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Abstract: Darwin’s theory of evolution is the central theme of biology and also all the theories of evolution. Paleontology (study of fossils) provides the convincing, direct and clear-cut evidences for evolution. Darwin declared: “he, who rejects these views on the nature of geological record, would rightly reject his whole theory”. However, diverse literature confirmed that the more common plant fossils are imprints of leaves and are identical to their existing forms. Invertebrate rare form fossils but those formed are identical to their present form. The entire vertebrate fossils are fragmentary bones. For example, fossils of dinosaurs are thigh bones, arm bones, teeth, footprints, bites etc; fossils of ancestors of humans are skull fragments, teeth, jaws etc. Transitional fossil is absent. Claimed transitional fossils of Archaeopteryx and Seymouria are not transitional at all; they are true bird and true reptile, respectively. Darwin himself declared there is no transitional fossils and transitional existing animal. Additionally, the obtained fossils are fossils of existing organisms or extinct organisms, which formed during the universal floods. Moreover, origin of the first life, arising period of other organisms and the age of earth are determined by the assumptions only, as it overlooks 3.5 billion years. Extinction of living organisms never produces new species; if produce there is no need of biodiversity conservation law. Moreover, the fossil evidences, especially living fossils oppose the continuity and the idea of evolution. Besides, fossil evidences oppose human evolution (Descent of Man) is not from the chimpanzee; Russel Wallace (co-discoverer of natural selection) also believes it. Even, Darwin himself declared that ‘Descent of Man’ can not explain by science but he believes it, as Lamarck, who long ago came to this conclusion. But believe is not science as believe in God is not science. Lamarck’s theory is never accepted by the modern biologists. Moreover, paleontological evidence indicates that human has been evolved 4-5 million years ago but recent genetic research indicates that modern human have been emerged about 100-200 thousand years ago only, which again oppose evolution of human is not from the lower animal. Based on absent of transitional fossils two American scientists Gould and Eldredge completely rejected the Darwin’s theory of gradual evolution and human evolution in their several research papers by declaring “invalid claims of gradualism made at the wrong scale with adequate data. Phyletic gradualism was an a priori assertion from the start-it was never "seen" in the rocks. It expressed the cultural and political biases of 19th century liberalism”. Consequently, the fathers of modern paleontologists and geologists opposed evolution. King and Wilson, and Sverdlov confirmed their researches that the genomes of chimpanzees and humans are very similar and their DNA sequences overall are 98% identical. Their researches are accurate and satisfactory. But it does not indicate evolution of human is from the lower animal like chimpanzee. Morris also supports this by many scientific logics. So, why does man unscientificaly relate them with the lower animal like chimpanzee/ape as their ancestor, who eats it own excreta?
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1. INTRODUCTION
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Darwin’s theory of evolution is the central theme of biology and also all the theories of evolution\(^1\). Of all the theories of biology, the theory of evolution is most important. It is so fundamental of biology that the biological science cannot be understood without it. Nearly all scientists support it\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^3\). Evolution suggests that life arose by natural process from non-living materials and achieved its present diversity including man\(^4\)\(^,\)\(^2\). Darwin’s theory of natural selection may be summarized as: all species of living organisms have evolved from simpler organisms over a vast period of time. Human beings, like all other plants and animals have been evolved from simpler organisms. This process of evolution is known as natural selection\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^3\) and\(^5\). Darwin defined evolution as the descent with modifications through the natural selection from a few ancestors\(^6\).

The evolutionary flowchart may be as follows (Fig.1): Organic matter→ unicellular organism \(^7\)→ invertebrate→ lung fish→ amphibian→ reptile→ placental mammal→ higher mammal→ human \(^3\),\(^8\).

However, there are some evidences for organic evolution, but the evidences are overwhelmingly convincing the biologists to the theory of evolution\(^9\). Those evidences have drawn from many areas of biology\(^10\). In the ‘Origin of Species’, Darwin also disapprovingly and masterly summarized the evidences of evolution\(^6\) and have been enlarged since his time\(^11\).

Fig.1. Evolution history of vertebrate and their relatives \(^12\)

Storer et al.\(^13\) declared that Paleontology, the study of fossils, is now an important science that links biology and geology, and provide the important evidences for evolution. It provides the calendar/pages of book for the history of life on the earth\(^14\). It is affirmed that study of the actual course of evolution is mostly based on fossils records/geological succession\(^9\). In addition, Paleontology is the final proof or disproof of evolution\(^16\). It is long-established that fossils provide the most clear-cut, convincing, strongest, verified, and direct evidences of evolution\(^17\)\(^,\)\(^18\).

Fig.2. Charles Darwin
Fig.3. Darwin’s book ‘Origin of Species’
Fig.4. Alfred Russel Wallace
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Nevertheless, there is a contradiction whether paleontological records provide the most clear-cut, convincing and direct evidences for evolution or not. Besides this, though Darwin and Wallace jointly publish their theory natural selection (in 1858), yet Alfred Russel Wallace did not believe evolution later on. Hence, he willingly withdrew his name from Darwin-Wallace theory of natural selection. Even he (Wallace) himself kindly proposed the term Darwinism for the theory of natural selection and also wrote a book entitled “Darwinism” (in 1889)\textsuperscript{19,20}. Purves and Orians\textsuperscript{21} drew attention that the fossil records contain tiny fraction of the species that offers very little evidences about the origins of major groups of organisms. According to ‘World Book Encyclopaedia’ the fossil record has many gaps, as only relatively few species were preserved as fossils\textsuperscript{22}. It is reported that the evidences of the fossil records are generally thought misleading and biased; because it is extremely incomplete and only really minor percent of all animals that had lived become fossils and gives a limited insight in history of many groups\textsuperscript{23}. The Famous paleontologist Lewin pointed out that biochemists and molecular biologist opined that the assuming relationships of fossils to the evolutionary evidences would be full of errors.\textsuperscript{24} Nonetheless, these disagreements are scattered; not so organized, less evidences and do not serve the actual purpose. So, it is necessary to aggregate those disagreements as well as organized and new information. Additionally, it is acknowledged that the origin of species without Darwin-Wallace Theory\textsuperscript{25} and it is established that evolution of first life without Oparin theory\textsuperscript{26}, molecular evolution of new species without neo-Darwinism/ modern synthetic theory\textsuperscript{27} and evolution without Lamarck’s theory and its use in the Darwinian theories of evolution\textsuperscript{28}. But review of literature reveals that there is no work on the direct and clear-cut evidences (paleontology/fossils) of evolution opposite to Darwin’s theory and also ‘Descent of Man’ from the lower animal like chimpanzee. So, to work on the above objectives are essential for the benefit of modern biology. This paper will be helpful to biologists, ecologists, anthropologists, geologists, paleontologists, sociologists, psychologist, archaeologists and who thinks about evolution.

