

# **TELL ME ABOUT THE CREATION**

In disproving the theory of evolution,  
scientific evidence demonstrates that  
all living things are created by God.

**HARUN YAHYA**

First published 2001  
© Goodword Books 2001

Goodword Books  
1, Nizamuddin West Market  
New Delhi 110 013  
Tel. (9111) 435 6666, 435 5454, 435 1128  
Fax (9111) 435 7333, 435 7980  
E-mail: [info@goodwordbooks.com](mailto:info@goodwordbooks.com)  
[www.goodwordforkids.com](http://www.goodwordforkids.com)

ISBN 81-7898-025-8

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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

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 author's books has a symbolic meaning linked to their contents. This seal represents the Qur'an as the last Book by God and the last word of Him and our Prophet, the last of all the prophets. Under the guidance of the Qur'an and Sunnah, the author makes it his main goal to disprove each one of the fundamental tenets of disbelieving ideologies and to say the "last word", so as to completely silence the objections raised against religion. The seal of the Prophet, who attained ultimate wisdom and moral perfection, is used as a sign of his intention of saying this last word.

All these works by the author centre around one goal: to convey the message of the Qur'an to people and thus to encourage them to think about basic faith-related issues, such as the existence of God, His unity and the hereafter, and to remind them of some important issues.

Harun Yahya enjoys a wide readership in many countries such as India, America, England, Indonesia, Poland, Bosnia, Spain and Brazil. His books have been translated into many languages, and English, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Urdu, Arabic, Albanian, Russian, Serbo-Croat (Bosnian), Uygur Turkish, and Indonesian versions are available.

Greatly appreciated all around the world, these works have been instrumental in many people putting 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 employed give these books a distinct touch which directly strikes any one who reads or examines them. Immune to objections, these works are characterised by their features of rapid effectiveness, definite results and irrefutability. The explanations provided in the books are undeniable, explicit and sincere, and enrich the reader with definitive answers. It is unlikely that those who read these books and give a serious thought to them can any longer sincerely advocate the materialistic philosophy, atheism and any other perverted ideology or philosophy. Even if they continue to advocate, this proves to be only a sentimental insistence since these books refute these ideologies from their very basis. All contemporary movements of denial are ideologically defeated today, thanks to the collection of books written by Harun Yahya.

There is no doubt that these features result from the wisdom and lucidity endowed them by God. The author certainly does not feel proud of himself; he merely intends to serve as a means in one's search for God's right path. Furthermore, the author makes no material gains from his books. Neither the writer, nor those who are instrumental in publishing and making these books accessible to the reader, make any material gains. They merely serve to earn the good pleasure of God.

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

Meanwhile, it would just be a waste of time and energy to propagate books which create confusion in people's minds, lead people into ideological chaos, and which clearly have no strong and precise effects in removing the doubts in peoples' hearts. It is apparent that it is impossible for books devised to put the stress on 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, impact and sincerity this service has rendered are manifest in the reader's conviction.

One point needs to be kept in mind: The main reason for the continuing cruelty and conflict, and all the ordeals Muslims undergo is the ideological prevalence of lack of religion. These things can only come to an end with the ideological defeat of lack of faith and by ensuring that everybody knows about the wonders of creation and Qur'anic morality, so that people can live by it. Considering the state of the world today, which forces 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 Harun Yahya series have assumed this leading role. By the Will of God, these books will be the means through which people in the 21st century will attain the peace and bliss, justice and happiness promised in the Qur'an.

The works of the author include The Disasters Darwinism Brought to Humanity, Communism in Ambush, The 'Secret Hand' in Bosnia, The Holocaust Hoax, Behind the Scenes of Terrorism, Israel's Kurdish Card, Solution: The Morals of the Qur'an, The Evolution Deceit, Perished Nations, For Men of Understanding, The Prophet Musa, The Golden Age, Allah's Artistry in Colour, Glory is Everywhere, The Truth of the Life of This World, Knowing the Truth, The Dark Magic of Darwinism, The Religion of Darwinism, The Qur'an Leads the Way to Science, The Real Origin of Life, The Consciousness of the Cell, The Creation of the Universe, Miracles of the Qur'an, The Design in Nature, Self-Sacrifice and Intelligent Behaviour Models in Animals, Children Darwin Was Lying!, The End of Darwinism, Deep Thinking, Never Plead Ignorance.

The author's other works on Qu'ranic topics include: Devoted to Allah, Abandoning the Society of Ignorance, Paradise, Knowledge of the Qur'an, Qur'an Index, Emigrating for the Cause of Allah, The Character of Hypocrites 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, Idolatry, The Religion of the Ignorant, The Arrogance of Satan, Prayer in the Qur'an, 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, The Nightmare of Disbelief, Prophet Isa Will Come, Beauties Presented by the Qur'an for Life, Bouquet of the Beauties of Allah 1-2-3-4, The Iniquity Called "Mockery", The Secret of the Test, The True Wisdom According to the Qur'an, The Struggle with 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, Enthusiasm and Vigor in the Qur'an, Seeing Good in Everything, How does 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.

# CONTENTS

## **An Outdated View: The Theory of Evolution**

**The Origin of Life**

**The Design in the Protein**

**The Design in the Cell**

**Genetic Information**

**The Design in Nature**

**Miller's Experiment**

## **The Natural Selection Misconception**

**Mutations**

**Irreducible Complexity**

**Impasse of Intermediate Forms**

**The Cambrian Period**

**Fish and Amphibians**

**Coelacanth Misconception**

**Reptiles**

**Birds and Reptiles**

**Archaeopteryx Misconception**

**Bird Feathers**

**The Origin of Mammals**

**Living Fossils**

**The Tale of Man's Evolution**

**Australopithecus**

**Homo Erectus**

**A Lost Human Race: Neanderthal**

**The Collapse of the Family Tree**

**The Bipedalism Impasse**

**False Faces**

**Pitldown Scandal**

**Why is Evolution Defended?**

**The Obvious Truth: Creation**

**Notes**

## AN OUTDATED VIEW: THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

**The idea that life is the product of an uncontrolled, purposeless process of coincidence is a 19th century myth. Looking at the matter from the primitive level of the science of the period, evolutionists assumed that life was very "simple".**

There are more than a million species living on the earth. How did these creatures with entirely distinct features and perfect designs come into being? Anyone who uses his reason would understand that life is the work of a perfect and supreme creation.

However, the theory of evolution denies this explicit truth. It holds that all species on earth evolved from one another through a process based on random occurrences.

The first person to seriously take up the issue of evolution – an idea which originated in Ancient Greece – was the French biologist Jean Baptiste Lamarck. Lamarck's theory, which he postulated in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, maintained that "living things transferred the traits they acquired during their lifetime to subsequent generations." In Lamarck's view, for instance, giraffes had evolved from antelope-like animals who extended their necks further and further as they tried to reach higher branches for food. The advent of the science of genetics, however, refuted Lamarck's theory once and for all.

The second important name to defend the theory after Lamarck was a British amateur naturalist, Charles Darwin. In his book *The Origin of Species*, published in 1856, he claimed that all species descended from a common ancestor through coincidences. According to Darwin, for instance, whales evolved from bears that tried to hunt in the sea.<sup>1</sup>

Darwin had serious doubts as he put forward his assertions. He was not so confident of his theory. He confessed to there being many points which he was unable to explain in the chapter titled "Difficulties On Theory". Darwin had hoped that these problems would be solved in the future with the progress of science, and made some projections. 20<sup>th</sup> century science, however, disproved Darwin's claims one by one. The common point of Lamarck's and Darwin's theories was that both rested on a primitive understanding of science. The absence of various domains of science such as biochemistry and microbiology at the time led evolutionists to think that living things had a simple structure that could form by chance. Since the laws of genetics were not known, it was supposed that creatures could simply evolve into new species.

The progress of science overthrew all of these myths and revealed that living things are the work of a superior creation.

## THE ORIGIN OF LIFE

**Evolutionists hold that living things spontaneously formed themselves from inanimate matter. However, this is a medieval superstition contradicting the main laws of biology.**

For many people, the question of "whether men descended from apes or not" springs to mind when Darwin's theory is mentioned. Before coming to that, however, there are numerous questions the evolutionary theory needs to answer. The first question is how the first living organism appeared on earth. Evolutionists answer this question by saying that the first organism was a cell that emerged from inanimate matter by chance. According to the theory, at a time when the earth consisted of inanimate rocks, soil, gases and so on, a living organism formed by chance through the effects of wind, rain, and lightning. This evolutionary claim, however, is contrary to one of the most fundamental rules of biology: Life comes only from life, which means that inanimate matter cannot generate life.

The belief that inanimate matter can produce life is actually a medieval superstition. According to this theory, called "spontaneous generation", it was believed that mice sprang naturally from wheat, or maggots arose "spontaneously" from meat. At the time when Darwin put forward his theory, the belief that microbes of their own accord formed themselves from inanimate matter was also very common.

