

**THE COLLAPSE OF THE
THEORY OF EVOLUTION
IN 20 QUESTIONS**

HARUN YAHYA

First published in February 2003

Translated by: Carl Rossini

Edited by: James Braham

ISBN 81-7101-438-0

IDARA ISHAAT-E-DINIYAT (P) LTD.

168/2 Jha House, Hazrat Nizamuddin

New Delhi - 110 013 India

Tel: 6926832, 6926833

Fax:+91 11 6322787

www.idara.com

www.islamic-books.com

E-mail:sales@idara.com

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

www.harunyahya.com

info@harunyahya.com

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1. WHY IS THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION NOT SCIENTIFICALLY VALID?
2. HOW DOES THE COLLAPSE OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION DEMONSTRATE THE TRUTH OF CREATION?
3. HOW FAR BACK DO TRACES OF MAN GO? WHY DO THESE NOT SUPPORT EVOLUTION?
4. WHY IS THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION "NOT THE BASIS OF BIOLOGY"?
5. WHY IS THE EXISTENCE OF DIFFERENT RACES NOT EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION?
6. WHY IS THE CLAIM THAT HUMAN AND APE GENOMES ARE 99 PERCENT SIMILAR AND THAT THIS CONFIRMS EVOLUTION NOT TRUE?
7. WHY IS THE CLAIM THAT DINOSAURS EVOLVED INTO BIRDS AN UNSCIENTIFIC MYTH?
8. WHAT SCIENTIFIC FORGERY IS THE MYTH THAT "HUMAN EMBRYOS HAVE GILLS" BASED ON?
9. WHY IS IT DECEPTIVE TO PORTRAY CLONING AS "EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION"?
10. COULD LIFE HAVE COME FROM OUTER SPACE?
11. WHY DOES THE FACT THAT THE EARTH IS FOUR BILLION YEARS OLD NOT SUPPORT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION?
12. WHY ARE WISDOM TEETH NOT EVIDENCE OF EVOLUTION?
13. HOW DO THE COMPLEX STRUCTURES OF THE MOST ANCIENT CREATURES DEMOLISH THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION?
14. WHY IS DENYING THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION PORTRAYED AS REJECTING DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRESS?
15. WHY IS IT MISTAKEN TO THINK THAT GOD COULD HAVE CREATED LIVING THINGS BY EVOLUTION?
16. WHY IS IT WRONG TO THINK THAT EVOLUTION COULD BE CONFIRMED IN THE FUTURE?
17. WHY IS METAMORPHOSIS NOT EVIDENCE OF EVOLUTION?
18. WHY IS IT IMPOSSIBLE TO ACCOUNT FOR DNA BY "CHANCE"?
19. WHY IS IT THAT BACTERIAL RESISTANCE TO ANTIBIOTICS IS NOT AN EXAMPLE OF EVOLUTION?
20. WHAT KIND OF RELATIONSHIP IS THERE BETWEEN CREATION AND SCIENCE?

NOTES

TO THE READER

In all the books by the author, faith-related issues are explained in the light of Qur'anic verses, and people are invited to learn God's words and to live by them. All the subjects that concern God's verses are explained in such a way as to leave no room for doubt or question marks in the reader's mind. The sincere, plain and fluent style employed ensures that everyone of every age and from every social group can easily understand the books. This effective and lucid narrative makes it possible to read them in a single sitting. Even those who rigorously reject spirituality are influenced by the facts recounted in these books and cannot refute the truthfulness of their contents.

This book and all the other works by Harun Yahya can be read individually or discussed in a group. Those readers who are willing to profit from the books will find discussion very useful in that they will be able to relate their own reflections and experiences to one another.

In addition, it is a great service to the religion to contribute to the presentation and circulation of these books, which are written solely for the good pleasure of God. All the books of the author are extremely convincing, so, for those who want to communicate the religion to other people, one of the most effective methods is to encourage them to read these books.

It is hoped that the reader will take time to look through the review of other books on the final pages of the book, and appreciate the rich source of material on faith-related issues, which are very useful and a pleasure to read.

In them, one will not find, as in some other books, the personal views of the author, explanations based on dubious sources, styles unobservant of the respect and reverence due to sacred subjects, or hopeless, doubt-creating, and pessimistic accounts that create deviations in the heart.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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

His pen-name is made up of the names "Harun" (Aaron) and "Yahya" (John), in memory of the two esteemed prophets who fought against lack of faith. The Prophet's seal on the cover of the books is symbolic and is linked to the their contents. It represents the Qur'an (the final scripture) and the Prophet Muhammad, the last of the prophets. Under the guidance of the Qur'an and sunnah, the author makes it his purpose to disprove each one of the fundamental tenets of godless ideologies and to have the "last word", so as to completely silence the objections raised against religion. The seal of the final Prophet, who attained ultimate wisdom and moral perfection, is used as a sign of his intention of saying this last word.

All author's works center around one goal: to convey the Qur'an's message to people, encourage them to think about basic faith-related issues (such as the existence of God, His unity and the Hereafter), and to expose the feeble foundations and perverted ideologies of godless systems.

Harun Yahya enjoys a wide readership in many countries, from India to America, England to Indonesia, Poland to Bosnia, and Spain to Brazil. Some of his books are available in English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Urdu, Arabic, Albanian, Russian, Serbo-Croat (Bosnian), Polish, Malay, Uygur Turkish, and Indonesian, and they are enjoyed by readers worldwide.

Greatly appreciated all around the world, these works have been instrumental in many people recovering their faith in God and in many others gaining a deeper insight into their faith. The wisdom, and the sincere and easy-to-understand style gives these books a distinct touch which directly effects any one who reads or studies them. Immune to objections, these works are characterized by their features of rapid effectiveness, definite results and irrefutability. It is unlikely that those who read these books and give serious thought to them can any longer sincerely advocate the materialistic philosophy, atheism or any other perverted ideology or philosophy. Even if they continue to do so, it will be only a sentimental insistence since these books refuted such ideologies from their very foundations. All contemporary movements of denial are now ideologically defeated, thanks to the collection of books written by Harun Yahya.

There is no doubt that these features result from the wisdom and lucidity of the Qur'an. 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.

Considering these facts, those who encourage people to read these books, which open the "eyes" of the heart and guide them to become more devoted servants of God, render an invaluable service.

Meanwhile, it would just be a waste of time and energy to propagate other books which create confusion in peoples' minds, lead man into ideological chaos, and which, clearly have no strong and precise effects in removing the doubts in peoples' hearts, as also verified from previous experience. It is apparent that 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 moral values of the Qur'an. The success and impact of this service are manifest in readers' conviction.

One point should be kept in mind: The main reason for the continuing cruelty, conflict, and all the ordeals the majority of people undergo is the ideological prevalence of disbelief. This state can only be ended 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, which leads people into the downward spiral of violence, corruption and conflict, it is clear that this service has to be provided more speedily and effectively. Otherwise, it may be too late.

It is no exaggeration to say that the collection of books by Harun Yahya have assumed this leading role. By the will of God, these books will be a means through which people in the 21st century will attain the peace, justice and happiness promised in the Qur'an.

The works of the author include *The New Masonic Order, Judaism and Freemasonry, Global Freemasonry, Kabbalah and Freemasonry, Knight Templars, Philosophy of Zionism, Kabbalah and Zionism, Islam Denounces Terrorism, Terrorism: The Ritual of the Devil, The Disasters Darwinism Brought to Humanity, Communism in Ambush, Fascism: The Bloody Ideology of Darwinism, The 'Secret Hand' in Bosnia, Behind the Scenes of The Holocaust, Behind the Scenes of Terrorism, Israel's Kurdish Card, The Oppression Policy of Communist China and Eastern Turkestan, Palestine, Solution: The Values of the Qur'an, The Winter of Islam and Its Expected Spring, Articles 1-2-3, A Weapon of Satan: Romanticism, The Light of the Qur'an Destroyed Satanism, Signs from the Chapter of the Cave to the Last Times, Signs of the Last Day, The Last Times and The Beast of the Earth, Truths 1-2, The Western World Turns to God, The Evolution Deceit, Precise Answers to Evolutionists, The Blunders of Evolutionists, Confessions of Evolutionists, The Misconception of the Evolution of the Species, The Qur'an Denies Darwinism, Perished Nations, For Men of Understanding, The Prophet Musa, The Prophet Yusuf, The Prophet Muhammad (saas), The Prophet Sulayman, The Golden Age, Allah's Artistry in Colour, Glory is Everywhere, The Importance of the Evidences of Creation, The Truth of the Life of This World, The Nightmare of Disbelief, Knowing the Truth, Eternity Has Already Begun, Timelessness and the Reality of Fate, Matter: Another Name for Illusion, The Little Man in the Tower, Islam and the Philosophy of Karma, The Dark Magic of Darwinism, The Religion of Darwinism, The Collapse of the Theory of Evolution in 20 Questions, Engineering in Nature, Technology Mimics Nature, The Impasse of Evolution I (Encyclopedic), The Impasse of Evolution II (Encyclopedic), Allah is Known Through Reason, The Qur'an Leads the Way to Science, The Real Origin of Life, Consciousness in the Cell, Technology Imitates Nature, A String of Miracles, The Creation of the Universe, Miracles of the Qur'an, The Design in Nature, Self-Sacrifice and Intelligent Behaviour Models in Animals, The End of Darwinism, Deep Thinking, Never Plead Ignorance, The Green Miracle: Photosynthesis, The Miracle in the Cell, The Miracle in the Eye, The Miracle in the Spider, The Miracle in the Gnat, The Miracle in the Ant, The Miracle of the Immune System, The Miracle of Creation in Plants, The Miracle in the Atom, The Miracle in the Honeybee, The Miracle of Seed, The Miracle of Hormone, The Miracle of the Termite, The Miracle of the Human Body, The Miracle of Man's Creation, The Miracle of Protein, The Miracle of Smell and Taste, The Miracle of Microworld, The Secrets of DNA.*

The author's childrens books are: *Wonders of Allah's Creation, The World of Animals, The Glory in the Heavens, Wonderful Creatures, Let's Learn Our Islam, The Miracles in Our Bodies, The World of Our Little Friends: The Ants, Honeybees That Build Perfect Combs, Skillful Dam Builders: Beavers.*

The author's other works on Quranic topics include: *The Basic Concepts in the Qur'an*, *The Moral Values of the Qur'an*, *Quick Grasp of Faith 1-2-3*, *Ever Thought About the Truth?*, *Crude Understanding of Disbelief*, *Devoted to Allah*, *Abandoning the Society of Ignorance*, *The Real Home of Believers: Paradise*, *Knowledge of the Qur'an*, *Qur'an Index*, *Emigrating for the Cause of Allah*, *The Character of the Hypocrite in the Qur'an*, *The Secrets of the Hypocrite*, *The Names of Allah*, *Communicating the Message and Disputing in the Qur'an*, *Answers from the Qur'an*, *Death Resurrection Hell*, *The Struggle of the Messengers*, *The Avowed Enemy of Man: Satan*, *The Greatest Slander: Idolatry*, *The Religion of the Ignorant*, *The Arrogance of Satan*, *Prayer in the Qur'an*, *The Theory of Evolution*, *The Importance of Conscience in the Qur'an*, *The Day of Resurrection*, *Never Forget*, *Disregarded Judgements of the Qur'an*, *Human Characters in the Society of Ignorance*, *The Importance of Patience in the Qur'an*, *General Information from the Qur'an*, *The Mature Faith*, *Before You Regret*, *Our Messengers Say*, *The Mercy of Believers*, *The Fear of Allah*, *Jesus Will Return*, *Beauties Presented by the Qur'an for Life*, *A Bouquet of the Beauties of Allah 1-2-3-4*, *The Iniquity Called "Mockery,"* *The Mystery of the Test*, *The True Wisdom According to the Qur'an*, *The Struggle Against the Religion of Irreligion*, *The School of Yusuf*, *The Alliance of the Good*, *Slanders Spread Against Muslims Throughout History*, *The Importance of Following the Good Word*, *Why Do You Deceive Yourself?*, *Islam: The Religion of Ease*, *Zeal and Enthusiasm Described in the Qur'an*, *Seeing Good in All*, *How do the Unwise Interpret the Qur'an?*, *Some Secrets of the Qur'an*, *The Courage of Believers*, *Being Hopeful in the Qur'an*, *Justice and Tolerance in the Qur'an*, *Basic Tenets of Islam*, *Those Who do not Listen to the Qur'an*, *Taking the Qur'an as a Guide*, *A Lurking Threat:Heedlessness*, *Sincerity in the Qur'an*, *The Religion of Worshipping People*, *The Methods of theLiar in the Qur' an*, *The Happiness of Believers*

INTRODUCTION

The Theory Of Evolution has been around for 150 years, and has had a great influence on the way people look at the world. It proposes the lie that they came into this world as the result of chance and that they are a "species of animal." Furthermore, it teaches them that the only law in life is a selfish struggle for survival and to stay alive. The effects of this idea can be clearly seen in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: people's increasing selfishness, the moral degeneration in society, the rapid spread of self-interest, ruthlessness, and violence, the development of totalitarian and bloody ideologies such as fascism and communism, social and individual crises as people grow distant from the morality of religion,...

The social results of the theory of evolution have been examined in other books of this author. (see Harun Yahya's *The Disasters Darwinism Brought to Humanity*, *Communism Lies in Ambush*, *The Black Magic of Darwinism*, and *The Religion of Darwinism*). It is revealed in these books that this theory, which claims to be "scientific," actually has no scientific basis at all, that it is a scenario stubbornly defended in the face of all the facts, consisting of nothing but superstitions.

It is essential that those who wish to learn about the true nature of the theory of evolution and the Darwinian "worldview" that has systematically dragged the world towards violence, savagery, ruthlessness, and conflict for the last 150 years turn to those books.

This book will consider the invalidity of the theory of evolution at a more general level. Evolutionists' claims on certain matters will be responded to with questions that are frequently asked, the meanings of which are not entirely understood. The answers provided in this book can be found in more scientific detail in those of this author's books such as *The Evolution Deceit*, and *Darwinism Refuted*.

1. WHY IS THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION NOT SCIENTIFICALLY VALID?

The theory of evolution maintains that life on Earth came about as the result of chance and emerged by itself from natural conditions. This theory is not a scientific law or a proven fact. Underneath its scientific façade it is a materialist worldview that Darwinists are trying to impose on society. The bases of this theory, which has been disproved by science in every field, are suggestions and propaganda methods consisting of deceptions, falsehood, contradiction, cheating, and sleight of hand.

The theory of evolution was put forward as an imaginary hypothesis in the context of the primitive scientific understanding of the nineteenth century, and to this day it has not been backed up by any scientific discovery or experiment. On the contrary, all the methods employed to confirm the theory have merely proven its invalidity.

However, even today many people think that the theory is a proven fact, like the force of gravity or the law of buoyancy. Because, as stated at the beginning, the true nature of the theory of evolution is very different from what is usually supposed. For this reason, some people do not know what rotten foundations this theory has, how it is disproved by science at every turn, and how evolutionists are trying to keep it alive in its death throes. Evolutionists have no other support than unconfirmed hypotheses, biased and unrealistic observations, and imaginary drawings, methods of psychological suggestion, countless falsehoods, and sleight-of-hand techniques.

Today, such branches of science as paleontology, genetics, biochemistry, and molecular biology have proven that it is quite impossible for life to come about as a result of chance and to emerge by itself from natural conditions. The living cell, it is commonly agreed by the world of science, is the most complex structure that mankind has so far encountered. Modern science has revealed that just one living cell has a much more complex structure and mutually interconnected complicated systems than a large city. Such a complex structure can only function if all its separate parts emerge at the same time and in full working order. Otherwise, it will serve no purpose, and will fall apart over time and disappear. We cannot expect that its parts developed by chance over millions of years as claimed by the theory of evolution. For that reason, the complex design in just one cell clearly shows that God created life. (For more details, see Harun Yahya, *The Miracle in the Cell*)

However, those who defend materialist philosophy do not want to accept the fact of creation for various ideological reasons. That is because the existence and spread of societies living in the light of that beautiful morality that true religion offers to man by means of God's commands and prohibitions is not in these materialists' interests. Masses devoid of any spiritual and moral values suit these people far better, since they can manipulate them for their own worldly interests. For this reason, they try to impose the theory of evolution, which encourages the lie that mankind was not created but rather emerged by chance and evolved from animals, and to keep it alive at whatever costs. Despite all the clear scientific proof that destroys the theory of evolution and confirms the fact of creation, they abandon all reason and logic and defend this nonsense at every available opportunity.

