today, even many evolutionists reject the thesis that horses went through a gradual evolution. In November, 1980, a four-day symposium was held at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago attended by 150 evolutionists. It dealt with the problems associated with the theory of a gradual evolution. A speaker, the evolutionist Boyce Rensberger, told that there was no proof in the fossil record for the scenario of the gradual evolution of the horse, and that there never was any such process:

The popularly told example of horse evolution, suggesting a gradual sequence of changes from four-toed, or fox-like creatures, living nearly 50 million years ago, to today's much larger one-toe 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.<sup>125</sup>

From the statements of Taylor, Nilsson and Rensberger, we can understand that there is no scientific support for the supposed evolution of horses, and that the sequence is full of contradictions. So, if there is no proof for the horse series, what is it based on? The answer is evident: As with all other Darwinist scenarios, the horse series is imaginary; evolutionists assembled some fossils according to their own preconceptions and gave the public the impression that the creatures had evolved from one another.

Marsh can be called the architect of the horse series, and there is no doubt that he played a role on creating this impression. Almost a century later, Marsh's "technique" was described by the evolutionist Robert Milner, who said that "*Marsh arranged his fossils to 'lead up' to the one surviving species, blithely ignoring many inconsistencies and any contradictory evidence.*"<sup>126</sup>

In short, Marsh created a scenario of his own and later assembled the fossils according to it as if arranging screwdrivers in his toolbox according to their size. But contrary to expectations, the new fossils upset Marsh's scenario. The ecologist Garret Hardin says:

There was a time when the existing fossils of the horses seemed to indicate a straight-line evolution from small to large. . . As more fossils were uncovered . . . it was all too apparent that evolution had not been in a straight line at all.<sup>127</sup>

The fossils could not be arranged to show a gradual evolution, such as Darwin had envisioned. The evolutionist, Francis Hitching, explains:

Even when all possible fossils are included, there appear to be major jumps in size of horses from one genus to the next, without transitional examples.<sup>128</sup>

Today, the horse series gives evolutionists nothing to hope for. It has been discovered that horses lived at the same time as their supposed ancestors and even side by side with them, and so evidently there is no way to establish an ancestral lineage among them. Besides, many characteristics discovered in the tooth and bone structure of horses invalidate this sequence. All this points to one evident fact: There was never any evolutionary relationship among these sequenced creatures. As with all others, these genera in their fossil layers appeared all at once. Despite all their efforts, evolutionists have not been able to demonstrate transitional characteristics among these genera, and it's worth a closer look at the horse series that Darwinists once defended so intently.

## **Inconsistency and Admissions by Evolutionists**

Contrary to the evolutionist scenario displayed in museums and textbooks, the horse series is inconsistent in terms of various criteria. First of all, evolutionists have not been able to establish any connection between *Eohippus* (or *Hyracotherium*), which they claim begins the sequence, and condylarths, supposedly the ancestors of ungulates.<sup>129</sup>

In addition, there are inconsistencies *within* the horse series. Some of the creatures included in the sequence are proven to have lived at the same time as one another. In January, 1981, *National Geographic* published the surprising report that researchers in Nebraska, USA came across thousands of 10-million-year-old fossils that had been preserved after a sudden volcanic eruption. This news dealt a severe blow to the scenario of horse evolution, because the published photographs of these fossils showed both three-toed and one-toed horses,<sup>130</sup> refuting the claim that genera in the horse series evolved from one another. These creatures, claimed to have an ancestral connection, actually lived at the same time and in the same place, and demonstrated no transitional characteristics that could prove evolution. This discovery demonstrated that the evolutionist propaganda of the horse series,

long disseminated in museums and textbooks, was completely imaginary and assembled on the basis of preconceptions.

A greater inconsistency committed in the name of Darwinism was *Mesohippus* and its supposed ancestors. Jonathan Wells, noted for his criticism of Darwinism in his *Icons of Evolution*, writes that although *Miohippus* actually appeared in the fossil record before *Mesohippus*, it persists after it.<sup>131</sup>

Interestingly, O.C. Marsh himself mentioned the existence of three-toed horses living in southwestern America at that time and that in this respect, they resembled the extinct *Protohippus*.<sup>132</sup> The inconsistency of the horse series lies not only in the fact that a genera existed in the same time and place as the so-called "ancestor" from which it claimed linear descent. No isolated area of the world can be taken by itself as evidence that horses came to be through an evolutionary process. Evolutionists have assembled fragments of fossils from different continents according to their preconceptions and used to corroborate their claims. However, this methodology does not accord with objective science.

While assembling the horse series, evolutionists relied on the fossils' number of toes and the size and structure of the teeth—but this procedure turned against them. In arranging their sequence, they claimed that the horse's supposed ancestors went from feeding on bushes to feeding on grass, and that their teeth evolved accordingly. But from studies made on 5-million-year-old teeth belonging to six different species of horses, Bruce MacFadden demonstrated that these creatures' teeth did not really undergo any change.<sup>133</sup>

On the other hand, an up-and-down variation can be seen in the number of ribs and lumbar vertebrae in the sequence, which is the exact opposite of what evolution would predict. For example, in the supposed evolutionary horse series, the number of ribs increased from 15 to 19, and later decreased to 18. In the so-called ancestors, the number of lumbar vertebrae went from six to eight, then back to six. These structures have a critical influence on these animals' movement and even their lives. Logically, a species whose vital structures undergo random variations clearly cannot perpetuate itself.

A final inconsistency in the horse series is the evolutionist assumption that an observed increase in a creature's size represents evolutionary "progress." Looking at the size of modern-day horses, we can see that this makes no sense. The largest modern-day horse is the *Clydesdale*, and the smallest is the *Fallabella*, only 43 centimeters high.<sup>134</sup> Despite the large variations in size in today's horses, evolutionists' past attempts to sequence horses according to their size was foolish indeed.

In short, the whole horse series is clearly an evolutionist myth based on prejudice. It has been left to the evolutionist paleontologists—the silent witnesses of Darwinism's collapse—to make this known. Since Darwin's time, they have



known that there were no fossil layers of intermediate forms. In 2001, Ernst Mayr said, "*Nothing has more impressed the paleontologists than the discontinuous nature of the fossil record*,"<sup>135</sup> expressing the longstanding disappointment among paleontologists that the countless intermediate forms that Darwin envisioned have never been found.

Perhaps for this reason, paleontologists have been speaking for decades about the invalidity of the horse series, even though other evolutionists continue to defend it avidly. In 1979, for example, David Raup said that the horse series was totally meaningless and invalid:

The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time. By this I mean that the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be modified or discarded as a result of more detailed information. What appeared to be a nice simple progression when relatively few data were available now appears to be much more complex and less gradualistic. So Darwin's problem has not been alleviated.<sup>136</sup>

About 20 years ago, an evolutionist paleontologist Dr. Niles Eldredge from one of the world's most famous museums, the American Museum of Natural History, confessed that evolutionist claims about the horse series diagrams displayed in his own museum were imaginary. Eldredge criticized assertions that this speculative series was valid enough to be included in textbooks.

I admit that an awful lot of that has gotten into the textbooks as though it were true. For instance, the most famous example still on exhibit downstairs is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps 50 years ago. That has been presented as literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now I think that is lamentable, particularly because the people who propose these kinds of stories themselves may be aware of the speculative nature of some of the stuff.<sup>137</sup>

These comments from experts clearly show that assertions about the horse series are unsubstantiated. Even today, however, museums around the world exhibit the horse series and tell visitors the tale that horses are an evolved species. Ironically, one of the gravest errors in scientific history is displayed in buildings intended to acquaint people with real science and raise their appreciation of its accuracy. What visitors see there is just a Darwinist myth that was discredited decades ago.

## **Claims of Vestigiality in a Horse's Legs and the Facts**

Evolutionists aver that the number of horse's toes decreased over time, basing this claim on splint bones found in modern-day horses' forelegs. In the so-called process of evolution, they say, horses' three toes receded to form the splint bones. However, splint bones are not the useless vestiges that evolutionists claim them to

be. They strengthen the leg for running and are known to play a role in reducing the stress caused by galloping. They provide attachment points for various muscles. Also, they form a protective groove housing the suspensory ligament, a vital elastic brace that supports the animal's weight as it moves.<sup>138</sup>

A horse's leg is evidence of Creation. Pierre-Paul Grassé explains the characteristics of a horse's hoof in technical language, then goes on to show that this continuity could not have been brought about by any random process. The excellence of the structure in the leg joints, its pressure-absorbing cushions, its lubricating liquid to facilitate movement, its ligaments and structure are all amazing:

Such a hoof, which is fitted to the limb like a die protecting the third phalanx, can without rubber or springs buffer impacts which sometimes exceed one ton. It could not have formed by mere chance: a close examination of the structure of the hoof reveals that it is a storehouse of coaptations and of organic novelties. The horny wall, by its vertical keratophyl laminae, is fused with the podophyl laminae of the keratogenous layer. The respective lengths of the bones, their mode of articulation, the curves and shapes of the articular surfaces, the structure of bones (orientation, arrangement of the bony layers), the presence of ligaments, tendons sliding with sheaths, buffer cushions, navicular bone, synovial membranes with their serous lubricating liquid, all imply a continuity in the construction which random events, necessarily chaotic and incomplete, could not have produced and maintained. This description does not go into the detail of the ultrastructure where the adaptations are even more remarkable; they provide solutions to the problems of mechanics involved in rapid locomotion on monodactyl limbs.<sup>139</sup>

Grassé's statements clearly show the perfect structure of a horse's leg. Even more is known today about it, as a recent study reveals.

In a 2002 study, researchers from the University of Florida discovered that one particular bone in a horse's leg (the third metacarpus bone) had unique properties. As revealed by this study, there was a hole, the size of a pea through which blood vessels could enter, on one side of the bone. Naturally holes cause weaknessess. In laboratory stress tests, however, contrary to ordinary expectations, the bone didn't break near the hole. Further analysis showed that the bone was arranged in such a way as to push stress into a stronger region, preventing the horse's leg from breaking at that point. This structure attracted so many admirers that NASA financed Andrew Rapoff, an assistant professor of aerospace and mechanical engineering, to imitate it in the aircrafts near the holes for wiring.<sup>140</sup>

The structure of a horse's leg surpasses the inventiveness of engineers trained in the most advanced technology; and is now mimicked by the aircraft industry. As Grassé pointed out, such special structures cannot be explained in terms of random occurrences. Plainly, the horse's leg has superior characteristics that cannot come

into being by coincidence; that is, horses came into being with all their characteristics by God's superior Creation. In conclusion, the horse series presented as fact in the 20th-century evolutionist literature has been discredited. Horses show no evidence of evolution, but their complex anatomy is an important example of the fact of Creation.

So, Darwinism's myth of horse evolution, like its other myths, has been discredited.

## **ONCE, THERE WAS THE STORY OF PEPPERED MOTHS**

*Biston betularia*, a moth species of the family *Geometridae*, is perhaps one of the most celebrated species of the insect world, and its fame is due to the fact that it was the main so-called "observed example" of evolution since Darwin.

There are two known variants of *Biston betularia*. The widespread light-colored type called *Biston betularia f. typica* is a light gray color, with small dark spots that lends it its common name, "the peppered moth." In the mid-19th century, a second variant was observed: dark in color, almost black, it was named *Biston betularia carbonaria*. The Latin word *carbonaria* means coal-colored. The same type is also called "melanic," which means dark-colored.

In 19th-century England, the dark moths became prevalent, and this coloration was given the name *melanism*. Based on this, Darwinists composed a myth that they would use consistently for at least a century, claiming that it was a most important proof of evolution at work. This myth found its place in nearly all biology textbooks, encyclopedia articles, museums, media coverage and documentary films about Darwinism.

The myth's narrative can be summed up as follows: At the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, in Manchester and other predominantly industrial areas, the bark on the trees was light in color. For this reason, darker, melanic moths landed on these trees could easily be seen by the birds that preyed on them, so that their life expectancy was very short. But 50 years later, as a result of industrial pollution, the light-colored lichens that lived on bark died off and the bark itself became blackened by soot. Now predators could easily spot the light-colored moths. As a result, the number of light-colored moths decreased, while the dark-colored melanic forms, harder to notice on the trees, survived to reproduce.

Evolutionists resorted to the deception that this process was a major proof for their theory; and that over time, light-colored moths had "evolved" into a darker-colored type. According to Darwinist literature, this was evolution in action.

Today, however, like the other classic Darwinist myths, this one has been discredited. In order to understand why, we must look at how the story developed.

## **Kettlewell's Glued Moths**

The thesis that the melanic form of peppered moths appeared and multiplied in England because of the Industrial Revolution began to be discussed even while Darwin was alive. In the first half of the 20th century, it remained current only as an opinion, because there was not a single scientific experiment or observation to prove it. In 1953, H.B.D. Kettlewell, a Darwinist medical doctor and amateur biologist, decided to conduct a series of experiments to supply the missing proof, and went out into the English countryside, the habitat of peppered moths. He released a similar number of light and dark peppered moths and observed how many of each type the birds preyed. He determined that more dark-colored moths were taken by predators from the light lichen-covered trees.

In 1959, Kettlewell published his findings in an article entitled "Darwin's Missing Evidence" in the evolutionist magazine *Scientific American*. The article caused a great stir in the world of Darwinism. Biologists congratulated Kettlewell for substantiating so-called "evolution in action." Photographs showing Kettlewell's moths on tree trunks were published everywhere. At the beginning of the 1960s, Kettlewell's story was written into every textbook and would influence the minds of biology students for four decades.<sup>141</sup>

The strangeness of his assertion was first noticed in 1985 when a young American biologist and educator, Craig Holdrege, decided to do a little more research concerning the story of the peppered moths, which he had been teaching his students for years. He came across an interesting statement in the notes of Sir Cyril Clarke, Kettlewell's close friend, who participated in his experiments. Clarke wrote:

All we have observed is where the moths do not spend the day. In 25 years, we have only found two betularia on the tree trunks or walls adjacent to our traps. .

.<sup>142</sup>

This was a striking admission. Judith Hooper, an American journalist and writer for *The Atlantic Monthly* and the *New York Times Book Review*, reported on Holdrege's reaction in her 2002 book, *Of Moths and Men: The Untold Story of Science and the Peppered Moth*:

"What is going on here?" Holdrege asked himself. He had been displaying photographs of moths on tree trunks, telling his students about birds selectively picking off the conspicuous ones. . . "And now someone who has researched the moth for 25 years reports having seen only two moths" sitting on tree trunks. What about the lichens, the soot, the camouflage, the birds? What about the grand story

of industrial melanism? Didn't it depend on moths habitually resting on tree trunks?

143

This strangeness, first noticed and expressed by Holdrege, soon revealed the true story of the peppered moth. As Judith Hooper went on, "*As it turned out, Holdrege was not the only one to notice the cracks in the icon. Before long the peppered moth had kindled a smoldering scientific feud.*"<sup>144</sup>

So, in the scientific argument, what facts became clear?

Another American writer and biologist, Jonathan Wells, has written on this subject in detail. His book *Icons of Evolution* devotes a special chapter to this myth. He says that Bernard Kettlewell's study, regarded as experimental proof, is basically a scientific scandal. Here are some of its basic elements:

- Many studies made after Kettlewell's experiments showed that only one type of these moths rested on tree trunks; all the other types preferred the underside of horizontal branches. Since the 1980s, it has become widely accepted that moths rarely rest on tree trunks. Cyril Clarke and Rory Howlett, Michael Majerus, Tony Liebert, Paul Brakefield, as well as other scientists have studied this subject over 25 years. They conclude that in Kettlewell's experiment, moths were forced to act atypically, therefore, the test results could not be accepted as scientific.

- Researchers who tested Kettlewell's experiment came to an even more striking conclusion: In less polluted areas of England, one would have expected more light-colored moths, but the dark ones were four times as many as the light ones. In other words, contrary to what Kettlewell claimed and nearly all evolutionist literature repeated, there was no correlation between the ratio in the moth population and the tree trunks.

- As the research deepened, the dimensions of the scandal grew: The moths on tree trunks photographed by Kettlewell were actually dead. He glued or pinned the dead moths to tree trunks, then photographed them. In truth, because moths actually rested underneath the branches, it was not possible to obtain a real photo of moths on tree trunks.<sup>145</sup>

Only in the late 1990s, the scientific world was able to learn these facts. When the myth of the Industrial Melanism that had been a feature in biology courses for decades came to such an end, evolutionists were disappointed. One of them, Jerry Coyne, said he felt very dismayed when he learned of the fabrications with regard to the peppered moths.<sup>146</sup>

## Rise and Fall of the Myth

How was this myth invented? Judith Hooper explains that Kettlewell, and other Darwinists who made up the evolutionist story of the peppered moths with him, distorted the evidence in their desire to find proof for Darwinism (and become famous in the process). In so doing, they deceived themselves:

They conceived the evidence that would carry the vital intellectual argument, but at its core lay flawed science, dubious methodology, and wishful thinking. Clustered around the peppered moth is a swarm of human ambitions, and self-delusions shared among some of the most renowned evolutionary biologists of our era.<sup>147</sup>

Greatly contributing to the myth's collapse were experiments that a few other scientists did on the subject after it became known that Kettlewell's experiments had been distorted. An evolutionist biologist who recently studied the story of the peppered moth and found it to be without substance was Bruce Grant, professor of biology at the College of William and Mary. Hooper reports Grant's interpretation of conclusions reached by other scientists who repeated Kettlewell's experiments:

"It doesn't happen," says Bruce Grant, of Kettlewell's dominance breakdown/buildup studies [on moths]. "David West tried it. Cyril Clarke tried it. I tried it. Everybody tried it. No one gets it." As for the background matching experiments, Mikola, Grant and Sargent, among others, repeated what Kettlewell did and got results contrary to his. "I am careful not to call Kettlewell a fraud," says Bruce Grant after a discreet pause. "He was just a very careless scientist." <sup>148</sup>

Other evidence that the evolutionist story of the peppered moths is completely wrong lies in North America's population of *Biston betularia*. The evolutionist thesis is that during the Industrial Revolution, air pollution turned the moth population black. Kettlewell's experiments and observations done in England were regarded as evidence of this. However, the same moth lives in North America, where no melanism has been observed despite the Industrial Revolution and the air pollution. Hooper explains this situation referring to the findings of Theodore David Sargent, an American scientist who studied the question:

[Evolutionists] . . . also ignored the studies on the North American continent that raised legitimate questions about the classical story of dark backgrounds, lichens, air pollution, and so on. Melanics are equally common in Maine, southern Canada, Pittsburgh, and around New York City . . . and in Sargent's view, the North American data falsify the classical industrial melanism hypothesis. This hypothesis predicts a strong positive correlation between industry (air pollution, darkened backgrounds) and the incidence of melanism. "But this was not true," Sargent points out, "in Denis Owen's original surveys—which showed the same extent of melanism wherever sampled, whether city or rural area—and hasn't been found by anyone since." <sup>149</sup>

With the discovery of all these facts, it came to light that the story of peppered moths was a giant hoax. For decades people all over the world were misled by photographs of dead moths pinned to a tree bark, intended to supply Darwin's missing evidence, and the constant repetition of an old-fashioned story. The evidence Darwin needed to find is still missing, because there's no such evidence.

A 1999 article published in *The Daily Telegraph*, a London newspaper, sums up how the myth was finally discredited:

Evolution experts are quietly admitting that one of their most cherished examples of Darwin's theory, the rise and fall of the peppered moth, is based on a series of scientific blunders. Experiments using the moth in the Fifties and long believed to prove the truth of natural selection are now thought to be worthless, having been designed to come up with the "right" answer. Scientists now admit that they do not know the real explanation for the fate of *Biston betularia*, whose story is recounted in almost every textbook on evolution.<sup>150</sup>

In short, the myth of industrial melanism—like other supposed proofs for evolution, avidly defended by many evolutionists—crumbled.

Once, because of conservatism and lack of knowledge, the scientific world could be duped by tales like that of the peppered moths. But now, all such Darwinist myths have been discredited.

## **UNTIL RECENTLY, THERE WERE STORIES OF THE DINO-BIRD**

Within the last ten years, dinosaurs with avian feathers, or imaginary "dino-birds," have been one of the Darwinist media's favorite pieces of propaganda. A series of headlines about dino-birds, reconstruction drawings, and persistent explanations from evolutionist "experts" persuaded many that half-bird, half-dinosaur creatures once existed.

The last, most exhaustive defense of this premise was undertaken by Richard O. Prum and Alan Brush, both well-known ornithologists, in the March 2003 issue of *Scientific American*. In their article, "The Feather or the Bird? Which Came First?", Prum and Brush were assertive, as if to finally put an end to the on-going arguments as to the origin of birds. They claimed that their findings had led them to a supposedly amazing conclusion: Feathers had evolved in dinosaurs, before birds came into existence. Feathers, they proposed, had evolved not for the purpose of flying, but for insulation, impermeability to water, to attract the opposite gender, camouflage, and defense. Only later were they used for flight.

However, this thesis in fact consisted of speculation devoid of any scientific evidence. The new thesis, developed by Prum and Brush and adopted by *Scientific*

*American*, was nothing more than a new, but hollow, version of the "birds are dinosaurs" theory, furiously defended with a blind fanaticism in recent decades. In fact, like the other icons of evolution, this was also completely rotten.

One person whose views may be consulted on this matter is one of the recognized authorities in the world on the origin of birds: Dr. Alan Feduccia of the Biology Department of the University of North Carolina. He accepts the theory that birds came into existence through evolution, but he differs from Prum and Brush and other proponents of the "dino-bird" in thinking that the theory of evolution is not clear on this matter. He refuses to give any credence to the hype over the dino-bird, deliberately presented as a fact, without evidence.

He wrote an article in the October 2002 issue of *The Auk*, a periodical published by the American Ornithologists' Union and which serves as a forum for highly technical discussions of ornithology. His article, "Birds are Dinosaurs: Simple Answer to a Complex Problem," explains that the theory that birds evolved from dinosaurs, avidly supported ever since John Ostrom first proposed it in the 1970s, rested on no scientific evidence. Feduccia also gave a detailed account of how such a theory was impossible, and explained a very important fact concerning the dino-birds said to have been found in China: It is not clear that the structures found on the fossil reptiles, presented as feathered dinosaurs, are feathers at all. On the contrary, there is much evidence that this so-called "dino-fuzz" has no relation to feathers. Feduccia writes:

Having studied most of the specimens said to sport protofeathers, I, and many others, do not find any credible evidence that those structures represent protofeathers. Many Chinese fossils have that strange halo of what has become known as dino-fuzz, but although that material has been "homologized" with avian feathers, the arguments are far less than convincing.<sup>151</sup>

After this statement, he says that Prum showed prejudice in his article in *Scientific American*:

Prum's view is shared by many paleontologists: birds are dinosaurs; therefore, any filamentous material preserved in dromaeosaurs must represent protofeathers.<sup>152</sup>

According to Feduccia, one reason why this prejudice was refuted was that traces of this dino-fuzz were also found on fossils that have no provable relationship with birds. In the same article, Feduccia says:

Most important, "dino-fuzz" is now being discovered in a number of taxa, some unpublished, but particularly in a Chinese pterosaur [flying reptile] and a therizinosaur [a carnivorous dinosaur]. . . Most surprisingly, skin fibers very closely resembling dino-fuzz have been discovered in a Jurassic ichthyosaur [extinct marine reptile] and described in detail. Some of those branched fibers are exceptionally close in morphology to the so called branched protofeathers ("Prum Protofeathers")



described by Xu [a Chinese paleontologist]. . . That these so-called protofeathers have a widespread distribution in archosaurs [a Mesozoic reptile] is evidence alone that they have nothing to do with feathers.<sup>153</sup>

In the past, Feduccia says, certain residue was found in the area of these fossils, but it was shown to be inorganic matter with no relation to the fossil:

One is reminded of the famous fernlike markings on the Solnhofen fossils known as dendrites. Despite their plantlike outlines, these features are now known to be inorganic structures caused by a solution of manganese from within the beds that reprecipitated as oxides along cracks or along bones of fossils.<sup>154</sup>

Another interesting point is that all the fossil "feathered dinosaurs" were found in China. How could these fossils have come to light in China, but nowhere else in the world? And why weren't any feathers or feather shafts found on these dinosaurs, claimed by evolutionists to be feathered, in these Chinese formations that could so well preserve even such a structure as the dino-fuzz? The answer is plain: It's because they didn't possess any avian feathers. Feduccia writes:

One must explain also why all theropods and other dinosaurs discovered in other deposits where integument is preserved exhibit no dino-fuzz, but true reptilian skin, devoid of any featherlike material (Feduccia 1999), and why typically Chinese dromaeosaurs preserving dino-fuzz do not normally preserve feathers, when a hardened rachis, if present, would be more easily preserved.<sup>155</sup>

So, what are these creatures, found in China, and presented as a supposed intermediate form between reptiles and birds?

Feduccia explains that some of the creatures presented as "feathered dinosaurs" were extinct reptiles with dino-fuzz, and that others were true birds:

There are clearly two different taphonomic phenomena in the early Cretaceous lacustrine deposits of the Yixian and Jiufotang formations of China, one preserving dino-fuzz filaments, as in the first discovered, so-called "feathered dinosaur" *Sinosauropteryx* (a commpsognathid), and one preserving actual avian feathers, as in the feathered dinosaurs that were featured on the cover of *Nature*, but which turned out to be secondarily flightless birds.<sup>156</sup>

That is, all the fossils presented as "feathered dinosaurs" or "dino-birds" belong either to flightless birds like chickens, or to reptiles that possess the feature called "dino-fuzz," an organic structure that has nothing to do with avian feathers. Clearly, no fossil establishes the existence of an intermediate form between birds and reptiles. (Besides the above-mentioned two basic groups, Feduccia also mentions "the abundant beaked bird *Confusiusornis*," some enantiornithines, and a newly identified seed-eating bird called *Jeholornis prima*, none of which is a dino-bird.)

Therefore, Prum and Brush's claim in *Scientific American* that fossils have proved that birds are dinosaurs is totally contrary to the facts.

## **The "Age Problem" that Evolutionists Want to Hide and the Misconception of "Cladistics"**

In all evolutionist articles that fan the flames of the dino-bird myth, including the one by Richard O. Prum and Alan Brush in *Scientific American*, there is one forgotten and even hidden but very important fact.

The fossils of what they falsely call the "dino-bird" or "feathered dinosaur" do not date back any more than 130 million years. However, there is an extant fossil of a true bird at least 20 million years older than the fossils they want to present as a "half bird:" *Archaeopteryx*. Known as the oldest bird, *Archaeopteryx* is a true bird with perfectly-formed flying muscles, feathers for flight and a normal bird's skeleton. Since it could soar through the skies 150 million years ago, how can evolutionists maintain such nonsense as to present other creatures that lived later in history as the primitive ancestors of birds?

Darwinists have discovered a new method of doing so: cladistics, which has been frequently used in paleontology over the past few decades to interpret fossils. Those who promote this method are not interested in the fossils' age; they only compare the measurable characteristics of extant fossils and, on the basis of these comparisons, devise an evolutionist family tree.

This method is defended on an evolutionist Internet site that explains the so-called rationale for positing *Velociraptor*, a much younger fossil than *Archaeopteryx*, as the latter's ancestor:

Now we may ask "How can *Velociraptor* be ancestral to *Archaeopteryx* if it came after it?"

Well, because of the many gaps in the fossil record, fossils don't always show up "on time." For example, a recently discovered partial fossil from the Late Cretaceous of Madagascar, *Rahonavis*, seems to be a cross between birds and something like *Velociraptor*, but appears 60 million years too late. No-one however says its late appearance is evidence against its being a missing link, it may just have lasted a long time. Such examples are called "ghost lineages"; we assume these animals existed earlier when we have probable ancient ancestors for them a long way back, and perhaps possible descendants back then too.<sup>157</sup>

This summation shows what a huge distortion cladistics is. The following point needs to be made clear: the *Velociraptor* in the above extract is one of the fossils portrayed as a supposed intermediate form in the myth of birds evolving from dinosaurs. Like the others, however, this is nothing more than biased evolutionist interpretation. The feathers seen in the imaginary reconstructions of *Velociraptor* merely reflect evolutionists' imaginations; the fact is that there is no evidence the animal had feathers at all. In addition, again as we have seen in the above quotation, evolutionists manifestly distort the results from the fossil record

according to their own theories. The only reason for supposing that a species, with a 70-million-year-old fossil, actually existed 170 million years earlier—and establishing an evolutionary family relationship on the basis of that supposition—is to distort the facts.

Cladistics is a covert confession that the theory of evolution cannot cope with the fossil record and opens a new dimension. To sum up:

1) Darwin predicted that, once the fossil record was studied in detail, intermediate forms would be discovered to fill in the gaps between all the known species. This is what the theory expected.

2) But 150 years of work in paleontology has produced no intermediate forms, and no traces of these creatures have been discovered. This is a great defeat for the theory.

3) In addition to the fact that no intermediate forms have been found, the age of those creatures posited as ancestors of others only on the basis of comparison is also in dispute. A creature that appears more "primitive" may have appeared in the fossil record later than a creature that seems more "developed."

So, at this point, evolutionists were constrained to develop the inconsistent method known as cladistics.

With cladistics, Darwinism, purporting to be a theory that starts from and relies on scientific evidence, has been revealed to be no such thing, but a dogma that distorts scientific evidence, changing it according to suppositions—much like Lysenkoism, the official scientific doctrine of the USSR in the time of Stalin. It was nonsense concocted by Trofim Lysenko, who rejected the laws of genetics and was an adherent of Lamarck's theory of inheritance of acquired characteristics. Like Lysenkoism, Darwinism, too, thus became recognized as having no basis in science.

## **The Unbridgeable Differences Between Birds and Dinosaurs**

Not only Prum and Brush's thesis, but every version of the "birds are dinosaurs" theory has been discredited. The differences in anatomical structure between birds and dinosaurs cannot be bridged by any process of evolution. Here I outline some of these differences, examined in detail in my other books:

1) The structure of birds' lungs is totally different from that of reptiles and all other land vertebrates. Air is unidirectional in birds, it always flows in one direction through the lung. So a bird is able to constantly take in oxygen and expel carbon dioxide at the same time. It is not possible that this structure, peculiar to birds, could have evolved from the lungs of an ordinary land vertebrate. Any creature possessing an intermediate structure could not breathe and therefore, would not survive.<sup>158</sup>

2) Embryological comparisons of birds and reptiles made in 2002 by Alan Feduccia and Julie Nowicki showed a major difference in the hand structure of the two, proving that it was impossible to establish an evolutionary connection between them.<sup>159</sup>

3) The final comparison between the skulls of the two groups showed the same conclusions. As a result of a study he carried out in 1999, Andre Elzanowski concluded that there were "*no specific avian similarities found in the jaws and palates of dromaeosaurids [a group of theropod dinosaurs].*"<sup>160</sup>

4) Another difference separating birds from reptiles is their teeth. It is known that in the past, some birds had teeth in their beaks—which for a long time was presented as a so-called proof of evolution. But eventually, it became known that birds' teeth were peculiar to them. On this subject, Feduccia writes:

Perhaps the most impressive difference between theropods and birds concerns the structure of teeth and the nature of their implantation. It is astounding that more attention has not been given to the dramatic differences between bird and theropod teeth, especially when one considers that the basis of mammal paleontology involves largely tooth morphology. To be brief, bird teeth (as seen in *Archaeopteryx*, *Hesperornis*, *Parahesperornis*, *Ichthyornis*, *Cathayornis*, and all toothed Mesozoic birds) are remarkably similar and are unlike those of theropods. . . There is essentially no shared, derived relationship of any aspect of tooth morphology between birds and theropods, including tooth form, implantation, or replacement.<sup>161</sup>

5) Birds are warm-blooded, while reptiles are cold-blooded. This means that they have two very different metabolisms and it's not possible that a change from one to the other was effected by random mutations. To remove this difficulty, it was proposed that dinosaurs were warm-blooded. But this thesis rests on no evidence and there is much proof to discredit it.<sup>162</sup>

All this removes scientific support for the evolutionist thesis about the origin of birds. The Darwinist media may be able to prolong the furor over the dino-bird, but it is now clear that this was a non-scientific propaganda campaign.

Everyone who examines the origin of birds and all the other creatures in nature apart from evolutionist dogma will plainly see that creatures are far too complex ever to be explained in terms of natural influences of random occurrences. The only explanation for this lies in the fact of Creation.

God, Who knows every kind of creation with His supreme knowledge, created every living thing perfectly in one moment. In the Qur'an, God reveals:

**Does not man see that We created him from a drop yet there he is, an open antagonist! He makes likenesses of Us and forgets his own creation, saying, "Who will give life to bones when they are decayed?" Say: "He**

**Who made them in the first place will bring them back to life. He is  
Knower of every kind of creation." (Surah Ya Sin: 77-79)**

# CONCLUSION

The professor of philosophy and history of science Thomas Kuhn, in his book, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, deals with the concept of paradigm—a scientific worldview accepted at any particular period of time. Sometimes scientists ally themselves closely with a paradigm, but over time as a result of new discoveries, it becomes clear that their paradigm was wrong. For example, at one time the commonly-held worldview was Claudius Ptolemy's model of an Earth-centered universe. It was a very strong paradigm, but was toppled by the discoveries of Copernicus, and a new paradigm was accepted in its place. According to Kuhn, the world of science often undergoes great paradigm shifts that are called "scientific revolutions."

Kuhn points out that a considerable number of scientists make every effort to preserve the existing paradigm; in other words, they are conservative. For this reason, according to him, those who initiate scientific revolutions are not those with "scientific authority," but those still outside the scientific world or young minds who have just entered that world. Kuhn quotes the known scientist Max Planck: "*A new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it.*"<sup>163</sup>

Today, the scientific world is experiencing a revolution. Darwinism has been scientifically discredited, but individuals regarded as "authorities" in the scientific community have not accepted this. Their refusal to see the light is totally an ideological and dogmatic one. But it is getting weaker, and the public is aware of this. The name of the light beginning to glow before the eyes of the scientific world is the fact of Creation. Scientists who have studied this subject assert that life is not the product of random natural forces as Darwin maintained, but on the contrary, is the work of a Creator with supreme knowledge. This Creator is God, the Lord of all the worlds. More and more scientists are accepting this fact every day, and the scientific collapse of Darwinism is being clearly demonstrated ever more clearly.

One of the most important names in the anti-evolutionist movement, Phillip E. Johnson of the University of California at Berkeley, is certain that very soon, Darwinism will be thrown into the garbage can. After speaking about the new legal measures in various American states that allow scientific proofs against Darwinism to be included in textbooks, Johnson comments:

The decisive turn of events is occurring not in public school curricula, but in the minds and writings of those who know the evidence and have some independence of mind. Darwinists know they are losing evidence, not gaining it, and that they are also losing public support. They are desperately trying to

postpone admitting, for example, that peppered moths do not rest on tree trunks and that natural selection does not produce increases in genetic information. They are also getting practice in explaining away defeats. . . <sup>164</sup>

Darwinists must consider how and why their theory has been criticized. Most of their colleagues have become aware of all the evidence examined in this book. Some still ignore these proofs and strive to support Darwinism. Uninformed of scientific developments, they want to live in the world of the 1950s, what they imagine to be Darwinism's finest days. If asked about proofs for evolution, they avidly propose the discredited Miller Experiment, the so-called gills in the human embryo, the story of the peppered moths or the fantastic horse series. They ignore the Cambrian Explosion, irreducible complexity and the origins of genetic information. But there is no longer any use for anyone influenced by outdated books and Darwinist propaganda to cling to this discredited theory. We invite Darwinists to avoid falling into such a situation, to discard their prejudice, accept the scientific evidence and see the truth.

Those attached to Darwinism must give up believing blindly in this theory, study the conclusions of science, and evaluate them without prejudice. If any evidence supports Darwinism, they must announce it. But when their arguments appear to be wrong, they must face facts and give up their blind attachment to the theory of evolution.

If sincere in their search, even Darwinism's most avid supporters will see that this theory is a great deception, as proven by scientific facts.

This scientific collapse of Darwinism is actually reported to us in the Qur'an, where God reveals:

**Say: "Truth has come and falsehood has vanished. Falsehood is always bound to vanish." (Surat al-Isra': 81)**

Darwinism is a false, deceptive doctrine. It once gained influence by taking advantage of lack of knowledge and an unsophisticated scientific milieu, and was able to deceive many people. But revelation of the truth, together with the evaluation of the real scientific findings by unprejudiced individuals, has led to this deception's collapse.

Today's Darwinists are trying to reject, hide or ignore the truth in order to sustain falsehood. But they are wrong; and in this, have deceived and humiliated themselves. In the Qur'an, God has revealed a verse from which Darwinists must learn a lesson:

**Do not mix up truth with falsehood and knowingly hide the truth. (Surat al-Baqara: 42)**

After seeing the truth, it is right to cease resisting it and to embrace it. Up to now, some may have believed in the lie of evolution because it was instilled in their minds by others. But if they are sincere, instead of running after a deception and being humiliated in this world and the next, they will seek to find the truth and live according to it. Sincerity and honesty, it must not be forgotten, will be rewarded both in this life and the next.



# **SOCIAL WEAPON: DARWINISM**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The twentieth century was one of the darkest and most deadly in all of human history. Vast amounts of blood were spilled and people subjected to the most terrible fear and oppression. Such dictators as Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot and Idi Amin inflicted genocide on millions. Hitler had those whom he regarded as "useless" exterminated in the gas chambers. Hundreds of thousands of people in many Western countries—from Great Britain to Germany, from the USA to Sweden—were compulsorily sterilized or left to die just for being sick, crippled or old. All over the world, people were oppressed and exploited because of ruthless competition. Racism became the ideology of certain states, and some races were not even regarded as human at all. Because of the conflicts and hot and cold wars between East and West, the peoples of communist and capitalist countries, and even brothers, became one another's enemies.

Not generally realized, however, is the nature of the ideological foundation that propelled the 20th century towards such disruption, chaos, war and conflict, and gave rise to such hatred and enmity. The groundwork of this ideological foundation was laid by the British economist Thomas Malthus. This twisted concept, widely accepted by people far removed from religious moral values, was further strengthened by another Briton, the sociologist Herbert Spencer, and disseminated by the theory of evolution put forward by yet another Englishman, Charles Darwin.

These three figures entirely ignored such religious moral virtues as cooperation, altruism, protecting the poor and weak, and regarding all human beings as equal. In contrast, they proposed the falsehood that life is a battlefield, that the oppression and even extermination of the poor and those races whom they regarded as "inferior" was justified; that as a result of that pitiless struggle, the "fittest" would survive and the rest would be eliminated—and that all this would lead to human "progress."

With his theory of evolution, Darwin sought to apply this philosophy of selfishness to the natural sciences. Ignoring the examples of solidarity and cooperation created by God in nature, he maintained that all living things were engaged in a ruthless struggle for survival. On the basis of no scientific evidence whatsoever, he even claimed that this same ruthlessness applied to human societies. When his theory of evolution was applied to human society, social Darwinism appeared on the scene.

Some people suggest that Social Darwinism was born in the second half of the 19th century and lost its influence during the second half of the 20th. But this

theory has had far more permanent and damaging adverse effects. A twisted world view, in complete contradiction to religious moral values, has spread, alleging that life is a "struggle for survival," and that people need to compete in order to succeed in that struggle, or at the very least to survive. New lifestyles emerged that were the source of totalitarian and bloody ideologies like communism and fascism, ferocious capitalism that ignores social justice; racism, ethnic conflicts, moral degeneration, and many more disasters that inflicted catastrophes on humanity.

All of a sudden, Social Darwinism imparted an alleged scientific validity to existing evils, ruthless policies and practices. Adopting that trend, which lacks any scientific basis whatsoever, many people failed to live by religious moral values and began to regard ruthlessness, savagery and cruelty as unexceptional. They ignored the fact that religious moral values require virtues such as compassion, affection, understanding, self-sacrifice, solidarity and mutual support between individuals and societies. Perpetrators claimed a scientific foundation to their cruelty, and that therefore, the savagery they inflicted could be regarded as justified. These false claims and suppositions were of course a terrible deception.

In this book, we shall be examining and illuminating two main subjects: First, the dangers of educating young people in the light of Darwinism and of the theory's wide acceptance will be shown to people unaware of, or who ignore, the threat that it poses to societies and individuals.

Second, it will respond to those who maintain that Darwin and evolutionists are not in total agreement with Social Darwinists, and will show that every evolutionist who signs up to the theory of evolution is in fact signing up to Social Darwinism as well.

Throughout, we shall be emphasizing that the model proposed by the theory of evolution, regarding human beings as a species of animal, is an error based on ruthlessness, lovelessness, selfishness and self-interest. Darwinism seeks to construct a world where humans live and behave like animals. Social Darwinism's teachings and practices make this quite clear. According to its twisted views, it is perfectly acceptable for an elderly, needy person to be dragged out of his home and taken away to be killed; or for handicapped people to be rounded up and left to die in concentration camps. According to this distorted thinking, those in the "inferior" classes can be ruthlessly persecuted, exploited and eliminated. Those who believe that human society can progress only when these savage policies are implemented regard such slaughter, genocide, cruelty and ruthlessness as a kind of success. They maintain that individuals and societies—indeed, entire cultures and nations—unable to achieve that success, must be done away with.

Without doubt, that is a most perverted and dangerous way of thinking. Perceiving this danger is of the greatest importance for those who oppose the theory and the ideologies based on it. Societal models based on Darwin and

Darwinism are models that will lead to the most dreadful catastrophes. On the other hand, the moral values that God commands to humanity and reveals in the Qur'an will always bring with them peace and well-being.

## **SOCIAL DARWINISM**

Racial inequality, and ethnic discrimination, unfair competition, the oppression of the poor, the exploitation of the weak by the strong, and the idea that might is right, are evils that societies have experienced throughout history. Thousands of years ago, for example, at the time of Prophet Moses (pbuh), Pharaoh regarded himself as superior to everyone else on account of his wealth and powerful army. He rejected Prophets Moses and Aaron (peace be upon them) and even sought to kill them, though they were clearly speaking the truth. Pharaoh also implemented discriminatory policies, divided his people into classes, describing some as "inferior," inflicted numerous tortures on the Israelites under his rule, killed their men aiming to bring their race to extinction. The Qur'an describes Pharaoh's perversions:

**Pharaoh exalted himself arrogantly in the land and divided its people into camps, oppressing one group of them by slaughtering their sons and letting their women live. He was one of the corrupters. (Surat al-Qasas, 4)**

**"Am not I better than this man who is contemptible and can scarcely make anything clear?" (Surat az-Zukhruf, 52)**

**In that way he [Pharaoh] swayed his people and they succumbed to him... (Surat az- Zukhruf, 54)**

**And We bequeathed to the people who had been oppressed the easternmost part of the land We had blessed, and its westernmost part as well... (Surat al-A'raf, 137)**

Ancient Egypt was by no means the only extremist society where only might was regarded as right, humans were divided into classes, those regarded as "inferior" were oppressed and subjected to inhuman treatment. There are numerous examples of other such regimes, right up to the present day.

In the 19th century, however, these evil practices acquired a whole new dimension. Up until then, measures and policies that had been regarded as cruel, suddenly began to be defended with the falsehood that they were "scientific

practices based on facts of nature." What was it that suddenly justified all these forms of ruthlessness?

Charles Darwin's theory of evolution was put forward in his book *The Origin of Species*. Published in 1859, it contained a number of conjectures about the origin of life that led to a most deceptive world view, devoid of any scientific evidence, and a perverted philosophy that denies the existence of God and regards "chance" as a creative force (surely God is beyond that). Views that man was a kind of animal, and life was a sphere of struggle and fierce competition were accepted as scientific truth.

Darwin did not develop this theory, which was advanced as a result of the 19th century's primitive understanding of science, on his own. Some 50 years earlier, in 1798, Thomas Malthus proposed a number of ideas that had nothing to do with reality, in his book *Essay on the Principle of Population*. This study—which has now been proven to have no scientific value at all—claimed that population increased far more quickly than food resources, and that therefore, population increase needed to be controlled. Malthus suggested that wars and epidemics acted as "natural" checks on population, and were thus beneficial. He was the first to refer to the "struggle for survival." According to his thesis, far removed from humane values, the poor must not be protected but allowed to live under the worst possible conditions and prevented from multiplying, and sufficient food resources must be reserved for the upper classes. (For details, see Chapter 2, "The History of Ruthlessness, from Malthus to Darwin.") This cruel savagery would certainly be opposed by anyone with a conscience and common sense. Although religious moral values require extending a helping hand to the poor and needy, Malthus—and his follower Darwin—said that these people should be ruthlessly left to die.

The British sociologist and philosopher Herbert Spencer headed the list of those who immediately adopted and developed these inhumane ideas. The term "the survival of the fittest," which sums up Darwinism's basic claim, actually belongs to Spencer. He also claimed that the "unfit" should be eliminated, writing that: "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."<sup>1</sup> In Spencer's view, the poor, uneducated, sick, crippled and unsuccessful should all die, and he sought to prevent the state from passing laws to protect the poor.

Spencer possessed a great lack of compassion for people who should awaken feelings of compassion and protection and, just like Malthus, he sought for ways to get rid of them. In *Darwinism in American Thought*, the American historian Richard Hofstadter makes the following comment:

Spencer deplored not only poor laws, but also state-supported education, sanitary supervision other than the suppression of nuisances, regulation of housing conditions, and even state protection of the ignorant from medical quacks.<sup>2</sup>

Darwin, powerfully influenced by Malthus and Spencer's ruthless world views, proposed in *The Origin of Species* the myth that species had evolved by means of natural selection. Darwin was no scientist, and took only an amateur's interest in biology. Under the very primitive microscopes of Darwin's time, cells appeared to be nothing more than blurry blots, and the biological laws of inheritance had not yet been discovered. Darwin's theory, developed with very limited scientific knowledge and under inadequate scientific conditions, claimed that nature always "selected" the fittest with the most advantages, and that life developed accordingly. According to this theory, built on totally erroneous foundations right from the outset, life was the work of chance; Darwin thus rejected the fact that life was created by God (Surely God is beyond that!). After *The Origin of Species*, Darwin set about adapting his unscientific theory to human beings in *The Descent of Man*. In that book, he referred to how the so-called backward races would be eliminated in the near future, and that the more advanced ones would develop and succeed. Darwin's adapting his theory of evolution to human beings, in this book and certain other of his writings, shaped Social Darwinism.

His determined followers then carried matters forward. The most prominent proponents and practitioners of Social Darwinism's were Herbert Spencer and Darwin's cousin Francis Galton in Britain, certain academics like William Graham Sumner in America, and Darwinists such as Ernst Haeckel, and later fascist racists like Adolf Hitler in Germany.

Social Darwinism quickly became a means whereby racists, imperialists, proponents of unfair competition under the banner of capitalism, and administrators who failed to fulfill their responsibility to protect the poor and needy attempted to defend themselves. Social Darwinists sought to portray as a natural law the oppression of the weak, the poor and so-called "inferior" races, as well as the elimination of the handicapped by the healthy, and small businesses by large companies, suggesting that this was the only way humanity could progress. They sought to justify all the injustices perpetrated throughout history under a scientific rationale. Social Darwinism's lack of conscience and compassion was depicted as a law of nature and the most important road to so-called evolution.

In particular, various American capitalists justified the climate of unrestrained competition they established, according to their own lights, with quotations from Darwin. In fact, however, this was nothing less than a huge deception. Those who attempted to give ruthless competition a so-called scientific basis were merely lying. For instance, Andrew Carnegie, one of the greatest capitalists and one of those caught up in that falsehood, said the following in a speech he gave in 1889:

The price which society pays for the law of competition, like the price it pays for cheap comforts and luxuries, is also great; but the advantages of this law are also greater still than its cost — for it is to this law that we owe our wonderful material development, which brings improved conditions in its train. ... While the law may be sometimes hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department. We accept and welcome, therefore, as conditions to which we must accommodate ourselves, great inequality of environment; the concentration of business, industrial and commercial, in the hands of a few; and the law of competition between these, as being not only beneficial, but essential to the future progress of the race.<sup>3</sup>

According to Social Darwinism the sole objective of a race is its physical, economic and political development. Individuals' happiness, well-being, peace and security appear unimportant. No compassion at all is felt for those who suffer and cry out for help, for those unable to provide their children, families and aged parents food, medicine or shelter, or for the poor and powerless. According to this twisted concept, someone poor but morally upright is regarded as worthless, and that person's death will actually benefit society. In addition, someone rich but morally corrupt is regarded as "most important" for the "progress of the race" and, no matter what the conditions, that individual is seen as very valuable. This twisted logic propels Social Darwinism's proponents towards moral and spiritual collapse. In 1879, another Social Darwinist, William Graham Sumner, expressed this perverted trend's deceptions:

... we cannot go outside of this alternative: liberty, inequality, survival of the fittest; non-liberty, equality, survival of the unfittest. The former carries society forward and favors all its best members; the latter carries society downwards and favors all its worst members.<sup>4</sup>

The most savage adherents of Social Darwinism were racists, the most dangerous, of course, being the Nazi ideologists and their leader, Adolf Hitler. The heaviest cost of Social Darwinism came at the hands of the Nazis, who implemented eugenics, the claim put forward by Darwin's cousin, Francis Galton, to the effect that communities can consist of higher-quality individuals by the elimination of poor genes. They also engaged in genocide using Darwinist statements as a screen, as if these in some way justified their actions. At the advice of Darwinist scientists they exterminated Jews, Gypsies and East Europeans, whom they regarded as inferior races. They slaughtered the mentally ill, the handicapped, and the elderly in gas chambers. In the 20th century, millions were killed by the most ruthless methods in the name of Social Darwinism before the eyes of the world.

The eugenics movement, led by Francis Galton, emerged as another disastrous product of Social Darwinism. Its supporters maintained that human

selection was needed to accelerate natural selection, believing that human development itself could thus be speeded up. They inflicted compulsory sterilization on "unnecessary" people in a great many countries, from America to Sweden. Regarded as less than human, hundreds of thousands were operated on against their will, without their families' knowledge or permission. The cruelest implementation of eugenics occurred in Germany, where the Nazis first sterilized the crippled, mentally defective or those with inherited diseases. Unsatisfied, they then began slaughtering these people *en masse*. Hundreds of thousands were put to death, just for being old or lacking fingers or limbs.

Such cruel savagery has absolutely no place in religious morality. God has commanded people to protect and nurture the needy. Meeting the needs of the poor, treating the handicapped with affection and compassion and observing their rights, and ensuring cooperation and solidarity in society are all required by religious ethics. Those who ignore the moral values commanded by God, however, propel towards catastrophe both themselves and the societies they live in.

Another catastrophe for which Social Darwinism provided alleged justification is colonialism. A number of administrators of colonial states tried to justify their ruthless exploitation of native populations with Darwinist theses lacking any scientific validity or logical consistency. They claimed that "inferior races" needed to be kept under the control of "superior races" because this was a law of nature, and founded their policies on this so-called scientific basis.

By using the twisted logic of Social Darwinism, combatants in the 20th century's two world wars sought to depict war as inevitable. They attempted to depict the killing of the innocent and the poor; the destruction of their homes, businesses, and livestock; the forcing of millions from their homes and lands; and the uncaring slaughter of babies and children as ways of ensuring human progress.

In conclusion, Social Darwinism was the motive force that cost the lives of millions in the 19th and 20th centuries. With it, many evils that had persisted for centuries acquired an alleged scientific justification. In his book *The Mismeasure of Man*, the late evolutionist paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould reveals this yet again in commenting on Darwin's *Origin of Species*:

Subsequent arguments for slavery, colonialism, racial differences, class structures, and sex roles would go forth primarily under the banner of science.<sup>5</sup>

## **Darwin Himself Was a Social Darwinist**

No matter how much today's evolutionists try to separate Darwin's name from the sufferings that Social Darwinism gave birth to, Darwin used unambiguous Social Darwinist expressions, especially in his *Descent of Man* and other writings. As far back as 1869, in a letter to Hugo Thiel he stated that he saw no objection to his theory being applied to society:

You will really 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.<sup>6</sup>

Benjamin Wiker is a lecturer in theology and science at Franciscan University and author of *Moral Darwinism: How We Became Hedonists*. In an interview, he stated that Darwin was the first Social Darwinist, and continued:

Like it or not, it is quite clear when you read his *Descent of Man* that Darwin himself was the first Social Darwinist and the father of the modern eugenics movement. Social Darwinism and eugenics are derived directly from his principle of natural selection.

I think the real reason for people objecting to someone making connections between Darwinism and things like eugenics is that they don't want the theory to be tarnished by its moral implications. But the implications are there, not only in the text, but as evidenced in the social and moral effects Darwinism has had in the century and a half since it appeared.<sup>7</sup>

As you'll see in the following chapters, many of Darwin's expressions and statements clearly reveal him to have been the original source of Social Darwinism. Modern evolutionists hesitate to accept these views on account of Social Darwinism's terrifying results in the 20th century. Yet competition, racism, and discrimination—fundamental elements of Social Darwinism—also lie at the basis of the theory of evolution. Whether or not evolutionists accept the fact, these are the consequences of adopting Darwinism. Any theory that views human beings as the product of chance, as a slightly more advanced form of animal; that claims that some races are less developed than others and are therefore closer to animals; and that humanity can progress by means of the strong oppressing the weak, will inevitably have tragic consequences. Evolutionists' apparent rejection of Social Darwinism is no solution. Our hope is that those whom has the theory deceived will finally come to accept that the theory of evolution is scientifically bankrupt.

## **The Error of Applying Nature's Laws to Human Beings**

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



strong muscles. In that primitive scientific climate, Darwin developed his theory. Neither Darwin nor any who supported him was able to submit evidence for the theory of evolution from such branches of science as paleontology, biology or anatomy. Moreover, observations and experiments performed in the following years, and especially new findings obtained in the 20th century, revealed that the theory was clearly wrong. But despite the theory's scientific weakness, its providing a basis for materialist and atheist thought led to its immediate adoption by one part of the scientific world.

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

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

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

Such errors lead Social Darwinists to look at societies from an inhuman perspective. An important example of that perspective, so devoid of reason and conscience, is how they thought that societies could progress by abandoning the weak and needy, the powerless and handicapped to their own devices. The fact is that such a selfish refusal brings with it decline, not progress. Those whom

Darwinism maintains should be neglected and left uncared for are conscious human beings, able to think and reason. When abandoned to injustice and cruelty, unless they possess the virtues of patience, forgiveness and understanding imparted by religious moral values, they may feel great anger and hatred for those who inflict such treatment on them. To assuage that anger, as many recent examples have shown, they may then resort to violence, which can then give rise to conflict and chaos. As a result of all the material and spiritual means expended to resolve those conflicts, there will be a decline in all spheres—from art to technology, from the economy to science—rather than progress.

Furthermore, killing the sick or handicapped in the name of eugenics, is not only terribly brutal, but also contributes nothing whatsoever to social progress. Such an open acceptance of murder will bring enormous losses that will spell ruin for society. Today, some 6% of the world's population—some half a billion people, a very large number—are handicapped. That would mean that everyone would lose someone from his family or circle of acquaintances, and will have acquiesced in their deaths. This will open spiritual wounds that wreak great harm on people's psychological well-being. In any society where a mother cannot trust her children, children their mother, or brothers each other, where one can allow another to be killed at any time, there will be severe degeneration and depression. In any case, a society that kills people just because they are handicapped is undergoing a devastating moral collapse. It must already have lost all spiritual values, all humanity. Without doubt, to claim progress by means of murder indicates very serious mental and psychological problems.

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

As the following pages will show, Social Darwinism sought, to apply to societies the theory of evolution—itsself based on Charles Darwin's rather backward scientific understanding—but its world view is in total conflict with human nature. When put into practice, it belittles humanity and drags it back towards depression and chaos, bringing hatred that leads to conflict, warfare, and murder. Social Darwinism reached its peak during the second half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th, but its adverse effects can still be seen in the present day. Under such names as "evolutionary psychology" and "genetic determinism," attempts are still being made to evaluate societies according to the errors of Darwinism. In order to protect the 21st century from further catastrophes, the dangers of Social Darwinism must be revealed in all their aspects, and the world must be told that there is no scientific evidence for the theory on which this philosophy is based.

## **THE HISTORY OF RUTHLESSNESS,**

# FROM MALTHUS TO DARWIN

As we already made clear, Darwin's views in *The Origin of Species* were most influenced by the British economist and demographer Thomas Robert Malthus.

In *Essay on the Principle of Population, as it Affects the Future*, first published in 1798, Malthus claimed that the human population was increasing every twenty-five years in a geometrical ratio (1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256...), while the food supply was increasing in an arithmetical ratio (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9...); that as the population doubled, food resources showed a much more modest rise. Malthus claimed that within 300 years, the ratio of population to food resources would be 4,096 to 13. Again according to this unscientific claim, resources were insufficient for the rapidly rising population, and Malthus alleged that it was becoming essential to engage in a serious struggle for survival. This was the same claim expressed in the subtitle to Darwin's *The Origin of Species: the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life...*

In his Essay, Malthus stated that this rapid population rise needed to be halted, and came up with a number of solutions. According to him, misery and vice were the two main factors that checked population growth. Phenomena such as famine and epidemics were examples of misery, which kept population in check. Other examples were such phenomena as wars. Malthus wrote that rapid population increase could be checked by such means as war, famine, disease and the killing of newborn babies, to balance population and food resources. Anyone with common sense and a conscience will agree that such a claim is irrational, illogical, and horrendously brutal. Accurate planning of income and essential resources for the well-being and peace of societies is of course of the greatest importance for the future of those societies. However, it is also evident that planning wars, slaughter and murder will inflict nothing but tears and suffering on a society's future.

Malthus had a number of other illogical recommendations. For example, he suggested that all possible measures should be taken to prevent poor or laboring-class couples from having children. Malthus's views reached a peak in 1834 with a new law passed in England setting up special "workhouses" for the poor. Under that law, married couples in workhouses were kept apart by means of fixed rules to reduce the rise in population.

One of the factors underlying these measures was the longstanding fear that the rapidly rising numbers of the "lower classes" would eventually overwhelm more civilized individuals. That fear is groundless, of course, and the product of a grave deception. First, it is out of the question for an individual to enjoy superiority over anyone else because of his material status, social position, language, race or

gender. God has created all human beings equal. What makes people valuable is the moral virtues and the fear of God they exhibit, not material means or physical attributes.

In the wake of the French Revolution, however, the British middle class provided enormous support for Malthusianism. Fearing that they might no longer maintain their former pre-eminence and power, they had no hesitation over adopting radical measures to preserve them. This is one of the characteristic errors made by those who distance themselves from religious moral values. The elite of that time thought that society's future lay in there being as many wealthy and as few poor as possible. Of course it is desirable to raise the number of wealthy people and the level of well-being in a society. However, the methods implemented to increase that well-being are of greatest importance. Raising the numbers of the wealthy by slaughtering the poor and oppressing the needy, as Social Darwinism suggests, is totally unacceptable, of course. Furthermore, increasing the number of wealthy individuals is, by itself, not enough for a society to progress. If those wealthy people lack such religious moral values as honesty, altruism, modesty, patience, and tolerance, their industry will damage a society instead of benefiting it. Plans aimed at advancing societies can achieve their objective only if that society reinforces its spiritual values at the same time as it makes material progress.

However, many in Malthus's time failed to realize this manifest truth and supported the perverted views that would later lead their societies into moral collapse.

To halt the rise in population, these were some of the ruthless solutions Malthus suggested:

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.** But above all, we should reprobate [strongly condemn] specific remedies for ravaging diseases; and those benevolent, but much mistaken men, who have thought they were doing a service to mankind by projecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disorders.<sup>8</sup>

Malthus also encouraged the death of babies:

... we are bound in justice and honour formally to disclaim the right of the poor to support. To this end, I should propose a regulation to be made, declaring, that no child born... should ever be entitled to parish assistance... The [illegitimate] infant is, comparatively speaking, of little value to the society, as others will immediately supply its place... **All the children born, beyond what would be required to**

**keep up the population to this [desired] level, must necessarily perish, unless room be made for them by the deaths of grown persons.<sup>9</sup>**

Malthus possessed a sufficiently twisted logical framework as to justify letting newborns die for the future of society. You might well assume that such perverted views are a thing of the past and could no longer be accepted by anyone today. Yet that is not the case. In modern-day China, population planning is carried out by means of the killing of newborn babies—making it easy to see the permanent effects on societies of the destructive views of Malthus and his follower Darwin. The communist Chinese state seeks to prevent its own people from living by religious moral values, and looks at them through a Darwinist eye. For that reason, in addition to the enormous social and moral collapse, human beings are forced to work in labor camps devoid of the most basic humane conditions. Children of parents with already more children than the number permitted by the state are collected and killed. People are executed for "thought crimes," the executions themselves having assumed the form of societal ceremonies. Contemporary China is an example of what awaits a society that falls under the influence of Darwinist views.

Malthus's theses not only prepared an oppressive law that further worsened the conditions of the poor in England, they also made social problems even more intractable. These theses, which still have their proponents today, and which led the way to a theory such as Darwinism which inflicted disasters like chaos, war, racism and atheism on the 20th century, have no valid scientific foundations whatsoever. Indeed, Malthus's ideas were inspired by a story relating to goats and dogs, the truth of which nobody could be sure of.