The findings of the French biologist Louis Pasteur put an end to this belief. As he put it: "The claim that inanimate matter can originate life is buried in history for good."<sup>2</sup>

After Pasteur, evolutionists still maintained that the first living cell formed by chance. However, all experiments and research carried out throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century ended in failure. The "chance" formation of a living cell aside, it has not even been possible to produce a living cell by a conscious process in the most advanced laboratories of the world.

Therefore, the question of how the first living organism emerged puts the evolutionary claim into a quandary right at the first step. One of the chief defenders of the theory of evolution at the molecular level, Prof. Jeffrey Bada, makes this confession:

Today as we leave the twentieth century, we still face the biggest unsolved problem that we had when we entered the twentieth century: How did life originate on Earth?<sup>3</sup>

While invalidating the theory of evolution, the law "life comes from life" also shows that the first life on earth came again from life, which means that it was created by God. He is the only One Who can give life to inanimate matter. In the words of the Qur'an, "**It is He Who brings out the living from the dead, and brings out the dead from the living.**" (Surat ar-Rum: 19)

## THE DESIGN IN THE PROTEIN

**Let us now put aside the question of "how the first cell originated" and ask a much easier question: How did the first protein originate? The theory of evolution has no answer to this question either.**

Proteins are the building blocks of the cell. If we compare the cell to a huge skyscraper, proteins are the bricks of the skyscraper. However, they do not have a standard form and structure as the bricks do. Even the simplest cells have roughly 2,000 different types of proteins. If cells can survive, it is thanks to the extraordinarily harmonious functioning of these distinct proteins.

Proteins are made up of smaller structures, or molecules, called "amino acids", which are formed by the different combinations made by carbon, nitrogen and hydrogen atoms. There are 500-1,000 amino acids in an average protein. Some proteins are much bigger.

The important point is that amino acids have to line up in a certain sequence to form a protein. There are 20 different amino acid types used in living organisms. These amino acids do not combine at random to form proteins. Every protein has a certain amino acid sequence and this sequence must be precisely matched. Even the deficiency or the replacement of a single amino acid renders that protein a useless lump of molecules. For this reason, every amino acid must be just at the right place in the right sequence. The instructions for this sequence are stored in the DNA of the cell and, according to them, the proteins are produced.

The theory of evolution claims that the first proteins formed "by chance". Probabilistic calculations, however, show that this is by no means possible. For instance, the probability of the amino acid sequence of a protein made up of 500 amino acids being in the correct order is 1 in  $10^{950}$ .<sup>5</sup>  $10^{950}$  is an incomprehensible figure formed by placing 950 zeros after 1. In mathematics, a probability smaller than 1 over  $10^{50}$  is considered to be almost impossible.

Briefly, even a single protein cannot form by chance. Evolutionists also admit this fact from time to time. For instance, Harold Blum, a famous evolutionist scientist, states that "the spontaneous formation of a polypeptide of the size of the smallest known proteins seems beyond all probability."<sup>6</sup>

So, what does all this mean? Perry Reeves, a professor of chemistry, gives the answer:

When one examines the vast number of possible structures that could result from a simple random combination of amino acids in an evaporating primordial pond, it is mind-boggling to believe that life could have originated in this way. It is more plausible that a Great Builder with a master plan would be required for such a task.<sup>7</sup>

## THE DESIGN IN THE CELL

**All living things are made up of cells. Even a single cell is self-sufficient; it can produce its own food, move, and communicate with other cells. With its extraordinary technology, the cell is concrete evidence that life cannot originate by chance.**

The cell, even a single protein of which cannot form by chance, is a wonder of design that renders the "chance" hypothesis of evolution completely meaningless. In the cell, there are power stations, complex factories, a huge data bank, storage systems, and advanced refineries.

In Darwin's time, nothing was known about the extraordinary structure of the cell. Under the primitive microscopes of the day, the cell seemed to be a murky lump. For this reason, both Darwin and other evolutionists of his time believed that a cell was a simple dribble of water that could easily originate by chance. The idea that life could be attributed to chance gained acceptance because of this primitive scientific view.

The scientific developments in the 20th century, however, revealed that the cell has an unimaginably complex system. Today, it is established that the cell, which has such a complex design, could not possibly originate by chance as the theory of evolution claims. It is certain that a structure too complex to be imitated even by man cannot be the work of "chance". Renowned British mathematician and astronomer Professor Fred Hoyle puts this impossibility like this:

The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.<sup>9</sup>

And in another commentary, Hoyle says: "Indeed, such a theory (that life was assembled by an intelligence) is so obvious that one wonders why it is not widely accepted as being self-evident. The reasons are psychological rather than scientific."<sup>10</sup>

## GENETIC INFORMATION

**Did you know that the nucleus of each of the trillions of cells making up the human body includes a data bank big enough to fill a 900-volume encyclopaedia?**

DNA is a huge molecule hidden in the nucleus of every living cell. All physical traits of a creature are coded in this helical molecule. All the information about our bodies, from the colour of our eyes to the structure of our internal organs and the form and functions of our cells, are encoded in sections called genes in DNA.

The DNA code is made up of the sequence of four different bases. If we think of each of these bases as a letter, DNA can be likened to a databank made up of an alphabet of four letters. All the information about a living thing is stored in this databank.

If we attempted to write down the information in DNA, this would take up approximately a million pages. This is equal to an encyclopaedia forty times bigger than *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which is one of mankind's greatest accumulations of information. This incredible information is stored in the tiny nucleus of our cells measuring about a thousandth of a millimeter in size.

It is calculated that a DNA chain small enough to fill a teaspoon has the capacity to store all the information contained in all the books ever written.

Of course, such an amazing structure could never have been formed by chance and this proves that life is created by God. Not surprisingly, evolutionists are unable to bring any explanation to the origin of DNA. However, they still embrace the "chance" hypothesis simply for the sake of keeping the theory alive. A well-known molecular biologist from Australia, Michael Denton, explains this in his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*:

To the skeptic, the proposition that the genetic programmes of higher organisms, consisting of something close to a thousand million bits of information, equivalent to the sequence of letters in a small library of one thousand volumes, containing in encoded form countless thousands of intricate algorithms controlling, specifying, and ordering the growth and development of billions and billions of cells into the form of a complex organism, were composed by a purely random process is simply an affront to reason. But to the Darwinist, the idea is accepted without a ripple of doubt - the paradigm takes precedence!<sup>11</sup>

## THE DESIGN IN NATURE

**The fact that living things have perfectly designed forms proves that they could never have originated by chance. The design in nature is a clear sign of creation.**

What would you think if you went out trekking in the depths of a thick forest and ran across a latest-model car among the trees? Would you think that various elements in the forest had come together by chance over millions of years and produced such a vehicle? All the raw materials making up the car are obtained from iron, plastic, rubber, earth or its by-products, but would this fact lead you to think that these materials had come together "by chance" and had, by themselves, manufactured such a car?

Without doubt, anyone with a sound mind would know that the car was the product of an intelligent design, that is, it was factory-made, and would wonder what it was doing there in the middle of a jungle. The sudden origination of a complex structure in a complete form out of the blue shows that it is made by an intelligent agent.

The example of the car also holds true for living things. In fact, the design in life is too striking to be compared to that in a car. The cell, the basic unit of life, is far more complex than any man-made technological product. Moreover, this irreducibly complex organism must have emerged suddenly and fully formed.

Therefore, it is crystal clear that all living things are the work of a superior "design". To put it more clearly, there is no doubt that all creatures are created by God.

In the face of this explicit truth, evolutionists resort to a single concept: "chance". By believing that pure chance can produce perfect designs, evolutionists cross the bounds of reason and science. The famous zoologist Pierre Grassé, the former president of the French Academy of Sciences, makes his point about the logic of "chance", which is the backbone of Darwinism:

The opportune appearance of mutations permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding: A single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with an infinitesimal probability could not fail to occur... There is no law against daydreaming, but science must not indulge in it.<sup>12</sup>

Grassé summarises what the concept of "coincidence" means for evolutionists: "...Chance becomes a sort of providence, which, under the cover of atheism, is not named but which is secretly worshipped."<sup>13</sup> This is the type of superstition that underlies Darwinism.

## MILLER'S EXPERIMENT

**Evolutionists often quote Miller's Experiment as evidence of the correctness of their claim that life formed by chance in primordial earth conditions. However, the experiment, which was carried out some 50 years ago, has lost its scientific implication due to the discoveries that followed.**

American chemist Stanley Miller conducted an experiment in 1953 to support the scenario of molecular evolution. Miller assumed that the primordial earth atmosphere was composed of methane, ammonia, and hydrogen gases. He combined these gases in an experiment set-up and gave electricity to the mixture. Almost a week later, he observed that some amino acids formed in this mixture.