It has actually been proved that it is impossible for the first living cell, or even just one of the millions of protein molecules in that cell, to have come about by chance. This has been demonstrated not only by experiments and observations, but also by mathematical calculations of probability. In other words, evolution collapses at the very first step: that of explaining the emergence of the first living cell.

Not only could the cell, the smallest unit of life, never have come about by chance in the primitive and uncontrolled conditions in the early days of the Earth, as evolutionists would have us believe, it cannot even be synthesized in the most advanced laboratories of the twentieth century. Amino acids, the building blocks of the proteins that make up the living cell, cannot of themselves build such organelles in the cell as mitochondria, ribosomes, cell membranes, or the endoplasmic reticulum, let alone a whole cell. For this reason, the claim that evolution brought about the first cell by chance remains the product of a fantasy based entirely on imagination.

The living cell, which still harbours many secrets that have not been explained, is one of the major difficulties facing the theory of evolution.

Another terrible dilemma from the point of view of evolution is the DNA molecule in the nucleus of the living cell, a coding system with 3.5 billion units containing all the details of life. DNA was first discovered using X-ray crystallography in the late 1940s and early 1950s, and is a giant molecule with a superb plan and design. For many years, Francis Crick, a Nobel-prize laureate, believed in the theory of molecular evolution, but eventually even he had to admit to himself that such a complex molecule could not have emerged spontaneously by chance, as the result of an evolutionary process:

An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that, in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle.¹

The Turkish evolutionist Professor Ali Demirsoy was forced to make the following confession on the issue:

In fact, the probability of the formation of a protein and a nucleic acid (DNA-RNA) is a probability way beyond estimating. Furthermore, the chance of the emergence of a certain protein chain is so slight as to be called astronomic.²

Homer Jacobson, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry, makes the following admission regarding how impossible it is for life to have come about by chance:

Directions for the reproduction of plans, for energy and the extraction of parts from the current environment, for the growth sequence, and for the effector mechanism translating instructions into growth—all had to be simultaneously present at that moment [when life began]. This combination of events has seemed an incredibly unlikely happenstance...³

The fossil record represents another crushing defeat for the theory of evolution. Among all the fossils discovered over the years, there is not one trace of the intermediate forms that would be necessary if living things were to have evolved stage by stage from simple species to more complex ones, as the theory of evolution claims. If such creatures had really existed, there would have been millions, even billions, of them. More importantly, the remains of these creatures should be present in the fossil record. If these intermediate forms had ever really existed, their numbers would be even greater than the number of animal species we know today, and everywhere the world should be full of their fossil remains. Evolutionists look for these intermediate forms in all the feverish fossil research that has been carried out since the nineteenth century. However, there has been no trace of these intermediate forms, despite all the eager searching for the last 150 years.

In short, the fossil record shows that living species emerged suddenly and perfectly formed, not by following a process from primitive forms to advanced ones as evolution claims.

Evolutionists have tried very hard to find evidence for their theory or so, but have actually proved by their own hand that no evolutionary process could have been possible. In conclusion, modern science reveals the

following indisputable fact: **Living things did not emerge as the result of blind chance, but God created them.**

2. HOW DOES THE COLLAPSE OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION DEMONSTRATE THE TRUTH OF REATION?

When we ask how life on Earth emerged, we find two different answers:

One is that living things emerged by evolution. According to the theory of evolution, which makes this claim, life began with the first cell, which itself emerged by chance or by some hypothetical natural laws of "self-organization." Again as a result of chance and natural laws, this living cell developed and evolved, and by taking on different forms gave rise to the millions of species of life on Earth.

The second answer is "Creation." All living things came into existence by being created by an intelligent Creator. When life and the millions of forms it takes, which could not possibly have come into existence by chance, were first created, they had the same complete, flawless, and superior design that they possess today. The fact that even the simplest-looking forms of life possess such complex structures and systems that could never have come about by chance and natural conditions is a clear proof of this.

Outside these two alternatives, there is no third claim or hypothesis today regarding how life emerged. According to the rules of logic, if one answer to a question with two alternative possible answers is proved to be false, then the other must be true. This rule, one of the most fundamental in logic, is called disjunctive inference (*modus tollendo ponens*).

In other words, if it is demonstrated that living species on Earth did not evolve by chance, as the theory of evolution claims, then that is clear proof that they were formed by a Creator. Scientists who support the theory of evolution agree that there is no third alternative. One of these, Douglas Futuyma, makes the following statement:

Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must indeed have been created by some omnipotent intelligence. 4

The fossil record provides the answer to the evolutionist Futuyma. The science of fossils (paleontology) shows that all living groups emerged on Earth at different times, all at once, and perfectly formed.

All the discoveries from excavations and studies over the last hundred years or so show that, contrary to evolutionists' expectations, living things came into existence suddenly, in perfect and flawless form, in other words that they were "created." Bacteria, protozoa, worms, molluscs, and other invertebrate sea creatures, arthropods, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals all appeared suddenly, with complex organs and systems. There are no fossils that show any so-called "transition" between them. Paleontology bears the same message as other branches of science: Living things did not evolve, but were created. As a result, while evolutionists were trying to prove their unrealistic theory, they by their own hands produced proof of creation.

Robert Carroll, an expert on vertebrate paleontology and a committed evolutionist, comes to admit that the Darwinist hope has not been satisfied with fossil discoveries:

Despite more than a hundred years of intense collecting efforts since the time of Darwin's death, the fossil record still does not yield the picture of **infinitely numerous transitional links** that he expected. 5

The Cambrian Explosion is enough to tear down the theory of evolution

The world of living things is divided by biologists into such fundamental groups as plants, animals, fungi etc. These are then subdivided into different "phyla." When designating these phyla, the fact that each one possesses completely different physical structures should always be borne in mind. *Arthropoda* (insects, spiders, and other creatures with jointed legs), for instance, are a phylum by themselves, and all the animals in the phylum have the same fundamental physical structure. The phylum called *Chordata* includes those creatures with a notochord or, most commonly, a spinal column. All the large animals such as fish, birds, reptiles, and mammals that we are familiar in daily life are in a subphylum of *Chordata* known as vertebrates.

There are around 35 different phyla of animals, including the *Mollusca*, which include soft-bodied creatures such as snails and octopuses, or the *Nematoda*, which include diminutive worms. The most important feature of these phyla is, as we touched on earlier, that they possess totally different physical characteristics. The categories below the phyla possess basically similar body plans, but the phyla are very different from one another.

So how did these differences come about?

Let us first consider the Darwinist hypothesis. As we know, Darwinism proposes that life developed from one single common ancestor, and took on all its varieties by a series of tiny changes. In that case, life should first have emerged in very similar and simple forms. And according to the same theory, the differentiation between, and growing complexity in, living things must have happened in parallel over time.

According to Darwinism, life must be like a tree, with a common root, subsequently splitting up into different branches. And this hypothesis is constantly emphasized in Darwinist sources, where the concept of the "tree of life" is frequently employed. According to this tree concept, one phylum must first emerge, and then the other phyla must slowly come about with minute changes over very long periods of time.

That is the theory of evolution's claim. But is this really how it happened?

Definitely not. Quite the contrary, animals have been very different and complex since the moment they first emerged. **All the animal phyla known today emerged at the same time, in the middle of the geological period known as the Cambrian Age.** The Cambrian Age is a geological period estimated to have lasted some 65 million years, approximately between 570 to 505 million years ago. But the period of the abrupt appearance of major animal groups fit in an even shorter phase of the Cambrian, often referred to as the "Cambrian explosion." Stephen C. Meyer, P. A. Nelson, and Paul Chien, in an article based on a detailed literature survey, dated 2001, note that the "Cambrian explosion occurred within an exceedingly narrow window of geologic time, lasting no more than 5 million years."⁶

Before then, there is no trace in the fossil record of anything apart from single-celled creatures and a few very primitive multicellular ones. All animal phyla emerged completely formed and all at once, in the very short period of time represented by the Cambrian Explosion. (Five million years is a very short time in geological terms!)

The fossils found in Cambrian rocks belong to very different creatures, such as snails, trilobites, sponges, jellyfish, starfish, shellfish, etc. Most of the creatures in this layer have complex systems and advanced structures,

such as eyes, gills, and circulatory systems, exactly the same as those in modern specimens. These structures are at one and the same time very advanced, and very different.

Richard Monastersky, a staff writer at *Science News* journal, states the following about the Cambrian explosion, which is a deathtrap for evolutionary theory:

A half-billion years ago, **...the remarkably complex forms of animals we see today suddenly appeared.** This moment, right at the start of Earth's Cambrian Period, some 550 million years ago, marks the evolutionary explosion that filled the seas with the world's first complex creatures.⁷

Phillip Johnson, a professor at the University of California at Berkeley who is also one of the world's foremost critics of Darwinism, describes the contradiction between this paleontological truth and Darwinism:

Darwinian theory predicts a "cone of increasing diversity," as the first living organism, or first animal species, gradually and continually diversified to create the higher levels of taxonomic order. The animal fossil record more resembles such a cone turned upside down, with **the phyla present at the start and thereafter decreasing.** ⁸

As Phillip Johnson has revealed, far from its being the case that phyla came about by stages, in reality they all came into being at once, and some of them even became extinct in later periods. The meaning of the emergence of very different living creatures all of a sudden and perfectly formed, is creation, as evolutionist Futuyma has also accepted. As we have seen, all the available scientific discoveries disprove the claims of the theory of evolution and reveal the truth of creation.

3. HOW FAR BACK DO TRACES OF MAN GO? WHY DO THESE NOT SUPPORT EVOLUTION?

We need to turn to the fossil record to find an answer to the question of when man appeared on Earth. This record shows that man goes back millions of years. These discoveries consist of skeletons and skulls, and the remains of people who lived at various times. One of the oldest traces of man are the "footprints" found by the famous palaeontologist Mary Leakey in 1977 in Tanzania's Laetoli region.

These remains caused a great furore in the world of science. Research indicated that these footprints were in a 3.6-million-year-old layer. Russell Tuttle, who saw the footprints, wrote:

A small barefoot *Homo sapiens* could have made them... In all discernible morphological features, the feet of the individuals that made the trails are indistinguishable from those of modern humans. ⁹

Impartial examinations of the footprints revealed their real owners. In reality, these footprints consisted of 20 fossilized footprints of a 10-year-old modern human and 27 footprints of an even younger one. Such famous paleoanthropologists as Don Johnson and Tim White, who examined the prints found by Mary Leakey, corroborated that conclusion. White revealed his thoughts by saying:

Make no mistake about it... They are like modern human footprints. If one were left in the sand of a California beach today, and a four-year old were asked what it was, he would instantly say that somebody had walked there. He wouldn't be able to tell it from a hundred other prints on the beach, nor would you. ¹⁰

These footprints sparked an important debate among evolutionists. That was because for them to accept that these were human footprints would mean that the imaginary progression they had drawn up from ape to man

could no longer be maintained. However, at this point dogmatic evolutionist logic once again showed its face. Most evolutionist scientists once more abandoned science for the sake of their prejudices. They claimed that the footprints found at Laetoli were those of an ape-like creature. Russell Tuttle, who was one of the evolutionists defending this claim, wrote:

In sum, the 3.5 million-year-old footprint traits at Laetoli site G resemble those of habitually unshod modern humans. None of their features suggest that the Laetoli hominids were less capable bipeds than we are. If the G footprints were not known to be so old, we would readily conclude that there were made by a member of our genus *Homo*... In any case, we should shelve the loose assumption that the Laetoli footprints were made by Lucy's kind, *Australopithecus afarensis*. 11

Another of the oldest remains to do with man was the ruins of a stone hut found in the Olduvai Gorge region by Louis Leakey in the 1970s. The remains of the hut were found in a layer 1.7 million years old. It is known that structures of this kind, of which similar examples are still used in Africa in the present day, could only be built by *Homo sapiens*, in other words modern man. The significance of the remains is that they reveal that man lived at the same time as the so-called ape-like creatures that evolutionists portray as his ancestors.

A 2.3 million-year-old modern human jaw found in the Hadar region of Ethiopia was very important from the point of view of showing that modern man had existed on the Earth much longer than evolutionists expected.12

One of the oldest and most perfect human fossils is KNM-WT 1500, also known as the "Turkana Child" skeleton. The 1.6 million-year-old fossil is described by the evolutionist Donald Johanson in these terms:

He was tall and thin, in body shape and limb proportions resembling present-day equatorial Africans. Despite his youth, the boy's limb nearly matched the mean measurements for white North American adult males. 13

It is confirmed that the fossil was that of a 12-year-old boy, who would have been 1.83 metres tall in adolescence. The American paleoanthropologist Alan Walker said that he doubted that "the average pathologist could tell the difference between the fossil skeleton and that of a modern human." Concerning the skull, Walker wrote that he laughed when he saw it because "it looked so much like a Neanderthal."14

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

We expected something big, something large, something inflated—you know, something primitive... Our expectation of an 800,000-year-old boy was something like Turkana Boy. And what we found was a totally modern face.... To me this is most spectacular—these are the kinds of things that shake you. Finding something totally unexpected like that. Not finding fossils; finding fossils is unexpected too, and it's okay. But the most spectacular thing is finding something you thought belonged to the present, in the past. It's like finding something like—like a tape recorder in Gran Dolina. That would be very surprising. We don't expect cassettes and tape recorders in the Lower Pleistocene. Finding a modern face 800,000 years ago—it's the same thing. We were very surprised when we saw it. 15

As we have seen, fossil discoveries give the lie to the claim of "the evolution of man." This claim is presented by some media organizations as if it were a proven fact, whereas all that actually exist are fictitious

theories. In fact, evolutionist scientists accept this, and admit that the claim of "the evolution of man" lacks any scientific evidence.

For instance, by saying, "We appear suddenly in the fossil record" the evolutionist paleontologists C. A. Villie, E. P. Solomon and P. W. Davis admit that man emerged all of a sudden, in other words with no evolutionary ancestor.¹⁶

Mark Collard and Bernard Wood, two evolutionist anthropologists were forced to say, "**existing phylogenetic hypotheses about human evolution are unlikely to be reliable.**" in an article they wrote in 2000.¹⁷

Every new fossil discovery places evolutionists in an even worse quandary, even if certain frivolous newspapers do print headlines such as "Missing link discovered." The fossil skull discovered in 2001 and named *Kenyanthropus platyops* is the latest example of this. The evolutionist paleontologist Daniel E. Lieberman from Washington University's Department of Anthropology had this to say about *Kenyanthropus platyops* in an article in the leading scientific journal, *Nature*:

The evolutionary history of humans is complex and unresolved. **It now looks set to be thrown into further confusion by the discovery of another species and genus, dated to 3.5 million years ago...** The nature of *Kenyanthropus platyops* raises all kinds of questions, about human evolution in general and the behaviour of this species in particular. Why, for example, does it have the unusual combination of small cheek teeth and a big flat face with an anteriorly positioned arch of the cheekbone? All other known hominin species with big faces and similarly positioned cheekbones have big teeth. **I suspect the chief role of *K. platyops* in the next few years will be to act as a sort of party spoiler, highlighting the confusion that confronts research into evolutionary relationships among hominins.** ¹⁸

The latest evidence to shatter the evolutionary theory's claim about the origin of man is the new fossil *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* unearthed in the Central African country of Chad in the summer of 2002.

The fossil has set the cat among the pigeons in the world of Darwinism. In its article giving news of the discovery, the world-renowned journal *Nature* admitted that "New-found skull could sink our current ideas about human evolution."¹⁹

Daniel Lieberman of Harvard University said that "This [discovery] will have the impact of a small nuclear bomb."²⁰

The reason for this is that although the fossil in question is 7 million years old, it has a more "human-like" structure (according to the criteria evolutionists have hitherto used) than the 5 million-year-old *Australopithecus* ape species that is alleged to be "mankind's oldest ancestor." This shows that the evolutionary links established between extinct ape species based on the highly subjective and prejudiced criterion of "human similarity" are totally imaginary.