2. Fossils of the Plants are Very Negligible

It is reported that in case of plants, only woods are found as fossils and the flowers, which are most important for identifications of plants are rarely obtained\textsuperscript{29}.

![Fig 5.](image1)

**Fig 5.** a) Silicafied wood, b) Silicafied wood, Fig 6. Bryophyta & its fossil

![Fig 6.](image2)

**Fig 6.** Bryophyta

![Fig 7.](image3)

**Fig 7.** a) Conifer leaf b) Conifer leaf’s fossil c) Conifer fruit d) Conifer fruit’s fossil

![Fig 8.](image4)

**Fig 8.** a) Fern b) Fossil of fern

![Fig 9.](image5)

**Fig 9.** a) Gymnosperm b) Fossil of gymnosperm leaf

Additionally, silicafied wood (Fig. 5.a, b) is a familiar example of plant fossils, whose tissues are infiltrated by silica, calcium or other minerals and thus frightened. However, the more common plant
fossils are imprints of plant leaves, sometimes molds and casts that preserve as a form of large parts. Therefore, fossils of plants are very negligible. However, the all obtained fossils of bryophytes (Fig.6), conifers (Fig.7.a, b, c & d) ferns (Fig.8.a & b) and gymnosperms (Fig.9.a & b), are indistinguishable to their existing forms, which oppose the evolution of plants. Again evolutions of plants in this way are not true: Algals →mats→bryophytes →lycopsods →ferns→gymnosperms and angiosperms.

3. Fossils of Invertebrates are rare but identical to existing forms

Almost no organism is entirely transformed into fossil, only hard parts are preserved as fossils. Thus, most fossils consist only of hard parts such as shells, bones and teeth, because those parts are not usually destroyed after the organism died. The soft parts of a dead organism are often consumed by the scavengers or decomposed by bacteria. Consequently, invertebrates having very delicate bodied and have no hard parts. So, they are rarely known through the geological records. Therefore, the gap in the fossil record is still noticeable among the soft bodied animals. The paleontological records of insects do not provide a satisfactory material, which can help to reconstruct its phylogeny. Hence, insects are classified according to their comparative morphology of recent species.

Subsequently, based on such type of fossil the determination about the origin of invertebrates is not possible. As a result, evolutionary history of most invertebrate phyla and some classes can not be traced. However, invertebrate fossils for examples, Limulus (Fig.31.a & b), crabs (Fig.10.a & b), prawns (Fig.11.a & b) and all insect fossils are identical to their existing forms. A few examples are shown in figures (a & b), (a & b), (a & b) & (a & b) and it (all insect fossils are identical to their existing forms) is supported by the report of Richard and Davies.

4. Discovery of Bacterium Fossils is Questionable

It is noted that invertebrates have no hard parts, so, they are rarely formed fossils. The vertebrate fossils are also rare as well as fragmentary bones. A bacterium is one-celled microscopic organism. Yet, according to ‘World Book Encyclopedia’ some of the oldest fossils, which dated more than 3 billion years ago, are imprints of one-celled organism. In addition, it has been acknowledged that 3.20 billion years-old imprint fossil of the bacterium Eubacterium isolatum (0.50 micro millimeters) has been discovered in the rock from South Africa in 1968. Curtis pointed out that this microfossil is 3.4 billion years-old. In addition, in 1980 other bacteria like microfossil (3.5 billion years old) was discovered in the rock from the Western Australia. So, it is questionable that how this bacterium fossil was formed as well as discovered. Again, if it is true, why bacteria are still unchanged and remain in their own kinds during the last 3.5 billions years? So, those bacterial fossils reduce the faithfulness of all obtained fossil.

5. All Vertebrates’ Fossils are Fragmentary Bones and Rare

Villee et al. has been reported that the fossil records of primates are fragmentary bone. Wilson quoted that the origins of vertebrates are unknown as the primitive vertebrates have not yet been found in the pale-ontological records. It is pointed out that mentioned that human fossils are fragmentary bones such as skull fragment, mandible and teeth. Even those fossils are not in their original form; those are rather moulds, casts, stones, and imprints etc. Only the complete and unchanged fossil is the Woolly mammoth. But by any definition Woolly mammoth is a fossil of a true elephant and it is identical to a
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modern elephant (Fig. 12.a & b).

Fig. 12.a) wooly mammoth b) a modern elephant (from Google)

6. Absent of Transitional Fossils

If the organisms of the same class arose from the same ancestor as Darwin opined; fossil records should provide a series of fossils from the progressive older that should show the stage of intermediate between specialized modern existing living organisms, but none found such at all. It has been reported that the recent paleontological research shows no transitional fossils, the so-called “missing links” between one major type of organism and the other. Morris declared that the fossil record is of devoid of transitional forms and all of the present orders, classes and phyla appear quite suddenly in the geological record. The same is largely true even for most families and genera.

i) Kimball pointed out that many of Darwin’s reviewers opined that the failure of paleontologists to find transitional links of fossils is a serious weakness of the idea of evolution.

ii) Theory of evolution is not universally accepted. Some people rejected the theory as they claim there are too many gaps in the evolutionary records.

iii) Prominent two American biologists Sinnott and Wilson noticed that the more difficult, however, the origin of separate groups of organisms- species, genera, and families are clearly distinct; with no intermediate forms between them, is not well-understood.

The absent of any transitional fossil indicate that there is no single fossil document that a living organism arises from a pre-existing organism.