This discovery aroused great excitement among evolutionists. In the next twenty years, some evolutionists, such as Sydney Fox and Cyril Ponnampuram, attempted to develop Miller's scenario.

The discoveries made in the 1970's repudiated these evolutionist attempts known as "primordial atmosphere experiments". It was revealed that the "methane-ammonia based primordial atmosphere model" Miller proposed and other evolutionists accepted was absolutely fallacious. Miller chose these gases on purpose, because they were very convenient for the formation of amino acids. Scientific discoveries, on the other hand, showed that the primordial atmosphere was composed of nitrogen, carbon dioxide and water vapour.<sup>14</sup> This atmosphere model was by no means suitable for the formation of amino acids. Moreover, it was understood that a great amount of oxygen naturally occurred in the primordial atmosphere.<sup>15</sup> This, too, invalidated the scenario of the evolutionists, because free oxygen would obviously decompose amino acids.

As a result of these discoveries, the scientific community acknowledged in the 1980's that Miller's Experiment and other "primordial atmosphere experiments" that followed it have no meaning at all. After a long silence, Miller also confessed that the atmosphere medium he used was unrealistic.<sup>16</sup>

What's more, this whole fuss was simply about "amino acid formation". Even if amino acids had formed, it is impossible for these simple organic molecules to give rise to extremely complex structures such as proteins by chance and produce a living cell which even mankind is unable to reproduce in laboratories today.

The fifty years that have passed since Miller's time have only served to further display the despair the theory of evolution faces at the molecular level.

## THE NATURAL SELECTION MISCONCEPTION

**Natural selection, which Darwin proposed as an evolutionary mechanism, has in fact no evolutionary power. Natural selection cannot form new species.**

Just as it is impossible for life to arise on earth by chance, so is it for species to transform themselves into other species. For no such power exists in nature. What we call nature is the sum of unconscious atoms that make up the soil, rocks, air, water, and everything else. This lifeless heap of matter has no power to transform an invertebrate creature into a fish, then make it climb on land and turn into a reptile, and then turn it into a bird and make it fly, and finally make it a human.

Claiming just the opposite, Darwin put forward a single concept as an "evolutionary mechanism": Natural Selection. Natural selection centres around the idea that the strongest creatures that are best fitted to their habitat will survive. For instance, in a deer herd threatened by wild animals, those that can run faster will survive. Yet certainly, this mechanism would not cause deer to evolve – it would not transform them into another living species, for instance, elephants.

There is not a single shred of observational evidence showing that natural selection has ever caused any living thing to evolve. A noted evolutionist, British paleontologist Colin Patterson confesses this fact:

No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever got near it and most of the current argument in neo-Darwinism is about this question.<sup>17</sup>

## MUTATIONS

**Mutations are genetic accidents that occur in living things. Like all accidents, they cause harm and destruction. "Evolution" through mutation is as unlikely as the improvement of a clock by a hammer blow.**

Realizing that natural selection has no evolutionary function, evolutionists introduced the concept of "mutation" to their claim in the 20th century. Mutations are distortions taking place in the genes of organisms through external effects such as radiation. Evolutionists claim that these distortions cause organisms to evolve.

Scientific findings, however, reject this claim, because all observable efficient mutations cause only harm to living things. All mutations that take place in humans result in mental or physical deformities such as mongolism (Down's syndrome), albinism, dwarfism, or diseases such as cancer.

Another reason why it is impossible for mutations to cause living things to evolve is that mutations do not add any new genetic information to an organism. Mutations cause existing genetic information to be randomly reshuffled similar to playing cards. In other words, no new genetic information is introduced by mutations.

Evolutionary theory, however, asserts that the genetic information of living things increases over time. For instance, while a very simply structured bacterium comprises of 2,000 different types of proteins, a human's organism has 100,000 types of proteins. Exactly 98,000 new proteins have to be "discovered" for a bacterium to evolve into a human being. It is by no means possible for these protein structures to be produced by mutations, because mutations cannot add anything to a DNA chain.

Not surprisingly, so far, not even a single mutation has been observed to develop the genetic information of any life form. Despite being an evolutionist himself, the Former President of the French Academy of Sciences, Pierre-Paul Grassé, made the following admission: "No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution."<sup>18</sup>

## IRREDUCIBLE COMPLEXITY

**All claims of Darwinism rest on the scenario of "gradual development". The "irreducibly complex" organs unravelled by 20th century science demolish this scenario and the entire theory of evolution along with it.**

If you ask an evolutionist: "How did the marvellous organs of living things come into being?", he will outline this scenario: "It is true that the extremely complex systems of living organisms cannot form all of a sudden by chance. These systems have rather developed step by step. First, a single part of the system emerged by chance. Since this part was advantageous for the organism, that organism benefited from natural selection. Then other parts formed by steps, eventually building the highly complex system."

The point that renders this scenario invalid right from the outset is the characteristic of "irreducible complexity" in the systems of living things. If a system is not functional without all of its components being in place, and if it is useless if even only one of its components is missing, then that system cannot be reduced to a simpler form. It either exists perfectly and functions, or it is useless.

On close consideration, we see that an "irreducibly complex" system cannot possibly form "step by step" through coincidences. For no "intermediate step" would be of any use unless the system were complete and perfect. A useless intermediate step, on the other hand, would be eliminated by natural selection and disappear according to the reasoning of evolution.

When Darwin put forward his theory, he had great doubts about this point. He imagined that the organs of living things could be reduced to simpler forms, yet he was also afraid that new developments would destroy his speculation. This is why he wrote the following lines in his book *The Origin of Species*:

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.<sup>19</sup>

Darwin's theory has today been overthrown just as he feared, because scientific findings prove that most of the systems in living organisms are irreducibly complex. Numerous structures and systems from the human eye to the cell, from the coagulation process in the blood to the protein, are of no use with even one of their components missing. Not surprisingly, no evolutionist can explain through which "steps" these organisms have formed.

While irreducible complexity – in Darwin's words – "absolutely" breaks down the theory of evolution, it, on the other hand, absolutely proves creation. Every irreducibly complex system demonstrates the existence of an intelligence that has built it. The complexity in living things proves the existence and the perfect creation of God, Who created life. As stated in the Qur'an, "**He is God – the Creator, the Maker, the Giver of Form. To Him belong the Most Beautiful Names. Everything in the heavens and earth glorifies Him. He is the Almighty, the All-Wise.**" (Surat al-Hashr: 24)

## IMPASSE OF INTERMEDIATE FORMS

**Darwin had written: "If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties... must assuredly have existed". However, evolutionists, despite their 140 year-long search, have not been able to find even one.**

The theory of evolution asserts that living things descended from a common ancestor. According to the theory, living beings differentiated from each other over a very long time with linked, gradual modifications.

If this assertion were true, then numerous "intermediary species" should have lived in history linking different living species. For instance, if birds had indeed evolved from reptiles, then billions of creatures which were half-bird/half-reptile should have lived throughout history.

Darwin knew that the fossil deposits ought to be full of these "intermediary transitional forms". Yet he was also well aware that no transitional form fossils were available. That was why he devoted a chapter to this problem in his book *The Origin of Species*.

Darwin was hoping that this great problem would be solved in the future and that transitional forms would be discovered with new excavations. Despite their best efforts, however, evolutionists have not been able to find even a single intermediate form in the 140 years that have passed since Darwin. The well-known evolutionist Derek Ager confesses this fact:

The point emerges that if we examine the fossil record in detail, we find—over and over again—not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another.<sup>20</sup>

The sudden origination of living beings on the Earth is proof that they were created by God. Evolutionist biologist Douglas Futuyma admits this fact:

Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from preexisting 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.<sup>21</sup>

## THE CAMBRIAN PERIOD

**When we examine the earth strata, we see that life on Earth appeared suddenly. Many diverse living species emerged abruptly and fully in the Cambrian Period. This finding is compelling evidence for creation.**

The deepest stratum of earth that contains fossils of complex living things is the "Cambrian", which has an estimated age of 520 to 530 million years. The fossils unearthed in Cambrian rocks belonged to complex invertebrate species like snails, trilobites, sponges, worms, jelly fish, starfish, crustaceans and sea lilies. Most interestingly, all of these distinct species emerged all of a sudden without any predecessor.

Richard Monastersky, the editor of *Earth Sciences*, which is one of the popular journals of evolutionist literature, admits this fact that put evolutionists into a quandary:

A half-billion years ago the remarkably complex forms of animals that we see today suddenly appeared. This moment, right at the start of the earth's Cambrian Period, some 550 million years ago, marks the evolutionary explosion that filled the seas with the earth's first complex creatures. The large animal phyla of today were present already in the early Cambrian and they were as distinct from each other as they are today.<sup>22</sup>

How these distinct living species with no common ancestors could have emerged is a question that remains unanswered by evolutionists. The Oxford zoologist Richard Dawkins, one of the foremost advocates of the evolutionary theory in the world, makes this confession:

It is as though they (the species of the Cambrian) were just planted there, without any evolutionary history.<sup>23</sup>

The Cambrian explosion is clear evidence that God created all living things. The only explanation of the sudden emergence of organisms without any evolutionary ancestors is creation. Accordingly, Darwin wrote: "If numerous species, belonging to the same genera or families, have really started into life all at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of descent with slow modification through natural selection."<sup>24</sup> This fatal stroke that frightened Darwin comes from the Cambrian period, right at the outset of the fossil record.