John Whitfield, in his article "Oldest Member of Human Family Found" published in *Nature* on July, 11, 2002, confirms this view quoting from Bernard Wood, an evolutionist anthropologist from George Washington University in Washington:

"When I went to medical school in 1963, human evolution looked like a ladder." he [Bernard Wood] says. The ladder 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. We have a menagerie of fossil hominids... How they are related to each other and which, if any of them, are human forebears is still debated.²¹

The comments of Henry Gee, the senior editor of *Nature* and a leading paleoanthropologist, about the newly discovered ape fossil are very noteworthy. In his article published in *The Guardian*, Gee refers to the debate about the fossil and writes:

Whatever the outcome, the skull shows, once and for all, that the old idea of a "missing link" is bunk... It should now be quite plain that the very idea of the missing link, always shaky, is now completely untenable. 22

As we have seen, the increasing number of discoveries is producing results opposed to the theory of evolution, not in favour of it. If such an evolutionary process had happened in the past, there should be many traces of it, and each new discovery should further strengthen the theory. In fact, in *The Origin of Species*, Darwin claimed that science would develop in just that direction. In his view, the only problem facing his theory in the fossil record was a lack of fossil discoveries. He hoped that future research would unearth countless fossils to support his theory. However, subsequent scientific discoveries have actually proved Darwin's dreams to be totally unfounded.

The importance of human-linked remains

The discoveries regarding man, of which we have seen a few examples here, reveal very important truths. In particular, they have once again demonstrated what a great product of fantasy the evolutionists' claim that man's ancestor was an ape-like creature is. For this reason, it is out of the question that these ape species could be man's ancestors.

In conclusion, the fossil record shows us that man came into existence millions of years ago in just the same form as he is now, and that he has come down to the present with absolutely no evolutionary development. If they claim to be genuinely scientific and honest, evolutionists should throw their imaginary progression from ape to man into the bin at this point. The fact that they do not give up this spurious family tree shows that evolution is not a theory that is defended in the name of science, but rather a dogma they are struggling to keep alive in the face of the scientific facts.

4. WHY IS THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION NOT THE "BASIS OF BIOLOGY"?

One claim that is frequently repeated by evolutionists is the lie that the theory of evolution is the basis of biology... Those who put forward this claim suggest that biology could not develop, or even exist, without the theory of evolution. This claim actually stems from a demagogy born out of despair. The philosopher Professor Arda Denkel, one of the foremost names in Turkish science, makes the following comment on this subject:

For instance, it is quite wrong to suggest that "Rejecting the theory of evolution means rejecting the biological and geological sciences and the discoveries of physics and chemistry." Because in order to make such an inference (here *a modus tollens*) there need to be some propositions regarding chemical, physical, geological and biological discoveries that imply the theory of evolution. However, the discoveries, or statements of them, do not imply the theory. Therefore, they do not prove it."23

It is enough to look at the history of science to realise what an invalid and irrational thing it is to claim that "evolution is the basis of biology." If the claim were true, it would mean that no biological sciences had developed in the world before the emergence of the theory of evolution, and that they were all born after it. However, many branches of biology, such as anatomy, physiology, and paleontology, were born and developed before the theory of evolution. On

the other hand, evolution is a hypothesis that emerged after these sciences, which Darwinists are trying to impose on these sciences by force.

A similar method to that employed by evolutionists was used in the USSR in Stalin's time. In those days communism, the official ideology of the Soviet Union, considered the philosophy of "dialectical materialism" to be the basis of all the sciences. Stalin had ordered that all scientific research should conform to dialectical materialism. In this way, all books on biology, chemistry, physics, history, politics, and even art had introductory sections to the effect that those sciences were based on dialectical materialism and the views of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

However, with the collapse of the USSR this obligation was lifted, and books returned to being ordinary technical, scientific texts containing the same information. The abandoning of such nonsense as dialectical materialism did not leave science in the shade, but rather lifted pressure and obligations from it.

In our day, there is no reason why science should remain tied to the theory of evolution. Science is based on observation and experimentation. Evolution, on the other hand, is a hypothesis regarding an unobservable past. Furthermore, the theory's claims and propositions have always been disproved by science and the laws of logic. Science will suffer no loss, of course, when this hypothesis is abandoned. The American biologist G. W. Harper has this to say on the subject:

It is frequently claimed that Darwinism is central to modern biology. On the contrary, if all references to Darwinism suddenly disappeared, biology would remain substantially unchanged... 24

In fact, quite to the contrary, science will progress in a much faster and healthier manner when it is freed from the insistence of a theory full of dogmatism, prejudice, nonsense, and fabrication.

5. WHY IS THE EXISTENCE OF DIFFERENT RACES NOT EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION?

Some evolutionists try to put the existence of different races forward as evidence for evolution. In fact, this claim is more frequently expressed by amateur evolutionists who have a less than sufficient knowledge of the theory they defend.

The thesis proposed by those who defend this claim is based on the question, "If, as divine sources say, life began with one man and one woman, how could different races have emerged?" Another way of putting it is: "Since Adam and Eve's height, colour, and other features were those of only two people, how could races with entirely different features have emerged?"

In fact, the problem lying beneath all these questions or objections is an insufficient knowledge of the laws of genetics, or the ignoring of them. In order to understand the reason for the differences between the races in today's world, it will be necessary to have some idea of the subject of "variation," which is closely linked to this question.

Variation, a term used in genetics, refers to a genetic event that causes the individuals or groups of a certain type or species to possess different characteristics from one another. The source of this variation is the genetic information possessed by the individuals within that species. As a result of breeding between those individuals, that genetic information comes together in later generations in different combinations. There is an

exchange of genetic material between the mother's and father's chromosomes. Genes thus get mixed up with one another. The result of this is a wide variety of individual features.

The different physical features between human races are due to variations within the human race. All the people on Earth carry basically the same genetic information, yet some have slanted eyes, some have red hair, some have long noses, and others are short of stature, all depending on the extent of the variation potential of this genetic information.

In order to understand the variation potential, let us consider a society in which brunette, brown-eyed people predominate over blond, blue-eyed individuals. As a result of the two communities intermingling and marrying over time, new generations which are brunette but blue-eyed will be seen. In other words, the physical characteristics of both groups will come together in subsequent generations and produce new appearances. When one imagines other physical characteristics mixing in the same way, it is clear that a great variety will emerge.

The important point that must be understood here is this: There are two genes that rule every physical feature. One may dominate the other, or they may both influence matters to an equal extent. For instance, two genes determine the colour of a person's eyes. One comes from the mother, the other from the father. Whichever gene is the dominant one, the individual's eye colour will be determined by that gene. In general, dark colours dominate lighter ones. In this way, if a person possesses genes for brown and for green eyes, his eyes will be brown because the brown eye gene is dominant. However, the recessive green colour can be passed down the generations and emerge at a later time. In other words, parents with brown eyes can have a green-eyed child. That is because that colour gene is recessive in both parents.

This law applies to all other physical features and the genes which govern them. Hundreds, or even thousands, of physical features, such as the ears, nose, the shape of the mouth, height, bone structure, and organ structure, shape, and characteristics, are all controlled in the same way. Thanks to this, all the limitless information in the genetic structure can be passed on to subsequent generations without becoming outwardly visible. Adam, the first human being, and Eve, were able to pass the rich information in their genetic structure on to subsequent generations even though only a part of it was reflected in their physical appearance. Geographical isolation that had happened over human history has led to an atmosphere where different physical features came together in different groups. Over a long period of time, this led to different groups having different bone structures, skin colour, height, and skull volumes. This eventually led to the different races.

However, this long period did not change one thing, of course. No matter what their height, skin colour and skull volume, all races are part of the human species.

6. WHY IS THE CLAIM THAT HUMAN AND APE GENOMES ARE 99 PERCENT SIMILAR AND THAT THIS CONFIRMS EVOLUTION NOT TRUE?

MANY evolutionist sources from time to time carry the claim that humans and apes share 99 percent of their genetic information and that this is proof of evolution. This evolutionist claim focuses particularly on chimpanzees, and says that this creature is the closest monkey to man, for which reason there is a kinship between the two. However, this is a false proof put forward by evolutionists who take advantage of the layman's lack of information on these subjects.

99% similarity claim is misleading propaganda

For a very long time, the evolutionist choir had been propagating the unsubstantiated thesis that there is very little genetic difference between humans and chimps. In every piece of evolutionist literature, you could read sentences like "we are 99 percent identical to chimps" or "there is only 1 percent of DNA that makes us human." Although no conclusive comparison between human and chimp genomes has been done, the Darwinist ideology led them to assume that there is very little difference between the two species.

A study in October 2002 revealed that the evolutionist propaganda on this issue—like many others—is completely false. Humans and chimps are not "99% similar" as the evolutionist fairy tale went on. Genetic similarity turns out to be less than 95 %. In a news story reported by CNN.com, entitled "Humans, chimps more different than thought," it reads:

There are more differences between a chimpanzee and a human being than once believed, according to a new genetic study.

Biologists have long held that the genes of chimps and humans are about 98.5 percent identical. But Roy Britten, a biologist at the California Institute of Technology, said in a study published this week that a new way of comparing the genes shows that the human and chimp genetic similarity is only about 95 percent.

Britten based this on a computer program that compared 780,000 of the 3 billion base pairs in the human DNA helix with those of the chimp. He found more mismatches than earlier researchers had, and concluded that at least 3.9 percent of the DNA bases were different.

This led him to conclude that there is a fundamental genetic difference between the species of about 5 percent.²⁵

New Scientist, a leading science magazine and a strong supporter of Darwinism, reported the following on the same subject in an article titled "Human-chimp DNA difference trebled":

We are more unique than previously thought, according to new comparisons of human and chimpanzee DNA. It has long been held that we share 98.5 per cent of our genetic material with our closest relatives. That now appears to be wrong. In fact, we share less than 95 per cent of our genetic material, a three-fold increase in the variation between us and chimps.²⁶

Biologist Roy Britten and other evolutionists continue to assess the result in terms of the evolutionary theory, but in fact there is no scientific reason to do so. The theory of evolution is supported neither by the fossil record nor by genetic or biochemical data. On the contrary, evidence shows that different life forms on Earth appeared quite abruptly without any evolutionary ancestors and that their complex systems prove the existence of an "intelligent design."

Human DNA is also similar to that of the worm, mosquito, and chicken!

Moreover, the above-mentioned basic proteins are common vital molecules present, not just in chimpanzees, but also in very many completely different living creatures. The structure of the proteins in all these species is very similar to that of the proteins present in humans.

For example, the genetic analyses published in *New Scientist* have revealed a **75% similarity between the DNA of nematode worms and man**.²⁷ This definitely does not mean that there is only a 25% difference between man and these worms!

On the other hand, in another finding which also appeared in the media, it was stated that the comparisons carried out between **the genes of fruit flies belonging to the *Drosophila* genus and human genes yielded a similarity of 60%.²⁸**

When living things other than man are studied, it appears that there is no molecular relationship such as that claimed by evolutionists.²⁹ This fact shows that the concept of similarity is not evidence for evolution.

"Common design": The reason for similarities

It is surely natural for the human body to bear some molecular similarities to other living beings, because they all are made up of the same molecules, they all use the same water and atmosphere, and they all consume foods consisting of the same molecules. Certainly, their metabolisms, and therefore their genetic make-ups, would resemble one another. **This, however, is not evidence that they evolved from a common ancestor.**

This "common material" is the result not of evolution but of "common design," that is, of their being created upon the same plan.

It is possible to explain this matter with an example: all construction in the world is done with similar materials (brick, iron, cement, etc.). This, however, does not mean that these buildings "evolved" from each other. They are constructed separately by using common materials. The same holds for living beings as well.

However, the complexity of the structure of living things cannot be compared to that of bridges, of course.

Life did not originate as the result of unconscious coincidences as evolution claims, but as the result of the creation of God, the Almighty, the possessor of infinite knowledge and wisdom.

7. WHY IS THE CLAIM THAT DINOSAURS EVOLVED INTO BIRDS AN UNSCIENTIFIC MYTH?

The theory of evolution is a fairy tale built on the hope of the impossible coming true. Birds have a special place in this story. Above all things, birds possess that magnificent organ, the wing. Beyond the structural wonders of wings, their function also inspires amazement. So much so that flight was man's obsession for thousands of years, and thousands of scientists and researchers put considerable effort into duplicating it. Apart from a few very primitive attempts, man only managed to build machines capable of flying in the twentieth century. Birds have been doing something which man tried to do with the accumulated technology of hundreds of years right through the millions of years that they have existed. Moreover, a young bird can acquire this skill after only a few attempts. Many of their characteristics are so perfect that not even the products of the latest modern technology can compare with them.

The theory of evolution relies on prejudiced comments and twisting the truth to account for the emergence of life and all its variety. When it comes to living things such as birds, science is finally sidelined completely, to be replaced by evolutionists' fantasy stories. The reason for this is the creatures that evolutionists claim to be the ancestors of birds. The theory of evolution maintains that the ancestors of birds were dinosaurs,

members of the reptile family. Such a claim raises two questions that need to be answered. The first is, "How did dinosaurs come to grow wings?" The second is, "Why is there no sign of such a development in the fossil record?"

On the subject of how dinosaurs turned into birds, evolutionists debated the matter for a long time and came up with two theories. The first of these is the "cursorial" theory. This maintains that dinosaurs turned into birds by taking to the air from the ground. Supporters of the second theory object to the cursorial theory, and say that it is not possible for dinosaurs to have turned into birds in this way. They offer another solution to the question. They claim that dinosaurs that lived in the branches of trees turned into birds by trying to jump from one branch to another. This is known as the "arboreal" theory. The answer to the question of how dinosaurs could have taken to the air is also ready: "While trying to catch flies."

However, we must first of all put the following question to those people who claim that a flight system, together with wings, emerged from the body of such an animal as a dinosaur: How did flies' flight system, that is much more efficient than that of a helicopter, which is in turn modelled on them, come about? You will see that evolutionists have no answer. It is certainly most unreasonable for a theory which cannot explain the flight system of such a tiny creature as the fly to claim that dinosaurs turned into birds.

As a result, all reasonable, logical scientists are agreed that the only scientific things about these theories is their Latin names. The essence of the matter is that flight by reptiles is simply the product of fantasy.

Evolutionists who claim that dinosaurs turned into birds need to be able to find evidence for it in the fossil record. If dinosaurs did turn into birds, then half-dinosaur, half-bird creatures must have lived in the past and left some trace behind them in the fossil record. For long years evolutionists claimed that a bird called "*Archaeopteryx*" represented such a transition. However, those claims were nothing but a great deception.

The *Archaeopteryx* deception

Archaeopteryx, the so-called ancestor of modern birds according to evolutionists, lived approximately 150 million years ago. The theory holds that some small dinosaurs, such as *Velociraptors* or *Dromaeosaurs*, evolved by acquiring wings and then starting to fly. Thus, *Archaeopteryx* is assumed to be a transitional form that branched off from its dinosaur ancestors and started to fly for the first time.

However, the latest studies of *Archaeopteryx* fossils indicate that this explanation lacks any scientific foundation. This is absolutely not a transitional form, but an extinct species of bird, having some insignificant differences from modern birds.

The thesis that *Archaeopteryx* was a "half-bird" that could not fly perfectly was popular among evolutionist circles until not long ago. The absence of a sternum (breastbone) in this creature was held up as the most important evidence that this bird could not fly properly. (The sternum is a bone found under the thorax to which the muscles required for flight are attached. In our day, this breastbone is observed in all flying and non-flying birds, and even in bats, a flying mammal which belongs to a very different family.)

However, the seventh *Archaeopteryx* fossil, which was found in 1992, disproved this argument. The reason was that in this recently discovered fossil, the breastbone that was long assumed by evolutionists to be missing was discovered to have existed after all. This fossil was described in the journal *Nature* as follows:

The recently discovered seventh specimen of the *Archaeopteryx* preserves a partial, rectangular sternum, long suspected but never previously documented. This attests to its strong flight muscles, but its capacity for long flights is questionable. 30

This discovery invalidated the mainstay of the claims that *Archaeopteryx* was a half-bird that could not fly properly.