7. Darwin Himself Declared there is no Transitional Fossils and Transitional Existing Animal

Eldredge and Gould pointed out that “Charles Darwin himself viewed the fossil record more as embarrassment than as an aid to his theory. Why, he asked (Origin of species p.310), do we not find the "infinitely numerous transitional links “hat would illustrate the slow and steady operation of natural selection? Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the gravest objection which can he urged against my theory (Origin of species p.280). Darwin resolved this dilemma by invoking the great inadequacy of surviving evidence (Origin of species p. 342). The geological record is extremely imperfect and this fact will to a large extent explain why we do not find interminable varieties, connecting together all the extinct and existing forms of life why the finest graduated steps. He, who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my whole theory”.

Darwin declared (Origin of species p.376) “We know how imperfect the geological record is, grave as these several difficulties are, in my judgment they do not through the theory of descent from a few created forms with subsequent modification”. Darwin also opined (Origin of species p.140) that the first difficulty and objection of his theory, why if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?

8. Claimed Transitional Fossils Archaeopteryx and Seymouria are not Transitional at all

There are two well-known, prominent and dramatic transitional fossils. One is Archaeopteryx and the other one is Seymouria. But various reporting showed that those two fossils are not transitional fossils at all. They are a true bird and a true reptile, respectively and its documents are placed here-
i) Transitional Fossil *Archaeopteryx* is a True Bird

The cast fossil of *Archaeopteryx* is a well-known, prominent and dramatic transitional fossil, which is found in Bavarian limestone in Germany. It proves that bird arose from thecodon dinosaurs/reptile and In opposition, the *Archaeopteryx* fossils are headless. Even, there were no obvious traces of a sternum in this fossil.

![Fig. 13. a) Archaeopteryx & b) c) reconstruction of Archaeopteryx](image)

In addition, the *Archaeopteryx* fossil is an imprint only. By an imprint fossil, which is headless and without sternum, one can not conclude that it as a connective fossil of bird and reptile. Nevertheless, it could be stated that the tail of *Archaeopteryx* that shows a reptilian character must be the impression of a single feather of its own and not a tail of dinosaurs. Vuletic support this opinion and mention that *Archaeopteryx* is not a transitional form, rather a full-fledged bird. Morris pointed out that *Archaeopteryx* was a true bird, by any reasonable definition, with feathers and warm blood. According to ‘World Book Encyclopaedia’ the fossil records of birds are very incomplete. Additionally, Gupta reported that the origin of modern bird is very controversial and the transition forms of reptiles to birds are poorly documented. Besides, it has been reported that other fossils of bird are fragmentary bones and the exact ancestry of bird is yet unknown.

These declarations are antagonistic to the concept of bird arising from the thecodon dinosaur. Moreover, *Archaeopteryx* has exact taxonomic position such as Class- Aves, Subclass- Archaeonithes, order- Archaeopterygiformes, Family- Archaeopterygidae and Genus- *Archaeopteryx*. So, *Archaeopteryx* is a true bird, not a transitional form.

ii) Transitional Fossil *Seymouria* is a True Reptile

The transitional fossil *Seymouria* (Fig.14 a, b & c) proves that amphibia modified to reptiles. This interesting fossil was found near the town Seymour, Texas in 1917. But modern literature indicates that *Seymouria* are not a transitional fossil of amphibian and reptile, it is a true reptile. Therefore, Colbert questioned that it is unknown whether *Seymouria* an amphibian or a reptile? The final answer to this question depends on whether *Seymour* like the modern reptiles, laid an amniote egg on the land; or whether like modern frogs, which it returns to the water to deposit its eggs. But unluckily, there is no direct paleontological evidence at present time that gives a clue about this important and diagnostic attribute of it.

![Fig. 14. a & b) Seymouria (from the Google) c) Reconstruction of a Seymouria](image)

However, at present, *Seymouria* is classified as a reptile and it has an accurate taxonomic recognition such as: Class-Reptilia, Subclass- Apsidospondyli, Superorder-Labyrinthodontia, Order- Seymouriamorphpha, Family- Seymouridae Genus- *Seymouria*. So, *Seymouria* is a true reptile, not transitional form. Dodson reported that at present *Seymouria* is usually classified as reptile. Therefore, *Seymouria* is a true reptile, but not a transitional form.
9. Emergence of Modern Punctuated Equilibrium Theory is the Evidence of Absent of Transitional Fossils

Based on the evidence of absent of transitional fossils, two American paleontologists Stephen J. Gould (Fig.15) and Nile Eldredge (Fig.16) developed a new model; call modern punctuated equilibrium (theory of macro-evolution). This theory does not agree with the Darwin’s theory of gradual evolution. According to this equilibrium model, most morphological changes take place rapidly or suddenly during speciation (formation of species) \(^{43,44}\). This theory is being adopted by more and more. It has been declared that at the end of 19th century the neo-Darwinism/synthetic theory was one thing, in the middle of the 20th century something else, due to the synthetic theory, and at that century it changed again due to the new ‘Theory of Punctuated Equilibrium.\(^{45}\)\(^{50}\).

10. Arguments of Formation of Fossils during Worldwide Flood

Whenever a buried animal or any part of it is preserved in some way for long time before it decays, it will be a fossil \(^{47}\). Consequently, the ecological conditions to form a fossil are: i) presence of hard part ii) immediate burial of an organism to protect the organism from oxidation iii) the consequent vicissitude (changes including pressure, height, folding and erosion) and iii) circulation of acidulated water to the organism \(^{29}\). For this reasons, it is noted when a large animal dies, the bones of this animal vanish within a few years by the scavenger; instead of forming fossil. So, formation of a fossil of an animal is impossible, as the dead body could not get the above available conditions for fossilization. So, fulfilling the conditions of fossilization and then to form a fossil is impossible, unless a worldwide flood occur. Vuletic \(^{51}\) acknowledged that the flood would have to universal one, since local flood would not have produced the pressure that would be needed to a create fossil. Morris \(^{45}\) cited that historically a worldwide flood is a record of particularly of all the nations and all the tribes on the earth. Hence, it would be opined that the obtained fossils were formed during that universal flood and stored at different layers of the earth by earthquake, accumulation of organic matter etc.