## FISH AND AMPHIBIANS

**Fish and amphibians emerged on the Earth suddenly and without any predecessors. Evolutionists cannot explain the origin of either of these living classes.**

Evolutionists assume that the sea invertebrates that appeared in the Cambrian stratum somehow evolved into fish over tens of millions of years. However, there is not a single transitional link indicating that evolution occurred between these invertebrates and fish. Actually, the evolution of invertebrates that have their hard tissues outside their bodies and no skeleton into bony fish that have theirs in the middle of their bodies is a very big transformation which should have left a great number of transitional links.

Evolutionists have been digging fossil strata for about 140 years looking for these hypothetical forms. They have found millions of invertebrate fossils and millions of fish fossils; yet nobody has ever found even one that is midway between them. An evolutionist paleontologist, Gerald T. Todd, asks the following questions in the face of this fact:

All three subdivisions of the bony fishes first appear in the fossil record at approximately the same time... How did they originate? What allowed them to diverge so widely?.. And why is there no trace of earlier, intermediate forms?<sup>26</sup>

The evolutionary scenario also argues that fish, which evolved from invertebrates, later transformed themselves into amphibians which are able to live on land. (Amphibians are animals capable of living both on land and in water, such as frogs.) But as you would imagine, this scenario also lacks evidence. There is not even a single fossil verifying that a half-fish/half-amphibian creature has ever existed. This fact is confirmed, albeit reluctantly, by a well-known evolutionist authority, Robert L. Carroll, who is the author of *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*: "We have no intermediate fossils between rhipidistian fish and early amphibians."<sup>27</sup>

In short, both fish and amphibians emerged suddenly and in their present form without any predecessors. In other words, God created them in a perfect form.

### THE MIRACLE OF METAMORPHOSIS

Frogs are first born in water, live there for a while, and then emerge on to land in a process known as "metamorphosis." Some people think that metamorphosis is evidence of evolution, whereas, the two have actually nothing to do with one another. The sole development mechanism proposed by evolution is mutation. Metamorphosis does not come about by coincidental effects as mutation does. On the contrary, this change results from the frogs' genetic code. In other words, it is already evident that when a frog is first born, it will have a type of body allowing it to live on land.

The evolutionists' claim of passage from water to land says that fish, with a genetic code completely designed to allow them to live in water, turned into land creatures as a result of chance mutations. But for this reason, metamorphosis actually tears evolution down, rather than shoring it up. Because the slightest error in the process of metamorphosis means the creature will die or be deformed. It is essential that metamorphosis should happen perfectly. It is impossible for such a complex process, which allows no room for error, to have come about by chance

mutations, as is claimed by evolution. Metamorphosis is actually a miracle that reveals the perfection in creation.

## COELACANTH MISCONCEPTION

**Up until 70 years ago, evolutionists had a fossil fish which they considered "the ancestor of land animals". Scientific developments, however, put an end to all evolutionist claims about this fish.**

The absence of intermediate form fossils between fish and amphibians is a fact evolutionists also admit to today. However, until 70 years ago, it was accepted that a fossil fish called the coelacanth was an outright intermediate form. Evolutionists claimed that the coelacanth, which was estimated to be 410 million years of age, was a transitional form with a primitive lung, a developed brain, a digestive and a circulatory system ready to function on land, and even a primitive walking mechanism. These evolutionary interpretations were accepted as undisputed truth in scientific circles until the end of the 1930's.

However, on December 22, 1938, a very interesting discovery was made in the Indian Ocean. A living member of the coelacanth family, previously presented as a transitional form that had become extinct 70 million years ago, was caught! The discovery of a "living" prototype of coelacanth undoubtedly gave evolutionists a severe shock. The evolutionist paleontologist, J.L.B. Smith, said that he could not have been more surprised if he had come across a living dinosaur.<sup>28</sup> In the following years, more than 200 coelacanths were caught in different parts of the world.

Living coelacanths revealed how far evolutionists could go in making up their imaginary scenarios. Contrary to their claims, coelacanths had neither a primitive lung nor a large brain. The organ that evolutionist researchers claimed to be a primitive lung turned out to be nothing but a lipid pouch.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, the coelacanth, which was introduced as "a reptile candidate getting prepared to pass from sea to land", was in reality a fish that lived in the depths of the oceans and always stayed more than 180 metres below the surface.<sup>30</sup>

## REPTILES

**The theory of evolution is also unable to account for the origin of reptiles. The members of this specific class have appeared distinctly without undergoing any evolutionary process. The physiological features of reptiles are widely different from those of their alleged ancestors, the amphibians.**

Dinosaurs, lizards, turtles and crocodiles... All of these species belong to the living class called "reptiles". Some reptiles, such as dinosaurs, are extinct but some are still alive.

Reptiles have particular features, such as their bodies being covered by plate-like structures called "scales". They are cold-blooded, which means that they cannot generate their own body heat. That is why they need direct sunlight to warm up their bodies. They give birth to their young by laying eggs.

Evolutionists cannot explain how reptiles came into being. The conventional evolutionist allegation on this issue is that reptiles evolved from amphibians. However, there is not a single scrap of evidence to prove this. On the contrary, an examination of amphibians and reptiles demonstrates that there are very great physiological differences between these two living groups and that a half-reptile/half-amphibian has no chances of survival.

Accordingly, such a creature does not exist in the fossil record. Renowned evolutionist paleontologist, Lewis L. Carroll, admits this fact in his article titled "The Problem of the Origin of Reptiles":

Unfortunately not a single specimen of an appropriate reptilian ancestor is known prior to the appearance of true reptiles. The absence of such ancestral forms leaves many problems of the amphibian-reptilian transition unanswered.<sup>31</sup>

Moreover, there are also insurmountable boundaries between reptile species such as reptiles, dinosaurs or lizards. All of these distinct species arose suddenly and distinctly on the Earth, because God so created them. This fact is thus stated in the Qur'an:

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

## BIRDS AND REPTILES

**Evolutionists make the claim that birds evolved from reptiles. When we examine the structure of these two living classes, however, we see that this assertion is extremely unscientific.**

Evolutionists claim that birds evolved from small-structured, reptilian dinosaurs. A comparison between birds and reptiles, however, demonstrates that these living classes are very different from each other and no evolution whatsoever could have taken place between them.

There are many structural differences between birds and reptiles. The most important one is their bone structure. Dinosaurs, the alleged ancestors of birds, according to evolutionists, have thick and solid bones because of their massive structure. Whereas the bones of living and extinct birds are hollow and thus very light. This light-weight bone structure is very important in the flight of birds.

Another important difference between reptiles and birds is their metabolic structure. While reptiles have the slowest metabolic rate in the world of living things, birds hold the highest records in this field. For instance, the body heat of a house sparrow can rise up to 48°C because of its fast metabolism. On the other hand, reptiles are not even capable of producing their own body heat and instead warm up under the sun. Reptiles are the least energy-consuming animals in nature, whereas birds are the most energy-consuming animals.

The respiratory system of birds also differs greatly from that of reptiles. Reptiles and mammals take air into their lungs through their trachea and then give it back through the same pipe. In birds, however, air makes a one-way journey through the lung channels; it enters from one side and departs from the other. Thanks to this respiratory system that does not exist in any other living class, birds make extremely efficient use of air. This system enables them to fly even at an altitude of 8,000 meters, where oxygen is very scarce.

Another characteristic that raises an unsurpassable barrier between birds and reptiles is feathers, a structure specific to birds. The bodies of reptiles are covered with scales, whereas the bodies of birds are covered with feathers.

Put briefly, numerous differences between birds and reptiles definitively refute the evolutionist claim that reptiles gradually evolved into birds. Birds and reptiles are living classes God created to be quite distinct from each other.

Alan Feduccia, a professor from the University of North Carolina, strongly opposes the theory that birds have a kinship with dinosaurs on the basis of scientific discoveries, despite the fact that he is an evolutionist himself:

Well, I've studied bird skulls for 25 years and I don't see any similarities whatsoever. I just don't see it... The theropod (a major group of dinosaurs) origins of birds, in my opinion, will be the greatest embarrassment of paleontology of the 20th century.<sup>33</sup>

## ARCHAEOPTERYX MISCONCEPTION

**Evolutionists point to the Archaeopteryx fossil as the only evidence to support their claim that "birds evolved from dinosaurs". The latest discoveries, however, prove that this creature is simply an extinct bird species.**

The most important intermediate form candidate that evolutionists refer to is a 150 million-year-old fossil bird called Archaeopteryx. Evolutionists claim that this fossil bird was a semi-dinosaur which could not fly properly.