## **From Goats and Dogs to Darwinism**

Malthus's real source of inspiration for his Essay was a story about goats on a Southeast Pacific island, said to have been left there by Juan Fernandez, a Spanish sailor. According to the tale, these goats multiplied and became a source of meat for mariners calling at the island. But the goats rapidly grew in number and began to consume all the sources of food on the island. In order to prevent British privateers—who molested Spanish trade—from making use of the goats' meat, the Spanish landed male and female dogs on the island. In time, the dogs began to grow in number, and killed most of the goats.

Condorcet Townsend, the French mathematician and revolutionary, wrote that in this way, a natural equilibrium was established. "The weakest of both species," he went on to say, "were the first to pay the debt of nature; the most active and vigorous preserved their lives. It is the quantity of food which regulates the number of the human species."<sup>10</sup>

As we already stated, various natural circumstances may have an effect on an animal's numbers increasing or declining and on species surviving or becoming extinct. Yet it is a grave error to suppose that this dynamic also applies to human societies, and experience shows the terrible results of putting such an error into practice.

Under the Poor Law then in force in Great Britain, the poor were not left to go hungry, but were forced to work very hard. Townsend maintained that these laws obliging the poor to work resulted in excessive difficulties and protests. Instead, he claimed that it was more reasonable to bring the poor to heel by means of hunger. According to Townsend, "hunger will tame the fiercest animals, and will teach them civility, obedience, and subjection."<sup>11</sup> At the root of that ruthless and unconscionable attitude lies the error of classing people according to their material means and physical attributes. Such discrimination, totally incompatible with religious moral values, has disrupted the social order and led to chaos, anarchy and conflict throughout history.

After Townsend, the story of the goats and dogs also constituted the basis of Malthus's theses. It also represents the source of inspiration for the error expressed in the term "the survival of the fittest," used by Herbert Spencer, and of Darwin's error of "evolution by natural selection."

As we have already emphasized, applying to human beings certain laws that apply to animals was a great error made by a chain of people, beginning with Townsend and followed by Malthus, Spencer and Darwin. They regarded humans as savage creatures that could be reined in only by radical measures and kept under control by war, hunger and poverty. The truth is, though, that human beings are endowed with reason and common sense. They act in accordance with logic and their conscience, not according to instincts, as animals do.

### **Malthus's Claims Not Based on Scientific Data**

Malthus's theory received support from various circles at the time, and also constituted the foundation of a number of perverted ideologies and movements in the following century. Yet it rests on no scientific foundations and is riddled with inconsistencies. For example:

- 1) At the time Malthus wrote, there were no data regarding population increases at his disposal. The first national census in Great Britain was carried out in 1801, three years after Malthus wrote his *Essay*. In any case, for Malthus to calculate the rate of population growth, he would have needed statistics for years previous to 1801. He therefore had no reliable statistics on which to base a figure for that growth, and his claims were based entirely on presupposition.

2) Nor did Malthus possess any data with which to calculate the growth of food resources. At the time, there was no way of calculating how much land was under cultivation, not how many crops it produced. Again, he engaged in mere conjecture.

3) In any case, the law that Malthus proposed was contradictory in itself. He suggested that populations increased geometrically. In that case, animals and plant populations also increased geometrically, and these two form the basis of human life. In practice, however, animals, plants and human beings do not multiply geometrically: Their rates of increase vary according to prevailing circumstances. The entire ecosystem, humans included, exists within a most balanced equilibrium. The self-evident order in nature is a long way from "Eat or be eaten," the so-called struggle for survival proposed by Malthus and Darwin.

In short, Malthus's erroneous and illogical claims rest on no scientific foundations whatsoever. Yet Darwin constructed his theory of evolution on Malthus's conjectures.

## **Darwin the Malthusian**

In his autobiography, Darwin wrote:

In October 1838, that is fifteen months after I had begun my systematic enquiry, I happened to read for amusement Malthus on *Population*, and being well prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence that everywhere goes on from long-continued 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...<sup>12</sup>

The concepts of evolution by natural selection and the struggle for survival took shape in Darwin's mind after reading Malthus. In *The Origin of Species* Darwin admitted that he had fully accepted Malthus's claims:

There is no exception to the rule that every organic being naturally increases at so high a rate, that, if not destroyed, the earth would soon be covered by the progeny of a single pair. Even slow-breeding man has doubled in twenty-five years, and at this rate, in less than a thousand years, there would literally not be standing-room for his progeny.<sup>13</sup>

Darwin described the relationship between Malthus's theory and the thesis of natural selection thus:

As more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with the individuals of distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life. It is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms.<sup>14</sup>

These ideas of Darwin's, which found support in the twisted thinking of Malthus, possess no scientific value. Moreover, this cruel perspective maintains that population planning can be ensured by eliminating the weak and poor, and preaches that the weak need to be destroyed. Regarding life not as based on peace, security and understanding, but as a matter of mere survival necessitating a ruthless struggle, it inflicted the most terrible catastrophes on societies.

## **From Malthus to a Ruthless World View**

Although Malthus and Darwin's views lacked any scientific foundation, they received wide support. We need to seek the reason for this in the period in which they both lived, which was post-Industrial Revolution England. Following the Industrial Revolution, the British aristocracy feared it would surrender its status and power to the working class. On the other hand, they needed a larger, cheap work force. As a result of that dilemma, the ruling class in Britain drew the conclusion that the "lower class" had to be weakened, brought under control, oppressed, and put to work. In stating that food resources were insufficient in the face of a rapidly rising population, Malthus suggested that the solution lay in preventing the "lower orders" from multiplying, thus causing a number of measures to be taken against the poor. By applying Malthus's thesis to natural sciences and biology, Darwin provided the claim with a fictitious scientific guise.

In his book *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, Richard Hofstadter says this about Darwin's support for Malthus's thesis:

Malthusianism had become popular in England... it had also been used to relieve the rich of responsibility for the sufferings of the poor. Malthus had been proved wrong by the course of events; and just when his theory was dying out in political economy it received fresh support from Darwinian biology.<sup>15</sup>

In an article, researcher and author Ian Taylor has this to say about the degenerate ideas in Malthus's thesis:

The lesson in all this is that Darwin and others who reject both God and the promise of His providence and intervention have found in the Malthus principle a terrifying spectre of tragedy and despair that has driven them into unspeakable ethical and absurd scientific propositions. This in spite of the obvious weaknesses and deficiencies in Malthus argument.<sup>16</sup>

Although science refuted Malthus's "ruthless, despair-inducing, nonsensical" claim, it has still managed to remain influential up to the present day. Ian Taylor's book *In the Minds of Men* summarizes the chain of ruthlessness that began with Malthus and ended with Hitler:

The maxim on which Malthus based his thinking was what later became the "survival of the fittest" theme. The notion can be traced from Condorcet to Malthus, to Spencer, to Wallace, and to Darwin. It eventually mushroomed out to influence



men such as Adolf Hitler, but we should be reminded that it all began in the tale of the goats and dogs.<sup>17</sup>

As we have seen, various administrators and leaders sought to use Malthus's opinions to mask their own interests. Various opinion formers with their own ideological concerns played an important role in those views receiving such wide acceptance. The disasters caused by the support given to this ruthless world view, were on a scale never been seen before. In the following pages, we shall examine how this merciless world view that began with Malthus gained strength under the name of Social Darwinism—and what it cost humanity.

## **THE "ROBBER BARONS," DARWIN'S FOLLOWERS**

Darwinism lies behind a great many dangerous intellectual trends, ideologies and practices that have persisted down to the present day. It is most interesting that it constitutes a foundation shared by ideologies that are completely opposed to one another. Darwinism played a role in the birth and spread of Nazism, fascism and communism, in the alleged justification of racist and communist massacres, and also constituted the alleged scientific basis for "unrestrained capitalism." In Victorian Britain and America, in particular, Darwinism received great acclamation and was hugely strengthened because of the support it offered to ruthless capitalists known as the "robber barons."

Savage capitalism's most important error is in putting no limit on the extent to which weaker businesses (and weaker individuals) can be crushed, exploited and eliminated. No doubt this cruelty and ruthlessness are totally unacceptable. Today this error is summed up in the saying, "Big fish eat little fish." In other words, small enterprises are eliminated—or acquired—by larger ones. That is Darwinism applied to the world of business.

During the 20th century, the world tried two main different economic models: the liberal one, based on private property and free intervention; and the socialist one, based on state property and a planned economy. Socialist economies failed in every country, inflicting poverty and misery on their societies. Liberal economics, on the other hand, displayed unquestioned success, bringing greater well-being to individuals and societies.

But by itself a liberal economy is not enough to bring well-being to a whole society. Thanks to the liberal economy, a society's economic well-being generally rises, but not everyone can enjoy his share of that increase. The poor remain poor, and the danger of social injustice begins to increase. To prevent that danger and to eliminate social injustice, two things are necessary:

1) The state must extend a hand to the down-and-out and the unemployed, as a requirement of the concept of the "social state" and take measures to help them.

2) Feelings of cooperation and solidarity, that religious moral values require, need to pervade society as a whole.

The second requirement is particularly important because in the end, it tends to define the first. If a society attaches powerful importance to religious and moral values, then the liberal economy that society implements will provide both economic development and social justice. The rich will use part of their acquired capital to help the poor and establish social programs to support the weak. (Indeed, this is the economic model revealed by God in the Qur'an. Private property does exist in Islam, but its owners are charged to use part of their assets, in the form of alms, to assist the poor and those in need.)

If a society undergoes moral degeneration, then the liberal economy turns into "savage capitalism" in which the poor and down-and-out are oppressed and receive no help at all, in which there are no social welfare programs, and where social injustice is regarded not as a problem but as a "natural" state of affairs.

The economic model we shall be criticizing here is not the liberal economy—the free economic model based on private property and competition—but savage capitalism.

The source of inspiration behind it, as we shall show in due course, is Social Darwinism.

Those who first brought Darwinist practices into the business world were the Americans known as the "robber barons." They believed in Darwinism and thought that its claim regarding "the survival of the fittest" somehow justified their own ruthless practices.<sup>18</sup> The result was the start of a ruthless competition in business, capable of ending even in murder. The robber barons' sole aim was to make even more money and gain even more power. They had no interest in social well-being, even for their own workers. Millions of lives were ruined when Darwinism entered the economy, causing extremely low wages, appalling working conditions, and long working hours. The lack of any safety precautions caused workers to fall ill, become injured, or even die.

## **The Cruelties of Darwinist Employers**

With the Industrial Revolution that began in England and soon spread to the whole of the rest of the world, new factories were built and machines began to be used in them. People were frequently injured because some employers attached no value to human life, especially that of the workers, and refused to take the necessary safety precautions. Most of these injuries resulted either in death or in the loss of fingers, hands or arms. It has been determined that in the 1900s a million workers a year died, suffered serious handicaps or fell sick.<sup>19</sup>

For workers who spent their lives in a factory, the loss of a limb or organ was almost inevitable. During their working lives, more than half of workers either fell ill or suffered serious injuries such as the loss of arms and legs, or of sight or hearing. For example, workers manufacturing stiff brim hats suffered mercury poisoning. Almost all radium dial painter workers ended up with cancer.<sup>20</sup>

Although employers were fully aware of working conditions and the accidents taking place, some took no steps at all to improve conditions. Many steel mill foundry workers worked twelve-hour shifts in temperatures of 40 to 50 degrees C (117oF) for very low wages.<sup>21</sup> In 1892, U.S. President Benjamin Harrison summarized these inhuman conditions by saying that every day, the average American worker faced the same hazards as a soldier at war.<sup>22</sup>

Some capitalist businessmen attached no importance to human life and regarded it as expendable. During the construction of the railroads alone, hundreds lost their lives due to bad conditions.<sup>23</sup> One of the most striking examples of this ruthlessness is of the American businessman J.P. Morgan, who purchased 5,000 defective rifles at \$3.50 apiece and sold them to the U.S. Army for \$22. In other words, he had so lost any trace of moral comprehension that he was capable of cheating his own nation and endangering the lives of its enlisted men. Soldiers who used these defective rifles had their thumbs blown off.<sup>24</sup> Troops injured by these rifles sued Morgan but lost, because in those days the courts generally decided in favor of the robber barons.<sup>25</sup>

When asked to build roof protection for his workers, one of the capitalist employers of the time replied, that "men are cheaper than shingles"—another example of the ruthlessness of those days.<sup>26</sup>

At the root of all this cruelty, the influence of Darwinism can be easily discerned. A world view that regards humans as a species of animal, and believes in the lie that some people are less developed than others, that life is a place of struggle where only might prevails, results in ruthlessness, pitilessness and oppression.

## **The Damage Wreaked by Darwinism in the Business World**

Most businessmen who supported unrestrained capitalism had actually been raised as believers in God. Later, however, under the influence of Darwinism's false suggestions, they abandoned their belief. For example, the American industrialist Andrew Carnegie, one of the foremost names in the steel industry in the 19th century, had first been devoted to Christianity. In his autobiography, Carnegie openly described how he and many of his friends had fallen under the deceptions of Darwinism.

However, the theory of evolution that Carnegie regarded as a fact, consisted of falsehood in its entirety. In the years that followed, advances in the world of science revealed the true face of that deception. Yet at that time, other businessmen who made the same error as Carnegie accepted savage capitalism as a result of Darwinist suggestion. This led them into regarding ruthless competition as perfectly justified to make even more money, and into attaching no value to altruism and human life.

Carnegie thought that competition was an inevitable law of life and constructed his entire philosophy upon that error. He maintained that, although the law of competition made it difficult for some people, it was best for the race, because it ensured the survival of the fittest in every department.<sup>27</sup>

Those who first introduced Carnegie to Darwinism were a number of so-called free and enlightened thinkers seeking a new "religion of humanity," whom he met at the home of a New York University professor.<sup>28</sup> One of the members of Carnegie's intimate circle was Herbert Spencer, the follower of Darwin and one of the most important figures in Social Darwinism. These businessmen adopted the twisted thinking of Spencer and Darwin, but were unable to calculate the impasse into which it would drag both them and their society.

Richard Milner, an anthropologist from the American Museum of Natural History and author of *The Encyclopedia of Evolution*, describes how Carnegie fell under the influence of Darwinism:

Carnegie rose in business to become a powerful, ruthless tycoon who exploited man and Earth, crushed competition, and justified his actions by a philosophy of Social Darwinism. Entrepreneurial competition, he believed, does a service to society by eliminating the weaker elements. Those who survive in business are "fit," and therefore deserve their positions and rewards.<sup>29</sup>

Carnegie and those who thought like him made a grave error to assume that being powerful and ruthless was part of business life. It is perfectly natural that people should earn a living in order to live at ease and in comfort. However, it is completely unacceptable to cause harm to others, to turn a blind eye to people in difficult circumstances for the sake of one's own interests, or to oppress the weak in order to increase one's own power still further. God has commanded people to be honest in business, as in all other spheres, and to protect the rights of the needy. It is an enormous lie to suggest that by oppressing the weak and even seeking to eliminate them altogether, one is aiming for the good of society.

In his later years, Carnegie always used Darwinist expressions in his conversations, statements and writings. In his book *Andrew Carnegie*, the historian Joseph F. Wall says this:

Not only in his published articles and books but also in his personal letters to business contemporaries, Carnegie makes frequent and easy allusions to the Social

Darwinist credo. Phrases like "survival of the fittest," "race improvement," and "struggle for existence" came easily from his pen and presumably from his lips. He did see business as a great competitive struggle...<sup>30</sup>

Another of those taken in by Darwinist suggestions was the famous American industrialist John D. Rockefeller, who said that: "growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest ... the working out of a law of nature..."<sup>31</sup>

One can see one of the clearest instances of the effect of Darwinism on the business world in Spencer's American trip, which Richard Hofstadter describes in *Social Darwinism in American Thought*:

However imperfect the appreciation of the guests for the niceties of Spencer's thought, the banquet showed how popular he had become in the United States. When Spencer was on the dock, waiting for the ship carry him back to England, he seized the hands of Carnegie and Youmans. "Here," he cried the reporters, "are my two best American friends." For Spencer it was a rare gesture of personal warmth; but more than this, it symbolized the harmony of the new science [Social Darwinism] with the outlook of a business civilization.<sup>32</sup>

One reason why some capitalists adopted Social Darwinism was that it absolved the wealthy from any responsibility for the poor. In societies that preserve moral values, the rich are expected to show an interest in helping the poor and needy, and Social Darwinism attempted to eliminate that virtue. In *The Golden Door: The United States from 1876 to 1918*, science writer Isaac Asimov comments on this ruthless aspect of Social Darwinism:

Spencer coined the phrase "survival of the fittest" and in 1884 argued, for instance, that people who were unemployable or burdens on society should be allowed to die rather than be made objects of help and charity. To do this, apparently, would weed out unfit individuals and strengthen the race. It was a horrible philosophy that could be used to justify the worst impulses of human beings.<sup>33</sup>

Just as those who implemented savage capitalism supported Darwinism, so Darwinists supported them. For example, William Graham Sumner claimed that millionaires were "the fittest individuals in society," then made illogical deductions that they therefore deserved special privileges and were "naturally selected in the crucible of competition."<sup>34</sup> In an article about Social Darwinism in *The Humanist* periodical, professor of philosophy Stephen Asma describes Spencer's support for capitalists:

Spencer coined the phrase survival of the fittest, and Darwin adopted the parlance in later editions of his *Origin of Species*. ... According to Spencer and his American disciples—business entrepreneurs like John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie—social hierarchy reflects the unwavering, universal laws of nature. Nature unfolds in such a way that the strong survive and the weak perish. Thus, the

economic and social structures that survive are "stronger" and better, and those structures that don't were obviously meant to founder.<sup>35</sup>

But as has already been emphasized, spiritual values and their preservation represent the principal element in the progress of societies. In societies where the spirit of cooperation and solidarity is strong, where people approach one another with compassion and respect, economic difficulties in circumstances can easily be overcome in a spirit of togetherness. But where human relations have disappeared, and people lacking any compassion and understanding regard everyone else solely as rivals, many more destructive effects began to arise, even if there is economic progress. Therefore, all individuals in a society need to produce solutions to raise the quality of life and well-being, to bring about an environment where people can enjoy not just economic but psychological security. Obviously, that can only happen by living by religious moral values. As has been proved countless times, no movement or ideology incompatible with religious moral values can ever provide the well-being, peace and security for which people long.

### **Savage Capitalism: The Joint Product of Social Darwinism and Irreligiousness**

From the 19th century onwards, Darwinist capitalists maintained that only the rich and powerful had the right to live and that the poor, the weak, the crippled and sick were "useless burdens," establishing oppressive systems in a great many countries. In this climate of ruthless competition, it was seen as perfectly justified to exploit, oppress, intimidate, frighten, injure and even kill people. No forms of immoral or illegal activity were prevented or condemned, since these were regarded as "compatible with the laws of nature."

In many countries where people do not live by religious moral values, this system still continues today. The gap between rich and poor is growing at an ever-increasing rate, and the conditions in which the needy live are ignored. According to the propaganda of Social Darwinism, protecting and caring for the poor and needy is a violation of the laws of nature, and since such people are regarded as a burden, no help is extended to them.

Great differences between levels of well-being exist not only within a country, but also between countries. As the level of well-being rises rapidly in the West, famine, sickness and poverty afflict many Third World countries, where people are dying from starvation and neglect. If used in a rational and conscientious manner, however, the world's resources are plentiful enough to provide for all those now abandoned to hunger and poverty.

In order for the world's resources to provide humane conditions, it is essential that Darwinism's intellectual influence be eradicated all over the world. When

Darwinist views and understanding are replaced by the moral values of the Qur'an, such problems will naturally be resolved. That is because while Darwinism inculcates the idea of ruthless competition and the oppression of the poor, religious moral values impart compassion, protection, mutual cooperation, solidarity and sharing. For instance, our Prophet (may God bless him and grant him peace) says in one of the hadith, "A believer is not the [mature] one who eats his fill when his neighbor is hungry."<sup>36</sup> These wise words of the Prophet (may God bless him and grant him peace) are one of the indications of Muslims' affection and compassion.

In many of His verses, God has commanded love, compassion, affection and altruism and given Muslims examples of proper moral behavior. While social Darwinism consists of the rich using the poor and needy as stepping stones in order to rise, Islamic moral values command the rich to protect them. Some of the verses on this subject revealed by God are as follows:

**Those of you possessing affluence and ample wealth should not make oaths that they will not give to their relatives and the very poor and those who have migrated in the way of God. They should rather pardon and overlook... (Surat an-Nur, 22)**

**They will ask you what they should give away. Say, "Any wealth you give away should go to your parents and relatives and to orphans and the very poor and travelers..." (Surat al-Baqara, 215)**

**... Eat of them and feed those who are poor and in need. (Surat al-Hajj, 28)**

**[Believers are] those in whose wealth there is a known share for beggars and the destitute. (Surat al-Ma'arij, 24-25)**

**They give food, despite their love for it, to the poor and orphans and captives: "We feed you only out of desire for the Face of God. We do not want any repayment from you or any thanks. Truly We fear from our Lord a glowering, calamitous Day." (Surat al-Insan, 8-10)**

In the Qur'an, God also reveals that those who do not help the poor and weak will be rewarded with Hell:

**They [the companions of the Right] will ask the evildoers: "What caused you to enter Saqar?" They will say, "We were not among those who**

**performed prayer and we did not feed the poor." (Surat al-Muddaththir, 41-44)**

**Then bind him in a chain which is seventy cubits long. He used not to believe in God the Magnificent, nor did he urge the feeding of the poor. Therefore here today he has no friend. (Surat al-Haqq, 32-35)**

It must not be forgotten: It is Almighty God, the Lord of all existence and all the universe, Who gives everyone his earnings and success. A person does not become wealthy by engaging in ruthless competition in the "struggle for survival" or by oppressing the weak. It is God Who gives everyone all that they possess, distributing wealth among them in order to test them. A wealthy person is actually tested by means of that wealth. God reveals this fact in a verse:

**We made everything on the Earth adornment for it so that We could test them to see whose actions are the best. (Surat al-Kahf, 7)**

A person is responsible, therefore, for using all the blessings given him by God in the best manner possible, in order to earn His approval. A true believer must act in the knowledge that all he possesses are a blessing from God, and that just as our Lord can increase his possessions whenever He chooses, He can also take them away.

## **SOCIAL DARWINISM AND THE FAVORED RACES MYTH**

Though racism can be found throughout history, Darwin was the first to give it an alleged scientific validity. The subtitle of *The Origin of Species* was *The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. Darwin's writings about "the preservation of favored races," and in particular the unscientific claims in his *The Descent of Man*, lent support to the Nazis' erroneous belief in the superiority of Aryan race, and a similar British belief about the Anglo-Saxons. In addition, Darwin's theory of natural selection spoke of a fight to the death, a "law of the jungle." Applying it to human societies made conflict and war inevitable between races and nations. A great many prominent figures of the time, from warlike statesmen to philosophers, from politicians to scientists, adopted Darwin's theory. In *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz*, Professor Karl A. Schleunes of North Carolina University's history faculty describes how:



Darwin's notion of struggle for survival was quickly appropriated by the racists... such struggle, legitimized by the latest [so-called] scientific views, justified the racists' conception of superior and inferior peoples... and validated the struggle between them.<sup>37</sup>

With the claims put forward by Darwin, those who held racist views naturally imagined that they had found a scientific foundation for their views about human classes. But shortly afterwards, science revealed that in the same way that Darwin's claims had no scientific validity, a great many movements built around Darwin's ignorant views had committed an enormous error.

With the support it received from Darwinism, the Nazis practiced racism in the most violent manner. Yet Germany was not the only place where so-called "scientific" racism reared its head. A number of racist administrators and intellectuals arose in many countries, particularly in Great Britain and America, racist laws and practices also made a rapid appearance.

Evolutionists in the 19th and early 20th centuries held almost totally racist views. Many scientists had no hesitation about openly expressing such opinions. Books and articles written at the time offer the most concrete proof. In *Outcasts from Evolution: Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority*, John S. Haller, a professor of history at Southern Illinois University, describes how all 19th-century evolutionists falsely believed in the superiority of the white race and that other races were inferior. One article in American Scientist magazine calls Haller's book:

... extremely important... documenting as it does what has long been suspected: the ingrained, firm, and almost unanimous racism of North American men of science during the 19th (and into the 20th) century... Ab initio, Afro-Americans were viewed by these intellectuals as being in certain ways unredeemably, unchangeably, irrevocably inferior.<sup>38</sup>

Another article in Science magazine made the following comment about some of Haller's claims:

What was new in the Victorian period was Darwinism... Before 1859, many scientists had questioned whether blacks were of the same species as whites. After 1859, the evolutionary schema raised additional questions, particularly whether or not Afro-Americans could survive competition with their white near-relations. The momentous answer was a resounding no. ... The African was inferior because he represented the "missing link" between ape and Teuton.<sup>39</sup>

Of course, this claim is totally unfounded. That people have different skin colors or different racial or ethnic origins doesn't make them superior or inferior to anyone else. One main reason why this deception became prevalent in the 19th century was the widespread ignorance of the time, itself due to the primitive scientific conditions.

Another example of a scientist known for his racist views was Princeton University's American biologist Edwin G. Conklin who, like other racists, had no qualms about openly expressing his perverted opinions:

Comparison of any modern race with the Neanderthal or Heidelberg types show that... Negroid races more closely resemble the original stock than the white or yellow races. Every consideration should lead those who believe in the superiority of the white race to strive to preserve its purity and to establish and maintain the segregation of the races.<sup>40</sup>

William Sollas, a professor of paleontology and geology from Oxford University, set out his views in his 1911 book *Ancient Hunters*:

Justice belongs to the strong, and has been meted out to each race according to its strength ... It is not priority of occupation, but the power to utilize, which establishes a claim to the land. Hence it is a duty which every race owes to itself, and to the human family as well, to cultivate by every possible means its own strength: directly it falls behind in regard it pays to this duty, whether in art of science, in breeding or in organisation for self-defence, it occurs a penalty which Natural Selection, the stern but beneficent tyrant of the organic world, will assuredly exact, and that speedily, to the full.<sup>41</sup>

To say that justice belongs to the strong—a grave error—will lead to terrible social chaos. No matter what the conditions and circumstances, all people must benefit from true justice, regardless of their color, language or gender. The claim made by Darwinist racists that justice only applies to the strong in no way reflects the truth. Every individual may wish to acquire things of the highest quality and the most attractive for himself and for his society, but he is never justified in ignoring the harm he inflicts on others in doing so. To claim the opposite violates reason and good conscience.

One can encounter racist views in subsequent years also, even in the writings of evolutionists who claim not to be racist—as a natural consequence of their belief in evolution. One of these is paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson who, no matter how strongly he resents being termed a racist, claimed in an article published in *Science* magazine that racial differences appeared as a result of evolution, and that some races are more advanced or backward than others:

Evolution does not necessarily proceed at the same rate in different populations, so that among many groups of animals it is possible to find some species that have evolved more slowly, hence are now more primitive, as regards some particular trait or even overall. It is natural to ask—as many have asked—whether among human races there may not similarly be some that are more primitive in one way or another or in general. It is indeed possible to find single characteristics that are probably more advanced or more primitive in one race than in another.<sup>42</sup>

Despite its having no scientific basis whatsoever, Simpson's superstitious view was adopted by certain circles for ideological reasons. In defending the theory of evolution's unscientific claims in their writings, books, and speeches, other scientists of the time also supported racism. An article titled "The Evolution of Human Races," by Henry Fairfield Osborn, president of the American Museum of Natural History and a prominent racist and evolutionist anthropologist of the early 20th century, made comparisons between races and came up with a number of deductions totally lacking any scientific evidence:

The standard of intelligence of the average adult Negro is similar to that of the eleven-year-old youth of the species *Homo sapiens*.<sup>43</sup>

As can be seen from such statements, most 19th- and 20th-century evolutionist scientists were racists who ignored the dangers posed by their twisted views. About the destructive effects of their so-called "scientific" racism, the American scientist James Ferguson has this to say:

In 19th-century Europe the concept of race was a preoccupation for the growing human sciences... These first physical anthropologists helped to develop the concept of Aryan supremacy, which later fueled the institutional racism of Germany in the 1930s, and of South Africa today.<sup>44</sup>

In an article about the racist views of evolutionist anthropologists, the late evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould says the following:

We cannot understand much of the history of late 19th and early 20th century anthropology... unless we appreciate its obsession with the identification and ranking of races.<sup>45</sup>

Once the theory of evolution acquired an alleged scientific validity, scientists were able to speak without hesitation of such illusory concepts as "inferior" races and some races being more closely related to apes than to human beings. Despotic dictators such as Hitler recognized such claims as a golden opportunity and killed millions of people because they were "inferior," "inadequate," "flawed" or "sick." One of the main reasons why almost all 19th century evolutionists were racists is that their intellectual forerunner, Darwin, himself held such views.

## **Darwin, Too, Was a Racist**

The great majority of present-day evolutionists say that unlike their 19th century counterparts, they are opposed to racism, and seek to free Darwin of racist imputations. Most writings about Darwin make great efforts to give the impression that he was compassionate, well intentioned, and opposed to slavery. The fact is, however, that Darwin believed that the theory of natural selection constituted a scientific justification for racial discrimination and conflict between races. Darwin's books, some of his letters, and his private notes contain openly racist expressions. For example, in *The Descent of Man*, Darwin claimed that certain races, such as

blacks and Aborigines, were inferior and that in due course, they would be eliminated and disappear in the struggle for survival:

At some future period not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate, and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes... will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as the baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.<sup>46</sup>

In those words Darwin equated certain races with primates and predicted that "civilized races of man" would eliminate "savage races" from the face of the Earth. In other words, Darwin was foreseeing genocide, a racial ethnic cleansing to take place in the near future. Indeed, Darwin's disastrous "predictions" actually did come about, and 20th-century racists saw the theory of evolution as offering them support to perpetrate terrible slaughter. Examples include the Nazis' murder of some 40 million people during the World War II, the South African government's apartheid system affording European races immense privileges over others, racist attacks against Turks and other foreigners in Europe, racial discrimination against blacks in the USA and against the native Aborigines in Australia, and the neo-Nazi movement that from time to time raises its head in various European countries. All gained strength from the alleged scientific support provided by Darwinism. (For further details on the connection between fascism, racism and Darwinism, see Harun Yahya's *Fascism: The Bloody Ideology of Darwinism*, Kultur Publishing, April 2002.)

Nor were Darwin's racist statements limited to these. For example, in *The Voyage of the Beagle*, published before *The Origin of Species*, he speaks of encountering "backward" human races from Tierra del Fuego:

It was without exception the most curious & interesting spectacle I ever beheld. I would not have believed how entire the difference between savage & civilised man is. It is much greater than between a wild & domesticated animal... [I] believe if the world was searched, no lower grade of man could be found.<sup>47</sup>

This is how Darwin describes the native people of Patagonia, whom he calls "barbarian":

Perhaps nothing is more certain to create astonishment than the first sight in his native haunt of a barbarian—of man in his lowest and most savage state. One's mind hurries back over past centuries, and then asks, could our progenitors have been men like these?—men, whose very signs and expressions are less intelligible to us than those of the domesticated animals... I do not believe it is possible to describe or paint the difference between savage and civilised man.<sup>48</sup>

In a letter to Charles Kingsley, Darwin described the Fuegian natives he saw:

I declare the thought, when I first saw in Tierra del Feugo a naked, painted, shivering, hideous savage, that my ancestors must have been somewhat similar beings, was at that time as revolting to me, nay more revolting, than my present belief that an incomparably more remote ancestor was a hairy beast. Monkeys have downright good hearts.<sup>49</sup>

All these are important indications of Darwin's racism. Disparaging certain races as much as he can, he humanizes and praises apes by referring to them as good-hearted animals. He openly maintained that "inferior" races needed to be eliminated, that this consequence of natural selection would make a major contribution to the advance of civilization, as in a letter to the scientist W. Graham in July 1881:

I could show fight on natural selection having done and doing more for the progress of civilization than you seem inclined to admit. Remember what risk the nations of Europe ran, not so many centuries ago of being overwhelmed by the Turks, and how ridiculous such an idea now is! The more civilised so-called Caucasian races have beaten the Turkish hollow in the struggle for existence. Looking to the world at no very distant date, what an endless number of the lower races will have been eliminated by the higher civilized races throughout the world.<sup>50</sup>

Darwin's racist nonsense extended even as far as the highly moral and glorious Turkish nation. (For more about Darwin's baseless and hostile statements regarding the Turkish nation, and how they are historically and scientifically unfounded, see Harun Yahya's *Evrin Teorisinin Irkçı Yüzü: Darwin'in Türk Düşmanlığı* (The Racist Face of the Theory of Evolution: Darwin's Hostility Towards the Turks), Kultur Publishing, Istanbul, October 2001.)

In predicting the elimination of "lower races" according to his own twisted lights, Darwin not only provided support for racism, but also established an allegedly scientific foundation for the race wars, slaughter and genocide to take place later in the 20th century.

Evolutionists make great efforts to disassociate Darwin's name from racism, but Harvard University's Stephen Jay Gould admitted the support Darwin gave to racism in a reference to *The Origin of Species*:

Biological arguments for racism may have been common before 1859, but they increased by orders of magnitude following the acceptance of evolutionary theory.<sup>51</sup>

Other prominent proponents of the theory of evolution, such as Thomas Huxley, were also racists. Shortly after the American Civil War and the emancipation of the black slaves, Huxley wrote the following:

No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man. And if this be true, it is simply incredible that, when all his disabilities are removed, and our prognathous relative

has a fair field and no favour, as well as no oppressor, he will be able to compete successfully with his bigger-brained and smaller-jawed rival, in a contest which is to be carried out by thoughts and not by bites.<sup>52</sup>

Huxley refers to the black race as if they were animals, not human beings, and makes the oft-disproven claim that the blacks will inevitably lag behind in the conceptual race.

The seeds of racism, sown together with the theory of evolution in the mid-1800s, began to produce their real fruits towards the mid-1900s. Friedrich Nietzsche, a contemporary of Darwin's and a passionate adherent of the theory of evolution, popularized such baseless terms as the "superman" and "the supreme race." National Socialism was the inevitable result. Hitler and the Nazis made Darwin's law of the jungle into state policy that left 40 million dead. (Further details will be examined in Chapter 5.)

### **At the Genetic Level, There Is No Racial Difference between Human Beings**

Particularly in the last ten years, the science of genetics has revealed that in biological terms, there are no differences between the races. The great majority of scientists agree on this. For instance, scientists attending the Advancement of Science Convention in Atlanta issued the following statement:

Race is a social construct derived mainly from perceptions conditioned by events of recorded history, and it has no basic biological reality.<sup>53</sup>

Research has determined that genetic differences between the races are very small, and that the races cannot be differentiated between in terms of genes. Scientists researching the subject state that typically there is a 0.2% genetic difference between any two people, even within the same group. Features that reveal racial differences such as skin color, and the shape of the eyes account only for 6% of this 0.2% variation. On the genetic level that means a 0.012% difference between races<sup>54</sup>—so small as to be irrelevant.

These latest findings are summarized in an article by Natalie Angier, "Do Races Differ? Not Really, DNA Shows," in the 22 August 2000 *New York Times*:

Scientists have long suspected that the racial categories recognized by society are not reflected on the genetic level. But the more closely researchers examine the human genome — the complement of genetic material encased in the heart of almost every cell of the body — the more most of them are convinced that the standard labels used to distinguish people by "race" have little or no biological meaning. They say that while it may seem easy to tell at a glance whether a person is Caucasian, African or Asian, the ease dissolves when one probes beneath surface characteristics and scans the genome for DNA hallmarks of "race."<sup>55</sup>

Dr. J. Craig Venter, head of the Cilera Genomics Corp. that runs the Human Genome Project, says that "race is a social concept, not a scientific one."<sup>56</sup> Dr. Venter and scientists from the National Institutes of Health mapped the entire human genome and concluded that there was only one single human race.

Dr. Harold P. Freeman, president of North General Hospital, NYC, sums up the results of his work on the issue of biology and race:

If you ask what percentage of your genes is reflected in your external appearance, the basis by which we talk about race, the answer seems to be in the range of 0.01 percent. This is a very, very minimal reflection of your genetic makeup.<sup>57</sup>

Another scientist to arrive at the same conclusion is Alan R. Templeton, a professor of biology from Washington University, who analyzed the DNA of members of different human populations. He observed that despite the great genetic variety among human beings, most of such variations were on the individual level. There may be some variations among populations, he states, but these are very small. Templeton summarizes his conclusions, as well as maintaining his preconceived belief in evolution, in these terms:

Race is a real cultural, political and economic concept in society, but it is not a biological concept, and that unfortunately is what many people wrongfully consider to be the essence of race in humans — genetic differences... I wanted to bring some objectivity to the topic. This very objective analysis shows the outcome is not even a close call: There's nothing even like a really distinct subdivision of humanity.<sup>58</sup>

According to Templeton's conclusions, the genetic similarity between Europeans and sub-Saharan Africans, and between Europeans and the Melanesians inhabiting islands northeast of Australia is greater than that between Africans and Melanesians. However, sub-Saharan Africans and Melanesians resemble each other in many ways, sharing dark skin, hair texture, and cranial-facial features. Though these features are typically used in describing a race, these populations resemble each other very little, genetically speaking. This finding, Templeton states, shows that "racial traits" are not observed in the genes.<sup>59</sup>

In their book *The History and Geography of Human Genes*, population geneticists Luca Cavalli-Sforza, Paolo Menozzi and Alberto Piazza arrive at the following conclusion:

Once the genes for surface traits such as coloration and stature are discounted, the human "races" are remarkably alike under the skin. The variation among individuals is much greater than the differences among groups.<sup>60</sup>

*Time* magazine's analysis of their book had this to say:

In fact, the diversity among individuals is so enormous that the whole concept of race becomes meaningless at the genetic level. The authors say there is "no scientific basis" for the theories touting the genetic superiority of any one

population over another... Despite the difficulties, the scientists made some myth-shattering discoveries. One of them jumps right off the book's cover: a color map of world genetic variation has Africa on one end of the spectrum and Australia on the other. Because Australia's aborigines and sub-Saharan Africans share such superficial traits as skin color and body shape, they were widely assumed to be closely related. But their genes tell a different story. Of all humans, Australians are most distant from the Africans and most closely resemble their neighbors, the southeast Asians.<sup>61</sup>

## **The New Imperialism and Social Darwinism**

Long before Darwin, colonialism began growing in 16th-century Europe. Exactly like racism, however, colonialism later drew strength from Darwin's theory and turned to a new target. Following the Industrial Revolution especially, commercial aims fueled the spread of European states to new continents and countries. Looking for new markets and raw materials, Europeans set about exploiting countries on other continents. Imperialist initiatives of the 19th century were based on different motives, however, which is why they became known as the *new imperialism*.

Social Darwinist suggestions dominated the new imperialist view of the world. One of the Darwinist causes of the new imperialism was the race for superiority. The British, French, Germans and other nations competing with one another were deceived into thinking that they needed to acquire new lands in order to emerge victorious as the most powerful nation in the race for superiority.

They were also driven by the mistaken goal of proving their superiority over other races. The Anglo-Saxons and Aryans regarded it was their natural right to assume control over the Africans, Asians and native Australians, whom they regarded as "inferior races," and to exploit their workforces and natural resources. Thus 19th-century imperialism developed more as a result of Darwinist aims than out of any economic concerns.<sup>62</sup>

The 1946 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica says that:

This new period of imperialism at the end of the 19th century found its spiritual support in Bismarckism and social Darwinism, in all the theories glorifying power and success, which had swept over Europe... Racial theories seemed to give to this new attitude, which was in opposition to all traditional [i.e. Christian] values of morality, a justification by "science" and "nature," the belief in which was almost becoming the dominant faith of the period.<sup>63</sup>

A great many researchers and authors accept that Social Darwinism represents the origin of the 19th century's new imperialism. For instance, in *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, Professor of History Gertrude Himmelfarb says this about the close relationship between Social Darwinist racism and imperialism:



Social Darwinism has often been understood in this sense: as a philosophy exalting competition, power and violence over convention, ethics, and religion. Thus it has become a portmanteau of nationalism, imperialism, militarism, and dictatorship, of the cults of the hero, the superman, and the master race.<sup>64</sup>

The well-known German historian Hans-Ulrich Wehler describes this aspect of Social Darwinism in these terms:

... it [Social Darwinism] allowed the emancipatory aspirations of the workers or colonial peoples to be dismissed as the futile protestations of inferior subjects in the struggle for existence. Vested with an aura of 'irrefutable' scientific knowledge, it was this versatility of application that gave Social Darwinism its power in its very real connection with the ruling interests. As an ideology it proved virtually ideal for justifying imperialism, [and] was kept alive by a host of popularizers in the industrialised nations.<sup>65</sup>

One can see Social Darwinist views in lines written in favor of imperialism in the retired German General Friedrich von Bernhardi's 1912 book, *Britain as Germany's Vassal*:

In the interest of the world's civilization it is our duty to enlarge Germany's colonial empire. Thus alone can we politically, or at least nationally, unite the Germans throughout the world, for only then will they recognize that German civilization is the most necessary factor in human progress. We must endeavor to acquire new territories throughout the world by all means in our power, because we must preserve to Germany the millions of Germans who will be born in the future, and we must provide for them food and employment. They ought to be enabled to live under a German sky, and to lead a German life.<sup>66</sup>

The hunger to acquire new territories, caused by the new imperialism, led to conflicts between the imperialist countries themselves. Again based on the errors of Darwinism, regarding local peoples as "inferior races" led to enormous cruelties. Imperialists maintained that they were setting out to bring civilization to the lands in question, but inflicted a terrible amount of tears and suffering.

## **Social Darwinism and Conflict between Races**

**One of the aspects of God's having created different races, tribes and nations on Earth is cultural exchange among them. In the Qur'an, God reveals that He has created different human societies "to know each other." (Surat al-Hujurat, 13)**

According to Social Darwinism's worldview, human beings exist not to get to know one another, but to fight. Accordingly, the most important impetus for human progress is conflict between races and nations. Social Darwinism's irrational

assumptions state that in order to emerge victorious from the conflict between races, new discoveries will be made. As a result, the "civilized" and "superior" will come out on top, and humanity will thus progress. To suggest that people will progress by killing and massacring one another, persecuting and oppressing others, is nothing more than barbarism. Disagreements and problems will arise from time to time. Yet all difficulties can be resolved by peaceful means. To imagine that violence offers a solution only makes the difficulties in question even more intractable. As already made clear, nations are perfectly justified in taking precautions to protect their future interests. But it is both illogical and a violation of good conscience to frame a policy ignoring the rights of other nations or believing that one nation's interests lie in destroying those of others.

Present-day evolutionists seek to portray Darwin, as "humane" and opposed to racism, but actually he was a proponent of conflict between races and advanced the lie that the "civilized"—at least in their own lights—white race would emerge victorious from such conflict. Some lines from Darwin's *The Descent of Man* read as follows:

When civilised nations come into contact with barbarians the struggle is short, except where a deadly climate gives its aid to the native race... The grade of their civilisation seems to be a most important element in the success of competing nations.<sup>67</sup>

Elsewhere in his book, Darwin refers to the conflict between "savages" and the "civilized," and claims that the latter will emerge superior. By these totally illusory assumptions, he prepared the groundwork for the chaos and suffering that would continue for nearly a century.

A great many Darwinists who came after him treated conflict between races as if it were scientific fact. For example, *National Life from the Standpoint of Science* by Karl Pearson, a 19th century evolutionary theorist regarded as a follower of Francis Galton, is important in revealing contemporaries' view of inter-racial conflict and the causes behind the new imperialism. Like other Social Darwinists, Pearson claimed that conflict between races is necessary, and that struggle within a single race is insufficient for evolution. Some of these claims of Pearson, which are devoid of any scientific truth, read as follows:

What I have said about bad stock seems to me to hold for the lower races of man. How many centuries, how many thousand of years, have the Kaffir or the negro held large districts in Africa undisturbed by the white man? Yet their intertribal struggles have not yet produced a civilization in the least comparable with the Aryan. Educate and nurture them as you will, I do not believe that you will succeed in modifying the stock. History shows me one way, and one way only, in which a high state of civilization has been produced, namely, the struggle of race with race, and the survival of the physically and mentally fitter race.<sup>68</sup>

Twisted statements like these provided imperialism with an allegedly scientific backing. The Europeans who occupied the African continent and a large part of Asia, as well as persecuting the Australian native peoples, claimed that their occupations were based on natural law and the only way for humanity to progress. (That this claim had no foundation was later proven by subsequent advances in the scientific world.) According to Pearson, wars formerly conducted in an unconscious manner would now have to be waged in a conscious, pre-planned fashion:

There is a struggle of race against race and of nation against nation. In the early days of that struggle it was a blind, unconscious struggle of barbaric tribes. At the present day, in the case of the civilized white man, it has become more and more the conscious, carefully directed attempt of the nation to fit itself to a continuously changing environment. The nation has to foresee how and where the struggle will be carried on... I have asked you to look upon the nation as an organized whole in continual struggle with other nations, whether by force of arms or by force of trade and economic processes. I have asked you to look upon this struggle of either kind as a not wholly bad thing; it is the source of human progress throughout the world's history.<sup>69</sup>

In the 19th century, this deviant belief that conflict between races and nations was a path to progress and which regarded races and nations other than its own as "inferior," took control over large parts of the world. Some imperialist Europeans behaved most ruthlessly towards the inhabitants of their conquered lands. From the measures they adopted, it was evident that they regarded these peoples as weak and inferior, denigrated them, and refused to accept them as humans who enjoyed equal rights with themselves. The new imperialism was a 19th-century implementation of Social Darwinism on a world scale.

One reason why Darwinist ideas received such wide support was that Europeans of the time had moved away from religious moral values, which require people to live in peace. God has commanded people to be tolerant and forgiving toward one another. Corrupting order in the world and inciting war and conflict are evils that bear a heavy responsibility in the sight of God. In the Qur'an, God has revealed that He does not love corruption or harm being inflicted on people:

**When he leaves you, he goes about the Earth corrupting it, destroying crops and animals. God does not love corruption. (Surat al-Baqara, 205)**

### **Ruthless Practices in the Colonies**

The Social Darwinist views that dominated the colonial elites revealed themselves in policies adopted towards the native peoples. These administrations did not regard these peoples of the countries they ruled as human, but as primitive,

intermediate life forms, and usually inflicted suffering, destruction and unhappiness. Social Darwinism was one major factor in these countries' ruthless policies. As already seen, the aggressive measures adopted by some nations, that in their arrogance regarded other nations as inferior, acquired false legitimization through Social Darwinism. These countries regarded themselves as perfectly justified in adopting such policies, which only increased their greed and aggression.

The Opium Wars are an interesting example. Great Britain began selling opium to China in the early 1800s, even though at the time the production, sale and consumption of opium were forbidden in Britain itself. The English governing class, who scrupulously protected their own people against this scourge, soon made the Chinese people dependent on opium. After his son died of excessive opium consumption, the emperor decided to put a stop to the British importing the drug into his country. A government official, Lin Zexu (Lin Tse-Hsü), was sent to Canton—the East India Company's largest port—about putting an end to the trade. Since the British merchants did not favor cooperation, Zexu had the opium warehouses closed. The British immediately followed this with military intervention. The Chinese were routed and forced to accept a humiliating treaty, under which the opium trade in China was regarded as legal. Lin Zexu lost his post in the government and was sent into exile.

The Portuguese, for their part, exercised their "superiority" by effectively making slaves of the natives. They kidnapped natives from their colony of Angola and sent them far across the sea as "contracted" workers for five years. But very few of them survived long enough to make the return trip.<sup>70</sup> In the great majority of occupied countries, colonizing powers took for themselves such territories and resources as they considered appropriate and gave them to settlers or companies from their own countries. They took no interest in the people who had lost their lands, and totally exploited their workforces, goods and mineral resources.

From their colonies, the British sent raw materials like cotton, tea and minerals to Britain, and later sent products made from them back to the colonies, to be sold at high prices. Cotton from India was processed in Britain, and the sale of Indian cotton was prohibited in India. In other words, they could use only cotton sold by the British. The Indians were also able to buy only salt produced by the British.

Another practice of the new imperialism was their belittling and behaving disrespectfully towards rulers of the countries they colonized. But in earlier times, from the era of Elizabeth I up until Napoleon, administrators had treated foreign leaders equally. The deviant idea of regarding oneself as superior gained increasing strength in 19th-century Europe, bringing with it insolence and rudeness.

Darwinist imperialists portrayed their colonization of other nations as the result of their races being "inferior" and "backward." According to such claims, the order of the superior race had to spread across the entire world, and if the world

were to progress, the inferior had to be improved. Put another way, the colonialist powers alleged that they were bringing "civilization" to the lands they conquered. Yet their practices and policies in no way reflected their claims to be "well intentioned." Along with their Social Darwinist ideas, the 19th- and 20th-century colonialist powers brought with them chaos, conflict, fear and humiliation, rather than well-being, happiness, culture and civilization. Even if one accepts that the colonialists did provide some benefits for their colonies, still the harm they wreaked was many times greater.

Karl Pearson's words cited below, devoid of any humanity or compassion, summarize these Darwinism-based views:

The struggle means suffering, intense suffering, while it is in progress; but that struggle and that suffering have been the stages by which the white man has reached his present stage of development, and they account for the fact that he no longer lives in caves and feeds on roots and nuts. This dependence of progress on the survival of the fitter race, terribly black as it may seem to some of you, gives the struggle for existence its redeeming features; it is the fiery crucible out of which comes the finer metal. You may hope for a time when the sword shall be turned into the ploughshare, when American and German and English traders shall no longer compete in the markets of the world for their raw material and for their food supply, when the white man and the dark shall share the soil between them, and each till it as he lists. But, believe me, when that day comes mankind will no longer progress; there will be nothing to check the fertility of inferior stock; the relentless law of heredity will not be controlled and guided by natural selection. Man will stagnate... The path of progress is strewn with the wreck of nations; traces are everywhere to be seen of the [slaughtered remains] of inferior races, and of victims who found not the narrow way to the greater perfection. Yet these dead people are, in very truth, the stepping stones on which mankind has arisen to the higher intellectual and deeper emotional life of today.<sup>71</sup>

This "world view" that regards most nations as inferior, and their suffering and death as a step on the path to so-called evolution, poses a danger to all humanity. If individuals join forces to depict an idea as scientific fact, no matter how dangerous or how unscientific and illogical it may be, and engage in propaganda on its behalf, then soon that idea and its byproducts will be accepted by those who lack sufficient information on the subject in question. This is where the hidden danger of Darwinism lies. People believing in concepts such as "the struggle for survival" and "conflict between superior and inferior races" carried out all kinds of ruthless actions under the shelter of these claims—or at least kept silent while others did so. As a result, racist, aggressive, and ruthless dictators such as Hitler, Mussolini and Franco emerged, and millions applauded their words. And because of these cruel ideologies, tens of millions lived and died in pain, fear and suffering.

## **Social Darwinism and War**

The deceptive idea that inter-racial conflict could lead to nations' progressing also laid the foundation for wars. Before World War I, when Social Darwinism was widespread, war was considered the "most appropriate means" for the elimination of the weak and the eradication of people seen as burdens, the survival of the strong, and the development of the human race.

Throughout history, many wars have been fought, but usually they took place within limits, not aimed directly at civilian populations, between the armies of the nations concerned. But in wars waged by Social Darwinist means, the real target was the people, to reduce the "surplus population" of the so-called "unfit" and the allegedly "inferior."

Before World War I, numerous writings and speeches described the Darwinist bases of war. Richard Milner, a contributing editor to *Natural History*, the magazine of New York's American Museum of *Natural History*, writes of the warlike Darwinist views of German intellectuals at the time:

During World War I, German intellectuals believed natural selection was irresistibly all-powerful (*Allmacht*), a law of nature impelling them to bloody struggle for domination. Their political and military textbooks promoted Darwin's theories as the "scientific" basis of a quest for world conquest, with the full backing of German scientists and professors of biology.<sup>72</sup>

During those years, General F. von Bernhardi engaged in propaganda on behalf of Social Darwinism. In his book *Germany and the Next War* Bernhardi maintained that conflict was a biological obligation and the best way of ridding the world of the unfit: "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind that cannot be dispensed with, since without it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization."<sup>73</sup>

The idea that war is a "regulative element" cannot be justified in rational or logical terms, nor with scientific facts. War is a destructive force that causes enormous losses of life and property, and its effects on society are enormously difficult to repair.

Nonetheless, those who regarded constant war and slaughter as requirements of so-called civilization continued to call for them. Elsewhere in Bernhardi's book, for instance, he wrote:

War is not merely a necessary element in the life of nations but an indispensable factor of culture, in which a truly civilized nation finds the highest expression of strength and vitality. ... War gives a biologically just decision, since its decisions rest on the very nature of things. ... It is not only a biological law, but a moral obligation and, as such, an indispensable factor in civilization.<sup>74</sup>

No doubt that one of the greatest errors made by those taken in by such ideas was to assume that war is compatible with human nature and thus, inevitable. In that view, the more people wage war, the more power and vitality they acquire. This is a great falsehood. God has created human beings in such a way that they are happiest when at peace. Chaos and conflict cause terrible tension in the human soul. The most rapid social, economic and cultural progress is made possible in a climate of peace and security. In her book *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, Gertrude Himmelfarb makes the following comment:

For the general [Bernhardi], it was the needs of war that came first, the imperialist adventures and nationalist experiments that followed. For others it was the reverse: the imperialist and nationalist aspirations brought war and militarism in their wake. There were even some who would have liked the virtues of war without the onus of militarism or nationalism; this was social Darwinism in its purest, most disinterested form.<sup>75</sup>

Sir Arthur Keith, an evolutionist anthropologist and biographer of Darwin, openly admitted that he was all in favor of war. Although he personally liked the idea of peace, he feared the results of such an experiment. Also, he made the illogical prediction that after 500 years of peace, the world would turn into "an orchard that has not known the pruning hook for many an autumn and has rioted in unchecked overgrowth for endless years."<sup>76</sup>

Keith's words indicate just how ruthless Darwinist suggestions can make people. Keith believed that the world needed to be "pruned" from time to time, that those "elements" that delayed the strengthening of the world needed to be cut away and discarded. He was openly supporting savagery. The "pruning" referred to by Keith was war, and those who died in war, whom he felt needed to be discarded, were helpless men and women and children. Those taken in by the deceptions of Darwinism feel no sympathy for these innocent people. The theory that in order to strengthen and develop the white race, those regarded as weak may be eliminated led to cruelties never seen before.

Social Darwinism's twisted views are one of the main reasons for the wars, conflict and slaughter that have continued unabated since the 19th century. As a result of the constant calls for war, even some who knew nothing about Social Darwinism fell under its spell.

In the early 20th century, those who came to believe that war was essential were not just a group of marginal ideologues, but a great many journalists, academics, politicians and civil servants.<sup>77</sup> They encouraged the eradication of women, children, the elderly and the needy, and the heedless expense of young lives on the battlefield supposedly for the "benefit of humanity."

These views were shared at the very highest levels. For instance, German Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg subscribed to the belief, common

among the middle class when World War I began, that conflict between Slav and Teuton was inevitable.<sup>78</sup> The Kaiser is known to have held similar views. Many historians regard the wicked claims that war was unavoidable and the cleansing of inferior races was natural and useful as some of the principal causes of World War I.

The philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche was also one of the most prominent supporters of Social Darwinism in Germany. According to him, the ideal social system should be based on armed conflict: "Man shall be trained for war and woman for the recreation of the warrior; all else is folly."<sup>79</sup> According to Nietzsche's twisted view, life consisted solely of war, and war contained everything within it.

Hitler, a fanatical Social Darwinist and great admirer of both Darwin and Nietzsche, put their warlike views into practice. Combining militarist thinking with the theory of evolution, Hitler said:

The whole of nature is a continuous struggle between strength and weakness, and eternal victory of the strong over the weak.<sup>80</sup>

These ideas advanced by Hitler and others like him were products of a terrible ignorance. Those who imagined that with the theory of evolution they were basing their militaristic and aggressive thinking on a scientific foundation were merely deceiving themselves. Yet with the tens of thousands of people they induced to follow them, they inflicted ruin on the world on an unprecedented scale.

In an article titled "The Philosophy and Morals of War," Max Nordau—one of the leaders of the Zionist movement—identifies Darwin as the primary supporter of war:

The greatest authority of all the advocates of war is Darwin. Since the theory of evolution has been promulgated, they can cover their natural barbarism with the name of Darwin and proclaim the sanguinary instincts of their inmost hearts as the last word of science.<sup>81</sup>

In *Darwin, Marx, Wagner: Critique of a Heritage*, Jacques Barzun, a history teacher at Columbia University, stated that Darwin stoked the fires of militarism and warfare everywhere:

War became the symbol, the image, the inducement, the reason, and the language of all human doings on the planet. No one who has not waded through some sizable part of the literature of the period 1870-1914 has any conception of the extent to which it is one long call for blood... The militarists of the second half of the century poeticized war and luxuriated in the prospect of it. With relative impunity for themselves, they took it for granted that all struggles in life must be struggles for life, and the death of the loser its "natural" goal.<sup>82</sup>

In the same book, Barzun described how Europe in particular fell under the influence of Darwinism's racist, militaristic tenants:

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 racist 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.<sup>83</sup>

These deceptions, identified and described by many academics, account for the 20th century's history of war, slaughter and genocide.

### **In God's Sight, Superiority Lies in Piety, Not in Race**

Such savagery was not limited to the Nazis. Many parts of the world have experienced terrible catastrophes because of racism. Because of it, hundreds of thousands have been regarded as worthless, humiliated, forced from their homes and enslaved, killed or abandoned to die, treated like animals, and used in pharmaceutical experiments. The examples cited in this book are just a few of the many documented instances of savagery and violence.

The social structure envisaged by Darwinism needs to be accurately identified. Like all other materialist theories, Social Darwinism, maintaining that people are selfish creatures who live solely for their own interests, responsible solely to themselves, can never bring proper moral values and happiness to individuals or to society as a whole. In order to acquire proper moral values and happiness, a person needs to abandon selfish desires. Religious moral values, as commanded by our Lord, teach people how this will be. People's responsibility towards God and the kind of moral values they need to attain His approval are revealed in the Qur'an.

If people have faith in God's commandments and the Book revealed by Him, then they will feel compassion and affection towards others.

Those who love and fear God and obey His commandments, see other people as beings He created, and make no distinctions between them on grounds of race, nation, skin color or language. In every human being, they see beauty created by God, and take pleasure in that beauty. Their faith makes them loving, compassionate and protective. However, someone brainwashed by Darwinism's falsehoods looks down on other races and nations, feels justified in oppressing and even eradicating them, and spreads nothing but tension, unhappiness and fear. The racism and imperialism witnessed in the 19th and 20th centuries are the result of this Darwinist world view.

In the Qur'an, God has forbidden discrimination on grounds of race and has revealed that people can attain superiority in His sight through faith and their fear of Him:

**O humanity! We created you from a male and female, and made you into peoples and tribe so that you might come to know each other. The**

**noblest among you in God's sight is the one with the most fear of God. God is All-Knowing, All-Aware. (Surat al-Hujurat, 13)**

## **THE RESULT OF THE DARWINISM-NAZISM COALITION: 40 MILLION DEAD**

In the light of what has been revealed about Social Darwinism so far, it should be no surprise that the Nazis, infamous architects of one of the most terrible acts of genocide in history, were tightly linked to it.

When one examines the writings, speeches and documents of Hitler and other Nazi ideologues, it's clear that they founded their policies on Darwinism.

Hitler thought that he could improve human race, as animal breeders do. He claimed that those he saw as "polluting" the Aryan race, those with genetic illnesses and the weak all needed to be eliminated; and he ordered the ruthless extermination of millions—proofs that he regarded human beings as animals and was attached to Darwinism. In an article titled "The Nazi Terror," Alexander Kimel—one of the few to survive the Nazi genocide—emphasizes the link between Darwinism and Nazism and describes how it was that the Nazis, with their belief in Social Darwinism, were able to treat people like animals and feel absolutely no pity for them:

Nazism with the acceptance of social Darwinism, equated man with animals, rob him of individual freedom of making choices, the ability to think for themselves. Brutality, terror, mendacity and ruthless exploitation of man by men became the norm of behavior. If the same laws of natural selection like the animals rule man, when the spark of the divine is removed from man's consciousness than [sic] men can be treated like an animals [sic]; he can be bred artificially, and treated like cattle. For example the war and the reckless conduct of the war brought very high casualties. Hitler tried to improve the situation, not by cutting losses, but by improving the breeding methods. In Auschwitz ... Mengele [a Nazi doctor] was [sic] conducted "scientific" experiments on twins, killing them, dissecting them, trying to figure out how to improve the breeding methods, to double the output of the German women. The Germans were treated like breeding animals the S.S. - their shepherds and their master breeder - their Fuhrer. The Germans were treated like prize cattle, other nationalities were treated like ordinary cattle and the Jews like vermin.<sup>84</sup>

The Nazis adopted this perspective to perpetrate one of the worst acts of genocide ever. The deception of the "superior race" that Hitler maintained was based on the falsehood of inequality among groups within a particular species. According to Hitler and his supporters, while some species evolved, some

individuals or groups within that species had remained backward and primitive. This perverted claim, constituting the bedrock of racism, was one fundamental element of Darwin's theory. In a book about Auschwitz, Dr. Karl A. Schleunes, a professor of history, accepts Darwinism's so-called scientific justification for racism:

Darwin's notion of struggle for survival ... justified the racists' conception of superior and inferior peoples and nations and validated the conflict between them.<sup>85</sup>

Evolutionist scientists painted just the kind of theoretical picture the Nazis desired. For example, the evolutionist Konrad Lorenz, regarded as the founder of modern ethology (the science of animal behavior), compared the improvement of races with biological structures:

Just as in cancer the best treatment is to eradicate the parasitic growth as quickly as possible, the eugenic defense against the dysgenic social effects of afflicted subpopulations is of necessity... When these inferior elements are not effectively eliminated from a [healthy] population, then - just as when the cells of a malignant tumor are allowed to proliferate throughout the human body - they destroy the host body as well as themselves.<sup>86</sup>

Regarding different races or a society's poor and needy as a kind of burden to be eliminated is inexplicably primitive and barbaric. The Nazis sought to conceal their savagery behind a so-called scientific mask, citing Darwinism's deceptions. Joseph Tenenbaum, author of *Race and Reich: The Story of an Epoch*, summarizes how Nazi policies took shape:

... struggle, selection, and survival of the fittest, all notions and observations arrived at ... by Darwin ... but already in luxuriant bud in the German social philosophy of the nineteenth century. ... Thus developed the doctrine of Germany's inherent right to rule the world on the basis of superior strength ... [of a] "hammer and anvil" relationship between the Reich and the weaker nations.<sup>87</sup>

After describing how the Nazis shaped their entire policies according to the lights of Darwinism, missing not a single point, Tenenbaum goes on:

Their political dictionary was replete with words like space, struggle, selection, and extinction (Ausmerzen). The syllogism of their logic was clearly stated: The world is a jungle in which different nations struggle for space. The stronger win, the weaker die or are killed...<sup>88</sup>

In the 1933 Nuremberg rally, Hitler proclaimed that "higher race subjects to itself a lower race ... a right which we see in nature and which," because it was founded on science, "can be regarded as the sole conceivable right."<sup>89</sup> By making this claim, he of course defended one of the worst falsehoods in history.