11. Reconstructions and Classifications of Fossilized Dinosaurs and Other Animals are Suspicious

Fossil of dinosaurs are very rare and fragmentary bones such thigh bones (femur), arm bones, teeth, footprints, tracks, bites etc. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dinosaur). So, the fossils of dinosaur supply very insufficient information. Based on such type of information, it is very difficult to identify the different categories of Dinosaurs. Yet, on the basis of such incomplete information, the evolutionist restored the imaginary original dinosaurs as well as described its origin, period of origin, shape, size, weight, taxonomy, morphology, anatomy, chronological modified characteristics, environment or ecology of their ancient period, which is very unwise. Based on the minute fossils information Dinosaurs is
classified into numerous categories such as two orders, four suborders, three divisions, four subdivisions, two cohorts, twelve infra-orders, twenty three families, three hundred genera (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dinosaurs). The following texts of the world renowned biologists welcoming to the above statement-
i) Lull 42 cited that the classification of dinosaurs is still in a somewhat unknown state, owing to the fragmentary fossil material.
ii) Hickman 17 drew attention that the fossil record is very incomplete. Even the almost entire absence of certain groups as fossils makes it impossible to determine with any degree of correctness, the nature of population’s communities and other important ecological concepts.
iii) Furthermore, Howell 54 wrote against the reconstruction of nine popular and best known precursors of human beings such as Pliopithecus, Proconsul, Dryopithecus, Oreopithecus, Ramipithecus, Australopithecus africanus, Australopithecus robustus, Austraopithecus boisei and Australopithecus afarensis to the poster in the accompanied books of coarse are very miss-representative. About same statement was prearranged by Lapointe 55. Consequently, the images of dinosaur as well as the image of other fossilized animals those found in different text books as well as in various websites are very imaginary.

12. The Age of Fossil and the Age of Earth (Geological Time Table) is determined by Assumption only

It is declared that by dating of rocks in which the fossils occur, one can get accurate idea of how old the fossils are 18. Additionally, the recent studies using the rate of radioactive decay of the isotopes of various elements have produced what is seen to be fairly the accurate measurement of the date of different fossils 30.

Nonetheless, fossils allowed scientists to construct the geological time scale that traces the history of life. The absolute method relies on the radioactive dating technique to assign an actual date to fossil 32.

In opposition, the origin of the first life, arising period of other organisms and the age of earth in the geological time table are determine by the assumption only; as it overlooks 3.5 billion years. Many biologists such as Starr and Taggart 12, Laetsch 14, Mark Vuletic 51 and many others also spoke out that and it is discoursed here:-

a) The Dating of Fossils is Not Appropriate and it is determined by Assumption Only –

The dating of fossils is not appropriate and it is determined by the assumption only, as the origin of the first life/archezoic period differs greatly in diverse literatures (Table- 1) and the amount of variation between the highest and the lowest is (5000−1500=3500) 3500 million years /3.5 billion years.

Table 1. The origin of first life/ ‘Archezoic period’ differs 3.5 billion years in diverse literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin of first life (million years)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Jordan and Verma 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Dodson 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Robertson 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500-3800</td>
<td>Starr and Taggart 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>Sinha and Sinha 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500</td>
<td>Ville 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3500-4100</td>
<td>Wallace, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3800</td>
<td>Purves and Orians 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>Smith 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000-4500</td>
<td>Hickman 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td>Noland and Beaver 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600</td>
<td>Dickerson 64, Kaskel et al. 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Sinnott and Wilson 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Therefore, 3.5 billion years are overlooking for determination of the age of fossil, which are nothing to the geologists, paleontologists and the evolutionist! Not only archezoic period but also the beginning of Permian, Devonian, Silurian etc (arising periods of other animal groups and plants) are differing greatly in various literatures (Table.2).

Table 2. The beginning of Permian, Devonian, Silurian, Ordovician and Cambrian differs million of years in various literatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permian</th>
<th>Devonian</th>
<th>Silurian</th>
<th>Ordovician</th>
<th>Cambrian</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>Dodson 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>Buffaloe 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Case 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>Hickman 17, Noland and Beaver 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Ritchie and Carola 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Laetsch 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Smith 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>Purves and Orians 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>Starr and Taggart 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Wallace 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>Birdsell 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>Alter 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, dating of fossil residue by radioactive method is not correct and this estimate is based on assumption only.

In addition, the following declarations of the world renowned biologists hospitable to the above announcement-
i) It drew attention that radioactive dating method is not perfect. Until fairly recently, there was no way to determine the age of the earth or to develop an actual time scale for the events in geologic and evolutionary history. For many years, scientists tried to measure the ages of rocks by assuming that erosion, mountain building and other geologic processes occurred at a constant rate. Such attempts failed, because there is no faithfulness.

ii) The age of fossil is calculated by the radioactive carbon methods are not a definite date but one within ± a certain years giving a standard deviation. Thus, instead of 15,300, the date would be given as 15,300 ± 300, which means that there is 67% chance that the correct figure will fall between 15,000 and 15,600.

iii) Paleontological record is biased and incomplete.

iv) The classification of geologic time and arising of organisms, even in its continuing refinements is arbitrary and unwisely. It is no more than a relative scale based on relative types and abundance of fossil, its times is anything but absolute. To classify the Triassic as lasting from about 230 million to 181 million years ago is to overlook (230 − 181 = 49 million) 49 million years.

v) Radioactive breakdown methods principally indicates the relative age, whether one fossil is older or younger than others, but are not accurate.

vi) Radioactive carbon methods, however, gives only comparative age and that too may not be correct because due to over pushing and other changes in the earth crust, the sequence of rocks may be disturbed.

vii) Lewin reported that the paleontologist David Pilbeam declared that paleo-anthropology is heavily influenced by the assumptions and those assumptions are totally unrelated to actual fossil residues.

viii) It is confirmed that many tests using 14C gives dates that are clearly wrong. Dating of fossils depends on the evolutionary assumption. Radiometric dating is extremely inaccurate, as is shown by the fact that such experiments often have error factors of a few millions. Many radiometric dating tests have yielded false results. Evolutionists rejected all those that are unreliable with prior assumptions and keep...
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those that verify their theory. Many types of radiometric dating have error factors of several million years.\(^{51}\)

ix) Lewin\(^ {65}\) cited that Biochemist Allen Wilson and Vincent Sarich discovered that the first people had to originate less than two hundred thousand (200,000) years ago and could only have come from an original two men. This virtually indicates all the paleontological dates are wrong. Additionally, Leakey and Lewin\(^ {66}\) noted that after fifteen years that opinion (Allen Wilson and Vincent Sarich discovered) was accepted by the paleontologists.

