Dawkins Has Taken the Bait

Certain publications in Turkey have recently been reporting statements directed at the Atlas of Creation at a conference given by Richard Dawkins a year ago as if they were something new. Dawkins Has Suffered a Huge Defeat, and That Is the Reason for His Refusal to Meet Mr. Adnan Oktar: In making imputations regarding Adnan Oktar, Dawkins forgets his own intellectual father, Darwin. It is Darwin whose ideas he defends to the hilt, the ignoramus who was unaware of the existence even of the sciences of biology, zoology, microbiology, genetics, paleontology, geology, molecular biology and paleoanthropology, who was expelled from all the schools he entered and had no other aim than to spend times with drunken mariners. Dawkins acts as supporter of a theory launched by Darwin, who was totally ignorant of science, in the outdated atmosphere of the 19th century, a theory that today even children find laughable.

Certain publications in Turkey have recently been reporting statements directed at the *Atlas of Creation* at a conference given by Richard Dawkins a year ago as if they were something new.



Dawkins Has Suffered a Huge Defeat, and That Is the Reason for His Refusal to Meet Mr. Adnan Oktar:

In making imputations regarding Adnan Oktar, Dawkins forgets his own intellectual father, Darwin. It is Darwin whose ideas he defends to the hilt, the ignoramus who was unaware of the existence even of the sciences of biology, zoology, microbiology, genetics, paleontology, geology, molecular biology and paleoanthropology, who was expelled from all the schools he entered and had no other aim than to spend times with drunken mariners. Dawkins acts as supporter of a theory launched by Darwin, who was totally ignorant of science, in the outdated atmosphere of the 19th century, a theory that today even children find laughable.



In addition to all this, Dawkins proposes the claim that Mr. Oktar does not have any knowledge of zoology as an excuse for not meeting with him. Yet at the same time he never lets go of the *Atlas of Creation*, Mr. Oktar's work that has rocked the entire world. At every available opportunity he personally arranges conferences on the very subject, participates in conferences held by others, makes a special issue out of the book, and collects people around him as he comments upon it. He does all in his power to criticize, at least in his own eyes, the author's works, yet he absolutely refuses a face-to-face meeting with him. Dawkins's huge reluctance to enter into a debate with Adnan Oktar, despite all the latter's calls, and his electing instead to respond, again in his own eyes, to the authors' ideas and his analyses on the subject all go to show how disturbing he finds the author's activities. The only reason why Dawkins refuses a face-to-face encounter with Mr. Oktar IS THAT HE HAS BEEN COMPLETELY ROUTED AND HAS NO ANSWER TO GIVE.

Adnan Oktar's statement on the subject during one interview runs as follows:

> **Adnan Oktar:** Dawkins says he refuses to debate with me because I have received no biological training. My friend, what can I say? What about your forefather Darwin? Did he receive any training, any training in zoology or biology? He was kicked out of all his schools. But he was certainly an expert when it came to drinking wine. He could tell you what vintage a wine was and where it came from and all that, but nothing about the matter at hand. Do you still believe in his nonsense? You do, even though you know how ignorant he was. Do you believe in the unscientific claims he made in the light of the backward science and deficient scientific understanding of the time? Yes, you do. That is one point. The second is, do you not debate with high school and middle school students wherever you go? Yes, you do. Have they received any training in biology? No, they have not. Do you debate with clergymen? Yes, you do. Have they had any training? No. That means you debate with people you calculate cannot beat you. With people you believe cannot defeat you. You would be devastated in a debate with me—in minutes, and even in seconds. Let me challenge you again.

But your forefather [Darwin] lies dead, while you weep at his graveside. (From Adnan Oktar's interview with Tempo TV and Kral Karadeniz TV broadcast on 28 September, 2009.)

Dawkins Has Taken the Bait and Hooked by a Picture of an Insect on the Hook



The picture of an insect on the hook in the *Atlas of Creation*, which Dawkins imagines to represent a major discovery, is one of an insect showing that a life form whose fossil remains date back millions of years is still alive today. Whether or not it is a model makes absolutely no difference. What matters is that this insect that lived millions of years ago is still in existence in the same form and living today.

Dawkins entered into a state of huge stress and panic following the manifest revelation in the *Atlas of Creation* of hundreds of pieces of evidence that obliterate evolution. For some reason, he says not a word about the thousands of different fossils in the various volumes of the *Atlas of Creation*, but displays his own ignorance in talking about a picture of a model everywhere he goes, as if this was some major discovery of genius. It is easy to see that Dawkins has nothing to say in the face of the fact that this life form, as well as all the others, is still alive today and has never changed over the course of millions of years.

Dawkins's futile efforts just go to show how true and influential the *Atlas of Creation* is. It is also an indication of the terrible collapse suffered by evolution all around the world in which the *Atlas* has been instrumental.