Moreover, the structure of the bird's feathers became one of the most important pieces of evidence confirming that *Archaeopteryx* was a flying bird in the true sense. The asymmetric feather structure of *Archaeopteryx* is indistinguishable from that of modern birds, and indicates that it could fly perfectly well. As the eminent paleontologist Carl O. Dunbar states, "Because of its feathers, [*Archaeopteryx* is] distinctly to be classed as a bird."³¹ Paleontologist Robert Carroll further explains the subject:

The geometry of the flight feathers of *Archaeopteryx* is identical with that of modern flying birds, whereas nonflying birds have symmetrical feathers. The way in which the feathers are arranged on the wing also falls within the range of modern birds... According to Van Tyne and Berger, the relative size and shape of the wing of *Archaeopteryx* are similar to that of birds that move through restricted openings in vegetation, such as gallinaceous birds, doves, woodcocks, woodpeckers, and most passerine birds... The flight feathers have been in stasis for at least 150 million years... ³²

Another fact that was revealed by the structure of *Archaeopteryx's* feathers was its warm-blooded metabolism. As was discussed above, reptiles and—although there is some evolutionist wishful thinking on the opposite direction—dinosaurs are cold-blooded animals whose body heat fluctuates with the temperature of their environment, rather than being homeostatically regulated. A very important function of the feathers on birds is the maintenance of a constant body temperature. The fact that *Archaeopteryx* had feathers shows that it was a real, warm-blooded bird that needed to retain its body heat, in contrast to dinosaurs.

The anatomy of *Archaeopteryx* and the evolutionists' error

Two important points evolutionary biologists rely on when claiming *Archaeopteryx* was a transitional form, are the claws on its wings and its teeth.

It is true that *Archaeopteryx* had claws on its wings and teeth in its mouth, but these traits do not imply that the creature bore any kind of relationship to reptiles. Besides, two bird species living today, the *touraco* and the *hoatzin*, have claws which allow them to hold onto branches. These creatures are fully birds, with no reptilian characteristics. That is why it is completely groundless to assert that *Archaeopteryx* is a transitional form just because of the claws on its wings.

Neither do the teeth in *Archaeopteryx's* beak imply that it is a transitional form. Evolutionists are wrong to say that these teeth are reptilian characteristics, since teeth are not a typical feature of reptiles. Today, some reptiles have teeth while others do not. Moreover, *Archaeopteryx* is not the only bird species to possess teeth. It is true that there are no toothed birds in existence today, but when we look at the fossil record, we see that both during the time of *Archaeopteryx* and afterwards, and even until fairly recently, a distinct group of birds existed that could be categorised as "birds with teeth."

The most important point is that the tooth structure of *Archaeopteryx* and other birds with teeth is totally different from that of their alleged ancestors, the dinosaurs. The well-known ornithologists L. D. Martin, J. D. Stewart, and K. N. Whetstone observed that *Archaeopteryx* and other similar birds have unserrated teeth with constricted bases and expanded roots. Yet the teeth of theropod dinosaurs, the alleged ancestors of these birds, had serrated teeth with straight roots.³³ These researchers also compared the ankle bones of *Archaeopteryx* with those of their alleged ancestors, the dinosaurs, and observed no similarity between them. ³⁴

Studies by anatomists such as S. Tarsitano, M.K. Hecht, and A.D. Walker have revealed that some of the similarities that John Ostrom, a leading authority on the subject who claims that *Archaeopteryx* evolved from dinosaurs, and others have seen between the limbs of *Archaeopteryx* and dinosaurs were in reality misinterpretations.³⁵ For example, A.D. Walker has analysed the ear region of *Archaeopteryx* and found that it is very similar to that of modern birds. ³⁶

In his book *Icons of Evolution*, American biologist Jonathan Wells remarks that *Archaeopteryx* has been turned into an "icon" of the theory of evolution, whereas evidence clearly shows that this creature is not the primitive ancestor of birds. According to Wells, one of the indications of this is that theropod dinosaurs—the alleged ancestors of *Archaeopteryx*—are actually younger than *Archaeopteryx*: "Two-legged reptiles that ran along the ground, and had other features one might expect in an ancestor of *Archaeopteryx*, appear later." ³⁷

All these findings indicate that *Archaeopteryx* was not a transitional link but only a bird that fell into a category that can be called "toothed birds." Linking this creature to theropod dinosaurs is completely invalid. In an article headed "*The Demise of the 'Birds Are Dinosaurs' Theory*," the American biologist Richard L. Deem writes the following about *Archaeopteryx* and the bird-dinosaur evolution claim:

The results of the recent studies show that the hands of the theropod dinosaurs are derived from digits I, II, and III, whereas the wings of birds, although they look alike in terms of structure, are derived from digits II, III, and IV... There are other problems with the "birds are dinosaurs" theory. The theropod forelimb is much smaller (relative to body size) than that of *Archaeopteryx*. The small "proto-wing" of the theropod is not very convincing, especially considering the rather hefty weight of these dinosaurs. The vast majority of the theropod lack the semilunate wrist bone, and have a large number of other wrist elements which have no homology to the bones of *Archaeopteryx*. In addition, in almost all theropods, nerve V1 exits the braincase out the side, along with several other nerves, whereas in birds, it exits out the front of the braincase, through its own hole. There is also the minor problem that the vast majority of the theropods appeared after the appearance of *Archaeopteryx*. ³⁸

These facts once more indicate for certain that neither *Archaeopteryx* nor other ancient birds similar to it were transitional forms. The fossils do not indicate that different bird species evolved from each other. On the contrary, the fossil record proves that today's modern birds and some archaic birds such as *Archaeopteryx* and *Confuciusornis*, have become extinct, but the fact that only some of the species that once existed have been able to survive down to the present day does not in itself support the theory of evolution.

Latest Evidence: Ostrich Study Refutes The Dino-Bird Story

The latest blow to the "birds evolved from dinosaurs" theory came from a study made on the embryology of ostriches.

Drs. Alan Feduccia and Julie Nowicki of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill studied a series of live ostrich eggs and, once again, concluded that, there cannot be an evolutionary link between birds and dinosaurs. EurekAlert, a scientific portal held by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), reports the following:

Drs. Alan Feduccia and Julie Nowicki of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill... opened a series of live ostrich eggs at various stages of development and found what they believe is proof that birds could not have descended from dinosaurs...

Whatever the ancestor of birds was, it must have had five fingers, not the three-fingered hand of theropod dinosaurs," Feduccia said... "Scientists agree that dinosaurs developed 'hands' with digits one, two and three... Our studies of ostrich embryos, however, showed conclusively that in birds, only digits two, three and four, which correspond to the human index, middle and ring fingers, develop, and we have pictures to prove it," said Feduccia, professor and former chair of biology at UNC. "This creates a new problem for those who insist that dinosaurs were ancestors of modern birds. How can a bird hand, for example, with digits two, three and four evolve from a dinosaur hand that has only digits one, two and three? That would be almost impossible."³⁹

In the same report, Dr. Feduccia also made important comments on the invalidity—and the shallowness—of the "birds evolved from dinosaurs" theory:

"There are insurmountable problems with that theory," he [Dr. Feduccia] said. "Beyond what we have just reported, there is the time problem in that superficially bird-like dinosaurs occurred some 25 million to 80 million years after the earliest known bird, which is 150 million years old."

"If one views a chicken skeleton and a dinosaur skeleton through binoculars they appear similar, but close and detailed examination reveals many differences," Feduccia said. "Theropod dinosaurs, for example, had curved, serrated teeth, but the earliest birds had straight, unserrated peg-like teeth. They also had a different method of tooth implantation and replacement."⁴⁰

This evidence once again reveals that the "dino-bird" hype is just another "icon" of Darwinism: a myth that is supported only for the sake of a dogmatic faith in the theory.

Evolutionists' bogus dino-bird fossils

With the collapse of evolutionists' claims regarding fossils like *Archaeopteryx*, they are now at a complete dead-end as regards the origin of birds. That is why some evolutionists have had to resort to classical methods—forgery. In the 1990s, the public were several times given the message that "a half-dinosaur, half-bird fossil has been found." The evolutionist media carried pictures of these so-called "dino-birds" and an international campaign was thus set in motion. However, it soon began to emerge that the campaign was based on contradiction and forgery.

The first hero of the campaign was a dinosaur called *Sinosauropteryx*, discovered in China in 1996. The fossil was presented to the whole world as a "feathered dinosaur," and made a number of headlines. However, detailed analyses in the months that followed revealed that the structures which evolutionists had excitedly portrayed as "bird feathers" were actually nothing of the kind.

This was how the matter was presented in an article called "Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur" in the journal *Science*:

Exactly 1 year ago, paleontologists were abuzz about photos of a so-called "feathered dinosaur," which were passed around the halls at the annual meeting of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. The *Sinosauropteryx* specimen from the Yixian Formation in China made the front page of *The New York Times*, and **was viewed by some as confirming the dinosaurian origins of birds. But at this year's vertebrate paleontology meeting in Chicago late last month, the verdict was a bit different:** The structures are not modern feathers, say the roughly half-dozen Western paleontologists who have seen the specimens...paleontologist Larry Martin of Kansas University, Lawrence, thinks the structures are frayed collagenous fibers beneath the skin—and so **have nothing to do with birds.**⁴¹

Another "dino-bird" storm blew up in 1999. Another fossil discovered in China was presented to the world as "major evidence for evolution." *National Geographic* magazine, the source of the campaign, drew and published imaginary "feathered dinosaur" pictures inspired by the fossil, and these hit the headlines in a number of countries. This species, which was said to have lived 125 million years ago, was immediately given the scientific name *Archaeoraptor liaoningensis*.

However, the fossil was a fake and was skilfully constructed from five separate specimens. A group of researchers, among whom were also three paleontologists, proved the forgery one year later with the help of X-ray computed tomography. The dino-bird was actually the product of a Chinese evolutionist. Chinese amateurs formed the dino-bird by using glue and cement from 88 bones and stones. Research suggests that *Archaeoraptor* was built from the front part of the skeleton of an ancient bird, and that its body and tail included bones from four different specimens. An article in the scientific journal *Nature* describes the forgery like this:

The *Archaeoraptor* fossil was announced as a 'missing link' and purported to be possibly the best evidence since *Archaeopteryx* that birds did, in fact, evolve from certain types of carnivorous dinosaur. But *Archaeoraptor* was revealed to be a forgery in which bones of a primitive bird and a non-flying dromaeosaurid dinosaur had been combined... The *Archaeoraptor* specimen, which was reportedly collected from the Early Cretaceous Jiufotang Formation of Liaoning, was smuggled out of China and later sold in the United States on the commercial market... We conclude that *Archaeoraptor* represents two or more species and that it was assembled from at least two, and possibly five, separate specimens.... 42

So how was it that *National Geographic* could have presented such a huge scientific forgery to the whole world as "major evidence for evolution"? The answer to this question lay concealed in the magazine's evolutionary fantasies. Since *National Geographic* was blindly supportive of Darwinism and had no hesitation about using any propaganda tool it saw as being in favour of the theory, it ended up signing up to a second "Piltdown man scandal."

Evolutionist scientists also accepted *National Geographic's* fanaticism. Dr. Storrs L. Olson, head of the famous U.S. Smithsonian Institute's Ornithology Department, announced that he had previously warned that the fossil was a forgery, but that the magazine's executives had ignored him. In a letter he wrote to Peter Raven of *National Geographic*, Olson wrote:

Prior to the publication of the article "Dinosaurs Take Wing" in the July 1998 *National Geographic*, Lou Mazzatenta, the photographer for Sloan's article, invited me to the National Geographic Society to review his photographs of Chinese fossils and to comment on the slant being given to the story. At that time, I tried to interject the fact that strongly supported alternative viewpoints existed to what *National Geographic* intended to present, but it eventually became clear to me that *National Geographic* was not interested in anything other than the prevailing dogma that birds evolved from dinosaurs.⁴³

In a statement in *USA Today*, Olson said, "**The problem is, at some point the fossil was known by *Geographic* to be a fake, and that information was not revealed.**"⁴⁴ In other words, he said that *National Geographic* maintained the deception, even though it knew that the fossil it was portraying as proof of evolution was a forgery.

We must make it clear that this attitude of *National Geographic* was not the first forgery that had been carried out in the name of the theory of evolution. Many such incidents have taken place since it was first proposed. The German biologist Ernst Haeckel drew false pictures of embryos in order to support Darwin. British evolutionists mounted an orangutan jaw on a human skull and exhibited it for some 40 years in the British

Museum as "Piltdown man, the greatest evidence for evolution." American evolutionists put forward "Nebraska man" from a single pig's tooth. All over the world, false pictures called "reconstructions," which have never actually lived, have been portrayed as "primitive creatures" or "ape-men."

In short, evolutionists once again employed the method they first tried in the Piltdown man forgery. They themselves created the intermediate form they were unable to find. This event went down in history as showing how deceptive the international propaganda on behalf of the theory of evolution is, and that evolutionists will resort to all kinds of falsehood for its sake.

8. WHAT SCIENTIFIC FORGERY IS THE MYTH THAT "HUMAN EMBRYOS HAVE GILLS" BASED ON?

The thesis that living things go through various stages in their mothers' wombs that can be seen as evidence for evolution has a special position amongst the unfounded claims of the theory of evolution. That is because the thesis, known as "recapitulation" in evolutionist literature, is more than a scientific deception: It is a scientific forgery.

Haeckel's recapitulation superstition

The term "recapitulation" is a condensation of the dictum "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny," put forward by the evolutionary biologist Ernst Haeckel at the end of the nineteenth century. This theory of Haeckel's postulates that living embryos re-experience the evolutionary process that their pseudo-ancestors underwent. He theorised that during its development in its mother's womb, the human embryo first displays the characteristics of a fish, then those of a reptile, and finally those of a human. The claim that the embryo possesses "gills" while it develops stems from this thesis.

However, this is utter superstition. Scientific developments in the years since recapitulation was first broached have enabled studies to be made of just how valid it is. These studies have shown that the recapitulation doctrine has no other basis than evolutionists' imaginations and deliberate distortions.

It is now known that the "gills" that supposedly appear in the early stages of the human embryo are in fact the initial phases of the middle-ear canal, parathyroid, and thymus. That part of the embryo that was likened to the "egg yolk pouch" turns out to be a pouch that produces blood for the infant. The part that was identified as a "tail" by Haeckel and his followers is in fact the backbone, which resembles a tail only because it takes shape before the legs do.

These are universally acknowledged facts in the scientific world, and are accepted even by evolutionists themselves. George Gaylord Simpson, one of the founders of neo-Darwinism, writes:

Haeckel misstated the evolutionary principle involved. It is now firmly established that ontogeny does not repeat phylogeny.⁴⁵

The following was written in an article in *New Scientist* dated October 16, 1999:

[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.** ⁴⁶

In an article published in *American Scientist*, we read:

Surely the biogenetic law is as dead as a doornail. It was finally exorcised from biology textbooks in the fifties. As a topic of serious theoretical inquiry it was extinct in the twenties... 47

As we have seen, developments since it was first put forward have shown that recapitulation has no scientific basis at all. However, those same advances would show that it was not just a scientific deception, but that it stemmed from a complete "forgery."

Haeckel's forged drawings

Ernst Haeckel, who first put the recapitulation thesis forward, published a number of drawings to back up his theory. **Haeckel produced falsified drawings to make fish and human embryos resemble each other!** When he was caught out, the only defense he offered was that other evolutionists had committed similar offences:

After this compromising confession of "forgery" I should be obliged to consider myself condemned and annihilated if I had not the consolation of seeing side by side with me in the prisoner's dock hundreds of fellow-culprits, among them many of the most trusted observers and most esteemed biologists. The great majority of all the diagrams in the best biological textbooks, treatises and journals would incur in the same degree the charge of "forgery," for all of them are inexact, and are more or less doctored, schematised and constructed. 48

In the September 5, 1997, edition of the well-known scientific journal *Science*, an article was published revealing that Haeckel's embryo drawings were the product of a deception. The article, called "**Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered,**" had this to say:

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*.49

Later in this same article, the following information was revealed:

Not only did Haeckel add or omit features, Richardson and his colleagues report, but **he also fudged the scale to exaggerate similarities among species, even when there were 10-fold differences in size.** Haeckel further blurred differences by neglecting to name the species in most cases, as if one representative was accurate for an entire group of animals. In reality, Richardson and his colleagues note, even closely related embryos such as those of fish vary quite a bit in their appearance and developmental pathway. "It [Haeckel's drawings] looks like it's turning out to be **one of the most famous fakes in biology,**" Richardson concludes.50

It is noteworthy that, although Haeckel's falsification came out in 1901, the subject was still portrayed in many evolutionist publications for nearly a century as if it were a proven scientific law. Those who held evolutionist beliefs inadvertently sent out a most important message by putting their ideology before science: Evolution is not science, it is a dogma that they are trying to keep alive in the face of the scientific facts.