Thus, estimation of age of fossil and preparation of geological time scale is extremely biased and prepared base on assumption only.

b) The Age of Earth is not Appropriate and it is Determined by Assumption only –

The age of earth is estimated by knowing the age of rocks similar to the estimation of the age of fossil. But it is not appropriate and it is determined by the assumption only. Hence, based on the radioactive dating method, the age of earth differs several million years in diverse texts (Table.3).

### Table 3. The age of earth differs several billion years in diverse texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The age of earth (billion years)</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) 2.5</td>
<td>Alter(^ {1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) 4.0</td>
<td>Mader(^ {10})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) 4.5</td>
<td>Wallace(^ {38})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) 4.6</td>
<td>Gottfried(^ {50})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) 6.0</td>
<td>Dickerson(^ {61})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the variation of 3.5 billion (6.0 billion–2.5 billion) years is negligible for the determination of origin of the earth, which indicates it is determined based on the assumption only. In addition, the following journalism support:

i) Lord Kelvin, a renowned physician, scientifically proved that the earth is to be only 20 to 40 million years old\(^ {14}\).

ii) The another suspect about the age of the earth; if the earth is as old as the geologist claim, uranium decay would have put into the atmosphere more helium than it is currently found there. At present the rate of arrival of a metritic layer from space, the earth after 4.5 billion years should be covered with a metric dust layer more this fact there on\(^ {51}\).

iii) Furthermore, according to the Bible, the earth is only some 6000 years old\(^ {9,50}\) and the Jewish calendar years were also based on the concept that the earth is less than 6000 years old\(^ {12}\).

So, dating of origin of the earth is extremely clashing and one may declare that it is determined based on the assumption only; as it overlooks 3.5 billion years.

### 13. Extinction of Species Never Succeeded By the Other Unrelated Forms/Species

Extinction is the death/disappearance of every member of a species or group of species and not exists anywhere on the earth\(^ {6,32,62}\). It is declared that the extinction of old forms is the almost predictable consequence of the production of new forms\(^ 6\). The ‘cynodon reptiles’ became extinct and they were succeeded by their own descendants, the adaptively superior mammals and dinosaurs succeeded by the other unrelated forms such as birds\(^ {19}\). Wolfe\(^ {64}\) concluded that extinction fit into the evolutionary process by opening opportunities for the rapid diversification of new species and higher taxonomic groups.

So, it is clear that the extinction is a major feature of evolution of new species. If so, then there is no need of biodiversity conservation efforts/law to prevent extinction of living organisms. It can be cited that this law has been developed to protect extinction and over 170 heads of states signed (in Rio de Janeiro) to obey that convention in 1993 for the saving of wild and domestic species\(^ {67}\).

In addition, it has been pointed out that at present 24 to 100 species are losing per day due to human
activities. Over the past three and a half centuries, nearly 200 animal species have become extinct in the United States alone and over 100 species of plants are becoming extinct everyday day from the forests of South America, Africa and Asia. Furthermore, almost every year for the past 40 years, at least one species of mammal has been become extinct. But there is no evidence that those extinct animal species produce any new animal species or superior species during or after their extinction.
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However, the recently fifteen (15) extinct animals are: i) the world's last passenger pigeon (Fig.17), extinct on September 1 in 1914, at the Cincinnati Zoo. ii) Cormorant (Fig.18) was extinct within a century. iii) Carolina Parakeet (Fig.19) was extinct in 1920 and last found in Florida. iv) The great auk (Fig.20) that lived in the Northern Hemisphere became extinct in 1884. v) Dodo (Fig.21) lived in the island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean and extinct on 1681. vi) Canary Islands (Fig.22) was extinct in 1940. vii) Caspian tiger (Fig.23) was extinct in 1940. viii) Tasmanian wolf (Fig.24) extinct for well over half a century ago ix) Quagga. Equus burchelli (Fig.25), subspecies of the Burchellâ zebra extinct in 1883 in an Amsterdam Zoo. x) Bubal Hartebeest (Fig.26) died in the Paris Zoo in 1923. xi) Pyrenean Ibex (Fig.27) was extinct in the mid-nineteenth century xii) the golden toad (Fig.28) was extinct in 1989. xiii) Tecopa pupfish (Fig.29) was a native in the Mojave Desert but extinct in 1981. xiv) Sea cow (Fig.30) was extinct in 1741. xv) The Baiji dolphin (Fig.31) was declared functionally extinct in 2006 [Listverselistentverse.com/2009/07/25/10-recently-extinct-animals].

Even, those recently extinct animal species produce no species during or after their extinction. Consequently, it is declared that there is no relationship among the extinct organisms and the living organisms. But to give the validity of the idea of evolution, evolutionists declared that all the previous successive organisms that had produced the existing organisms are extinct.