Hitler's words in his "On the Fate of the Nation" speech are a summary of Darwinist views:

Among the most motivating factors of life are self-defense and the protection of future generations. Politics is nothing more than people's struggle for survival.

This powerful wish to live is universal and directs the entire nation. The desire to survive must lead to conflict, because as well as being unsatisfiable this desire is also the foundation of life. The room to live is limited. Ruthlessness is therefore an inseparable part of humanity! Man became lord of the earth as the result of conflicts and constant struggle. This is the superiority not of mankind but of the strength of those who attain power and dominion. There are differences between races. The world took its culture from an elite class. Whatever we see today is all the result of Aryan work and success. However, the real factor in every race that leads to results is the important individuals it manages to raise. It is not democratic multitudes that have shaped mankind, but important individuals.<sup>90</sup>

Hitler's perverted rantings influenced a great many at the time. Tens of thousands of the ignorant signed up to these assumptions, products of Hitler's imagination. As already emphasized, the urge for conflict or a ruthless struggle for survival does not advance societies' progress. All individuals strive for a wealthier, more pleasant life, but achieving that goal is directly proportionate to their society's attachment to spiritual and moral values. Seeking to eliminate others through endless aggression merely damages all parties. Physical or cultural differences do not make one race superior to another. On the contrary, in climates where peace and security prevail, differences are valuable elements that bring about cultural enrichment.

If these differences are to be transformed into cultural richness, religious moral values are essential. No matter what the circumstances, God has commanded people to be forgiving, never to depart from the path of justice, and to treat others with affection and compassion. Believers know that there is great wisdom in the creation of different races and nations, and therefore act in a spirit of brotherhood and solidarity. Arrogantly seeking to classify people according to the race they belong to, in the absence of any justification, is a feature of unbelievers and those who set up other deities beside God. One verse describes the unbelievers' fanatical rage:

**Those who disbelieve filled their hearts with fanatical rage - the fanatical rage of the Time of Ignorance... (Surat al-Fath, 26)**

Under the influence of his mental imbalance, Hitler saw the fact that Darwin's theory ran so parallel to his own twisted views as an excellent means of spreading them. His attachment to Darwinism can be seen in his book *Mein Kampf*, published in 1925. In Chapter 4, for example, he wrote that Darwinism was the only basis of a successful Germany. Robert Clark, author of *Darwin: Before and After*, makes this comment on Hitler's devotion to Darwinism:

Evolutionary ideas - quite undisguised - lie at the basis of all that is worst in Mein Kampf - and in his public speeches. ... Hitler reasoned ... that a higher race would always conquer a lower.<sup>91</sup>

Beate Wilder-Smith, author of *The Day Nazi Germany Died*, describes the fundamental factor in Nazi doctrine:

One of the central planks in Nazi theory and doctrine was ... evolutionary theory [and] ... that all biology had evolved ... upward, and that ... less evolved types ... should be actively eradicated [and] ... that natural selection could and should be actively aided, and therefore [the Nazis] instituted political measures to eradicate ... Jews, and ... blacks, whom they considered as "underdeveloped".<sup>92</sup>

In *American Scientist*, Professor George J. Stein wrote an article headed "Biological Science and the Roots of Nazism":

... straightforward German social Darwinism [was] of a type widely known and accepted throughout Germany and ... more importantly, was considered by most Germans, scientists included, to be scientifically true. More recent scholarship on national socialism and Hitler has begun to realize that ... [their application of Darwin's theory] was the specific characteristic of Nazism. National socialist "biopolicy," ... [was] based on a mystical-biological belief in radical inequality, ... based on the eternal struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest as the law of nature, and the consequent use of state power for a public policy of natural selection...<sup>93</sup>

Professor Stein's article makes clear that the claim that human beings are no different from animals underlay German Social Darwinism. He continues:

The basic outline of German social Darwinism [was] ... man was merely a part of nature with no special transcendent qualities or special humanness. On the other hand, the Germans were members of a biologically superior community ... politics was merely the straightforward application of the laws of biology. In essence, Haeckel and his fellow social Darwinists advanced the ideas that were to become the core assumptions of national socialism.... The business of the corporate state was eugenics or artificial selection....<sup>94</sup>

These errors of National Socialism, clearly set out in Stein's text, prepared the groundwork for a world war in which many countries were forced to participate. Nazism, which grew and developed with the support of Darwin's illusory theories, was the architect of a disaster the like of which the world had seldom ever seen. So terrible was this catastrophe that millions lost their lives and whole cities were wiped off the map. The worst harm was suffered by German society itself—which Nazi propaganda had claimed would gain strength and progress. Once again it was demonstrated that ruthless conflict and seeking to eliminate others can never carry a nation forward.

As long as he lived, Hitler never abandoned the view Nazis held of themselves and others, which he summarized in the words: "We Nazis ... are barbarians! We want to be barbarians. It is an honorable title [for, by it,] we shall rejuvenate the world."<sup>95</sup>

As in Sir Arthur Keith's words, Hitler "consciously sought to make the practice of Germany conform to the theory of evolution."<sup>96</sup> About the theory of evolution, Hitler and war, Keith says the following:

If war be the progeny of evolution - and I am convinced that it is - then evolution has "gone mad", reaching such a height of ferocity as must frustrate its proper role in the world of life... There is no way of getting rid of war save one, and that is to rid human nature of the sanctions imposed on it by the law of evolution.<sup>97</sup>

In *Hitler's Personal Security*, Peter Hoffmann discusses Hitler's Darwinist views:

Hitler believed in struggle as the Darwinian principle of human life that forced every people to try to dominate all others; without struggle they would rot and perish. Even in his own defeat in April 1945, Hitler expressed his faith in the survival of the stronger and declared the Slavic peoples to have proven themselves the stronger.<sup>98</sup>

In short, as can be seen from the opinions of a great many historians and researchers, as well as from Hitler's writings and speeches, Nazism drew strength and nourishment from Darwinism and using allegedly scientific arguments, Hitler and the other Nazi leaders sought to justify all their own psychopathic cruelty. In fact, the cultural environment that encouraged such an ideology also bore traces of Darwinism. As we shall see in the following pages, the Social Darwinism that entered Germany in the first half of the 20th century, thanks to fanatical Darwinists like Ernst Haeckel, profoundly influenced German society and constituted a most important philosophical foundation for Nazism's success.

## **War in Nazi Germany and Evolution**

According to Social Darwinism's perverted thinking, war allows societies to advance, selects the fittest and eliminates the weak. War is regarded as a positive force because it eradicates not only weak races, but also the weaker within the "superior race." That's why Social Darwinism approves of war. The Nazism adopted militarism with the same Social Darwinist logic. Robert Clark, in *Darwin: Before and After*, cites *Mein Kampf* as a reference and provides the following information about Hitler:

Hitler's attitude to the League of Nations and to peace and war were based upon the same principles. "A world court ... would be a joke ... the whole world of Nature is a mighty struggle between strength and weakness - an eternal victory of the strong over the weak. There would be nothing but decay in the whole of nature if this were not so. States which [violate] ... this elementary law would fall into

decay. ... He who would live must fight. He who does not wish to fight in this world where permanent struggle is the law of life, has not the right to exist." To think otherwise is to "insult" nature. "Distress, misery and disease are her rejoinders."<sup>99</sup>

With Social Darwinism, the ideology of conflict and warlike hysteria grew stronger. Darwinist concepts were a very influential catalyst that encouraged these trends and led to them being adopted by an entire society. For the first time, racism and a longing for conflict thus found an alleged scientific foundation and were presented to society as an irrefutable fact. The writings of Dr. Albert Edward Wiggam, an evolutionary theoretician during the Nazi era, published in 1922, reflect one of "deceptions" most frequently encountered in the world of German ideas of the time:

... at one time man had scarcely more brains than his [so-called] anthropoid cousins, the apes. But, by kicking, biting, fighting ... and outwitting his enemies and by the fact that the ones who had not sense and strength enough to do this were killed off, man's brain became enormous and he waxed both in wisdom and agility if not in size ...<sup>100</sup>

The conclusion the Nazis drew from this imaginary "evolutionary history," the product of a sick mentality, is this: According to the Nazis' false perspective, war was constructive in long term, because evolutionists maintained that human beings advanced only by means of lethal conflict. Like Hitler and Rosenberg, other Nazi ideologues also claimed that contemporary civilizations had come into being chiefly through constant war. Various so-called scientists of the time also defended this twisted viewpoint.

University of Berlin's Professor Haeckel, for instance, a known proponent of Darwinism, praised the ancient Greek militaristic state of Sparta, claiming that the Spartans being a chosen people explained why they were so successful and superior to others. He said that by killing all but the "perfectly healthy and strong children" the Spartans were "continually in excellent strength and vigor."<sup>101</sup> Haeckel regarded these savage practices as justified. According to him, Germany should have followed this Spartan custom too, because infanticide of the deformed and sickly children was "a practice of advantage to both the infants destroyed and to the community." These unconscionable recommendations of Haeckel's are important in revealing the logical framework represented by the unscientific claims of Darwinism, according to which the idea that all lives have equal value and need to be protected was merely a "traditional dogma" and allegedly a violation of scientific truth.<sup>102</sup> No rational person of good conscience could ever accept these claims, but eminent Germans strongly adopted them at one time.

Not just in Germany but in a great many parts of the world, Social Darwinism rejected the moral values, along with virtues such as compassion, protection, cooperation, sympathy and patience taught by the Divine religions. In place of

these virtues, it claimed that killing those who were incompatible with society's interests—through destruction and ruthlessness, all of which belong to satan, the great misleader of humanity—was actually superior. The hatred they felt for Divine religions lies at the heart of the Nazis' enmity towards the Jews.

Yet neo-Nazism still survives in the world, showing that this sick ideology continues to pose a danger. No matter what name it may go by, the lifestyle that Social Darwinism advances consists solely of conflict, struggle, bloodshed, war, suffering and fear. Death camps like Auschwitz are where Social Darwinism is put into practice. Darwinism inevitably leads to Social Darwinism. In a world where Social Darwinism again comes to rule, new Auschwitzes will be inevitable.

### **Hitler Was a Tyrant Because He Was a Social Darwinist**

Hitler and the other Nazi leaders experienced no guilt over the savagery they inflicted for so many years, and even regarded themselves as heroes. They thought of themselves as saviors who would bring about the evolution of humanity, to whom later evolved generations would feel grateful. That, however, was a lie.

The dangerous ideas that resulted from Hitler's sick mentality were broadened and put into practice under the influence of Social Darwinism. According to his ideology, concentration camps were not prisons where innocents were tortured and exterminated, but rather places of quarantine where sickly, weak and undesirable elements were isolated for the protection of the master race. Thus Darwinism went down in history as a false science that constituted the basic philosophy of a war and genocide that inflicted the worst destruction, suffering and terror in history. Hitler himself went down as a tyrant who implemented this false science.

## **SOCIAL DARWINISTS' STERILIZATION AND DEATH LAWS**

Another of Social Darwinism's most wide-ranging practices is eugenics, the so-called science that seeks to improve the human race by means of breeding. The term was first proposed in 1883 by Charles Darwin's cousin Francis Galton, and consists of a combination of two Greek words; eu (good) and genet (birth). Put together, the word implies "well-born," or "genetic soundness." In contrast to its linguistic meaning, however, far from connoting good, this concept leads to savage cruelty.

Supporters of eugenics claimed that only their own race or class needed protection and improvement, and that other races or classes needed to be subjected to "artificial selection." According to Galton, only the British upper class



needed such protection. He therefore proposed that the poor, the sick, the weak and the untalented should be prevented from multiplying.

The Nazis, on the other hand, maintained that those who were not healthy Aryans were a burden on the state and needed to be eliminated by means of sterilization or extermination. They then put these ideas into practice. While sterilizing hundreds of thousands as part of their eugenics policy, the Nazis also killed more thousands for being sick, crippled, mentally handicapped, elderly, unskilled or without families, by sending them to the gas chambers, poisoning them, or leaving them to starve.

Proponents of eugenics think that most of the features of a person's character is inherited, or make partial claims to that effect. According to the supporters of eugenics, including Galton himself, undesirable characteristics like laziness or poverty are inherited. Imagining that idle parents would bear idle children, they attempted to prevent these people marrying in the first place. It is interesting how evolutionists could advocate such an illogical and nonsensical claim, in the name of so-called science.

The eugenics supported by Darwinists led to the suffering of a great many. Examining the development of this cruelty will give a better appreciation of the basic foundations of those who supported it. How Darwin supported and encouraged the perversion known as eugenics in the name of so-called science is therefore of great importance. Although the origins of eugenics extend back as far as Plato's *Republic*, with Darwinism it acquired an alleged scientific appearance and nearly became a branch of science in its own right. Karl Pearson, whose racist views we have already cited and who was strongly influenced by Galton, stated that the theory of evolution underlies the origin of eugenics:

... modern eugenics thought arose only in the nineteenth century. The emergence of interest in eugenics during that century had multiple roots. The most important was the theory of evolution, for Francis Galton's ideas on eugenics - and it was he who created the term "eugenics" - were a direct logical outgrowth of the scientific doctrine elaborated by his cousin, Charles Darwin.<sup>103</sup>

## **Darwin's Legacy to His Cousin Galton: Eugenics**

The foundations of the perversion of eugenics were actually laid by Malthus and Darwin. Malthus's *Essay*, Darwin's source of inspiration, contained the basic ideas that would come to constitute eugenics. For example, Malthus claimed that human beings could multiply by means of the same methods as those used for breeding animal stock:

It does not, however, by any means, seem impossible that, by an attention to breed, a certain degree of improvement similar to that among animals might take

place among men. Whether intellect could be communicated may be a matter of doubt; but size, strength, beauty, complexion, and, perhaps, even longevity, are in a degree transmissible.<sup>104</sup>

From this and a great many other statements, Malthus clearly regarded human beings as a kind of animal. His twisted perspective influenced Darwin, who made a number of predictions containing the disaster that was to become eugenics. In *The Descent of Man*, he expressed concern that thanks to various social practices, the weak were not being eliminated and that this could lead to a biologically backward trend. According to Darwin, the flawed ones among "savage peoples" and animals were swiftly eliminated, but it was a grave error for such members among civilized people to be protected by medicine and do-gooders. In the same way that animal breeders improved their stock lines through artificial selection, by eliminating the weak and sickly, human societies needed to do the same:

No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of a domestic race; but excepting in the case of man himself, hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed.<sup>105</sup>

With savages, the weak in body and mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilised men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment. ... Thus the weak members of civilised societies propagate their kind.<sup>106</sup>

These words, the work of a diseased mentality, formed the basic encouragement for racists, proponents of eugenics and supporters of war; and eventually inflicted terrible catastrophes on humanity. At the end of *The Descent of Man*, Darwin made a great many more unscientific claims, including that the "struggle for existence" benefited humanity, in that the more gifted would be more successful in the battle of life than the less gifted; and that without it, people would sink into indolence.<sup>107</sup>

With these distorted theories, Darwin laid the groundwork for eugenic practices. The theory of evolution being regarded as so-called scientific fact led to eugenicist and racist policies being accepted and put into practice.

## **Eugenics in Great Britain**

As already mentioned, the leader of eugenics was Darwin's cousin Francis Galton, but Leonard Darwin, Darwin's own son, was also one of the supporters and

proponents of eugenics in Britain. Winston Churchill was another who lent the movement his support.<sup>108</sup>

Galton maintained that the principle of the "survival of the fittest" had to be complied with and that only the strongest should be allowed to participate in the world. According to Galton's unscientific and illogical thesis, humanity was in a position to take control of its own evolution and even to produce a master race. Galton openly stated his belief in the superiority of the "master class" and the "master race." He also claimed that blacks possessed a low level of intelligence, saying:

... the number among the negroes of those whom we should call half-witted men, is very large. Every book alluding to negro servants in America is full of instances. I was myself much impressed by this fact during my travels in Africa. The mistakes the negroes made in their own matters, were so childish, stupid, and simpleton-like, as frequently to make me ashamed of my own species.<sup>109</sup>

Galton went so far as to suggest that various breeds of dogs were higher in intellect than some races of human.<sup>110</sup> But in his evaluation of blacks and slaves, he ignored one very evident truth: that the great majority of books about slaves were written by slave owners. In addition, since slaves were immersed in a society entirely foreign to them, in a culture of which they knew nothing, naturally much of their behavior and actions should seem ignorant. Clearly, any European taken to live in an African village would exhibit the same sort of incompetence in trying to adapt to a foreign culture and way of life.

More importantly, Galton's claims about blacks or his own citizens going to live in other countries possess no scientific validity, but were based solely on the illusory assumptions of various so-called scientists, brainwashed by a materialist world view, under the primitive thinking of the time.

Prejudiced and inconsistent, Galton's theses were by no means restricted to these. For example, he also proposed that for there to be social progress, those with low intelligence and intellectual levels had to be prevented from multiplying, and the smarter ones encouraged to do so. Otherwise, he warned, there would be social collapse. Obviously however, real social collapse would come about when the model proposed by Galton and the like, based on slaughter, conflict, violence, and slaughter, were put into practice. During a lecture to the Huxley Institute in 1901, Galton claimed that "brains of our nation lie in the higher of our classes."<sup>111</sup> In addition, he recommended that children of the upper class should be identified at birth and 1,000 pounds be paid to their families. He suggested that upper-class women should give birth to at least one extra son and daughter.<sup>112</sup>

Galton's belief—that an increase in the numbers of people whom he regarded as superior class could lead to social progress—is irrational, illogical, and unscientific. A great many elements lead any society to progress, but the most

important are the moral values and characters of those who make up that society. A society whose members possess strong moral values and characters will progress swiftly, and permanently. It is impossible for such features to be passed on genetically. If someone wants his society to make progress, he must turn his attention to the spiritual strengthening of individuals by various cultural and educational means. Galton and those like him sought to increase the numbers of the rich and reduce those of the poor by treating human beings literally like animals in the countries in which they were influential, and even sought to justify even murder on that account—a terrible cruelty and indescribable ignorance.

Nonetheless, at Galton's prompting, the first activity of the eugenics movement in Britain was based on birth control. This measure, taken by those who had been deceived by the deceptions of the theory of evolution, was aimed solely at the poor and those whom they regarded as of an "inferior" race.

In the 1920s and 1930s it was thought that the numbers of the poor increasing, even as the numbers of the upper class were going down, represented a threat. In 1925, for instance, Julian Huxley wrote the following in *Nature* magazine:

The proportion of desirables is decreasing, of undesirables is increasing. The situation must be got in hand.<sup>113</sup>

According to the eugenicists, the first step to ensure a balance between the "desirables" and "undesirables" was so-called racial hygiene. First, it needed to be determined for whom "racial hygiene" was desired and for whom it was not. Exceedingly primitive and unbelievable means were used to make that distinction. In Britain and the USA, for instance, people's heads began being measured. With these campaigns under Galton's leadership, the sizes of people's skulls were measured and their intelligence allegedly determined from the results. However, science would later reveal absolutely no direct relationship between skull measurements and intelligence.

Following on the skull measurements, intelligence tests began being employed. According to the results, it was decided that some should be sterilized and kept under lifetime observation and supervision. Later, however, it was realized that the intelligence tests used did not provide reliable results. These totally unreliable analyses reflected the scientific ignorance of the times. Factors such as the conditions under which test subjects were raised and the education they received were ignored, and it was concluded only whether they were inherently intelligent. In any case, the objective was not actually to secure reliable results, but to eliminate or isolate the "undesirable" poor, the sick and races regarded as "inferior."

## **Eugenics in the USA**

After Galton's death, the leadership of the eugenics movement passed to America. Henry Goddard, Henry Fairfield Osborn, Harry Laughlin and Madison Grant were just a few of Galton's American heirs.

The Rockefeller Institute and the Carnegie Foundation headed the list of the supporters of eugenics in the USA. The Rockefeller Institute financed the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute, one of the leaders of the eugenics movement in Germany, and in the 1920s, had a special building constructed for the genetic research of Professor Ernst Rüdin, who was obsessed by the idea of racial hygiene. The Mental Hygiene Movement was largely supported by the Rockefeller Institute. Moreover, the Nobel prize-winning Dr. Alexis Carrel, also from the Rockefeller Institute, happily applauded the slaughter carried out in Germany, and had no reservations over the mentally ill and convicted prisoners being subjected to mass killings.<sup>114</sup>

The perversion of eugenics led to a great many American states passing compulsory sterilization laws. In the USA, a total of 100,000 people were sterilized mostly against their will. As just one example of the dimensions that eugenicist barbarity assumed, in the early 20th century, 8,000 "unsuitable" people were sterilized in Virginia. This inhuman practice was legal in many states until as late as 1974.<sup>115</sup>

One of the foremost Americans in eugenics was Charles B. Davenport, known for his articles that sought to combine genetic laws with Darwinism. Yet the claims put forward in his articles went no further than mere assumptions. In 1906 he insisted that the American Breeders' Association carry out studies on eugenics. In 1910 he founded the Eugenics Record Office (ERO), which received from 13 to 29% of the budget set aside for the Station for Experimental Evolution. In short, the ERO was much better financed than other scientific institutions of its time. This organization trained many people to work on spreading the barbarity of eugenics. Students were taught to implement and evaluate various intelligence tests, such as Stanford-Binet, intensively employed in eugenic practices.<sup>116</sup>

People trained by the ERO were charged with collecting statistics in their working areas. With these data, the ERO aimed to prevent those it deemed unsuitable from marrying and having children. In 1924, the ERO drew up a sterilization bill which recommended that people regarded as committing the "crime" of being sick be sterilized.

To both reason and conscience, it is unacceptable for people to be sterilized against their will. Those with genetic defects, sicknesses of various kinds, and physical or mental handicaps should be treated with affection and compassion. In societies where religious moral values prevail, such people are protected, and their needs met in the best way possible. It is nothing short of barbarity to seek to forcibly sterilize or eliminate those described as having "criminal tendencies" by the proponents of the barbarity of eugenics. Such people can be educated with the

requisite cultural programmes and made useful members of society. Even where the people in question are difficult to improve, the most ethical and just solutions must be found, rather than exterminating them.

In the years that followed, Americans' common sense realized that eugenics was literally nothing more than savagery and took necessary measures to halt these practices. Yet at that same time the Nazis had adopted the American laws as a role model in their first measures regarding sterilization and forcibly sterilized 2 million people.<sup>117</sup>

As the examples cited so far clearly show, deceptive propaganda so full of falsehoods of Social Darwinism tries to make people less sensitive to one another, to eliminate feelings of sympathy and compassion, until human beings treat each other literally like animals. This is the exact opposite of the virtues imparted by religious moral values. The Qur'an commands looking after the weak and needy, and protecting the sick and those with nobody to care for them. No matter what the circumstances, God commands believers to ensure others' comfort before their own, and to be patient and altruistic always. To those who do good by displaying patience, God imparts these glad tidings:

**They give food, despite their love for it, to the poor and orphans and captives: "We feed you only out of desire for the Face of God. We do not want any repayment from you or any thanks. Truly We fear from our Lord a glowering, calamitous Day." So God has safeguarded them from the evil of that Day and has made them meet with radiance and pure joy and will reward them for their steadfastness with a Garden and with silk. (Surat al-Insan, 8-12)**

## **Eugenics in Nazi Germany**

Ian Kershaw's 1998 biography of Adolf Hitler states that Social Darwinism, eugenics and fascism were closely interconnected in 1920s Germany:

Integral nationalism, ... national socialism, social Darwinism, racism, biological anti-Semitism, eugenics, elitism intermingled in varying strengths...<sup>118</sup>

Dr. Robert Youngson, who has studied errors in the history of science, states in his analysis that the idea of eugenics underlay the Nazi slaughter, and that eugenics itself was a great scientific error:

The culmination of this darker side of eugenics was, of course, Adolf Hitler's attempt to produce a "master race" by encouraging mating between pure "Aryans" and by the murder of six million people whom he claimed to have inferior genes. It is hardly fair to Galton to blame him for the Holocaust or even for his failure to anticipate the consequences of his advocacy of the matter. But he was certainly the principal architect of eugenics, and Hitler was certainly obsessed with the idea. So,

in terms of its consequences, this must qualify as one of the greatest scientific blunders of all time.<sup>119</sup>

Describing Galton's irrational, unscientific views as merely a "scientific blunder" is actually a too "optimistic" approach. Actually, the claims made by Galton and those like him formed the basis of unprecedented savagery and slaughter. When Nazi Germany adapted the Social Darwinist world view to society, the catastrophes that ensued are a historical lesson of what can happen.

The Nazis adopted as a state policy the killing of every "inferior," "deficient," "flawed" and sick" human being who "polluted" the Aryan race. Hitler set out the reason:

... peoples to decay ... In the long run, nature eliminates the noxious elements. One may be repelled by this law of nature which demands that all living things should mutually devour one another. The fly is snapped up by a dragonfly, which itself is swallowed by a bird, which itself falls victim to a larger bird ... to know the laws of nature ... enables us to obey them.<sup>120</sup>

Hitler made the grievous error of suggesting that various phenomena that maintain the ecological balance in nature also applied to human beings. If animals regard each other as prey, that does not mean that humans should ruthlessly destroy those they regard as weaker. Animals have no conscience. Human beings, on the other hand, possess both conscience and consciousness, the ability to distinguish between right and wrong, good and bad, and the capacity for judgment. Only those, like Hitler, who seek to justify their own psychological imbalances maintain that human beings should lead an animalistic lifestyle. Indeed, Hitler expressed the extent to which he had carried this deception:

If I can accept a divine Commandment, it's this one: "Thou shalt preserve the species." The life of the individual must not be set at too high a price. If the individual were important in the eyes of nature, nature would take care to preserve him. Amongst the millions of eggs a fly lays, very few are hatched out—and yet the race of flies thrives.<sup>121</sup>

The life of every human being is valuable, no matter what his or her race, gender or language. What those of good conscience should do is to do all in their power to protect every human being, with no regard to race or physical characteristics. During World War II, the catastrophes caused by the Nazi ideologues regarding human life as of so little value, and their vengeful feelings towards other nations, became apparent to all. Furthermore, Hitler's world view represented a nightmare also for his own people, not only for other races. Eugenics, widely implemented in Germany, is one instance of this.

## • The Rise of the Eugenics Movement in Germany

In 1900, the German industrialist Alfred Krupp sponsored a contest for the best essay on the subject of "What can we learn from the principles of Darwinism for application to inner political development and the laws of the state?"

First prize went to Wilhelm Schallmeyer, who interpreted culture, society, morality, and even "right" and "wrong" in terms of the struggle for survival. He wanted all laws brought into line with these concepts to prevent the white races from degenerating to the level of the Australian Aborigines—and as long as society protected the physically and mentally weak, degeneration was inevitable. Dr. Alfred Ploetz, the Social Darwinist who founded racial hygiene in Germany, announced that he fully supported Schallmeyer's barbaric ideas. He insisted, for example, that at times of war, the racially inferior should be sent to the front in order to protect the white race. Since soldiers fighting in the front lines were generally killed, this would preserve the "purer" part of the race from being weakened unnecessarily. Going even further, he suggested that a panel of doctors be present at each birth to judge whether the infant was fit enough to live, and, if not, kill it.<sup>122</sup>

These terrifying recommendations were the first moves made by the eugenics movement prior to Nazi rule. On 14 July 1933, four months after the elections that brought the Nazis to power, the eugenics and so-called "mental hygiene" movement began spreading rapidly. Before that date, sterilization for purposes of eugenics was banned, even though it was carried out in practice. But now, permission was given for the implementation of eugenic savagery under the "Law for the Prevention of Hereditary Disease in Posterity," better known as the Sterilization Law. The chief architect of this tyranny was Ernst Rüdin, a professor of psychiatry at Munich University and director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute. Shortly after the Sterilization Law was passed, Rüdin—together with a number of Nazi Party lawyers and specialists—published a statement on the law's meaning and aims. Essentially, its intent was to rid the nation of "impure and undesirable" elements so that it might achieve the Aryan ideal.

To subject the helpless in need of protection to the inhuman treatment of eugenics could be acceptable only to those deceived by the falsehoods of Social Darwinism. All these people need to be helped with their sicknesses and weaknesses. The Nazis thought they could treat them as they wished, caused terrible scenes of barbarity for as long as they remained in power.

According to this terrible law put into effect in Germany, sterilization could be performed without the permission of the person concerned. A state doctor had the legal right to conduct forcible sterilization, with police assistance. In his book *Into the Darkness: Nazi Germany Today*, the pro-Nazi American Lothrop Stoddard wrote of his impressions of the eugenic courts during a visit to Germany. An official from the tuberculosis section of the public health service headquarters told Stoddard the following:



The treatment given a tuberculosis patient is partly determined by his social worth. If he is a valuable citizen and his case is curable, no expense is spared. If he is adjudged incurable ... no special effort is made to prolong slightly an existence which will benefit neither the community nor himself. Germany can nourish only a certain amount of human life at a given time. We National Socialists are in duty bound to foster individuals of social and biological value.<sup>123</sup>

In Islamic moral values, however, people possess an equal right to treatment, no matter what their material means, rank or status. To abandon people to die because they have various physical defects or are not wealthy is clearly murder; and to seek to implement this in the social sphere constitutes mass murder.

The scope of Nazi Germany's Sterilization Law was increasingly broadened. On 24 November 1933, it was decreed that "habitual offenders against public morals" were to be sterilized. The Nazis' "racial pollution" theses now included the crime of opposing public morality. The years that followed would show that the National Socialists' terrible plans were by no means limited to sterilization.

### • **The Nuremberg Laws**

The Sterilization Law was not sufficient for the Nazis to achieve their real objective. In order to establish a "purified Aryan race," the Nuremberg Laws were passed in 1935. Under these laws—savagery and primitiveness legalized—, enshrined the ideal of the so-called purification of the Aryan race.

Work on racial purification began with an enquiry into civil servants' family trees. Those thought not to belong to the Aryan race were forced into retirement. The Nuremberg Laws divided the German people into half: those who were subjects of the state and those who enjoyed full citizenship and political rights. Jews, Gypsies and members of other races were merely subjects of the state who did not enjoy citizenship rights. The second of the Nuremberg Laws, "For the Protection of German Blood and German Honor," (known as the Blood Protection Law for short) sought to guarantee the nation's so-called racial purity.

Under this new law, marriage between German citizens and German subjects became a crime. It also constituted a precedent for future practices implemented to isolate "undesirable individuals."

### • **Master Race Specification Programs**

The first step in the eugenics program was to classify the features possessed by the race the Nazis regarded as superior. The characteristics of the so-called master race were enumerated as follows:

Blond, tall, long-skulled, with narrow faces, pronounced chins, narrow noses with a high bridge, soft hair, widely spaced pale-coloured eyes, pinky-white skin colour.<sup>124</sup>

These and similar criteria, manifestly the product of a diseased mentality, are both a violation of science and also morally unacceptable. As already emphasized, there are no logical or moral grounds for discriminating against people on the grounds of the color of their skin, eyes or hair.

Despite these irrational criteria, it wasn't that easy for the Nazis to distinguish the races from one another. To that end, they carried out various measurements, using exceedingly primitive methods, to measure people's skulls, and implemented a number of intelligence tests with no scientific validity. Women who met their necessary racial requirements were placed in special houses and kept pregnant by Nazi officers for as long as this primitive state of affairs continued. Children of unknown fathers were brought into the world in these immoral "human stud farms." These children represented the next generation of the so-called master race. However, the totally unexpected result was that the average IQs of children born on these farms were lower than the average IQs of their mothers and fathers.<sup>125</sup>

### **The T4 Euthanasia Program: "Scientific" Murders**

These laws laid the foundations for even more unimaginable measures. One of these practices may be summarized as mass murder of the mentally impaired. The T4 Euthanasia Program took its name from the initials of the address of the headquarters in Berlin where the measures were administered: Tiergartenstrasse 4.

Under the T4 program, the incurable, the physically or mentally impaired, those with psychological problems and the elderly were killed to ensure so-called racial purity. Children, women and the elderly were subjected to the gas chambers, simply for being members of a different race, while thousands of innocent people of the same race were slaughtered for being viewed as weak and powerless. Hitler initiated this ruthless campaign in 1939. The killings continued officially until 1941, but on an unofficial basis until the final Nazi defeat in 1945.

T4 contained measures known as "Geheime Reichssache" (Secret Reich Matters), and those charged with implementing them were obliged to remain silent. One reason why little information could be obtained about euthanasia in Nazi Germany is that later, the personnel trained and employed within the program were sent as soldiers to the most dangerous fronts. The resistance partisans in Yugoslavia were known for killing enemy troops rather than taking them prisoner. Most witnesses to the euthanasia were sent to that particular front and eliminated.

In *Fundamental Outline of Racial Hygiene*, Alfred Ploetz was one of the first to speak about the killing of the sick and handicapped. According to Ploetz, from the point of view of "the protection and hygiene of the race," it was a grave error for the sick and weak to be protected and cared for (which is exactly what should happen in a healthy society). According to his perverted thinking, the weak were

being protected and kept alive when they ought to be eliminated. Ploetz was sufficiently heartless as to maintain that the doctors' board should immediately kill a handicapped or flawed newborn baby with a low dose of morphine.

Others followed in Ploetz's footsteps. In 1922 the jurist Karl Binding and the psychiatrist Alfred Hoche published a book supporting euthanasia titled *Die Freigabe der Vernichtung lebensunwerten Lebens* (The Release of the Destruction of Life Devoid of Value). Their book claimed that the sick and handicapped were a burden both to themselves and to society, that killing them would be no great loss, that the cost of keeping such "useless" individuals alive was very high, and that the state could spend that money in more productive areas. As a solution, they proposed killing the physically and mentally handicapped, and demanded that the religious and legal obstacles be lifted.<sup>126</sup> One of Hoche's irrational assumptions was that the moral values concerning the protection of life would soon disappear, and the elimination of "unnecessary" life would be essential to society's survival.<sup>127</sup>

To have a clearer grasp of just how terrifying that recommendation was, consider if you found yourself in a society where these proposed models were actually practiced. What if your deaf sister, your blind mother, your psychologically disturbed grandfather, your lame grandmother, or aging father were taken away for death before your very eyes, in the name of science and for the benefit of society? No doubt you would understand that there was nothing scientific whatsoever about the murder of people you love. You would have no difficulty seeing these claims as the result of a diseased mentality. Such barbarity would inflict indescribable suffering on you and everyone you know. Such suffering was indeed experienced in many societies, especially in Nazi Germany, and murders in the hysteria of eugenics left deep wounds in the conscience of society.

The efforts made by evolutionists to ignore or forget the scale of these depravities are ultimately doomed to failure. No matter how they seek to cover them up, the facts are clear. Humanity experienced terrible suffering and grave losses on account of the ideological foundations laid by Darwinism.

At the same time that the barbarity of eugenics was taking place in Nazi Germany, it also spread to a number of other countries, particularly the USA. In 1935, Dr. Alexis Carrel of the Rockefeller Institute published his book, *Man the Unknown*, which was translated into nine different languages within three years. In his book's final chapter, "The Remaking of Man," Carrel pointed to eugenics and euthanasia as alleged solutions to social problems. He said that the mentally ill and criminals should be killed at small euthanasia centers equipped with appropriate gasses, and sought to justify murder in the following words:

There remains the unsolved problem of the immense number of defectives and criminals. They are an enormous burden for the part of the population that has remained normal. As already pointed out, gigantic sums are now required to

maintain prisons and insane asylums and protect the public against gangsters and lunatics. Why do we preserve these useless and harmful beings? The abnormal prevent the development of the normal. This fact must be squarely faced. Why should society not dispose of the criminals and the insane in a more economical manner? We cannot go on trying to separate the responsible from the irresponsible, punish the guilty, spare those who although having committed a crime, are thought to be morally innocent.

We are not capable of judging men. However the community must be protected against troublesome and dangerous elements.

How can this be done? Certainly not by building larger and more comfortable prisons, just as real health will not be promoted by larger and more scientific hospitals. In Germany the Government has taken energetic measures against the multiplication of inferior types, the insane and criminals. The ideal solution would be to eliminate all such individuals as soon as they proved dangerous.

Meanwhile criminals have to be dealt with effectively. Perhaps prisons should be abolished. They could be replaced by smaller and less expensive institutions. The conditioning of petty criminals with the whip or some more scientific procedure, followed by a short stay in hospital would probably suffice to insure order. Those who have [committed more serious crimes] ... should be humanely and economically disposed of in small euthanasic institutions supplied with proper gases. A similar treatment could be advantageously applied to the insane, guilty of criminal acts. Modern society should not hesitate to organise itself with reference to the normal individual. Philosophical systems and sentimental prejudices must give way before such a necessity. The development of human personality is the ultimate purpose of civilisation.<sup>128</sup>

Dr. Carrel maintained that the murder of criminals and those thought to be harmful to society was the best, most "economic" solution. As already made clear, when Social Darwinism seeks a solution to social problems, it fails to consider the human dimension, and proposes exceedingly mechanical, inhumane, ruthless and cruel solutions that are totally incompatible with human conscience. It maintains that human beings, especially the so- called "undesirable," should be regarded as animals or chattels.

True, the fight against crime and criminals is of the greatest importance to society. But this fight must absolutely be waged on the level of ideas. Environments that lay the groundwork for crime must be eliminated, and various cultural and educational programs must try to win back those who engage in criminal activity. Falsehoods that portray human beings as a species of animal lay the basis for crime of all sorts; purporting to justify murder, theft, rape, aggression and all forms of evil. Depicting people as justified in committing crimes, and then suggesting that they be punished by death is totally inexplicable. For that reason, it's of the

greatest importance that those who keep supporting the theory of evolution—either for lack of sufficient information or because they fail to consider the catastrophes to which these claims can lead—realize the scale of the danger. To seek well-being for a society by killing criminals is most savage, primitive and barbaric. The most effective, permanent means of lowering the crime rate and the numbers of those engaged in criminal activity is to strengthen society in spiritual terms, and to improve education, living standards, and levels of well-being. Most important of all, society's religious belief and love of God must be strengthened. Someone who fears God knows that after death he will receive a reward or punishment for his actions in this world; someone who loves God, also loves those things He has created. He respects and loves other people and always behaves in a moral manner. The more such a conception becomes rooted in society, the more that society will enjoy well-being, peace, and progress.

### • **Hitler's Secret Death Warrant**

After Nazi Germany passed its racist laws, the time had come to obtain public acceptance of eugenic measures, especially euthanasia. Various propaganda methods, with films heading the list, were employed to bring people to believe the lie that there is no point in making great efforts to keep harmful people alive. Newspapers published reports and articles about how much money was being spent on the mentally handicapped, and how that money could be more usefully spent elsewhere. The campaign was initiated on such a scale that it even entered school textbooks.<sup>129</sup>

Germany's first euthanasia measures were taken at the end of 1938, at which time a certain Knauer from Leipzig wrote Hitler a letter, saying that he wanted a doctor to put an end to a child of his who was born blind, with only parts of its arms and legs and seemed to be an idiot. In response, Hitler sent his private physician, Professor Karl Brandt, to Leipzig, where the child was duly put to death.<sup>130</sup>

Hitler signed a document authorizing Karl Brandt and Reich-leader Philip Bouhler to permit euthanasia in special cases. The official permission, known as the "Führer-Order," read:

Reichsleader Bouhler and Dr. Brandt, M.D. are charged with the responsibility of enlarging the authority of certain physicians to be designated by name in such a manner that persons who according to human judgement can upon most careful diagnosis of their condition of sickness be accorded a mercy death.

**Signed - A. Hitler<sup>131</sup>**

This authority, which made murder a part of daily life, formed the basis for crimes perpetrated by the psychiatrists of the Nazi Germany. Later, ironically, the defendants in the Nuremberg and other war crimes trials tried to depict it as an order and a mitigating factor in their crimes.

## **How Was the T4 Euthanasia Program Put into Practice?**

In mid-1939 the final preparations for the program were initiated. In October, questionnaires about the mentally ill, prepared by advisors and the Psychiatry Committee, were sent out to hospitals and institutions. These sought the following information: "Name of patient, marital status, nationality, next of kin. Is patient visited on a regular basis? If so, by whom? With whom does financial responsibility lie? How long has patient been in hospital? How long has patient been ill? Diagnosis, main symptoms. Is patient bed-ridden? Is patient under restraint? Was patient admitted because of an incurable disease or condition? Is the patient war-wounded? And patient's race." Front groups operating under the T4 program distributed the questionnaires.

Under the T4 system, four front groups had been set up to carry out orders from the real T4 team, and in the event of any investigation, the groups would conceal the true source of the operations. Any hospital or family investigating a death warrant or the form of death found it impossible to reach anyone further back than the four front groups.

Working in parallel to these four groups was another group, whose members had become expert on the killing of children in particular. This group was named the Realms Committee for Scientific Approach to Severe Illness due to Heredity and Constitution and had two other organizations in association with it. The Charitable Company for the Transport of the Sick was responsible for transporting patients to the killing centers. The Charitable Foundation for Institutional Care dealt with final arrangements and procedures.

One of the Nazis' heartless practices was to demand "expenses" from the families of the patients killed, although the families were unaware they were actually paying for their relatives' murder.

The questionnaires were filled in by the doctors or psychiatrists responsible for the patients in the asylum. The returned forms were evaluated by T4's own psychiatrists and other experts. No patients were examined or observed directly. The decision on whether or not a patient was to be killed was based on information in the questionnaires.

When the forms were first sent out, a number of mental hospitals and suitable buildings were re-arranged for use as killing sites and murder training schools. The death chambers inside the buildings were camouflaged as showers.

This is how this terrifying system functioned: After the questionnaires' responses were received, a notice was sent to the institutions caring for those patients selected for death, announcing that space was to be made available for war-wounded, or that patients were to be removed elsewhere to receive better treatment. One of the front groups collected these patients and transported them

to one of the killing centers. There, they were exterminated within a few hours of their arrival.

Not only the mentally incurable were butchered. As the practice of euthanasia gained pace, the Nazis began to include other "undesirables." Death warrants were issued for the mentally unstable, schizophrenics, the elderly and infirm, epileptics, and people suffering from Parkinson's disease, paralysis, multiple sclerosis, brain tumors and other organic neurological disorders. Children were killed in the same way, and orphanages and reformatories were investigated in detail to discover new victims.

One very important point must be made clear: 50% of those killed might have recovered had they been permitted to do so.<sup>132</sup>

In order to conceal the T4 operations, great efforts went in to making the death centers appear like ordinary mental hospitals. This was admitted at the Nuremberg trials by Viktor Brack, head of the 2nd unit of the KdF (a term used to refer to the Chancellery of the Führer) and one of the main figures responsible for the euthanasia program. Brack stated that on entering the death chambers, the patients carried towels and soap and thought they were going to have a real shower. Instead of water, though, they were "showered" with poison gas.

High-level Nazis devoted to Hitler selected the students who carried out the killings, who were given very special training. At first they would watch the killings and, as their training progressed, they would take patients to the chambers and begin to switch on the poison gas. They would watch the victims in their death throes, and after death had been ascertained, they would ventilate the chambers and remove the bodies. They thus massacred thousands of innocent victims.

These murders were all carried out under tight security, with every possible precaution to prevent the slightest leak of information, because the people killed in these buildings were not members of "other races." Most were Germans and Austrians. If the German public ever learned that their compatriots were being killed in this way, the Nazis would find this difficult to explain, and so adopted all possible security measures.

The students, who had now turned into executioners of sorts, soon grew used to the murder procedures, and became immune to the pleadings, screams and writhings of the victims. During this process, their instructors closely observed their reactions and wrote reports about them. It was calculated that if students had no difficulty in killing members of their own race simply because they were sick, then it would be even easier for them to kill members of "inferior races," and they were trained for "wider ranging" practices in future. Students who were unable to bear these killings or who protested were sent to the front and placed in "suicide squads" by their unit commanders.

In order to become executioners, the students were trained to be cold-blooded, "flawless assassins"—to withstand the cries and writhings of the dying and the smell of burning human flesh and, to be able to speak to the people they were sending to their deaths as if they really were just going to the showers. They were rewarded and encouraged in various ways. In addition to these various incentives, they were also awarded the Iron Cross Second Class medals, for "Secret Reich matter."

Slowly the public became aware of what was going on in these institutes, and protests began. It was then announced that Hitler had issued an order for the killings to cease. They did not, however, and all that happened was a change of methods, involving either lethal injection or starvation, with the dead buried in mass graves. In this way, the savagery of euthanasia continued throughout the war.

### **Special Action 14f13**

After slaughtering a great many "undesirable" and allegedly "useless" mentally ill people, the T4 program widened its sphere of activity under the code name 14f13. Previously restricted to mental hospitals and research institutes, the program was now directed toward German and Austrian prisoners who fell sick because of the conditions they were kept in, and towards Jews, Poles and Gypsies in the concentration camps. Operation 14f13 began in December 1941. Special commissions consisting of psychiatrists were added to the Berlin T4 team, and they selected sick and in their view, otherwise, undesirable individuals and sent them to concentration camps to empty out medical departments and sick centers. The patients selected were generally sent to one of six killing centers and killed there. The people selected from the concentration camps were generally classified according to their ability to work, and if unfit for hard labor, were sent to their deaths.

In 1943, children, too, began being killed in Hadamar, one of the death stations. In addition to the physically or mentally handicapped, these also included those in state shelters or orphanages.<sup>133</sup>

### **Irreligion Lies at the Root of Ruthlessness and Lack of Compassion**

Nazi Germany is a clear example of the sufferings inflicted on people when Social Darwinist ideas are put into practice. Joseph L. Graves Jr., professor of evolutionary biology and author of *The Emperor's New Clothes*, which criticizes racist theories, makes this comment:

The tragedy of Nazi Germany stands as the clearest example of what can happen if eugenics, racial hierarchy, and Social Darwinism are taken to their logical conclusions.<sup>134</sup>



How did these people come to harbor such great hatred, insensitivity and ruthlessness? How did they come to be such murderers and enemies of the human race? The manifest answer is that people educated in the light of Darwinist teachings, who regard human beings as no more than animals, who imagine life as a battleground, and who believe that all forms of evil are justified in the struggle for survival will inevitably constitute a ruthless social order. Those who deny that man is created and possesses a soul breathed into him by God, who refuse to regard their fellow humans as valuable entities with reason and conscience, and who regard them as no different than animals and plants, will naturally be unaffected by mass murder and the sufferings of the helpless. When such people think that harm might come to them or their own interests, they can easily kill others, feeling no pity or compassion, or abandon them to a life of poverty and unhappiness. One cannot expect such a heartless individual to protect the sick, help the needy, or engage in altruistic behavior. Such a person will not even protect his ailing and elderly parents. He will regard caring for his handicapped brother as a waste of time, energy and money. If this diseased world view spreads, then everyone—administrators to family members, from doctors to teachers—will behave under its influence. It is impossible for such virtues as altruism, patience, compassion, affection, respect or devotion to apply in societies that do not live by religious moral values, whose lack has always brought destruction and catastrophe.

## **A THEORY THAT BELITTLES WOMEN**

The alleged scientific support that Social Darwinism provided for racism, fascism and imperialism, as well as communism, is a familiar subject that has been much written about. But one lesser known fact is that a great many Darwinists, including Charles Darwin himself, have believed in the error that women are biologically and mentally inferior to men. The mental difference that Darwinists claim to exist between the genders is of such a dimension that some evolutionists even divided them into different physical species: men being *Homo frontalis* and women *Homo parietalis*.<sup>137</sup>

Darwin described women as an "inferior" species, according to his own lights, because his world view was based on natural selection. According to this unscientific and irrational view, men are proportionately more fit than women to compete in war, find a mate, and obtain food and clothing; while women have remained at a distance from such activities. According to this scientifically baseless deduction, natural selection exerts a stronger influence on men, so they achieved a superior position in all spheres, and evolved further than women. As the following

pages will show, Darwin proposed these illusory deductions not on any scientific findings, but merely on the basis of evolutionist preconceptions.

Many researchers have revealed that Darwin's views on natural selection encouraged sexual discrimination. For instance, professor of history and philosophy of science Evelleen Richards concluded that Darwin's views of women's nature fed into his evolutionary theorizing, "thereby nourishing several generations of [so-called] scientific sexism."<sup>138</sup> The evolutionist scientific writer Elaine Morgan states that using various branches of science such as biology and ethnology, Darwin encouraged men to think that women were "manifestly inferior and irreversibly subordinated."<sup>139</sup>

As the evolutionist scientist John R. Durant has stated, the two main consequences of the theory of evolution are racism and sexual discrimination:

Darwin rested his case upon a judicious blend of zoomorphic and anthropomorphic arguments. Savages, who were said to possess smaller brains and more prehensile limbs than the higher races, and whose lives were said to be dominated more by instinct and less by reason ... were placed in an intermediate position between nature and man; and Darwin extended this placement by analogy to include not only children and congenital idiots but also women, some of whose powers of intuition, of rapid perception, and perhaps of imitation were "characteristic of the lower races, and therefore of a past and lower state of civilization."<sup>140</sup>

The errors made by Darwin that Durant referred to appear in *The Descent of Man*:

It is generally admitted that with women the powers of intuition, of rapid perception, and perhaps of imitation, are more strikingly marked than in man; but some, at least, of these faculties are characteristic of the lower races, and therefore of a past and lower state of civilisation.<sup>141</sup>

When one considers Darwin's general views about women and marriage, one can clearly see how he regarded women as second-class citizens. This unscientific opinion was also reflected in his theory of evolution. This is how he described why marriage was useful:

... children—constant companion, (friend in old age) who will feel interested in one, object to be beloved and played with—better than a dog anyhow—Home, and someone to take care of house—Charms of music and female chit-chat. These things good for one's health.<sup>142</sup>

In short, Darwin regarded marriage desirable because "a woman's friendship is better than a dog's." His statements about marriage made no reference at all to features such as friendship, affection, love, devotion, loyalty, closeness, sincerity and trust between two people who spend their lives together. About marriage, Darwin also had this to say:

... loss of time—cannot read in the evenings—fatness and idleness—anxiety and responsibility—less money for books, etc.,—if many children, forced to gain one's bread ... perhaps my wife won't like London; then the sentence is banishment and degradation with indolent idle fool.<sup>143</sup>

These unconscionable statements are perfectly natural, coming as they do from one who saw no difference between human beings and animals, and thought that women and children in particular were actually closer to animals. Someone who regards his wife and children as an inferior species will of course feel little affection for them, make few sacrifices on their behalf, and take no interest in them for as long as it is to his advantage not to do so. In fact, Darwin's statements show once again that there is no room for human love, closeness and friendship in Darwinian morality.

Darwin claimed that men were superior to women:

The chief distinction in the intellectual powers of the two sexes is shown by man's attaining to a higher eminence, in whatever he takes up, than can women—whether requiring deep thought, reason, or imagination, or merely the use of the senses and hands. If two lists were made of the most eminent men and women in poetry, painting, sculpture, music, ... history, science, and philosophy ... the two lists would not bear comparison. We may also infer, from the law of the deviation from averages, so well illustrated by Mr. Galton, in his work on "Hereditary Genius" that if men are capable of a decided pre-eminence over women in many subjects, the average of mental power in man must be above that of women.<sup>144</sup>

Of course, Darwin had no scientific basis for proposing this, but his biased and prejudiced claims about women spread rapidly among his scientific contemporaries.

The materialist Carl Vogt, a professor of natural history at the University of Geneva, accepted all the conclusions drawn by Darwin, without subjecting them to any scientific analysis, and claimed that "the child, the female, and the senile white" all had the intellectual features and personality of the "grown up Negro."<sup>145</sup> Vogt went even further, proposing that they were actually closer to animals than men. According to Vogt, a woman was "a stunted man" whose development had been obstructed because her evolution had come to a premature halt.<sup>146</sup> Vogt even concluded that the gap between males and females increases with civilization's progress and is greatest in the advanced societies of Europe.<sup>147</sup> Darwin was greatly influenced by Vogt's rantings, and felt honored to count him among his most important supporters.<sup>148</sup>

Many times in history, there have been mostly successful efforts to keep women in the background, due to the ignorance and backwardness of the societies in question. However, this is something that stems entirely from the influence of the established culture. There is absolutely no biological retardation, as Darwin and his supporters maintained, since God has created men and women equal. To claim

that men are superior, and to use this allegation to treat women as second-class citizens, is a primitive behavior practiced by societies that do not live by religious moral values. In our day, when equal opportunities are ensured, there are countless examples of women known to be just as successful, intelligent and capable as men.

## **Gender Discrimination Based on Skull Measurements**

In order to demonstrate that women were "inferior," some evolutionist scientists sought to prove that they had smaller brain capacities. Some resorted to such humiliating and illogical methods as measuring women's skulls. They imagined that the greater the size of the brain, the more advanced the level of intelligence (which is now known to be invalid), compared their skulls, and declared the women to be inferior. This was actually one of the unscientific methods referred to in Darwin's book:

As the various mental faculties gradually developed themselves the brain would almost certainly become larger. ... the large proportion which the size of man's brain bears to his body, compared to the same proportion in the gorilla or orang, is closely connected with his higher mental powers ... that there exists in man some close relation between the size of the brain and the development of the intellectual faculties is supported by the comparison of the skulls of savage and civilised races, of ancient and modern people, and by the analogy of the whole vertebrate series.<sup>149</sup>

According to the claim put forward by Darwin, studies on skull measurements and brain volumes (under the primitive scientific conditions of his time) would furnish data supporting the theory of evolution. Yet actually, the scientific results ran totally contrary to this claim. Different skull measurements or brain volumes provided no information to support the theory of evolution. Indeed, it is now conclusively accepted that such measurements do not constitute any valid comparison.

One scientist who imagined that he could allege that women were inferior by using craniology (the science of skull measurement) was Paul Broca. Regarded as one of the founders of physical anthropology, he was one of those who employed and supported such primitive methods as measuring the skulls of human groups and attaching values to them.<sup>150</sup> In the light of these supposedly scientific measurements, Broca went on to display the following distorted logic:

In general, the brain is larger in mature adults than in the elderly, in men than in women, in eminent men than in men of mediocre talent, in superior races than in inferior races ... Other things equal, there is a remarkable relationship between the development of intelligence and the volume of the brain.<sup>151</sup>

Broca was particularly interested in the skull differences between men and women. In a prejudiced manner, he analyzed the skull measurements he collected

and came up with the assumption that women were intellectually inferior.<sup>152</sup> Broca also claimed that the difference in brain size between men and women was increasing. Yet he had not the slightest evidence to confirm or support that claim, and in order to support it, he resorted to an equally unscientific assumption: that the increasing difference was "a result of differing evolutionary pressures upon dominant men and passive women."<sup>153</sup>

Today, even evolutionists admit that Broca's conclusions have no scientific value. Gould offers the following comment:

... they [Broca's facts] were gathered selectively and then manipulated unconsciously in the service of prior conclusions.<sup>154</sup>

To put it another way, Broca had "unconsciously" interpreted the data he obtained in a preconceived way, in light of the deceptive theory of evolution.

Another evolutionist who used skull measurements and regarded women as inferior was Gustave Le Bon, one of the founders of social psychology. Le Bon said:

In the most intelligent races ... are a large number of women whose brains are closer in size to those of gorillas than to the most developed male brains. This inferiority is so obvious that no one can contest it for a moment; only its degree is worth discussion. ... Women ... represent the most inferior forms of human evolution and ... are closer to children and savages than to an adult, civilized man. They excel in fickleness, inconsistency, absence of thought and logic, and incapacity to reason. Without a doubt there exist some distinguished women ... but they are as exceptional as the birth of any monstrosity, as, for example, of a gorilla with two heads; consequently, we may neglect them entirely.<sup>155</sup>

As with so many other claims, Darwinists were totally mistaken in these regarding women. Contrary to what evolutionists imagine, women's tender, compassionate and considerate way of thinking does not mean they are backward, but actually shows them to be superior. Programmed to regard human beings as a species of animal, evolutionists may regard such features as evidence of backwardness, but such attributes are most important to increase the quality of human life. Human characteristics, whose existence evolutionists never wish to admit, permit advances and progress in a great many spheres, including art, literature and technology.

## **Science Again Refutes Darwinism**

Measuring people's skulls and classifying them according to race and gender has been totally invalidated by science, since skull and brain size have nothing to do with intelligence or mental capacity.

In nature, in fact, there is clearly no direct relationship between brain size and intelligence. For example, elephants and whales have much larger brains than humans. In addition, the cranial capacity of present-day human beings ranges from

about 700 cc to 2,200 cc.<sup>156</sup> Yet these differences do not establish different levels of intelligence among people.

Apart from skull measurements, genetic science has also revealed that Darwin's claims about the differences between men and women are incorrect. According to the laws of inheritance, a man passes on his genes to both his male and female offspring. If the man possesses biologically "superior" characteristics, as Darwin maintained, then his daughter will possess those same superior features. But Darwin and his contemporaries knew so little about genetics that Darwin was even able to suggest that "the characteristics of a species acquired by sexual selection are usually confined to one sex."<sup>157</sup> Darwin also made ignorant suggestions to the effect that such superior qualities as genius, the higher powers of imagination and reason are "transmitted more fully to the male than the female offspring."<sup>158</sup>

### **According to Qur'anic Morality, Men and Women are Equal, and Superiority is Defined by Heedfulness**

In terms of Qur'anic moral values, there is no difference between men and women. God has imposed equal responsibilities on both, and holds both responsible for the same matters. Whether one is a male or female does not make a person superior in the sight of God, but fear and deep love of and devotion to Him, and proper moral values do. In one of His verses, our Lord reveals that regardless of gender, those who exhibit the best behavior will receive the best reward for their moral values:

**Anyone, male or female, who does right actions and is a believer, will enter the Garden. They will not be wronged by so much as the tiniest speck. (Surat an-Nisa', 124)**

God has also set out the attributes that any believer needs to possess:

**The men and women of the believers are friends of one another. They command what is right and forbid what is wrong, and perform prayer and give the alms, and obey God and His messenger. They are the people on whom God will have mercy. God is Almighty, All-Wise. (Surat at-Tawba, 71)**

As revealed by God in the verse, every human being has the same responsibilities. Those men and women who fulfill them, who turn solely to God and have faith, have been imparted these glad tidings:

**Their Lord responds to them "I will not let the deeds of any doer among you go to waste, male or female..." (Surah Al 'Imran, 195)**

The mental characteristics that Darwinists use as criteria are abilities given by God, irrespective of gender. In one verse, God reveals: **"You who believe! If you fear [and respect] God, He will give you discrimination..." (Surat al-Anfal, 29)** As this verse reveals, judgment—and thus, intellect—develops not according to gender, but according to fear of God.

Everyone, male or female, who acts with the reason given by God, may achieve success in many areas and acquire superior characteristics. A true believer, however, most seeks to earn God's mercy, compassion and Paradise.

## **DARWINISM AND MORAL COLLAPSE**

Moral degeneration constantly increases. Behavior that was disapproved of, scorned, forbidden or condemned a few generations before gradually becomes accepted, even sought after, and widely practiced—a very important question of which most people are unaware. Lifestyles and behavior until recently regarded as immoral are now permissible under the name of "different choices." Perversions such as homosexuality are accepted. Aggression in society; the rise in fraud; the way that spouses can easily deceive each other and sometimes both come to live with this; the serious rise in divorce and in drug and alcohol addiction; increases in such crimes as robbery and muggings; the way that people can commit murder without any qualms, the rise in the crime rate; the way people have no respect left for one another, the spread of gossip—these are just a few ways in which moral degeneration manifests itself. This situation, particularly prevalent in some Western countries, clearly shows how dangerous this degeneration is.