9. WHY IS IT DECEPTIVE TO PORTRAY CLONING AS "EVIDENCE FOR EVOLUTION"?

The fact that such a question as whether such a scientific advance as cloning "supports evolution" is asked or even comes to mind actually reveals a very important truth. This is the cheapness of the propaganda that evolutionists resort to to get people to accept their theory. Since the subject of cloning has nothing to do with the theory of evolution, it cannot be a matter of concern for any professional evolutionist. However, some of those who blindly support evolution at whatever cost, and particularly certain circles within media organizations, have even tried to turn such a totally unconnected matter as cloning into propaganda for evolution.

What does cloning a living thing mean?

The DNA of the living thing that is proposed to be copied is used in the cloning process. The DNA is extracted from any cell belonging to the organism in question, and then placed into an egg cell belonging to another organism of the same species. A shock is then given immediately afterwards, which prompts the egg cell to start dividing. The embryo is then placed into a living thing's womb, where it continues to divide. Scientists then await its development and birth.

Why has cloning nothing to do with evolution?

The concepts of cloning and evolution are completely different. The theory of evolution is built on the claim that inanimate matter turned into living matter by chance. (There is not the slightest scientific proof that this could actually happen.) Cloning, on the other hand, is the copying of a living thing by using genetic material from that creature's cells. The new organism starts from a single cell, and a biological process is transferred to the laboratory and repeated there. In other words, there is no question of such a process happening by "chance"—the basic claim of the theory of evolution—nor of "lifeless matter coming to life."

The cloning process is no evidence for evolution whatsoever. It is, however, clear evidence of a biological law that totally undermines evolution. That is the famous principle that "Life can only come from life," put forward by the famous scientist Louis Pasteur towards the end of the nineteenth century. The fact that cloning is presented as evidence for evolution, despite that open truth, is a deception being carried out by the media.

Advances in many branches of science over the last 30 years have demonstrated that the emergence of life cannot be explained in terms of chance. Evolutionists' scientific errors and one-sided comments have been well-documented, and the theory of evolution has become indefensible within the realm of science. This fact has propelled some evolutionists to look in other areas. That is why scientific advances such as "cloning," or "test-tube babies," have been so fanatically used as evidence for evolution in the recent past.

Evolutionists have nothing more to say to society in the name of science, and so take refuge in the gaps in people's scientific knowledge and try to prolong the theory's life in that way, even though that merely brings the theory to a pitiable state. Just like all other scientific advances, cloning is a very important and revealing scientific advance that also sheds light on the fact that life was created.

Other misinterpretations of cloning

Another misunderstanding that people have fallen into as regards cloning is the idea that cloning can "create human beings." However, cloning bears no such interpretation. Cloning consists of adding genetic information which already exists to a living reproduction mechanism that also already exists. No new mechanism or genetic information is created in the process. Genetic information is taken from someone who already exists and is placed inside a female womb. This enables the child that is eventually born to be the "identical twin" of the person from whom the genetic information was taken.

Many people who do not fully understand what cloning is have all kinds of fantastic ideas about it. For instance, they imagine that a cell can be taken from a 30-year-old man and another 30-year-old can be created that same day. Such an example of cloning is only to be found in science fiction, and is not and never will be possible. Cloning basically consists of bringing a person's "identical twin" to life by natural methods (in other words in a mother's womb). This has nothing to do with the theory of evolution, nor with the concept of "creating man."

Creating a human being or any other living thing—in other words bringing something into existence out of nothing—is a power peculiar to God. Scientific advances confirm the same thing by showing that this creation cannot be done by man. This is expressed in a verse:

The Originator of the heavens and Earth. When He decides on something, He just says to it, "Be!" and it is. (Qur'an, 2: 117)

10. COULD LIFE HAVE COME FROM OUTER SPACE?

When Darwin put forward his theory in the middle of the nineteenth century, he never mentioned how the origin of life, in other words the first living cell, came to be. Scientists looking for the origin of life at the beginning of the twentieth century began to realise that the theory was invalid. The complex and perfect structure in life prepared the ground for many researchers to perceive the truth of creation. Mathematical calculations and scientific experiment and observation demonstrated that life could not be the "product of chance," as the theory of evolution claimed.

With the collapse of the claim that coincidence was responsible and the realisation that life was "planned," some scientists began to look for the origin of life in outer space. The best-known of the scientists who made such claims were Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe. These two cobbled together a scenario in which they proposed that there was a force which "seeded" life in space. According to the scenario, these seeds were carried through the emptiness of space by gas or dust clouds, or else by an asteroid, and eventually reached the Earth, and life thus started here.

Nobel Prize-winner Francis Crick, co-discoverer with James Watson of the double helix structure of DNA, is one of those who has sought the origin of life in outer space. Crick came to realise that it is quite unreasonable to expect life to have started by chance, but he has claimed instead that life on Earth was started by intelligent "extraterrestrial" powers.

As we have seen, the idea that life came from outer space has influenced prominent scientists. The matter is now even discussed in writings and debates on the origin of life. The idea of looking for the origin of life in outer space can be considered from two basic perspectives.

Scientific inconsistency

The key to evaluating the "life began in outer space" thesis lies in studying the meteorites that reached the Earth and the clouds of gas and dust existing in space. No evidence has yet been found to support the claim that celestial bodies contained non-earthly creatures that eventually seeded life on Earth. No research that has been carried out so far has revealed any of the complex macromolecules that appear in life forms.

Furthermore, the substances contained in meteorites do not possess a certain kind of asymmetry found in the macromolecules that constitute life. For instance, amino acids, which make up proteins, which are themselves the basic building blocks of life, should theoretically occur as both left- and right-handed forms ("optical isomers") in roughly equal numbers. However, only left-handed amino acids are found in proteins, whereas this asymmetric distribution does not occur among the small organic molecules (the carbon-based molecules found in living things) discovered in meteorites. The latter exist in both left- and right-handed forms.⁵¹

That is by no means the end of the obstacles to the thesis that bodies and substances in outer space gave rise to life on Earth. Those who maintain such an idea need to be able to explain why such a process is not happening now, because the Earth is still being bombarded by meteorites. However, study of these meteorites has not revealed any "seeding" to confirm the thesis in any way.

Another question confronting the defenders of the thesis is this: Even if it is accepted that life was formed by a consciousness in outer space, and that it somehow reached Earth, how did the millions of species on Earth come about? That is a huge dilemma for those who suggest that life began in space.

Alongside all of these obstacles, no trace has been found in the universe of a civilisation or life form that could have started life on Earth. No astronomical observations, which have picked up enormous speed in the last 30 years, have given any indication of the presence of such a civilisation.

What lies behind the "extraterrestrial" thesis?

As we have seen, the theory that life on Earth was begun by extraterrestrials has no scientific basis to it. No discoveries have been made to confirm or support it. However, when the scientists who put forward the suggestion began to look in that direction, they did so because they perceived one important truth.

The truth in question is that a theory that seeks to explain life on Earth as being the result of chance is no longer tenable. It has been realised that the complexity revealed in the life forms on Earth can only be the product of intelligent design. In fact, the areas of expertise of the scientists who sought the origin of life in outer space give a clue as to their rejection of the logic of the theory of evolution.

Both are world-renowned scientists: Fred Hoyle is an astronomer and bio-mathematician, and Francis Crick a molecular biologist.

One point which needs to be considered is that those scientists who look to outer space to find the origin of life do not actually make any new interpretation of the matter. Scientists such as Hoyle, Wickramasinghe, and Crick began to consider the possibility that life came from space because they realised that life could not have come about by chance. Since it was impossible for life on Earth to have begun by chance, they had to accept the existence of a source of intelligent design in outer space.

However, the theory put forward by them on the subject of the origin of this intelligent design is contradictory and meaningless. Modern physics and astronomy have revealed that our universe originated as a result of a huge explosion some 12-15 billion years ago known as "The Big Bang." All matter in the universe came about from that explosion. For this reason, any idea that seeks the origin of life on Earth in another matter-based life form in the universe has to explain in turn how that form of life came into existence. The meaning of this is that such a suggestion does not actually solve the problem, but takes it one step further back. (For more detail, see Harun Yahya's books *The Creation of the Universe* and *Timelessness and The Reality of Fate*).

As we have seen, the thesis that "life came from outer space" does not support evolution, but is a view that reveals the impossibility of evolution and accepts that there can be no other explanation for life than intelligent design. The scientists who suggested this began with a correct analysis but then went down a false road, and started the silly search for the origin of life in outer space.

It is obvious that the concept of "extraterrestrials" cannot account for the origin of life. Even if we accept for one moment the hypothesis that "extraterrestrials" actually exist, it is still clear that they could not have come into being by chance, but must themselves be the product of intelligent design. (That is because the laws of physics and chemistry are the same everywhere in the universe, and they make it impossible for life to emerge by chance.) This shows that God, Who is beyond matter and time, and possesses infinite might, wisdom, and knowledge, created the universe and everything in it.

11. WHY DOES THE FACT THAT THE EARTH IS FOUR BILLION YEARS OLD NOT SUPPORT THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION?

Evolutionists base their scenarios on natural effects and chance. One of the concepts they most shelter behind while doing so is that of "considerable time." For instance, the German scientist Ernst Haeckel, who supported Darwin, claimed that a living cell could originate from simple mud. With the realisation in the twentieth century of how complex the living cell actually is, the silliness of that claim became apparent, but evolutionists continued to mask the truth with the "considerable time" concept.

By doing this, they are trying to free themselves from the problem by plunging it into a quandary instead of answering the question of how life could have come about by chance. By giving the impression that the passage of a long period of time could be useful from the point of view of the emergence of life and increase in variety, they present time as something that is always beneficial. For example, the Turkish evolutionist Professor Yaman Örs says: "If you want to test the theory of evolution, place an appropriate mixture into water, wait a few million years, and you will see that some cells emerge."⁵²

This claim is utterly illogical. There is no evidence to suggest that such a thing could happen. The idea that animate matter could emerge from inanimate is actually a superstition dating back to the Middle Ages. At that time, people assumed that the sudden appearance of some living things was the result of "spontaneous generation." According to this belief, people considered that geese emerged from trees, lambs from watermelons, and even tadpoles from patches of water formed in clouds, falling to Earth as rain. In the 1600s, people began to

believe that mice could be born in a mixture of wheat and a dirty piece of cloth, and that flies formed when dead flies were mixed with honey.

However, the Italian scientist Francesco Redi, proved that mice did not form in a mixture of wheat and a dirty piece of cloth, nor living flies from a mixture of dead flies and honey. These living things did not originate from those lifeless substances, they merely used them as vehicles. For example, a living fly would deposit its eggs on a dead one, and a short while later a number of new flies would emerge. In other words, life emerged from life, not inanimate matter. In the nineteenth century, French scientist Louis Pasteur proved that germs did not come from inanimate matter, too. This law, that "life only comes from life," is one of the bases of modern biology.

The fact that the peculiar claims we have been discussing above were actually believed may be excused on the grounds of the lack of knowledge of seventeenth century scientists, bearing in mind the conditions at the time. Nowadays, however, at a time when science and technology have progressed so far, and the fact that life cannot emerge from inanimate matter has been demonstrated by experiment and observation, it is really surprising that evolutionists such as Yaman Örs should still be defending such a claim.

Modern scientists have demonstrated many times that it is impossible for that claim to actually happen. They have carried out controlled experiments in the most advanced laboratories, reproducing the conditions at the time when life first emerged, but these have all been in vain.

When phosphorus, potassium, magnesium, oxygen, iron, and carbon atoms, which are all essential for life, are brought together, all that emerges is a mass of inanimate matter. Evolutionists, however, suggest that a mass of atoms came together and organised themselves, over time, in the ideal proportions, at the appropriate time and place, and with all the necessary links between them. They further claim that as a result of the perfect organization of these inanimate atoms, and the fact that all these processes went ahead undisturbed, there duly emerged human beings capable of seeing, hearing, speaking, feeling, laughing, rejoicing, suffering, feeling pain and joy, laughing, loving, feeling compassion, perceiving musical rhythms, enjoying food, founding civilisations, and carrying out scientific research.

However, it is perfectly clear that even if all the conditions evolutionists insist on are realised, and even if millions of years are allowed to pass, such an experiment will be doomed to failure.

Evolutionists try to conceal this fact, however, with deceptive explanations such as "All things are possible with time." The invalidity of this claim, which is based on introducing an element of bluff into science, is also obvious. This invalidity can be quite clearly seen when the subject is considered from different points of view. In one simple example, let us consider when the passing of time is useful, and when it is harmful. Imagine, if you will, a wooden boat on the seashore, and a captain who at first maintains that boat, repairing, cleaning, and painting it. As long as the captain takes an interest in it, the boat will become ever more attractive, safe, and well-maintained.

Then let us imagine that the boat is left abandoned. This time, the effects of the sun, rain, wind, sand, and storms will cause the boat to decay, age, and eventually become unusable.

The only difference between these two scenarios is that in the former there is an intelligent, knowledgeable, and powerful intervention. The passing of time can only bring benefits with it when it is controlled by an intelligent force. If it is not, time has destructive effects, not constructive ones. In fact, this is a scientific law. The law of entropy, known as the "Second Law of Thermodynamics," states that all systems in the universe tend directly towards disorder, dispersion, and decay when left to themselves and to natural conditions.

This fact demonstrates that the long life of the Earth is a factor that destroys knowledge and order and increases chaos—the exact opposite of what evolutionists claim. The emergence of an ordered system based on knowledge can only be the product of an intelligent intervention.

When the proponents of evolution relate the fairy tale of the transformation of one species into another, they take refuge in the idea of it happening "over a long period of time." In that way, they propose that things somehow happened in the past which have never been confirmed by any experiment or observation. However, everything in the world and in the universe happens in accordance with fixed laws. These do not change over time. For example, things fall to Earth because of the force of gravity. They do not start to fall upwards with the passage of time. Neither will they do so even if trillions of years go by. Lizard offspring are always lizards. That is because the genetic information to be passed on is always that of a lizard, and no supplementary information can be added to it with natural causes. Information may diminish, or even decay, but it is quite impossible for anything to be added to it. That, in turn, is because the adding of information to a system requires knowledgeable and intelligent external intervention and control. Nature itself does not possess such properties.

Repetitions that occur over time, and the fact that they take place often, change nothing. Even if trillions of years are allowed to go by, a bird will never hatch out of a lizard's egg. A long lizard may, or a short one—a stronger one or a weaker one—but it will always be a lizard. A different species will never emerge. The concept of "a considerable time" is a deception designed to take the matter out of the realm of experiment and observation. It makes no difference whether 4 billion years go by, or 40, or even 400. That is because there is no natural law or tendency to make the impossibilities described in the theory of evolution actually possible.

12. WHY ARE WISDOM TEETH NOT EVIDENCE OF EVOLUTION?

ONE of the theory of evolution's important deceptions is its claim regarding "vestigial organs." Evolutionists claim that some organs in living things lose their original function over time, and that such organs then disappear. Taking that as a starting point, they then try to send out the message, "If the living body had really been created, it would have no functionless organs in it."

Evolutionist publications at the start of the twentieth century announced that the human body contained up to a hundred organs that no longer served any purpose, including the appendix, the coccyx, the tonsils, the pineal gland, the external ear, the thymus, and wisdom teeth. However, the decades that followed saw major advances in medical science. Our knowledge of the organs and systems in the human body increased. As a result of this, it was seen that the idea of vestigial organs was just a superstition. The long list drawn up by evolutionists rapidly shrank. It was discovered that the thymus is an organ which produces important immune system cells, and that the pineal gland is responsible for the production of important hormones. It also emerged that the coccyx supports the bones around the pelvis, and that the external ear plays an important role in identifying where sounds come from. In short, it emerged that ignorance was the only foundation on which the idea of "vestigial organs" rested.

Modern science has many times demonstrated the error of the concept of such organs. Yet some evolutionists still try to make use of this claim. Although medical science has proved that almost all of the

organs that evolutionists claim are vestigial actually serve a purpose, evolutionary speculation still surrounds one or two organs.