This evolutionist claim proven false over and over again, collapsed for good with an Archaeopteryx fossil unearthed in 1992.

The absence of a "sternum", that is the chest bone, in this creature, which is essential for flight muscles, was held up as the most important evidence that this bird could not fly properly. The seventh Archaeopteryx fossil unearthed in 1992 revealed that the chest bone that evolutionists have long assumed to be missing actually existed. The presence of this bone proved that Archaeopteryx was a flying bird.<sup>34</sup>

In addition, it has been proved that two other points which evolutionists mention while presenting Archaeopteryx as an intermediate form – the claws on its wings and the teeth in its mouth – do not in any way imply that this bird is an intermediate form. It has been observed that two bird species living today, toucan and hoatzin both have claws on their wings by which to hold on to branches. Also, there have been different bird species throughout history that had teeth. Moreover, according to the measurements of famous ornithologists, such as Martin, Stewart and Whetstone, the tooth structure of Archaeopteryx was completely different from that of reptiles.<sup>35</sup> All these findings show that the evolutionary claims that Archaeopteryx is an intermediate form have no scientific basis.

## BIRD FEATHERS

**Feathers, which have an extremely complex design and aerodynamic characteristics, are unique to birds. The claim that bird feathers evolved from reptile scales is completely groundless.**

The bodies of reptiles are covered with scales, whereas the bodies of birds are covered with feathers. Since evolutionists consider reptiles the ancestors of birds, they are obliged to claim that bird feathers have evolved from reptile scales. However, there is no similarity between scales and feathers.

A professor of physiology and neurobiology from the University of Connecticut, A.H. Brush, accepts this reality, although he is an evolutionist: "Every feature from gene structure and organization, to development, morphogenesis and tissue organization is different (in feathers and scales)."<sup>36</sup> Moreover, Prof. Brush examines the protein structure of bird feathers and argues that it is "unique among vertebrates."<sup>37</sup>

There is no fossil evidence to prove that bird feathers evolved from reptile scales. On the contrary, "feathers appear suddenly in the fossil record, as an 'undeniably unique' character distinguishing birds" as Prof. Brush states.<sup>38</sup> Besides, in reptiles, no epidermal structure has yet been detected that provides an origin for bird feathers.<sup>39</sup>

The "Feathered dinosaur fossils discovered in China" story, which came to light in 1996 amidst great media propaganda was totally unfounded, and it was realised in 1997 that the *Sinosauropteryx* fossil in question possessed no structures resembling feathers.<sup>40</sup>

On the other hand, when we examine bird feathers closely, we come across a very complex design that cannot be explained by any evolutionary process. The famous ornithologist Alan Feduccia states that "every feature of them has aerodynamic functions. They are extremely light, have the ability to lift up which increases in lower speeds, and may return to their previous position very easily". Then he continues, "I cannot really understand how an organ perfectly designed for flight may have emerged for another need at the beginning".<sup>41</sup>

The design of feathers also compelled Charles Darwin to ponder over them. Moreover, the perfect aesthetics of the peafowl's feathers had made him "sick" (his own words). In a letter he wrote to Asa Gray on April 3, 1860, he said "I remember well the time when the thought of the eye made me cold all over, but I have got over this stage of complaint..." And then continued: "... and now trifling particulars of structure often make me very uncomfortable. The sight of a feather in a peacock's tail, whenever I gaze at it, makes me sick!"<sup>42</sup>

## THE ORIGIN OF MAMMALS

**Contrary to evolutionist claims, mammals emerged on Earth suddenly without any predecessors.**

**Moreover, evolutionists have no explanation for the origin of distinct mammal groups.**

As so far examined, the theory of evolution proposes that some imaginary creatures that came out of the sea transformed themselves into reptiles and that birds were formed by the evolution as that of reptiles. According to the same scenario, reptiles are the ancestors not only of birds but also of mammals. However, on the one hand, there are big, structural gaps between reptiles, which have scales on their bodies, which are cold-blooded, and which reproduce by laying eggs, and on the other, mammals, which have fur on their bodies, which are warm-blooded, and which reproduce by giving birth to live offspring. An example of the structural barriers between reptiles and mammals is their jaw structure. Mammals' mandibles consist of only one mandibular bone and the teeth are placed on this bone. In reptiles, however, there are three little bones on both sides of the mandible.

Another basic difference is that all mammals have three bones in their middle ear (hammer, anvil, and stirrup). In all reptiles, there is a single bone in the middle ear. Evolutionists claim that the reptile jaw and reptile middle ear evolved gradually into the mammal jaw and ear. Yet the question of how this change occurred remains unanswered. In particular, the question of how an ear with a single bone evolved into an ear with three bones and how the process of hearing kept on functioning in the meanwhile can never be explained.

Not surprisingly, not a single fossil to link reptiles and mammals is to be found. This is why evolutionist paleontologist Roger Lewin was forced to say that "the transition to the first mammal... is still an enigma".<sup>43</sup>

George Gaylord Simpson, one of the biggest evolutionary authorities in the 20th century makes the following comment on this fact that is quite perplexing for evolutionists:

The most puzzling event in the history of life on earth is the change from the Mesozoic, the Age of Reptile, to the Age of Mammals. It is as if the curtain were rung down suddenly on the stage where all the leading roles were taken by reptiles, especially dinosaurs, in great numbers and bewildering variety, and rose again immediately to reveal the same setting but an entirely new cast, a cast in which the dinosaurs do not appear at all, other reptiles are supernumeraries, and all the leading parts are played by mammals of sorts barely hinted at in the preceding acts.<sup>44</sup>

All of these demonstrate that mammals also appeared on Earth suddenly and fully formed, without any ancestors. This is concrete evidence of the fact that they were created by God.

## LIVING FOSSILS

**There is no difference between fossil life forms dating back hundreds of millions of years and their counterparts living today. This fact utterly disproves the evolutionary claim.**

The theory of evolution argues that living things are in constant change, continuously developing through coincidences. The fossil record, however, indicates just the opposite. When we look at fossils, we see that there is no difference between life forms that lived hundreds of millions of years ago and their counterparts living today. Modern fish, reptiles and mammals are exactly the same as the fish, reptiles and mammals that appeared for the first time on the Earth. Some living species are driven to extinction, but no species has turned into another species.

This makes it clear that all living species were created by God to be quite distinct from each other, and they have not undergone any evolution since the day they were created.

## THE TALE OF MAN'S EVOLUTION

**Just like evolutionists' other claims on the origin of life forms, their claim about the origin of man has likewise no scientific basis. Discoveries show that "the evolution of man" is simply a tale.**

Darwin put forward his claim that human beings and monkeys descended from a common ancestor in his book *The Descent of Man* published in 1871. From that time onwards, the followers of Darwin have tried to bolster this claim. But despite all the research that has been carried out, the claim of "human evolution" has not been backed up by any concrete scientific discovery, particularly in the fossil field.

The man in the street is for the most part unaware of this fact, and thinks that the claim of human evolution is supported by a great deal of firm evidence. The reason for this incorrect opinion is that the subject is frequently discussed in the media and presented as a proven fact. But real experts on the subject are aware that the claim of "human evolution" has no scientific foundation. David Pilbeam, one of Harvard University's palaeontologists, says the following:

If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meagre evidence we've got he'd surely say, 'forget it: there isn't enough to go on.'<sup>45</sup>

And William Fix, the author of an important book on the subject of palaeoanthropology, makes this comment:

There are numerous scientists and popularizers today who have the temerity to tell us that there is 'no doubt' how man originated. If only they had the evidence.<sup>46</sup>

This claim of evolution, which "lacks any evidence," starts the human family tree with a species of monkey called *Australopithecus*. According to the claim, *Australopithecus* began to walk upright over time, his brain grew, and passed through a series of stages to come to man's present state (*Homo sapiens*.)

But the fossil record does not back up this scenario. Despite the claim of all kinds of intermediate forms, there is an impassable barrier between the fossil remains respectively of man and monkeys. Furthermore, it has been revealed that the species which are portrayed as each others' ancestors are actually contemporary species that lived in the same period. Ernst Mayr, one of the most important proponents of the theory of evolution in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, accepts this truth: "The chain reaching as far as *Homo sapiens* is actually lost."<sup>47</sup>

## AUSTRALOPITHECUS

**Creatures, named *Australopithecus* by evolutionists, are actually nothing but an extinct ape species...**

*Australopithecus* means "southern ape". Falling into different categories, all *Australopithecus* species are extinct apes that resemble the apes of today. Their cranial capacities are the same, or smaller than the chimpanzees of our day. There are projecting parts in their hands and feet which they used to climb trees, just like today's chimpanzees, and their feet have grasping abilities to hold on to the branches. Many characteristics such as the closeness of the eyes, sharp molar teeth, mandibular structure, long arms, short legs, are evidence of these creatures being no different from today's apes.