### 14. Fossils Evidences are challenging of Continuous Process of Evolution as Well as the Idea of Evolution

Organic evolution is a continuous process. Even at present, evolution is occurring rapidly.
So, the living world is constantly evolving, without any future/goals. Nevertheless, there are numerous fossils, which are identical to their existing forms. More especially the following well known fossil (so-called living fossils) oppose to the continuous process of evolution as well as the idea of evolution:

i) Coelacanths *Latimeria chalumnae* is believed to be the ancestors of the amphibians. It occurs in the fossil record from the late Paleozoic (550-260 millions year ago) to the Mesozoic (260-130 million years ago). Since none occurred in the last 70 million years of the fossil record. So, it is believed that they became extinct. But in 1939 more than 30 specimen of (about 5 feet long) *Latimeria* (Fig.32.a & b) was caught from South Africa. They are being intensively studied and found that it is the Mesozoic fish of their kinds.

ii) It is thought that amphibians are modified into reptiles, but the fossilized tail toad (*Ascaphus* spp) still lives in the wet forest of the Pacific coast. Nevertheless, it is identical with its ancestor’s fossil (Fig.33.a & b).

iii) The evolutionists generally theorize that the opossum *Didelphis virginiana* (Fig.34.a&b.) was the primitive ancestor of the mammals, first appeared on the continent about 65 million years ago [news.ufl.edu./2009/12/15/opossum/]. But, it is alike with its ancestor’s fossil (Fig.34.a & b).

iv) It is thought that crocodiles were also present during Mesozoic era about 200 million years. But still crocodiles look practically alike with its ancestor’s fossils (Fig.35.a & b).

v) It is believed that *Neopilina* lived from the early Cambrian to the middle Devonian period and was extinct since 350 million years ago. But recently (around 1960) *Neopilina* spp. are found in the trench of Costa Rica and the Cedoras trench of Lower California. *Neopilina* (Fig. 36.a & b) looks practically similar with its ancestor’s fossils (Fig.36.a & b).

vi) The earliest horse shoe crab *Limulus* (Fig.37.a, b & c) fossils are found in the strata from the late Ordovician period, roughly 450 million years ago. Save for looks almost similar with its ancestor’s
fossils (Fig.37a, b &c).

vii) Cockroaches (*Periplanata americana*) have been evolved about 310 million years ago during Carboniferous period. But it is identical with its ancestor’s fossils (Fig.38.a & b). Modern insects arouse 230 million years ago (during Permian period) but all modern insects are identical to their fossils, for examples, modern red cotton bug (Fig.39.a & b) ant (Fig.40.a & b) and aphid (Fig.41.a & b), are identical with their fossils.

vii) Japanese maidenhair tree *Ginkgo biloba* is found in the remote forest of Western China but become familiar throughout China. It is the only living member of a group of plants that was plentiful in the Mesozoic (260-130 million years ago). Those plants have remained with little change for many million years (Fig.42.a & b).

viii) The psilopsida is the ancestor of the whole vascular plant group. Most members of this group are known only as fossil. There are two living genera: *Psilotum* (Fig.43.a & b) and *Tmesipteris*, which are still unchanged during the long period (Fig.43.a & b).

If evolution is a continuous process, why are those animals and plants are still remain unchanged during millions and millions of year? So, the fossil is a challenging of continuous process of evolution as well as the concept of evolution.

15. Fossil Evidences Oppose Evolution of Human from the Chimpanzee

It is long-established that human has evolved in this way: Tree shrew, an ant eater, *Tupaia* (Fig. 47.a, b) → Lemurs & tarsiers → *Pliopithecus* → *Dryopithecus* → *Proconsul* → *Oreopithecus* → *Australopithecus africanus* → *Australopithecus* (Java man) → *Homo erectus erectus* → *Homo erectus pekinsis* (Peking man) → *Eoanthropus dawsoni* (Piltdown man) → *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis* (Neanderthal man) → *Homo sapiens* (Cro-Magnon) → Modern man *Homo sapiens* (Fig.45) 29.

It could be cited that a series of fossils are found only in case of ancestors of humans (table-4). It is pointed out that the actual evolutionary history of the primates and man are largely known from the fossil records 42. However, fossil record opposes ‘Descent of Man’ from the lower animal. There are numerous literatures but a few are placed here-
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a) The Best Known 12 Homonids Fossil are not Transitional Form between the Monkey and the Ape -

There are 12 homonids fossils, which are best known as the transitional form between the monkey and the ape. But those homonids fossils are the fossils of true monkey and true ape, not transitional. The following literature prove this-

i) Howell 54 acknowledged that the first nine of the twelve (12) best known homonids (Pliopithecus, Proconsul, Dryopithecus, Oreopithecus, Ramipithecus, Australopitiecus africanus, A. robustus, A. boisei and A. afarensis) fossils to be completely monkeys or ape and not a part of human. About same statement is also given by Lapointe 55.

ii) Regarding the four fossils such as Australopitiecus africanus, A. robustus, A. boisei and A. afarensis. Bliss 69 drew attention that Professor Solley Zuckerman, a famous British anatomist, and his group analyzed about all four fossils of the Australopithecus for 15 years and confirmed that those four organisms were not transitional form between the ape and the monkey. Even they do not walk straight. They are also not alike as any modern ape that is living today. But they were nothing more than the ape. He again pointed out that Dr. Charles Oxard, a Professor of anatomy, has also given almost the same opinion about the fossils of four Australopithecus.

It is declared that the skeleton of Australopithecus afarensis (Lucy) is the 40% complete fossil of the genus Homo 18. But Johnson (the one, who put the parts together) admits that ‘Lucy’ was ape (she had the jaws, teeth, face and brain of ape). Even, the fossil of that Australopithecus afarensis was fragmentary bones. This fragments is found miles apart and at greatly varying depths (about 200 feet) and then placed jointly as if form the same individual. The fragments are also small with most of the skeletons missing 70. In addition, famous paleontologists Lewin 85 noticed that Lucy look like to be an ape’s head on a human’s body.