The most noteworthy of these is our wisdom teeth. The claim that these teeth are a part of the human body that has lost all purpose still appears in evolutionist sources. As evidence for this, it is stated that these teeth give a great many people a lot of trouble, and that chewing is not impaired when they are surgically removed.

Many dentists, influenced by the evolutionists' claim that wisdom teeth serve no purpose, have come to see their extraction as a routine matter, and do not make the same kind of effort to protect them as they do for other teeth.⁵³ However, research in recent years has shown that wisdom teeth have the same chewing function as other teeth. Studies have also been carried out to show that the belief that wisdom teeth damage the position of other teeth in the mouth is completely unfounded.⁵⁴ Scientific criticism is now amassing ways in which problems with wisdom teeth which could be solved in other ways are instead solved by extracting them.⁵⁵ In fact, the scientific consensus is that wisdom teeth have a chewing function just like all the others, and that there is no scientific justification for the belief that they serve no purpose.

So, why do wisdom teeth cause a substantial number of people problems? Scientists who have researched the subject have discovered that wisdom tooth difficulties have manifested themselves in different ways among human communities at different times. It is now understood that the problem was seldom seen in pre-industrial societies. It has been discovered that the way in which soft foodstuffs have come to be preferred to harder ones, over the last few hundred years in particular, has negatively affected the way the human jaw develops. It has thus been realised that most wisdom tooth troubles emerge as a result of jaw development problems relating to dietary habits.

It is also known that society's nutritional habits also have negative effects on our other teeth. For instance, the increasing consumption of foodstuffs high in sugar and acid has increased the rate that other teeth decay. However, that fact does not make us think that all our teeth have somehow "atrophied." The same principle applies to wisdom teeth. Problems with these teeth stem from contemporary dietary customs, not from any evolutionary "atrophy."

13. HOW DO THE COMPLEX STRUCTURES OF THE MOST ANCIENT CREATURES DEMOLISH THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION?

Living things form a chain in the fossil record. When we look at these from the oldest to the more recent, they emerge in the form of micro organisms, invertebrate sea creatures, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. Proponents of the theory of evolution describe this chain in a prejudiced manner, and try to present it as proof of the theory of evolution. They claim that living things developed from simple to complex forms, and that during this process a wide variety in living species came about. For example, evolutionists suggest that the fact that no human fossils are to be found when 300-million-year-old fossil beds are examined is in some way proof of this. The Turkish evolutionist Professor Aykut Kence says:

Do you wish to invalidate the theory of evolution? Then go and find some human fossils from the Cambrian Age! Anyone who does that will disprove the theory of evolution, and even win the Nobel Prize for his discovery.⁵⁶

Development from the primitive to the complex is an imaginary concept

Let us examine the evolutionist logic that pervades Professor Kence's words. The statement that living things developed from primitive forms to complex ones is an evolutionist prejudice that in no way reflects the truth. The American professor of biology Frank L. Marsh, who considered that evolutionist claim, maintains in his book *Variation and Fixity in Nature*, that **living things cannot be arranged in a continuous, unbroken series from simple to complex.**⁵⁷

The fact that almost all known animal phyla suddenly emerged in the Cambrian period is strong evidence against evolutionist claims in this regard. Furthermore, those creatures which suddenly emerged possessed complex bodily structures, not simple ones—the exact opposite of the evolutionist assumption.

Trilobites belonged to the *Arthropoda* phylum, and were very complicated creatures with hard shells, articulated bodies, and complex organs. The fossil record has made it possible to carry out very detailed studies of trilobites' eyes. The trilobite eye is made up of hundreds of tiny facets, and each one of these contains two lens layers. This eye structure is a real wonder of design. David Raup, a professor of geology at Harvard, Rochester, and Chicago Universities, says, "the trilobites 450 million years ago used an optimal design which would require a well trained and imaginative optical engineer to develop today."⁵⁸

Another interesting aspect of the matter is that flies in our day possess the same eye structure. In other words, the same structure has existed for the last 520 million years.

Very little was known about this extraordinary situation in the Cambrian Age when Charles Darwin was writing *The Origin of Species*. Only since Darwin's time has the fossil record revealed that life suddenly emerged in the Cambrian Age, and that trilobites and other invertebrates came into being all at once. For this reason, Darwin was unable to treat the subject fully in the book. But he did touch on the subject under the heading "On the sudden appearance of groups of allied species in the lowest known fossiliferous strata," where he wrote the following about the Silurian Age (a name which at that time encompassed what we now call the Cambrian):

For instance, I cannot doubt that all the Silurian trilobites have descended from some one crustacean, which must have lived long before the Silurian age, and which probably differed greatly from any known animal... Consequently, **if my theory be true**, it is indisputable that before the lowest Silurian stratum was deposited, long periods elapsed, as long as, or probably far longer than, the whole interval from the Silurian age to the present day; and that during these vast, yet quite unknown, periods of time, the world swarmed with living creatures. To the question why we do not find records of these vast primordial periods, I can give no satisfactory answer.⁵⁹

Darwin said "If my theory be true, it is indisputable that the world swarmed with living creatures before the Silurian Age." As for the question of why there were no fossils of these creatures, he tried to supply an answer throughout his book, using the excuse that "the fossil record is very lacking." But nowadays the fossil record is quite complete, and it clearly reveals that creatures from the Cambrian Age did not have ancestors. This means that we have to reject that sentence of Darwin's which begins "If my theory be true." Darwin's hypotheses were invalid, and for that reason, his theory is mistaken.

Another example demonstrating that life did not develop from primitive forms to complex ones and that life was already exceedingly complex from the moment when it first emerged is the shark, which the fossil record shows to have emerged some 400 million years ago. This animal possesses superior features not even seen in animals created millions of years after it, such as the way it can regenerate lost teeth. Another example is the astonishing resemblances between mammals' eyes and those of octopuses which lived on Earth millions of years before mammals.

These examples make it clear that living species cannot be neatly arranged from the primitive to the complex.

This fact also emerged as the result of analyses of studies of living things' forms, functions, and genes. For instance, when we examine the very lowest levels of the fossil record from the point of view of shape and size, we see many creatures that were much larger than those which came later (such as dinosaurs).

When we look at the functional properties of living things, we see exactly the same thing. As regards structural development, the ear is an example that disproves the claim of "development from the primitive to the complex." Amphibians possess a middle-ear space, yet reptiles, which emerged after them, have a much simpler system, based on a single small bone, and have no middle-ear space at all.

Genetic studies have produced similar results. Research has demonstrated that the number of chromosomes has no relation to animals' complexity. For example, human beings possess 46 chromosomes, the copepod six, and the microscopic creature called radiolaria exactly 800.

Living things were created at the most "appropriate" time for them

The real fact that emerges from examination of the fossil record is that living things emerged in the periods most suitable for them. God has designed all creatures superbly, and has made them well-suited to meet their needs at the times when they emerged on the Earth.

Let us consider one example of this: the Earth at the time when the oldest bacteria fossils emerge, some 3.5 billion years ago. Atmospheric and temperature conditions at the time were not at all suited to support complex creatures or human beings. That also applies to the Cambrian Age, the finding of human fossils from which, according to the evolutionist Kence, would invalidate the theory of evolution. This period, which refers to some 530 million years ago, was definitely unsuitable for human life. (There were no land animals at all at that time.)

The situation is the same in the great majority of succeeding periods. Examination of the fossil record shows that conditions able to support human life have only existed for the last few million years. The same applies to all other living things. Each living group emerged when the appropriate conditions for it had been arrived at—in other words, "when the time was right."

Evolutionists make an enormous contradiction in the face of that fact, trying to explain it as if these appropriate conditions themselves had created living things, whereas the coming about of "appropriate conditions" only meant that the right time had come. Living things can only emerge with a conscious intervention—in other words, a supernatural creation.

For this reason, the emergence of living things by stages is evidence not of evolution, but of the infinite knowledge and wisdom of God, Who created them. Every living group created established the appropriate conditions for the next group to emerge, and an ecological balance with all living things was set up for us over a long period of time.

On the other hand, we must be aware that this long period of time is only long to us. For God it is but a single "moment." Time is a concept that only applies to created things. As the creator of time itself, God is not bound by it. (For more details see Harun Yahya: *Timelessness and the Reality of Fate*.)

If evolutionists wish to show that one species turned into another, then showing that living things emerged step by step on the Earth is no good. The evidence they have to come up with is fossils of the intermediate forms that link these different species together. A theory that maintains that invertebrates turned into fish, fish into reptiles, and reptiles into birds and mammals has to find the fossils to prove it. Darwin accepted that, and wrote that countless examples of these would have to be found, even though none were so far available. In the 150 years that have passed since then, no intermediate forms have been found. As the evolutionist paleontologist Derek W. Ager has admitted, the fossil record shows "**not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another.**"⁶⁰

In conclusion, natural history reveals that living things did not come about by chance, but that they were created, stage by stage, over long periods over time. This is in complete agreement with the information about creation given in the Qur'an, in which God reveals that he created the universe and all living things in "six days":

God is He Who created the heavens and the Earth and everything between them in six days and then established Himself firmly upon the Throne. You have no protector or intercessor apart from Him. So will you not pay heed? (Qur'an, 32: 4)

The word "day" in the verse (yawm in Arabic) also means a long period of time. In other words, the Qur'an notes that all of nature was created over different times, not all at once. Modern geological discoveries paint a picture that confirms this.

14. WHY IS DENYING THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION PORTRAYED AS REJECTING DEVELOPMENT AND PROGRESS?

The word "evolution" has been used in several senses in recent times. A social aspect has been added to it, for instance, and the word has come to mean human progress and technological development. There is nothing wrong with the concept of "evolution" when it is used in this sense. There is no doubt that man will use his intelligence, knowledge, and strength to develop over time. The sum of human knowledge will grow from generation to generation. In the same way that this is not evidence for the theory of evolution itself, which seeks to explain the emergence of life by chance, neither does it conflict in any way with the fact of creation.

Yet evolutionists engage in a facile word game here, and confuse a true concept with a false one. For example, it is true to state that "On account of man's long years of living as a social being, his knowledge, culture, and technology are in a constant state of development." (We must remember, however, that there can be regression over time as well as progress. Sociologically speaking, there have been times of progress, as well as times of stagnation and regression.) However, the claim that "In the same way as man has developed and progressed, living species have also advanced and changed over time" is completely false. Although it is

perfectly logical and scientific to say that, as a thinking being, man's knowledge has increased and been passed on to subsequent generations, allowing constant progress, it is utterly senseless to claim that living species developed and evolved by chance and coincidence, in accordance with uncontrolled and unconscious natural conditions.

The greatest names in the advancement of science were all creationists

No matter how much evolutionists try to identify themselves with concepts such as innovation and progress, history has shown that the real initiators of innovation and progress have always been faithful scientists who have believed in divine creation.

We see the mark of such believing scientists at every point of scientific progress. **Leonardo da Vinci, Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo**, who opened a new era in astronomy, **Cuvier**, the founder of paleontology, **Linnaeus**, the founder of the modern classification system for plants and animals, **Isaac Newton**, the discoverer of the law of gravity, **Edwin Hubble**, who discovered the existence of the galaxies and the expansion of the universe, and many others have believed in God and that life and the universe were created by Him.

One of the greatest scientists of the twentieth century, **Albert Einstein**, said:

I cannot conceive of a genuine scientist without that profound faith. The situation may be expressed by an image: science without religion is lame...⁶¹

The German **Max Planck**, who laid the foundations of modern physics, said:

Anybody who has been seriously engaged in scientific work of any kind realises that over the entrance to the gates of the temple of science are written the words: Ye must have faith. **It is a quality which the scientist cannot dispense with.**⁶²

The history of science reveals that change and progress have been the work of creationist scientists. On the other hand, of course, scientific developments in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries especially have allowed us to come by countless pieces of evidence of creation. Modern science and technology have allowed us to discover the fact that the universe came into being from nothing, in other words that it was "created." It is a fact accepted by the whole scientific world that the universe came into being and developed as a result of the explosion of one single point. In this way, the model of the infinite universe, with no beginning or end, maintained by materialists under the primitive scientific conditions of the nineteenth century has been destroyed. It has been realised that the universe was created, as it says in the Qur'an, and that it has a beginning and frontiers and has expanded over time. The Qur'an expresses this fact thus:

Do those who disbelieve not see that the heavens and the Earth were sewn together and then We unstitched them and that We made from water every living thing? So will they not believe? (Qur'an, 21: 30)

It is We Who have built the universe with (Our Creative) power, and verily, it is We Who are steadily expanding it. (Qur'an, 51: 47)

It was again twentieth century scientific progress that allowed us to discover more evidence of the design in life. The electron microscope revealed the structure of the cell, the smallest unit of life, as well as the parts that comprise it. The discovery of DNA demonstrated the infinite intelligence in the cell. Biochemical and

physiological advances have shown the flawless workings at the molecular level of the body, and its superior design which cannot be explained by anything other than creation.

As opposed to all this, it was the primitive state of science 150 years ago that prepared the ground for the formation of the theory of evolution.

In conclusion, it is impossible to consider those who believe in creation, and who constantly provide new evidence of it, as being opposed to progress, development, and science. On the contrary, such people are their greatest supporters. Those who actually oppose progress are those who turn their backs on all the scientific evidence and defend the theory of evolution, which is nothing but an unsubstantiated fantasy.

15. WHY IS IT MISTAKEN TO THINK THAT GOD COULD HAVE CREATED LIVING THINGS BY EVOLUTION?

While it has been scientifically proven that the magnificent design apparent in all living and non-living things in the universe could not have come about by the blind forces of nature and chance, some people nevertheless claim that there is indeed a Creator, but that He created life through an evolutionary process.

It is evident that God, the Almighty, created the whole universe and life. It is His decision whether creation should be instantaneous or by stages. We can only understand how it happened by means of the information God has given us (in other words, from the verses of the Qur'an), and the scientific evidence apparent in nature.

When we look at these two sources, we see no case for "creation by evolution."

God has revealed many verses in the Qur'an which deal with the creation of man, life, and the universe. None of these verses contains any information about creation through evolution. In other words, not one verse indicates that living things came about by evolving from one another. On the contrary, it is revealed in those verses that life and the universe were brought into being by God's command "Be!"

Scientific discoveries have also revealed that "creation by means of evolution" is out of the question. The fossil record shows that different species emerged not by evolving from one another, but independently, suddenly, and with all their individual structures. In other words, creation is different for every species.

If there were such a thing as "creation by means of evolution," we should be able to see the proof of it today. God has created everything in a particular order, within a framework of causes and laws. For instance, it is most certainly God Who makes ships float on water. However, when we look for the cause of this, we see that it is the creation of the supporting power of water. It is nothing other than the might of God that allows birds to fly. In fact, when we examine how it happens, we find the laws of aerodynamics. For this reason, if life had been created by a process of various stages, there would obviously be systems that provide the laws and advances in genetics to explain it. Furthermore, other physical, chemical, and biological laws would be known. There would be proof from laboratory research to show that one living species could turn into another. Yet again, it should be possible thanks to that research to develop enzymes, hormones, and similar molecules that a species lacks in order to bring advantages to it. In addition, it would be possible to create new organelles and structures that the living thing in question had never possessed before.

Laboratory studies would be able to show examples of creatures that had been mutated and actually benefited from the process. We would furthermore see that these mutations could be passed on to subsequent generations and actually become a part of the species. Then again, there would be millions of fossils of intermediate forms that had lived in the past, and there would be living things in our time that had not yet completed their transition processes. In short, there should be countless examples of such a process.

However, there is not a single piece of evidence that one species transmutes into another. As we have already seen, fossil data show that living species emerged all at once, with no ancestors behind them. In the same way as this fact destroys the theory of evolution, which claims that life came about by chance, it also shows the scientific invalidity of the claim that God brought life into being and then it evolved by stages.

God created living things in a supernatural way, by the single command "Be!" Modern science confirms this fact, and proves that living things emerged suddenly on the Earth.

Those who support the idea that "It is possible that God created living things by means of evolution" are actually trying to build "reconciliation" between creation and Darwinism. They are making a fundamental mistake, however. They are missing the basic logic of Darwinism and the kind of philosophy it serves. Darwinism does not consist of the concept of the transmutation of species. It is actually an attempt to explain the origin of living species by material factors alone. To put it another way, it tries to gain acceptance for the claim that living things are the product of nature, by giving it a scientific veneer. There can be no "common ground" between that naturalistic philosophy and a belief in God. It is a grave error in an effort to seek to find such common ground, to cede ground to Darwinism, and to agree with the false claim that it is a scientific theory. As 150 years of history have shown, Darwinism is the backbone of materialist philosophy and atheism, and no search for common ground will ever change the fact.