Evolutionists claim that although the *Australopithecus* species have the anatomy of an ape, they walked upright like humans.

Extensive research done on various *Australopithecus* specimens by two world-renowned anatomists from England and the USA, namely, Lord Solly Zuckerman and Prof. Charles Oxnard, has shown that these creatures were not bipedal and had the same sort of movement as today's apes. Having studied the bones of these fossils for a period of 15 years, with funding from the British government, Lord Zuckerman and his team of 5 specialists reached the conclusion – although Zuckerman was an evolutionist himself – that Australopithecines were only an ordinary ape species and were definitely not bipedal.<sup>48</sup> Correspondingly, Oxnard, who is also an evolutionist, also likened the skeletal structure of *Australopithecus* to that of modern orang-utans.<sup>49</sup>

The detailed analyses conducted by the American anthropologist Holly Smith in 1994 on the teeth of *Australopithecus* indicated that *Australopithecus* was an ape species.<sup>50</sup>

Within the same year, Fred Spoor, Bernard Wood and Frans Zonneveld, all specialists on anatomy, reached the same conclusion through a totally different method. This method was based on the comparative analysis of the semi-circular canals in the inner ear of humans and apes which provided for sustaining balance. The inner ear canals of all *Australopithecus* specimens analysed by Spoor, Wood and Zonneveld were the same as those of modern apes.<sup>51</sup> This finding once more showed that the *Australopithecus* species is a species similar to modern apes.

## ***HOMO ERECTUS***

**Presented as "primitive man" by evolutionists, *Homo Erectus* is actually a lost human race.  
The differences between *Homo Erectus* and us are simply racial differences.**

In the scheme of "man's evolution" devised by evolutionists, fossils classified as *Homo Erectus* come after the *Australopithecus* species. (The classification, "Homo habilis", which was proposed by certain evolutionists, has been included in the *Australopithecus* species in recent years.)

As the word "erect" implies, "*Homo Erectus*" means a "man walking upright". Evolutionists have had to separate these men from previous ones by adding the quality of "erectness", because all the available *Homo Erectus* fossils are straight to an extent not observed in any of the *Australopithecus* or *Homo habilis* specimens. There is no difference between the skeleton of modern man and that of *Homo Erectus*.

A good indication of this is the "Turkana Boy" fossil that is included in the *Homo Erectus* class. It is confirmed that the fossil was of a 12-year-old boy, who would have been 1.83 meters tall in his adolescence. The upright skeleton structure of the fossil is no different from that of modern man, on which point 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."<sup>52</sup>

The primary reason for evolutionists to define *Homo Erectus* as "primitive" is the cranial capacity of its skull (900-1100 cc), which is smaller than that of the average modern man, and its thick eyebrow projections. However, there are many people living today in the world who have the same cranial capacity as *Homo Erectus* (for instance the pygmies) and there are some other races that have protruding eyebrows (for instance the Australian Aborigines).

It is a commonly agreed fact that differences in cranial capacity do not necessarily denote differences in intelligence or abilities. Intelligence depends on the internal organisation of the brain rather than its volume.<sup>53</sup>

Even evolutionist Richard Leakey states that the differences between *Homo Erectus* and modern man are no more than racial variance:

"One would also see differences in the shape of the skull, in the degree of protrusion of the face, the robustness of the brows and so on. These differences are probably no more pronounced than we see today between the separate geographical races of modern humans."<sup>54</sup>

In short, human beings, whom evolutionists classify as *Homo Erectus*, are a lost human race whose level of intelligence is no different from our own. There is, on the other hand, a huge gap between *Homo Erectus*, a human race, and the apes that preceded it in the "human evolution" scenario, (*Australopithecus*, or *Homo habilis*). This means that the first men appeared in the fossil record suddenly and right away without any evolutionary history. There can be no clearer indication of their being created.

## A LOST HUMAN RACE: NEANDERTHALS

**Today, it has been definitively verified that Neanderthal man, who is presented as the "primitive ancestor of man" by evolutionists, is simply a lost human race.**

Neanderthals are human beings who suddenly appeared 100,000 years ago in Europe and disappeared—or were assimilated by being blended with other races—quietly yet quickly 35,000 years ago. Their only difference from modern man is their skeleton being more robust and their cranial capacity slightly bigger. Neanderthals are a human race and this fact is admitted by almost everybody today. Evolutionists have tried very hard to present them as "a primitive species", yet all findings indicate that they were no different from a "robust" man walking on the street today. A prominent authority on the subject, Erik Trinkaus, a paleoanthropologist from New Mexico University writes:

Detailed comparisons of Neanderthal skeletal remains with those of modern humans have shown that there is nothing in Neanderthal anatomy that conclusively indicates locomotor, manipulative, intellectual, or linguistic abilities inferior to those of modern humans.<sup>55</sup>

Many contemporary researchers define Neanderthal man as a sub-species of modern man and call him "Homo sapiens neandertalensis". The findings testify that Neanderthals buried their dead, fashioned musical instruments, and had cultural affinities with the *Homo sapiens sapiens* living during the same period. To put it precisely, Neanderthals are a "robust" human race that simply disappeared in time.

## THE COLLAPSE OF THE FAMILY TREE

**The scenario of "man's family tree" is refuted by fossil evidence. It is understood today that species which are presented as ancestors of one another are actually different races that lived at the same period.**

The scenario of "human evolution" is a totally fiction. In order for such a family tree to exist, a gradual evolution from ape to man should have taken place and the fossil record of this process should have been found. However, there is a huge gap between apes and humans. Skeletal structures, cranial capacities, and other such criteria as walking upright or bent sharply forward are what distinguish humans from apes.

Another significant finding proving that there can be no family tree among these different species is that the species that are presented as ancestors of each other in fact lived concurrently. If, as the evolutionists claim, australopithecines converted to *Homo habilis* and if they, in turn, converted to *Homo Erectus*, the eras they lived in should necessarily have followed each other. However, there is no such chronological order.

The evolutionist paleontologist Alan Walker confirms this fact by stating that "there is evidence from East Africa for late-surviving small *Australopithecus* individuals that were contemporaneous first with *H. Habilis*, then with *H. erectus*."<sup>56</sup> Louis Leakey has found fossils of *Australopithecus*, *Homo habilis* and *Homo Erectus* almost next to each other in Olduvai Gorge region, Bed II layer.<sup>57</sup>

A paleontologist from Harvard University, Stephen Jay Gould, explains this deadlock of evolution although he is an evolutionist himself:

"What has become of our ladder if there are three coexisting lineages of hominids (*A. africanus*, the robust australopithecines, and *H. habilis*), none clearly derived from another? Moreover, none of the three display any evolutionary trends during their tenure on earth."<sup>58</sup>

When we move on from *Homo Erectus* to *Homo sapiens*, we again see that there is no family tree to talk about. There is evidence showing that *Homo Erectus* and archaic *Homo sapiens* continued living up to 27,000 years and even 10,000 years before our time. In the Kow swamp in Australia, some 13,000-year-old *Homo Erectus* skulls have been found. On Java Island, a *Homo Erectus* skull was found that was 27,000 years old.<sup>59</sup>

These finds indicate that the creatures presented as the "ancestors of man" by the theory of evolution are either extinct species that have nothing to do with one another or lost human races.

## THE BIPEDALISM IMPASSE

**Human beings move in a completely different way from other creatures. No other animal can walk upright on its two feet as humans do. Evolutionists, however, claim that the bipedal upright stride of humans evolved by steps from the apes' quadripedal bent stride.**

This claim is not true. Firstly, the fossil record shows that no life form ever had a way of movement in between the human and the ape stride. Detailed examinations of the fossil record prove that creatures of the *Australopithecus* and *Homo habilis* classes walked on all fours and by leaning forward, while human races such as *Homo Erectus* and Neanderthal man walked upright just like us. This means that the bipedal upright stride emerged with humans for the first time and all of a sudden.

Besides, anatomical research conducted in recent years establishes that the gradual evolution of the ape stride into the human stride is impossible. In 1996, the British anatomist Robin Crompton, who conducted research into the bipedal stride of humans, concluded that a motion in between the ape stride and the human stride is not possible. Crompton showed that a living thing can either walk upright or on all fours. A type of in-between stride would be quite ineffective.<sup>60</sup>

The immense gap between man and ape is not limited solely to bipedalism. Many other issues still remain unexplained such as brain capacity, the ability to talk, and so on. Elaine Morgan, an evolutionist paleoanthropologist, makes the following confession in relation to this issue:

Four of the most outstanding mysteries about humans are:

- 1) why do they walk on two legs?
- 2) why have they lost their fur?
- 3) why have they developed such large brains?
- 4) why did they learn to speak?

