

Evolution claims that species gradually evolved over millions of years step by step from 'primitive', into highly complex organisms by mutation & natural selection. To the ordinary man evolution is portrayed as if it were a proven fact just like the Law of Gravity. The theory is imposed on the whole world by two important means, the scientists and the media, who present their views as absolute truth. We are all too familiar with the common newsreel cliché that the evolutionary chain has been confirmed 'yet again' by another discovery of the missing link, so proving our ancestry from apes. This is imposed on the masses who accept the theory blindly.

Various methods are used to persuade the public; these consist of a mixture of science & psychology. Latin names are given to any skulls and skeletons that have been found. These are arranged in order and depicted in diagrams & imaginary drawings. Palaeontology (study of fossils) is used extensively. The advantage of this is that, many extinct species have existed in the past and their fossilised remains are presented as the 'evidence for evolution' in the form of 'missing links'. The overall scientific atmosphere created in this way is usually enough to convince the general public.

This perception, however, is far from reality. Firstly, important conflicting facts are ignored and said to be 'experimental error'. Much of the evidence is logically flawed because circular reasoning is used. The interpretation of the fossil record for example, is not objective as it is influenced by the assumption that evolution has taken place, so everything must be forced to fit the framework. So to presuppose the truth of what you are trying to prove is the illogical practice of begging the question.

A related logical fallacy is the failure of evolutionists to understand the difference between scientific and historical evidence. If you can mimic a series of events today which you suppose happened in the past - that does not prove they actually happened. The supposed formation of amino acids or RNA is a good example of this. So many experiments performed with present day animals, plants and biological molecules are logically flawed.

The modern version of Darwin's theory or neo-Darwinian evolution proposes two imaginary mechanisms: (i) Random genetic mutations - these are said to be the driving force behind evolution.

Yet we know that most genetic mutations are almost always harmful to the organism, or at best neutral. Not surprisingly no useful mutations have been demonstrated to date.

(ii) Natural selection - this process is said to help positive characteristics to spread, so things 'evolve'. Why and how natural selection operated even before life existed, remains an unsolved mystery.

Even if life started there are so many unanswered questions. How did life evolve from non-living forms - given the chaotic environment of the earth at the time? How did the very first cell survive the harsh environment? Genetic material needs a parent cell. Where was the parent? How did the very first complex structures such as DNA or RNA molecules come into being? What instructed these molecules to replicate? Why was life the best way for non-living forms to exist longer? In fact you could ask an endless number of such questions.

So before we even begin to discuss the fossil evidence, and the missing links, or so-called 'evolution in action' such as the bacterial resistance to antibiotics, it is important to realize that the evolution theory collapses at the very first hurdle and that is the question of the origin of life itself. Scientists can dig up fossils all day long and make evolutionary diagrams that join each species together with arrows, but the real work of life does not happen at the level of the whole animal or organ. Life is lived at the cellular level and is based on machines made of molecules! These important parts of living things are too small to be seen and handle all of life's details.

Molecular machines haul cargo from one place in the cell to another along highways made of other molecules. Others act as cables, ropes, and pulleys to hold the cell in shape or turn cellular switches on and off. Solar-powered machines capture the energy of photons and store it in chemicals. Electrical machines allow current to flow through nerves. Manufacturing machines build other molecular machines. Cells copy themselves with machinery and ingest food with machinery. In short, highly sophisticated molecular machines control every cellular process and the details of life are finely calibrated and the machinery of life enormously complex.

However, if you search scientific literature on the question of how molecular machines developed, you find an eerie silence. The complexity of life's foundation has paralysed attempts to account for it; molecular machines raise an impenetrable barrier to evolution.

Back in the nineteenth century the question of how life works was one that Darwin or his contemporaries could not answer. They knew that eyes were for seeing; but how exactly do they see? How does blood clot? How does the body fight disease? How does the cell work? Modern science has begun to answer all these questions by moving out of the realm of biology and into biochemistry. With the advent of modern biochemistry, we are now able to look at the rock-bottom level of life. We can examine whether the small steps required to produce large evolutionary changes can ever get small enough. The more you research, you will find that there are vast unbridgeable canyons separating everyday life forms from their counterparts; even when you examine the tiniest forms level of life at the microscopic scale.