16. WHY IS IT WRONG TO THINK THAT EVOLUTION COULD BE CONFIRMED IN THE FUTURE?

When forced into a corner, some people who support the theory of evolution resort to the claim "Even if scientific discoveries do not confirm the theory of evolution today, such developments will take place in the future."

The basic starting point here is evolutionists' admission of defeat in the scientific arena. Reading between the lines, we can translate as follows: **"Yes, we defenders of the theory of evolution admit that the discoveries of modern science do not support us. For that reason, we can see no alternative but to refer the matter to the future."**

Yet science does not function by such logic. A scientist does not first of all blindly devote himself to a theory, hoping that one day the evidence to prove that theory will emerge. Science examines the available evidence and draws conclusions from it. That is why scientists should accept the "design," or the fact of creation in other words, which scientific discoveries have proved.

Despite this, however, evolutionist incitement and propaganda can still influence people, especially those who are not fully conversant with the theory. For this reason, it will be useful to set out the reply in full:

We can consider the validity of the theory of evolution with three basic questions:

1. How did the first living cell emerge?
2. How can one living species turn into another?
3. Is there any evidence in the fossil record that living things underwent such a process?

A great deal of serious research has been carried out during the twentieth century into these three questions, which the theory simply has to answer. What this research has revealed, however, is that the theory of evolution cannot account for life. This will become apparent when we consider these questions one by one.

1. The question of the "first cell" is the most deadly dilemma for the proponents of evolution. Research on the subject has revealed that it is impossible to explain the emergence of the first cell by means of the concept of "chance." Fred Hoyle puts it this way:

The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way is comparable to the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.⁶³

Let us use an example to see the contradiction evolutionists are involved in. Remember the famous example of William Paley and imagine someone who has never seen a clock in his life, someone on a desert island for instance, who one day comes across one. This person who sees a wall-clock from 100 metres away will not be able to make out exactly what it is, and may be unable to distinguish it from any natural phenomenon thrown up by the wind, sand, and Earth. Yet as that person draws closer, he will understand just by looking at it that it is the product of design. From even closer up, he will be left in absolutely no doubt. The next stage may be to examine the features of this object, and the art apparent in it. When he opens it up and has a detailed look, he will see that there is a greater accumulation of knowledge inside it than was apparent from the outside, and that is a product of intelligence. Every subsequent examination will just make that analysis even more certain.

The truth about life that emerges as science advances is in a similar situation. Scientific developments have revealed the perfection in life on the system, organ, tissue, cellular, and even molecular levels. Every new detail we grasp enables us to see the wondrous dimension of this design a little more clearly. Nineteenth-century evolutionists, who took the view that the cell was a little lump of carbon, were in the same situation as that person looking at the clock from 100 metres away. Today, however, it is impossible to find even one scientist who does not admit that each individual part of the cell is a magnificent work of art and design on its own. Even the membrane of a tiny cell, which has been described as a "selective filter," contains enormous intelligence and design. It recognizes the atoms, proteins, and molecules around it as if it possessed a consciousness of its own, and only allows into the cell those which are needed. (For further details, see Harun Yahya's *Consciousness in the Cell*.) Unlike the limited intelligent design in the clock, living organisms are stunning artifacts of intelligence and design. Far from proving evolution, the ever wider-ranging and detailed research that is carried out into living structures, only some of whose make-up and functions have been uncovered so far, allows us to understand the truth of creation even better.

2. Evolutionists maintain that one species can turn into another by means of mutation and natural selection. All the research carried out on the matter has shown that neither mechanism has any evolutionary effect whatsoever. Colin Patterson, the senior paleontologist at the Natural History Museum in London, stresses the fact in these words:

No one has ever produced a species by the mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever got near it, and most of the current argument in neo-Darwinism is about this question. ⁶⁴

Research into mutation shows that it has no evolutionary properties. The American geneticist B. G. Ranganathan says:

First, genuine mutations are very rare in nature. Secondly, most mutations are harmful since they are random, rather than orderly changes in the structure of genes; any random change in a highly ordered system will be for the worse, not for the better. For example, if an earthquake were to shake a highly ordered structure such as a building, there would be a random change in the framework of the building, which, in all probability, would not be an improvement.⁶⁵

As we have seen, the mechanisms that the theory of evolution suggests for the formation of species are completely ineffective, and actually harmful. It has been understood that these mechanisms, which were proposed when science and technology had not yet advanced to the level necessary to show that the claim was nothing but the product of fantasy, have no developmental or evolutionary effects.

3. Fossils also show that life did not emerge as the result of any evolutionary process, but that it came about suddenly, the product of perfect "design." All the fossils that have ever been found confirm this. Niles Eldredge, the well-known paleontologist from Harvard University and curator of the American Museum of Natural History, explains that there is no possibility that any fossils that might be found in the future could change the situation:

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. ⁶⁶

Another American scholar, Robert Wesson, states in his 1991 book *Beyond Natural Selection*, that "the gaps in the fossil record are real and phenomenal." He elaborates this claim in this way:

The gaps in the record are real, however. The absence of a record of any important branching is quite phenomenal. Species are usually static, or nearly so, for long periods, species seldom and genera never show evolution into new species or genera but replacement of one by another, and change is more or less abrupt. ⁶⁷

In conclusion, some 150 years have gone by since the theory of evolution was first put forward, and all subsequent scientific developments have worked against it. The more science has examined the details of life, the more evidence for the perfection of creation has been found, and the more it has been understood that the emergence of life and its subsequent variation by chance is quite impossible. Every piece of research reveals new evidence of the design in living things, and makes the fact of creation ever clearer. Every decade that has passed since Darwin's time has just revealed the invalidity of the theory of evolution even more.

In short, scientific advances do not favour the theory of evolution. For that reason, further developments in the future will not do so either, but will demonstrate its invalidity even further.

It remains to say that the claims of evolution are not something that science has not yet solved or explained, but will be able to explain in the future. On the contrary, modern science has disproved the theory of evolution in all areas and demonstrated that it is impossible from all points of view for such an imaginary process ever to have taken place. To claim that such an untenable belief will be proven in the future is nothing but the product of the imaginative and utopian mindsets of those Marxist and materialist circles that see evolution as underpinning their ideologies. They are merely trying to console themselves in their terrible despair.

For this reason, the idea that "science will prove evolution in the future" is no different from believing that "science will one day show that the Earth rests on the back of an elephant."

17. WHY IS METAMORPHOSIS NOT EVIDENCE OF EVOLUTION?

Some creatures undergo physical changes to allow them to survive and adapt to different natural conditions at different times. This process is known as metamorphosis. People with insufficient knowledge of biology and evolutionist claims also sometimes try to portray the process as evidence for the theory of evolution. Those sources which cite metamorphosis as "an example of evolution" are superficial, narrow-based works of propaganda which seek to mislead those who do not possess sufficient information on the subject, juvenile evolutionists, or a few ignorant Darwinist biology teachers. Scientists who are considered experts on evolution, and who thus know more about the dilemmas and contradictions inherent in the theory, hesitate to even refer to this ridiculous claim. That is because they know how senseless it is...

Butterflies, flies, and bees are some of the best-known creatures that undergo metamorphosis. Frogs, which start life in water and then live on land, are another example. This has nothing to do with evolution, because the theory tries to account for the differentiation between living things in terms of chance mutations. Metamorphosis, however, bears no similarity at all to that claim, being a pre-planned process which has nothing to do with mutation or chance. It is not chance that brings metamorphosis about, but genetic data which are built-in in the creature from the moment it is born. The frog, for example, possesses the genetic information to allow it to live on land while it is still living underwater. Even while still a larva, the mosquito possesses the genetic information regarding its pupa and adult states. The same thing applies to all creatures that undergo metamorphosis.

Metamorphosis is evidence for creation

Recent scientific research into metamorphosis has shown that it is a complex process controlled by different genes. As regards the metamorphosis of the frog, for instance, the relevant processes in the tail alone are controlled by more than a dozen genes. This means that this process comes about thanks to several components working together. This is a biological process that bears the feature of "irreducible complexity," which shows that metamorphosis is proof of creation.

"**Irreducible complexity**" is a concept that has been given its place in the scientific literature by Professor Michael Behe, a biochemist who is known for his research proving the invalidity of the theory of evolution. What it means is that complex organs and systems function by the working together of all the component parts that make them up, and that if even the smallest part ceases to function, so will the whole organ or system. It is impossible for such complex structures to have emerged by chance, with tiny changes over time, as the theory of evolution maintains. That is what happens in metamorphosis. The process of metamorphosis happens through exceedingly sensitive balances and timings in hormones which are in turn affected by different genes. The creature will pay for even the tiniest error with its life. It is impossible to believe that such a complex process could have come about by chance and by stages. Since even a tiny error will cost the animal its life, it is impossible to speak in terms of a "trial and error mechanism," or natural selection, as evolutionists maintain. No creature can hang around for millions of years waiting for its missing components to come about by chance.

Bearing this fact in mind, it is also apparent that the subject constitutes no evidence at all for evolution, as some people who are ill-informed about metamorphosis assume it to do. On the contrary, when the complexity

of the process and the systems that control it are taken into consideration, animals which undergo metamorphosis can be seen to be clear evidence for creation.

18. WHY IS IT IMPOSSIBLE TO ACCOUNT FOR DNA BY "CHANCE"?

The level of scientific knowledge we have arrived at today shows that the evident design and complex systems in living things make it impossible for them to have emerged by chance. For instance, thanks to the recent "Human Genome Project," the marvelous design and the enormous information content in human genes have been revealed for all to see.

In the framework of that project, scientists from many countries, from the United States to China, worked for 10 years to decipher one by one the 3 billion chemical codes in DNA. As a result, nearly all the information in human genes has been set out in its correct order.

Although this is a very exciting and important development, as Dr. Francis Collins, who leads the Human Genome Project states, so far only the first step has been taken in the decoding of the information in DNA.

In order to understand why it took 10 years and the work of hundreds of scientists to uncover the codes that make up this information, we have to understand the magnitude of the information contained within DNA.

DNA reveals the existence of an infinite source of knowledge

There is enough information in the DNA of a single human cell to fill an encyclopedia of one million pages. It would be impossible to read it all in one lifetime. If one person set out to read one DNA code per second, non-stop, all day every day, it would take him 100 years. That is because the encyclopedia in question possesses nearly three billion different codes. If we wrote down all the information in DNA on paper, it would stretch from the North Pole to the Equator. That means some 1,000 large volumes—more than enough to fill a big library.

Even more important, all this information is contained in the nucleus of each and every cell, which means that as each individual consists of some 100 trillion cells, there are 100 trillion versions of the same library.

If we wish to compare this treasury of information with the level of knowledge so far reached by man, it is impossible to provide any example of the same magnitude. An unbelievable picture presents itself: 100 trillion x 1,000 books! That is more than the number of grains of sand in the world. Furthermore, if we multiply that number by the six billion people currently living on the Earth, and the billions more who have ever lived, then the number is beyond our capacity to grasp, and the amount of information stretches to infinity.

These examples are an indication of what imposing information we are living cheek by jowl with. We possess advanced computers that can store great amounts of information. However, when we compare DNA to these computers, we are amazed to see that the most modern technology—the product of the cumulative human labour and knowledge over the centuries—does not even possess the storage capacity of a single cell.

Gene Myers is one of the most prominent experts of Celera Genomics, the company that carried out the Human Genome project. His words regarding the outcome of the project are a statement of the great knowledge

and design in DNA: **"What really astounds me is the architecture of life...The system is extremely complex. It's like it was designed... There's a huge intelligence there."** 68

Another interesting aspect is that all life on the planet has been produced according to the coded descriptions written in this same language. No bacterium, plant, or animal is formed without its DNA. It is quite evident that all of life emerges as the result of descriptions that employ the same language and stemming from the same source of knowledge.

This leads us to an obvious conclusion. All living things in the world live and multiply according to information created by one single intelligence.

This makes the theory of evolution utterly meaningless. That is because the foundation of evolution is "chance," but chance cannot create information. If one day the formula of a medicine that can cure cancer were found on a piece of paper, all of mankind would join forces to discover the scientist concerned and even give him an award. Nobody would think, "I wonder if the formula appeared when some ink was spilt onto the page." Everybody who possesses reason and clear thinking will think that that the formula was written by someone who had made a deep study of chemistry, human physiology, cancer, and pharmacology.

The evolutionist claim that the information in DNA came about by chance is completely irrational, and is equivalent to saying that the formula on the paper also came about by chance. DNA contains the detailed molecular formulae of 100,000 types of proteins and enzymes, together with the delicate order governing how these will be used during production. Alongside these, it contains the production plans for the message-carrier hormones and the inter-cellular communications protocols they are used in, and all kinds of other complex and specified information.

To claim that DNA and all the information within it came about by chance events and natural causes reflects either total ignorance of the subject or materialist dogmatism. The idea that a molecule such as DNA, with all the magnificent information and complex structure it contains, could be the product of chance is not even worth taking seriously. Unsurprisingly, evolutionists try to gloss over the subject of the source of life, as with so many other subjects, by describing it as an "unsolved secret."

19. WHY IS IT THAT BACTERIAL RESISTANCE TO ANTIBIOTICS IS NOT AN EXAMPLE OF EVOLUTION?

ONE of the biological concepts that evolutionists try to present as evidence for their theory is the resistance of bacteria to antibiotics. Many evolutionist sources mention antibiotic resistance as an example of the development of living things by advantageous mutations. A similar claim is also made for the insects which build immunity to insecticides such as DDT.

However, evolutionists are mistaken on this subject too.

Antibiotics are "killer molecules" that are produced by microorganisms to fight other microorganisms. The first antibiotic was penicillin, discovered by Alexander Fleming in 1928. Fleming realised that mould produced a molecule that killed the *Staphylococcus* bacterium, and this discovery marked a turning point in the world of medicine. Antibiotics derived from microorganisms were used against bacteria and the results were successful.

Soon, something new was discovered. Bacteria build immunity to antibiotics over time. The mechanism works like this: A large proportion of the bacteria that are subjected to antibiotics die, but some others, which are not affected by that antibiotic, replicate rapidly and soon make up the whole population. Thus, the entire population becomes immune to antibiotics.

Evolutionists try to present this as "the evolution of bacteria by adapting to conditions."

The truth, however, is very different from this superficial interpretation. One of the scientists who has done the most detailed research into this subject is the Israeli biophysicist Lee Spetner, who is also known for his book *Not by Chance* published in 1997. Spetner maintains that the immunity of bacteria comes about by two different mechanisms, but neither of them constitutes evidence for the theory of evolution. These two mechanisms are:

- 1) The transfer of resistance genes already extant in bacteria.
- 2) The building of resistance as a result of losing genetic data because of mutation.

Professor Spetner explains the first mechanism in an article published in 2001:

Some microorganisms are endowed with genes that grant resistance to these antibiotics. This resistance can take the form of degrading the antibiotic molecule or of ejecting it from the cell... [T]he organisms having these genes can transfer them to other bacteria making them resistant as well. Although the resistance mechanisms are specific to a particular antibiotic, most pathogenic bacteria have... succeeded in accumulating several sets of genes granting them resistance to a variety of antibiotics. 69

Spetner then goes on to say that this is not "evidence for evolution":

The acquisition of antibiotic resistance in this manner... is not the kind that can serve as a prototype for the mutations needed to account for Evolution... The genetic changes that could illustrate the theory must not only add information to the bacterium's genome, they must add new information to the biocosm. The horizontal transfer of genes only spreads around genes that are already in some species. 70

So, we cannot talk of any evolution here, because no new genetic information is produced: genetic information that already exists is simply transferred between bacteria.