In addition to all this, although Dawkins regards a single picture of a model as some kind of trump card, he himself uses nothing but models, drawings and reconstructions in all his own articles and conferences. AND THAT IS BECAUSE HE CANNOT PRODUCE ONE SINGLE FOSSIL THAT REPRESENTS EVIDENCE OF EVOLUTION. While he deceives people with models, he attempts to use a picture of a model in the *Atlas of Creation*, that consists entirely of scientific evidence, one that scientifically documents how a life form that existed millions of years ago is still alive today, against the *Atlas*. This shows that, like all other Darwinists, Dawkins has nothing to do with being scientific and lives in a state of profound ignorance.

It is impossible for Dawkins, and for all other Darwinists, to have anything to do with being scientific, because SCIENCE FURTHER DEMOLISHES THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION WITH EVERY PASSING DAY.

Statements by Adnan Oktar on the subject read:



Adnan Oktar: I used a plastic model of an animal in one place in the *Atlas of Creation*. This person then made a huge fuss, as if he had discovered something. Daily Vatan then took it up, wondering why we had used a plastic model instead of an original animal. Yet he has no qualms about using drawings and pictures that are totally irrelevant, but we do not hold them against you. Since the plastic model is identical to a picture of the living life form in question of course I can use whatever I wish.

Presenter: That is a bit of very fine detail. There is the question of declining a debate but closely following your every move. He must have read the whole thing in order to pick it up.

Adnan Oktar: He will say, how could he debate with the author of this book? Because he will be unable to respond even to 10 pages of it. Not even 5 pages. I am now in the course of preparing the 4th and 5th volumes of the work, and I have used plastic models of frogs, for instance. They look different and nice, and there is also a bit of a jest in them. I have led that person to take the bait. This is the only subject he criticizes. I deliberately put the hook. There was a hook there, clearly visible. I put the insect on the hook and he went for it. He is now talking about it everywhere, showing people the insect on the hook.

It is an honor for us that this person should so avoid us. In the ring a wrestler comes out and waits for his opponent. If that opponent fails to show, then he is declared as the winner to great applause. This is something far greater than a technical knockout, as he was too afraid even to turn up. But I would have liked to inflict a knockout as well. Let him show up, but he cannot because I would crush him in a single moment. (From Adnan Oktar's interview with Tempo TV and Kral Karadeniz TV on 28 September, 2009.)

There Are No Transitional Fossils between the Crocodile and the Squirrel, because "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS TRANSITIONAL FOSSILS"

Darwinists make the nonsensical claim that the whole current diversity of life sprang from a single cell. The transition from squirrel to bird or from chimpanzee to human being so fanatically espoused by Dawkins is just as nonsensical as the transition from crocodile to squirrel that Dawkins criticizes in his own eyes. The claim made by Dawkins's intellectual father Darwin, who was a total ignoramus devoid of any understanding of biology, zoology or paleontology, that whales evolved from bears is the product of the same perverted logic. It is therefore utterly ludicrous for Dawkins to say "we never claimed there was any transition from crocodile to squirrel," AS IF EVOLUTION HAD ANY LOGICAL CLAIM.

Someone witnessing Dawkins's claim on this subject might well form the impression that transitional fossils from such an imaginary transition of the kind maintained by Dawkins actually exist. And that is just what Dawkins is aiming for. He aims to deceive people with no knowledge about transitional fossils by means of these words of demagoguery. It will therefore be of use to reiterate here some important information, the scientific evidence for which we have already provided hundreds of times before. In summary, that information is as follows:

Contrary to what Dawkins and all other Darwinists maintain,

- THERE IS NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL SHOWING A PASSAGE FROM A SINGLE-CELLED ORGANISM TO A MULTI-CELLED ONE.
- THERE IS NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL POINTING TO A PASSAGE FROM WATER TO DRY LAND.
- THERE IS NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL POINTING TO REPTILES TURNING INTO MAMMALS.
- THERE IS NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL POINTING TO A PASSAGE FROM LAND TO THE AIR**.**
- THERE IS NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL POINTING TO A TRANSITION FROM TERRESTRIAL TO MARINE MAMMALS.
- THERE IS NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL POINTING TO THE IMAGINARY EVOLUTION OF FLYING MAMMALS.
- THERE IS NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL POINTING TO A PASSAGE FROM CHIMPANZEES TO HUMAN BEINGS.

No matter what Dawkins may maintain and no matter what kind of a transition he may espouse, **NOT A SINGLE TRANSITIONAL FOSSIL EXISTS** that might confirm it.

LIVING THINGS **NEVER CHANGED** OVER MILLIONS OF YEARS.

And therein lies Dawkins's difficulty. That fact has now been announced to the whole world for the very first time since Darwin's "Origin of Species" deception 150 years ago. The *Atlas of Creation*, a significant work of reference revealing this, has therefore become Dawkins's number one target. Dawkins HAS TAKEN THE BAIT when he least expected it. It is because he knows there is nothing to be done, because he refuses a face-to-face debate with Mr. Oktar in the knowledge that he will be utterly routed, that he instead resorts to such pitiful, pathetic and childish methods. And this **is a declaration of the Darwinist defeat.**
https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/dawkins-has-taken-the-bait