So, the best known 12 homonids fossils are fossils of ape, not the connective one. About same statement also is given by Lapointe 55.

b) Claimed Ape-Man Fossils are Fossils of Modern Man-

The obtained fragment fossils of Java man Homo erectus erectus, Peking man Homo erectus pekinsis, Pitldown man Eoantropus dawsoni, Neanderthal man Homo sapiens neanderthalensis and Cro-Magnon Homo sapiens were claimed as pre-modern man. But these fossils were actually fossils of modern man and opinions of different biologists about it are places here-

i) McElory et al. 71 cited that Rudolf Virchow (a German anthropologist, and originator of the cell theory) did not believe that the fossils of Homo sapiens neanderthalensis to be a fossil of a primitive man, but a skull of a modern man showing pathological abnormalities.

ii) Falk 72 blunt out that fossils of Cro-Magnon Homo sapiens was the same in body and brain that found in the modern man (that is, it is the fossil of modern man).

iii) Ranganathan 73 reported that many scientists have agreed that fossil-remains of Neanderthal man and Cro-Magnon man would be alike to a modern man i.e. these two fossils were also the fossils of a modern man.

iv) Leakey and Lewin 74 noted that the fossils of Peking man, Neanderthal man and Cro-Magnon man were found in place where monkeys and ape were not ever found. It is proved that those three homonids are neither the ancestor’s nor the next generations of the monkey and ape; they are true modern man. As a result, it is the fossil of a contemporary man.

v) Case 15 and Gupta 29 confirmed that collection of cape bearing skulls in Neanderthal site are considered to represent features of religion and magic, some Neanderthal burial were purposefully decorated flower evoke a sympathetic and aesthetic feeling. As a result, skull fossils of Neanderthal are the fossils of modern man as they were religious as well as sympathetic and aesthetic feeling.

vi) Vuletic 51 pointed out that the fossils of Pitldown man was accepted as a valid specimen for 40 years but later this fossil turned out to be a pig tooth.

Consequently, fossil evidences indicate that “Descent of Man” not from the lower animal.
### Table 4. The obtained series of fossils of ancestor of human

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fossil discovered</th>
<th>Fossil species</th>
<th>Discoverer &amp; year</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lower jaw</td>
<td><em>Praultiparticus</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Egypt, Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A jaw, teeth</td>
<td><em>Propliopithecus</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaws, teeth, a</td>
<td><em>Dryopithecus</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Asia and Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humerus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete skull</td>
<td><em>Proconsul africanus</em></td>
<td>L.S.B. Leaky, 1948</td>
<td>Rusinga Island, Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper jaw</td>
<td><em>Kenyapithecus wickeri</em></td>
<td>L.S.B. Leaky, 1962</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teeth and pelvis</td>
<td><em>Oreopithecus</em></td>
<td>Hurzeler, 1972</td>
<td>Northern Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaws, Fragmentary</td>
<td><em>Ramapithecus punjabicus</em></td>
<td>Edward Lewis, 1932, Edward Lewis- 1974</td>
<td>Siwalik Hills, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeleton bone</td>
<td><em>Australopithecus australis</em> (Lucy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant skull</td>
<td><em>Africanus</em></td>
<td>Raymond Dart, 1924</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult skull</td>
<td><em>A transvalensis/ A. Robustus</em></td>
<td>Robert Broom , 1936</td>
<td>Sterkfontein, S. Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull</td>
<td><em>Z. boisei/A. boiei</em></td>
<td>Mary Leaky, 1959</td>
<td>Tanzania, E. Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts of skull</td>
<td><em>Homo habilis</em></td>
<td>L.S.B. Leaky,1960</td>
<td>Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull cap</td>
<td><em>Homo erectus erectus</em></td>
<td>Eugene Dubois, 1891</td>
<td>Trinil, Central Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single tooth</td>
<td><em>H. erectus pekinensis</em></td>
<td>Davidson Black, 1903</td>
<td>Near Peking, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaws</td>
<td><em>H. E. mauritanicus</em></td>
<td>Davidson Black,1955</td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower jaw</td>
<td><em>H. heidelbergenensis</em></td>
<td>Otto Schoetensack, 1908</td>
<td>Near Heidelberg, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull fragments</td>
<td><em>Homo sapiens neanderthalensis</em></td>
<td>Fuhlrott, 1856</td>
<td>Neander Valley, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Neanderthal man)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skulls</td>
<td><em>Homo rodensiensis</em> (Rodensia man )</td>
<td>Fuhlrott, 1921</td>
<td>Northern Rhodesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skulls &amp; limbs</td>
<td><em>Eoanthropus dawsoni (Piltdown man)</em></td>
<td>Charls Dawson, 1908, 1912</td>
<td>Near Piltdown, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skulls fragments</td>
<td><em>Homo sapiens fossilis</em> (Cro-Magnon man )</td>
<td>MacGreger, 1868</td>
<td>Cro-Magnon Valley, France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**16. Darwin himself agreed that ‘Descent of Man’ cannot be explained by Science**

Darwin himself agreed that the origin of human cannot be explained by science. In the introduction of the ‘Descent of Man’ he opined that it contains hardly any original facts regarding man. But as the conclusions, at which he arrived, after drawing up a draft, appeared to him interesting. He thought that it might be interesting to others. It has often and confidently been asserted, that man’s origin can never be known. But the ignorance more frequently leads to confidence than does knowledge; it is those who know little, and those who know much, who so positively assert that this or that problem can never be solved by science. Man is considered with other some ancient, lower, and extinct forms, is not in any degree new long ago, Lamarck, who came to this conclusion 75.
17. Alfred Russel Wallace never believed that Descent of Man’ from the Chimpanzee
Co-discoverer of natural selection Alfred Russel Wallace (in 1896) never believes that human is evolved from lower animal. He argued that the attributes that defined the civilized human e.g. artistic, musical; mathematical and other skills clearly point out to the existence in man of something, which he has not derived from his animal progenitors—rather may best be referred to as being of a spiritual essence or nature. Thus, it may perceive that the love of truth, the delight in beauty, the passion for justice, and the thrill of exultation with which one hear of any act of courageous self-sacrifice, are the workings within us of a higher nature which has not been developed by man of the struggle for material existence. Darwin was deeply distressed by Wallace's change of heart, and much of the ‘Descent of Man’ is in response to opinions put forth by A. R. Wallace.