At the root of all this lie the incorrect answers to the question of why human beings exist. The truth is that people exist in order to know God, their Creator. In the verse, **"Only in the remembrance of God can the heart find peace"** (Surat ar-Ra'd, 28), God reveals that there is only one source of the peace that people seek in the wrong places. The religious moral lifestyle commanded by God will bring a person peace and happiness in the world.

Ignoring this fact brings with it moral degeneration, and produces unhappiness, despair, and depression.

One major cause of this moral corruption is the Darwinist ideology defining a human being not as a servant of God, but as a selfish animal that came into being by chance. According to this unscientific claim, a human should not be expected to

have different laws and moral values from those of an animal. Life is a struggle, and human beings must be totally ruthless, fighting tooth and nail with one another.

This means total contempt for proper moral values. In his book *Defeating Darwinism*, Professor Phillip E. Johnson of the University of California, Berkeley writes of the negative effects that have appeared in society since the 1960s with the weakening of religious beliefs and the prevalence of a materialist world view:

It would be roughly accurate to say that the 1960s marked the second American Declaration of Independence, ... [the declaration of some people's detachment] from God. One might expect far reaching moral and legal consequences to follow from such a declaration, and so they did.<sup>159</sup>

The molecular biologist Michael Denton states that it's impossible to analyze the troubles that left their mark on the 20th century without considering Darwinism:

The twentieth century would be incomprehensible without the Darwinian revolution. The social and political currents which have swept the world in the past eighty years would have been impossible without its intellectual sanction. It is ironic to recall that it was the increasingly secular outlook in the nineteenth century which initially eased the way for the acceptance of evolution, while today it is perhaps the Darwinian view of nature more than any other that is responsible for the agnostic and skeptical outlook of the twentieth century. What was once a deduction from materialism has today become its foundation.<sup>160</sup>

At this point it will be appropriate to examine the Darwinist claims that prepared the foundation for this moral collapse and degeneration.

## **Darwinism Constitutes the Basis of Atheism**

One of the main reasons why materialist circles support Darwinism with such intense determination is its atheistic aspect.

Atheism has existed since very ancient times, but with Darwinism, atheists imagined that they had finally found an answer to the question of how living things (and human beings) came to exist, which for centuries they had been unable to answer. They suggested that natural order and equilibrium had arisen as the result of coincidences, and that there was no purpose in the universe. However, every one of these views collapsed in the face of scientific, political and social advances made in the 20th century. Discoveries and analyses in a great many disciplines, from astronomy to biology, from psychology to social ethics, totally uprooted the theses of evolution and the assumptions of atheism.

Many evolutionists and materialists admit that Darwinism inevitably ends in atheism. Thomas Huxley was the first to state this openly, saying that when the theory of evolution was fully accepted, it would be impossible to believe in religion.



William Provine, professor of history at Cornell University and also an evolutionist, states that the world view of someone who believes in the theory of evolution is at complete variance with religion.<sup>161</sup>

Charles Smith, former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, also admits this, saying "Evolution is Atheism."<sup>162</sup>

Phillip Johnson describes the importance of the theory of evolution for atheistic and intellectual trends incompatible with religious moral values:

... the triumph of Darwinism implied the [denial of the existence] of God and set the stage for replacing biblical religion with a new faith based on evolutionary naturalism. That new faith would become the basis not just of science but also government, law and morality. It would be the established ... philosophy of modernity.<sup>163</sup>

As Johnson states, many scientists with a blind faith in Darwinism and materialism have made it their aim to use science as a means of rejecting God. But the fact is, science is a most valuable means of revealing the proofs of God's existence. The last 20 years have seen a rapid rise in the numbers of scientists who support the fact of creation. Every new study, and every new piece of information shows that an exceedingly sensitive and flawless equilibrium exists in the entire universe, and reveals the work of a superior and great Intelligence that belongs to Almighty God, Who is exalted and rich beyond any need.

Michael Denton states that Darwinism brings atheism in its wake and causes great damage to humanity's way of looking at itself:

... [Darwin's] new and revolutionary [at the same time unreasonable and unscientific] view of the living world ... implied that all the diversity of life on Earth had resulted from natural and random processes and not, as was previously believed, from the creative activity of God. [Surely God is beyond that!] The acceptance of this great claim ... was to play a decisive role in the secularization of western society. ... It was because Darwinian theory broke man's link with God and set him adrift in a cosmos without purpose or end that its impact was so fundamental. No other intellectual revolution in modern times ... so profoundly affected the way men viewed themselves and their place in the universe.<sup>164</sup>

The loss or weakening of belief in God leads to a society's spiritual collapse. People with no fear of God, who deny that they will find their true, eternal lives after death and will be recompensed for their deeds in this world with Paradise or Hell, can be exceedingly unreliable, aggressive, ruthless and self-interested, and prone to dangerous criminal behavior. For someone who has no fear of God, there are no bounds. As long as that person thinks that he can somehow avoid being punished by laws, he may commit all kinds of immorality and cause all kinds of disruption in society, may cheat people, hurt them and engage in much similar behavior.

Fear and love of God, on the other hand, ensure that people live by proper moral values, behaving in ways that meet with His approval. This allows a society to progress, and also strengthens it. Otherwise, there will be no end to conflict, war, ruthlessness and injustice.

God commands goodness, justice, honesty and order. In the Qur'an, He reveals:

**And to Madyan We sent their brother Shu'ayb who said, "My people, worship God! You have no other deity than Him. A clear sign has come to you from your Lord. Give full measure and full weight. Do not diminish people's goods. Do not cause corruption in the land after it has been put right. That is better for you if you are believers." (Surat al-A'raf, 85)**

**Do not lie in wait on every pathway, threatening people, barring those who believe from the way of God, seeking in it something crooked. Remember when you were few and He increased your number: see the final fate of the corrupters! (Surat al-A'raf, 86)**

### **Darwinism Proposes the Lie that Man is Unrestrained and Purposeless**

The following words by the evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson are the clearest summary of Darwinism's view of humanity, founded totally on deceptions:

Man stands alone in the universe, a unique product of a long, unconscious, impersonal, material process with unique understanding and potentialities. These he owes to no one but himself, and it is to himself that he is responsible.<sup>165</sup>

This claim represents one of Darwinism's classical falsehoods, and one of the main causes of societal collapse. Darwinists cannot offer the slightest scientific evidence for proposing that man managed to bring himself into the world, yet seek to preserve this falsehood for ideological reasons. According to their unrealistic claim, there is no predetermined reason for the existence of human beings—allegedly purposeless entities who will one day die and disappear. Yet the truth is very different. God created man from nothing. Behind human creation is a definite purpose, which is revealed in the Qur'an. God created human beings to serve Him. Every human will remain on Earth for the time allotted in line with a specific destiny, and after that allotted period has come to an end with death, will be resurrected. On the Day of Judgment, all human beings will be called to account for their actions in this world. That evolutionists try with all their power to forget this fact, and to cause others to deny it, changes nothing. So long as they refuse to abandon these errors in this world, denying God and the Day of Judgment and maintaining that man is a purposeless entity, when the Day of Judgment actually

comes, the regret they experience will be very great. Our Lord has revealed this in the Qur'an:

**If only you could see when they are standing before the Fire and saying, "Oh! If only we could be sent back again, we would not deny the signs of our Lord and we would be among the believers." (Surat al-An'am, 27)**

Suggesting that there is no purpose behind their lives leads people to suffer a feeling of emptiness and terrible depression. Those who believe that falsehood see life as meaningless and unnecessary, and this in turn leads to a spiritual collapse. The irrational, illogical claims of Richard Dawkins, one of today's most prominent proponents of the theory of evolution, are typical of the materialist view. Dawkins maintains that human beings are all mere "gene machines," and that the only reason for existence is to pass their genes on to subsequent generations. According to Dawkins, there is no other purpose behind the universe: Man and the universe are both products of coincidence and chaos. This belief will inflict great despair and unhappiness, since nothing has any significance for someone who believes that at the moment of death, he will simply cease to exist. Friendship, love and good deeds give no joy to someone who imagines that they will receive no reward and will not survive in any case.

In addition, this distorted moral fabric will make people imagine that their evil deeds will go unrecompensed. That will lead them to imagine that they can conceal those deeds to avoid being punished for them, and therefore feel no compunction or hesitation over lying, hypocrisy, gossiping, making unjust profits, theft and even murder. In any society where the number of people deceived by such a twisted conception increases, then order and stability will be out of the question.

One of the most striking instances of the damage that Darwinist propaganda inflicted on the human soul appears in the preface to Dawkins' book *Unweaving the Rainbow*:

A foreign publisher of my first book confessed that he could not sleep for three nights after reading it, so troubled was he by what he saw as its cold, bleak message. Others have asked me how I can bear to get up in the mornings. A teacher from a distant country wrote me reproachfully that a pupil had come to him in tears after reading the same book, because it had persuaded her that life was empty and purposeless. He advised her not to show the book to any of her friends, for fear of contaminating them with the same nihilistic pessimism.<sup>166</sup>

As can be seen from Dawkins's admission, the pessimism and purposelessness that Darwinism suggests represent a grave threat to society. People are offered not a bleak message, as by Dawkins suggested, but a bleak lie that seeks to divert

them from the truth that inspires joy. That joy lies in the fact that man is not lonely, friendless, and abandoned but possesses a purpose stipulated by God.

Forgetting that God has created human beings for a specific purpose, societies are condemned to suffer a moral and spiritual collapse. Most of those addicted to drugs and alcohol, who turn their backs on life, and suffer such psychological disorders like depression and stress, and who commit suicide, are unaware of their lives' true purpose.

Despite being an evolutionist, Fred Hoyle says this of the nihilistic philosophy—that life is pointless and that human beings are worthless—emanating from *The Origin of Species*:

I am haunted by a conviction that the nihilistic philosophy which so-called educated opinion chose to adopt following the publication of *the Origin of Species* committed mankind to a course of automatic self destruction. A doomsday was then set ticking.<sup>167</sup>

God has created all human beings to serve Him, and has breathed His own soul into them. Man is not an entity that came into being by chance from inanimate substances, but an entity created by Almighty God, to whom He gave reason and conscience and all kinds of blessings. Human beings—whom Darwinist materialists imagine to be purposeless and free of any restraint—actually have a most valuable purpose in life, to please Almighty God, Who created them, brought them into being from nothing, and gave them a soul and consciousness. At every moment of our lives, we should abide by our Lord's commandments with the greatest care and enthusiasm, hoping to earn His mercy and eternal Paradise in return. A person's true life is in the Hereafter, which will begin after death. In this world, a person must live in order to attain Paradise.

God reveals in the Qur'an that human beings are not free from all restraint:

**Does man reckon he will be left to go on unchecked? (Surat al-Qiyama, 36)**

**Did you suppose that We created you for amusement and that you would not return to Us? (Surat al-Muminun, 115)**

### **The Social Darwinist Lie That "Man Is a Species of Animal"**

Those deceived by this irrational, unscientific claim maintain that all of man's attributes are a legacy from his so-called "animal ancestors." This has dangerous effects on a person's view of himself and of others. Someone who regards other people as animals will disregard their ideas, and consider their lives to be of little value. He will regard a person's death as no more important than that of a dog or a

cat. The fact that people are in need will cause no discomfort to someone who regards them as animals and thinks that in any case, animals evolve through conflict and competition. Such a frightening view completely does away with love and respect among people. For these reasons, those deceived by Darwinism must not ignore what this deception will cost them.

George Gaylord Simpson says this about the way Darwinism regards human beings:

In the world of Darwin, man has no special status other than his definition as a distinct species of animal. He is in the fullest sense a part of nature and not apart from it. He is akin, not figuratively but literally, to every living thing, be it an ameba, a tapeworm, a flea, a seaweed, an oak tree, or a monkey—even though the degrees of relationship are different...<sup>168</sup>

In fact, however, this claim is unscientific, irrational, and illogical. Humans and animals are entirely different entities created by God. Animals act in the light of instincts and lack reasoning. A human being, on the other hand, is an entity capable of judgment and who can reason. Those who maintain that man is a species of animal seek to apply the law of the jungle to human societies, which will lead to a terrifying chaos that eliminates all peace and well-being.

Darwin expressed this distorted view in one of his letters, wondering whether human beings' ideas could be of any value, based on the falsehood that they evolved from animals:

With me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the minds of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would anyone trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?<sup>169</sup>

Darwin's words neatly summarize evolutionists' terrifying view of humanity. This grave error of Darwin's came to pervade a large part of the Western world, and the idea that human beings are animals is still propagated in many countries today, even in school textbooks. For example, *Biology: Visualizing Life*, published in 1994, says:

You are an animal, and share a common heritage with earthworms and dinosaurs, butterflies and sea stars.<sup>170</sup>

Benjamin Wiker, a university lecturer in science and theology and author of *Moral Darwinism: How We Became Hedonists*, states how, after Darwin there came an enormous deviation in the way man was regarded. He describes how the error of considering human beings to be the same as animals spread, ignoring the differences between them:

... most if not all of "traditional" morality is based on the assumption that human beings are a distinct species. Thus, the prohibition against murder is defined in terms of human nature. Don't murder! Don't murder what? Aphids? Anteaters?

Orangutans? No, don't kill another innocent human being. With Darwinism, however, that species distinction between human beings and other animals is completely blurred. There is no longer any moral line to be drawn because the species line has been erased.

Darwinists like Richard Dawkins and Peter Singer understand this perfectly. ... Once we see ourselves as just one more animal on the evolutionary spectrum, then we must either affirm that our morality applies to all living things or deny that our morality has any foundation at all. Generally Darwinists provide a kind of incoherent stew of both. They treat some animals as if they had the same moral status as human beings, and treat human beings, in some respects, as if they were just one more animal. On the one hand, they will argue for animal rights; on the other, they assert that deformed or old and infirm human beings should be "put down" out of the same compassion we show for our pets.<sup>171</sup>

As we've seen, one main reason why evolutionists seek to portray man as a species of animal is their desire to eradicate all moral values. If man were an animal, as Darwinism would have us believe, then even the concept of morality would be of no importance to people. The damage this would inflict on society is beyond all imagining. For that reason, all humanity must be on its guard against Darwinism and the deceptions of this scientific forgery.

In alleging that human beings are no different from animals in physical and biological terms, Darwinism also seeks to impose the idea that human and animal behavior are no different from one another. This lets undesirable characteristics and behavior, such as violence, aggression, and selfishness, ruthless competition, rape and homosexuality, allegedly inherited from man's animal ancestors, assume the status of "natural behavior" for people. For instance, the evolutionist scientist Philip Jackson Darlington writes:

The first point is that selfishness and violence are inherent in us, inherited from our remotest animal ancestors. Violence is, then, natural to man; a product of evolution.<sup>172</sup>

All sorts of crimes are therefore seen as normal and justified, and it is even suggested that they should not be punished. In *Ever Since Darwin*, Stephen Jay Gould says this view began with the Italian expert on criminology professor Cesare Lombroso:

Biological theories of criminality were scarcely new, but Lombroso [Italian physician, Cesare Lombroso] gave the argument a novel, evolutionary twist. Born criminals are not simply deranged or diseased; they are, literally, throwbacks to a previous evolutionary stage. The hereditary characters of our primitive and apish ancestors remain in our genetic repertoire. Some unfortunate men are born with an unusually large number of these ancestral characters. Their behavior may have

been appropriate in savage societies of the past; today, we brand it as criminal. We may pity the born criminal, for he cannot help himself...<sup>173</sup>

As is evident from the evolutionist Gould's description of Lombroso's idea, the commission of crime is regarded as something beyond free will, a legacy from human beings' alleged animal ancestors. However, this is an unrealistic claim. God has created all human beings with their lower selves that constantly impel them towards evil, but also with a conscience that protects them and cause them to avoid evil and do good. It is revealed in verses that:

**And [I swear by] the self and what proportioned it and inspired it with depravity or sense of duty, he who purifies it has succeeded, he who covers it up has failed. (Surat ash-Shams, 7-10)**

All human beings, therefore, are aware of whether their deeds are good or bad, and their behavior proper or otherwise. Everyone is responsible for avoiding what is evil and doing what is good. In the same way that those people who do good receive the finest recompense for their actions, so those who do evil will inevitably be punished. The theory of evolution, depicting all forms of crime and immorality as justified, leads people to terrible disasters, both in this world and the Hereafter.

Unlike animals, a human being possesses a soul breathed into him or her by God, reason, free will, conscience, common sense and the ability to distinguish between good and bad. Humans are able to make decisions and judgments, deliver punishment and reward, and learn from experience, and are tested by God. None of these abilities are to be found in any other living thing, nor is it possible for them to be so, because they have nothing to do with humans' physical structures, or their genes. They are all features of the human soul.

That being so, everyone with reason must acknowledge that truth and accordingly, live an honorable and determined life, reconcilable with good conscience.

### **Poor Morality Imposed by the False "Struggle for Survival"**

As already stated, one of Darwinism's main deceptions is the claim summed up in terms like "the struggle for survival" and "the survival of the fittest." According to evolutionists' unrealistic claims, life is a sphere of conflict and competition for all living things, including man. In such a world, there is no place for features of proper morality such as love, respect, cooperation or altruism.

In *The Descent of Man*, Charles Darwin wrote that humanity had reached its current position through struggle, that it had to continue to struggle in order to progress, and that no law should be allowed to impede that process:

Man, like every other animal, has no doubt advanced to his present high condition through a struggle for existence consequent on his rapid multiplication; and if he is to advance still higher he must remain subject to a severe struggle.

Otherwise he would soon sink into indolence, and the more highly-gifted men would not be more successful in the battle of life than the less gifted. Hence our natural rate of increase, though leading to many and obvious evils, must not be greatly diminished by any means. There should be open competition for all men...<sup>174</sup>

In the dark world imposed by Darwinism, the important thing is for people to spend their whole lives in struggle. Yet this claim lacks any scientific validity, and is also incompatible with reason and logic. When such dangerous suggestions are put into practice, honesty and heroism, loyalty and devotion will be replaced by hypocrisy and selfishness, mendacity and disloyalty; and only those who possess these negative characteristics will be victorious. The foundations on which Darwinism bases its twisted view of the world and morality are frequently implied by evolutionists, in order to influence people.

For example, in an article titled "The Center of Life," Lorraine Lee Larison Cudmore, who holds a doctorate in biology, openly admits that in the evolutionist view of life, compassion and pity have no place:

Evolution is ... hard, inescapable... There is just no room for compassion or good sportsmanship. Too many organisms are born, so, quite simply, a lot of them are going to have to die. The only thing that does matter is, whether you leave more children carrying your genes than the next person leaves.<sup>175</sup>

Like racism, savage capitalism and eugenics examined previously in this book, the perverted ideas and dangerous practices reinforced by Darwinism are the results of errors and deceptions concerning the struggle of the strongest for survival. The fact remains, though, that life is not a sphere of struggle. Human beings' only struggle must be against their own lower selves. By fighting against evils in his own nature and those around him, a person must seek to bring positive features such as love, compassion, affection, peace, security, respect, and loyalty to prevail. That is a requirement of the moral values that are pleasing to God and which He has chosen for His servants.

## **Social Darwinism Attaches No Value to Human Life**

When Darwinism's dogma of the "struggle for life" and its mistaken views are put into practice, human life is rendered worthless. Killing people for any reason whatsoever, abandoning them to starvation, provoking war, slaughter, carrying out



acts of terrorism, and exterminating people for being mentally or physically handicapped or belonging to a different race all become "legitimate."

In line with this twisted mentality, one who attaches no value to human life is the American professor E. A. Ross. According to Ross's Social Darwinist view: "The Christian cult of charity as a means of grace has formed a shelter under which idiots and cretins have crept and bred." Again according to Ross: "The state gathers the deaf mutes into its sheltering arm, and a race of deaf mutes is in process of formation." Since these actions obstruct so-called natural evolutionary development, he declared that the shortest way to better this world was to leave all such people on their own to be eventually eliminated through natural selection.<sup>176</sup>

What a ruthless view this is! Man is possessed of a conscience, and conscience commands one to protect the weak, the down-and-out and the poor. Otherwise, if man loses his ability "to think like a human being," then he really will achieve a position inferior to that of animals—because animals show great solidarity and cooperation. (For detailed information, see Harun Yahya's *Devotion Among Animals: Revealing the Work of God*, Global Publishing, Istanbul.)

Ross is not the only Social Darwinist to place scant value on human life. A great many share his terrifying ideas. For example, the evolutionist Peter Singer, Princeton University's professor of bioethics, goes so far as to say that people with severe physical handicaps must be regarded as unworthy of life. He expressed this cruel opinion in the following terms:

If we compare a severely defective human infant with ... a dog or a pig, for example, we will often find the nonhuman to have superior capacities... Only the fact that the defective infant is a member of the species *Homo sapiens* leads it to be treated differently from the dog or pig. Species alone, however, is not morally relevant...<sup>177</sup>

Singer went even further and said that the mentally handicapped might be killed in scientific experiments or even for food purposes! Singer's exact words are:

Mental defectives do not have a right to life, and therefore might be killed for food – if we should develop a taste for human flesh – or for the purpose of scientific experimentation.<sup>178</sup>

Even such revolting and savage behavior can be supported in Darwinist logic. Joseph Fletcher, former president of the Right to Die Society, makes a similar claim regarding the mentally handicapped:

Humans without some minimum of intelligence or mental capacity are not persons, no matter how many of their organs are active, no matter how spontaneous their living processes ... [Idiots] are not, never were, and never will be in any degree responsible. Idiots, that is to say, are not human.<sup>179</sup>

The killing of newborn babies is yet another practice condoned by Darwinism, which attaches no value to human life. Darwinism condones such an

unconscionable idea: If looking after a newborn poses a hardship for the parents that will hold them back in their struggle for survival, then in evolutionary terms, that baby should be killed. Darwin claimed that animals were frequently observed to kill their newborn, and that this was an important factor in population control. In an article in Science magazine, the evolutionist Barbara Burke has this to say:

Among some animal species, then, infant killing appears to be a natural practice. Could it be natural for humans, too, a trait inherited from our primate ancestors? ... Charles Darwin noted in *The Descent of Man* that infanticide has been "probably the most important of all checks" on population growth throughout most human history.<sup>180</sup>

As we have seen earlier, Darwinists like Haeckel encouraged suicide and claimed that those who thought life was unbearable had the right to put an end to it. Yet God has made the taking of one's own life a sin.

All these savage practices and beliefs—eugenics, euthanasia and racism—show how Darwinism is an ideology that attaches no value to human life, and is constructed on myths of no scientific value.

The fact is that the life of every single human being is of great importance. Under Qur'anic moral values, people regard each other as valuable and important, and sacrifice for one another. A believer will give food to someone else, even if he needs it himself:

**They give food, despite their love for it, to the poor and orphans and captives. (Surat al-Insan, 8)**

Muslims are charged with protecting the poor, helping the abandoned and protecting orphans, helpless women and men, children and the elderly. In one verse, for example, God has commanded people not even to say **"Ugh!"** to their parents (Surat al-Isra', 23) and always to **"say the best"** to one another (Surat al-Isra', 53). In another verse, God reveals: **"... if someone kills another person—unless it is in retaliation for someone else or for causing corruption in the Earth—it is as if he had murdered all humanity. And if anyone gives life to another person, it is as if he had given life to all humanity."** (Surat al-Ma'ida, 32)

It's a manifest truth that a society where everyone regards every human being as having reason and conscience, as valuable and important will be filled with peace, security, love and respect.

## **THE "EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGY" ERROR**

In the wake of *The Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man*, a great many evolutionists began speculating how human social behavior, emotions, judgments and ideas—all attributes of the human spirit—might have been shaped by evolution. According to the most widespread error, if our bodies' appearance and functioning were shaped by evolution, then the behavior our bodies exhibit must have been shaped by evolution, too. Evolutionists, unable to account for how the biological structures in living things came into being, now began inventing tales regarding the so-called evolution of the human soul.

In *The Descent of Man* Darwin claimed that in the future, evolution would constitute the foundation of psychology, and expressed his illusory claim in these terms:

In the distant future I see open fields for far more important researches. Psychology will be based on a new foundation, that of the necessary acquirement of each mental power and capacity by gradation. Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history.<sup>181</sup>

The first comprehensive initiative to account for the origins of human and animal behavior in evolutionary terms came from Harvard entomologist Edward O. Wilson. Despite the complete failure of Wilson's initiative, it came to be known as "sociobiology."

In *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, published in 1975, Wilson maintained that animal behavior had a completely biological foundation. Basing his error on biological evolution, he thought that particular genes controlled human and animal behavior. His true field of expertise was insects, which he referred to in the first 26 chapters of his book. In the 27th chapter, he attempted to adapt these claims to human beings. His 1978 book *Human Nature* speculated that human genes were responsible for such behavior as hatred, aggression, xenophobia, amicability, homosexuality and characteristic differences between men and women. None of Wilson's claims went any further than conjecture.

None of the claims made by him and his supporters have ever been backed up by scientific findings. On the contrary, all scientific data have shown that his ideas are utterly mistaken.

Another of Wilson's unscientific claims is that living things are nothing more than gene carriers, and that their most important responsibility is to transmit those genes to subsequent generations. In his view, evolution is actually the evolution of genes. In his book *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, he expresses this unscientific claim thus:

In a Darwinist sense, the organism does not live for itself. Its primary function is not even to reproduce other organisms; it reproduces genes, and it serves as their temporary carrier. Each organism generated by sexual reproduction is a

unique, accidental subset of all the genes constituting the species. Natural selection is the process whereby certain genes gain representation in the following generations superior to that of other genes located at the same chromosome positions. ... But the individual organism is only their vehicle, part of an elaborate device to preserve and spread them with the least possible biochemical perturbation. Samuel Butler's famous aphorism, that the chicken is only egg's way of making another egg, has been modernized: the organism is only DNA's way of making more DNA.<sup>182</sup>

Wilson's claims were solely the result of evolutionist preconceptions. Even among evolutionists, some objected to Wilson's conjecture. One of them was Stephen Jay Gould:

But Wilson makes much stronger claims. Chapter 27 ... is primarily, an extended speculation on the existence of genes for specific and variable traits in human behavior - including spite, aggression, xenophobia, conformity, homosexuality, and the characteristic behavioral differences between men and women in Western society.<sup>183</sup>

With the evolutionist zoologist Richard Dawkins, evolutionist speculation concerning human behavior that began with Wilson reached an unbelievable and illogical peak.

## **Dawkins and "Selfish-Gene" Bearing Robots**

As a result of the unscientific claims made about genes by sociobiology and its extension, evolutionary psychology, the "selfish gene" deception was put forward and popularized by Richard Dawkins.

According to him, a living thing's most important objective is survival and reproduction—in short, protecting its genes and passing them on to subsequent generations. This claim is entirely speculation.

According to this conjecture of the theory of evolution, inanimate chemical substances at one time organized themselves (however that actually happened), and established a DNA-based system capable of reproducing itself. The first organism to emerge from this imaginary chemical soup was a gene with no purpose other than to multiply. Somehow, it "decided" to copy itself, and began doing so, producing new genes. As a result of errors during this copying process, genes with different features emerged. Later, these genetic materials "learned" in some way how to constitute various bodies and thus reproduce these genetic materials more effectively. The genes that encoded the best body were thus copied more effectively than others. Evolutionists maintain that as a result of this, the how and why of which they can't account for, bodies gradually developed in terms of form and function. This story, which could not possibly have taken place, constitutes one of the fundamental claims of modern Darwinism. Yet evolutionists are also perfectly

well aware that it is impossible for the human body, any organ in it, the cells that comprise such organs, or even a single component of these cells to have brought itself into being.

Dawkins, however, took this myth as his starting point and claimed that there is "competition" between genes. He set out his distorted view of humanity in his book *The Selfish Gene*:

We are survival machines—robot vehicles blindly programmed to preserve the selfish molecules known as genes. This is a truth which still fills me with astonishment. Though I have known it for years, I never seem to get fully used to it. One of my hopes is that I may have some success in astonishing others...<sup>184</sup>

According to Dawkins' illogical claim, a human being is simply a gene-bearing robot. Its only reason for existence is to multiply the genes it bears, support them in competition with other genes, and to pass them on to subsequent generations. It is evident that this claim, ignoring the existence of the soul and regarding the human being as a mechanical device, lacks any realistic aspect.

Nonetheless, the majority of evolutionists seeking a materialist explanation have supported this unscientific theory of Dawkins'. In his book *Human Nature*, Wilson maintains that human beings acquire importance and purpose only through their genes:

... no species, ours included, possesses a purpose beyond the imperatives created by its own genetic history (i.e., evolution)... The species lacks any goal external to its own biological nature.<sup>185</sup>

According to this materialistic belief with no scientific foundation, if the continuation of genes is the only aim, then the human beings responsible for protecting them must be as selfish and ruthless as possible in the interests of their genes. According to Dawkins and his supporters, "selfish" genes will be victorious in that competition. In *The Selfish Gene*, Dawkins summarizes this perverted Darwinist viewpoint:

We, and all other animals, are machines created by our genes. Like successful Chicago gangsters, our genes have survived, in some cases for millions of years, in a highly competitive world. This entitles us to expect certain qualities in our genes. I shall argue that a predominant quality to be expected in a successful gene is ruthless selfishness. This gene selfishness will usually give rise to selfishness in individual behavior. However, as we shall see, there are special circumstances in which a gene can achieve its own selfish goals best by fostering a limited form of altruism at the level of individual animals. "Special" and "limited" are important words in the last sentence. Much as we might wish to believe otherwise, universal love and the welfare of the species as a whole are concepts that simply do not make evolutionary sense.<sup>186</sup>

According to Dawkins' ignorance, since the genes borne by human beings are selfish, man must be selfish, too. That being so, "selfish robots" can be expected to resort to any measures in order to protect and preserve their genes. There is no longer any reason not to commit murder, theft or rape. One cannot expect "selfish machines" to obey any moral law, or to behave in a conscientious, ethical way. Under these circumstances, the killing of one human being is not a crime or immoral, but a genetic compulsion to further one's own interests. Since genes are selfish, so is their behavior. Dawkins' view of human beings is exceptionally dangerous and implies the fragmentation of social morality.

In fact, however, the selfish gene claim is illogical and nonsensical, since Dawkins and others like him describe genes as entities with consciousness and willpower. Yet genes are long chains of DNA—spiral ladders of nucleic acids held together by sugar and phosphate strands. In the same way that H<sub>2</sub>O (water) or H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> (sulfuric acid) are molecules, so is DNA a molecule. In the same way that it is impossible to speak of "selfish water," "selfish salt" or "jealous sulfuric acid," neither can one speak of "selfish genes."

Evolutionists depict human beings as collections of matter, and somehow try to ascribe reasoning somewhere within that assortment. That they can ascribe reasoning and consciousness to genes shows how inconsistent the theory of evolution has become. Today, Darwinism maintains that there is reason and consciousness in molecules, and in the inanimate atoms that comprise these molecules, and has replaced the paganism that ascribed reason and consciousness to idols of stone or wood.

### **Another Dilemma for Evolution: Altruistic "Genes"**

According to the theory of evolution, in nature there is a struggle to death in which only the strong survive. However, it can be observed that living things generally help one another, make sacrifices for each other, and even risk their lives for the benefit of others. To account for this fact, which is totally at odds with the theory of evolution's basic claim, Wilson proposed a number of groundless hypotheses which statements went on to form the basis of sociobiology. Wilson based his explanations on another deception: W. D. Hamilton's "kin selection," according to which a living thing protecting its young or another member of the group is not engaging in altruistic behavior, but is actually protecting its own "selfish genes." Since the objective is to pass on its genes to subsequent generations, and since a mother's genes exist in her offspring, then a mother defending her offspring at the cost of her own life is effectively defending her own genes. In other words, selfishness actually underpins her self-sacrifice!

This is a most nonsensical claim! First and foremost, no animal in nature possesses awareness of its own genes, and therefore can't feel motivated to protect them. In addition, it can't know that its genes are also present in its offspring or cousins, and so it has no reason to sacrifice its life for them. It is impossible for genes—unconscious chains of molecules—to direct a living thing in this way.

Moreover, there are many instances in nature of animals assisting not just those of their own species that bear their own genes, but others as well. Evolutionists cannot explain this, because the idea that a creature engaging in altruistic behavior is actually protecting its own genes is totally nonsensical.

Neither is the evolutionists' quandary resolved by claiming that the urge to protect its young is encoded in the genetic structure of living things, because then the question arises of how such complex behavior was encoded in the genes in the first place. The theory of evolution can't explain how even a single gene might have come into existence through coincidences, so it's impossible for it to explain how information encoded in the genes could have come into being by chance. Every piece of information encoded in the genes is the creation of God, the Lord of infinite knowledge and wisdom.

Sociobiologists seek to apply the same claim about animals' altruistic behavior to human beings. In other words, when a mother protects her child from danger without a moment's hesitation, she is actually concerned over protecting her genes. Evolutionists' rejection of attributes belonging to the human soul and their attempts to account for such phenomena in terms of evolution are based on no scientific evidence whatsoever. With their illogical claims, evolutionists disregard the human consciousness and conscience. The fact remains that a human being is possessed of a soul and the capacities for reasoned thought and judgment, and can distinguish between right and wrong. When a mother makes a sacrifice for her child, she does so because she loves that child, feels affection and compassion for him, and makes that sacrifice because she sees him as weak and assumes the responsibility of protecting him. When her child is in pain, for instance, she puts herself in the child's position and will be prepared to make any sacrifice to relieve his pain. These are attributes that a robot or "gene bearing machine," so beloved of evolutionists, can never possess.

In fact, evolutionists are well aware that evolution can never account for attributes belonging to the human soul. For example, the evolutionist Robert Wallace says the following in his book *The Genesis Factor*:

I do not believe that man is simply a clever egotist, genetically driven to look after his own reproduction. He is that. But he is at least that. He is obviously much more. The evidence for this is simple and abundant. One need only hear the Canon

in D Major by Johann Pachelbel to know that there are immeasurable depths to the human spirit...<sup>187</sup>

Wallace stresses a point of the greatest importance. According to evolutionists' unrealistic definition, a human being is merely a machine bearing genes. It's thus impossible for such an entity to take pleasure from music, enjoy watching a film or even to produce one, to read or write books, to learn what has been read, or to exchange ideas. Human beings are clearly very different from how evolutionists portray them, and everyone can see the proof of this in themselves. Evolutionists' unscientific claims can never answer the questions of how a human being, with a capacity for deep thought and feeling emotions and enjoyment, came into being, and what was the origin of those characteristics.

## **The Collapse of Genetic Determinism**

With the sequencing and analysis of the human genome, the view became widespread that DNA possessed tremendous power and that genes played an enormous role in determining who we really are. Almost every day, newspapers featured articles suggesting that we are under the control of our own genes: "Scientists Target Genius Gene," "Kennedy Tragedies Put Down to Risk Taking Gene," "Scientists Say Research on Male Siblings Proves the Existence of a 'Homosexual Gene.'" Reports about genes controlling everything from schizophrenia to jealousy, from alcoholism to television watching habits, appeared in scientific and non-scientific journals.

People reading all these headlines thought that all kinds of attributes, from intelligence to character, from success to failure, were encoded in the human genome; and some people began believing, erroneously, that our lives could be boiled down to a formula.

Research into the human genome is exceedingly valuable, and studies on human genetic structure have yielded important information about a number of diseases. However, as those running the Human Genome Project and scientists involved in the field have clearly stated, this in no way justifies loading unrealistic functions onto the genes. Research reveals that human genes play so small a role in character, behavior and thinking as to be insignificant. In an article titled, "The Human Genome Map: The Death of Genetic Determinism and Beyond," Mae-Wan Ho of the Institute of Science in Society, says the following:

The number of genes is far less than needed to support the extravagant claims throughout the past decade that individual genes not only determine how our bodies are constructed, what diseases we suffer from, but also our patterns of behaviour, our intellectual ability, sexual preference and criminality.<sup>188</sup>



Francis S. Collins, director of the National Human Genome Research Institute, makes it clear that genes are not what makes human beings human. In an article titled "Heredity and Humanity: Have No Fear. Genes Aren't Everything," Collins says:

Fortunately, ten years of intensive study of the human genome have provided ample evidence that these fears of genetic determinism are unwarranted. It has shown us definitively that we human beings are far more than the sum of our genetic parts. Needless to say, our genes play a major, formative role in human development—and in many of the processes of human disease; but high-tech molecular studies as well as low-tech (but still eminently useful) studies of identical and fraternal twins make it perfectly evident that our genes are not all-determining factors in the human experience.<sup>189</sup>

In the same article, Collins states that genes have no major effect on human behavior. He explains how looking at a criminal's genes to see if this person has a genetic predisposition to crime and determining a punishment in that light could lead to unjust outcomes:

But what about non-disease-related traits, such as intelligence and violent behavior? ... The discovery of a prevalent gene variant strongly correlated with violence could have a profound effect upon our millennia-old understanding of free will, and weigh down the scales of justice in two equally dangerous ways. If someone who commits a violent crime has the gene variant, his lawyer could use a DNA defense ("If it's in the gene, the man is clean!"), and the defendant could well be seen by a judge and jury as not responsible for his actions. Yet it is also possible to imagine a scenario in which someone who has never even contemplated a violent act is found to have the gene variant and then subjected to the presumption of guilt (or even sent away to a postmodern-day leper colony) for the rest of his life.

If genes truly controlled behavior, our justice system and its guiding principle of equal protection would not be the only casualties. How would our concept of equal opportunity survive? What about the idea of merit? Just think of the frightening "genetocracy" depicted in the movie *Gattaca* (and note the letters that make up its name), a world in which children are assigned to castes at birth, based on an assessment of their intellectual capacity and professional potential as inscribed in their DNA.<sup>190</sup>

In his article, Collins describes the illogicality of claiming that behavior is encoded in the genes with a quotation from the biologist Johnjoe McFadden:

To build on a metaphor offered by the biologist Johnjoe McFadden, looking for genes that encode our unique behaviors and the other products of our minds is like analyzing the strings of a violin or the keys of a piano in the hope of finding the Emperor Concerto. Indeed, the human genome can be thought of as the grandest of orchestras, with each of our approximately thirty thousand genes representing a unique instrument playing in the wondrous and massive concert that is molecular

biology. Each instrument is essential, and each must be in tune to produce the proper (and highly sophisticated) musical sound. Likewise, genes are essential to the development of the brain, and must be "in tune" to produce functioning neurons and neurotransmitters. But this emphatically does not imply that genes make minds any more than a viola or a piccolo makes a sonata.<sup>191</sup>

Collins devotes the end of his article to illuminating another reason why human attributes cannot stem from their DNA, and draws attention to God's superior creation:

For many of us, there is still another powerful reason, wholly apart from the mechanics of science, to reject the notion that DNA is the core substance of our humanity. It is the belief [in] a higher power... Of course, some scientists and writers dismiss this spiritual notion as pure superstition. [This is certainly a great error of theirs!] Thus Richard Dawkins has observed that "we are machines built by DNA whose purpose is to make copies of the same DNA... It is every living object's sole reason for living." Really? Is there nothing about being human that is different from being a bacterium or a slug?

Can the study of genetics and molecular biology really account for the universal intrinsic knowledge of right and wrong common to all human cultures in all eras...? Can it account for the unselfish form of love that the Greeks called *agape*? Can it account for the experience of feeling called to sacrifice for others even when our own DNA may be placed at risk? While evolutionary biologists proffer various explanations for human behaviors that undermine the efficient propagation of our genes, there is something about those claims that rings hollow to us.

The notion that science alone holds all the secrets of our existence has become a religion of its own... Science is the proper way to understand the natural, of course; but science gives us no reason to deny that there are aspects of human identity that fall outside the sphere of nature, and hence outside the sphere of science.<sup>192</sup>

As Collins noted, chains of molecules consisting of carbon-hydrogen-nitrogen-oxygen compounds cannot possibly endow a person with such feelings as love, devotion, taking pleasure from art, rejoicing, maternal emotions, desire or self-sacrifice. If the soul is discounted, a human being is nothing more than flesh and bone. The genes, which are themselves material entities, do not permit this assembly of flesh and bone to think, make mathematical calculations, enjoy the food it consumes, miss a friend it has not seen for a long time, or take pleasure in something beautiful. A human being is an entity created by God, very different and separate from the body, its brain and cells and genes. It is revealed in the Qur'an that a human being is an entity with a soul given by God:

**He Who has created all things in the best possible way. He commenced the creation of man from clay; then produced his seed from an extract of base fluid; then formed him and breathed His Spirit into him and gave you hearing, sight and hearts. What little thanks you show! (Surat as-Sajda, 7-9)**

The human soul is breathed into man by God. Evolutionist materialists, unwilling to accept the existence of God and that human beings possess metaphysical characteristics, seek to keep spreading the lie that everything is encoded in the genes—which obviously cannot create the human soul, though evolutionists blindly ignore this.

Actually, this distorted belief is by no means new. Throughout history, it has been known under the name of paganism. In the same way that the ancients made idols out of wood and then claimed that these were their deities, the theory of evolution maintains that genes are the purpose and creator of everything. (Surely God is beyond that!) This primitive and dogmatic point of view, which was hoped to provide a basis for the theory of evolution, has been invalidated by scientific findings. Even Collins, who led the historic research into genes, openly states that genes actually have no power, and that human beings are metaphysical entities.

Paganism, ascribing divine status to material entities with no power of their own, is a tradition that has persisted down the ages and, in the present day, is maintained by the evolutionist mindset. In the Qur'an, God reveals this about those who ascribe divine status to entities devoid of any power:

**But they have adopted deities apart from Him which do not create anything but are themselves created. They have no power to harm or help themselves. They have no power over death or life or resurrection. (Surat al-Furqan, 3)**

In another verse, God reveals the following regarding this belief's perverted nature:

**Say: "Call on those you make claims for apart from Him. They possess no power to remove any harm from you or to change anything." (Surat al-Isra', 56)**

God's commandment to anyone of reason is this:

**Do not call on something besides God which can neither help nor harm you. If you do, you will then be wrongdoers. (Surah Yunus, 106)**



# CONCLUSION

"Moral Collapse Worse than Economic Collapse!" "Child Prostitutes..." "Rape Is Natural According to Young Britons," "400 Homosexual and Lesbian Couples Marry in Finland," "Gay Wedding," "Anger Refuses to Abate," "There Is No End to Corruption," "Corruption Headache," "Drug Abuse Starts at 13," "Oppression Everywhere," "War on Famine," "The Nightmare Continues," "A Year of War, Scandal and Revolt," "Serbs Imitate the Nazis," "Civilians Crushed by Tanks," "The Earth Is Like a Keg of Gunpowder," "The World Afflicted by Tears and Fire," "Crime Explosion," "Alcohol Consumed Like Water," "European Youth Surrender to Alcohol," "USA Fails to Prevent Violence," "Humanity Has Vanished," "Spiritual Collapse," "American Youth Facing Moral Collapse," "Humanity Heading towards Solitude"...

These are just a few examples of headlines that appear just about every day in newspapers. There are so many reports of this kind that most people have grown used to such events. Many see nothing extraordinary in the constant fighting, conflict and anarchy all over the world, how even people in the same country fight with one another, the endless corruption, failure to extend helping hands to the poor and needy, the increasing spread of psychological disorders such as stress and depression, and the growing number of suicides. The whole world seems to have adopted a lifestyle of conflict and fighting, trouble and tension, in which injustice and ruthlessness reign supreme.

One of the main reasons for that acceptance is that all these phenomena are regarded as "natural," as the inevitable consequences of human nature. Actually, however, these are the consequences of the materialist and Darwinist world view that holds humanity in its grasp. Social Darwinism investigated in this book represents one very important part of that view.

Though most people are unaware of it, they are encouraged to follow a Darwinist-materialist life, which feels no sadness or concern over the poverty facing nations of the Third World; which is insensitive to the plight of the oppressed; which advocates a selfish lifestyle; which regards the spread of hatred, revenge and competition as quite justified, particularly in the business world; and which leaves people feeling little love or affection for their fellow humans. As you have seen throughout this book, the Darwinist-materialist world view legitimizes, and thus encourages all forms of corruption, from rape to war.

In fact, every single human suffers from the Darwinist-materialist world view in some way. A great many people live unhappy, troubled and tense lives; from the black student subjected to racist attacks to elderly parents abandoned by selfish children; from the workers forced to labor in terrible conditions for low wages to

young people who imagine there is no purpose to life and who inflict trouble on themselves by living unrestrained and irresponsibly.

It is essential that the materialist world view be defeated intellectually if this vicious circle is to come to an end and let humanity achieve a world of peace and happiness. It is therefore of the greatest importance that people should know that Darwinism has suffered a total scientific collapse and learn about the terrible catastrophes that ensue when it is put into practice.

In addition, those taken in by the error of Darwinism need to realize that the theory of evolution, defended despite all its deficiencies and errors, is now left with no scientific validity whatsoever. Every advance made in the world of science confirms that the theory of evolution is consigned to the dusty shelves of history. Furthermore, as revealed throughout this book, experience shows that the life model put forward by the theory of evolution brings nothing but oppression, injustice and ruthlessness, loss and suffering. Darwinists, too, therefore need to realize the evils encouraged by their theory, and to cease their support for it forthwith. Our hope is that this book will help those taken in by Darwinism's errors see that they have made a grave mistake.

# **How Do Images Come To Be Seen As Matter?**

## **THE OTHER NAME FOR ILLUSION: MATTER**

### **FOREWORD**

What is explained in this book is an important truth, which has surprised many and changed their perspectives on life. This truth can be summarized as follows: **"All events and objects that we encounter in real life—buildings, people, cities, cars, places—in fact, everything we see, hold, touch, smell, taste and hear—come into existence as visions and feelings in our brains"**.

We are taught to think that these images and feelings are caused by a solid world outside of our brains, where material things exist. **However, in reality we never see real existing materials and we never touch real materials.** In other words, every material entity which we believe exists in our lives, is, in fact, only a vision which is created in our brains.

This is not a philosophical speculation. It is an empirical fact that has been proven by modern science. Today, any scientist who is a specialist in medicine, biology, neurology or any other field related to brain research would say, when asked how and where we see the world, that **we see the whole world in the vision center located in our brains.**

This fact has been scientifically proven in the twentieth century, and although it may seem surprising, it necessarily implies answers to two questions; **"If our lives are visions created in our brains, then who is it that creates these visions? And who is it that sees these visions in our brains without having eyes and enjoys them, gets excited and happy?"** You will find the answers to these two important questions in this book.

### **THE SECRET BEYOND MATTER IS NOT WAHDATUL WUJOOD**

The topic called "The Real Essence of Matter" has been criticized by some people. Having misunderstood the essence of the subject, these people claim that what is explained as the secret beyond matter is identical to the teaching of

Wahdatul Wujood. Let us state, before all else, that the author of this book is a believer strictly abiding by the doctrine of Ahlus Sunnah and does not defend the view of Wahdatul Wujood.

However, it should also be remembered that Wahdatul Wujood was defended by some leading Islamic scholars including Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi. It is true that numerous significant Islamic scholars who described the concept of Wahdatul Wujood in the past did so by considering some subjects found in these books. Still, what is explained in these books is not the same as Wahdatul Wujood.

Some of those who defended the view of Wahdatul Wujood were engrossed by some erroneous opinions and made some claims contrary to the Qur'an and the doctrine of Ahlus Sunnah. They, for example, completely rejected the creation of God. When the subject of the secret beyond matter is told, however, there is definitely no such claim. This section explains that all beings are created by God, and that the originals of these beings are seen by Him whereas people merely see the images of these beings formed in their brains.

Mountains, plains, flowers, people, seas—briefly everything we see and everything that God informs us in the Qur'an that exists and that He created out of nothing is created and does indeed exist. However, people cannot see, feel or hear the real nature of these beings through their sense organs. What they see and feel are only the copies that appear in their brains. This is a scientific fact taught at all schools primarily in medicine. The same applies to the article you are reading now; you can not see nor touch the real nature of it. The light coming from the original article is converted by some cells in your eyes into electrical signals, which are then conveyed to the sight center in the back of your brain. This is where the view of this article is created. In other words, you are not reading an article which is before your eyes through your eyes; in fact, this article is created in the sight center in the back of your brain. The article you are reading right now is a "copy of the article" within your brain. The original article is seen by God.

In conclusion, the fact that the matter is an illusion formed in our brains does not "reject" the matter, but provides us information about the real nature of the matter: that no person can have connection with its original.

This fact is told in the book *Idealism, The Philosophy of the Matrix, and the True Nature of Matter* as follows:

## **THERE IS MATTER OUTSIDE OF US, BUT WE CANNOT REACH IT**

... [S]aying that matter is an illusion does not mean it does not exist. Quiet the contrary: whether we perceive the physical world or not, it does exist. But we see it



as a copy in our brain or, in other words, as an interpretation of our senses. For us, therefore, the physical world of matter is an illusion.

The matter outside is seen not just by us, but by other beings too. The angels God delegated to be watchers witness this world as well:

**And the two recording angels are recording, sitting on the right and on the left. He does not utter a single word, without a watcher by him, pen in hand! (Surah Qaf: 17-18)**

Most importantly, God sees everything. He created this world with all its details and sees it in all its states. As He informs us in the Qur'an:

**... Heed God and know that God sees what you do. (Surat al-Baqara: 233)**

**Say: "God is a sufficient witness between me and you. He is certainly aware of and sees His servants." (Surat al-Isra': 96)**

It must not be forgotten that God keeps the records of everything in the book called Lawh Mahfuz (Preserved Tablet). Even if we don't see all things, they are in the Lawh Mahfuz. God reveals that He keeps everything's record in the "Mother of the Book" called Lawh Mahfuz with the following verses:

**It is in the Source Book with Us, high-exalted, full of wisdom. (Surat az-Zukhruf: 4)**

**... We possess an all-preserving Book. (Surah Qaf: 4)**

**Certainly there is no hidden thing in either heaven or Earth which is not in a Clear Book. (Surat an-Naml: 75)**

# INTRODUCTION

When you look out of the window, you think that you see an image with your eyes, as this is the way that you have been taught to think. However, in reality this is not how it works, because you do not see the world with your eyes. You see the image created in your brains. This is not a prediction, nor a philosophical speculation, but the scientific truth.

This concept can be better understood when we realize how the visual system operates. The eye is responsible for transforming light into an electric signal by means of the cells in the retina. This electrical signal reaches the sight center in the brain. The signals create the vision you see when you look out of the window. In other words, the sights you see are created in your brain. You see the image in your brain, not the view outside the window. For example, in the picture shown on the right hand side, the light reaches the eyes of the person from outside. This light passes to the small sight center located at the back of the brain after the cells in the eyes transform it into electrical signals. It is these electrical signals which form the picture in the brain. In reality when we open the brain, we wouldn't be able to see any image. However, some kind of consciousness in the mind receives electrical signals in the form of an image. The brain perceives electrical signals in the form of an image, yet it has no eye, eye cells, or retina. So, to whom does the consciousness in the brain belong?

The same question can be asked about the book you are reading now. The light coming to your eyes is converted into electrical signals and reaches your brain, where the view of the book is created. In other words, the book you are reading right now is not outside you, it is actually inside you, in the sight center in the back of your brain. Since you feel the hardness of the book with your hands, you might think that the book is outside you. However, this feeling of hardness also originates in the brain. The nerves on your fingertips transmit electrical information to the touch center in your brain. And when you touch the book, you feel the hardness and intensity of it, the slipperiness of the pages, the texture of the cover and the sharpness of the edge of the pages, all within your brain.

In reality however, **you can never touch the real nature of the book.** Even though you think that you're touching the book, it is your brain that perceives the tactile sensations. In addition, you do not even know if this book exists as a material thing outside of your brain. You merely interpret the image of the book within your brain. However, you should not be tricked by the fact that a writer wrote this book, the pages were designed by a computer and printed by a publisher. The things that will be explained in due course will show you that the people, computers and the publishers in every stages of the production of this book are only visions

that appear in your brain, and you will never know whether or not they exist outside of your brain.

We can therefore conclude that everything we see, touch and hear merely exists in our brains. This is a scientific truth, proven with scientific evidence. The significant point is the answer to the question asked above, which this scientific truth has led us to ask; **who is it that has no eye, but watches sights through a window in our brains and enjoys or becomes anxious from these sights?** This will be explained in the following pages.

## **IT IS A SCIENTIFIC FACT THAT THE WORLD COMES INTO EXISTENCE IN OUR BRAINS**

We acknowledge that all the individual features of the world are experienced through our sense organs. The information that reaches us through those organs is converted into electrical signals, and the individual parts of our brain analyze and process these signals. After this interpreting process takes place inside our brain, we will, for example, see a book, taste a strawberry, smell a flower, feel the texture of a silk fabric or hear leaves shaking in the wind.

We have been taught that we are touching the cloth outside of our body, reading a book that is 30 cm (1 ft) away from us, smelling the trees that are far away from us, or hearing the shaking of the leaves that are far above us. However, this is all in our imagination. All of these things are happening within our brains.

At this point we encounter another surprising fact; that there are, in fact, no colors, voices or visions within our brain. All that can be found in our brains are electrical signals. This is not a philosophical speculation. This is simply a scientific description of the functions of our perceptions. In her book *Mapping The Mind*, Rita Carter explains the way we perceive the world as follows:

Each one [of the sense organs] is intricately adapted to deal with its own type of stimulus: molecules, waves or vibrations. But the answer does not lie here, because despite their wonderful variety, each organ does essentially the same job: it translates its particular type of stimulus into electrical pulses. **A pulse is a pulse is a pulse. It is not the colour red, or the first notes of Beethoven's Fifth—it is a bit of electrical energy.** Indeed, rather than discriminating one type of sensory input from another, the sense organs actually make them more alike.

**All sensory stimuli, then enter the brain in more or less undifferentiated form as a stream of electrical pulses created by neurons firing**, domino-fashion, along a certain route. This is all that happens. **There is no reverse transformer that at some stage turns this electrical activity back into light waves or molecules.** What makes one stream into vision and another into smell depends, rather, on which neurons are stimulated.<sup>1</sup>

In other words, all of our feelings and perceptions about the world (smells, visions, tastes etc.) are comprised of the same material, that is, electrical signals. Moreover, our brain is what makes these signals meaningful for us, and interprets these signals as senses of smell, taste, vision, sound or touch. It is a stunning fact that the brain, which is made of wet meat, can know which electrical signal should be interpreted as smell and which one as vision, and can convert the same material into different senses and feelings.

Let us now consider our sense organs, and how each one perceives the world.

## **It's Not Our Eyes That See, It Is Our Brain**

Because of the indoctrination that we receive throughout our lives, we imagine that we see the whole world with our eyes. Eventually, we usually conclude that our eyes are the windows that open up to the world. However, science shows us that **we do not see through our eyes**. The millions of nerve cells inside the eyes are responsible for sending a message to the brain, as if down a cable, in order to make "seeing" happen. If we analyze the information we learned in high school, it becomes easier for us to understand the reality of vision.

The light reflecting off an object passes through the lens of the eye and causes an upside-down image on the retina at the back of the eyeball. After some chemical operations carried out by retinal rods and cones, this vision becomes an electrical impulse. This impulse is then sent through connections in the nervous system to the back of the brain. The brain converts this flow into a meaningful, three-dimensional vision.

For example, when you watch children playing in a park, you are not seeing the children and the park with your eyes, because the image of this view forms not before your eyes, but at the back of your brain.

Even though we have given a simple explanation, in reality the physiology of vision is an extraordinary operation. Without fail, light is converted into electrical signals, and, subsequently, these electrical signals reveal a colorful, shining, three-dimensional world. R. L. Gregory, in his book *Eye and Brain: The Psychology of Seeing*, acknowledges this significant fact, and explains this incredible structure:

We are given tiny distorted upside-down images in the eyes, and we see separate solid objects in surrounding space. From the patterns of simulation on the retinas we perceive the world of objects, and this is nothing short of a miracle.<sup>2</sup>

All of these facts lead to the same conclusion. Throughout our lives, we always assume that **the world exists outside of us**. However, the world is within us. Although we believe that the world lies outside us, it is in the smallest part of our brain. For example, the CEO of a company might consider the company building, his car in the parking lot, his house by the beach, his yacht, and all the people who work for him, his lawyers, his family, and his friends to be outside of his body.

However, all of these things are merely visions formed in his skull, in a tiny part of his brain.

He is unaware of this fact and, even if he knew, would not bother to think about it. If he stood proudly next to his latest-model luxury car, and the wind blew a piece of dust or a small object into his eye, he might gently scratch his itching, open eye and notice that the "material things" he saw moved upside down or to the sides. He might then realize that material things seen in the environment are not stable.

What this demonstrates is that **every person throughout his or her life witnesses everything inside their brain and cannot reach the specific material objects that supposedly cause their experiences. The images we see are copies in our brains of the objects that we assume to exist outside of us. We can never know to what extent these copies resemble the originals, or whether or not the originals even exist.**

Although German psychiatry professor Hoimar Von Ditfurth is a materialist, he acknowledges this fact about scientific reality:

No matter how we put the argument, the result doesn't change. What stands before us in full shape and **what our eyes view is not the "world". It is only its image, a resemblance, a projection whose association with the original is open to discussion.**<sup>3</sup>

For example, when you take a look at the room in which you are sitting, what you see is not the room outside of you, but a copy of the room that exists in your brain. You will never be able to see the original room with your sense organs.

## **How can a bright and colorful image appear in your dark brain?**

There is another point that should not be neglected; light cannot pass through the skull. The physical area in which the brain is located is completely dark, and light cannot possibly penetrate it. **However, incredible as it may seem, it is possible to observe a bright and colorful world in this total darkness.** Colorful natural beauty, bright sights, all the tones of the color green, the colors of fruits, the designs of flowers, the brightness of the sun, people walking on a busy road, fast cars in traffic, clothes in a shopping mall—are all created in the dark brain.

Imagine a barbecue burning in front of you. You can sit and watch the fire for a long time, but throughout this entire time, your brain never deals with the original of light, brightness or heat from the fire. Even when you feel its heat and see its light, the inside of your brain remains dark and maintains a constant temperature. It is a profound mystery that, in the darkness, the electrical signals turn into

colorful, bright visions. Anyone who thinks deeply will be amazed by this wondrous occurrence.

## **Light is also composed in our brain**

While discussing what science has discovered about vision, we mentioned that the light we receive from the outside gives rise to some movements of the eye cells, and these movements form a pattern from which our visual experience emerges. However, there is another point that we need to make: **Light, as we perceive it, does not reside outside of our brain.** The light we know and understand is also formed within our brain. What we call light in the outside world, which is supposedly outside our brains, consists of electromagnetic waves and particles of energy called photons. When these electromagnetic waves or photons reach the retina, light, as we experience it, begins to come into existence. This is the way light is described in physical terms:

The term "light" is used for electromagnetic waves and photons. The same term is used in physiology, as the feeling experienced by a person when electromagnetic waves and photons strike the retina of the eye. In both objective and subjective terms, "light" is a form of energy coming into existence in the eye of a person, which a person becomes aware of through the retina by the effects of vision.<sup>4</sup>

Consequently, light comes into existence as a result of the effects that some electromagnetic waves and particles cause in us. In other words, there is no light outside our bodies which creates the light we see in our brains. There is only energy. And when this energy reaches us we see a colorful, bright, and light-filled world.

## **Colors also originate in our brains**

Starting from the time, we are born, we deal with a colorful environment and see a colorful world. However, there isn't one single color in the universe. Colors are formed in our brains. Outside there are only electromagnetic waves with different amplitudes and frequencies. What reaches our brains is the energy from those waves. We call this "light", although this is not the light we know as bright and shiny. It is merely energy. When our brains interpret this energy by measuring the different frequencies of waves, we see "colors". In reality, the sea is not blue, the grass is not green, the soil is not brown and fruits are not colorful. They appear as they do because of the way we perceive them in our brains. Daniel C. Dennett, who is known for his books about the brain and consciousness, summarizes this universally accepted fact:

The common wisdom is that modern science has removed the color from the physical world, replacing it with colorless electromagnetic radiation of various wavelengths.<sup>5</sup>

In *The Amazing Brain*, R. Ornstein and R. F. Thompson have stated the way colors are formed as follows.

**'Color' as such does not exist in the world; it exists only in the eye and brain of the beholder.** Objects reflect many different wavelengths of light, but these light waves themselves have no color.<sup>6</sup>

In order to understand why this is so, we must analyze how we see colors. The light from the sun reaches an object, and every object reflects the light in waves of different frequencies. This light of varying frequency reaches the eye. (Remember that the term "light" used here actually refers to the electromagnetic waves and photons, not the light which is formed in our brains.) The perception of color starts in the cone cells of the retina. In the retina, there are three groups of cone cells, each of which reacts to different frequencies of light. The first group is sensitive to red light, the second is sensitive to blue light, and the third is sensitive to green light. With the different levels of stimulations of these cone cells, millions of different colors are formed. However, the light reaching the cone cells cannot form colors by itself. As Jeremy Nathans of John Hopkins Medical University explains, the cells in the eye do not form the colors:

All that a single cone can do is capture light and tell you something about its intensity. It tells you nothing about color.<sup>7</sup>

The cone cells translate the information they get about colors to electrical signals thanks to their pigments. The nerve cells connected with these cells transmit these electrical signals to a special area in the brain. The place where we see a world full of color throughout our lives is this special area in the brain.