The orthodox answers to these questions are:

- 1) 'We do not yet know';
- 2) 'We do not yet know';
- 3) 'We do not yet know';
- 4) 'We do not yet know'.

The list of questions could be considerably lengthened without affecting the monotony of the answers.<sup>61</sup>

In short, "the evolution of man" is nothing but an unsubstantiated tale. Man is created by God already equipped with all the abilities and features he possesses.

## FALSE FACES

**Even if evolutionists are unsuccessful in finding scientific evidence to shore up their theories, they are very successful at one thing: propaganda. The most important elements of this propaganda are the false drawings and designs known as "reconstructions."**

Reconstruction can be explained as drawing a picture or constructing a model of a living thing based on a single bone that has been unearthed. The "ape-men" we see in newspapers, magazines, or films are all reconstructions.

The important thing here is how scientific these drawings are. Since fossils are usually disordered and incomplete, any conjecture based on them is likely to be totally imaginative. As a matter of fact, the reconstructions made by evolutionists based on the fossil remains are prepared precisely to suit the purposes of the evolutionary thesis.

At this point, we have to highlight a particular point: studies based on bone remains cannot reveal the "soft tissues" of a creature. The hair, skin, nose, ears, lips, or other facial features of a living thing cannot be determined from its bone remains. It is very easy for someone committed to evolution to devise an imaginary creature by shaping these soft tissues as he wishes. Earnest A. Hooton from Harvard University, explains the situation like this:

To attempt to restore the soft parts is an even more hazardous undertaking. The lips, the eyes, the ears, and the nasal tip leave no clues on the underlying bony parts. You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthaloid skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely only to mislead the public... So put not your trust in reconstructions.<sup>62</sup>

Evolutionists animate the creatures that exist only in their imagination by using the method of "reconstruction" and present them to people as if they are "their ancestors". When they are unable to find the "half-man half-ape" creatures in the fossil record, they prefer to deceive the public with false drawings.

## PILTDOWN SCANDAL

**The Piltdown Man skull was presented to the world over a period of 40 years as the biggest piece of evidence for the claim of "human evolution". This skull, however, was actually the biggest science fraud in history.**

A well-known doctor and also an amateur paleoanthropologist, Charles Dawson came out with an assertion that he had found a jawbone and a cranial fragment in a pit in Piltdown, England in 1912. Even though the jawbone was more ape-like, the teeth and the skull were like a man's. These specimens were labelled the "Piltdown Man". Alleged to be 500,000 years old, they were displayed as an absolute proof of human evolution in several museums. For more than 40 years, many scientific articles were written on the "Piltdown Man", many interpretations and sketches were made, and the fossil was presented as an important piece of evidence of human evolution. No less than five hundred doctoral theses were written on the subject.<sup>63</sup>

In 1949, Kenneth Oakley from the British Museum's paleontology department attempted to try the method of "fluorine testing", a new test used for determining the date of some old fossils. A trial was carried out on the fossil of the Piltdown Man. The result was astounding. During the test, it was realised that the jawbone of the Piltdown Man did not contain any fluorine. This indicated that it had remained buried for no more than a few years. The skull, which contained only a small amount of fluorine, showed that it was only a few thousand years old.

Detailed research revealed that Piltdown man was the biggest science fraud in history. This was an artificial skull; the cranium belonged to a 500-year-old man, and the mandibular bone belonged to a recently dead ape! The teeth were thereafter specially arranged in an array and added to the jaw, and the joints were filed in order to resemble that of a man. Then all these pieces were stained with potassium dichromate to give them an ancient appearance.

Le Gros Clark, who was in the team that disclosed the forgery, could not hide his astonishment at this situation and said that "the evidences of artificial abrasion immediately sprang to the eye. Indeed so obvious did they seem it may well be asked - how was it that they had escaped notice before?"<sup>64</sup> In the wake of all this, "Piltdown Man" was hurriedly removed from the British Museum where it had been displayed for more than 40 years.

The Piltdown scandal clearly showed that there was nothing that evolutionists would stop short of doing in order to prove their theories. Moreover, this scandal showed that evolutionists had no findings to reinforce their theories. Since they have no evidence, they prefer to fabricate it themselves.

## WHY IS EVOLUTION DEFENDED?

**Since the day of its formulation, the evolutionary theory has served the best interests of materialist philosophy. Today, those who make efforts to keep this theory alive are the proponents of this philosophy.**

Why is the theory of evolution still defended despite the obvious evidence against it? The American evolutionist biologist, Michael Walker, makes the following confession as he answers this question:

One is forced to conclude that many scientists and technologists pay lip service to Darwinian theory only because it supposedly excludes a creator.<sup>65</sup>

The only purpose of the promoters of the theory is to foster the materialist philosophy which denies God. Materialism is a blind faith that admits the existence of matter alone and denies all supra-material beings. Since materialists derive their so-called scientific argument from the theory of evolution, they have sustained Darwinism since the day of its inception.

The founder of dialectic materialism (communism), Karl Marx, wrote of Darwin's book, *The Origin of Species*, which laid the basis for the theory of evolution, as "the book which contains the basis in natural history for our view."<sup>66</sup>

Since that day, all materialists, with Marxists in the forefront, blindly defend Darwinism.

Yet, the lie of evolution that has cheated the world for the last 140 years will not live on for long. The British philosopher Malcolm Muggeridge states the inevitable collapse of the theory:

I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books in the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has.<sup>67</sup>

### DARWINISM AND RACISM

Another ideology that was nourished by Darwinism was racism. In his book, *The Origin of Species*, Darwin suggested that European white races had progressed in evolution, whereas the other races were still at the same level as apes. These ideas provided a so-called scientific justification for racist thinkers. The racist illustration seen on the side, showing black people and apes in the same tree, is a representation of the impact of Darwinism in 19<sup>th</sup> century England.

The racist heritage of Darwinism provided the basis for ideologies such as Nazism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The racist views of the Nazi leader Adolf Hitler derived from Darwin's theory of evolution. In Hitler's book *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle), there were views inspired by Darwin's concept of the struggle for existence.

## **KARL MARX**

The first person to understand the importance of Darwin's contribution to materialism was Karl Marx, the founder of communism. Marx showed his sympathy to Darwin by dedicating to him *Das Kapital*, which is considered his greatest work. In the German edition of the book which he sent to Darwin, he wrote: "From a devoted admirer to Charles Darwin"

## **FRIEDRICH ENGELS**

Friedrich Engels, the biggest associate of Marx, regarded the theory of evolution as a great support for materialism. Engels praised Darwin and Marx as being the same: "Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so did Marx discover the law of evolution in human history."<sup>69</sup>

## THE OBVIOUS TRUTH: CREATION

**As science demolishes the theory of evolution which seeks to explain forms of life as chance developments, it demonstrates in the process that there is a perfect creation in nature. All living things came into being by God's creation.**

The theory of evolution maintains that life is the work of "chance". However, all the scientific evidence we have reviewed in this book shows that this is untrue and life is created with a design too superior to be explained away by chance.

The belief in "chance" was born in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when life was supposed to be simple, and it was carried into the 20<sup>th</sup> century for ideological purposes. Today, however, the scientific community acknowledges how nonsensical this claim is, and a great number of scientists admit that life is the work of a superior Creator. Chandra Wickramasinghe describes the reality he faced as a scientist who had been inculcated into believing in the myth of "chance" for years:

From my earliest training as a scientist, I was very strongly brainwashed to believe that science cannot be consistent with any kind of deliberate creation. That notion has had to be painfully shed. At the moment, I can't find any rational argument to knock down the view which argues for conversion to God. We used to have an open mind; now we realize that the only logical answer to life is creation-and not accidental random shuffling.<sup>70</sup>

One does not need to visit biochemistry laboratories or fossil beds to be able to see this obvious truth. Anyone may see the fact of creation in any part of the world he examines by using his conscience and reason. He can easily understand the infinite wisdom, knowledge and power of his Creator by simply thinking how he grew into a human being who is able to read and understand these lines considering that he was just a drop in the beginning.

No one came to this world by chance. God, the Lord of all the worlds, created the entire universe and all of mankind. God describes His creative power in the Qur'an, which He sent down to people as a guide:

**Mankind! An example has been made, so listen to it carefully. Those whom you call upon besides God are not even able to create a single fly, even if they were to join together to do it. And if a fly steals something from them, they cannot get it back. How feeble are both the seeker and the sought! They do not measure God with His true measure. God is All-Powerful, Almighty. (Surat al-Hajj: 73-74)**

## FROM A CELL TO A HUMAN BEING

The creation of man in the mother's womb is a miracle on its own. The union of the sperm and the ovum forms a living cell. Then this cell multiplies. The multiplying cells start to differentiate by a secret order. They are arranged and ordered to form bones, eyes, the heart, vessels or the skin. At the end of this intricate process, a single cell turns into a perfect human being. Referring to this creation, God calls out to man:

**"O man! What has deluded you in respect of your Noble Lord? He Who created you and formed you and proportioned you and assembled you in whatever way He willed."**  
(Surat al-Infitar: 6-8)

## THE CREATION OF THE CAMEL

In the Qur'an, God says **"Have they not looked at the camel - how it was created?"** (Surat al-Ghashiyah: 17). When we look at the camel, we see that this animal is specially created for desert conditions. It has a metabolism that enables it to live without water for weeks, it has special tissues to protect its body from the burning sand, and it has even special eyebrow systems that will curtain its eyes against sand storms.

