

Abram Katz's Fantastical Claims

An article in the American daily New Haven Register, written by Abram Katz and containing various comments regarding subjects included in Harun Yahya's Atlas of Creation, contained both inaccurate information and unscientific interpretations.

An article in the American daily New Haven Register, written by Abram Katz and containing various comments regarding subjects included in Harun Yahya's Atlas of Creation, contained both inaccurate information and unscientific interpretations.

First and foremost it need to be made absolutely clear that the information in Abram Katz's article regarding the views of Adnan Oktar, who writes under the pen-name Harun Yahya, is incorrect. Adnan Oktar has stated many times in his works and in interviews that the Jews are part of the community referred to in the Qur'an as the "Peoples of the Book," and that he holds sincere Jews, and of course Christians, in the deepest respect. Mr. Oktar stresses in his works that it is ideologies incompatible with religious moral values that lie at the root of the troubles currently being experienced in the Middle East. He reiterates that the solution is for genuine Jews, Muslims and Christians to support one another, to live by religious moral values as they see fit, and to constitute a model in which they can maintain their existence in freedom. In short, the unjust aspects and errors that Adnan Oktar criticizes in his works are very definitely not those of Jewish society in general. Neither do they represent Zionism, a perfectly legitimate ideology that supports the need for a Jewish homeland. What is criticized in Adnan Oktar's books is versions of Zionism that ignore religious virtues and are far removed from spiritual values and belief in Allah. That false ideology is condemned from many directions, and first and foremost by Jews themselves. Indeed, many thinkers and political scientists are agreed that it is radical, atheistic Zionism that lies at the root of the violence in the Middle East. An examination of such books by Harun Yahya as A Call for Unity and Wisdom and Sound Advice from the Old Testament will make the sincerity of his views on this subject crystal clear.

Abram Katz's Errors Regarding Fossil Specimens

Abram Katz's comments regarding the fossil specimens in the Atlas of Creation are inaccurate and conflict with the scientific findings. In his article, Katz denies the fact that there are no fossils to support the idea of evolution, yet he provides not a single example to back up that fictitious claim. This is a tactic frequently resorted to by evolutionists. They often refer to "fossils supporting evolution" in their papers and books, on programs they take part in and in their speeches and lectures. But when they need to come up with a concrete example they take refuge in profound silence. Indeed, the challenge issued to evolutionists "if you have any specimens supporting evolution then bring them forward," has remained unanswered ever since the publication of the Atlas of Creation.

Abram Katz's comments concerning the origins of mammals and the ages of the fossil specimens cited are nothing more than unscientific preconceptions. The theory of evolution, which maintains that life forms descended from one another gradually over very lengthy periods of time, has established a particular age for each and every species in the light of its own imaginative powers. However, these ages are based on the idea that living things are descended from one another and developed on a gradual basis, a claim devoid of any scientific foundation. The fact is, however, that concrete scientific findings, and particularly the fossil record, show that species are not descended from one another. Each and every living species appears suddenly in the fossil record and never changes at all for so long as it remains in existence. To put it another way, living things were created and never evolved at all. It is pointless to attempt to ignore this fact, revealed by the hundreds of fossils in the Atlas of Creation, which represent only a minute fraction of the total number unearthed, by way of preconceptions lacking any scientific validity. If Darwinists were to free themselves for a moment from the evolutionary indoctrination they have been subjected to, and if they were to begin to evaluate these realities from a scientific perspective, they too would see the truth of this.

Evolutionist Dilemmas on the Subject of the Origin of Mammals

Evolutionists claim that various imaginary life forms evolved and emerged from the sea, and then turned into reptiles, and that birds subsequently evolved from reptiles. According to that same scenario, reptiles are not only the forerunners of birds, but also of mammals. However, there are huge differences between these two categories. Mammals are warm-blooded animals (which produce and regulate their own body heat), give birth to and suckle their young, and are covered in fur. Reptiles, on the other hand, are cold-blooded (unable to produce their own body heat and whose temperatures change according to that of their surroundings), multiply by laying eggs, do not suckle their young and are covered in scales.

But how did a reptile supposedly begin to produce its own body heat, establish a perspiration mechanism to control that temperature, to exchange its scales for fur and begin producing milk? The theory of evolution needs to provide satisfactory answers to these questions if it is to account for the origin of mammals.

Yet when we look at evolutionist sources we see an obstinate silence on the subject, or else totally imaginary and unscientific fairy tales. Roger Lewin, a well-known evolutionist, was forced to admit that "The transition to the first mammal . . . is still an enigma." [1]

In short, as with all other living groups, the origin of mammals cannot be explained in terms of the theory of evolution. George Gaylord Simpson admitted this many years ago:

This is true of all thirty-two orders of mammals The earliest and most primitive known members of every order already have the basic ordinal characters, and in no case is an approximately continuous sequence from one order to another known. In most cases, the break is so sharp and the gap so large that the origin of the order is speculative and much disputed This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by paleontologists. It is true of almost all classes of animals, both vertebrate and invertebrate it is true of the classes, and of the major animal phyla, and it is apparently also true of analogous categories of plants. [2]

[1] Roger Lewin, "Bones of Mammals, Ancestors Fleshed Out," *Science*, Vol. 212, June 26, 1981, p. 1492.

[2] George G., Simpson, *Tempo and Mode in Evolution*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. 105, 107.

<https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/abram-katzs-fantastical-claims>