This demonstrates that there are no colors or light beyond our brains. There is only energy which moves in the form of electromagnetic waves and particles. Both color and light exist in our brains. We do not actually see a red rose as red simply because it is red. Our brain's interpretation of the energy that reaches our eye leads us to perceive that the rose is red.

Color blindness is proof that colors are formed in our brains. A small injury in the retina can lead to color blindness. A person affected by color blindness is unable to differentiate between red and green colors. Whether an external object has colors or not is of no importance, because the reason why we see objects colorful is not their being colorful. This leads us to the conclusion that all of the qualities that we believe belong to the object are not in the outside world, but in our brains. However, since we will never be able to go beyond our perceptions and reach the outside world, we will never be able to prove the existence of materials and colors. The famous philosopher, Berkeley, acknowledges this fact with the following words:

If the same things can be red and hot for some and the contrary for others, this means that we are under the influence of misconceptions and that "things" only exist in our brains.<sup>8</sup>

## **We Hear All Types Of Sound In Our Brains**

The hearing process also operates in a similar manner to the visual process. In other words, we hear sounds in our brains in the same way that we see the view of the outside world in our brains. The ear captures the sounds around us and delivers them to the middle ear. The middle ear amplifies the sound vibrations and delivers them to the inner ear. The inner ear transforms these sound vibrations into electric signals, on the basis of their frequency and intensity, and then transmits them to the brain. These messages in the brain are then sent to the hearing center where the sounds are interpreted. Therefore, the hearing process takes place in the hearing center in essentially the same way that the seeing process takes place in the seeing center.

Therefore, actual sounds do not exist outside our brains, even though there are physical vibrations we call sound waves. These sound waves are not transformed into sounds outside or inside our ears, but rather inside our brains. As the visual process is not performed by our eyes, neither do our ears perform the hearing process. For example, when you are having a chat with a friend, you observe the sight of your friend in your brain, and hear his or her voice in your brain. As the view in your brain is formed, you will have a deep feeling of three dimensions, and your friend's voice is also heard with a similar feeling of depth. For example, you could see your friend as being a long way from you, or sitting behind you; accordingly you feel his voice as if it is coming from him, from near you or from your back. However, your friend's voice is not far away or behind you. It is in your brain.

The extraordinariness about the real nature of the sound you hear is not limited to this. The brain is actually both lightproof and soundproof. Sound never in fact reaches the brain. Therefore, despite the volume of the sounds you hear, the interior of your brain is actually very quiet. However, you hear noise, such as voices, very clearly in your brain. They are so clear that a healthy person hears them without difficulties or distortions. You hear the symphony of an orchestra in your soundproof brain; you can hear all the sounds in a wide range of frequencies and decibel from the sounds of the leaves to the sounds of jet planes. When you go to a concert of your favorite singer, the deep and loud noise that fills the whole stadium is formed in the deep silence of your brain. When you sing by yourself loudly you hear the sound in your brain. However, if you were able to record the sound in your brain with a tape recorder at that moment, you would hear only silence. This is an extraordinary fact. The electrical signals that reach the brain are



heard in your brain as sound, for example the sound of a concert in a stadium filled with people.

## **All Smells Occur In The Brain**

If someone is asked how he senses the smells around him, he would probably say "with my nose". However, this answer is not the right one, even though some would instantly conclude that it was the truth. Gordon Shepherd, a professor of neurology from Yale University, explains why this is incorrect; *"We think that we smell with our noses, [but] this is a little like saying that we hear with our ear lobes."*<sup>9</sup>

Our sense of smell works in a similar mechanism to our other sense organs. In fact, the only function of the nose is its ability to act as an intake channel for smell molecules. Volatile molecules such as vanilla, or the scent of a rose, come to receptors located on hairs in a part of the nose called the epithelium and interact with them. The result of the interaction of the smell molecules with the epithelium reaches the brain as an electric signal. These electric signals are then perceived as a scent by the brain. Thus, all smells which we interpret as good or bad are merely perceptions generated in the brain after the interaction with volatile molecules has been transduced into electric signals. The fragrance of perfume, of a flower, of a food which you like, of the sea—in short all smells you may or may not like—are perceived in the brain. However, the smell molecules never actually reach the brain. In our sense of smell, it is only electrical signals which reach the brain, as happens with sound and sight.

Consequently, a smell does not travel in any particular direction, because all smells are perceived by the smell center in the brain. For example, the smell of a cake does not come from the oven, in the same way that the smell of the dish does not come from the kitchen. Likewise, the smell of honeysuckle does not come from the garden and the smell of the sea, some distance away from you, does not come from the sea. All of these smells are sensed at one point, in a related area of the brain. There is no concept of right or left, front or back, outside of this sense center. Although each of the senses seem to occur with different effects, and may appear to be coming from different directions, they all in fact occur within the brain. The smells which occur in the smell center of the brain are assumed to be the smells of outside materials. However, the image of the rose is generated in the sight center and the smell of a rose is generated in the smell center. If there is a genuine smell outside, you can never reach the original of it.

George Berkeley, a philosopher who has realized the importance of this truth, says *"At the beginning, it was believed that colors, odors, etc., 'really exist,' but subsequently such views were renounced, and it was seen that they only exist in dependence on our sensations."*

It may be instructive to consider dreams in order to understand that smell is only a sensation. When people dream, in the same way that all images are seen very realistically, smells are also perceived as if they were real. For example, a person who goes to a restaurant in his dream may choose his dinner amid the smells of the foods that are on the menu; someone who dreams of going on a trip to the sea side senses the distinctive smell of the sea, and someone who dreams of a daisy garden would experience, in his dream, the pleasure of the magnificent scents. Likewise, someone who dreams of going to a perfume shop and choosing a perfume would be able to distinguish between the smells of the perfumes, one by one. Everything in the dream is so realistic that when the person wakes up, he or she might be surprised by this situation.

In fact, it is not necessary to examine dreams to understand the subject. It is even sufficient to imagine one of the depictions that were mentioned, such as the example of the daisy. If you concentrate on the daisy, you can feel as if you are aware of its scent, even though it isn't there. The scent is now occurring in the brain. If you want to visualize your mother in your mind, you can see her in your mind, even though she isn't there in front of you; in the same way you can imagine the smell of the lily, even though it isn't there.

Michael Posner, a psychologist and Marcus Raichle, a neurologist from Washington University comment on the issue of how sight and other senses occur, even in the absence of an external stimulus:

Open your eyes, and a scene fills your view effortlessly; close your eyes and think of that scene, and you can summon an image of it, certainly not as vivid, solid, or complete as a scene you see with your eyes, but still one that captures the scene's essential characteristics. In both cases, an image of the scene is formed in the mind. The image formed from actual visual experiences is called a "percept" to distinguish it from an imagined image. The percept is formed as the result of light hitting the retina and sending signals that are further processed in the brain. **But how are we able to create an image when no light is hitting the retina to send such signals?**<sup>10</sup>

There is no need for an external source to form an image in your mind. This same situation holds true for the sense of smell. In the same way as you are aware of a smell which does not really exist in your dreams or imagination, you cannot be sure whether or not those objects, which you smell in real life, exist outside you. Even if you assume that these objects exist outside of you, you can never deal with the original objects.

## **All Tastes Occur In The Brain**

The sense of taste can be explained in a manner similar to those of the other sense organs. Tasting is caused by little buds in the tongue and throat. The tongue

can detect four different tastes, bitter, sour, sweet and salty. Taste buds, after a chain of processes, transform sensory information into electrical signals and then transfer them to the brain. Subsequently, those signals are perceived by the brain as tastes. The taste that you experience when you eat a cake, yogurt, a lemon or a fruit is, in reality, a process that interprets electrical signals in the brain.

An image of a cake will be linked with the taste of the sugar, all of which occurs in the brain and everything sensed is related to the cake which you like so much. The taste that you are conscious of after you have eaten your cake, with a full appetite, is nothing other than an effect generated in your brain caused by electrical signals. You are only aware of what your brain interprets from the external stimuli. You can never reach the original object; for example you cannot see, smell or taste the actual chocolate itself. If the taste nerves in your brain were cut off, it would be impossible for the taste of anything you eat to reach your brain, and you would entirely lose your sense of taste. The fact that the tastes of which you are aware seem extraordinarily real should certainly not deceive you. This is the scientific explanation of the matter.

## **The Sense Of Touch Also Occurs In The Brain**

The sense of touch is one of the factors which prevents people from being convinced of the aforementioned truth that the senses of sight, hearing and taste occur within the brain. For example, if you told someone that he sees a book within his brain, he would, if he didn't think carefully, reply "I can't be seeing the book in my brain—look, I'm touching it with my hand". Or, if we said "we cannot know whether the original of this book exists as a material object outside or not", again the same superficially minded person might answer "no, look, I'm holding it with my hand and I feel the hardness of it – that isn't a perception but an existence which has material reality".

However, there is a fact that such people cannot understand, or perhaps just ignore. **The sense of touch also occurs in the brain as much as do all the other senses. That is to say, when you touch a material object, you sense whether it is hard, soft, wet, sticky or silky in the brain.** The effects that come from your fingertips are transmitted to the brain as an electrical signal and these signals are perceived in the brain as the sense of touch. For instance, if you touch a rough surface, you can never know whether the surface is, in reality, indeed a rough surface, or how a rough surface actually feels. That is because you can never touch the original of a rough surface. The knowledge that you have about touching a surface is your brain's interpretation of certain stimuli.

A person chatting to a close friend while drinking a cup of tea immediately lets go of the cup when he burns his hand on the hot cup. However, in reality, that person feels the heat of the cup in his mind, not in his hand. The same person

visualizes the image of the cup of tea in his mind, and senses the smell and taste of it in his mind. However, this man does not realize that the tea he enjoys is actually a sensation within his brain. He assumes that the glass exists outside of himself, and talks to his friend, whose image occurs again within his brain. In fact, this is an extraordinary case. The assumption that he is touching the original glass and drinking the original tea, which appears to be justified by his impression of the hardness and warmth of the cup and the taste and smell of the tea, shows the astonishing clarity and perfection of the senses which exist within one's brain. This important truth, which needs careful consideration, is expressed by twentieth century philosopher Bertrand Russell:

As to the sense of touch when we press the table with our fingers, that is an electric disturbance on the electrons and protons of our fingertips, produced, according to modern physics, by the proximity of the electrons and protons in the table. If the same disturbance in our finger-tips arose in any other way, we should have the sensations, in spite of there being no table.<sup>11</sup>

The point that Russell makes here is extremely important. In fact, if our fingertips are given a stimulus in a different manner, we can sense entirely different feelings. However, as it will be explained in detail in due course, today this can be done by mechanical simulators. With the help of a special glove, a person can feel the sensation of stroking a cat, shaking hands with someone, washing his hands, or touching a hard material, even though none of these things may be present. In reality, of course, none of these sensations represent occurrences in the real world. This is further evidence that all the sensations felt by a human being are formed within the mind.

## **We Can Never Reach The Original Of The World That Occurs Within Our Brain**

As has been demonstrated here, everything that we live through, see, hear and feel in our life occurs within the brain. For example, someone who looks out of the window while sitting on an armchair feels the hardness of the armchair and the slipperiness of the fabric in his brain. The smell of the coffee coming from the kitchen occurs in the mind, not in the kitchen some distance away. The view of the sea, birds and trees he sees from the window are all images formed in the brain. The friend who is serving the coffee, and the taste of the coffee also exist in the brain. In short, someone sitting in his living room and looking out of the window is in reality looking at his living room, and the view seen from the window on a screen in his brain. **What a human being would refer to as "my life" is a collection of all perceptions being put together in a meaningful way and watched from a screen in the brain, and one can never come out of one's brain.**

We can never know the true nature of the original of the material world outside the brain. We cannot know, whether or not the original, for example the green of a leaf, is as we perceive it. Likewise, we can never find out if a dessert is really sweet or whether that is just how our brain perceives it to be. Imagine, for example, a landscape you have seen before. That landscape is not in front of you, but you are seeing it in your brain. The science writer Rita Carter says that we do not actually see the originals when we see a face or a view, but an interpretation of the original or a version that is a complete reconstruction of it. She adds that no matter how well these copies are reproduced, they will still be different or inferior to the original. (Rita Carter, *Mapping the Mind*, University of California Press, London, 1999, p. 135)

The same thing applies to the time when you look at a landscape. There is in fact no difference between your imagining a landscape from a distance and seeing it close up. Therefore, when you look at a view you are actually seeing a version constructed in the brain, not the original.

Anyone who considers this will clearly see the truth. One such person, George Berkeley, expresses this truth in his work *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*:

By sight I have the ideas of light and colours, with their several degrees and variations. By touch I perceive hard and soft, heat and cold, motion and resistance... Smelling furnishes me with odours; the palate with tastes; and hearing conveys sounds... And as several of these are observed to accompany each other, they come to be marked by one name, and so to be reputed as one thing. Thus, for example, a certain colour, taste, smell, figure and consistence having been observed to go together, are accounted one distinct thing, signified by the name apple; other collections of ideas constitute a stone, a tree, a book, and the like sensible things...<sup>12</sup>

The truth Berkeley expresses in these words is this: We define an object by interpreting different sensations that are experienced in the brain. As is the case in this example, the taste and smell of an apple, its hardness and roundness and those sensations related with the other qualities of it are perceived as a whole by our brain and we perceive this whole as the apple. However, we can never actually deal with the original of the apple, only our perception of it. What we can see, smell, taste, touch or hear are only the copies within the brain.

When we consider all that has been discussed up to this point, the truth will be revealed in all clarity. For example:

- If we can see a street full of colorful lights and all the colors with their own brilliant shadings inside the brain where there is no actual light, then we are seeing copies of the notice boards, lights, streetlights and the headlamps of cars which are produced from the electric signals within the brain.

- Since no sound can enter the brain, we can never hear the original of the voices of loved ones. We hear only copies.

- We cannot feel the cool of the sea, the warmth of the sun – we only feel the copies of them in our brains.

- In the same way, nobody has been able to taste the original of mint. The taste someone would sense as mint is only a perception which occurs in the brain. This is because the person cannot touch the original of the mint, see the original of the mint or smell or taste the original of the mint.

In conclusion, throughout our lives we live with copy-perceptions which are shown to us. However, these copies are so realistic that we never realize that they are copies. For example, lift your head and have a look around the room. You see that you are in a room full of furniture. When you touch the arms of the armchair in which you are sitting, you feel the hardness of it as if you are really touching the original of it. The reality of these images shown to you, and the excellent artistry in the creation of these images are sufficient to convince you and billions of other people that the images are "material". Even though most people have read that every sensation relating to the world is formed in their brains, since it is taught in high school biology classes, the images are so convincing that they have difficulty believing that these images are only fantasies in their brain. The reason for this is that each image is created very realistically and perfected to an art.

Some people accept that images occur in the brain, yet they claim that the originals of the images are external. But they can never prove this, because nobody has been able to move out of the perceptions that exist in the brain. Everybody lives in the cell that is in the brain, and no one can experience anything except that which is shown by his perceptions. Consequently, one can never know what happens outside of his perceptions. Thus to say "there are originals outside" would in fact be an unjustified presupposition, because there is nothing that could be held up as evidence. Furthermore, even if there are originals outside, these "originals" will again be seen in the brain, meaning that the observer would deal with the images formed in his or her brain. Consequently such claims are unsupportable because people are unable to reach the "material equivalents" which they suppose to exist.

We should also emphasize that scientific or technological development cannot change anything, as every scientific discovery or technological invention occurs in the minds of people, and consequently is of no help to people in reaching the outside world.

The views of renowned philosophers like B. Russell and L. Wittgenstein on this subject are as follows:

For instance, whether a lemon truly exists or not and how it came to exist cannot be questioned or investigated. A lemon consists merely of a taste sensed by

the tongue, an odour sensed by the nose, a colour and shape sensed by the eye; and only these features of it can be subject to examination and assessment. Science can never know the physical world.<sup>13</sup>

Philosopher G. Berkeley clearly expressed that our perceptions exist only in our minds and that we would be mistaken in automatically assuming that they exist in the outside world:

We believe in the existence of objects just because we see and touch them, and they are reflected to us by our perceptions. However, our perceptions are only ideas in our mind. Thus, objects we captivate by perceptions are nothing but ideas, and these ideas are essentially in nowhere but our mind... Since all these exist only in the mind, then it means that we are beguiled by deceptions when we imagine the universe and things to have an existence outside the mind. So, none of the surrounding things have an existence out of our mind.<sup>14</sup>

In addition, it is of no importance for people whether something which a person cannot reach, see or touch, exists or not, **because regardless of whether or not there is a material world, a human being only watches the world of perceptions in his brain.** A person can never come across the true original of a material. Furthermore it is enough for everyone to see the copy. For example, someone who wanders around a garden with colorful flowers is not seeing the original of the garden, but the copy of it in his brain. However, this copy of the garden is so realistic that everyone receives some pleasure from the garden, as if it were real when in fact it is imaginary. Billions of people, right up until the present day, have assumed that they have been seeing the original of everything. Consequently, there is no reason for people to be interested in the "outside".

## **The Sense Of Distance Is Also A Perception That Occurs In The Brain**

Imagine a crowd on a street, with shops, buildings, cars, horns honking... When you look at this picture it appears to be real. That is why most people cannot understand that the picture they see is produced in their brain, and mistakenly suppose that all of it is real. The picture has been created so perfectly that it is impossible to understand that the image that they perceive as real is not the original of the outside world, but only a copied image which exists in the mind.

The elements which make a picture so convincing and impressive are distance, depth, color, shade and light. These materials are used with such perfection that they become a three-dimensional, colorful and vivid image inside the brain. When an infinite amount of detail is added to the picture a whole new world emerges that, without realization, we assume is real for all life, although we only interpret it in our mind.

Imagine now that you are driving a car. The steering wheel is at arms length from you and there is a set of traffic lights about 100 m (or 300 ft) in front of you. The car in front of you is about 10 m (30 ft) away, while there are mountains on the horizon, which, according to your estimation, would be many kilometers (miles) away in the distance. However, all of these estimations are wrong. Neither the car nor the mountains are as far away as you would assume. In fact, the entire picture, as on a movie reel, exists on a two dimensional frame, on only one surface within the brain. The images reflected to the eye are two-dimensional, like those on a TV screen. In such circumstances, how can a perception of depth and distance occur?

What is referred to as a sense of distance is a way of seeing three-dimensionally. The elements causing the effects of distance and depth in images are perspective, shade and motion. The form of perception called spatial perception by optical science is provided by highly complicated systems. This system can be explained simply in this way: The sight which reaches the eye is two dimensional. That is to say, it has measures of height and width. The senses of depth and distance result from the fact that two eyes see two different images at the same time. The image that reaches each of our eyes differs from the other in terms of the angle and light. The brain assembles these two different images to form our sense of depth and distance.

We can perform an experiment to understand this better. First, extend your right arm in front of you and hold up your index finger. Now focus on this finger while closing your left eye first and then your right eye. Because two different visions come to each eye, you will see the finger move slightly to one side. Now open both of your eyes and while continuing to focus on your right index finger, move your left index finger as close to your eye as you can. You will notice that the closest finger will have created two images. This is because now a different depth has formed in the closer finger from that in the farther finger. If you open and close your eyes one by one, you will see that the finger located nearer your eye will appear to move more than the finger which is further away. This is due to the increasing difference in the views appearing in each eye.

While a three dimensional film is being made, this technique is used; Images shot from two different angles are placed on the same screen. The audience wears special glasses which have a color filter and polarize the light. The filters in the glasses filter out one of the two views, and the brain transforms these into one single three-dimensional image.

The perception of depth in a retina with two dimensions is very similar to the technique used by artists to give the observer a feeling of depth in a picture with two dimensions. There are certain factors resulting in the feeling of depth, such as the placement of objects on top of one another, the atmosphere perspective, changes in texture, linear perspective, the dimensions, the height and the



movement. For example the change of texture is very important in perceiving depth. For example, the ground that we walk on in a farm full of flowers is actually a tissue. The tissues closer to us are more detailed while the tissues further from us seem pale and harder to discern. Therefore, it is easier to estimate the distance of objects located on a tissue. Besides this, effects of shadow and light also contribute to the perception of a three-dimensional view.

The reason we admire a picture made by a successful artist is the sense of depth and reality which are given to the picture, which is created by using the elements of shade and perspective.

Perspective results from the fact that distant objects appear smaller in proportion to those which are nearer, depending on the person who is looking at it. For example, when we look at a view, distant trees appear small, while those nearby appear large. Likewise, in a picture with a mountain in the background, the mountain is drawn smaller than the person in the foreground. In linear perspective, artists use parallel lines. For example, train tracks produce an effect of distance and depth by meeting with the horizon.

The method that painters use in their paintings is also valid for the image that occurs in the brain. Depth, light and shade are produced by the same method in two dimensional space in the brain. The greater the amount of detail in the picture, the more realistic it appears and the more it deceives our senses. We behave as if there was real depth and distance, as if there was a third dimension. However, all pictures are like a film square on a flat surface. The visual cortex in the brain is extremely small! The distances, the images such as those of distant houses, stars in the sky, the moon, the sun, airplanes flying in the air, and birds – they are all crammed into this small space. That is to say, there is technically no distance between a glass that you can hold by extending your hand and an airplane that, if you looked up, you would understand to be thousands of kilometers above; all of them are on the single surface, that is, in the sense center of the brain.

For example, a disappearing ship on the horizon is not actually miles away from you. The ship is in your brain. The window sill that you are looking at, a poplar tree in front of the window, the road in front of your house, the sea and the ship on the sea are all in the sight center of the brain, on a two dimensional surface. Just like a painter can represent the feeling of distance on a two dimensional canvas by using the proportions of size, elements of color, shade and light and perspective, so can the sense of distance also occur in the brain. In conclusion, the fact that we sense objects to be far away or nearby should not fool us, as distance is a sensation like all the others.

## **Are You In The Room, Or Is The Room Inside You?**

One of the reasons that prevent people from understanding that the images seen are actually sensed in the brain, is that people see their body in the image. They come to this wrong conclusion that "since I am in this room, the room does not occur in my brain." Their mistake is to forget that their body is an image too. Just like everything we see around us is an image which exists in the brain, so does our body also exist as an image in the brain. For example, while sitting on an armchair, you can see the rest of your body below your neck. This image too is produced by the same perceptual system. When you put your hand on your leg, you sense a kinesthetic feeling in the brain. This means that you see your body in the brain, and you feel yourself touching your body in the brain.

If the body is an image in the brain, is the room inside of you or are you in the room? The obvious answer to this is "the room is inside of you". And you see the image of your body inside the room, which in turn is in the brain.

Let us explain this with an example. Let us suppose that you call a lift. When it comes, your neighbor, who lives upstairs from you, is in it. You get into the lift. In reality, are you in the lift or is it in you? The truth is: the lift with the images of the neighbor and your body all occurs in your brain.

In conclusion, we are not "inside" anything. Everything is inside us; everything occurs in the brain. The sun, the moon, stars or an airplane flying in the sky many miles away cannot change this truth. The sun and the moon, like the book that you hold are only images which occur in a very small sight center in the brain.

## **The World Of Senses Can Occur Without Outside World's Existence**

One factor which invalidates the claim that the world of senses that we see has a material equivalent is that we do not need an outside world for senses to occur in the brain. Many technological developments such as simulators and also dreams are the most important evidences of this truth.

Science writer, Rita Carter, states in her book, *Mapping The Mind*, that "there's no need for eyes to see" and describes at length an experiment carried out by scientists. In the experiment, blind patients were fitted with a device that transformed video pictures into vibrating pulses. A camera mounted next to the subjects' eyes spread the pulses over their backs so they had continuous sensory input from the visual world. The patients started to behave as if they could really see, after a while. For example, there was a zoom lens in one of the devices so as to move closer the image. When the zoom is operated without informing the patient beforehand, the patient had an urge to protect himself with two arms because the image on the subject's back expanded suddenly as though the world was looming in.<sup>15</sup>

As it is seen from this experiment, we can form sensations even when they are not caused by material equivalents in the outside world. All stimuli can be created artificially.

### **"The world of senses" that we experience in dreams**

A person can experience all senses vividly without the presence of the outside world. The most obvious example of this is dreams. A person lies on his bed with closed eyes while dreaming. However, in spite of this, that person senses many things which he or she experiences in real life, and experiences them so realistically that the dreams are indistinguishable from the real life experience. Everyone who reads this book will often bear witness to this truth in their own dreams. For example, a person lying down alone on a bed in a calm and quiet atmosphere at night might, in his dream, see himself in danger in a very crowded place. He could experience the event as if it were real, fleeing from danger in desperation and hiding behind a wall. Moreover, the images in his dreams are so realistic that he feels fear and panic as if he really was in danger. He has his heart in his mouth with every noise, is shaken with fear, his heart beats fast, he sweats and demonstrates the other physical affects that the human body undergoes in a dangerous situation. However, there is no external equivalent of the events in his dream. They exist only in his mind.

A person who falls from a high place in his dream feels it with all his body, even though he is lying in bed without moving. Alternatively, one might see oneself slipping into a puddle, getting soaked and feeling cold because of a cold wind. However, in such a case, there is neither a puddle, nor is there wind. Furthermore, despite sleeping in a very hot room, one experiences the wetness and the cold, as if one were awake.

Someone who believes he is dealing with the original of the material world in his dream can be very sure of himself. He can put his hand on his friend's shoulder when the friend tells him that "matter is an image; it isn't possible to deal with the original of the world", and then ask "Am I an image now? Don't you feel my hand on your shoulder? If so, how can you be an image? What makes you think in this way? Let's take a trip up the Bosphorus; we can have a chat about it and you'll explain to me why you believe this." The dream that he sees in his deep sleep is so clear that he turns on the engine with pleasure and accelerates slowly, almost jumping the car by pressing the pedal suddenly. While going on the road, trees and road lines seem solid because of the speed. In addition, he breathes clean Bosphorus air. But suppose he is woken up by his ringing alarm clock just when he's getting ready to tell his friend that what he's living at that moment isn't a dream. Wouldn't he object in the same manner regardless of whether he was asleep or awake?

When people wake up they understand that what they've seen until that moment is a dream. But for some reason they are not suspicious that the life that starts with a "waking" image (what they call "real life") can also be a dream. However, the way we perceive images in "real life" is exactly the same as the way we perceive our dreams. We see both of them in the mind. We cannot understand they are images until we are woken up. Only then do we say "what I have just seen was a dream". So, **how can we prove that what we see at any given moment is not a dream?** We could be assuming that the moment in which we are living is real just because we haven't yet woken up. It is possible that we will discover this fact when we are woken up from this "waking dream" which takes longer than dreams we see everyday. We do not have any evidence that proves otherwise.

Many Islamic scholars have also proclaimed that the life around us is only a dream, and that only when we are awakened from that dream with "a big awakening", will people be able to understand that they live in a dreamlike world. A great Islamic scholar, Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi, referred to as Sheikh Akbar (The greatest Sheikh) due to his superior knowledge, likens the world to our dreams by quoting a saying of the Prophet Muhammad (may God bless him and grant him peace):

The Prophet Muhammad [may God bless him and grant him peace] said that "people are asleep and wake up when they die." This is to say that the objects seen in the world when alive are similar to those seen when asleep while dreaming, meaning that they exist in the imagination.<sup>16</sup>

In a verse of Qur'an, people are told to say on doomsday when they are resurrected from the dead:

**They will say, "Alas for us! Who has raised us from our sleeping-place? This is what the All-Merciful promised us. The Messengers were telling the truth." (Surah Ya Sin: 52)**

As the verse demonstrates, people wake up on doomsday as if waking from a dream. Like someone woken from the middle of a dream in deep sleep, such people will similarly ask who has woken them up. As the verse points out, the world around us is like a dream and everybody will be woken up from this dream, and will begin to see images of the afterlife, which is the real life.

## **Worlds that are produced superficially**

Modern technology presents many important examples of how sensory experience can be simulated with a high degree of realism, without the help of any external or material world. In particular, the technology called "virtual reality", which has developed considerably in recent years, gives us some insight on the subject.

Simply put, virtual reality involves showing animated three-dimensional images generated on a computer so as to construct "a real world" with the help of some equipment. This technology, which is used in many different fields for different aims, is called "artificial reality" or "virtual world" or a "virtual atmosphere". The most important characteristic of virtual reality is that a person who uses a special device believes that what he sees is real, and moreover he is captivated by that image. For that reason, recently, the word "immersive" is also used to describe virtual reality, with "immersive" meaning to involve deeply. (*i.e. Immersive Virtual Reality*)

The tools used to create a virtual world are a helmet (which houses a screen that provides an image) and a pair of electronic gloves (which provide a feeling of touch). A device in the helmet checks the movements and angle of the head in order to provide an image on the screen which is consistent with the head's angle and position. Sometimes, stereo pictures are reflected on the walls and floor of a room-size cell. People who wander through the room can see themselves through stereo glasses in different places, such as at the side of a waterfall, on the summit of a mountain, or sunbathing on the deck of a ship in the middle of the sea. The helmets create 3D pictures with a realistic sense of depth and space. The pictures are provided in proportion to human sizes and the sense of touch is provided by other equipment, such as gloves. Thus, a person who uses this equipment can touch the objects that he sees in the virtual world and can pick them up and move them. The sounds one hears in such places are also convincing, coming from any direction with different depths and volumes. In some applications, the very same virtual atmosphere can be presented to a few people in very different places in the world. Three people from different countries (even different continents) can see themselves with the others getting on board a powerboat.

The system used in the devices that create the virtual world is essentially the same as the system used in our five senses. For example, with the effect of a mechanism inside a glove worn by the user, some signals are given to the fingertips and then transmitted to the brain. When the brain processes these signals, the user has the impression of touching a silk carpet or a vase with a serrated surface, with puffy prints on it, even though there is no silk carpet or vase around.

One of the important fields in which virtual reality is now being used is medicine. With a technique developed in Michigan University, doctoral candidates (in particular emergency service staff) complete a part of their training in an artificial operating room. In this application, images related to an operating room are reflected onto the floors and walls of a room and the images of an operating table and a patient are reflected in the middle of the room. By putting on 3D glasses, doctoral candidates start to operate on this virtual patient.

These examples illustrate that a person can be placed in a realistic yet unreal world with the help of artificial stimuli. With current technology, an image can be produced which is an effective practice aide. There is no reason in principle that eventually this technology couldn't produce a reality which is indistinguishable from the real world. It is very interesting that some famous films made recently deal with the subject. For instance, in a Hollywood film called "*Matrix*", when the nervous system of two heroes of the film are connected to a computer while lying on a sofa, they can see themselves in completely different places. In one scene, they find themselves participating in eastern sports; in another, they are in completely different clothes walking in a very crowded street. When the hero, under the influence of his realistic experience, says that he does not believe that the pictures are created by a computer, the picture is frozen by the computer. The person then becomes convinced that the world which he believed to be real is indeed only an image.

In conclusion, it is possible in principle to create artificial images or, in other words, an artificial world with the help of artificial stimuli. So, we cannot claim that the "life image" that we are seeing all the time is the original outside world, and that what we deal with is "the original". Our senses could well be coming from a very different source.

### **The important truth indicated by hypnosis**

One of the best examples of a world created with artificial stimuli is the technique of hypnosis. When a person is hypnotized, he experiences extremely convincing events which are indistinguishable from reality. The person under hypnosis sees pictures, people and various images, and hears, smells and tastes many things, none of which exist in the room. Meanwhile, because of the experience, he becomes happy, upset, excited, bored, worried or flustered. Moreover, the effect of the experience on the person under hypnosis can be watched from outside physically. In very deep hypnotic trances, certain kinds of symptoms can be observed in the hypnotized person, such as an increase in the pulse rate and blood pressure, redness of the skin, high temperature, and the removal of an existing pain or ache.<sup>17</sup>

In one hypnotic experiment, a hypnotic subject is told that he is in a hospital and that there is a dying patient on the tenth floor of the hospital. He has been hypnotized into believing that if he rushes to the patient with the right medicine, the patient will be rescued. The subject, under the influence of hypnosis, thinks he is rushing to the tenth floor. Meanwhile he gets out of breath and can't control it, due to a feeling of being extremely tired. Then the subject is told that he is on the top floor, and succeeded in fetching the medicine, and that he can lie on a comfortable bed. The subject then starts to relax.<sup>18</sup> Although the subject

experiences the locations and the atmospheres as if they were completely real, the places, people or events as told to him do not exist.

In another experiment, a hypnotic subject in a normal room is told that he is in a Turkish bath and that the bath is very hot. As a result, he starts to sweat.<sup>19</sup>

This draws our attention to a very important point. In order for a person to sweat, some conditions must exist. The reality that we come across in this instance of hypnosis is that the hypnotized person has sweated, even though there is no physical factor which would cause him to sweat. This example shows clearly that there is no physical necessity of physical existences of places or atmosphere to feel such an atmosphere or place. Similar effects can be created through artificial stimulants or hypnotic suggestion.

The British hypnotherapy specialist, Terence Watts, a member of many organizations including The National Hypnotherapy Association, The National Psychotherapists Association, The Professional Hypnotherapists Center, The Hypnotherapy Research Association, states in an article that during hypnosis, some people who are recollecting a past event exhibit some physical changes related to the event. For example, if there was an element of suffocation in the event remembered, a hypnotic subject might become breathless while explaining the event under hypnosis and might even stop breathing for a while. Watts stated that under hypnosis, even finger marks appeared on one of his patients where a slap on the face was recalled. Watts also explains that this is not a mystery but a reaction to sense of pain in the body.<sup>20</sup>

One of the most striking examples seen in hypnotic applications is that even a wound can appear on the skin of the hypnotized person through incultation. For example, Paul Thorsen, a researcher, touches the arm of the person under hypnosis with a tip of a pen and tells him that it's a hot skewer. Soon, a blister (as would have been produced by a second degree burn) formed in the region where the tip of the pen touched. Thorsen also hypnotized a person called Anne O. into believing that the letter A was being drawn onto her arm by pressing hard. Although nothing else was done, redness emerged in the shape of an "A" in that area.<sup>21</sup> Researchers H. Bourru and P. Burot, persuading a hypnotized person that his arm was being cut, saw that the arm was bleeding after being slightly drawn on by a pencil.<sup>22</sup>

J.A. Hadfield told a sailor in hypnosis that he was going to press a hot iron bar on the sailor's arm and that the arm would burn. However, he merely touched it gently with his fingertip, after which he covered it. Six hours later when the cover was removed, there was a slight redness and puffiness in that area. Hadfield states that "the following day the puffiness became larger and swelled like a burn."<sup>23</sup>

These changes that occurred to the human body during hypnosis show that we do not need the outside world to produce sensations of sight, sound, touch, feeling,

pain or ache. For example, although there is no hot iron bar in the outside world, if the person is persuaded, there can be a burn mark on his arm.

These examples show that when we examine how an image occurs, and follow technological developments, and also when we add consciousness-altering methods such as hypnosis to this knowledge, a certain truth becomes clear. Throughout his life, a human being assumes that he is living in a world which is external to his body. However, everything referred to as the world is only our brain's interpretation of the signals which reach the sense centers. In other words, we can never deal with any world other than the one that occurs in our mind. We can never know what happens or exists outside us. We cannot claim that the sources of signals reaching the brain are material existences that exist outside. This reality has begun to take its place in science books and is taught to people since high school age. The problem is that people do not consider the full significance of this fact.

### **Who Is It That Experiences All These Perceptions?**

So far we have established that everything we perceive takes place in our brains, and that we have no need for the outside world or material beings to experience these perceptions. At this point we face a question which would be asked by anyone who thinks on this subject a little bit.

As we know, the electric signals coming from the cells in our eyes are transformed into an image in our brains. For example, the brain interprets some electrical signals coming to the visual center in the brain as a field filled with sunflowers. In reality, it is not the eye that is seeing.

Therefore, if it is not our eyes which are seeing, what is it that sees the electrical signals as a sunflower field, at the back of our brain, in a pitch dark place, without feeling any necessity for any eyes, retina, lens, visual nerves or pupil and enjoys the view in the sight?

Or who is it that hears (without needing an ear) the voice of a very close friend, becomes happy on hearing it, and misses it when he cannot hear it, when the brain is totally sound proof?

Or who is it in the brain that feels the fur of the cat when stroking it, without having any need for a hand, fingers or muscles?

Who is it that feels sensations such as heat, cold, and a sense of consistency, depth, and distance, as they originate in the brain?

Who is it that smells the lemon, lavender flower, rose, melon, watermelon, orange, and barbecued meat inside the brain (even though the brain is smellproof), and feels hungry because of the smell coming from the grill?

We have thus far discussed how everything we perceive continuously is actually formed inside our brains. Who is it then that sees the sights in a brain as if watching television, and becomes excited, happy, sad, nervous, or feels pleasure,



anxiety or curiosity while watching them? Who is responsible for the consciousness which is capable of interpreting everything seen and everything felt?

What is the entity in the brain that has consciousness and throughout life is capable of seeing all the sights shown to him in a dark, quiet head, that is capable of thinking, and reaches conclusions and makes decisions in the end?

It is obvious that it is not the brain, made up of water, lipid and protein, and unconscious atoms, that perceives all this and is responsible for consciousness. There must be a being beyond the brain. Despite being a materialist, Daniel Dennett ponders the above question in one of his books:

My conscious thinking, and especially the enjoyment I felt in the combination of sunny light, sunny Vivaldi violins, rippling branches – plus the pleasure I took in just thinking about it all – how could all that be just something physical happening in my brain? How could any combination of electrochemical happenings in my brain somehow add up to the delightful way those hundreds of twigs genuflected in time with the music? How could some information-processing event in my brain be the delicate warmth of the sunlight I felt falling on me? For that matter, how could an event in my brain be my sketchily visualized mental image of ... some other information-processing event in my brain? It does seem impossible. It does seem as if the happenings that are my conscious thoughts and experiences cannot be brain happenings, but must be something else, something caused or produced by brain happenings, no doubt, but something in addition, made of different stuff, located in a different space. Well, why not?<sup>24</sup>

On the other hand, R. L. Gregory questions the existence of the entity in the back of the brain, which sees all sights:

There is a temptation, which must be avoided, to say that the eyes produce pictures in the brain. A picture in the brain suggests the need of some kind of internal eye to see it – but this would need a further eye to see its picture... and so on, in an endless regress of eyes and pictures. This is absurd.<sup>25</sup>

**Materialists who believe that nothing exists except matter cannot understand this particular question. Who does this "internal eye", which sees and perceives things seen and reacts to such things, belong to?**

In the following passage, Karl Pribram describes this important search by science and philosophy for the identity of the perceiver:

Philosophers since the Greeks have speculated about the "ghost" in the machine, the "little man inside the little man" and so on. Where is the I—the entity that uses the brain? Who does the actual knowing? Or, as Saint Francis of Assisi once put it, "What we are looking for is what is looking".<sup>26</sup>

Although many people venture close to this reality in answering the question "who is the entity that sees", they hesitate to accept all of its implications. As demonstrated in the examples above, in discussing the entity in our brains, some

refer to the "little man", while others say "the ghost in the machine", some refer to "the being using the brain" while some say "the internal eye". All these terms have been used to describe the entity beyond the brain which possesses consciousness, and the means of reaching this entity. However, materialist assumptions keep many people from understanding the true nature of this being which actually sees and hears.

The only source that answers this question is religion. In the Qur'an, God states that He created man in a physical way initially and then "breathed His Spirit" to the man He created:

**When your Lord said to the angels, "I am creating a human being out of dried clay formed from fetid black mud when I have formed him and breathed My Spirit into him, fall down in prostration in front of him!" (Surat al-Hijr: 28-29)**

**(He) then formed him and breathed His Spirit into him and gave you hearing, sight and hearts. What little thanks you show! (Surat as-Sajda: 9)**

In other words, the human being has another existence besides its physical body. That entity inside the brain which says "I am seeing" the sight inside the brain, and "I am hearing" the sound inside the brain and aware of its own existence, and which says "I am me", is the soul given to human beings by God.

Any human being with a mind and a conscience can understand this: the being that watches every incident inside the brain—watches as if looking at a screen throughout his life—is his soul. **Every human being has a soul that sees without the need for an eye, hears without the need for an ear and thinks without the need for a brain.**

The materialistic view—which maintains that matter is the only thing that exists, and that human consciousness is only a result of some chemical reactions in the brain—is in a quandary about this issue. To see this it might be instructive to ask the following questions to a materialist:

n Sight is formed in our brains but what is it that watches this sight in our brains?

n Try to see in your mind's eye your neighbor living downstairs in your apartment building when he is not with you. Who is it that vivifies this person so clearly in your imagination down to the details of his costume, the lines in his face, the whites in his hairs; the tone of his voice, the way he speaks, the way he walks?

A materialist will be unable to give a satisfactory answer to such questions. The only explanation to these questions is the soul given to man by God. However, materialists do not accept the existence of any being other than matter. For this

reason the truth explained in this book deals a massive blow to atheist materialist thought, and constitutes a subject that materialists refuse to discuss most.

### **Who Lets Our Souls Watch All Of These Views?**

At this level there is another question that should be asked: Our soul watches the sights in our brains. But who is it that creates these sights? Could the brain itself form a bright, colorful, clear, shadowy sight and form a whole world through electrical signals in a tiny space? The brain is no more than a wet, soft, curvy piece of meat. Could a simple piece of meat like this create a sight clearer than any that could be provided by a television set with the latest technology, without any snow or horizontal jitter? Could a vision of such high quality be formed inside a piece of meat? Could this wet piece of meat form a stereo sound of higher quality than a stereo hi-fi system with the highest technology, without any sizzling noises? Of course, it is impossible for a brain, which is made of one and a half kilograms (four pounds) of meat to form such perfect perceptions.

Here we arrive at another truth. Since together with everything surrounding us, the body we have, our hands, arms and faces are the shadow beings, then our brains are also shadow beings. Thus we cannot say that this brain which is itself actually only a visual sensation, forms these visual sensations.

Bertrand Russell points out this truth in his work *The ABC of Relativity*:

Of course, if matter in general is to be interpreted as a group of occurrences, this must apply also to the eye, the optic nerve and the brain.<sup>27</sup>

Realizing this fact, French philosopher Bergson said in his book, *Matter and Memory*, that "the world is made up of images, these images only exist in our consciousness; and the brain is one of these images."<sup>28</sup>

Who, then, is the being that shows these sights to our souls, with all their reality and clarity, and lets us live a life with all of these perceptions and without any interruptions?

The being that shows all the sights to our souls, lets us hear all the sounds, and creates all the tastes and smells for our pleasure, is the Lord of all the worlds, the creator of everything, God.

### **One Of The Most Important Dilemmas Of Materialism: Human Consciousness**

Materialist philosophy can never explain the source of human consciousness, i.e. the qualitative experiences that belong to the human soul. For the materialist philosophy, matter is the only thing that exists. Qualities belonging to the soul of a human being, such as consciousness, thought, decision-making processes, happiness, excitement, longing, enjoyment and judgment can never be explained in the materialistic concept. Materialists pass quickly over this subject saying "human

consciousness is only the result of the functions of the brain". A materialist scientist, Francis Crick summarizes this materialistic claim as follows:

Your joys and your sorrows, your memories and your ambitions, your sense of personal identity and free will, are in fact no more than the behaviour of a vast assembly of nerve cells and their associated molecules.<sup>29</sup>

However, such a claim cannot be defended by either science or logic. The materialist prejudices lead materialists to make such explanations regarding the qualities of a soul that belongs to human beings. In order not to accept the fact that there is a being beyond the material world, they attempt to reduce human intelligence to matter and make such claims that have no relation with intelligence or logic.

The science writer John Horgan, although sympathetic to the materialist position called "reductionism", points out the following problems with Francis Crick's claims:

In a sense, Crick is right. We are nothing but a pack of neurons. At the same time, neuroscience has so far proved to be oddly unsatisfactory. Explaining the mind in terms of neurons has not yielded much more insight or benefit than explaining the mind in terms of quarks and electrons. There are many alternative reductionisms. We are nothing but a pack of idiosyncratic genes. We are nothing but a pack of adaptations sculpted by natural selection. We are nothing but a pack of computational devices dedicated to different tasks. We are nothing but a pack of sexual neuroses. **These proclamations, like Crick's, are all defensible, and they are all inadequate.**<sup>30</sup>

Of course, these explanations are all inadequate and they are definitely not logical. Any fanatic materialist is in fact aware of this truth. Not surprisingly, Thomas Huxley, the foremost advocate of Darwin also stated that consciousness cannot be explained by the interaction of neurons: **"How it is that anything so remarkable as a state of consciousness comes about as a result of irritating nervous tissue, is just as unaccountable as the appearance of the Djin, when Aladdin rubbed his lamp."**<sup>31</sup>

From Huxley's time until the present, the failure to explain human consciousness through neurons hasn't changed. However, this is not because of the inadequacy of science regarding this issue. In contrast, especially towards the end of the 20th century, there have been many developments in the field of neurology with many mysteries being solved. However, these findings have showed that human consciousness can never be reduced to matter and the reality lies beyond the material. One of the leading Darwinist-materialist writers in Germany, Hoimar Von Ditfurth, also confesses the fact that the currently adopted methods cannot describe human consciousness:

**With our present research in natural history and genetic development, it is obvious that we will not be able to give an answer to what consciousness, spirit, intelligence and feelings are.** That is because psychic-consciousness level is the highest level that evolution has arrived, at least in this world. Therefore, although we are able to look at the other stages and phases of evolution from the outside, by rising above them, again by the help of our consciousness, we are unable to approach consciousness (or spirit) itself in a similar way. That is because no level higher than consciousness is available to us.<sup>32</sup>

American philosopher and doctor of mathematics, William A. Dembski, states in his article, "Converting Matter into Mind", that the bio-chemical functioning of neurons in the human brain and which mental functions it involves have been understood, although qualities such as decision making, wishing, or reasoning cannot be "reduced to matter". Dembski also points out that specialists on consciousness have realized the error of reductionism;

**...Cognitive scientists abandon hope of understanding this higher level through the lower neurological level.** ...Thus while the commitment to materialism persists, the hope of explaining human intelligence at the neural level, which for the materialist is the logical level, is not a serious consideration.<sup>33</sup>

It is impossible to describe consciousness with a materialist worldview, regardless of the extent of scientific development. As details of the brain surface, it becomes clearer that the mind is irreducible to matter. Materialists must put aside their prejudices and think deeper and research further if they are to understand the concept of human consciousness, as it is impossible to define the real meaning of consciousness through matter. Consciousness is a function of the soul that is given to man by God.

## **Questions For Materialists**

It is totally illogical to state that thoughts, judgments, decision mechanisms, or feelings (such as happiness, excitement, and disappointment) are merely the results of the interaction of neurons in the brain of a human being. Materialists who consider this issue more deeply are aware of this truth. The famous materialist, Karl Lashley, made the following comment towards the end of his career, even though he had defended the idea for years that human consciousness could be reduced to matter:

Whether the mind-body relation is regarded as a genuine metaphysical issue or a systematized delusion, it remains a problem for the psychologist (and for the neurologist when he deals with human problems) as it is not for the physicist. . . . **How can the brain, as a physico-chemical system, perceive or know anything; or develop the delusion that it does so?**<sup>34</sup>

Lashley drew attention to this conflict in one single question. However, there are many other details that materialists must consider. The explanations listed below illustrate some of the issues that reveal the impasse of the materialist approach, and which must therefore be considered in depth :

- Stating that thoughts, excitements and feelings are products of neurons is to claim that such things are the products of the unconscious atoms, or products of the sub elements of atoms, such as quarks or electrons.

- Unconscious atoms cannot know the feeling of happiness or sadness and neither can they enjoy music, taste, good friendship or a chat with a friend.

- Unconscious atoms cannot be Darwinist or materialist and come together to write a book.

- Unconscious atoms cannot view themselves or the nerve cells that form themselves under an electron microscope and reach scientific solutions from their research.

- What is meant by the statement "consciousness is in the neurons of our brains"? Neurons, just like other cells, are made of cell membrane, mitochondria, DNA and ribosomes. Therefore, according to the materialists, where does consciousness lie in these things? If they suppose that consciousness is a result of chemical reactions between the neurons and electrical signals, they are mistaken, because they cannot explain a single "chemical reaction with consciousness". Nor can they show us an "electric wave" that starts to "think" at a certain voltage level.

If materialists think sincerely about these issues, they will realize that all people including themselves are different from groups of neurons or bunches of atoms. Despite being a materialist, the brain specialist Wolf Singer, admits this fact by saying *"In this confusing material of the universe there is 'something' that perceives itself as 'I am'."*<sup>35</sup>

This "something" that the scientist refers to is actually the soul that is given to the human being by God. Due to this soul possessed by the human being, a person can think, be happy, get excited, produce new ideas, or oppose the ideas of others, or know the concepts such as honour, respect, love, friendship, loyalty, sincerity and honesty. The neurons and atoms that form human beings cannot think, make decisions, produce philosophical ideas or know the feeling of love, compassion or affection.

Materialists, when they are alone, know this truth and accept it. However, due to their regarding their materialist prejudices as the requirement of science and reason, they cannot come to accept this absolute reality. On the other hand, the predicament they put themselves into just to defend materialism, and the illogical ideas they accept, actually cause much greater damage to them. A person who says "Our thoughts are the product of our atoms and neurons" is no different than a

person who thinks his or her dreams are real, or a person who invents incredible stories like fairytales and then believes in them.

The truth is actually this: a human being is a being that possesses a soul given by God, and with this soul, he can think, talk, be pleased, make decisions, establish civilizations and manage countries.

## **WHY IS THE TRUTH ABOUT MATTER SUCH AN IMPORTANT SUBJECT?**

What people conceive of as matter does not have absolute existence, and is in reality made up of nothing but perceptions is as remarkable as the facts that the universe was created from nothing, that existence is eternal, and that we rise again to eternal life after death. God creates the universe at every moment with its numberless details, perfect and without defect. Moreover, this creation is so flawless that many people who have lived on the earth so far have not understood that the universe and everything they see is an illusion, and that they have no connection with the reality of matter.

In the 21st century, this truth has become more evident because scientific discoveries have definitely proven that we are actually never in touch with matter. Although some people still refuse to accept this fact, it is not something that can be ignored, disregarded or rejected. On the contrary, **knowing the true nature of matter is an important condition of being a realist.** For this reason, it is very important for those who consider this question to grasp its significance. Some of those who read about the real nature of matter have stated that they do not understand why so much importance has been given to this question. They even say that it has no relation to faith, and ask why it has a place in every discussion about faith. However, the importance of this topic is now evident. A knowledge of the true nature of matter scares materialists because it destroys their worldview, and it is very important for Muslims to understand this truth and to try to let people know about it.

This knowledge helps people to understand some questions about faith and must be explained as being as important as any other matter concerning faith. As a result of an explanation of the real nature of matter, people are cleansed from their attachment to the things of this world, they direct their thoughts to the afterlife, they are rescued from a grave error and they can easily grasp some truths that those errors prevented them from understanding. Someone with a materialist view of the world, or someone who has been brought up under the influence of this kind of worldview, can never understand certain questions such as, "Where is God?", "Do heaven and hell and hell exist?", "What is the nature of spirit and eternity?", "Is

there life after death?". But perceiving that matter is an illusion naturally provides answers to these questions, and enables people to clearly see that God is the one absolute Being.

When people understand what matter is, they strongly sense that everything by which they are bound to the life of this world—their desires, passions and everything that makes them forget God and the Day of Judgment—are deceptive and vain. Learning the true nature of matter is what saves people from the desires of this world. It directs them with pure hearts and sincerity towards God and saves them from the error of associating others with Him.

This is a century in which people display arrogance, conceit and every kind of inhuman and amoral behavior. However, when they realize that they themselves, and those whom they look up to, are just shadow beings, their arrogance and conceit will be replaced by humility and gentleness.

All these developments will be the means by which we will achieve a secure and comfortable society, in which people can live without meanness, selfishness and pitiless competition.

Certainly, there will be one important result that will come from an awareness of the fact that we have no contact with matter, and that any idea we form of matter is an image: The collapse of materialist philosophy.

Now, we shall discuss in detail why the fact that matter is not absolute is one of the most important discoveries in history.

## **The Truth About Matter Shows That God Is The One Absolute Being**

One of the most important things implied by this fact is that God is the One Absolute Being. Some people, under the influence of materialist philosophy, think that matter is absolute being. Some of these people believe that God exists, but when they talk about the existence of God, and where He is, they display their ignorance. For example, if they are asked "Where is God?", they will answer, "Show me your intelligence; you cannot. So, God is a reality like intelligence, but you cannot see it." Others say (God is surely beyond that) that God has an illusory existence like that of radio waves. According to their view, they themselves and the things they possess are absolute existence and God's existence encompasses this material existence like radio waves. **However, what is illusory is they themselves and the things they possess. The One Absolute Being is God.** God's existence embraces everything. Human beings are in no way absolute beings but a transient image.

God reveals this truth in these words:



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

The fullness of faith consists of understanding this truth, avoiding the mistake of associating others with God and acknowledging God as the One Absolute Being. Someone who knows that, apart from God, everything is a shadow existence, will say with certain faith (at the level of Haqq-al yakin – truth of certainty) that only God exists and there is no other deity (or any being with strength) besides Him.

The materialists do not believe in the existence of God, because they cannot see Him with their eyes. But their claims are completely invalidated when they learn the real nature of matter. Someone who learns this truth understands that his own existence has the quality of an illusion, and grasps that a being which is an illusion will not be able to see a being which is absolute. As it is revealed in the Qur'an, human beings cannot see God but God sees them.

**Eyesight cannot perceive Him but He perceives eyesight... (Surat al-An'am: 103)**

Certainly, we human beings cannot see the Being of God with our eyes but we know that He completely encompasses our inside, our outside, our views and our thoughts. For this reason, God reveals Himself in the Qur'an as "**controlling hearing and sight**" (Surah Yunus: 31) We cannot say one word, we cannot even take one breath without God's knowing it. Therefore, God knows everything we do. This is revealed in the Qur'an:

**God - Him from Whom nothing is hidden, either on earth or in heaven. (Surah Al 'Imran: 5)**

It is very important that God watches us, sees us and hears us at every moment. Someone who realizes this, even if he does not see God with his eyes, knows that He is aware of him at every moment. For this reason, no matter what he is doing, he knows that God is watching him. Consequently, he is careful not to do anything to displease Him and will be mindful of what he does, says, and thinks. In the Qur'an, it is revealed that God is close to us in everything we do; that He watches us and that nothing eludes Him.

**You do not engage in any matter or recite any of the Qur'an or do any action without Our witnessing you while you are occupied with it. Not even the smallest speck eludes your Lord, either on earth or in heaven. Nor is there anything smaller than that, or larger, which is not in a Clear Book. (Surah Yunus: 61)**

Certainly God, Who is Absolute Being, knows every aspect of the human beings which He has created as illusions. This is a very simple thing for God. But some in their ignorance may find this hard to understand. However, when we observe the impressions we think are the "external world", that is, as we lead our lives, the closest being to us is not an impression, it is clearly God. The secret of the verse **"We created man and We know what his own self whispers to him. We are nearer to him than his jugular vein"** (Surah Qaf: 16) is hidden in this fact. But when a person thinks that his body is composed of matter, he cannot conceive of this important reality; this is again because he thinks that the nearest thing to him is his body. For example, if this person conceives of his existence as being his brain, he does not admit the possibility that there is a being closer to him than his jugular vein. However, when he conceives of the fact that there is no such thing as matter, and that everything is a facsimile that he experiences in his mind, then concepts such as outside, inside, far and near have no meaning. His jugular vein, his brain, hands, feet, his house and his car that he thought were outside himself, even the sun, the moon and the stars that he thought were so far away, are all on the same plane. God has encompassed him all around and is eternally near to him.

That God is eternally near to human beings is also revealed in this verse: **"If My servants ask you about Me, I am near (to them)..."** (Surat al-Baqara: 186) In another verse the same reality is expressed, **"Surely your Lord encompasses mankind round about."** (The Qur'an, 17: 60). In spite of this, people continue to err by thinking that the nearest thing to themselves is themselves. However, God is closer to us even than we are to ourselves. The fact that God is the nearest Being to a human being is emphasized again in these verses: **"Why then, when death reaches his throat and you are at that moment looking on—and We are nearer him than you but you cannot see"** (Surat al-Waqi'a: 83-85) Indeed, a person on the point of death or lying in a hospital bed may think that the closest being to him is the doctor at his bedside, his mother who is embracing him, or his friends touching him and holding his hand. But as it says in this verse, God is closer to him at that time than anyone else. Moreover, God is the single closest Being to him not only at that particular moment, but from the first moment of his existence. But, because people do not see it with their eyes, they are ignorant of this reality.

The fact that God is not circumscribed by space but embraces all things is revealed in another verse:

**Both East and West belong to God, so wherever you turn, the Face of God is there. God is All-Encompassing, All-Knowing. (Surat al-Baqara: 115)**

In another verse, God explains this reality in this way:

**It is He Who created the heavens and the earth in six days, then established Himself firmly on the Throne. He knows what goes into the earth and what comes out of it, what comes down from heaven and what goes up into it. He is with you wherever you are—God sees what you do. (Surat al-Hadid: 4)**

All of this implies that God is the One, True, Absolute Existence. With His Knowledge, God embraces human beings who are shadow beings and every other thing. This fact is also pointed out in the following verse:

**Your God is God alone, there is no deity but Him. He encompasses all things in His knowledge. (Surah Ta Ha: 98)**

In another verse of the Qur'an, God warns people against being heedless:

**What! Are they in doubt about the meeting with their Lord? What! Does He not encompass all things? (Surah Suffilat: 54)**

## **Human Actions Also Belong To God**

God has created man as a shadow being with no power or will independent of Himself. This reality is revealed in this verse:

**But you will not will unless God wills... (Surah Fussilat: 30)**

Some people are unaware of this great fact. They accept that God created them, but think that the work they do belongs to them. However, every action performed by a human being is created with the permission of God. For example, a person who writes a book writes it with the permission of God; every sentence, every idea, and every paragraph is composed because God wishes it. God reveals this very important principle in several verses; one of these verses is, "... **God created both you and what you do?**". (Surat as-Saffat: 96) **In these words "... when you threw; it was God Who threw...**", (Surat al-Anfal: 17) God reveals that everything we do is an act that belongs to Him.

In other verses, God instructs the prophet to take charity from believers, but in the continuation of the verse, He explains that it is really He Who takes charity:

**Take charity from their wealth to purify and cleanse them and pray for them. Your prayers bring relief to them. God is All-Hearing, All-Knowing. Do they not know that it is God Who receives repentance from His servants and accepts such acts of charity, and that God is the Ever-Returning, the Most Merciful? (Surat at-Tawba: 103-104)**

The great Islamic scholar Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi explains that the deeds we do belong to God:

As for the spirits, the source of the actions that derive from them is not found in their entities. **It is God alone who puts spirits and objects into action continuously.** If there is nothing in the world but impressions, that means that there is nothing in reality but one being. Spirit and matters are not comprised of chosen beings and determined facts. They are comprised of divine acts; various manifestations of the almighty being. In the same way, things that are said to be finite or infinite are nothing but a single entity seen from two different points.<sup>36</sup>

As Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi explains, it is God Who creates every deed and makes the soul of the doer believe that it is he himself who is performing it. God creates this sense so realistically in every soul that someone who throws a stone, for example, really thinks that he is throwing it himself. However, a person who is a

shadow being cannot perform the act of throwing, but God makes him feel as if he is performing the act. As a result of the wonderful perfection in God's creation, a person senses this feeling intensely and actually thinks that he is holding the stone, drawing back his arm to exert strength for speed and throwing it.

Human beings live at every moment dependent on God and, whether they know it or not, or whether they accept it or not, they are subject to God. God reveals this in this verse:

**Everyone in heaven and earth prostrates to God willingly or unwillingly, as do their shadows in the morning and the evening. (Surat ar-Ra'd: 15)**

Whoever you know, who lives or has lived in this world, in the present or in the past, wherever he may be, whatever he may possess, or no matter how stubborn a denier he may be, this reality does not change for him or for anyone. Every human being is subject to God's will, every person is a shadow being created from the breath of God's Spirit. Anyone who knows this finds it impossible to accept praise for his wealth, knowledge, title or reputation; nor can he accept adulation for his place or position in society or success in his profession. Those who are still arrogant despite this are in fact completely powerless. After God has revealed that the person who thinks he has thrown the stone has not really thrown it, but that it was God Himself who threw it, it is unfathomable ignorance for anyone to think that he deserves credit for any human success.

In this way God tests and trains every human being. Today those who cannot understand or accept this obvious reality will, when they are raised from the dead, see everything in its true light and understand that their own strength avails for nothing:

**The metaphor of those who reject their Lord is that their actions are like ashes scattered by strong winds on a stormy day. They have no power at all over anything they have earned. That is extreme misguidance. (Surah Ibrahim: 18)**

God is the only Being who has power over all things:

**Everything in the heavens and everything on earth glorifies God. Sovereignty and praise belong to Him. He has power over all things. (Surat at-Taghabun: 1)**

**An Understanding Of The Real Nature of Matter  
Will Lead People To Faith**

People who will come to realize that they have been watching images shown to their spirits throughout their lives, will believe with certainty that it is God Who created both their spirits and these uninterrupted images.

The reason why some people stubbornly refuse to accept the secret of matter is their unwillingness to conceive of the magnitude of God's greatness and to accept their own nothingness. But even if these people do not want to accept it, there is an indisputable truth: Everything in heaven and on earth is God's and a manifestation of God. The only absolute Being is God. The other beings that God has created are not absolute beings but appearances. All the 'I's', that is individuals, who observe the appearances that God has created are all spirits from God.