## THE INSPIRATION OF HONEYBEES

Honeybees display an extraordinary architectural skill. The hexagonal cells they build are based on complex mathematical calculations. They use a system whereby they can do the maximum storage with the minimum material. The interesting aspect of the cells is that honeybees start to build the cells from different points and meet in the middle. However, there is no discord at the intersection point. This situation shows that bees are governed from a single centre. God states in the Qur'an that bees act upon His inspiration:

*"Your Lord inspired the bees: 'Build dwellings in the mountains and the trees, and also in the structures which men erect. Then eat from every kind of fruit and travel the paths of your Lord, made easy for you to follow.' From their bellies comes a drink of varying colours, containing healing for mankind. There is certainly a sign in that for people who reflect."* (Surat an-Nahl: 68-69)

***They said,  
Glory be to You!  
We have no knowledge  
except what You have taught us.  
You are the All-Knowing,  
the All-Wise***

**(Surah Al-Baqarah: 32)**

## Notes

- 1) Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 184
- 2) Sidney Fox, Klaus Dose, *Molecular Evolution and The Origin of Life*, New York: Marcel Dekker, 1977. p. 2
- 3) Jeffrey Bada, "Origins", *Earth*, February 1998, p. 40
- 4) Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on Earth", *Scientific American*, Vol 271, October 1994, p. 78
- 5) Please see Harun Yahya, *The Evolution Deceit*, Ta Ha Publishers, 1999, p. 93
- 6) W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Co., 1991, p. 304
- 7) J. D. Thomas, *Evolution and Faith*. Abilene, TX, ACU Press, 1988. p. 81-82
- 8) Ali Demirsoy, *Kalıtım ve Evrim (Inheritance and Evolution)*, Ankara: Meteksan Yayınları, 1984, p. 64
- 9) "Hoyle on Evolution", *Nature*, Vol 294, 12 November 1981, p. 105
- 10) Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1984, p. 130
- 11) Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*. London: Burnett Books, 1985, p. 351
- 12) Pierre-P Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York: Academic Press, 1977, p. 103.
- 13) Pierre-P Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, p. 107
- 14) J. P. Ferris, C. T. Chen, "Photochemistry of Methane, Nitrogen, and Water Mixture As a Model for the Atmosphere of the Primitive Earth", *Journal of American Chemical Society*, Vol 97:11, 1975, p. 2964.
- 15) "New Evidence on Evolution of Early Atmosphere and Life", *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, Vol 63, November 1982, p. 1328-1330
- 16) "Life's Crucible", *Earth*, February 1998, p. 34
- 17) Colin Patterson, "Cladistics", BBC, Brian Leek ile Röportaj, Peter Franz, 4 March 1982.
- 18) Pierre-Paul Grassé, *Evolution of Living Organisms*, Academic Press, New York, 1977, p. 88
- 19) Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 189
- 20) Derek A. Ager, "The Nature of the Fossil Record", *Proceedings of the British Geological Association*, Vol 87, 1976, p. 133
- 21) Douglas J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1983. p. 197
- 22) Richard Monestarsky, "Mysteries of the Orient", *Discover*, April 1993, p. 40
- 23) Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, London: W. W. Norton 1986, p. 229
- 24) Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964, p. 302
- 25) David Raup, "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology", *Bulletin, Field Museum of Natural History*, Vol 50, January 1979, p. 24
- 26) Gerald T. Todd, "Evolution of the Lung and the Origin of Bony Fishes: A Casual Relationship", *American Zoologist*, Vol 26, No. 4, 1980, p. 757
- 27) R. L. Carroll, *Vertebrate Paleontology and Evolution*, New York: W. H. Freeman and Co. 1988, p. 4.
- 28) Jean-Jacques Hublin, *The Hamlyn Encyclopædia of Prehistoric Animals*, New York: The Hamlyn Publishing Group Ltd., 1984, p. 120
- 29) Jacques Millot, "The Coelacanth", *Scientific American*, Vol 193, December 1955, p. 39
- 30) *Bilim ve Teknik (Science and Technology)*, November 1998, No. 372, p. 21

- 31) Lewis L. Carroll, "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles" *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol 44. p. 393
- 32) Fossils of Seymouria are found in Lower Permian rocks, dated at about 280 million years. However, the earliest known reptiles Hylonomus and Paleothyris are found in Lower Pennsylvanian rocks and the Middle Pennsylvanian rocks, dated at about 310-330 million years. (See Barbara J. Stahl, *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, Dover, 1985, pp. 238-239)
- 33) Pat Shipman, "Birds do it... Did Dinosaurs?", *New Scientist*, 1 February 1997, p. 28
- 34) *Nature*, Vol 382, 1 August 1996, p. 401
- 35) L. D. Martin, J. D. Stewart, K. N. Whetstone, *The Auk*, Vol 98, 1980, p. 86.
- 36) A. H. Brush, "On the Origin of Feathers", *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, Vol. 9, 1996. p. 132.
- 37) A. H. Brush, "On the Origin of Feathers", p. 131.
- 38) A. H. Brush, "On the Origin of Feathers", p. 133.
- 39) A. H. Brush, "On the Origin of Feathers", p. 131.
- 40) "Plucking the Feathered Dinosaur", *Science*, Vol 278, 14 November 1997, p. 1229.
- 41) Douglas Palmer, "Learning to Fly", (*Review of The Origin of and Evolution of Birds* by Alan Feduccia, Yale University Press, 1996), *New Scientist*, Vol 153, 1 March 1997, p. 44.
- 42) Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, Boston: Gambit, 1971, p. 101.
- 43) Roger Lewin, "Bones of Mammals, Ancestors Fleshed Out", *Science*, Vol 212, 26 June 1981, p. 1492.
- 44) George Gaylord Simpson, *Life Before Man*, New York: Time-Life Books, 1972, p. 42.
- 45) Richard E. Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, Michael Joseph Limited, London 1981, p. 43
- 46) William R Fix., *The Bone Peddlers*, Macmillan Publishing Company: New York, 1984, pp.150-153
- 47) *Scientific American*, December 1992
- 48) Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, New York: Toplinger Publications, 1970, pp. 75-94.
- 49) Charles E. Oxnard, "The Place of Australopithecines in Human Evolution: Grounds for Doubt", *Nature*, Vol 258, p. 389
- 50) Holly Smith, *American Journal of Physical Antropology*, Vol 94, 1994, pp. 307-325.
- 51) Fred Spoor, Bernard Wood, Frans Zonneveld, "Implication of Early Hominid Labryntine Morphology for Evolution of Human Bipedal Locomotion", *Nature*, Vol 369, 23 June 1994, p. 645-648.
- 52) Boyce Rensberger, *The Washington Post*, 19 November 1984
- 53) Marvin Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1992, p. 83
- 54) Richard Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, London: Sphere Books, 1981, p. 62
- 55) Erik Trinkaus, "Hard Times Among the Neanderthals", *Natural History*, Vol 87, December 1978, p. 10; R. L. Holloway, "The Neanderthal Brain: What Was Primitive", *American Journal of Physical Anthropology Supplement*, Vol 12, 1991, p. 94
- 56) Alan Walker, *Science*, Vol 207, 1980, p. 1103.
- 57) A. J. Kelso, *Physical Antropology*, 1st ed., New York: J. B. Lipincott Co., 1970, p. 221; M. D. Leakey, *Olduvai Gorge*, Vol 3, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971, p. 272.
- 58) S. J. Gould, *Natural History*, Vol 85, 1976, p. 30
- 59) *Time*, 23 December 1996
- 60) Ruth Henke, "Aufrecht aus den Baumen", *Focus*, Vol 39, 1996, p. 178
- 61) Elaine Morgan, *The Scars of Evolution*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 5
- 62) Earnest A. Hooton, *Up From The Ape*, New York: McMillan, 1931, p. 332
- 63) Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1980, p. 59.
- 64) Stephen Jay Gould, "Smith Woodward's Folly", *New Scientist*, 5 April 1979, p. 44

- 65) Michael Walker, *Quadrant*, October 1982, p.44
- 66) David Jorafsky, *Soviet Marxism*, Natural Science, p. 12
- 67) Malcolm Muggeridge, *The End of Christendom*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980, p. 59
- 68) Francis Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, vol 1. New York, D. Appleton and Company, 1888. pp. 285-86
- 69) Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1959. p. 348
- 70) Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Interview in London Daily Express*, August 14, 1981.