18. Recent Genetic Research and Common Logic Oppose Contradict Evolution of Human from the Chimpanzee
Recent genetic research and common logic oppose ‘Descent of Man’ not from the lower animal. There are many literatures about this statement, but a small number is mentioned here-

i) Paleontological evidences indicate that the remote ancestor of human had evolved 4-5 million years ago in Africa. But recent genetic research indicates that modern human have emerged from Africa about 100-200 thousands years ago and subsequently spread to other continents. So, recent genetic research indicates that practically all the paleontologist’s dates are wrong and the evolution of human is not from the lower animal.

ii) It is established that man is descended from a hairy, tailed quadrupe/Quadrumana specifically from Tupaia (Fig.47.a & b). That tree shrews (Tupaia) is still survives in the forests of Malaya and the Philippines Villee et al. Consequently, based on geological time scale, this Tupaia is more than 58 million years old. So, why is Tupaia still unmodified and in their original form?

iii) Vuletic noticed that Haldane’s dilemma confirmed that human could not have evolved over the time span. From the assumed population growth rates, it can be extrapolated backwards from today’s population to prove that there could not have been humans before 10,000 thousand years ago. But according to evolutionists social human arose about one million years ago. He again declared that human could not have evolved from apes, because if so, there would be no longer any ape here and there.

iv) The world-renowned American sociologists pointed out that Darwin’s work could not be readily applied to human beings.

v) Cremo wrote a book entitled ‘Human Devolution’ and there he opined that ‘Descent of Man’ not from the lower animal.

vi) Lewin drew attention that all the branch of scientific analysis such as mitochondrial DNA, population genetics, ecology etc has focused that the ‘Descent of Man’ not from the lower animal. But it advocates to the ‘Noah’s Ark hypothesis’, which campaigner that man originated from the one set of people at same location, not from many people and not that location as the evolutionists concluded.

vii) A CBS News poll indicated that 55% of Americans believe the ‘Descent of Man’ not from the lower animal, like chimpanzee and only 13% think that humans evolved without divine guidance.

v) Gould and Eldredge challenged that the record fossils of human evolution seem to provide a
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particularly good example: no gradualism has been detected within any hominid taxon, and many are long-rangirig; the trend to larger brains arises from differential success of essentially static taxa.

19. The Father of Modern Paleontology and Geology are Opposite to Evolution

Georges Baron Cuiver (1769-1832), the father of modern paleontology, did not believe in evolution. He had spent 25 years comparing fossils with living organisms and examined the fossilized animals and observed that those fossilized animals were unlike those living today 12. Cuiver was one of the world experts for the reconstruction of fossil animals. He vigorously opposed the idea of evolution 36. Adam Sedoric (1785-1873), a professor of geology in Cambridge became instrumental in founding the scientific tripode at the university. After the publication of “Origin of Species” he strongly and seriously opposed Darwin’s theory. Furthermore, Richard Owen (1804-1892), a paleontologist, natural historical writer, superintendent of the Natural History Museum and a powerful figure in the Victorian scientific circles, was one of the Darwin’s most alarming challengers 80. In Darwin’s word, “We see this in the plainest manner by the fact that all the most eminent paleontologists, namely Cuiver, Agassiz, Barrande, Falconer, Forbes etc. and all our greatest geologists Lyell, Merchison, Sedwick etc. have unanimously often vehemently maintained the immutability of species 6. Aristotle, the father of biology did not believe the idea evolution but believed that organisms had always existed tin the planet 36.

20. DISCUSSION

Darwin’s theory of evolution is the central theme of biology and also all the theories of evolution1. Darwin declared: “he, who rejects these views on the nature of geological record, would rightly reject his whole theory (Origin of Species p.276)” 6.

But it is seen that invertebrate rare formed fossils but those formed fossils are identical to the existing invertebrate. Vertebrate fossils including human fossils are fragmentary bones such as thigh bones, arm bones, jaw, teeth, skull fragments, footprints, tracks, bites etc. Transitional fossils are the main sign of history of evolution a living organism but transitional fossils are completely absent. Consequently, modern punctuated equilibrium theory is emerged due to the absent of transitional fossils. Based on such type of fossil; biologists cannot declare that living organisms evolved in this way: organic matter→ unicellular organism→ invertebrate→ lung fish→ amphibian→ reptile→ placental mammal→ higher mammal→ human. Moreover, in case of human evolution—Alfred Russel Wallace (the co-discoverer of natural selection) never believed that human was evolved from the lower animal. Even, ‘Darwin himself declared that ‘Descent of Man’ cannot explain by science but he believes it, as Lamarck, who long ago came to this conclusion. But believe is not science as believe in God is not science’ 2. Besides, it is confirmed that Lamarck theory is wrong, unnecessary and modern biologists never accept it 3, 9, 26, 37, 38, and 81. Moreover, based on fossil records Eldridge and Gould 43, Gould and Eldridge 44, completely rejected the Darwinian idea of gradual evolution and gradual evolution of human in their research papers by declaring: “phyletic gradualism (Darwin’s theory) was an a priori assertion from the start—it was never "seen" in the rocks; it expressed the cultural and political biases of 19th century liberalism. Huxley advised Darwin to avoid it as an ‘unnecessary difficulty. We think it is now become an empirical fallacy’” 43. “Invalid claims of gradualism (Darwin’s theory) made at the wrong scale and invalid claims of gradualism based on inadequate data”44. In addition, it has been pointed out that the symbol of natural selection is derived from the dominant socioeconomic ideology of the Victorian era, now rejected by nearly all humanity. Indeed, much of reason for the instant success of Darwin’s theory is that it was cut off from the very fabric of Victorian era or the English society. There is no cause still to cling this metaphor. As it can serve no other purposes than to support those injustices, which gave it birth 82. King and Wilson 83 and Sverdlov 84 confirmed their researches that the genomes of chimpanzees and humans are very similar; their DNA sequences overall are 98% identical. But base on this article it may concluded that their researches are
accurate satisfactory but it does not indicate that evolution human (Descent of Man) is not from the lower animal like chimpanzee. In supporting Morris\cite{85} drew attention that if humans are 98% chemically similar to apes, which indicated that human and apes arose from a common ancestor. Then it may be mention that milk chemistry indicates that the donkey is the man’s closest relative; the tests of cholesterol level indicate that the garter snake is man’s closest relative; tear enzyme chemistry indicates that the chicken is man’s closest relative; on the basis of another type of blood chemistry test, the butter bean is the man’s closest relative.
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