When people grasp the great secret of this knowledge, they will attain great clarity of consciousness and the haze enshrouding their spirits will lift. Everyone who understands it will freely submit to God, love Him and fear Him. In addition, human feelings of pride and self-satisfaction will be replaced by humility and modesty. This is what God wants from human beings. Those who understand this amazing fact will look at things from a different point of view and start out on a totally different life. They will acknowledge God's power appropriately, and distance themselves from the kind of person described by this verse:

**They do not measure God with His true measure. The whole earth will be a mere handful for Him on the Day of Rising and the heavens folded up in His right hand. Glory be to Him! He is exalted above the partners they ascribe! (Surat az-Zumar: 67)**

## **Understanding The Reality Of Matter Removes Worldly Ambitions**

What we have described so far is one of the most profound truths that you have heard in your whole life. We have shown that the whole material world is really a shadow, and that this is the key to understanding the existence of God, His creation, and the fact that He is the one absolute Being. At the same time, we have presented a scientifically undeniable demonstration both of how helpless human beings are and a manifestation of God's wonderful artistry. This knowledge compels people to belief making it impossible for them not to believe. This is the main reason why some people avoid this truth.

The things that are being explained here are as true as a physical law or a chemical formula. When necessary, human beings can solve the most difficult mathematical problems and understand many very complex matters. However, when these same people are informed that matter is an appearance formed in the human mind, and that they have no connection with it, they have no desire at all to

understand. This is an exaggerated case of an inability to understand, because the idea discussed here is no more difficult than the answer to the questions, "What is two times two?" or "How old are you?", If you ask any scientist or professor of neurology where they see the world, they will answer you that they see it in their brains. You will find this fact even in high school biology text books. But despite the fact that it is clearly evident, information pertaining to the fact that we perceive the material world in our brains and the results that this information entails for human beings can be overlooked. It is of major significance that one of the most important scientifically proven facts is so carefully hidden from people's eyes.

The fundamental reason why people easily accept all scientific facts, yet are so afraid to accept this one, is that learning the truth about matter will basically change the way everyone looks at life. Those who believe that matter and the self are absolute beings will discover one day that everything they have worked for and protected based on this idea - their spouses, their children, their wealth, even their own personalities - is an illusion. People are very afraid of this reality and pretend not to understand it even if they do. They try with determination to disprove the facts, which are simple enough for even a primary school child to understand. The reason behind this opposition is that they are afraid to lose what this world offers.

For someone who is attached to his possessions, his children, or the transient offerings of this world, the illusory nature of matter is cause for great fear. At the moment such a person understands this, he will have died before his natural death, and he will have surrendered his possessions and his soul. In the verse, **"If He did ask you for it (all your wealth) and put you under pressure, you would be tight-fisted and it would bring out your malevolence."** (Surah Muhammad: 37), God reveals how human beings will behave with meanness and rancor when He demands their possessions from them.

But when a person learns the real nature of matter, he will understand that his soul and his possessions already belong to God. If he knows that there is nothing to give or to resist giving, he will submit himself and all he possesses to God before he dies. For sincere believers, this is a beautiful and honorable thing and a way to draw nearer to God. Those who do not believe or whose faith is weak cannot recognize this beauty and stubbornly reject this reality.

## **Those Who Own Factories, Yachts Or Land, Which Are Images In The Brain Worry Themselves For Nothing**

In this section we will consider the example of a heedless factory owner who has lived all his life with the ambition of being rich, and who worked day and night since he was young, thinking that he would earn everything by the sweat of his brow. This example will show us a very important truth.

The person whom we shall describe is middle-aged. He has two children, a boy and a girl, whom he sends to good schools. He owns a few cars, a yacht, some houses and some land. This man thinks he has everything that is admired in the life of this world. He thinks he has attained everything that a person could hope for in this life. Besides his wealth, he has gained a great deal of respect. Everyone who knows him regards him as a person who is respected, and has standing and position in society. This opinion is shared by the servants who attend him in the morning, the chauffeur who bows as he opens the car door for him, the security guards who greet him with respect when he enters the company building, and the employees who stand to attention from the moment he enters the factory until he gets to his office. He has many close friends and acquaintances in high places and positions. Every day he runs from meeting to meeting; he is a member of some boards and societies, and even chairman of others. In the course of a day he gives orders to hundreds of individuals. In his bank and private safe he has more money, stocks and bonds that he can count. As he adds up these things from time to time, he gains even more satisfaction; he is proud of himself and congratulates himself. What gives him a special feeling of satisfaction and self-confidence is the fact that he earned everything himself by his own hard work, and that he attained what he had devoted his whole life to achieving.

One day, while he is sailing on a yacht with his friends, someone comes up to him and says: *"Everything you see here at this moment—all these people, this yacht, the sea, the factories, the houses, the employees who jump to your command—are all appearances happening in your brain. You do not know whether the originals of these appearances exist outside your brain or not. If the nerves entering your brain were severed, this yacht, the people on it, their voices and conversations, the smell of the sea, the taste of the fruit juice you are drinking, in short, everything would cease to exist in a moment. All of these things as well as everything you have owned in your whole life are in your mind. There is no difference between your houses, cars, yachts, factories and companies and things you own in your dreams. It is like having a dream about going to Europe in your own private airplane and waking up in the morning to find that there is no airplane, and that you are not in Europe but in bed. If one day you wake up from this sleep you call your life; how can you be sure that you will not be in a completely different place observing images pertaining to this life?"*

This rich man will react strongly to what he is being told. If these facts were told to him plainly with all scientific proof, even if he understood he would not accept the truth. In his mind, to accept that everything he owned was a dream-like fantasy would mean that he had been following an illusion his whole life. Then, everything for which a person is praised, everything that gives him a sense of pride and self-importance is an illusion. The situation of that person will be as humiliating



and ridiculous as that of a person who is rich in his dreams and puts on airs because of this imaginary wealth. When the rich man in our example goes into his company after he has grasped this truth, he will not be moved to arrogance by the respect and esteem shown to him. This is because he now knows that those who show him respect and bow to him are only facsimiles in his mind. Or when these things are told to him, he will not be able to "show off" to his guests with his yacht because both the yacht and the guests on it are appearances in his brain.

When he is told that matter is an illusion and that he can have no connection at all with the source of material existence, the farm he bought the day before will come into his mind. In that case, the money he counted out bill by bill and gave to the vendor, the farm he bought with all its fixtures, the surrounding area surveyed as he made the purchase—all would exist only in his mind. It would be exactly as if he had dreamed the night before that he had won an important contract and made a lot of money from it. When he woke up nothing would be left, and what he thought was real would be a dream.

If this is the case, he is not in the yacht now. The yacht is an appearance inside him. When he thinks he is going into his house furnished in the latest style, in fact, he is opening a big garden gate and entering a house in his brain. The house, the furnishings, the garden and the garden gate are in his mind.

If this person is aware that what he is being told is clearly true, he will come to realize that everything he owns at that moment are fundamentally shadow beings. All these things are images shown to him by God Who created him. In order to test him, God created his life and the appearances of the things that he would think he owned. But forgetting that God gave him these things and blessed him with the wealth of these appearances, he became arrogant and spoiled by these things, gave himself airs and regarded people as his inferiors. Then, he has spent his life vainly clambering after an illusory dream world. But one day he realizes that he has been caught up in illusions and wasting his time, that none of these things has absolute existence and that only God exists.

In one verse, God calls attention to those who have refused to accept this reality throughout history and those who have pretended not to know it:

**But the actions of those who disbelieve are like a mirage in the desert. A thirsty man thinks it is water but when he reaches it, he finds it to be nothing at all, but he finds God there. He will pay him his account in full. God is swift at reckoning. (Surat an-Nur: 39)**

As we can see in this verse, God compared the deeds of deniers to a mirage or a phantom. When these people attach themselves to these phantoms and discover

that they cannot expect help from them, they understand that the phantoms are not real and that God alone is the one absolute reality.

One of the main reasons why people are so afraid of this reality and do not wish to accept it is that they understand, like the man in the example above, that everything they own, their respect, their wealth will pass away in one moment. Here we call your attention to one point: we are not saying here that "everything a person owns will stay behind after death and do him no good". By saying that "everything a person owns is an appearance", that person, in a sense, loses what he owns while still alive. When he sees that what he has striven for throughout his life, has troubled him and made him sad, and that he has tried to beat down other people in the process, he realizes that it was all an empty deception. In one verse, the Qur'an reveals that heedless people live in deception. The greedy attachment of people to property is related in a verse as follows:

**To mankind the love of worldly appetites is painted in glowing colours: women and children, and heaped-up mounds of gold and silver, and horses with fine markings, and livestock and fertile farmland. All that is merely the enjoyment of the life of this world. The best homecoming is in the presence of God. (Surah Al 'Imran: 14)**

In another verse it is revealed that the life of this world is a game, a waste of time and a deception:

**Know that the life of this world is merely a game and a diversion and ostentation and a cause of boasting among yourselves and trying to outdo one another in wealth and children: like the plant-growth after rain which delights the cultivators, but then it withers and you see it turning yellow, and then it becomes broken stubble. In the hereafter, there is terrible punishment but also forgiveness from God and His good pleasure. The life of this world is nothing but the enjoyment of delusion. (Surat al-Hadid: 20)**

When people realize that these appearances they thought they owned during this life are actually an illusion, they understand that they have struggled and worried in vain, and that they have wasted their time. There are those who jealously guard what they own, and for the sake of these things become angry and abuse others, get irritated and pound the table with their fist. But when they realize that they have no connection with the actual material things, they are ashamed and deeply sorry that they are like someone who, in a dream, assaults other people, gets angry and shouts at them. They immediately understand that they

should act in a way that will be pleasing to God, the Origin of all the appearances shown to them. Those who comprehend this reality, that is, believers say:

**Say: "My prayer and my rites, my living and my dying, are for God alone, the Lord of all the world." (Surat al-An'am: 162)**

It is important never to forget this important point: It does not matter at which point in his life a person comes to understand this reality; it is never too late. He can change his way of looking at life right away and reorder his way of living according to this principle; he can begin to live not for illusions but for our Lord, the One Absolute Being. God is always forgiving to His servants.

Those who slyly pretend not to know this reality, and refuse to accept the fact that God is the One Absolute Being, have fallen into a powerful trap. God describes their state:

**... What they achieved here will come to nothing. What they did will prove to be null and void. (Surah Hud: 16)**

Even if a person does not want to accept this reality now and prefers to deceive himself by believing that the things he owns are absolute things, everything will become very clear after he dies on that Last Day when he is raised again to life. On that day, as it says in the verse, his **"sight is sharp"** (Surah Qaf: 22), and he will come to a much clearer awareness of everything. But if he has spent his worldly life running after illusory goals, he will wish that he had never lived in that world. He will perish saying, **"If only death had really been the end! My wealth has been of no use to me. My power has vanished."** (Surat al-Haqqa: 27-29)

### **Those Who See The Real Nature Of Matter Lose Their Arrogance**

Some people who become aware of this plain truth get upset. When they understand that their factories, houses, cars, property, children, spouses, relatives, and social position are all illusions experienced in the brain, their helplessness and powerlessness lies open before God. They understand that both they themselves and all that they own, even the whole universe is an illusion and that they themselves are nothing. All that is left is the spirit they call "I". Because it was God Who gave them this spirit, they must believe in God and submit to Him, even though they may not have believed before.

When a person grasps these facts, a feeling of humility and dependence replaces pride, arrogance and self-satisfaction. If all the wealth of the world and the

most important position in it were given to a person such as this, he would not become conceited, proud or arrogant. He will not forget that he is only observing images that God has given to him, and he will not get caught up in illusions. This sublime reality will remove ambition, pride and conceit, as well as such negative feelings as spite, hatred and anger. Those who know that everything is an illusion will not engage in cut-throat competition with one another or harbor spite or enmity against anyone. In an environment where everyone has submitted himself only to God, there will be humility, submission, compassion, deference, love and intimacy.

Therefore, it is highly unreasonable for a person to pretend not to know this truth, and to fear it and run away from it. A person without faith may well fear this truth because if he accepts these facts, he will also be forced to accept the existence of God. But believers must embrace with pleasure and enthusiasm the fact that matter is a reflection that God makes them experience in their minds and that the one Absolute Being is God. For a believer, to fear God's magnificent artistry and to avoid seeing it makes no sense. When the truth is evident, it is pointless not to acknowledge it, and to continue to be deceived by the clear lines of shadows and three-dimensional apparitions. The believer does not fear the truth, but thinks about the beauty and depth of reality, and considers how much more wondrous God's flawless artistry becomes within this system.

## **This Reality Threatens Those Who Are Attached To This World By Ambition**

A man who has received an award for what he has achieved, received the award in his brain. Those who applaud him as he receives the award are, in fact, an apparition of people in his brain.

A person watching this awards ceremony on the little screen in his brain has no way of connecting with the source of the people in the auditorium, the award, or the auditorium itself. These things stay inside the brain. It is as if the person were watching the reward being given to him on a videocassette.

This is the reason why people avoid this reality with horror. When those who are bound to this world by ambition understand that their standing and position in society, the awards they win, their bank accounts, yachts, real estate, and the people that praise and esteem them are all apparitions in their brains, they are consumed by a tremendous anger. They avoid accepting this fact in all their arrogance because, they realize that it implies that their esteem, reputation and property will not be worth the ambitious commitments they have made. But no matter how hard they try to escape this reality, they cannot change the fact that they lead the whole of their lives inside their skulls.

## **Worries And Difficulties Are Like Images In A Dream**

Some people realize that certain things happen as apparitions in the brain, but tend to forget that this is true for all phenomena. However, the whole of human life—all of it—actually does occur as an apparition in the brain. For example, a businessman who goes bankrupt receives images of his workplace and his employees in his brain. The things he sold and the money he received for them are all impressions in his brain. When this man loses all his money, he loses the image of that money. A person who loses his workplace and all possessions loses the image in his brain of the workplace and the property. Or a person who has his car stolen again has lost the appearance of a car in his mind. He can no longer see this car-like apparition which he thought he owned, but of course he was never actually connected to the original of that apparition even for one moment throughout his whole life.

Not only things like this, but every difficulty a person experiences in the course of his life is in the brain. For example, consider a person who lives in a country where there is internal strife. He lives every moment in mortal danger and comes every moment face to face with assaults from hostile soldiers, but he is actually face to face with an appearance of hostile soldiers in his brain. A person who is wounded or loses his arm in a skirmish loses the apparition of the arm in his brain and all his feeling of pain is a perception formed in the brain. The threatening,

spiteful and aggressive things said to him by his enemies are composed of sounds formed in the brain.

As a result, events which produce difficulties, worries and fear are illusions occurring in the brain. A person who sees what these illusions really are does not feel anxious because of the difficulties in which he finds himself, nor does he complain about them. Even if he were confronted by the most aggressive and dangerous enemy, he would know that he is face to face with illusions in his brain and would not be overcome by fear or hopelessness. He knows that each one of these things is an apparition formed by God and that He created them for a purpose. No matter what he encounters, he is at peace in his trust and submission to God. In some verses of the Qur'an, God reveals that there will be no fear or sorrow for believers. One verse reads:

**Those who say, "Our Lord is God," and then go straight will feel no fear and will know no sorrow. (Surat al-Ahqaf: 13)**

A person who knows that throughout his whole life everything that has happened, and every sound he has heard, are images created by God in his brain will, instead of becoming fearful and vainly filled with anxiety and panic, trust in the endless mercy and compassion of the Creator who made him and these images.

### **The Environment That Will Come To Be When The Real Nature Of Matter Is Not Kept Secret**

Those who know that they have no connection with the actual material things, and that they are in the presence only of images that God presents to them, will change their whole way of living, their view of life and their values. This will be a change that will be useful both from the personal and social point of view, because someone who sees this truth will live without difficulty according to the high moral qualities that God has revealed in the Qur'an.

For those who do not regard the world as important and who understand that matter is an illusion, it is spiritual things that deserve to be given importance. Someone who knows that God is listening to him and watching him at every moment, and is aware that he will render an account of his every action in the hereafter, will naturally live a morally virtuous life. He will be very careful about what God has commanded and what He has forbidden. Everyone in society will be filled with love and respect for one another, and everyone will compete with one another in the performance of good and noble deeds. People will change the values according to which they judge others. Material things will lose their value and therefore, people will be judged not according to their standing and position in society but according to their moral character and their piety. No one will pursue those things whose source is illusion; everyone will seek after truth. Everyone will

act without worrying about what others will think; the only question in their minds will be whether or not God will be pleased with what they do. In the place of the feelings of pride, arrogance and self-satisfaction that come from possessions, property, standing and position, there will be a sense of the understanding of humility and dependence. Therefore, people will willingly live according to those examples of good moral qualities spoken of in the Qur'an. Eventually, these changes will put an end to many problems of today's societies.

In place of angry, aggressive people, anxious even about small profit, there will be those who know that everything they see is an illusion. They will be well aware that reactions of anger and loud shouting make them look foolish. Well-being and trust will prevail in individuals and societies and everyone will be pleased with his life and possessions. These, then, are some of the blessings that this hidden reality will bring to individuals and societies. Knowing, considering and living according to this reality will bring many more goodnesses to human beings. Those who wish to attain these goodnesses should consider this reality well and endeavor to understand it. In one verse, God says,

**Clear insights have come to you from your Lord. Whoever sees clearly, does so to his own benefit. Whoever is blind, it is to his own detriment... (Surat al-An'am: 104)**

### **Knowing The Real Nature Of Matter Is The End Of Materialism**

The philosophy of materialism is the worldview that is most threatened by the fact that the material world is an impression shown to our spirits, and that we cannot know whether or not anything exists outside our minds. In order to understand this better, we must look at the general definition of materialism. Materialism is defined in materialist writings as:

Materialism accepts the eternity and endlessness of the world, that it is not created by God and is infinite in time and space.<sup>37</sup>

In the 8th volume of the Larousse Encyclopedia, materialist philosophy is defined as follows:

Materialism is a doctrine which does not accept the existence of any other substance than matter. It is the opposite of idealism which says that the essence and substance of reality is created by spirit.

As we can see in this brief definition, materialist philosophy regards matter as the only absolute existent and believes that, apart from matter, no thought or thing exists. Materialist philosophy does not accept the existence of spirit but regards human consciousness as a product of the activities of the brain. (We considered the invalidity of this materialist claim in the section entitled, "One of the Most Important Dilemmas of Materialism: Human Consciousness"). One of the most important

implications of what is explained throughout this book is the fact that materialist philosophy is completely invalid. This is due to the fact that it is now very clear today that what we call matter is an impression in our mind; it is impossible for us to demonstrate that these impressions have any material referent outside our mind. This is because it is impossible for us to come out of our minds and come into contact with a material source of things. If we accept this fact summarized in two sentences, neither matter nor materialism remains. Even if we think that our perceptions have a material counterpart outside our minds, seeing that we can never attain to this counterpart, it is clearly unnecessary and pointless to construct a philosophy on matter whose very existence is doubtful and to base a view of life on it.

The basic reason why those who espouse materialist philosophy are disturbed by this important secret underlying matter and refuse to accept it even though it is very evident, is that they understand that it will mean the end of their philosophy. Throughout history every materialist has been disturbed by the description of the nature of matter, even by the other materialists' reading books telling about this fact, and they have expressed their misgivings. For example, one of the leaders of the bloody Russian Revolution, Vladimir I. Lenin, in his book written almost a century ago called *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, warned his followers of this fact:

Once you deny objective reality, given us in sensation, you have already lost every weapon against fideism, for you have slipped into agnosticism or subjectivism-and that is all that fideism requires. **A single claw ensnared, and the bird is lost.** And our Machists have all become ensnared in idealism, that is, in a diluted, subtle fideism; they became ensnared from the moment they took "sensation" not as an image of the external world but as a special "element". It is nobody's sensation, nobody's mind, nobody's spirit, nobody's will.<sup>38</sup>

These sentences show how uncomfortable this fact made materialists; Lenin was very afraid of it and wanted to erase it from his own mind and from the minds of his comrades. But materialists today are in a much greater state of discomfort than Lenin was because the invalidity of materialism has, in the last 100 years, become more clearly and strongly established. Considered in the past to be a philosophical speculation or a matter of opinion, the unreality of matter has now been proven for the first time in history in an irrefutable and scientifically based manner. The science writer Lincoln Barnett says that even hinting at this possibility makes materialist scientists anxious and fearful:

Along with philosophers' reduction of all objective reality to a shadow-world of perceptions, **scientists have become aware of the alarming limitations of man's senses.**<sup>39</sup>



In Turkey and throughout the whole world, this fear and anxiety can be seen very clearly in every materialist who confronts this issue. For example, in Turkey, materialists have suffered a serious set-back from the collapse of the theory of evolution, which they supposed to be the basis of their philosophy. Now they have begun to understand that they have lost a more important support than Darwinism—matter itself. For this reason they are now saying that, from their point of view, this issue is a very serious danger which causes their cultural fabric to be totally shredded.

In fact, this points to a promise revealed to human beings by God in the Qur'an. Where truth is plain, false ideas are bound to perish:

**Say: "Truth has come and falsehood has vanished. Falsehood is always bound to vanish." (Surat al-Isra': 81)**

**Rather We hurl the truth against falsehood and it cuts right through it and it vanishes clean away! Woe without end for you for what you portray! (Surat al-Anbiya': 18)**

Materialism and those who have espoused it throughout history use matter as a pretext to rebel against God, Who created them from nothing, gave them life and created the universe for them to live in. Asking such superficial and specious questions as "If matter exists, where is God in it?", they deny the existence of God and exert much effort to get others to deny Him. Today they see one of their most important supports destroyed; the reality described here has ripped their philosophy up from its roots and left no possibility for further discussion. The matter on which they had based all their ideas, their lives, their arrogance and their denial has slipped from their hands in an instant.

Throughout history, materialists have left a heritage of denial and methods of denial. For example, many materialists today use the words of Lenin quoted above and urge their associates not to listen to or read about this reality. However, the fact that science has clearly explained the nature of matter, together with the fact that it is so easy to use technology such as the internet to diffuse this information throughout the world, has brought their efforts to nothing. Individuals are reading about this reality, learning about it and coming to understand it. Those who have accepted materialism until recently as the most valid worldview now are very surprised to learn the real truth about matter and life in this world. This is an extraordinary trap that God has set for the deniers. No matter how deniers throughout history have set traps for true religion making material idols just to deny God, God, in turn, has prepared an environment where their idols will be taken out of their hands and where they themselves will be caught in the traps they have

set. God reveals how throughout history He has responded to the traps set by deniers.

**... they were planning and God was planning, but God is the Best of Planners. (Surat al-Anfal: 30)**

By giving people the impression that they are in contact with the source of matter, God has made materialists fall into a trap and has humiliated them in a way that has not been seen before. They have regarded as absolute being things composed of illusion—their possessions and property, positions and titles, the society in which they live, in fact, the whole world. And by trusting in these things, they exalt themselves before God. In their arrogance they rebel and go forward in their denials. While doing this, their only strength lies in matter. But they have fallen into such a lack of understanding that they never think that God encompasses and surrounds them. In the Qur'an, God reveals the final condition that deniers will reach as a result of their lack of understanding:

**Or do they desire to dupe you? But the duped ones are those who disbelieve. (Surat at-Tur: 42)**

Materialists have not yet realized that they are moving step by step towards the greatest defeat in their history. For example, when they have discovered that all images are perceptions in the brain, they have not been able to take into account that this will cause the foundation of their belief to collapse. When a materialist scientist, at the end of his researches, discovers that things are not really composed of material substance, as he had believed, he has given a blow to materialist belief with his own hands. In one verse, God reveals that deniers will unconsciously fall into the trap that they themselves have set:

**And likewise in every city We set up its greatest wrongdoers to plot in it. They plot against themselves alone, but they are not aware of it. (Surat al-An'am: 123)**

No doubt, the realization of this fact is the most horrible thing that could happen to a materialist. The fact that everything he owns is composed of illusion is, in his own words, to be sentenced to a living death.

Together with this reality, only God and they are left. In this verse, God points out the fact that everyone is totally alone in His presence.

**Leave the person I created on his own to Me alone. (Surat al-Muddaththir: 11)**

This remarkable fact is also revealed in many other verses:

**You have come to Us all alone just as We created you at first, leaving behind you everything We bestowed on you... (Surat al-An'am: 94)**

**Each of them will come to Him on the Day of Rising all alone. (Surah Maryam: 95)**

In another verse, God reveals that deniers will be addressed with these words on the Last Day:

**On the Day We gather them all together, We will say to those who associated others with God, "Where are the partner-gods, for whom you made such claims?" (Surat al-An'am: 22)**

After this, deniers will see the loss and destruction of all the things they regarded as more important than God, things they thought existed in the world such as possessions, children and all the things around them. God reveals this truth in this verse:

**See how they lie against themselves and how what they invented has forsaken them! (Surat al-An'am: 24)**

The 21st century is a turning point in which this reality will be spread among all people and materialism will be wiped off the face of the earth. Why people believed what they believed in the past or held the opinions they held is not important. What is important is that, after seeing the truth, they must not resist it and not be too late to understand this truth which will be completely understood at the time of death. We must not forget that there is no escape from truth.

## **TIME IS A PERCEPTION, TOO**

At this point in the book it has been explained that matter, thought to be an absolute existent, is actually nothing but a perception—an image experienced by every person in his brain. And it has been shown how important this reality has been for the increase of fear and love toward God, the spread of spirituality and good morals and the collapse of materialism.

There is another concept similar to matter that materialists have considered eternal and absolute—time. But like matter, time is also a perception and is not eternal; there is a moment when it was created. This fact, which has now been established by scientific proofs, was revealed in several verses of the Qur'an.

## **Time Is A Concept That Is Formed From The Comparison Of One Moment With Another**

Time is a concept that depends totally on our perceptions and the comparison we make between our perceptions. For example, at this moment you are reading this book. Suppose that, before reading this book, you were eating something in the kitchen. You think that there is a period between the time when you were eating in the kitchen and this moment, and you call it "time". In fact, the moment you were eating in the kitchen is a piece of information in your memory, and you compare this moment with the information in your memory and call it time. If you do not make this comparison, the concept of time disappears and the only moment that exists for you will be the present moment.

For example, a high school graduation ceremony is something in a person's memory. By comparing other pieces of information in his memory since the graduation, with the present moment, he forms an idea of time and, according to the information in his memory, he determines the length or the shortness of this time. But this sense of length or shortness is completely in his brain, and comes from this comparison.

In the same way, when someone sees a person bend over to pick up a pen that he had dropped on the floor and put it on the table, he makes a comparison. In the moment when the observer saw the person put the pen on the table, that person's bending over, picking up the pen, walking to the table are pieces of information in the observer's brain. The perception of time arises from the comparison of the person putting the pen on the table with these pieces of information.

Renowned physicist Julian Barbour defines time in this way:

Time is nothing but a measure of the changing positions of objects. A pendulum swings, the hands on a clock advance.<sup>40</sup>

In short, time is composed of **a few pieces of information hidden as a memory in the brain; rather, it arises from the comparison of images.** If a person did not have a memory, that person would live only in the present moment; his brain would not be able to make these interpretations and, therefore, he would not have any perception of time.

## **The Views Of Scientists On The Idea That Time Is A Perception**

Today it has been scientifically accepted that time is a concept that arises from our making a definite sequential arrangement among movements and changes. We will try to make this clearer by giving examples from those thinkers and scientists who have established this view.

The physicist Julian Barbour caused a great stir in the scientific world with his book entitled *The End of Time* in which he examined the ideas of timelessness and eternity. He pointed out that the idea that time was a perception was very difficult for many people to accept. In an interview with Barbour reported in *Discover* magazine, these comments are made about time being a perception:

"I still have trouble accepting it" he (Barbour) says. But then, common sense has never been a reliable guide to understanding the universe – physicists have been confounding our perceptions since Copernicus first suggested that the sun does not revolve around Earth. After all, we don't feel the slightest movement as the spinning Earth hurtles through the void at some 67,000 miles per hour. **Our sense of the passage of time, Barbour argues, is just as wrongheaded as the credo of the Flat Earth Society.**<sup>41</sup>

As we can see above, this renowned physicist pointed out that any idea we have of time being absolute is false, and that research done in modern physics has confirmed this. **Time is not absolute; it is a variously perceived, subjective concept depending on events.**

François Jacob, thinker, Nobel laureate and famous professor of genetics, in his book entitled *Le Jeu des Possibles* (The Possible and the Actual) says this about the possibility that time can move backwards:

Films played backwards make it possible for us to imagine a world in which time flows backwards. A world in which milk separates itself from the coffee and jumps out of the cup to reach the milk-pan; a world in which light rays are emitted from the walls to be collected in a trap (gravity center) instead of gushing out from a light source; a world in which a stone slopes to the palm of a man by the astonishing cooperation of innumerable drops of water which enable the stone to jump out of water. Yet, in such a world in which time has such opposite features, the processes of our brain and the way our memory compiles information, would similarly be functioning backwards. The same is true for the past and future and the world will appear to us exactly as it currently appears.<sup>42</sup>

Because our brain works by arranging things in a sequence, we do not believe that the world works as described above; we think that time always moves forward. However, this is a decision our brain makes and is therefore totally relative. If the information in our brains were arranged like a film being projected backwards, time would be for us like a film being projected backwards. In this situation, we would start to perceive that the past was the future and the future was the past and we would experience life in a way totally opposite than we do now.

In fact, we cannot know how time moves or, indeed, if it moves at all. **This demonstrates that time is not an absolute reality but only a kind of perception.**

The fact that time is a perception was proved by the greatest physicist of the 20th century, Albert Einstein, in his "General Theory of Relativity". In his book, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, Lincoln Barnett says this:

Along with absolute space, Einstein discarded the concept of absolute time – of a steady, unvarying inexorable universal time flow, streaming from the infinite past to the infinite future. Much of the obscurity that has surrounded the Theory of Relativity **stems from man's reluctance to recognize that sense of time, like sense of colour, is a form of perception.** Just as space is simply a possible order of material objects, so **time is simply a possible order of events.** The subjectivity of time is best explained in Einstein's own words. "The experiences of an individual" he says, "appear to us arranged in a series of events; in this series the single events which **we remember appear to be ordered according to the criterion of 'earlier' and 'later'.** There exists, therefore, for the individual, an I-time, or **subjective time.** This in itself is not measurable. I can, indeed, associate numbers with the events, in such a way that a greater number is associated with the later event than with an earlier one."<sup>43</sup>

From these words of Einstein, we can understand that the idea that time moves forward is totally a conditioned response.

Einstein himself pointed out, as quoted in Barnett's book: "Space and time are forms of intuition, which can no more be divorced from consciousness than can our concepts of colour, shape, or size."<sup>44</sup>

According to the "General Theory of Relativity", time is not absolute; apart from the series of events according to which we measure it, it has no independent existence.

Our dreams are very important in understanding the relativity of time. In our sleep we experience events that we believe go on for days but actually, we are having a dream which lasts for only a few minutes or even a few seconds.

In order to make this clearer, let us think of an example. Let us think of a specially designed room with one window and that we spend a certain amount of time in it. In the room there is a clock by which we will be able to see the passage of time. Through the window we can see the sun coming up and going down at regular intervals. After a few days we are asked how long we have stayed in the room. Our answer will be calculated by information we have received based on looking at the clock from time to time and on how many times the sun rose and set. For example, we calculate that we have spent three days in the room. But if the person who put us in the room comes and says that we were actually in the room for two days, that the sun we saw in the window was actually artificially produced,

and that the clock in the room was fast, then our calculations would make no sense.

This example shows that our knowledge about the rate at which time passes depends on references which change according to the person who is perceiving it.

This is an example of how under different circumstances a person perceives the same amount of time as longer or shorter. Here is another example. For a person who is waiting for his brother to come out of an operation, one hour seems like several. But if the same person is doing something he really enjoys, he cannot understand how the hour passed so quickly.

Einstein scientifically established the following fact in his "General Theory of Relativity": The rate at which time passes changes according to the speed of a body and its distance from the center of gravity. If the speed increases, time decreases, contracts, moves slower and seems that the point of inertia approaches.

Let us explain this with one of Einstein's thought experiments. Suppose that there are two twin brothers. One of them stays in this world, the other goes on a space journey during which he travels almost at the speed of light. When he returns from space, he will find that his twin brother is much older than he is. The reason for this is that the time passed much more slowly for the brother who went on the space trip. The same example can be thought of in relation to a father who went on a space trip in a rocket traveling at nearly 99 percent of the speed of time and his son who remained on this earth. According to Einstein, if the father was 27 years old and his son was three, 30 earth-years later when the father returned to earth, the son would be 33 and the father would be 30 years old. <sup>45</sup>

The relativity of time is not something that is relative to the speeding up or slowing down of the clock; it comes from the fact that every material system, to the particles at the subatomic level, works at different rates of speed. In an environment where time was slowed down, a person's heartbeat, rate of cell division and brain activity would happen more slowly. In this situation, a person would go about his daily business unaware that time had slowed down.

## **The Concept Of The Relativity Of Time Is Revealed In The Qur'an**

As we explained in previous pages, time is not an absolute reality; with discoveries in modern science it has been definitely proved that it is a relative perception. It is a wonder that this discovery made by science in the 20th century was revealed in the Qur'an 1400 years before.

For example, in some verses, it is pointed out that life is very short. A human life of approximately 60 years is said to be as short as an hour in a day.

**On the Day He calls you, you will respond by praising Him and think that you have only tarried a very short time. (Surat al-Isra': 52)**

**On the day We gather them together—when it will seem if they had tarried no more than an hour of a single day - they will recognize one another... (Surah Yunus: 45)**

In other verses, it is revealed that time is much shorter than people think it is.

**He will say, "How many years did you tarry on the earth?" They will say, "We tarried there for a day or part of a day. Ask those able to count!" He will say, "You only tarried there for a little while if you did but know!" (Surat al-Muminun: 112-114)**

In other verses in the Qur'an it is said that time moves with a different speed in different dimensions. For example, it is revealed that one day in God's sight is equal to a thousand years. (Surat al-Hajj: 47) Other verses speak of this:

**The angels and the Spirit ascend to Him in a day whose length is fifty thousand years. (Surat al-Ma'arij: 4)**

**He directs the whole affair from heaven to earth. Then it will again ascend to Him on a Day whose length is a thousand years by the way you measure. (Surat as-Sajda: 5)**

In the style used in many verses of the Qur'an, it is clearly shown that time is a perception. For example, God speaks of a number of believers (The Companions of the Cave) whom He put into a deep sleep for over 300 years. Later, when He woke them up, these people thought that they had been asleep for a very short time; they could not imagine how long they had been asleep:

**So We sealed their ears with sleep in the cave for a number of years. Then We woke them up again so that we might see which of the two groups would better calculate the time they had stayed there. (Surat al-Kahf: 11-12)**

**That was the situation when we woke them up so they could question one another. One of them asked, "How long have you been here?" They replied, "We have been here for a day or part of a day." They said, "Your Lord knows best how long you have been here..." (Surat al-Kahf: 19)**



The situation referred to in the verse below is an important proof that time is a psychological perception:

**Or the one who passed by a town which had fallen into ruin? He asked, "How can God restore this to life when it has died?" God caused him to die a hundred years then brought him back to life. Then He asked, "How long have you been here?" He replied, "I have been here a day or part of a day." He said, "Not so! You have been here a hundred years. Look at your food and drink—it has not gone bad—and look at your donkey so We can make you a Sign for all mankind. Look at the bones —how We raise them up and clothe them in flesh." When it had become clear to him, he said, "Now I know that God has power over all things." (Surat al-Baqara: 259)**

As we see, these verses clearly reveal that time is relative and not absolute. This means that time changes according to the perceptions of the perceiver; it is not a concrete existent that exists on its own apart from the perceiver.

### **The Relativity Of Time Explains The Reality Of Destiny**

As we see from the account of the relativity of time and the verses that refer to it, time is not a concrete concept, but one that varies depending on perceptions. For example, a space of time conceived by us as millions of years long is one moment in God's sight. A period of 50 thousand years for us is only a day for Gabriel and the angels.

This reality is very important for an understanding of the idea of destiny. Destiny is the idea that God created every single event, past, present, and future in "a single moment". This means that every event, from the creation of the universe until doomsday, has already occurred and ended in God's sight. A significant number of people cannot grasp the reality of destiny. They cannot understand how God can know events that have not yet happened, or how past and future events have already happened in God's sight. From our point of view, things that have not happened are events which have not occurred. This is because we live our lives in relation to the time that God has created, and we could not know anything without the information in our memories. Because we dwell in the testing place of this world, God has not given us memories of the things we call "future" events. Consequently, we cannot know what the future holds. But God is not bound to time or space; it is He Who has already created all these things from nothing. For this reason, past, present and future are all the same to God. From His point of view, everything has already occurred; He does not need to wait to see the result of an action. The beginning and the end of an event are both experienced in His sight in a

single moment. For example, God already knew what kind of end awaited Pharaoh even before sending Moses to him, even before Moses was born and even before Egypt became a kingdom; and all these events including the end of Pharaoh were experienced in a single moment in the sight of God. Besides, for God there is no such thing as remembering the past; past and future are always present to God; everything exists in the same moment.

If we think of our life as a filmstrip, we watch it as if we were viewing a videocassette with no possibility to speed up the film. But God sees the whole film all at once at the same moment; it is He Who created it and determined all its details. As we are able to see the beginning, middle and end of a ruler all at once, so God encompasses in one moment, from beginning to end, the time to which we are subject. However, human beings experience these events only when the time comes to witness the destiny that God has created for them. This is the way it is for the destinies of everyone in the world. The lives of everyone who has ever been created and whoever will be created, in this world and the next, are present in the sight of God in all their details. The destinies of all living things—planets, plants and things—are written together with the destinies of millions of human beings in God's eternal memory. They will remain written without being lost or diminished. The reality of destiny is one of the manifestations of God's eternal greatness, power and might. This is why He is called the Preserver (al-Hafiz).

## **The Concept Of "Past" Comes From Information In Our Memories**

Because of suggestions we receive, we think we live in separate divisions of time called past, present and future. However, the only reason we have a concept of "past" (as we explained earlier) is that various things have been placed in our memories. For example, the moment we enrolled in primary school is a bit of information in our memory and we perceive it therefore as an event in the past. However, future events are not in our memories. Therefore, we regard these things that we do not yet know about as things that will be experienced or happen in the future. But just as the past has been experienced from our point of view, so has the future. But, because these events have not been given to our memories, we cannot know them.

If God puts future events into our memories, then, the future would be the past for us. For example, a thirty year old person has thirty years of memories and events in his memory and, for this reason, thinks he has a thirty year past. If future events between the ages of thirty and seventy were to be put into this person's memory, then, for this thirty year old individual, both his thirty years and the "future" between the ages of thirty and seventy, would become the past. In this situation past and future would be present in the memory, and each one would be lived experiences for him.

Because God has made us perceive events in a definite series, as if there were a time moving from past to future, He does not inform us of our future or give this information to our memories. The future is not in our memories, but all human pasts and futures are in His eternal memory. This, as we said before, is like observing a human life as if it were already wholly depicted and complete in a film. Someone who cannot advance the film sees his life as the frames pass one by one. He is mistaken in thinking that the frames he has not yet seen constitute the future.

## **Past And Future Are News Of The Unseen**

In the verses, God reveals that the only one who knows what is secret, invisible, unseen and unknown is He Himself:

**Say: "O God, Originator of the heavens and the earth, Knower of the Unseen and the Visible, You will judge between Your servants regarding what they differed about." (Surat az-Zumar: 46)**

**Say: "Death, from which you are fleeing, will certainly catch up with you. Then you will be returned to the Knower of the Unseen and the Visible and He will inform you about what you did." (Surat al-Jumu'a: 8)**

**He said, "Adam, tell them their names." When he had told them their names, He said, "Did I not tell you that I know the Unseen of the heavens and the earth, and I know what you make known and what you hide?" (Surat al-Baqara: 33)**

Generally, the word "secret" is thought to refer only to something unknown about the future; however, both the past and the future are secret. Those who have lived in the past and those who will live in the future are kept in God's sight. However, God gives some of the knowledge kept in His sight to the memories of people and makes it known. For example, when God gave knowledge concerning the past in the Qur'an, He told the Prophet Muhammad (may God bless him and grant him peace) that this was news of the unseen:

**That is some of the news of the Unseen which We reveal to you. Neither you nor your people knew it before this time. So be steadfast. The best end result is for those who do their duty. (Surah Hud: 49)**

**This is news of the Unseen which We reveal to you. You were not with them when they decided what to do and devised their scheme. (Surah Yusuf: 102)**

God gave the Prophet Muhammad (may God bless him and grant him peace) information about some things that had not yet happened which was news of the unseen about the future. For example, the taking of Mecca (Surat al-Fath: 27) and the victory of the Greeks over the pagans (Surat ar-Rum: 3-4) were revealed to the Prophet Muhammad (may God bless him and grant him peace) before they happened. The Prophet's (may God bless him and grant him peace) sayings about the signs of the day of resurrection and the end times (which were news of the unseen to people of that time) show that God taught these things to him.

The Qur'an explains that news of the unseen is given to prophets and some devout believers. For example, it was revealed to Joseph that the trap set for him by his brothers will come to nothing (Surah Yusuf: 15), and to the mother of Moses it was revealed that her son would escape the cruelty of Pharaoh and become a prophet. (Surat al-Qasas: 7)

Finally, all that we call past and future is news of the unseen hidden in the sight of God. God gives some of this knowledge to the memories of those He chooses, at a time He chooses, thus making them aware of some of the unseen. The events which become visible and observable are characterized by human beings as being past events.

## **The Importance Of Submission To Destiny**

The fact that past and future are already created in God's sight, and that everything has happened and is present at God's sight, demonstrates a very important truth. **Everyone is in complete submission to his destiny.** Just as a person cannot change his past, so he cannot change his future, because, like the past, the future has already happened. Everything in the future is determined—when and where events will happen, what he will eat, who he will talk to, what he will discuss, how much money he will earn, what diseases he will get, and when, where and how he will die. All these things are already in God's sight and already experienced in His memory. But this knowledge is not yet in a person's memory.

Therefore, those who are sorry, upset, outraged and worried about the future, are anxious in vain. The future they are so worried and anxious about has already happened. And no matter what they do, they cannot change these things.

At this point it is very important to point out that it is necessary to avoid a mistaken understanding of destiny. Some people misunderstand and think that what is in their destiny will happen anyway so there is nothing they can do. It is true that everything we experience is determined in our destiny. Before we experienced an occurrence, it has been experienced in God's sight and is written in all its details in the Mother of the Book (Lawh Mahfuz) in God's sight. But God gives everyone the sense that he can change things and make his own choices and decisions. For example, when a person wants to drink some water, he does not say "If it is my destiny I will drink", and sit down without making any move. Instead, he gets up, takes a glass and drinks the water. Actually, he drinks a predetermined amount of water from a predetermined glass. But as he does this, he senses that he is acting according to his own desire and will. He senses this throughout his life in everything that he does. The difference between a person who submits himself to God and to the destiny created by God, and someone who cannot grasp this reality is this: the person who submits himself to God knows that everything he does is according to the will of God despite the sense that he has done it himself. The other person mistakenly assumes that he has done everything with his own intelligence and power.

For example, when a person who has submitted himself to God learns that he has contracted a disease, knows that the disease is in his destiny and he trusts in God. He thinks that because God has put it in his destiny, it will certainly bring him great good. But he does not wait without taking any measures thinking that if he is destined to get better he will get better. On the contrary, he takes all possible precautions; he goes to a doctor, pays attention to his diet and takes medicine. But he does not forget that the effectiveness of the doctor, the treatment, the medicine, as well as whether or not he will get better are all in his destiny. He knows that all this is in God's memory and was present there even before he came

into the world. In the Qur'an, God reveals that everything that human beings experience is written beforehand in a book:

**Nothing occurs, either in the earth or in yourselves, without its being in a Book before We make it happen. That is something easy for God. That is so that you will not be grieved about the things that may have escaped you or exult about the things that come to you. God does not love any vain or boastful man. (Surat al-Hadid: 22-23)**

For this reason, anyone who believes in destiny will not be troubled or despair about things that happen to him. On the contrary, he will have the utmost trust and confidence in his submission to God. God has determined in advance everything that happens to a person; He has commanded that we not be sorry for the things that happen to us, and be self-satisfied by the blessings that we receive. The difficulties that human beings experience, together with their wealth and success, is determined by God. All these things are in the destiny predetermined by our Lord to test human beings. As it is revealed in one verse, **"... God's command is a pre-ordained decree."** (Surat al-Ahzab: 38)

In another verse, God reveals that **"We have created all things in due measure."** (Surat al-Qamar: 49) Not only human beings but also all things animate and inanimate, the sun, the moon, mountains and trees have their destiny determined by God. For example, a broken antique vase was broken at the moment determined by its destiny. While it was being made, it was determined who would use this centuries-old vase, as well as in which corner of which house and with which other objects it would stand. The designs on the vase and its colors were determined in advance in its destiny. It was known in God's memory on which day, which hour, which minute, by whom and how it would be broken. The first moment the vase was made, the first moment it was placed in the window for sale, the first moment it was placed in the corner of the house, the moment it was broken into pieces, in short, every moment in the centuries-long life of this vase, was present in God's sight as one single moment. Whereas even though the person who would break the vase was not aware that he would break it until a moment before it happened, that moment was experienced and known in God's sight. For this reason, God tells human beings not to be sorry for the things that may have escaped them. What have escaped them escaped in accordance with their destiny, and they cannot change it. People must learn a lesson from what happens in their destiny, see the purpose and benefits that accrue to them from it. They must always incline themselves toward the endless mercy, compassion and justice of our Lord, Who creates their destiny, and spares and protects His servants.

Those who lead their lives heedless of this important reality are always anxious and fearful. For example, they are very worried about the future of their children. They are very concerned about questions such as these: What school will they go to? What profession will they follow? Will they have good health? What kind of lives will they lead? However, every moment of a person's life is determined in God's sight, from the time he is a single cell to the time he learns to read and write, from the first answers he gives in a university exam to what company he will work in during his life, what papers he will sign and how many times he will sign them, where and how he will die. All of these things are hidden in the memory of God. For example, **at this moment**, a person is in the fetal stage, at primary school and at the university. These are all in God's memory as **one single moment**, along with the moment he celebrates his thirty-fifth birthday, the first day he begins his job, the moment when he sees the angels after he dies, the moment when he is buried, and the moment on the Last Day when he will give an account to God.

Consequently, it is pointless to worry and be fearful about a life whose every moment has been lived, experienced and is still present in the memory of God. No matter how hard a person tries and no matter how anxious he may be, everyone, his children, spouse, friends and relatives will live the life that is present at God's sight.

If this is the case, a person of conscience and intelligence who grasps this reality must submit humbly to God and to the destiny He has created. Actually, everyone is already in submission to God, created in subservience to Him. No matter whether he likes it or not, he lives subservient to the destiny created for him by God. A person who denies his destiny is a denier because being a denier is written in his destiny.

Those who submit themselves willingly to God may hope to enjoy God's pleasure and mercy and to win paradise; they will live a life of well being in security and happiness both in this world and in the world to come. This is because, for a person who submits himself to God, knowing that there is nothing better for him than the destiny created for him by God, there is nothing to fear or be anxious about. This person will make every effort, but he knows that this effort is in his destiny and, no matter what he does, he will not have the ability to change what is written in his destiny.

A believer will submit himself to the destiny created by God. In the face of what happens to him, he will do his best to understand the purpose of these happenings, take precautions, and make an effort to change things for the better. But he will take comfort in his knowledge that all these things come to be according to destiny and that God had determined the most beneficial things in advance. As an example of this, the Qur'an mentions measures taken by Jacob for the security of his children. In order to make his sons beware of people with evil intentions,

Jacob advised his sons to enter the city by different gates but he reminded them that this would never influence the destiny determined by God.

**He said, "My sons! You must not enter through a single gate. Go in through different gates. But I cannot save you from God at all, for judgment comes from no one but God. In Him I put my trust, and let all those who put their trust, put it in Him alone." (Surah Yusuf: 67)**

People may do what they like, but they will never be able to change their destiny. This is revealed in this verse:

**Then He sent down to you, after the distress, security, restful sleep overtaking a group of you, whereas another group became prey to anxious thoughts, thinking other than the truth about God—thoughts belonging to the Time of Ignorance—saying, "Do we have any say in the affair at all?" Say, "The affair belongs entirely to God." They are concealing things inside themselves which they do not disclose to you, saying, "If we had only had a say in the affair, none of us would have been killed here in this place." Say, "Even if you had been inside your homes, those people for whom killing was decreed would have gone out to their place of death." So that God might test what is in your breasts and purge what is in your hearts. God knows the contents of your hearts. (Surah Al 'Imran: 154)**

It can be seen in this verse that even if a person runs away from a task in the way of God in order not to die, if his death is written in his destiny, he will die anyway. Even the ways and methods resorted to in order to escape death are determined in destiny and everyone will experience those things that are written in his destiny. And in this verse, God reveals to human beings that the purpose of the things created in their destiny is to test them and to purify their hearts. In the Qur'an it is said that everyone's death is determined in the sight of God and that the conception of a baby happens with the permission of God.

**God created you from dust and then from a drop of sperm and then made you into pairs. No female becomes pregnant or gives birth except with His knowledge. And no living thing lives long or has its life cut short without that being in a Book. That is easy for God. (Surah Fatir: 11)**

In the verses below it is revealed that everything a person does is written sentence by sentence and what those in paradise experience are also things that



have already been experienced. As we said earlier, the real life of paradise is for us in the future. But the lives of those in paradise, their conversations and feasting is in God's memory at this moment. Before we were born, the future of humanity in this world and the next had been experienced in God's sight in a moment and is being kept in God's memory.

**Everything they did is in the Books.  
Everything is recorded, big or small.  
The heedful are amid Gardens and Rivers,  
on seats of honour in the presence of a Competent Sovereign. (Surat  
al-Qamar: 52-55)**

We can understand from this way of speaking in the Qur'an that, in God's sight, time is a single moment and for Him there is no past or future. As we see, some events that will be for us in the future, are understood in the Qur'an as being long passed. This is because both the past and the future are created by God as a single moment. Therefore, an event which is related to occur in the future, in fact, has already occurred, but, because we cannot understand this, we think of them as future. For example, in the verses where the account to be given to God by human beings is described, it is understood as a long passed event.

**And the trumpet is blown, and all who are in the heavens and all who are on the earth swoon away, save him whom God wills. Then it is blown a second time, and behold them standing waiting! And the earth shone with the light of her Lord, and the Book is set up, and the prophets and the witnesses are brought, and it is judged between them with truth, and they are not wronged. Every self will be repaid in full for what it did. He knows best what they are doing. Those who disbelieve will be driven to Hell in companies and when they arrive there and its gates are opened its custodians will say to them, "Did messengers from yourselves not come to you, reciting your Lord's signs to you and warning you of the meeting on this Day of yours?" They will say, "Indeed they did, but the decree of punishment is justly carried out against the unbelievers." They will be told, "Enter the gates of Hell and stay there timelessly, for ever. How evil is the abode of the arrogant!" And those who fear [and respect] their Lord will be driven to the Garden in companies and when they arrive there, finding its gates open, its custodians will say to them, "Peace be upon you! You have done well so enter it timelessly, for ever." (Surat az-Zumar: 68-73)**

Some further examples of this are the following:

**And every soul came, along with a driver and a witness. (Surah Qaf: 21)**

**And the heaven is cloven asunder, so that on that day it is frail.  
(Surat al-Haqqa: 16)**

**And because they were patient and constant, He rewarded them with a garden and garments of silk. Reclining in the garden on raised thrones, they saw there neither the sun's excessive heat nor excessive cold. (Surat al-Insan: 12-13)**

**And Hell is placed in full view for all to see. (Surat an-Nazi'at: 36)**

**But on this day the believers laugh at the unbelievers. (Surat al-Mutaffifin: 34)**

**And the sinful saw the fire and realized they are going to fall into it and find no way of escaping from it. (Surat al-Kahf: 53)**

In the above verses, the events we are to experience after death are described as finished. This is because God is not bound to the relative dimension of time as we are. God has willed all these events in timelessness; human beings have done them, experienced them all and brought them to a conclusion. The verse below reveals that every kind of occurrence, great and small, happens within the knowledge of God and is inscribed in a book.

**You do not engage in any matter or recite any of the Qur'an or do any action without Our witnessing you while you are occupied with it. Not even the smallest speck eludes your Lord, either on earth or in heaven. Nor is there anything smaller than that, or larger, which is not in a Clear Book. (Surah Yunus: 61)**

## **ETERNITY IS HIDDEN IN GOD'S MEMORY**

Some of those who do not completely understand that matter is actually a complex of perceptions formed in the brain fall into error and draw wrong conclusions. For example, some people understand the explanations about matter being an illusion to mean that matter does not exist. Others think that matter exists as an illusion only when we are looking at it, but when we are not looking at it, it does not exist. Neither of these ideas is correct.

First, to say that matter does not exist, or that people, trees or birds do not exist is definitely wrong. All of these things exist and have been created by God. But, as we have explained from the beginning of this book, God has created all

these things as an image or a perception. That is to say, after God created these things, He did not give them a concrete independent existence. Every one of them continues to be created at every moment.

Whether we see them or not, all these things are eternal in God's memory. All those things that have existed before us, and that will exist after us, have already been created by God in one single moment. As has been explained in the earlier chapter, time is an illusion; God created time and He is not bound by it. Therefore, those things that will exist for us in the future have been created in one moment in God's sight and they currently exist. But we cannot see them yet because we are bound by time.

Just as those things we will see in the future (or will exist in the future for us) are present every moment in God's memory, so, in the same way, things in the past do not cease to exist, but are present in God's memory. For example, when you were a fetus in your mother's womb, the day when you started to learn how to read and write, the moment you picked up your first school report, the moment you first drove a car, the time an old lady smiled at you when you gave her your seat on a bus, and other such things you experienced in the past, together with all the moments you will experience in the future, are at this moment in God's memory and will remain there for eternity.

Suppose you kick a stone as you walk along a path. The time when you would kick that stone was determined and created in your destiny even before you were born. The fact that this stone fell off a larger piece of rock, and every stage at which each of its cracks and recesses was formed—all of these were present in the sight of God even before you kicked the stone.

The same thing is true of a dead butterfly you see in a garbage can or a dry leaf falling from a tree onto your head. From the time the butterfly was still a caterpillar to the time it left its cocoon, from the time its wings dried to the time it fell into the garbage, everything was predetermined in its destiny. In God's sight, the living butterfly and the dead butterfly continue to exist and will continue to exist eternally.

## **Everything Is Recorded In The Mother Of The Book**

As we explained in the foregoing section, God created in one moment every event and every creature that we perceive as past and future. In the Qur'an it is revealed that the destinies of every human being and every other creature are hidden in the Mother of the Book:

**And truly, it is in the Mother of the Book, in Our Presence, high in dignity, and full of wisdom. (Surat az-Zukhruf: 4)**

**... We possess an all-preserving Book. (Surah Qaf:4)**

**Certainly there is no hidden thing in either heaven or earth which is not in a Clear Book. (Surat an-Naml: 75)**

In other verses, God says that everything that happens in heaven and on earth is recorded in this book.

**Those who disbelieve say, "The Hour will never come." Say: "Yes, by my Lord, it certainly will come!" He is the Knower of the Unseen, Whom not even the weight of the smallest particle eludes, either in the heavens or in the earth; nor is there anything smaller or larger than that which is not in a Clear Book. (Surah Saba': 3)**

It is revealed in these verses that, since the universe was created, everything animate and inanimate, every event which happens are the creation of God and are therefore in His knowledge. In other words, all these things are in God's memory. The Mother of the Book is a manifestation of God as the Preserver (Al-Hafiz).

## **Past And Future Are Actually Experienced In The Present**

Because time does not exist in the sight of God, all things happen in a single moment, that is in the "present". All events which we think of as past and future are present to God; in His sight everything is much more clear and vital than we can perceive. For example, at this moment Jonah (pbuh) is being cast into the sea as a result of the drawing of lots; Joseph (pbuh) is being thrown in to the well by his brothers; he is eating his first meal in prison and leaving the prison. At this moment Mary is speaking with Gabriel; Jesus (pbuh) is being born. At this moment Noah (pbuh) is driving the first nail into the ark and leaving the ark with his family at the place God chose for them. The mother of Moses (pbuh) is putting his cradle into the water, Moses (pbuh) is receiving his first revelation from God in the bush, he is dividing the sea and the believers are passing through it. At this moment Pharaoh and his army are being drowned as they cross through the sea and Moses (pbuh) is speaking with Khidr, Khidr is repairing the walls of the orphan children. Those who asked Dhu'l-Qarnayn to build a barrier to protect them are at this moment presenting their request and Dhu'l-Qarnayn is building the rampart that was not to be breached until the Day of Judgment. Abraham (pbuh) is at this moment warning his father, breaking down the idols of the pagans, and the fire they threw at him is giving Abraham (pbuh) coolness. Prophet Muhammad (may God bless him and grant him peace) is at this moment receiving a revelation from Gabriel and he is

being taken from Masjid al-Haram to Masjid al-Aqsa. At this moment the people of 'Ad are being destroyed. The dwellers in Paradise are on their thrones engaged in mutual conversation; the dwellers in Hell are being consigned to the flames suffering in great sorrow for which there is no remedy or recourse.

God sees and hears all these things, in this moment, with a far greater clarity than we can imagine. God can hear sounds at frequencies that we cannot hear and He can see things that we cannot see. All the events and sounds that we can perceive and not perceive are all present in the sight of God and experienced at every moment in all their vividness. None of these things is ever lost but continue in God's memory with all their details.

This is also true of all the events in your life. For example, the foundation of the house left to you by your grandfather is at this moment being constructed. Your father is now being born in this house. The moment you first started to talk is happening now. You are now eating the meal you will "actually" eat ten years from now.

The reality that all these examples present us with is this: no moment, no event or no existing thing has ever, or will ever cease to exist. As a film we are watching on television is recorded on a film strip and composed of several frames, and as our not seeing some of the frames does not mean that they do not exist, so it is with what we call "the past" and "the future".

It is very important to understand one point correctly: none of these images is like a memory or a dream. All of them are vivid as if you were experiencing them at this moment. Everything is vitally alive. Because God does not give us these perceptions, we see them as past. And God can show us these images whenever He wants to; by giving us the perceptions proper to these events, He can make us experience the events.

From these examples it can be seen that for God, past and future are both the same. For this reason, nothing is hidden from God, as is pointed out in this verse;

**(Luqman told his son): "My son, even if something weighs as little as a mustard-seed and is inside a rock or anywhere else in the heavens or earth, God will bring it out. God is All-Pervading, All-Aware." (Surah Luqman: 16)**

## **To Those In Paradise Who Desire To See It, God Can Show The Past Just As It Happened**

If a servant of God in Paradise wishes, God can show him things from the earthly life just as they happened. (Surely God knows best) For example, if a person in Paradise asks God to let him see his dead dog alive again, his burned house before it was destroyed, or the Titanic before it sank, God can show it all to him even more vivid than it was before. For example, as the Titanic makes its way on the sea, the fish surrounding it will all be in the same place as at that moment and the passengers will be discussing the same things using the same words. Or ancient great civilizations can be seen in the high point of their splendor and wealth. A person who is curious about the Inca civilization can see any period of this civilization whenever he wishes. Because every event continues to be lived eternally with the same vividness in God's memory, the person who wants to see an event will find everything present the same as it was.

In one verse, God reveals that in Paradise people will have everything they desire:

**... You will have there all that your selves could wish for. You will have there everything you demand. (Surah Fussilat: 31)**

If those in Paradise wish it, God will show them every worldly image and occurrence that will give them sorrow but will make them happy and joyous. This is a great blessing that God has prepared for His worthy servants in Paradise.

## **The Importance Of This Matter For Human Beings**

This matter is of great importance for human beings because everything that happens to us in a day, even things we have forgotten by the time evening comes, the way we act, our attitudes and every thought that crosses our minds are unforgotten and kept in God's sight.

For example, a person gossiping with his friend forgets this; it is not important to him. But that moment when he gossiped remains forever in God's sight. Or if a person has a negative thought about Muslims, that thought, the moment he thought it, the expression on his face and the sentences he used all remain forever in God's sight. Or the self-sacrifice with which a person feeds his friend although he himself is hungry will remain eternally in God's sight together with the circumstances of that moment, and the attitude and the thoughts that were expressed. Or a person who remains patient in a difficulty for God's sake and speaks kind words to the one who is troubling him will not have his fine moral behavior lost, but kept for eternity. And on the Day of Judgment, God will question all the good and evil deeds that a person has committed; those things which people

have done but forgotten will confront them unforgotten and unchanged. Some people will even be surprised that the book they are given in the course of the reckoning is so detailed and they will say,



**The Book will be set in place and you will see the evildoers fearful of what is in it. They will say, "Alas for us! What is this Book which does not pass over any action, small or great, without recording it?" They will find there everything they did and your Lord will not wrong anyone at all. (Surat al-Kahf: 49)**

For this reason, a person aware of this reality must never forget that his every act and thought are locked for ever in God's memory and will continue to exist there; he must take care and fear the Day of Judgment.