Biochemistry has pushed Darwin's theory to the limit. It has done so by opening up the ultimate black box, the cell, and we are now beginning to understand how life actually works. It is the astonishing complexity of sub cellular organic structures that has forced the question - how could all this have evolved? To feel the brunt of the question, let's briefly examine an example of a biochemical system such as vision.

In Darwin's thinking, evolution could not build a complex organ in one step or a few steps; radical innovations such as the eye would require generations of organisms to slowly accumulate beneficial changes in a gradual process. He realized that if in one generation an organ as complex as the eye suddenly appeared, it would be tantamount to a miracle, since its many sophisticated features seemed to be interdependent (i.e. it was an 'all or nothing' structure).

Darwin managed to persuade much of the world that a modern eye evolved gradually from a simple group of pigmented cells not much more than a light sensitive spot. He did not even try to explain where the relatively simple light-sensitive spot came from. It was completely beyond 19th century science to discover how the eye works, i.e. what happens when a photon of light first hits the retina.

As a matter of fact, no question about the underlying mechanisms of life could be answered. How did animal muscles cause movement? How did photosynthesis work? How was energy extracted from food? How did the body fight infection? No one knew.

To Darwin, vision was a black box, but now scientists have examined in some detail how sight actually works. We know that even at the very basic level of the light sensitive spot, vision is very complex and involves the interaction of numerous molecular parts. The moment a light particle hits the light sensitive spot a varied number of biochemical processes.

In order to understand the barriers to evolution we really have to bite the bullet of complexity, and realise how even apparently simple anatomical structures are biochemically very complex and represent an impregnable barrier to evolution. Just like the numerous parts that make up a car engine, vision involves a number of molecular structures such as: 11-cis retinal, rhodopsin, rhodopsin kinase, arrestin, guanylate cyclase, transducin, phosphodiesterase, GTP, CyclicGMP and ion channels. These are just the main 'players' then you have all the associated molecular 'nuts and bolts' which hold everything together.

The first animals with complex eyes were found not in the age of mammals but in the Cambrian era of Earth's history (around 600 million years ago). The fossil record shows that many differing invertebrate species emerged on the world scene simultaneously, without any sign of evolution. When higher invertebrates first appeared in the record, complex organs and organ systems also emerged in their finished forms. Molluscs, for example, had eyes that were as complex as vertebrate eyes, complete with cornea, lens, retina and nervous systems. There is no theory of evolution that can explain so early the arrival of such complex organs in their finished state.

These findings led to the punctuated equilibria theory which states that the reason there are no fossilised evolutionary links between species is because evolution took huge sudden jumps in 100,000 or 300,000 year increments, during different periods of Earth's history. This is a clear admission by scientists that the fossil record is so incomplete that a theory explaining huge regular gaps has had to be formulated. Darwin's suggestion that evolution came about through

small successive modifications or changes cannot be applied to every observed creature. In fact Darwin admitted, *"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."*

Summary

If scientific conclusion is supposed to be based on hard evidence then why have we allowed speculation to run amok in the case of evolution? Is it because it appears to be true or seems reasonable? Not very long ago the Sun appeared to revolve around the Earth but that was not true. Man, mammals, birds, reptiles, fish and invertebrates may appear to be rising from the preceding organism but this is not true either. Every species has instincts of its own specific kind and there are no intermediate fossils linking different groups together. It suited the mental climate of the 19th century scientist who thought that matter was the only reality and nothing existed which could not be perceived through the senses. In this century, however with the explosion of knowledge and science, when previous theories lacking hard evidence have been discarded it is really surprising that scientists are still clinging on to the shaky hypothesis of Darwinian and neo-Darwinian evolution.

The greatest evidence of God is His creation. Nature and our study of nature, both proclaim the fact that there is One God who, in His Wisdom, has created and continues to sustain the universe. The very existence of the universe, with its superb organisation is inexplicable except as having being brought into existence by a Creator.

Exhibition Islam is a registered UK charity and the world's leading Islamic exhibition provider. We work to raise a greater understanding of Islam using mobile, museum-style displays. We also provide a range of visually stunning publications.

For further information on Islam please refer to:
The Islam Guide
(Published by Exhibition Islam: ISBN 978-0-9555238-1-6)

For further information on our services please visit:
www.exhibitionislam.com

Registered UK Charity Number 1121147

Darwin's Black Box



EXHIBITION
ISLAM



EXHIBITION
ISLAM