The second type of immunity, which comes about as a result of mutation, is not an example of evolution either. Spetner writes:

... [A] microorganism can sometimes acquire resistance to an antibiotic through a random substitution of a single nucleotide... Streptomycin, which was discovered by Selman Waksman and Albert Schatz and first reported in 1944, is an antibiotic against which bacteria can acquire resistance in this way. But although the mutation they undergo in the process is beneficial to the microorganism in the presence of streptomycin, it cannot serve as a prototype for the kind of mutations needed by NDT [Neo-Darwinian Theory]. The type of mutation that grants resistance to streptomycin is manifest in the ribosome and degrades its molecular match with the antibiotic molecule. 71

In his book *Not by Chance*, Spetner likens this situation to the disturbance of the key-lock relationship. Streptomycin, just like a key that perfectly fits in a lock, clutches on to the ribosome of a bacterium and inactivates it. Mutation, on the other hand, decomposes the ribosome, thus preventing streptomycin from holding on to the ribosome. Although this is interpreted as "bacteria developing immunity against streptomycin," this is not a benefit for the bacteria but rather a loss for it. Spetner writes:

This change in the surface of the microorganism's ribosome prevents the streptomycin molecule from attaching and carrying out its antibiotic function. It turns out that this degradation is a loss of specificity and

therefore a loss of information. The main point is that Evolution... cannot be achieved by mutations of this sort, no matter how many of them there are. Evolution cannot be built by accumulating mutations that only degrade specificity. 72

To sum up, a mutation impinging on a bacterium's ribosome makes that bacterium resistant to streptomycin. The reason for this is the "decomposition" of the ribosome by mutation. That is, no new genetic information is added to the bacterium. On the contrary, the structure of the ribosome is decomposed, that is to say, the bacterium becomes "disabled." (Also, it has been discovered that the ribosome of the mutated bacterium is less functional than that of a normal bacterium.) Since this "disability" prevents the antibiotic from attaching onto the ribosome, "antibiotic resistance" develops.

Finally, there is no example of mutation that "develops the genetic information." Evolutionists, who want to present antibiotic resistance as evidence for evolution, treat the issue in a very superficial way and are thus mistaken.

The same situation holds true for the immunity that insects develop to DDT and similar insecticides. In most of these instances, immunity genes that already exist are used. The evolutionary biologist Francisco Ayala admits this fact, saying, "**The genetic variants required for resistance to the most diverse kinds of pesticides were apparently present in every one of the populations exposed to these man-made compounds.**"⁷³ Some other examples explained by mutation, just as with the ribosome mutation mentioned above, are phenomena that cause "genetic information deficit" in insects.

In this case, it cannot be claimed that the immunity mechanisms in bacteria and insects constitute evidence for the theory of evolution. That is because the theory of evolution is based on the assertion that living things develop through mutations. However, Spetner explains that neither antibiotic immunity nor any other biological phenomena indicate such an example of mutation:

The mutations needed for macroevolution have never been observed. No random mutations that could represent the mutations required by Neo-Darwinian Theory that have been examined on the molecular level have added any information. The question I address is: Are the mutations that have been observed the kind the theory needs for support? The answer turns out to be NO!⁷⁴

20. WHAT KIND OF RELATIONSHIP IS THERE BETWEEN CREATION AND SCIENCE?

As we have shown in all the questions we have considered so far, the theory of evolution is completely at odds with scientific discoveries. This theory, born of the primitive level of science in the nineteenth century, has been completely invalidated by successive scientific discoveries.

Those evolutionists who are blindly devoted to the theory look for a solution in demagoguery, since no scientific foundation is left to them. The most frequently resorted to of these is the clichéd slogan that "creation is a faith, so it cannot be considered part of science." The claim goes that evolution is a scientific theory, whereas creation is just a belief. However, this repetition of "evolution is science, creation is a belief" stems from a totally erroneous perspective. Those who keep repeating that are confusing science and materialist philosophy. They

believe that science must remain within the borders of materialism, and that those who are not materialist have no right to make any statements at all. However, science itself completely rejects materialism.

Studying matter is not the same as being a materialist

Let us first briefly define materialism in order to examine the matter in more detail. Materialism is a philosophy that has existed since Ancient Greece and is based on the idea that matter is all that exists. According to materialist philosophy, matter has always existed and will continue to do so for all time. Nothing exists apart from matter. This is not a scientific claim, however, because it cannot be subjected to experiment and observation. It is simply a belief, a dogma.

However, this dogma became mixed up with science in the nineteenth century, and even came to be the basic foundation of science. Yet science is not compelled to accept materialism. Science studies nature and the universe, and produces results without being limited by any philosophical classification.

In the face of this, some materialists frequently take refuge in a simple word game. They say, "Matter is the only subject of study for science, so it has to be materialist." Yes, science only studies matter, but "studying matter" is very different from "being a materialist." That is because when we study matter, we realise that matter contains knowledge and design so great that they could never have been produced by matter itself. We can understand that this knowledge and design are the result of an intelligence, even if we cannot see it directly.

For instance, let us imagine a cave. We do not know if anyone has been in it before us. If, when we enter this cave, there is nothing in it but dust, earth, and stones, we can infer that there is nothing but randomly distributed matter there. However, if there are expertly produced pictures in stunning colours on the walls, we may assume that an intelligent entity has been there before us. We may not be able to see that entity directly, but we can infer its existence from what it produces.

Science has refuted materialism

Science studies nature in the same way as shown in that example. If all the design in nature could only be explained by material factors, then science could confirm materialism. However, modern science has revealed that there is design in nature that cannot be explained by material factors, and that all matter contains a design brought into being by a Creator.

For example, all experiments and observation prove that matter could not by itself have given rise to life, for which reason life must stem from a metaphysical creation. All evolutionist experiments in this direction have ended in failure. Life can never have been created from inanimate matter. The evolutionist biologist Andrew Scott makes the following admission on the subject in the well-known journal *New Scientist*:

Take some matter, heat while stirring and wait. That is the modern version of Genesis. The "fundamental" forces of gravity, electromagnetism and the strong and weak nuclear forces are presumed to have done the rest... But how much of this neat tale is firmly established, and how much remains hopeful speculation? In truth, the mechanism of almost every major step, from chemical precursors up to the first recognizable cells, is the subject of either controversy or complete bewilderment.⁷⁵

The root of life is based on speculation and debate because materialist dogma insists that life is the product of matter. Yet the scientific facts show that matter has no such power. Professor Fred Hoyle, an astronomer and mathematician who was knighted for his contributions to science, makes the following comment on the subject:

If there were a basic principle of matter which somehow drove organic systems toward life, its existence should easily be demonstrable in the laboratory. One could, for instance, take a swimming bath to represent the primordial soup. Fill it with any chemicals of a non-biological nature you please. Pump any gases over it, or through it, you please, and shine any kind of radiation on it that takes your fancy. Let the experiment proceed for a year and see how many of those 2,000 enzymes [proteins produced by living cells] have appeared in the bath. I will give the answer, and so save the time and trouble and expense of actually doing the experiment. You will find nothing at all, except possibly for a tarry sludge composed of amino acids and other simple organic chemicals. 76

Actually, materialism is in an even worse dilemma. Matter cannot even form life when combined with human knowledge and time, let alone form it by itself.

The truth that we have briefly glanced at is the truth that matter cannot form design and knowledge by itself. Yet the universe and the living things in it contain extraordinarily complex design and knowledge. That shows us that this design and knowledge in the universe and living things are the works of a Creator Who possesses infinite power and knowledge, Who existed before matter and rules it.

If we look carefully, this is an entirely scientific conclusion. It is not a "belief," but a truth acquired through observation of the universe and living things in it. That is why the evolutionists' claim that "Evolution is scientific, whereas creation is a belief that cannot enter the domain of science" is a superficial deception. It is true that in the nineteenth century materialism was confused with science, and that science was led off course by materialist dogma. However, subsequent developments in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have completely overthrown that hoary old belief, and the truth of creation, that had been concealed by materialism, has finally emerged. As the banner headline "Science Finds God," used by the famous magazine *Newsweek* in its historic July 27, 1998, edition makes clear, behind all the materialist deception, science finds God, the Creator of the universe and all that is in it.

NOTES

1. Francis Crick, *Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 88
2. Ali Demirsoy, *Kalitim ve Evrim* (Inheritance and Evolution), Meteksan Publishing Co., Ankara, 1984, p. 39
3. Homer Jacobson, "Information, Reproduction and the Origin of Life," *American Scientist*, January 1955, p. 121.
4. Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1983, p. 197.
5. Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 25. (emphasis added)
6. Stephen C. Meyer, P. A. Nelson, and Paul Chien, *The Cambrian Explosion: Biology's Big Bang*, 2001, p. 2.
7. Richard Monastersky, "Mysteries of the Orient," *Discover*, April 1993, p. 40. (emphasis added)
8. Phillip E. Johnson, "Darwinism's Rules of Reasoning," in *Darwinism: Science or Philosophy* by Buell Hearn, Foundation for Thought and Ethics, 1994, p. 12. (emphasis added)
9. Ian Anderson, "Who made the Laetoli footprints?" *New Scientist*, vol. 98, 12 May 1983, p. 373.
10. D. Johanson & M. A. Edey, *Lucy: The Beginnings of Humankind*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 250
11. R. H. Tuttle, *Natural History*, March 1990, pp. 61-64
12. D. Johanson, Blake Edgar, *From Lucy to Language*, p.169
13. D. Johanson, Blake Edgar, *From Lucy to Language*, p.173
14. Boyce Rensberger, *Washington Post*, 19 October 1984, p. A11.
15. "Is This The Face of Our Past," *Discover*, December 1997, pp. 97-100
16. Villee, Solomon and Davis, *Biology*, Saunders College Publishing, 1985, p. 1053
17. *Hominoid Evolution and Climatic Change in Europe*, Volume 2, Edited by Louis de Bonis, George D. Koufos, Peter Andrews, Cambridge University Press 2001, chapter 6, (emphasis added)
18. Daniel E. Lieberman, "Another face in our family tree," *Nature*, March 22, 2001, (emphasis added)
19. John Whitfield, "Oldest member of human family found," *Nature*, 11 July 2002
20. D.L. Parsell, "Skull Fossil From Chad Forces Rethinking of Human Origins," *National Geographic News*, July 10, 2002
21. John Whitfield, "Oldest member of human family found," *Nature*, 11 July 2002
22. *The Guardian*, 11 July 2002
23. Arda Denkeli, *Cumhuriyet Bilim Teknik Eki* (Science and Technology Supplement of the Turkish daily Cumhuriyet), February 27, 1999
24. G. W. Harper, "Alternatives to Evolution," *School Science Review*, vol. 61, September 1979, p. 26
25. <http://www.cnn.com/2002/TECH/science/09/24/humans.chimps.ap/index.html>
26. <http://www.newscientist.com/news/news.jsp?id=ns99992833>
27. Karen Hopkin, "The Greatest Apes," *New Scientist*, vol. 62, issue 2186, 15 May 1999, p. 27, (emphasis added)
28. *Hurriyet*, February 24, 2000, (emphasis added)
29. Harun Yahya, *Darwinism Refuted*, pp.207-222
30. *Nature*, vol. 382, August, 1, 1996, p. 401.

31. Carl O. Dunbar, *Historical Geology*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1961, p. 310.
32. Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 280-81.
33. L. D. Martin, J. D. Stewart, K. N. Whetstone, *The Auk*, vol. 97, 1980, p. 86.
34. L. D. Martin, J. D. Stewart, K. N. Whetstone, *The Auk*, vol. 97, 1980, p. 86; L. D. Martin, "Origins of the Higher Groups of Tetrapods," Ithaca, Comstock Publishing Association, New York, 1991, pp. 485-540.
35. S. Tarsitano, M. K. Hecht, *Zoological Journal of the Linnaean Society*, vol. 69, 1980, p. 149; A. D. Walker, *Geological Magazine*, vol. 117, 1980, p. 595.
36. A.D. Walker, as described in Peter Dodson, "International Archaeopteryx Conference," *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 5(2):177, June 1985.
37. Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, Regnery Publishing, 2000, p. 117
38. Richard L. Deem, "Demise of the 'Birds are Dinosaurs' Theory," <http://www.yfiles.com/dinobird2.html>.
39. "Scientist say ostrich study confirms bird 'hands' unlike these of dinosaurs," http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2002-08/uonc-sso081402.php
40. "Scientist say ostrich study confirms bird 'hands' unlike these of dinosaurs," http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2002-08/uonc-sso081402.php
41. Ann Gibbons, "Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur," *Science*, vol. 278, no. 5341, 14 November 1997, pp. 1229 – 1230
42. "Forensic Palaeontology: The Archaeoraptor Forgery," *Nature*, March 29, 2001
43. Storrs L. Olson "OPEN LETTER TO: Dr. Peter Raven, Secretary, Committee for Research and Exploration, *National Geographic Society* Washington, DC 20036," Smithsonian Institution, November 1, 1999
44. Tim Friend, "Dinosaur-bird link smashed in fossil flap," *USA Today*, 25 January 2000, (emphasis added)
45. G. G. Simpson, W. Beck, *An Introduction to Biology*, Harcourt Brace and World, New York, 1965, p. 241
46. Ken McNamara, "Embryos and Evolution," *New Scientist*, vol. 12416, 16 October 1999, (emphasis added)
47. Keith S. Thompson, "Ontogeny and Phylogeny Recapitulated," *American Scientist*, vol. 76, May/June 1988, p. 273
48. Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, Ticknor and Fields, New York, 1982, p. 204
49. Elizabeth Pennisi, "Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered," *Science*, 5 September,
50. Elizabeth Pennisi, "Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered," *Science*, 5 September, (emphasis added)
51. Massimo Pigliucci, Rationalists of East Tennessee Book Club Discussion, October 1997
52. Evrim Kuramı Konferansı (Conference on the Theory of Evolution), Istanbul Üniversitesi Fen Fakültesi (University of Istanbul, Faculty of Economics), June 3, 1998
53. Leonard M.S., 1992. Removing third molars: a review for the general practitioner. *Journal of the American Dental Association*, 123(2):77-82
54. M. Leff, 1993. Hold on to your wisdom teeth. *Consumer reports on Health*, 5(8):4-85.
55. *Daily.T* 1996. Third molar prophylactic extraction: a review and analysis of the literature. *General Dentistry*, 44(4):310-320
56. Evrim Kuramı Konferansı (Conference on the Theory of Evolution), Istanbul Üniversitesi Fen Fakültesi (University of Istanbul, Faculty of Science), June 3, 1998

57. http://www.icr.org/creationproducts/creationscienceproducts/Variation_and_Fixity_in_Nature.html (emphasis added)
58. David Raup, "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology," *Bulletin, Field Museum of Natural History*, vol. 50, January 1979, p. 24
59. Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, 1859, p. 313-314, (emphasis added)
60. Derek A. Ager, "The Nature of the Fossil Record," *Proceedings of the British Geological Association*, vol 87, 1976, p. 133, (emphasis added)
61. *Science, Philosophy and Religion, A Symposium*, published by the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, Inc., New York, 1941, (emphasis added)
62. Max Planck, *Where Is Science Going?*, Allen & Unwin, 1933, p.214, (emphasis added)
63. "Hoyle on Evolution," *Nature*, vol. 294, November 12, 1981, p. 105.
64. Colin Patterson, "Cladistics," Interview by Brian Leek, interviewer Peter Franz, March 4, 1982, *BBC*, (emphasis added)
65. B. G. Ranganathan, *Origins?*, Pennsylvania: The Banner Of Truth Trust, 1988
66. N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982, p. 59
67. R. Wesson, *Beyond Natural Selection*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1991, p. 45
68. "Human Genome Map Has Scientists Talking About the Divine" by Tom Abate, *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 19, 2001, (emphasis added)
69. Dr. Lee Spetner, "Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue: Continuing an exchange with Dr. Edward E. Max," 2001, <http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp>
70. Dr. Lee Spetner, "Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue: Continuing an exchange with Dr. Edward E. Max," 2001, <http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp>
71. Dr. Lee Spetner, "Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue: Continuing an exchange with Dr. Edward E. Max," 2001, <http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp>
72. Dr. Lee Spetner, "Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue: Continuing an exchange with Dr. Edward E. Max," 2001, <http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp>
73. Francisco J. Ayala, "The Mechanisms of Evolution," *Scientific American*, Vol. 239, September 1978, p. 64, (emphasis added)
74. Dr. Lee Spetner, "Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue: Continuing an exchange with Dr. Edward E. Max," 2001, <http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp>
75. Andrew Scott, "Update on Genesis," *New Scientist*, vol. 106, May 2nd, 1985, p. 30.
76. Fred Hoyle, *The Intelligent Universe*, Michael Joseph, London, 1983, p. 20-21.

e-mail: info@islamdenouncesterrorism.com

e-mail: info@perishednations.com