## **REPLIES TO OBJECTIONS REGARDING THE REALITY OF MATTER**

Although the issue of the reality of matter is exceedingly straightforward and easy to understand, some people attempt to avoid accepting the only possible conclusion, for a number of different reasons, and pretend not to comprehend it.

Many people who have understood the problem have expressed their extraordinary excitement at learning "the secret behind matter," and how it has changed their lives and way of thinking. Many people try to go deeper into the issue, asking questions to try to understand it better. You can see some of the comments they make in the chapter "Those Who Learn The Secret of Matter Feel Great Excitement."

Others, however, stubbornly deny this extraordinary truth, and put forward various objections of their own in an effort to reject it. Anyone who does reject it has to scientifically demonstrate that images or sounds do not form inside the brain. Yet none of the objections that are put forward, from scientists, professors of neurology, brain experts, psychologists, psychiatrists or professors of biology, in short from anybody at all, deny that our perceptions are formed within our brains. This is because it is a scientifically established fact.

Despite this, some people try to cover the matter up by playing word games or adopting an overblown scientific manner. They try to avoid the evident truth which follows from the statement beginning "Since images form in our brains..." One of the clearest examples of this is the answers given by scientists who are asked whether images form in the brain.

One of these scientists replies: "No, images do not form in the brain. The incoming signals form a representation of a visual experience."

Let us now examine the method this scientist employs to ignore the truth. Asked whether images form within the brain, he starts out with a definite "No." He then follows up by saying that the signals form a representational image which

enables us to see what we are looking at. So he is actually answering the above question in the affirmative. Of course the image in the brain is a "representational one". Our brains can never contain a real table, or sun or the sky. The image we have is a representation, in other words a copy. When we say we can "see the world," we are actually perceiving this "representational world", or "copy", or "imaginary world". These expressions are all different ways of saying the same thing. One scientist, asked whether what we see in our brains is a representational world, answers, "Definitely not. What we see in our brain is a copy of the world." In other words, he first rejects the question asked, but then uses a rather more confused explanation to confirm that we actually do see in our brains. This is a dishonest method resorted to by some scientists who fear that if they accept this truth they will in turn be forced to give matter up, which they believe is the only thing that exists.

Others feel unable to deny that images form in our brains, but because they hesitate to say, "Yes, I see the whole world in my brain," they give a more meandering answer, "The brain simply processes the incoming signals and orders neural activity, that is how you see and hear." Yet in any case, the real subject of discussion is where the image forms once the brain has carried out all its processing. The answer provided by this scientist is not an answer at all but a short account of the stage before the formation of an image. The brain processes the signals, but it does not then send them back to the eye or the ear. For this reason, it is not the eye that sees, or the ear that hears. That being the case, what does the brain do after processing the incoming signals? Where is the processed information stored, and where is it turned into images or sounds? Who is it who perceives this information as images or sounds? When these scientists are asked for answers to questions like these, they try to avoid accepting the truth by offering long, convoluted accounts. Actually, it is a wonder that there is any debate about such an obvious truth at all.

However, all these ways of objecting to or avoiding the issue to hand are feeble and invalid. Until someone who objects to the reality that is described in these pages comes up with scientific facts to disprove that all our perceptions are formed within our brains, what he says will be of absolutely no worth. It is a fact that images and all our senses form in our brains. However, even though someone has clearly grasped this concept, he may still deny that it is God Who forms these images. He may say, 'I don't even like to think about it,' or 'It is uncomfortable to imagine that I can never see actual matter itself,' or "my life does not have any meaning any more." That person may find it unnerving that nothing exists but God. Yet he cannot say that he sees what he does with his own eyes, or that the originals of what he sees exist somewhere outside him. That is because there is no scientific evidence or observation to show that that is the case, and neither can there ever be

any. In any case, even the most determined materialists accept that images are seen inside the brain.

This chapter will mainly be devoted to replying to the objections of those who cannot bring themselves to accept this fact. Reading these objections and the replies to them, you will see that the replies are actually quite evident when examined with honesty and without prejudice.

**Objection:** "When you see a bus coming towards you, you get out of the way to avoid being crushed. That means the bus exists. Why should you get out of the way if you see it in your brain?"

**Reply:** The point where those who ask such questions are mistaken is that they think the concept of "perception" only applies to the sense of sight. In fact, all sensations, such as touch, contact, hardness, pain, heat, cold and wetness also form in the human brain, in precisely the same way that visual images are formed. For instance, someone who feels the cold metal of the door as he gets off a bus, actually "feels the cold metal" in his brain. This is a clear and well-known truth. As we have already seen, the sense of touch forms in a particular section of the brain, through nerve signals from the fingertips, for instance. It is not your fingers that do the feeling. People accept this because it has been demonstrated scientifically. However, when it comes to the bus hitting someone, not just to his feeling the metal of the indoor—in other words when the sensation of touch is more violent and painful—they think that this fact somehow no longer applies. However, pain or heavy blows are also perceived in the brain. Someone who is hit by a bus feels all the violence and pain of the event in his brain.

In order to understand this better, it will be useful to consider our dreams. A person may dream of being hit by a bus, of opening his eyes in hospital later, being taken for an operation, the doctors talking, his family's anxious arrival at the hospital, and that he is crippled or suffers terrible pain. In his dream, he perceives all the images, sounds, feelings of hardness, pain, light, the colors in the hospital, all aspects of the incident in fact, very clearly and distinctly. They are all as natural and believable as in real life. At that moment, if the person who is having that dream were told it was only a dream, he would not believe it. Yet all that he is seeing is an illusion, and the bus, hospital and even the body he sees in his dream have no physical counterpart in the real world. Although they have no physical counterparts, he still feels as if a 'real body' has been hit by a 'real bus.'

In the same way, there is no validity to the materialists' objections along the lines of "You realize that matter actually exists when someone hits you," "You can have no doubt as to the existence of matter when someone kicks your knee," "You run away when you meet a savage dog," "When a bus has hit you, you understand

whether it is in your brain or not," or "In that case, go and stand on the motorway in front of the oncoming traffic". A sharp blow, the pain from a dog's teeth or a violent slap are not evidence that you are dealing with the matter itself. As we have seen, you can experience the same things in dreams, with no corresponding physical counterparts. Furthermore, the violence of a sensation does not alter the fact that the sensation in question occurs in the brain. This is a clearly proven scientific fact.

The reason why some people think that a fast-moving bus on the motorway or an accident caused by that bus are striking proofs of the fact they are dealing with the physical existence of matter is that the image concerned is seen and felt as so real that it deceives one. The images around them, for instance the perfect perspective and depth of the motorway, the perfection of the colors, shapes and shadows they contain, the vividness of sound, smell and hardness, and the completeness of the logic within that image can deceive some people. On account of this vividness, some people forget that these are actually perceptions. Yet no matter how complete and flawless the perceptions in the mind may be, that does not alter the fact that they are still perceptions. If someone is hit by a car while walking along the road, or is trapped under a house that collapses during an earthquake, or is surrounded by flames during a fire, or trips up and falls down the stairs, he still experiences all these things in his mind, and is not actually confronting the reality of what happens.

When someone falls under a bus, the bus in his mind hits the body in his mind. The fact that he dies as a result, or that his body is completely shattered, does not alter this reality. If something a person experiences in his mind ends in death, God replaces the images He shows that person with images belonging to the hereafter. Those who are unable to understand the truth of this now on honest reflection will certainly do so when they die.

**Objection:** "It is true that I see all objects in my mind, but I am seeing things that actually exist outside."

**Reply:** The fact that we perceive the whole world in our brains has been definitively established by science, and no right-thinking person can claim anything to the contrary. However, the point that people fail to understand is this: If we perceive all things in our minds, then how can we be sure of the existence of things outside our minds? This doubt is valid: We never can be sure that there do exist physical counterparts of the things we perceive in our minds. That is because we can never step outside our brains and see what is really out there. That is why it is impossible to claim that the images in our brains really correspond to things in the outside world. Nobody—not the person making the claim, nor a neurologist, nor a

brain surgeon, nor a philosopher, nor anyone else—has ever been able to step out of his own brain to see what there is outside it.

Everything that a person knows about his life is perceived by the brain by means of the electrical signals reaching it. In other words, we always live in the worlds that exist within our own brains. The birds we see when we look at the sky, the car about to disappear from sight at the other end of the street, the things in our rooms, the book in our hands, our friends, relations and everything else—all of these are copy images that reach our brains. Nobody can step outside this life within the brain. Neither science nor technology can be of any assistance in doing so. That is because whatever a scientist may invent, he still invents it within that image in his brain. For that reason, the object he invents to see the outside world with still remains inside his brain.

Although the truth of this is perfectly clear, some people still maintain that the images they see still correspond to physical realities in the outside world. They believe in "matter" (even though they have never seen matter itself), and they ignore the fact that matter is nothing but a name people give to the illusions they see. It is not possible for anyone to know what matter actually looks like, because nobody has ever come face to face with the original of anything. From the time of the first man right up to today, not one human being has ever heard the original of any sound, nor seen the original of any view, nor enjoyed the original smell of a rose.

We must also remember this: Anyone who claims that there is a physical world that exists beyond our perceptions still needs eyes with which to see that world. And that outside world will turn into an electrical signal when it passes through his eyes, and those electrical signals will create an image inside his brain. Consequently, that person will still be seeing the world inside his brain. If the nerves leading to that person's brain are severed, the image of the world that he maintains exists "outside" will also suddenly cease. That being the case, what is the point of insisting on something the original of which we can never see, and which can be of absolutely no use to us even if it does exist?

**Objection: "Matter exists outside my brain. The pain when a knife slips and cuts my hand and the blood that flows from it are not an image. What is more, my friend was with me and saw it happen."**

**Reply:** We actually considered the reply to this objection in the previous answer. Given the importance of the subject, however, it will be beneficial to run over it one more time.

Those who say this kind of thing ignore the fact that not only sight, but other senses such as hearing, smell and touch also happen inside the brain. That is why

they say, "I may see the knife in my brain, but the sharpness of the blade is a fact, just look how it has cut my hand." However, the pain in that person's hand, the warmth and wetness of the blood, and all the other perceptions still form within the brain. The fact that his friend may have witnessed the incident changes nothing, because his friend is also formed in the same visual center of his brain where the knife is formed. This person could also experience the same feelings in a dream—the way he cut his hand with a knife, the pain in his hand, the image and the warmth of his blood. He can also see in that dream the friend who saw him cut himself. Yet the existence of his friend does not prove the physical existence of what he sees in his dream.

Even if someone came up just when he was cutting his hand in that dream and said: "What you are seeing is just perceptions, this knife is not real, the blood flowing from your hand and the pain in it are not real, they are just events you are witnessing in your mind," the person will not believe him, and will object. He might even say: "I am a materialist. I do not believe in such claims. There is a physical reality in everything I am now seeing. Look, can't you see the blood?"

Those who insist that matter does actually physically exist outside are like the person we have just been considering. In the world of perceptions they live in, they hear the words, "All these things are perceptions, and you can never reach the original sources of these perceptions, nor can you know whether these originals even exist or not," yet they violently oppose this truth.

Yet we must not forget that nobody who cuts his hand just says, "This is only an image" and sits down without doing anything about it. That is because God has created effects binding people to the images they perceive. For instance, someone who cuts his hand puts something on it, bandages it or goes to the doctor. However, all of these processes again happen as images in the brain. The bandage and the medicine he puts on are all images that form inside the brain.

**Objection: "Is saying that matter is an illusion we perceive in our minds compatible with Islam?"**

**Reply:** Some Muslims suggest that the fact that matter is an illusion is not compatible with Islam, and maintain that religious scholars in the past rejected this fact. That is not actually the case, however. On the contrary, what we are saying here is in complete conformity with the verses of the Qur'an. Many of the verses that imply matter is an illusion are exceedingly important for a definite understanding of subjects revealed in the Qur'an, such as heaven and hell, timelessness, infinity, resurrection and the hereafter.

Unquestionably, even if he is unaware of this subject, a person can still live in complete faith. He can have faith, with all his heart and feeling no doubt, in what

God has revealed in the Qur'an. We must still make it clear, however, that an awareness of this subject allows such a person to deepen his faith and certainty. A number of Islamic scholars of the past looked on the matter from that same point of view. The only factors that prevented what they had to say from being widely spread and known were 1) the fact that the level of science when they lived was unable to totally clarify the subject and 2) the existence of trends that were apt to lead to its being misunderstood.

The most important of those Islamic scholars who explained the true nature of matter was *Imam Rabbani*, who has been widely respected in the Islamic world for hundreds of years and is seen as "the greatest reformer of the 10th century according to the Muslim calendar." In his book *Letters*, Imam Rabbani provides a detailed commentary on this very subject. In one of his letters, Imam Rabbani says that God created the entire universe at the level of perception:

I have used the following sentence above, "God's creation is at the sphere of senses and perceptions." This means "God's creation is at such a sphere that at that sphere, there is no permanency or existence for objects apart from senses and perceptions."<sup>46</sup>

On close examination, Imam Rabbani is careful to emphasize that the world we see, in other words all that exists, has been created on the level of perception. All that exists outside this level of perception is the Being of God. Actually, this concept of "outside" is a hypothetical one, because a perception has no body, and takes up no volume. Imam Rabbani explains that things (in other words, matter) have no existence on the outside:

**Nothing but God exists on the outside... Perhaps all of Almighty God's creation finds constancy on the sphere of perception...** In the same way that matter has no existence in the outside world, it appears on the outside in a colorless form... **If it does have a fixed appearance, that is again only on the perceptual level.** It only has permanency **thanks to God's artistry on that one level.** In short, it only has permanency and appearance on one level. It does not have existence on one plane and appearance on another... It contains no sign on the outside that might allow it to be seen there...<sup>47</sup>

As a result, as we can see from Imam Rabbani's clear exposition, either by referring to science or by thinking with our powers of reason, we reach the conclusion that **we can never know whether there is an actual physical counterpart corresponding to what we perceive.** All we can see is the image presented to us in our minds. It is God, the Lord of all the Worlds, who creates this image and presents it to us.

The great Islamic scholar **Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi** also believes that the only thing that has definitive existence is God, Who has created the whole universe only on the perceptual level. He is known as "The Greatest Master" (Shaykh al-Akbar) on

account of the depth of his knowledge, and in his work *The Essence of Wisdom* (Fusûs al-Hikam), he reveals that the universe is but a shadow existence consisting of what is manifested by God:

I say that you must know that apart from God, all that exists, or everything in the universe, stands in the same relation to God as a shadow to a man. That being the case, everything apart from God is but His shadow... **There is no doubt that the shadow exists in perception.**<sup>48</sup>

Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi offers a clear reply to those who see themselves as having an existence independent of God, who believe that they enjoy a separate existence:

As I have explained to you, the world is a concept. It has no real existence. That is what illusion means. You have thought to yourselves that the world is something that intrinsically exists: That its existence depends on itself, and that it exists independent of God. However, that is not the case. Do you not see that the shadow derives from its owner and since it is connected to him, it is seemingly impossible for it to separate it from its owner... This being so, you must know that you are but a dream. **All that you perceive, and all that which you say is "separate from the Lord" or "it is not me" is also but a dream. All that exists does so within a dream. God is the only One to possess true existence in its very essence.**<sup>49</sup>

As Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi's words demonstrate, man is something that possesses the soul God has breathed into him, a manifestation of God. God is all that really exists, whereas man is a dream. This is a most important truth, and we would be making a grave error to believe the opposite.

Alongside these two, **Mawlana Jami** also expresses this astonishing truth, that he came by from signs in the Qur'an and by using his own powers of reason, in the words; **"Whatever exists in the universe is but a perception. It is like a reflection in a mirror, or a shadow".**

As we have seen, great Islamic thinkers have made this truth perfectly clear, and for this reason it is not credible to claim that it conflicts with the Qur'an and the Sunnah, or that it is rejected by the world of Islam. What is more, it must not be forgotten that it is a scientifically proven fact, which nobody can deny, that we see all that we do in our brains. Because this was not scientifically known in past times, it is quite natural that some Islamic scholars should not have referred to it. Furthermore, the fact that matter is an illusion has been described in a perverted way by some circles, who have tried to do away with the rules and laws of religion in this way. On account of these twisted and dishonest views, some Islamic scholars have issued warnings against these dangers. However, these comments have deviated from the truth. They should not be compared with the comments we have seen above.



In fact, Imam Rabbani mentions those philosophers who depart from the truth when discussing the subject of matter. He stresses that what he says is very different to their twisted views. He says the following in his *Letters*:

When I refer to the world as "imaginary," I do not mean that it is made and shaped by the imagination... Of course, **what it really means is that God has created the world on the perceptual level...** An imaginary thing has no true appearance or body... This can be likened to a circle created by the fast cycling of a point. It also has an appearance, but not a body...

On the other hand, **philosophers who are comprised of a group of lunatics actually talk about something else.** What they mean is that the world is the work of imagination and it is shaped by the imagination. **There is a great difference between the two.**<sup>50</sup>

**As Imam Rabbani has made clear, the ancient Greek sophists said that "matter is a perception we have created ourselves." This view is rationally and scientifically flawed, and departs from true religion. As we have stressed from the very beginning, the truth is that matter is a perception created by God.**

It is a grave error to confuse this false view of those philosophers, with the explanation given here by Islamic scholars that "matter is a perception created by God."

**Objection: "If everything is an illusion, how can we explain some of the attributes of God?"**

**Reply:** Some believers think that when we accept the true nature of matter, a curtain is brought down on many of the names of God, and that if matter is simply an illusion, the manifestation of some of those names cannot be explained. This is again an error that stems from shallow thinking and failure to understand the nature of the subject.

First of all, no force or idea can draw a curtain over any of the names of God. No scientific truth can prevent the manifestation of any of these names. It is God Who creates these truths in the first place. God is not bound by the things and laws He creates. For this reason, no power or knowledge in the world can do away with any of these manifestations. Even thinking such a thing would be failing to appreciate the infinite might of God.

Furthermore, the fact that matter is but a perception that forms in our minds is an important proof that, contrary to what these people may think, the manifestation of the names of God takes place at all times and in all places. That is because, just like a film, this image which forms on the perceptual level cannot come about of

itself, and there must be something that displays it, and that means a Creator which brings it into being.

The fact that the image is permanent and unbroken is clear evidence that our Creator continues His act of creation at all times. In fact, one verse says that the earth and the sky (in other words, the universe) are not fixed and unvarying, that they only exist by virtue of God's creation, and that they will cease to exist when that creation ceases:

**God keeps a firm hold on the heavens and earth, preventing them from vanishing away. And if they vanished no one could then keep hold of them. Certainly He is Most Forbearing, Ever-Forgiving. (Surah Fatir: 41)**

In the Qur'an, sura 27, verse 64, God reveals that He "**originates creation and then regenerates it**". In another verse, He draws attention to the fact that people are at every moment being created:

**Do they make things into partner-gods which cannot create anything and are themselves being created? (Surat al-A'raf: 191)**

In other words, **the reason for the permanent and unbroken nature of the images we see, is not that they have a fixed and material existence, but that God creates them at every moment.** So the manifestation of God's continuous creation can be seen at every moment, in everything a person sees or feels.

In consequence, this truth makes the manifestation of the attributes of God in the universe even clearer. For example, someone who knows that when he goes into a garden all the fruit, flowers and trees are actually images being presented to him in his own mind will recall that it is God, the **Provider (al-Razzaq)**, who gives him countless blessings and beauties, and who shows these images to him. Someone with a pleasant house who knows the true nature of all the furniture, antiques, gold and silver in it, in other words who realizes that they are all images in his brain, can never brag about his possessions. Just like the Prophet Solomon (pbuh), he identifies God, the **Giver (al-Vahhab)** as He Who shows the beauty of these possessions to him and makes him wealthy by means of it. Or, when someone convinces another of the existence and oneness of God, that He is the only Absolute Being, together with the existence of heaven and hell, he thus sees the manifestation of God's attribute of He Who reveals the true path, the **Guide (al-Hadi)**.

We must here recall that it is a scientific fact that everyone sees the images, hears the sounds that accompany them, and feels their physical properties in his

brain. We can never know, by means of our perceptions, what lies outside our brains, and whether these objects have any actual counterparts there. We can be sure, however, that there is a power as the result of which we see these images and hear these sounds, and who creates them in a relationship of cause and effect. That force is God. If He did not create these images for us, there would be no life in this world. In this way, God's creation and the manifestation of His attributes continue at every moment. For instance, God continues to create this book and the words in it, together with the colors in the pictures it contains, for whoever reads it.

This shows to us God's attribute of Creation (al-Khaliq), and the power of His creation. At this very moment, God is showing the billions of people on earth billions of separate images. Each of these images is created without pause, in perfect harmony, and down to the finest detail. Every individual is shown images without the tiniest error of detail. Thinking of this wonder will demonstrate God's infinite might and that He is the only Ruler of the Worlds.

When saying that matter was created on the level of perception, Imam Rabbani explains that the names of God are also manifested on the level of perception:

... The Glorious God **assigned an appearance from all appearances for names from all names in the sphere of non-existence with his Perfect Might. And He created it at the sphere of sensations and perceptions.** At the time He willed and in the way He willed... **The constancy of the world is not at the exterior level but at the level of sensations and perceptions...** Even in the exterior, there is nothing permanent and existing other than the being and attributes of the Almighty God...<sup>51</sup>

It is impossible for anyone who comprehends this truth to swell up with pride because of his success, wealth, property and titles. Since at every moment, in every place, he knows there is a manifestation of the name of God, and that he is perceiving an image that God is causing in him, he can never forget how helpless and needy he is in the face of God.

He believes in the truth stated in the verse below as "Haqq-al yakin" or with truth of certainty:

**Mankind! you are the poor in need of God whereas God is the Rich Beyond Need, the Praiseworthy. (Surah Fatir: 15)**

**Objection: "This is an old philosophy that was once put forward by the idealists"**

**Reply:** Because some people are very uncomfortable at the true explanation of matter, they try to compare the truth that matter is an illusion we perceive in our

brains to earlier philosophies. Developments in the sciences, however, reveal that this is a scientific fact, not a mere philosophical speculation. So these peoples' efforts are all in vain.

Besides, the fact that other thinkers in other times have supported an idea neither disproves nor makes it worthless. The fact that matter is a perception has been understood and stated by people in earlier as well as our own times.

Furthermore, the ideas of the idealists of the past were not disproved by the materialists who emerged later. Therefore, saying, "This idea has been expressed in the past" proves nothing.

**The idea that we perceive the world in our brains is not a philosophical speculation:**

The true facts about matter are not something that has been discovered for the first time, although it is true that in the past they were discussed only in the form of a philosophical speculation. However, the facts have now been scientifically proved.

Many thinkers, religious scholars and scientists throughout history have brought this subject up and explained that matter is really a collection of perceptions. For instance, ancient Greek philosophers such as Pythagoras, the Elea School and Plato—with his allegory of the cave—have looked at the subject from that aspect. Documents that have come down to us show that religions such as Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Taoism, Judaism and Christianity have all discussed the matter. Prominent Islamic scholars such as Imam Rabbani, Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi and Mawlana Jami have also discussed the essence of matter in the same way. However, it is the Irish philosopher Berkeley whose ideas on the subject need to be given the most detailed discussion.

Berkeley said that matter was a totality of perceptions. He came in for fierce attacks from the materialists of the time who believed that matter enjoyed a physical existence, and who tried to silence him by insults and slander. A materialist, Bertrand Russell did the same thing. Although Russell is one of the thinkers that materialists have the greatest faith in, and although he is seen as a great supporter of the materialist viewpoint, he was unable to refute what Berkeley said. In his book *The Problems of Philosophy*, he described the situation in these terms:

...Berkeley retains the merit of having shown that the existence of matter is capable of being denied without absurdity, and that if there are any things that exist independently of us they cannot be the immediate objects of our sensations.<sup>52</sup>

However, because of the lack of scientific facts at the time when they lived, neither Berkeley nor other thinkers were able to support their views with empirical evidence. As a consequence, it was not possible for the matter to be completely

understood or widely discussed, particularly given the pressure from those who held the opposite view. Some of these incorrectly evaluated the truth they had discovered, and even though they came close to the truth, they were unable to draw the correct conclusions. Others with hidden agendas tried to drag the matter in a completely erroneous direction.

### **The Essence of Matter is a Scientific Fact:**

In our time, however, the "perception of matter in the mind," is no longer a matter of philosophical speculation, but has turned into a fact backed up by scientific proof. Advances in the world of science have revealed the functioning of man's sensory organs. As we saw at the beginning of this book, this functioning is the same for every sensory organ. The signals coming to our sensory organs from the outside world are turned into electrical signals by our cells and forwarded to the perception centers in our brain by our nerves. So man sees, hears, smells, tastes or touches the world in tiny perception centers in his brain.

These scientific facts are now completely clear, and can be found in any book on physiology or high school biology textbook. The way images and perceptions form in the brain is now taught in a detailed manner in medical schools. As our knowledge has advanced, sciences such as physics, quantum physics, psychology, neurology, biology and medicine have clarified the factual details of the process.

For instance, the theoretical physicist Dr. Fred Alan Wolf, who has attracted considerable attention with his research and has written eight award-winning books, explains that quantum physics in particular has revealed that the world we see is actually an illusion:

...there is something beyond all materialism, beyond the physical world, out of which all reality, the whole of existence, projects. This would overwhelm traditional dualism – and I take this view not as a mystic but as a quantum physicist. I think that our most modern understanding of the physical world suggests that there may be an ineffable realm, a mystical realm, an "imaginal" realm, out of which the physical world pops into existence. Kind of like what [the German physicist and pioneer of quantum mechanics] Werner Heisenberg suggested when he brought the notion of consciousness into physics – when he said that it's the observer who creates the observed simply by the act of observation... I see reality differently. Reality to me is more like a dream – I see a dreaming reality. **I envision a dreamer, or a great spirit, of which we're all a part... And I think that using this model we can achieve some real scientific breakthroughs, rather than attempting to reduce everything down to the simplest level.**<sup>53</sup>

This scientist has seen the fact that the material world is actually an "illusion" in the light of scientific discoveries, and is only one of the scientists who have done so. Those who reject this evident scientific truth do so for ideological reasons, not

scientific ones. That is because these scientists do not wish to accept this fact, knowing as they do that it will completely undermine the materialism to which they are so stubbornly attached. In fact, Dr. Wolf makes it clear that this reality will exclude any possibility of materialism.

When we consider the scientific results that have been obtained, there is no credibility in treating the fact that we perceive the outside world in our brains as a philosophical speculation. **It is not a philosophical speculation at all, but a scientific fact clearly revealed by scientific discoveries.** It is a fact that everyone lives within, and which nobody can deny. Everyone, religious or not, knows that unconditionally, and even if someone does reject it, that rejection is meaningless.

**Objection: "Is the subject of the truth of matter the same as the idea of the unity of being (Wahdat al-Wujud)?"**

**Reply:** It is true that the idea of the unity of being is something that many Islamic scholars of the past have discussed while considering some subjects that appear in this book. However, what is being discussed here is not exactly the same as the unity of being.

Throughout history, many scholars and thinkers have explained this principle. Some of them, however, have been led astray by a false idea, and have seen the things that God has created as totally non-existent. However, to say that matter is an illusion formed inside our brains does not mean that "none of the things we see exist." That is **because all the things we see, the mountains, meadows, flowers, people, seas, in short everything we see, everything whose existence God has described in the Qur'an, has been created and does exist. However, each and every one exists as an image.**

Everything created by God exists whether we see it or not. It has in any case been created, and as we have seen, it will continue to exist under the memory of God from the moment it is created until the moment it dies. (For further information see *Eternity Has Already Begun* by Harun Yahya).

As a result of this, the fact that matter is an illusion in our minds does not mean it does not exist. But this fact does tell us something about the true nature of matter i.e. that it is a perception.

**Objection: "How can anyone love something he knows to be an illusion? If we accept that everything is an illusion formed within our minds, how are we to love our mothers, fathers, friends and the prophets?"**

**Reply:** A person asking this question does not know, or has not understood that he is also an illusion. Whereas he accepts his friends and family as illusions, he accepts himself as absolute. However, like those close to him, he is also an illusion. The body he sees and touches, like those of those he loves, is an image that forms inside his brain.

Furthermore, the fact that such peoples' friends and family are also perceptions in their minds does not prevent them being loved. If someone loves his family and friends because of their corporeal or material existences, then that is in any case a false love. True love consists in loving someone because of the features manifested in him by God. For instance, although we have never seen the Prophet Muhammad (may God bless him and grant him peace), we feel great love and affection for him because we know that many of the attributes of God, such as The Supporter (Al-Wali), The Sovereign Lord (Al-Malik), The Generous One (Al-Karim), The Trustee (Al-Wakil), The Guide (Al-Hadi) are manifested in him. Yet the only source of this love we have for the Prophet Muhammad (may God bless him and grant him peace) is the love and affection we feel for his true Lord, God.

Muslims love people, and all other things too, because of their love of God, and because all of these things are a manifestation of Him. For instance, a Muslim who loves a young gazelle, does so because God's compassion and love are manifested in it, because the lovable qualities God has created in the animal please him, and its appearance inspires a feeling of compassion in him. He does not love the animal itself, or any other creature, on its own as an independent entity.

A Muslim feels no independent love or ties for any person or thing. The origin of all love is the love of God. One Qur'anic verse says, "... **besides God, you have no protector and no helper,**" and stresses that man has no other friend than God. (Surat al-Baqara: 107) Another verse asks, "**Is God not enough for His servant?**". (Surat az-Zumar: 36) That being the case, those we love cannot be our friends and parents independently of God. For that reason, the fact that all our family and friends are perceptions in our mind just reinforces that truth. When we love our mothers, what we actually love are the qualities of God that He manifests in her, The Merciful (Ar-Rahim), the Compassionate (al-Rauf) and the Protector (al-Asim). Alternatively, when we love a brother believer, we really love the pleasing morality that God manifests in him. Since we hope that his character and nature will be pleasing to God, they are also pleasing to us. Since we see that he loves and fears God, we also take pleasure in this faithful image that God has created. For that reason, when we love someone, whether they have a separate physical existence or not, we are really loving God, and our love and affection for that image are really love and affection for their true source, God.

Those people who love others independently of God, as having an independent existence distinct from Him, are making a grave error. According to the Qur'an, love

and devotion are only to be felt for God, and other things are loved for their manifestations of Him. God has the following to say about those who love people and ascribe to them an independent existence:

**Some people set up equals to God, loving them as they should love God. But those who believe have greater love for God. If only you could see those who do wrong at the time when they see the punishment, and that truly all strength belongs to God, and that God is severe in punishment. (Surat al-Baqara: 165)**

As it says in the verse, to ascribe to people or things a force outside the existence of God means to consider them the equals and partners of God. However, nothing that exists has the power to do anything or carry out any action apart from God. In many verses of the Qur'an, people are warned about ascribing powers to anything else than God:

**Those you call on besides God are servants just like yourselves. Call on them and let them respond to you if you are telling the truth. Do they have legs they can walk with? Do they have hands they can grasp with? Do they have eyes they can see with? Do they have ears they can hear with? Say: "Call on your partner-gods and try all your wiles against me and grant me no reprieve. My Protector is God Who sent down the Book. He takes care of the righteous." Those you call on besides Him are not capable of helping you. They cannot even help themselves. If you call them to guidance, they do not hear. You see them looking at you, yet they do not see. (Surat al-A'raf: 194-198)**

As is clearly stated in the above verses, it is not possible for anyone other than God to help anyone else. Not even a person's parents, children or friends, whose existence he assumes throughout the course of his life, can actually do anything to help him. Help from friends and family only happens by the will and permission of God. It is not even possible for someone to help himself outside the will of God. It is even impossible for anyone to walk, see or feel, in short to survive, if that is not the will of God.

Neither must we forget that things and people, of whose external existence we can have no idea, but which some people claim to have physical existence in the external world, will be taken away from those who make such suggestions in the hereafter. As the Qur'an has revealed, everyone will be called to account all alone. In other words, in the same way that everyone is actually alone with God in this



world, so he will be called to account in the same way after death. God states this in a verse;

**You have come to Us all alone just as We created you at first, leaving behind you everything We bestowed on you. We do not see your intercessors accompanying you, those you claimed were your partners with God. The link between you is cut. Those you made such claims for have forsaken you. (Surat al-An'am: 94)**

When looking at a friend, for instance, everyone sees the image of a friend that God creates in his mind. If the nerves to his brain are cut, the image of his friend will disappear. It is only God Who is Living and Eternal. So how, in that case, can anyone be attached to anything, the original of which he can never establish contact with, and which only exists in his mind? It must not be forgotten that it is only God Whom a person must love and submit to.

**Objection: "A person wants his loved ones to be as real and permanent as he is."**

**Reply:** Some of those who object to this matter say: "A person wants his friends to be as real and permanent as he is. How can they be any different?"

Such statements show that these people have not understood what we have been saying about the true nature of matter, or else have not thought deeply enough about it. People who say such things are not "real and permanent" as they believe themselves to be, so they cannot expect their loved ones to be real and permanent. When one considers the matter, a person will understand that his own body is merely an image that God shows to his soul.

When some people feel their bodies, feel pain when they cut their fingers, or meet some of their bodies' physical needs, this may give them the feeling that their bodies have a true physical existence. However, a person's own body is actually a perception, just like everything else, and nobody can ever know whether his body has a physical counterpart outside his perception of it. For example, the pain when one cuts one's finger is again a perception. So is the feeling of fullness one enjoys after eating something. Artificial signals from outside the human body can also produce the same feelings. However, nobody can ever be sure of his own body's physical existence. It is the soul that God has given to man that feels pains or understands the words on a page, for that reason, the individual himself is also a manifestation of God. These people are not real and permanent, as they would believe.

**Objection: "To conclude that the universe is a collection of perceptions means abandoning enquiry into how the universe functions, in other words science."**

**Reply:** This is a form of objection generally put forward by materialists, and is used to show this subject as opposed to science and intended to negate it. However, it is clearly false and invalid.

God shows us the images we experience within ourselves as united by a network of cause and effect relationships, all linked together by laws. The images that form in our brains of night and day, for instance. We perceive night and day as being linked to the Sun and the movement of the Earth. When the image of the Sun in our minds is at its height, we know that it is noon, and when the Sun goes down, we witness the fall of night. When creating perceptions belonging to the universe, God created them together with a cause and effect relationship. We never experience daytime after the Sun has gone down. Thus science is the observation and study of this cause and effect relationship that God has created in our minds.

Let us consider another example: In the illusion within our minds, whenever we let a pen go, it falls to the ground. As a result of research into the cause and effect relationship that governs these kinds of occurrences, we discover "the law of gravity." God presents the images he shows us in our minds as linked to particular causes and laws. One of the reasons for the creation of these causes and laws is that life is created as a test. Science is born as a result of research into the order within which these laws and the collection of perceptions called the "universe" function. That is why it is very important to study science, the laws that appear to govern the extraordinary images that God has created.

In conclusion, there is no justification for materialist claims that accepting the fact that matter is perception means rejecting science. On the contrary, those who genuinely accept the fact see science as an important way of understanding this collection of images, and the secrets within them.

There is a great difference between this conception of science and that of the materialists. The laws of nature that we have discovered by observing the totality of images in question are the laws of God, Who created that same totality. The view of science held by materialists, who think that matter has a real existence, that the laws of nature stem from matter itself, and that it is these laws which actually created them, collapses in the light of this truth.

Neither must we forget that God possesses the power to create all these perceptions without the need for any cause or law. For example, God can create a rose without using a seed, or rain without the need for clouds, or shadow and day and night without the Sun. God reveals this fact in a verse:

**Do you not see how your Lord stretches out shadows? If He had wished He could have made them stationary. Then We appoint the sun to be the pointer to them. Then We draw them back to Ourselves in gradual**

**steps. It is He Who made the night a cloak for you and sleep a rest, and He made the day a time for rising. (Surat al-Furqan: 45-47)**

As we have seen in this verse, God reveals that He first created shadow, then the Sun as a cause of it. Dreams are an example that can help us to understand this creation better. Although our dreams have no material counterpart, we still perceive the light and warmth of the Sun. From that point of view, dreams are indications that perceptions of the Sun can be created in our minds without its actually being there.

However, within this test, God has also provided humans with a reason for everything. Day is caused by the Sun, and rain by clouds. All of these are images that God creates individually in our minds. By creating a cause before an effect, God enables us to think that everything functions within specific rules, and thus enables us to carry out scientific enquiry.

**Objection: "Is there not a contradiction between describing the being of God with the proofs of His existence in nature on the one hand, and saying that the physical world, put forward as a proof of His existence, does not exist on the other?"**

**Reply:** Some people who have not fully understood the essence of matter suppose that the statement "The physical world consists of a collection of perceptions" means "Nothing exists." However, saying that matter is a totality of perceptions or an image we perceive in our brains is not the same as saying that matter does not exist. There is a physical universe, but it exists only as a totality of perceptions. Just like our dreams, it exists solely on the perceptual level.

Matter's existence on the perceptual level is very definite proof of the existence of God. That is because since nothing that exists on the perceptual level (just like an image) can possibly create itself, that shows there must be a Creator who brings it into being. Thus, the fact that the physical universe is only an image is concrete proof of the existence and oneness of God. For that reason, there is no contradiction between matter's being an image and existing things manifesting the existence of God. Quite the contrary, one is a logical consequence of the other.

God has created everything that exists. However, He has created them all as images. Examining and studying the properties of these image-objects demonstrates proof of the superiority of God's creation, His art and His infinite knowledge. As a result, there is no contradiction between saying that matter is a totality of perceptions and then studying the properties of these perceptions and seeing the greatness, and might of God.

It must also be made clear that some people think that God only exists as long as there exist beings that think about Him (God is surely beyond that), and as a result of this a grave error, put forward a number of objections. However, if God wished He could eliminate all the images that He has created, and destroy all that exists, yet He would still exist. That is because He is infinite and timeless. Several verses draw attention to the fact that God can destroy whatever He wishes at any time:

**Mankind! if He wanted, He could remove you altogether, and produce others instead. God certainly has the power to do that. (Surat an-Nisa': 133)**

**Mankind! you are the poor in need of God whereas God is the Rich Beyond Need, the Praiseworthy. If He wills He can dispense with you and bring about a new creation. That is not difficult for God. (Surah Fatir: 15-17)**

It is a very important fact that even if God did destroy everything that exists, what counts would still be His own existence. God existed before anything else, and will continue to exist even if everything else ceases to exist. This is revealed in a verse:

**Everyone on it will pass away; but the Face of your Lord will remain, Master of Majesty and Generosity. (Surat ar-Rahman: 26-27)**

**Objection: "If we accept this account, then there can be no concepts of lawful or unlawful."**

**Reply:** This is a completely unrealistic claim. The fact that the physical world forms in our perceptions does not do away with the secret of the test. Whether matter exists as a perception or outside our minds, what God has said to be forbidden is forbidden, and what is lawful is lawful. For example, God has forbidden the eating of pork. Saying, "Pork is only an image in my mind" and then going on to eat it is evidently hypocritical and unintelligent. Alternatively, saying "These people are just images in my mind, so it does not matter if I lie to them" is not something that anyone who fears God and has understood what we are discussing could ever do. That applies to all the limits, commands and prohibitions imposed by God. The fact of what we are discussing does not do away with giving alms, for instance. The fact that the alms we give exist in the minds of the people we give them to does not mean we need not perform this obligation. God has created the whole world as

a totality of perceptions, however, within these perceptions we are still charged with abiding by what the Qur'an has revealed.

In the past, some people twisted this truth to try and do away with the concepts of lawful and unlawful. However, they already possessed a twisted belief system, and they may have wanted to use this truth for their own ends. Yet it should be understood that the conclusion they arrived at was incorrect.

In conclusion, anyone who honestly considers the situation will clearly see that, for the purposes of the test which God gives us, it is not necessary that matter exists. God has created this test within the world of images. There is no basis to the suggestion that matter needs to exist for someone to pray or distinguish between what is lawful and unlawful. Furthermore, the important thing is the soul. It is the soul that will be punished or rewarded with blessings in the hereafter. For that reason, the fact that matter is a perception in our minds does not prevent us doing what is lawful and avoiding what is unlawful or carrying out our religious obligations.

At this point, we need to be clear that those who claim they have no responsibility for images will say, "We thought we were not responsible, that is why we are here," when they are sent to Hell. These people, even though they will understand that Hell is an image, in the same way as this world is, will still suffer its torments forever.

**Objection: "Everybody says leaves are green when they look at a tree. Since everyone describes this tree in the same way, that means it does not exist in my mind alone."**

**Reply:** What people around us call green, we also call green. However, is the color they call green the same green we see in our minds, or do they refer to what we see as blue, and call it green? There is no way we can ever know. As we have already seen, there are no colors outside our mind. There are only different length light waves outside, and it is our brains which process these into colors. Thus colors form within us, and no one else can ever see the color we see in our brains.

This is a subject that has been discussed by many philosophers and scientists, and the latter have agreed that "We can never say whether someone else sees the rose which we see as red in the same way as we do, or whether what we see as blue he refers to as red." This applies to perceptions, not just colors. Daniel Dennett, for instance, expresses his thoughts on and interest in the subject:

Locke discussed it in his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), and many of my students tell me that as young children they hit upon the same idea for themselves, and were fascinated by it. The idea seems to be transparently clear and safe:

"There are the ways things look to me, and sound to me, and smell to me, and so forth. That much is obvious. I wonder, though, if the ways things appear to me are the same as the ways things appear to other people."

Philosophers have composed many different variations on this theme, but the classic version is the interpersonal version: How do I know that you and I see the same subjective color when we look at something? Since we both learned our color words by being shown public colored objects, our verbal behavior will match even if we experience entirely different subjective colors – even if the way red things look to me is the way green things look to you, for instance.<sup>54</sup>

Drew Westen, a professor of psychology from Harvard University, says that from the scientific point of view we can never know whether somebody else perceives a rose in the same way we do:

If perception is a creative, constructive process, to what extent do people perceive the world in the same way? Does red appear to one person as it does to another? If one person loves garlic and another hates it, are the two loving and hating the same taste, or does garlic have a different taste to each? The constructive nature of perception raises the equally intriguing question of whether, or to what extent, people see the world as it really is. Plato argued that what we perceive is little more than shadows on the wall of a cave, cast by the movement of an unseen reality in the dim light. What does it mean to say that a cup of coffee is hot? And is grass really green? A person who is color-blind for green, whose visual system lacks the capacity to discriminate certain wavelengths of light, will not see the grass as green. Is greenness, then, an attribute of the object (grass), the perceiver, or some interaction between the observer and the observed? These are philosophical questions at the heart of sensation and perception.<sup>55</sup>

As we see, the fact that we make the same definitions, or call the colors by the same name, does not mean that we see the same things. To compare the perceptions of people is absolutely impossible, because everyone sees a distinct world within his brain which belongs to him alone. The next objection includes yet another explanation pertaining to this objection.

**Objection: "I am in a garden with two friends, and the three of us see exactly the same things. If what we each see in our minds is the same, that means that there must be originals of these things outside our minds."**

**Reply:** The fact that you and other people see the same things is no confirmation of the claim that there is a physical counterpart of what you all see. That is because you also see your companions in your mind. For example, when strolling with your friends in a fruit garden, in the same way that the apples,

apricots, colored flowers, the sounds of the birds, the warm breezes, and the smells of the fruit and flowers all form in your brain, so do your friends, and the things you all talk about. In other words, your friends are walking in the garden you see in your mind, not one in the outside world. So the fact that your friends see the same things as you does not mean that there is a physical counterpart of all that you see.

When you watch a match in a stadium full of people, the fact that thousands of people see a goal being scored at the same time and react to it at the same moment is no proof of the physical existence of the stadium, the players, the referee nor the thousands of people in the stands. The players, fans, cheering and everything else you see there all take place inside your brain. The player who scores a goal and the fans who rejoice at it are all inside you. You rejoice at a goal scored in your mind, and clap and cheer with the crowd in your brain. In conclusion, the fact that the people you see alongside you confirm what you see does not mean that what you see has any physical counterpart in the external world. No matter what their number is, the people you say are "right beside" you, are actually in your brain.

**Objection: "We perceive the external world as it actually is so there isn't any abnormality in our behavior. For instance, when we come to a cliff, we stop instead of keeping on and walking over the edge."**

**Reply:** This objection shows that the questioner is seriously confused, and has not understood what is being said. That is because the objection rests on the following claim: "There is a physical world out there. However, everybody sees that world differently in his own mind." This person thinks that such a claim is being made, and goes on to object to it, thinking that he disproves the claim by saying: "There is a material reality out there, and we see it as it is. Nobody sees it any differently. The proof of this is that when there is a cliff edge out there we see it as such, and stop walking."

However, the fact under discussion here is very different from what that person supposes. One case says, "There is an outside world, but we see this world differently from how it truly is." The other says, "We perceive all that we experience in our minds, and we can never make direct contact with any sort of original independent entity. For that reason we can never know whether these originals exist in the external world, or not."

The fact that we do not walk over the edge of a cliff does not mean that we see the external world as it really is. When we walk along a straight path and then stop at the cliff edge, we are walking along a path in our brain, and see the cliff edge in our brain. In fact, even if we do fall off the edge of the cliff, we still perceive doing so in our brains. That happens in exactly the same way as when a bus hits us,



or a dog bites us, as we have seen above. When we fall off the cliff, the pain of any injuries or broken bones we suffer still forms in our brains.

**Objection: "There is no doubt that God shows us these images in order to test us. However, why should God, the Creator of all actions, bring about such a test?"**

**Reply:** Naturally, God has no need to test people to see their attitudes, since it is our Lord who has created all events, times and places. God is not constrained by time and place. What for us are the past and future have been lived and come to an end in an instant in His sight. However, God allows us to experience these tests and causes so that people should witness their own attitudes and understand why they go to heaven or hell. Someone who knows that God is his friend—that He is infinitely just, compassionate and loving— will accept this creation of His.

God shows us things that have already happened in His sight. He gives people the feeling that they are doing these actions themselves, of their own free will. Within that feeling, He announces by means of the Qur'an that we are responsible for everything He reveals. That responsibility is to obey all of our Lord's commands. We can learn beyond this only if God wills. If He wishes, God can reveal this secret and wisdom to us either in the world or in the hereafter. Or if He wishes, never at all. As stated in a verse, **'they cannot grasp any of His knowledge save what He wills'**. (Surat al-Baqara: 255) Whatever happens, God is our Lord and Protector. It is therefore our duty to trust in Him, who gives us so many blessings, and to be pleased with everything He creates.

Some people in the past have grasped the truth about the essence of matter, yet because their faith in God and their understanding of the Qur'an have been weak, they have produced deviant ideas. Some have said, "Everything is an illusion, so there is no point in worship." Such ideas are twisted and ignorant. It is true that everything is an image presented to us by God. However, it is also true that God charges us to abide by the Qur'an. What we have to do is to carefully abide by His commands and prohibitions.

In the Qur'an, God reveals that He has provided very little information about the soul. God has created this image of a test for a certain cause:

**We will test you with a certain amount of fear and hunger and loss of wealth and life and fruits. But give good news to the steadfast. (Surat al-Baqara: 155)**

**You will be tested in your wealth and in yourselves and you will hear many abusive words from those given the Book before you and from those**

**who associate others with God. But if you are steadfast and do your duty, that is the most resolute course to take. (Surah Al 'Imran: 186)**

There is considerable wisdom within this test. One of these is that we are tested and then sent to heaven or hell for all eternity as a result. Further wisdom could lie in the way people can witness what they do throughout their lives, and see why the morality by which they have lived should lead them to heaven or hell at the Day of Judgment. But God knows best. All we can do is to pray that He will reveal His knowledge to us.

**Objection: "From what we have seen so far, our perception will continue even after death. Will that last forever? Are heaven and hell nothing but totalities of perception?"**

**Reply:** God has created the people in such a way that we can only perceive the world by means of images presented to our souls. In other words, we can still see the images presented to us, whether there is a real physical world out there or not. However, after death God will create the individual in a different manner, although we can never know what that is.

Nevertheless, the fact that heaven and hell are experienced as perceptions does not in the least detract from the pleasure received from the former, nor the suffering from the latter. In the same way that someone in this world feels pain when he burns his hand, so he will also feel the reality of this perception in the hereafter. As has already been mentioned, feelings such as pain are also perceived in the brain. However, this perception, which everybody experiences, has been created to be exceedingly realistic, just like all our other perceptions. People can even faint from the violence of the pain they feel. In the same way, some images can cause people intense discomfort, even though they are created as perceptions in our minds. For instance, an unpleasant sight or sound, or a bad smell can cause great discomfort. The fact these are perceived in the brain changes nothing. **Therefore, even though hell will be presented to the soul as a perception, that fact does nothing to lighten the torment that will be experienced there.** In the same way that God creates the life of this world to be so clear and convincing that people assume it to be "a definite fact," He has the power to do exactly the same thing in the hereafter. God reveals in several verses that the torments of hell are quite unbearable:

**... My punishment is the Painful Punishment. (Surat al-Hijr: 50)**

**We will make those who disbelieve suffer a severe punishment and repay them for the worst of what they did. That is the repayment of the enemies of God - the Fire. They will have it for their Eternal Home as repayment for their renunciation of Our Signs. (Surah Fussilat: 27-28)**

The same thing applies to heaven. Everything a person enjoys or which gives him pleasure is a perception that forms in his mind. Someone enjoying a conversation with his best friend, for instance, is in reality doing so in his mind. Or someone enjoying the magnificent sight of a waterfall, and listening to the roaring of the water, is actually seeing sights and hearing sounds in his mind. There is no question about that. Yet that does not stop him enjoying that image. That is why God reveals in the Qur'an that heaven represents supreme achievement for people, and that it contains everything their souls will take pleasure from:

**But those who heed their Lord will have Gardens with rivers flowing under them, remaining in them timelessly, for ever: hospitality from God. What is with God is better for those who are truly good. (Surah Al 'Imran: 198)**

**Their Lord gives them the good news of His mercy and good pleasure and Gardens where they will enjoy everlasting delight, remaining in them timelessly, for ever and ever. Truly there is an immense reward with God. (Surat at-Tawba: 21-22)**

**As for him whose balance is heavy, he will have a most pleasant life. (Surat al-Qari'a: 6-7)**

Furthermore, someone who knows that it is God Who allows him to see these delightful images will take even greater pleasure from the fact. For example, someone who picks an apple from a tree, with its lovely smell and pleasing appearance, and thinks of God Who has created that smell and appearance for him, will enjoy that image even more than other people. God will prepare different images of heaven for each believer, and the best examples of whatever a believer's soul craves will be given to him there. In this world and in the hereafter, a person's only friend, protector and Creator is God. All the prophets, apostles, devout believers, houris and others that he will see with him in heaven are beings that form the clearest manifestation of God's friendship, love and closeness.

It is quite evident that God allows us to receive this totality of perceptions throughout our lives. An honest person who realizes this can feel no doubt about His justice, flawless creation, and that He creates the best and most beautiful of

everything. God will also create heaven and hell as perceptions. Yet that fact does not change the promises God makes in the Qur'an. While a person is offered the greatest joys and pleasures for all eternity in heaven, the terrible suffering in hell will also last for all eternity. God's creation is flawless, and He keeps His promises.

**Those are people from whom We accept the best of what they have done and pass over their evil deeds. They are among the Companions of the Garden, in fulfillment of the true promise made to them. (Surat al-Ahqaf: 16)**

As verses make clear, heaven exists at this very moment in the sight of God. He has created heaven and hell, and both of them exist, in time and form, in His sight.

**Objection: "Can we never directly experience absolute existence? I am uneasy at knowing that I exist only in a world of perceptions."**

**Reply:** Only God exists absolutely. Whatever else we see is a manifestation of God. People generally assume that they and others do physically exist, and that God permeates them, a bit like radio waves. (God is surely beyond that) Yet the truth is the exact opposite of that. In other words it is only God Who exists. We must not be deceived by the fact that we cannot directly see His Being. Wherever anyone turns, whoever he looks at, whatever he is actually seeing is the manifestations of God.

Furthermore, far from making someone uneasy, this fact should give even greater happiness to anyone who believes in God. It is a great honor that God is all that exists and that we, His servants, are illusions. That fact is cause for rejoicing. It multiplies the awe we feel for our Lord, and our submission to His infinite might.

It is also an important statement that people will naturally be freed from their worldly desires, and that will allow them to worship God without attributing any partners to Him. That is because saying "Something else must exist besides God," is actually attributing an equal to Him, and claiming that there is another power outside that of God. However, that can never be the case with a true believer. Such a person has no fear of anything but God. When he comes by any strength or power, he knows that these really belong to God. When a doctor finds a cure for his sickness, he praises God as the One who has really supplied the cure. He knows that the doctor is just an agent for the cure God has caused to come about.

God always creates the most beautiful and best of everything. That fact must never be forgotten. In one verse, God reveals:

**Return to your Lord, well-pleasing and well-pleased! (Surat al-Fajr: 28)**

A person must always be content with every event that God creates. In that case it can be clearly understood how this truth we are discussing can bring people closer to God. What is more, when the Qur'an is read again with this truth in mind, the wisdom in many of the verses can be more readily appreciated.

It is true, however, that someone who does not believe in God, who is trapped by his worldly desires, who has no hope of the hereafter, and who holds materialist views, could be made terribly uneasy by this situation. It is truly disappointing and crushing for such people to understand that all the things they desire, all the people they assume to have absolute existence, are really just illusions. When they understand the truth, they will see that they have spent all their lives chasing illusions, and wearing themselves out in vain with their desires. They will see that they wasted their energies in denying the truth. They will be truly saddened by that, and even humiliated.

They will also suffer grave disappointment in the hereafter from assuming that all such illusions were truly real.

**Those are the people who have lost their own selves. What they invented has abandoned them. Without question they will be the greatest losers in the hereafter. (Surah Hud: 21-22)**

Yet, the fact that everything is an illusion, that God is all that truly exists, is a source of great joy to anyone who accepts God as his only friend and protector, and who genuinely loves Him.

**Objection: "Is the end of this world of perception nothingness? Can people remain in that nothingness?"**

**Reply:** One of the things that prevent people from thinking about this subject is that they are frightened of remaining in complete nothingness. When they consider the implications of this, they realize that what they think they touch is actually nothing at all. However, nothing apart from the will of God can remove any of the causes that He has created to test us in this world. These causes will continue to be created until the moment of our death.

We will continue to undergo such tests as feeling the hardness of a table, seeing our blood when we cut our hand, pain, suffering, fear and sickness. The fact that we live in a world of nothing but perceptions will not do away with our close connection to such causes. Even when we die, there will still not be nothingness. As

God has revealed in the Qur'an, we will begin a new life of different dimensions and causes. There is no reason to think that we will end up in nothingness. Since God has created human beings in this environment which tests us, He will continue to provide us with perceptions. That is in fact what He reveals in the Qur'an. When our perceptions in this world cease, perceptions of the hereafter will start, and we will never feel ourselves to be in nothingness.

**Objection: "Can someone who understands that everything is an illusion continue to be tested in this world?"**

**Reply:** This is a very important subject. Some people suggest that the test will come to an end when this truth is finally understood. However, that is a dishonest idea. As we have already seen in other replies, the test will continue as long as we live.

Even though God causes us to live in this world of perceptions, He also links the world to all its many causes and effects. For instance, when we are hungry we eat something. We do not say, "It is all an illusion, so it does not matter." If we do not eat, we grow weak and eventually die. God can remove these causes and effects whenever He wishes, for whoever He wishes, by whatever means He wishes. We can never know when or why He will do this. However, this is a most important truth: God charges us with abiding by the whole of the Qur'an, and we continue to live in the sphere of causes in order to abide by the divine commandments in it. For example, God commands people to do good and avoid evil. He orders defenseless women and children to be spared cruelty and suffering. In the Qur'an God asks "Why are you not fighting in their name?" It would be completely wrong and dishonest to adopt an attitude rejecting these responsibilities that God has placed on our shoulders.

On the contrary, someone who is aware that it is God Who shows him everything that goes on will feel an enormous obligation in response to every image he sees. Unlike many people, he will always try to support good and prevent evil. That responsibility can never be passed on to others, and no excuses to the effect of "Let someone else do a bit, I've done all I can" are acceptable. Someone who knows the true facts of the situation will say, "If God is showing me this image, then He wants me to find a solution, and I am responsible for doing so."

In conclusion, everyone must do all he can to carry out the responsibilities laid on his shoulders in the Qur'an. Knowing the true nature of matter -and coming by a view of the world in accordance with that nature- further strengthens all our efforts to gain God's good pleasure, and increases our determination many times over.

**Objection:** "Is it really true that God is everywhere? Does His sovereignty not lie in the heavens?"

**Reply:** Some people believe in the existence of themselves, matter, and the world they see around them. They think of God as an illusion that somehow surrounds this existing matter. (God is surely beyond that) Or, since they cannot see God with their own eyes, they say "God must be somewhere we cannot see, in space, or somewhere far away in the sky." That is an enormous mistake.

God is everywhere, not just in the heavens. As the only thing that truly exists, God permeates all the universe, all people, and all places. Wherever you turn, the face of God is there. It is wrong according to the Qur'an to say that God's sovereignty lies only in the heavens, because He is everywhere. As we have seen in earlier sections, it has been revealed in several verses of the Qur'an that God is everywhere, closer to us than our own bodies, and that wherever we turn we see the face of God. For instance, He says **"... His Footstool encompasses the heavens and the earth..."** (Surat al-Baqara: 255) Another verse stresses that there is no doubt that the Lord encircles all that people do:

**"... But my Lord encompasses everything that you do! " (Surah Hud: 92)**

As is revealed in the Qur'an, God is not solely in the heavens. God is everywhere. This truth has been given us by means of the Qur'an.

The explanation of the secret behind matter will enable people to understand these verses better. Those people who see that matter has no absolute existence will understand that God is everywhere, that He sees and hears them every moment, that He witnesses everything and is closer to them than their own bodies, and that He hears every prayer offered to Him.

## **Conclusion: Hell Is The Home Of Argument**

In the Qur'an, God draws attention to human beings' argumentative natures, **"We have variegated throughout this Qur'an all kinds of examples for people, but, more than anything else, man is argumentative!"** (Surat al-Kahf: 54) Some people pretend not to understand the simplest truths, no matter how clear they are, especially if they think these truths conflict with their own interests. They go into unnecessary detail, ask pointless questions that can never lead to any definitive conclusion, and reveal an argumentative nature. On account of that character trait, some people throughout history have argued with all the prophets and messengers chosen by God, and put forward unrealistic arguments to oppose the clear truth that has been given to them. The aim behind this opposition

was not a genuine desire to learn the truth, but rather a wish to make difficulties so they could ignore it.

We must exclude here those people who ask questions out of a genuine desire to learn the truth, consider and understand it. Of course it is totally reasonable and necessary to ask questions about this very important subject, and to refer to those who know more about it, since most people will have come across it for the first time in their lives and it will completely change their ways of looking at the world. It is also evident that people who ask questions out of a genuine desire to understand are different from those who are simply argumentative and skeptical and lack all understanding. The people we are talking about here are those who refuse to see the truth, and who have grown used to argument and denial.

God describes the state of mind of such argumentative types in a verse:

**They retort, "Who is better then, our gods or him?" They only say this to you for argument's sake. They are indeed a disputatious people. (Surat az-Zukhruf: 58)**

One of the examples of stubborn and argumentative people given in the Qur'an is Pharaoh. Although the prophet Moses (pbuh) explained the whole truth to him quite clearly, he asked a question that had nothing to do with what the prophet had been saying, the answer to which could not possibly do him any good. This is the question he asked the Prophet Moses (pbuh) when told about the existence of God:

**He said, "What about the previous generations?" (Surah Ta Ha: 51)**

It is evident that Pharaoh only asked the question to start an argument. There was no sincere desire to learn in it, and he thought in his own feeble mind that the Prophet Moses (pbuh) would have no answer. However, the prophet immediately understood why he asked it, and gave him a clear reply:

**He said, "Knowledge of them is with my Lord in a Book. My Lord does not misplace nor does He forget." (Surah Ta Ha: 52)**

Naturally, argumentative and denying natures are not restricted to Pharaoh and similar types who lived in the past. A large part of people today are always ready to start an argument about subjects that clash with their own interests, and particularly about religion. They do not really want to understand a subject that is perfectly obvious if approached with a measure of honesty. This is immediately clear from their attitudes and the questions they ask. Subjects such as destiny and the nature of matter in particular, such as we have been considering in this book,



are some that people most often try to ignore. For that reason, questions asked about these subjects are often inspired by a wish to convince themselves such things are not true, rather than a sincere inquiry into the truth. For instance, those who ask, "If everything is an image, what is the purpose of carrying out our religious duties?" cannot realize what a meaningless question that is. The only reason they suggest the fact that man is created as an image should stop him praying, or the fact that food is an image should stop some things from being unlawful, is simply to raise an objection, without thinking about the matter at all. Their sole aim, which lacks any logic, is to refuse to accept the truth.

Believers, however, immediately accept the truth when they see it, and abide by it. They say, "We have heard and obeyed," as the Qur'an puts it. When argumentative types ask them questions, they give clear replies without getting drawn into polemics. God has revealed that believers give this kind of reply when questioned by those who want to have an argument:

**Say, "Do you argue with us about God when He is our Lord and your Lord? We have our actions and you have your actions. We act for Him alone." (Surat al-Baqara: 139)**

Those who argue with true believers, who refuse to understand that God is all that truly exists and that they themselves actually belong to God, thus rejecting obvious truths, and who question the existence of heaven and hell, the compassion of God, and His justice with illogical questions must understand the following: They will continue these arguments for all eternity in hell. Qur'anic verses describe hell as a place of eternal argument and conflict:

**Arguing in it with one another, they will say, "By God, we were plainly misguided" (Surat ash-Shu'ara': 96-97)**

**When they are squabbling with one another in the Fire, the weak will say to those deemed great, "We were your followers, so why do you not relieve us of a portion of the Fire?" Those deemed great will say, "All of us are in it. God has clearly judged between His servants." (Surah Ghafir: 47-48)**

As we have seen in the above verses, the deniers will continue to argue even in the flames of hell. In other verses, Allah reveals the following about those who try to provoke believers, and cites their words:

**They will say, "Our Lord, give him who brought this on us double the punishment in the Fire!" They will say, "How is it that we do not see some men whom we used to count among the worst of people? Did we turn them into figures of fun? Did our eyes disdain to look at them?" All this is certainly true - the bickering of the people of the Fire. (Surah Sad: 61-64)**

The souls in hell will still continue to argue in those dark and narrow places, under the iron cudgels and the boiling water poured over them, as their skins melt from the heat of the flames. The pointless debates will go on forever, and they will keep asking each other why they are suffering these torments. They will continue to fall out over God and the believers:

**Here are two rival groups who disputed concerning their Lord. Those who disbelieve will have garments of fire cut out for them, and boiling water poured over their heads, which will melt the contents of their bellies as well as their skin, and they will be beaten with cudgels made of iron. Every time they want to come out of it, because of their suffering, they will be driven back into it: "Taste the punishment of the Burning!" (Surat al-Hajj: 19-22)**

However, they will never be able to come to any conclusion from these debates. Those who argued over the truth in this world, and thus ignored it, will continue arguing in the pains of hell, in great sorrow, which will never cease.

The continuation of this debate among the companions of hell is a sign that not even when they see the fires of hell will those who do not believe come to understand the truth of what they are talking about. They will continue to deny, even among the torments of hell:

**Those in the Fire will say to the custodians of Hell, "Call on your Lord to make the punishment less for us for just one day." They will ask, "Did your Messengers not bring you the Clear Signs?" They will answer, "Yes." They will say, "Then you call!" But the calling of the disbelievers only goes astray. (Surah Ghafir: 49-50)**

It is clear that explanations and reminders given these people will be of no benefit, since they will continue to refuse to call on to their Lord even in the fires of hell and to be swollen with pride. No matter how many examples are given them, no matter how much proof, they still will not understand. God reveals how some people will never believe in another verse:

**They have sworn by God with their most earnest oaths that if a Sign comes to them they will believe in it. Say: "The Signs are in God's control alone." What will make you realize that even if a Sign did come, they would still not believe? (Surat al-An'am: 109)**

For that reason, we must not be surprised if some people refuse to accept the truth of what we have been discussing here, no matter how clear and evident it is. Their stubbornness in the face of the truth is actually a revelation from God.

# CONCLUSION

## THE TRUTH CANNOT BE AVOIDED

An increasing number of people are coming to accept this truth, which changes people's fundamental ideas and obliges them to have faith in God. Accepting this truth enables people to love and willingly abide by all the features of that pleasing morality revealed in the Qur'an, and removes all evil feelings—such as competitiveness, hatred and enmity—and replaces them with love, compassion and humility, which is the true nature of matter. Those who say, **"How is it that it took me so long to realize a truth so obvious and simple as this?"** are in the majority.

It is very important that anyone who understands this one truth should tell others about it. It enables people to definitively grasp other difficult subjects, such as destiny, time, death, the resurrection, heaven and hell. Everyone who does this will both enable others to understand the Qur'an better and more quickly, and will be a means whereby people turn rapidly to the true path.

God has given the glad tidings that when nothing is associated with Him, when only He is worshipped, when only He is accepted as the one deity and the one power, then the morality of the Qur'an will rule on the earth:

**God has promised those of you who believe and do right actions that He will make them successors in the land as He made those before them successors, and will firmly establish for them their religion with which He is pleased and give them, in place of their fear, security. "They worship Me, not associating anything with Me." Any who disbelieve after that, such people are deviators. (Surat an-Nur: 55)**

For the morality of the Qur'an to hold sway all over the world, the most important condition is for people to believe that there is no other power than God. The subjects discussed in this book need to be thoroughly understood in order to get rid of such polytheistic ideas as thinking that matter has an absolute existence outside God, that He can only permeate matter in an illusory manner, to see God as an entity just as abstract as intelligence, to imagine that human beings have a power other than God, that people can change their destiny if they choose, or that time and place are absolute. Those who ask why the matter is so important and why we devote space to this subject at every available opportunity in all our books, should think some more about it.

God is the only being to exist absolutely. He sees and hears us as we read or think about this book and knows the secrets of our hearts. God surrounds us from every direction. **God exists absolutely. It is we His servants who are abstract. This fact is a source of great joy and beauty to all who love God and realize that they are His servants.** It cannot be right for Muslims to seek to avoid this truth. Muslims must accept the truth with all their hearts, not diminish themselves in the sight of God by ignoring it. God issues a warning to His believing servants in the Qur'an:

**Do not mix up truth with falsehood and knowingly hide the truth.  
(Surat al-Baqara: 42)**

We must not forget that the revelation of this truth will be a means whereby materialism will be overthrown, and spirituality and pleasing morality will rule the earth. People in materialist circles who realize this are very uneasy when this truth is revealed, and resort to the most ridiculous and desperate means to prevent it from reaching peoples' ears. This is because they know it will undermine the entire basis of their philosophy. However, the truth about matter has now been revealed in complete clarity and openness. This truth, which used to be just a philosophical speculation because of the lack of scientific evidence, has now been totally validated scientifically. Frederick Vester, for instance, who grasped the truth of the matter, has this to say,

The statements of certain thinkers that "man is an image, everything experienced is temporary and deceptive, and this universe is a shadow," seem to be proven by science in our day.<sup>56</sup>

All materialist squirming is to no avail. Now that knowledge can be communicated all over the world in the blink of an eye, this truth that they have tried to hide from peoples' eyes for hundreds of years is now being read, learned **and explained everywhere, from Guyana to England, America to Indonesia, Singapore to Sweden, and even in the strongholds of materialism, Russia, China, Cuba and Albania.** Materialism is falling apart with the greatest collapse in history. That is because it has today been realized that we can never approach the original of matter. We cannot know whether it exists outside our minds. It is totally illogical to build a philosophy on something that nobody can ever see. **If we can never have a direct relationship with matter, then there can be no materialism.**

This important fact, which makes it easier to understand a number of signs and subjects in various verses of the Qur'an, completely demolishes the superstitious and antireligious belief that is materialism. This is a major development. God states in the Qur'an:

**Rather We hurl the truth against falsehood and it cuts right through it and it vanishes clean away! Woe without end for you for what you portray! (Surat al-Anbiya': 18)**

As is revealed in this verse, when the truth comes to replace falsehood, matter, which is the brain of materialism, which is a false ideology, also disappears. No materialist has the slightest chance of holding back or changing this fact.

## **THOSE WHO LEARN THE TRUTH ABOUT MATTER FEEL GREAT EXCITEMENT**

The letters below are from people who read about 'The Secret Behind Matter,' in previously published books. These extracts from these letters contain only their thoughts after learning the truth.

- Everyone who reads this work will understand that matter has no meaning in the true sense, and is actually just an illusion. The fact that matter is an illusion is so enormous that it seems almost impossible to describe it. For instance: Can you imagine the excitement felt by someone who dies and returns to life? Or the ineffable excitement felt by someone who flies through the air, walks through a wall, or is in several places at the same time? Yet this matter is not comparable even to those miraculous states. The word extraordinary is mild in comparison. Even to say that it is wonderfully strange and exciting is insufficient. It is an incomparable manifestation of God's deep and sublime art. Yet what I do not understand, how was it that something so easy to grasp was hidden from man's understanding for so many years? How did mankind fail to realize it? Or else were those who did realize frightened, and so chose to tell nobody? I read it once and immediately understood. Everything is perfectly obvious... K.H.G. Frankfurt

- We must immediately tell this truth, which shocks man's reason, to everyone. What are we waiting for? Is it not perfectly clear? We must immediately use all possible means to tell the world about it. This truth will bring people closer to God. In my view, this is a truth that will rock everything in the world to its foundations. I can find no other words to say. My respects to you, and may God have you in His keeping.' F.E. Ankara

- I read the chapter "The Secret Behind Matter" at the back of The Evolution Deceit. There is one thing I did not understand. It is something rather odd. What is this thing, this me, inside me? What a great secret this is. I wonder when people will ever understand it. It is perfectly clear, and not hard to grasp at all. Why did it take us so long to understand? When everyone in the world understands it, I think there will be countless revolutions in science. I do not know what to call this situation. I

was amazed, stunned. I gave thanks to the great God. I now understand everything better. Yet I find it rather difficult to explain it to others. Some people fail to understand. They say they are standing in front of me. Yet when they say so, I am an image in their brains. That person thinks I am outside. I am now simply wondering how better to explain by amazement. I am waiting for this subject in your new book. If the examples are all taken from daily life, it will be easier to explain things to others. S.K. Muğla.

- Dear Mr. Yahya, I have read 'The Secret Behind Matter' in your books many times. My view is that matter is definitely an illusion. This is something wondrous, that life is just like a dream. It has affected me in an extraordinary way. However, the impression of the existence of matter that I have, and the feelings it inspires in me, are so convincing that I generally live as if matter did really exist. Yet when I think about it for a moment, I immediately clearly feel that matter is just an illusion. Yet it is really so believable. I laugh at myself. Sometimes, something annoys me so much that I raise my voice. Then I am embarrassed when I remember the image in my brain I shouted at. What an astounding creation we have. The idea that matter exists is so powerful that nobody who did not know the truth could ever doubt it. I sometimes look at the Bosphorus. I think about how long it would take to get to the opposite shore. I look into the distance. Then I think. Even the place I believe to be furthest away is inside me, in my brain, inside my brain as an image in other words. Man is an extraordinary creature. God has created him with such splendid knowledge that I do not exactly know how to describe or talk about it. Let me say, however: I hope that you and your work will find favor with God for giving us this great knowledge. E.M. Istanbul

- I read your account of the secret behind matter at the back of The Evolution Deceit with great interest and excitement. At first, I understood it in theory, but not in practice. Then it suddenly fell into place when I was thinking about it. I was caught up in a stunning excitement. "God," I said, "this is an amazing thing." Such a thing had never crossed my mind. They used to say that life was like a dream. I thought that was just a figure of speech. Such people did not mean it in the true sense of the words, but as a simile. Who knows what they would do if they knew it was actually true? It is an extraordinary situation. Yet everyone who reads the book is quite calm. I wonder if they have fully understood it. How can they be so calm in the face of such a position? I have now understood death, the hereafter, resurrection, life in heaven and everything much better. In the Qur'an, God says, "It is easy for Us to create you again." Everything is now clear in my mind. Everyone I talk to on the subject has difficulty in understanding it. How can I explain it more easily and clearly? Some people I described the subject to got really very excited. I wonder if I am wrong to explain it all so directly? Would it be better if I first explain about the love of God, that He is the Compassionate and Merciful, and that He

wants people to attain the very best and live in the best possible way? What do you think? S. U. Edirne

- Ever since I was a child, I had thought that matter was genuinely perceived and clearly existed. Yet since primary school I was always told that all the senses form inside the brain. It was a fact I knew very well. I explained it clearly so many times in biology classes, but I still never really saw the true face of the matter. I would say that images formed in the brain, but that matter existed far away outside me. It is out there, and I see it. My thinking was confused, along the lines that the image formed where my eye was, and then in the brain. Thought that matter existed absolutely, right there in front of me. Actually, I cannot have thought too deeply about it. Whereas matter appears in only one place. I see that place and matter as being together. It is as if I am in front of a thin curtain, but it is not clear what is actually doing the watching, a nothingness or a soul. Yet there is a power that perceives everything, a nothingness that takes up no space, yet a consciousness that perceives the five senses. Are you thinking of writing a more detailed work on the subject? Also, your books are not available in the province where I live. Can I inform the publishers? With my respectful wishes for your every success. Y.C. Kayseri

- I explained this subject to a number of my friends. They are university graduates, yet they are quite incapable of conceiving what the subject is all about. "Come off it," they say. "OK, the image may form in my brain. But you are right there in front of me," as they put their hands on my shoulder. I describe how that conversation and action is all taking place in the brain. I even say that if the nerves leading to the brain were cut they would be unable to see, or touch. They still don't understand. That failure to understand seems to me like 'the emergence of a diagnostic metaphysical truth,' because they are unable to grasp this concept. Yet I explained it to my nephew, a primary school student, and he got it at once. I ask myself whether their comprehension has been deliberately prevented. Or whether they have no personal identity. Is that possible? The Qur'an speaks about people whose eyes and ears are closed. Is it possible some people do not have any consciousness of seeing or hearing? Could you go into these matters in the next edition of your book? Thank you in advance. E.A. Istanbul

- Dear Harun Yahya, I particularly enjoy reading philosophy, and so I read about the secret behind matter with great enjoyment. That matter is an illusion has been explained several times in the past. Yet people have probably not had the time to consider the perceptions that convince them that matter does exist, or else they would have grasped this evident truth. However, they have much greater opportunities to see truth of it these days. The studies into and descriptions of the structure of the eye, the nerves that carry the image to the eye, the visual center in the brain and similar matters have made it a great deal easier to understand this



truth. Furthermore, the development of specific physics, three-dimensional films, television, video and the like have all made it easier to provide vivid examples. In my view, this subject will come to predominate in the world in this century. As you also know, quantum physics is already shouting the truth out loud. I expect it will be even easier if some people do not retreat into a childish fear of the truth, and if the pain of the shattering of the love of the world can be overcome. I do not think that running away from the truth, hiding one's head in the sand and ignoring the facts are not an attitude compatible with human honor. There are many things I want to say, but I do not wish to take up your time. With my very best wishes. T.E. Richmond

- Why do the television, radio and newspapers not tell people that matter is an illusion? This certain truth should be evaluated by prominent scientists on panel shows or television debates. I wonder whether anyone could be found to oppose it, and what he would say. I have heard accounts from people who have failed to understand it, and I have been amazed. How is it that grown up people fail to grasp such an obvious fact? Such people might turn up, but it is the nation that will make the final judgment. Not only will the nation learn from it, but it will also see the logic, or rather the illogicality, of those who cannot understand this truth. My view is that this subject is very important in Islam. I hope that this importance will grow as time passes... K.I. Samsun

- Your description of matter affected me very deeply. It goes beyond the powers of human reason. It is not something that can be completely understood. It is odd to think that even this letter I am writing is an image. Image meets image, and they communicate. It really is an astounding situation. In my view, everyone who reads about it will understand... W.B.F. England

- My way of looking at life has changed since reading the chapter in your book about the secret behind matter. The other day, for instance, I got angry at someone and was about to raise my voice. Then I realized that everything was inside my brain. I immediately calmed down, and all my anger had ebbed away. It seemed as if I were behaving like an old woman getting angry at a poor actor in a Turkish film. These truths, that constitute such a major change, need to be communicated to much wider communities, and you must therefore bring out a new book. If you do bring out such a book, would you please let me know? M.V. Aydin.

- I have read The Secret Behind Matter. Does everything really happen in my brain? Is my brain not an image, too? That is what I really fail to understand. Everyone should be told about it in schools and on the television. I would like to go into the matter in much greater detail. What do you suggest? I would be most grateful if you would help. K.B. Antalya.

- I am an eye doctor. A patient asked me about how we see the other day. The first questions were technical ones, but then he started asking things that really

made me think. Such as who it is who sees the images in the brain. I was strongly affected. I believe in the existence of God and the soul, yet it had never occurred to me to explain the existence of the soul in such a scientific and clear way, although it lies within my field of expertise. I read what you had to say on the matter on your Internet page. Are there any other sources, or do you have any other books you can recommend? It might even be a foreign source. I really think that this is an important subject, well worth learning, researching and thinking about. Not only what I have read broadens peoples' horizons, but it leads them to question many things in life. It is genuinely important. F.N.G. Eskisehir.

- I watched the CD *THE SECRET BEYOND MATTER* yesterday. I tried my best to understand, and think I managed to do so. Yet at this moment I feel a great emptiness, and there are questions I want to find answers to. Please help me. M.H. Izmir

- When I read "THE SECRET BEYOND MATTER" I thought everything was a screenplay written just for me. I mean I felt as if I was in a film such as Truman Show or Matrix. I felt as if I am living in a machine designed just for me. I found myself in a number of states when I looked at things in that way. You have gone into the matter in greater depth than anyone to date. E.H. Toronto.

- I have just watched part of your video, *The Secret Behind Matter*. The subject has been very well explained, although I think we will need more examples when we explain it to others. The examples in the documentary are definitely sufficient, but a few more, particularly from daily life, would make it easier for us to understand and explain, I think, if a subsequent version is produced. That is because people cannot comment on this subject as it requires, and they are putting false ideas forward. In order to put a stop to that, I think it would be useful to reinforce the existing examples with some simpler ones. S.G. Istanbul

- My views on the material world and life have changed fundamentally. Life, other people and those around me are no longer what they were. The more I learn the facts, the more I have started to turn away from certain things, I have started to look inside myself and think more. I wonder if that is right. But in one way I feel more at peace, more secure and happier. What people do and say now seem quite facile to me. I am looking for someone who will listen to and understand what I am experiencing. I hope that, as always, you will help me on this most important issue. I do not want to waste my life in vain. K.U. Tekirdağ.

## **Comments From Some Scientists and Thinkers Asked About The Nature Of Matter**

- Many thanks for your e-mail and its most interesting contents. I am not a scientist, but I found your questions very interesting. I cannot give any scientific answers to your questions but I must say that I learnt a lot by reading them. Thank

you for writing and I will share your questions with some friends in the sciences to see what answers they will give. Best wishes and, again, than you for writing. Kofi Opoku

- All of your questions and observations are insightful and right on target! These are old questions of course, but to this day they are not fully resolved. In fact modern neuroscience and psychology and even philosophy would be much advanced if their researchers were as concerned about these questions as you are. Unfortunately, your question #13 is also right on target (Question #13. Some people are incredibly afraid when these topics are discussed? What do you think the reason for this may be?) The answer is that when you see the world correctly, the way you describe it, it is a very very frightening prospect. But the truth is always worth discovering, even if it is a frightening truth. Steve Lehar

- You ask a number of interesting questions that have troubled philosophers for centuries. Certainly we could be living in a virtual world inside some supercomputer, and never know the difference, as in the movies Tron or The Matrix, but as long as the "laws of nature", which could be part of the programming, remain stable, and we can't tell the difference, it doesn't make a difference. Naturally, many people are afraid of thoughts of this kind because they threaten their comfortable worldviews. Jon Roland (President and CEO of the Vanguard Research Institute)

# NOTES

1. C. Darwin, *The Origin Of Species*, Chapter X, "On the Imperfection of the Geological Record."
2. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter X, p. 234.
3. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter I, p. 179.
4. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Chapter I, p. 172.
5. N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982, pp. 45-46.
6. R. A. Raff and T. C. Kaufman, *Embryos, Genes and Evolution: The Developmental Genetic Basis of Evolutionary Change*, Indiana University Press, 1991, p. 34.
7. T. N. George, "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *Science Progress*, Vol. 48, January 1960, p. 1.
8. N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, p. 59.
9. *Science*, July 17, 1981, p. 289.
10. S. M. Stanley, *The New Evolutionary Timetable: Fossils, Genes, and the Origin of Species*, Basic Books Inc. Publishers, N.Y., 1981, p. 71.
11. R. Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, 1986, p. 229.
12. C. Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 1st ed., p. 302.
13. M. Czarnecki, *McLean's*, 19 January 1981, p. 56.
14. H. Gee, *In Search of Deep Time, Beyond the Fossil Record to a New History of Life*, The Free Press, A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1999, p. 5.
15. A. S. Romer, *Chapter in Genetics, Paleontology and Evolution* (1963), p. 114
16. N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, p. 127.
17. M. Midgley, *Evolution as a Religion*, London: Routledge Classics, 2002, p. 1.
18. E. O. Wilson, et al., *Life on Earth*, [1973], Sinauer Associates: Sunderland MA, 1975, reprint, p. 624.
19. F. Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1982, pp. 30-31.
20. F. Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, pp. 30-31.

# Notes

1. Søren Løvtrup , *Darwinism: The Refutation of A Myth*, New York: Croom Helm, 1987, p. 422.
2. Richard Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, London: Michael Joseph Limited, 1981, p. 43.
3. David Pilbeam, *American Scientist*, Vol. 66, May-June, 1978, p. 379.
4. Jonathan Wells earned a doctorate at Yale University, and another for molecular and cell biology at the University of California, Berkeley. He is also continuing his research on Darwinism at the Discovery Institute in Seattle.
5. Some readers may find it odd to see evolution described as a religion, although this is actually most accurate. Any religion expresses basic principles that a person believes in and which shape his perspective on life. In imposing a materialist perspective, the theory of evolution is based not on science, but on faith. Among those who have described this theory as a religion are such evolutionists as Julian Huxley and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.
6. Benjamin D. Wiker, "Does Science Point to God? Part II: The Christian Critics", *The Crisis Magazine*, July-August 2003, <http://www.crisismagazine.com/julaug2003/feature1.htm>.
7. Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. 2, Charles Darwin to J.D. Hooker, Down [March 29, 1863].
8. "The Crucible of Life," *Earth*, February 1998.
9. "The Rise of Life on Earth," *National Geographic*, March 1998.
10. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution, Science or Myth, Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution is Wrong*, Washington, DC, Regnery Publishing, 2000, p. 21.
11. Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny: A New World*, Istanbul: Ufuk Kitaplari, 2001, p. 133.
12. Paul Davies, C.W. [renowned physicist] & Adams Phillip [journalist], *More Big Questions*, ABC Books: Sydney, Australia, 1998, pp. 53-54, 47-48, 48.
13. Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box; The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, The Free Press, 1996, p. x.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.
15. Gerald L. Schroeder, *The Hidden Face of God*, The Free Press, New York, 2001, p. 62.
16. Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, p.5.
17. W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 325.
18. *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*, Chicago, 1993.
19. *Ibid.*

20. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, New York: The Modern Library, p. 234.
21. Alan Feduccia, *The Origin and Evolution of Birds*, Yale University Press, 1999, p. 81.
22. Niles Eldredge, and Ian Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982, pp. 45-46. (*emphasis added*)
23. C.P. Hickman [Professor Emeritus of Biology at Washington and Lee University in Lexington], L.S. Roberts [Professor Emeritus of Biology at Texas Tech University], and F.M. Hickman, 1988, *Integrated Principles of Zoology*, Times Mirror/Moseby College Publishing, St. Louis, MO. 939 p. 866.
24. T. S. Kemp, *Fossils and Evolution*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 246.
25. David Berlinski, *Commentary*, September 1996, p. 28.
26. Gerald Schroeder, *Evolution: Rationality vs. Randomness*, <http://www.geraldschroeder.com/evolution.html>.
27. Stephen J. Gould, "An Asteroid to Die For," *Discover*, October 1989, p. 65.
28. Gregory A. Wray, "The Grand Scheme of Life," Review of *The Crucible Creation: The Burgess Shale and the Rise of Animals* by Simon Conway Morris, *Trends in Genetics*, February 1999, vol. 15, no. 2.
29. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 31.
30. Niles Eldredge, Ian Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, pp.126-127.
31. Richard C. Lewontin, *Human Diversity*, Scientific American Library: New York NY, 1995, p. 163.
32. Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time: Beyond the Fossil Record to a New History of Life*, New York: The Free Press, 1999, pp. 116-117.
33. Bernard Wood, Mark Collard, "The Human Genus," *Science*, vol. 284, No 5411, April 2, 1999, pp. 65-7.
34. Pat Shipman, "Doubting Dmanisi," *American Scientist*, November- December 2000, p. 491.
35. Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, The University of Chicago Press, p. 312.
36. John R. Durant, "The Myth of Human Evolution," *New Universities Quarterly* 35. (1981), pp. 425-438.
37. G. A. Clark and C. M. Willermet (eds.), *Conceptual Issues in Modern Human Origins Research*, New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 1997, p. 76.
38. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 225.
39. Paul S. Taylor, *Origins Answer Book*, Eden Communications, 1995, p. 35.
40. John Whitfield, "Oldest member of human family found," *Nature*, July 11, 2002.
41. D.L. Parsell, "Skull Fossil From Chad Forces Rethinking of Human Origins," *National Geographic News*, July 10, 2002.
42. John Whitfield, "Oldest member of human family found", *Nature*, July 11, 2002.

43. "Face of Yesterday: Henry Gee on the dramatic discovery of a seven-million-year-old hominid," *The Guardian*, July 11, 2002.
44. Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time*, p. 5.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
46. F. Clark Howell, *Thoughts on the Study and Interpretation of the Human Fossil Record*, p. 1.
47. Tom Abate, *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 19, 2001.
48. *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "Modern Materialism."
49. Werner Gitt, *In the Beginning Was Information*, CLV, Bielefeld, Germany, pp. 107-141.
50. George C. Williams, *The Third Culture: Beyond the Scientific Revolution*, (ed. John Brockman), New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995, pp. 42-43.
51. Phillip Johnson's Weekly Wedge Update, "DNA Demoted," April 30, 2001, [http://www.arn.org/docs/pjweekly/pj\\_weekly\\_010430.htm](http://www.arn.org/docs/pjweekly/pj_weekly_010430.htm).
52. *Ibid.*
53. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species & The Descent of Man*, New York: The Modern Library, p. 398.
54. Charles Darwin, "Letter to Asa Gray," September 10, 1860, in Francis Darwin (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1896), p. 131.
55. "Haeckel's Fraudulent Charts"; [http://www.pathlights.com/ce\\_encyclopedia/17rec03.html](http://www.pathlights.com/ce_encyclopedia/17rec03.html).
56. L. Rutimeyer, "Referate," *Archiv fur Anthropologie*, 1868.
57. Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, New York: Ticknor and Fields 1982, p. 204.
58. Elizabeth Pennisi, "Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered," *Science*, September 5, 1997. (*emphasis added*)
59. *Ibid.* (*emphasis added*)
60. *Ibid.*
61. Ken McNamara, "Embryos and Evolution," *New Scientist*, vol. 12416, October 16, 1999. (*emphasis added*)
62. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 84.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 86.
65. Charles Darwin, "Letter to Asa Gray," September 10, 1860, in Francis Darwin (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. II, p. 131.
66. For a demolition of Dawkins' thesis of the "blind watchmaker" see Lee Spetner, *Not By Chance: Shattering the Modern Theory of Evolution*, Judaica Press, 1997; Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, The

Free Press, 1996; Phillip E. Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 2nd. ed., InterVarsity Press, 1993.

67. Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, London: Penguin Books, 1986, pp. 93-94.

68. Michael Denton, "The Inverted Retina: Maladaptation or Pre-adaptation?," *Origins & Design*, 19:2, Issue 37, 1999.

69. *Ibid.*

70. G.L. Walls, *The Vertebrate Eye*, New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1963, p. 652.

71. Michael Denton, "The Inverted Retina: Maladaptation or Pre-adaptation?," *Origins & Design*, 19:2, Issue 37, 1999.

72. T.J. McIlwain, *An Introduction to the Biology of Vision*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 14.

73. Michael Denton, "The Inverted Retina: Maladaptation or Pre-adaptation?," *Origins & Design*, 19:2, Issue 37, 1999.

74. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, Ill. ed. Chapter 13: "Mutual Affinities of Organic Beings: Morphology: Embryology: Rudimentary Organs."

75. [www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Lab/6562/evolution/designgonebad.html](http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Lab/6562/evolution/designgonebad.html).

76. S. R. Scadding, "Do 'Vestigial Organs' Provide Evidence for Evolution?," *Evolutionary Theory*, Vol. 5, May, 1981, p. 173.

77. Paul A. Nelson, "Jettison the Arguments, or the Rule? The Place of Darwinian Theological Themata in Evolutionary Reasoning," *Access Research Network*, 1988, [http://www.arn.org/docs/nelson/pn\\_jettison.html](http://www.arn.org/docs/nelson/pn_jettison.html).

78. George Schaller, H. Jinchu, P. Wenshi, and Z. Jing, *The Giant Pandas of Wolong* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 4; 58. (*emphasis added*)

79. "Role of the giant panda's 'pseudo-thumb,'" *Nature*, Vol. 397, January 28, 1999, pp. 309-310.

80. *Ibid.*

81. Gretchen Vogel, "Objection #2: Why Sequence the Junk?," *Science*, February 16, 2001.

82. Wojciech Makalowski, "Not Junk After All," *Science*, Vol. 300, Number 5623, May 23, 2003.

83. <http://www.arn.org/docs/odesign/od182/ls182.htm#anchor569108>.

84. "Does nonsense DNA speak its own dialect?," *Science News*, Vol. 164, December 24, 1994.

85. Hubert Renauld and Susan M. Gasser, "Heterochromatin: a meiotic matchmaker," *Trends in Cell Biology* 7 (May 1997): pp. 201-205.



86. Emile Zuckerkandl, "Neutral and Nonneutral Mutations: The Creative Mix-Evolution of Complexity in Gene Interaction Systems," *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 44, 1997, p. 53. (*emphasis added*)
87. Hubert Renauld and Susan M. Gasser, "Heterochromatin: a meiotic matchmaker," *Trends in Cell Biology* 7, May: 1997, pp. 201-205.
88. Evolutionists resort to the Selfish DNA thesis to account for the alleged evolutionary emergence of non-coding DNA. This thesis is an illusory claim that there is a kind of competition among DNA components that have lost their function. As shown in this text, the thesis has been shattered by this study on cryptomonads.
89. M.J. Beaton and T. Cavalier-Smith, 1999, "Eukaryotic non-coding DNA is functional: evidence from the differential scaling of cryptomonad genomes," *Proc. Royal Soc. London, B*. 266: pp. 2053-2059.
90. L.L. Sandell, V.A. Zakian, 1994, "Loss of a yeast telomere: arrest, recovery, and chromosome loss," *Cell* 75: pp. 729-739.
91. S. J. Ting 1995, "A binary model of repetitive DNA sequence in *Caenorhabditis elegans*," *DNA Cell Biology*, 14: pp. 83-85.
92. E. R. Vandendries, D. Johnson, R. Reinke, 1996, "Orthodenticle is required for photoreceptor cell development in the *Drosophila* eye," *Developmental Biology* 173: pp. 243-255.
93. B.L. Keplinger, A.L. Rabetoy, D.R. Cavener, 1996, "A somatic reproductive organ enhancer complex activates expression in both the developing and the mature *Drosophila* reproductive tract," *Developmental Biology* 180: pp. 311-323.
94. J. Kohler, S. Schafer-Preuss, D. Buttgerit, 1996, "Related enhancers in the intron of the beta1 tubulin gene of *Drosophila melanogaster* are essential for maternal and CNS-specific expression during embryogenesis," *Nucleic Acids Research* 24: pp. 2543-2550.
95. R. Nowak, "Mining Treasures from 'junk DNA'," *Science* 263 (1994): p. 608.
96. "DNA; Junk or Not," *The New York Times*, March 4, 2003.
97. Gretchen Vogel, "Objection #2: Why Sequence the Junk?," *Science*, February 16, 2001.
98. S. Hirotsune, N. Yoshida, A. Chen, L. Garrett, F. Sugiyama, S. Takahashi, K. Yagami, A. Wynshaw-Boris, and Yoshiki, "An expressed pseudogene regulates the messenger-RNA stability of its homologous coding gene," *Nature* 423: pp. 91-96.
99. J. T. Lee, 2003, "Molecular biology: Complicity of gene and pseudogene" [News and Views], *Nature* 423: pp. 26-28.
100. "The Birth of an Alternatively Spliced Exon: 3' Splice-Site Selection in Alu Exons," Galit Lev-Maor, *Science*, Vol. 300, Number 5623, May 23, 2003, pp. 1288-1291.
101. *Science*, May 23, 2003.

102. George Turner, "How Are New Species Formed?," *New Scientist*, June 14, 2003, p. 36.
103. Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried*, Boston, Gambit INC., 1971, p. 36.
104. *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.
105. E. Deevey, "The Reply: Letter from Birnam Wood," in *Yale Review*, (1967), Vol. 61, p. 636.
106. Ernst Mayr, *Animal Species and Evolution*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963, pp. 285-286.
107. *Ibid.*, p. 290.
108. Lane P. Lester, Raymond G. Bohlin, *Natural Limits to Biological Change*, 2nd Ed., Probe Books, 1989, pp. 13-14.
109. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 159-175.
110. Lane Lester, Raymond G. Bohlin, *Natural Limits to Biological Change*, 2nd edition, Probe Books, 1989, pp. 67, 70.
111. Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, pp. 88-97.
112. *Ibid.*, p. 88.
113. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 178, 186.
114. Lane Lester, Raymond G. Bohlin, *Natural Limits to Biological Change*, Probe Books, 1989, pp. 170-171.
115. Merle d'Aubigne, "How Is It Possible to Escape the Idea of Some Intelligent and Organizing Force?" in Margenau and Varghese (eds.), *Cosmos, Bios, Theos*, p. 158.
116. Scott Gilbert, John Opitz, and Rudolf Raff, "Resynthesizing Evolutionary and Developmental Biology," *Developmental Biology* 173, Article No. 0032, 1996, p. 361.
117. Personal letter (written 10 April 1979) from Dr. Collin Patterson, Senior Paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History in London, to Luther D. Sunderland; quoted in *Darwin's Enigma* by Luther D. Sunderland, San Diego: Master Books, 1984, p. 89.
118. T. S. Kemp, *Fossils and Evolution*, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 19.
119. Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 103.
120. Nicholas Wade, "Why Humans and Their Fur Parted Ways," *The New York Times*, August 19, 2003.
121. Henry Gee, *In Search of Deep Time*, p. 103.
122. O. C. Marsh, "Recent Polydactyle Horses," *American Journal of Science* 43, 1892, pp. 339-354.
123. Gordon Rattray Taylor, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, New York: Harper & Row, 1983, p. 230.

124. Heribert Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbildung* Lund, Sweden: Verlag CWE Gleenrup, 1954, pp. 551-552.
125. Boyce Rensberger, "Ideas on Evolution Going Through a Revolution Among Scientists," *Houston Chronicle*, November 5, 1980, sec. 4, p. 15.
126. Milner, *The Encyclopedia of Evolution*, 1993, p. 222.
127. Garret Hardin, *Nature and Man's Fate*, New York: Mentor, 1961, pp. 225-226.
128. Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*, pp. 16-17, 19, 28-30.
129. R.E. Kofahl, *Handy Dandy Evolution Refuter*, San Diego: Beta Books, 1997, p. 159.
130. M.R. Voorhies, "Ancient Ashfall Creates a Pompeii of Prehistoric Animals," *National Geographic*, Vol. 159, No. 1, January 1981, pp. 67-68,74; "Horse Find Defies Evolution," *Creation Ex Nihilo* 5(3):15, January 1983, <http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/3723.asp>.
131. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 199; Royal Truman, *A review of Icons of Evolution*, [www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/tj/docs/tj\\_v15n2\\_icons\\_review.asp](http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/tj/docs/tj_v15n2_icons_review.asp).
132. O.C. Marsh, "Recent polydactyl horses," *American Journal of Science*, 43: 339-354, 1892.
133. Bruce J. MacFadden et al., "Ancient diets, ecology, and extinction of 5-million-year-old horses from Florida," *Science* 283 (5403): 824-827, February 5,1999.
134. "Horse and horsemanship," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 20:646655, 15th edition 1992.
135. Ernst Mayr, *What Evolution Is*, New York: Basic Books, p. 16.
136. D.M. Raup, "Conflicts between Darwin and paleontology," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin* 50:22, 1979.
137. L.D. Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, 1988, p.78.
138. J. Bergman and G. Howe, *'Vestigial Organs' Are Fully Functional*, Kansas City: Creation Research Society Books, 1990, p. 77.
139. Pierre-Paul Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, pp. 51-52.
140. University of Florida, "From the Bone of a Horse, a New Idea for Aircraft Structures," December 2, 2002, <http://www.napa.ufl.edu/2002news/horsebone.htm>.
141. Judith Hooper, *Of Moths and Men*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2002, p. xvii.
142. *Ibid.*, p. xviii.
143. *Ibid.*
144. *Ibid.*
145. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, pp. 141-151.

146. Jerry Coyne, "Not Black and White," a review of Michael Majerus' *Melanism: Evolution in Action*, in *Nature*, 396 (1988), pp. 35-36.
147. Judith Hooper, *Of Moths and Men*, pp. xix-xx.
148. *Ibid.*, p. 304.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 301.
150. Robert Matthews, "Scientists Pick Holes in Darwin's Moth Theory," *The Daily Telegraph*, London, March 18, 1999.
151. Alan Feduccia, "Birds are Dinosaurs: Simple Answer to a Complex Problem," *The Auk*, October 2002, vol. 119 (4), pp. 1187-1201.
152. *Ibid.*
153. *Ibid.*
154. *Ibid.*
155. *Ibid.*
156. *Ibid.*
157. "The bird-Dino link;"  
<http://www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Hall/2099/DinoKabin.html>
158. Michael J. Denton, *Nature's Destiny*, New York: The Free Press, 1998, p. 361.
159. David Williamson, "Scientist Says Ostrich Study Confirms Bird 'Hands' Unlike Those of Dinosaurs," EurekaAlert, August 14, 2002, [http://www.eurekaalert.org/pub\\_releases/2002-08/uonc-sso081402.php](http://www.eurekaalert.org/pub_releases/2002-08/uonc-sso081402.php).
160. A. Elzanowski, "A comparison of the jaw skeleton in theropods and birds, with a description of the palate in the Oviraptoridae," *Smithsonian Contributions to Paleobiology*, 1999, 89 pp: 311-323.
161. Alan Feduccia, "Birds are Dinosaurs: Simple Answer to a Complex Problem," *The Auk*, October 2002, vol. 119 (4), pp. 1187-1201.
162. V. Morell, "A Cold, Hard Look at Dinosaurs," *Discover*, 1996, 17 (12): pp. 98-108.
163. [http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Max\\_Planck](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Max_Planck)
164. Phillip Johnson, "A Step Forward in Ohio," *Touchstone*, vol. 16, Issue 1, January-February 2003, p. 11;  
<http://www.touchstonemag.com/docs/issues/16.1docs/16-1pg11.html>.

## NOTES

1. Herbert Spencer, *Social Status*, 1850, pp. 414-415.
2. Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, Rev. Ed., Boston: Beacon Press, 1955, p. 41.
3. Mark Kingwell, "Competitive States of America, Microsoft proves it: we're still wrestling with that treasured national ideal," *New York Times*, June 25, 2000; [http://www.spaceship-earth.org/Letters/Editor/Competitive\\_States\\_of\\_America.htm](http://www.spaceship-earth.org/Letters/Editor/Competitive_States_of_America.htm)
4. "Modern History Sourcebook: William Graham Sumner (1840-1910): "The Challenge of Facts;" <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1914sumner.html>
5. Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1981, p. 72.
6. Francis Darwin, *The life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, D. Appleton and Co., 1896, vol. 2, p. 294.
7. "Darwin as Epicurean: An Interview with Benjamin Wiker," <http://www.touchstonemag.com/docs/issues/15.8docs/15-8pg43.html>
8. Thomas R. Malthus, *An Essay on the principle of population as it affects the future improvement of society*, Reprint, London: Reeves and Turner, (1798) 1878, p. 412. (emphasis added)
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 411, 430-431. (emphasis added)
10. Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1957, p. 112.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Sir Gavin de Beer, *Charles Darwin*, London : Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1963.
13. C. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, London, 1859, 2nd edition 1964, Cambridge:Harvard University Press, p. 64.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, p. 88.
16. Ian Taylor, "Historical Sketch: Robert Thomas Malthus (1766-1834);" <http://www.creationism.org/csshs/v04n3p18.htm>
17. Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, Toronto: TFE Publishing, 3rd. ed., 1991, p. 65.
18. Jerry Bergman, "Darwin's Influence on Ruthless Laissez Faire Capitalism," March 2001; <http://www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-333.htm>
19. Robert Hunter, *Poverty*, New York: Torchbooks, 1965.
20. Jeanne Stellman, Susan Daum, *Work is Dangerous to Your Health*, New York: Random House Vintage Books, 1973.
21. Otto Bettmann, *The Good Old Days! They Were Terrible!* New York: Random House, 1974, p. 68.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 70.

23. Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States*, New York: Harper Collins, 1999, p. 255.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Bettmann, *The Good Old Days! They Were Terrible!*, p. 71.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Kenneth Hsu, *The Great Dying; Cosmic Catastrophe, Dinosaurs and the Theory of Evolution*, New York, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1986, p. 10.
28. Joseph F. Wall, *Andrew Carnegie*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1970, p. 364.
29. Richard Milner, *Encyclopedia of Evolution*, 1990, p. 72.
30. Wall, *Andrew Carnegie*, p. 389.
31. William Ghent, *Our Benevolent Feudalism*, New York: Macmillan, 1902, p. 29.
32. Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, p. 49.
33. Isaac Asimov, *The Golden Door: The United States from 1876 to 1918*, Boston: Houston Mifflin Company, 1977, p. 94.
34. Milner, *Encyclopedia of Evolution*, p. 412.
35. Stephen T. Asma, "The New Social Darwinism: Deserving Your Destitution," *The Humanist*, 1993, 53(5):11, 10/3.
36. Sahih al-Bukhari, *Al-Adab Al-Mufrad*; al-Hakim and al-Baihaqi.
37. Karl A. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1970, pp. 30, 32 ; Jerry Bergman, "Eugenics and Nazi Racial Policy," p. 118.
38. Sidney M. Mintz, *American Scientist*, vol.60, May/June 1972, p. 387.
39. John C. Burham, *Science*, vol.175, February 4, 1972, p. 506.
40. Edwin G. Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, New York, NY: Scribner's, 1921, p. 34.
41. "Evolution and Ethnicity;" <http://www.ncl.ac.uk/lifelong-learning/distrib/darwin/08.htm>
42. George Gaylord Simpson, "The Biological Nature of Man," *Science*, vol.152 (April 22, 1966), p. 475.
43. Henry Fairfield Osborn, "The Evolution of Human Races," *Natural History*, January/February 1926; 2nd pub. *Natural History*, vol. 89, April 1980, p. 129.
44. James Ferguson, "The Laboratory of Racism," *New Scientist*, vol. 103, September 27, 1984, p. 18.
45. Stephen Jay Gould, "Human Equality is a Contingent Fact of History," *Natural History*, vol.93, November 1984, p. 28.
46. Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, 2nd ed., New York: A L. Burt Co., 1874, p. 178.
47. Matt Ridley, *Nature Via Nurture*, Chapter One, "The Paragon of Animals."

48. Charles Darwin, *The Voyage of the Beagle*, edited David Amigoni, London: Wordsworth, 1997, p. 477.
49. "Evolution and Ethnicity;" <http://www.ncl.ac.uk/lifelong-learning/distrib/darwin/08.htm>
50. Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, 1888. New York:D. Appleton and Company, pp. 285-286.
51. Stephen Jay Gould, *Ontogeny and Phylogeny*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1977 , p. 127.
52. Thomas Huxley, *Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews*, New York, NY: Appleton, 1871, p. 20.
53. Robert Lee Hotz, "Race has no Basis in Biology, Researchers Say," *Los Angeles Times*, February 20, 1997.
54. *Ibid.*
55. Natalie Angier, "Do Races Differ? Not Really, DNA Shows," *New York Times*, August 22, 2000.
56. *Ibid.*
57. *Ibid.*
58. Tony Fitzpatrick, "Genetically Speaking, Race Doesn't Exist in Humans;" [http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/1998-10/WUis-GSRD-071098.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/1998-10/WUis-GSRD-071098.php) (*emphasis added*)
59. *Ibid.*
60. Sribala Subramanian, "The Story in Our Genes;" *Time*, January 16, 1995, p. 38.
61. *Ibid.*
62. Jim Knapp, *Imperialism: The Struggle to Be Superior*, <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jimknapp/papers/Imperialism.html>
63. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1946 edition, vol. 12, p. 122A.
64. Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, Elephant Paperbacks, Chicago:1996, p. 416.
65. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *The German Empire*, 180; <http://www.geocities.com/Area51/Rampart/4871/Darwin.html>
66. T. D. Hall, "The Scientific Background of the Nazi "Race Purification" Program, US & German Eugenics, Ethnic Cleansing, Genocide, and Population Control;" <http://www.trufax.org/avoid/nazi.html>
67. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, p. 297.
68. Karl Pearson, *National Life from the Standpoint of Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900, pp. 11-16, 20-23, 36-37, 43-44.
69. *Ibid.*
70. John Merriman, *A History of Modern Europe, vol. 2: From the French Revolution to the Present*, pp. 990-991.
71. Pearson, *National Life from the Standpoint of Science*.

72. Milner, *Encyclopedia of Evolution*, p. 59.
73. Oscar Levy, *Complete Works of Nietzsche*, 1930, vol. 2, p. 75.
74. Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, p. 417.
75. *Ibid.*
76. *Ibid.*
77. W. Carr, *A History of Germany 1815-1990*, 4th. ed, p. 205.
78. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
79. Levy, *Complete Works of Nietzsche*, vol. 2, p. 75.
80. H. Enoch, *Evolution or Creation* (1966), pp. 147-148.
81. Max Nordau, "The Philosophy and Morals of War," *North American Review*, 169 (1889), p. 794.
82. Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, Garden City, N.Y. :Doubleday, 1958, pp. 92-93.
83. *Ibid.*, pp. 92-95.
84. Alexander Kimel, "Nazi Terror;" <http://www.kimel.net/terror.html>
85. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz*, pp. 30-32.
86. A. Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus; The Social Costs of the New Scientific Racism*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1980, p. 349.
87. Arthur Keith, *Evolution and Ethics*, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1946, p. 230.
88. *The Nuremberg Trials*, vol. 14, Washington D.C: U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 279.
89. J. Tenenbaum, *Race and Reich*, New York: Twayne Pub., 1956, p. 211.
90. Adolf Hitler, *Um das Schicksal der Nation*, in B. Dusik (ed.), Hitler. Reden Schriften Anordnungen. Februar 1925 bis Januar 1933, vol. 2(2), Munich, 1992, Doc 245.
91. Robert Clark, *Darwin: Before and After*, Grand Rapids International Press, Grand Rapids, MI, 1958, p. 115.
92. Beate Wilder-Smith, *The Day Nazi Germany Died*, Master Books, San Diego, CA, 1982, p. 27.
93. George J. Stein, "Biological Science and the Roots of Nazism," *American Scientist* 76(1): 50-58, 1988, p. 51.
94. *Ibid.*, p. 56.
95. H. Rauschning, *The Revolution of Nihilism*, New York: Alliance Book Corp., 1939.
96. Keith, *Evolution and Ethics*, p. 230.
97. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
98. Peter Hoffman, *Hitler's Personal Security*, London: Pergamon Press, 1979, p. 264.
99. Clark, *Darwin: Before and After*, pp. 115-116.
100. A. E. Wiggam, *The New Dialogue of Science*, Garden City, NY: Garden Publishing Co., 1922, p. 102.



101. Ernst Haeckel, *The History of Creation: Or the Development of the Earth and Its Inhabitants by the Action of Natural Causes*, New York: Appleton, 1876, p. 170.
102. Stein, "Biological Science and the Roots of Nazism," *American Scientist*, p. 56; Ernst Haeckel, *The Wonders of Life; A Popular Study of Biological Philosophy*, New York: Harper, 1905, p. 116.
103. K. Ludmerer, *Eugenics*, In: *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, Edited by Mark Lappe, New York: The Free Press, 1978, p. 457.
104. Thomas Robert Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, Sixth Edition, 1826, based on the second edition (1803).
105. Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, pp.133-134.
106. *Ibid.*, p. 133.
107. *Ibid.*, p. 945.
108. Allan Chase, *The Legacy of Malthus*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1980, p. 136.
109. Francis Galton, *Hereditary Genius: An Inquiry into its Laws and Consequences*, London: Macmillan, 1892, p. 330.
110. Joseph L. Graves Jr., *The Emperor's New Clothes*, Rutgers Universtiy Press, 2001, p. 96.
111. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
112. *Ibid.*
113. *Nature* 116 (1925), p. 456.
114. Bernhard Schreiber, *The Men Behind Hitler - A German Warning to the World*, p. 18.
115. Bob Brown, "Va. House Voices Regret for Eugenics," *Washington Post*, February 3, 2001.
116. Graves, Jr., *The Emperor's New Clothes*, pp. 116-117.
117. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
118. Ian Kershaw, *Hitler*, New York: W.W Norton & Company, 1998, p. 134.
119. R. Youngson, *Scientific Blunders; A Brief History of How Wrong Scientists Can Sometimes Be*, New York: Carroll and Graf Pub., 1998.
120. A. Hitler, *Hitler's Secret Conversations 1941-1944, With an introductory essay on The Mind of Adolf Hitler* by H.R. Trevor-Roper, New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1953, p. 116.
121. *Ibid.*
122. Schreiber, *The Men Behind Hitler*.
123. *Ibid.*
124. J. C. Fest, *The Face of the Third Reich*, New York: Pantheon, 1970, pp. 99-100.
125. Jerry Bergman, "Darwinism and the Nazi Race Holocaust;" <http://home.christianity.com/worldviews/52476.html>
126. Schreiber, *The Men Behind Hitler*.

127. *Ibid.*
128. *Ibid.*
129. *Ibid.*
130. *Ibid.*
131. *Ibid.*
132. *Ibid.*
133. *Ibid.*
134. Graves, Jr., *The Emperor's New Clothes*, p. 128.
135. Doc. Dr. Haydar Sur, "Sağlık Hizmetlerinin Gecmisi ve Gelismisi" (The Past and Development of Health Services); <http://www.merih.net/m1/whaysur12.htm>
136. "Osmanlıda İlim" (Science of the Ottomans); <http://www.mihir.com/mihir/osm/sistem/ilim.htm>
137. Jerry Bergman, "The History of Evolution's Teaching of Women's Inferiority;" <http://www.rae.org/women.html>  
In this article, Bergman— who has published more than 400 articles in numerous scientific journals and newspapers and known for his works criticizing Darwinism— examined Darwin's and his contemporary evolutionists' view toward women and compiled some of their statements despising them. By doing so, he exposed, with quite striking evidence, an unknown aspect of Darwin and Darwinism.
138. Evelleen Richards, "Will the Real Charles Darwin Please Stand Up?" *New Scientist*, (Dec. 22/29 1983): p. 887.
139. Elaine Morgan, *The Descent of Woman*, New York: Stein and Day, 1972, p. 1.
140. John R. Durant, "The Ascent of Nature in Darwin's Descent of Man" in *The Darwinian Heritage*, Ed. by David Kohn, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985, p. 295.
141. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1871 (1896 ed.), p. 326.
142. Charles Darwin, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin 1809-1882*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1958, pp. 232-233.
143. *Ibid.*
144. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, p. 564.
145. Carl Vogt, *Lectures on Man: His Place in Creation, and the History of Earth*, edited by James Hunt, London: Paternoster Row, Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1864, xv, p. 192.
146. Stephanie A. Shields, "Functionalism, Darwinism, and the Psychology of Women: A Study in Social Myth," *American Psychologist*, no. 1 (1975): p. 749.
147. Evelleen Richards, "Darwin and the Descent of Women," in David Oldroyd and Ian Langham (Eds.), *The Wider Domain of Evolutionary Thought* (Holland: D. Reidel, 1983), p. 75.
148. *Ibid.*, pp. 74, 49.

149. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, p. 54.
150. Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man*, p. 83.
151. *Ibid.*, pp. 83, 188.
152. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
153. *Ibid.*
154. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
155. *Ibid.*, pp. 104-105.
156. Wayne Jackson, *More Skull-Duggery*, October 7, 2002, <http://www.christiancourier.com/penpoints/skullDuggery.htm>
157. John Hurrell Crook, "Sexual Selection, Dimorphism, and Social Organization in the Primates," in Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man 1871-1971* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1972.
158. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, p. 565.
159. Phillip E. Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism*, Intervarsity Press, 1997, pp. 103-104.
160. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, 1988, p. 358.
161. William Provine, "Evolution and the Foundation of Ethics," *MBL Science*, (A Publication of Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Massachusetts), vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 25-29; *The Scientist*, September 5, 1988.
162. Bert Thompson, *Evolution as a Threat to the Christian Home*, Apologetics Press, USA.
163. Johnson, *Defeating Darwinism*, p. 99.
164. Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pp. 17, 67.
165. George Gaylord Simpson, *Life of The Past: An Introduction to Paleontology*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
166. Richard Dawkins, *Unweaving The Rainbow*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1998, p. ix.
167. Sir Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, 1983, p. 9.
168. George Gaylord Simpson, "The World into Which Darwin Led Us," *Science* 131 (1960), p. 970.
169. Francis Darwin (ed.), *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (1903; 1971 reprint), vol. 1, p. 285.
170. George B. Johnson, *Biology: Visualizing Life*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1994, p. 453.
171. "Darwin as Epicurean: An Interview with Benjamin Wiker;" <http://www.touchstonemag.com/docs/issues/15.8docs/15-8pg43.html>
172. P. J. Darlington, *Evolution for Naturalists*, 1980, pp. 243-244.
173. Stephen Jay Gould, *Ever Since Darwin*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992, p. 223.
174. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, p. 403.

175. Lorraine Lee Larison Cudmore, "The Center of Life," *Science Digest*, November 1977, p. 46.
176. Thomas F. Gossett, *Race: The History of an Idea in America*, Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1963, p. 170.
177. Peter Singer, "Sanctity of Life or Quality of Life?", *Pediatrics*, July 1983, pp. 128-129.
178. Martin Mawyer, "Death Act Dies in California," *Fundamentalist Journal*, June 7, 1988, p. 61.
179. *Ibid.*
180. Barbara Burke, "Infanticide," *Science* 84, May 1984, p. 29.
181. Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species*, 1859, p. 449.
182. E. O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, Cambridge, 1975, p. 3.
183. Gould, *Ever Since Darwin*.
184. Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, 1976, Oxford: Oxford University Press, opening pages.
185. E. O. Wilson, *On Human Nature*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978, pp. 2-3.
186. Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, 2nd. ed., 1989, Oxford: Oxford University Press., p. 2.
187. Robert Wallace, *The Genesis Factor*, New York: William Morrow and Co., 1979, pp. 217-218.
188. Mae-Wan Ho, "The Human Genome Map, the Death of Genetic Determinism and Beyond," *ISIS Report*, February 14, 2001; <http://www.i-sis.org.uk/HumangenTWN-pr.php>
189. Francis S. Collins, Lowell Weiss ve Kathy Hudson, "Have no fear. Genes Aren't Everything," *The New Republic*, 06/25/2001.
190. *Ibid.*
191. *Ibid.*
192. *Ibid.*

# NOTES

- 1- Rita Carter, *Mapping The Mind*, University of California Press, London, 1999, p. 107
- 2- R. L. Gregory, *Eye and Brain: The Psychology of Seeing*, Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 1990, p. 9
- 3- Hoimar von Ditfurth, *Der Geist Fiel Nicht Vom Himmel* (The Spirit Did Not Fall From The Sky), p. 256
- 4- M. Ali Yaz, Sait Aksoy, *Fizik 3* (Physics 3), Surat Publishers, Istanbul, 1997, p. 3
- 5- Daniel C Dennett, *Brainchildren, Essays on Designing Minds*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1998, p. 142
- 6- Daniel C Dennett, *Brainchildren, Essays on Designing Minds*, p. 142
- 7- [www.hhmi.org/senses/a/a110.htm](http://www.hhmi.org/senses/a/a110.htm)
- 8- Georges Politzer, *Principes Elémentaires de Philosophie (Elementary Principles of Philosophy)*, Editions Sociales, Paris, 1954, p. 40
- 9- [www.hhmi.org/senses/a/a110.htm](http://www.hhmi.org/senses/a/a110.htm)
- 10- Michael I. Posner, Marcus E. Raichle, *Images of Mind*, Scientific American Library, New York, 1999, p. 88
- 11- Bertrand Russell, *ABC of Relativity*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1964, pp. 161-162
- 12- George Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, 1710, Works of George Berkeley, vol. I, ed. A. Fraser, Oxford, 1871 p. 35-36
- 13- Orhan Hançerlioğlu, *Düşünce Tarihi (History of Idea)*, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul: 1987, p.447
- 14- George Politzer, *Principes Fondamentaux de Philosophie*, Editions Sociales, Paris, 1954, pp. 38-39-44
- 15- Rita Carter, *Mapping The Mind*, p. 113
- 16- Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi, *Fusus al-Hikam*, p. 220
- 17- William Kroger, Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis, <http://www.lucidexperience.com/HypnoPapers/512.html>
- 18- Dr. Tahir Özakkaş, *Gerçeğin Dirilişine Kapı HIPNOZ* (The Door Opening to the Awakening of Reality: Hypnosis), "Üst Ultrastabilite" (Upper Ultrastability), Se-da Yayınları, Vol.. 1, 1st Edition, p. 204-205
- 19- Dr. Tahir Özakkaş, *Gerçeğin Dirilişine Kapı HIPNOZ* (The Door Opening to the Awakening of Reality: Hypnosis), "Üst Ultrastabilite" (Upper Ultrastability), p. 267
- 20- Terrence Watts, Abreaction, The psychological phenomena that hypnotherapists either love or hate, <http://www.hypnosense.com/abreaction.htm>

- 21- Poul Thorsen, *Die Hypnose in Dienste der Menschheit*, Bauer-Verlag, Freiburg-Haslach, 1960, p. 52-53
- 22- René Sudre, *Traité de Parapsychologie*, Payot, Paris, 1956, p. 341
- 23- Dr. Recep Doksat, *Hipnotizma* (Hypnotism), p.106-108
- 24- Daniel C. Dennett, *Consciousness Explained*, Little, Brown and Company, NY 1991, p. 26-27
- 25- R. L. Gregory, *Eye and Brain: The Psychology of Seeing*, p. 9
- 26- Ken Wilber, *Holographic Paradigm and Other Paradoxes*, p.20
- 27- Bertrand Russell, *ABC of Relativity*, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1964, pp. 161-162
- 28- Henri Bergson, *Matter and Memory*, Zone Books, New York, 1991
- 29- John Horgan, *The Undiscovered Mind: How the Human Brain Defies Replication, Medication, and Explanation*, New York:Free Press, 1999, p. 258-259
- 30- John Horgan, *The Undiscovered Mind: How the Human Brain Defies Replication, Medication, and Explanation*, p.258-259
- 31- John Horgan, *The Undiscovered Mind: How the Human Brain Defies Replication, Medication, and Explanation*, p.229
- 32- Hoimar von Ditfurth, *Der Geist Fiel Nicht Vom Himmel* (The Spirit Did Not Fall From The Sky), p.13
- 33- William A. Dembski, *Converting Matter into Mind*, 1998, [www.arn.org](http://www.arn.org)
- 34- William A. Dembski, *Converting Matter into Mind*, 1998, [www.arn.org](http://www.arn.org)
- 35- *Cumhuriyet Bilim Teknik Dergisi* (Cumhuriyet Science and Technology Journal), 7 July 2001, no. 746, p. 18; *Der Spiegel*, 1/2001.
- 36- Ferid Kam, M.Ali Ayni, *İbni Arabî'de Varlık Düşüncesi* (The Idea of Being in Ibn Arabi), p. 37
- 37- *Materyalist Felsefe Sözlüğü* (Dictionary of Materialist Philosophy), Istanbul, Sosyal Yayınlar, 4. Edition, p. 326
- 38- V.I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empiriocriticism*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, p.334-335
- 39- Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, William Sloane Associate, New York, 1948, p. 84
- 40- Tim Folger, "From Here to Eternity", *Discover*, December 2000, p.54
- 41- Tim Folger, "From Here to Eternity", *Discover*, December 2000, p.54
- 42- François Jacob, *Le Jeu Des Possibles*, University of Washington Press, 1982, p. 111
- 43- Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, William Sloane Associate, New York, 1948, p. 52-53
- 44- Lincoln Barnett, *The Universe and Dr. Einstein*, William Sloane Associate, New York, 1948, p. 17
- 45- Paul Strathern, *The Big Idea:Einstein and Relativity*, Arrow Books, 1997, p. 57

- 46- İmam Rabbani, *Letters of Rabbani*, Vol II, 357. Letter, p. 163
- 47- İmam Rabbani, *Letters of Rabbani*, Vol II, 470. Letter, p.1432
- 48- Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi, *Fusus al-Hikam*, p. 117-118
- 49- Muhyiddin Ibn al-'Arabi, *Fusus al-Hikam*, p. 120-122
- 50- İmam Rabbani, *Letters of Rabbani*, Vol II, 480. Letter, p. 543, 545
- 51- İmam Rabbani, *Letters of Rabbani*, Vol II, 470. Letter, p. 517-518
- 52- Bertrand Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy*, 1912, p.5
- 53- Robert Lawrence Kuhn, *Closer To Truth*, Mc Graw-Hill, New York, 2000, p. 8
- 54- Daniel Dennett, *Consciousness Explained*, s.389
- 55- Drew Westen, *Psychology; Mind, Brain and Culture*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc, NY 1996, p. 118
- 56- Frederick Vester, *Denken, Lernen, Vergessen*, vga, 1978, p. 6