

<https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.7.8.2025.493-510>

African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: <http://www.afjbs.com>

Research Paper

Open Access

Challenge of eight Evidences of Darwin's Theory and the other theories of Evolution

Md. Abdul Ahad

Dept. of Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur (5200), Bangladesh
 Email: maahadhstu@gmail.com; maahad2011hstu@gmail.com

Volume:7Issue,8Aug2025

Received:20Jun,2025

Accepted:15July,2025

Published:22Aug2025

[doi:10.48047/AFJBS.7.8.2025.493-510](https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.7.8.2025.493-510)

Abstract This article is based on the author himself published article that published during 2015-2024 in various web science Journals, and proved that fossil evidence, artificial selection, taxonomical evidence, embryological evidence, geographical distribution, vestigial organs, biochemical and molecular similarities, and contemporary evidence are opposite to Darwin's theory/organic evolution. However, fossils are the direct evidence of evolution. But all the obtained fossils of plants, invertebrates, and vertebrates are practically 100% identical to the present-day organism, which opposes Darwin's theory and other theories of evolution. Darwin claimed that vertebrate embryos are similar and support the organic evolution. But modern researchers proved that vertebrate embryos are not similar but rather dissimilar, it opposes embryological evidence. Darwin claimed that animals were dispersed away from their places of origin and then became subsequently modified to match with the environment and thus the geographical distribution occurred. But animals do not evolve to match with the climate rather they migrate to safe place, if impossible they extinct. Artificial/hybridization selection is a model of natural selection. But hybridization between two plants or animal species is not possible; if possible, offspring must produce a sterile hybrid. So, there is no evidence of a reproductive isolated variety or species evolve either artificially or naturally. Taxonomical evidence is based on the evolutionary classification. But evolutionary classification is absent of both in plant and in the animal kingdom. As the claimed evolutionary classification of Hutchinson, Engler and Prantl, etc. is not valid as evolutionary classification. According to Darwin vestigial organs are useless. But modern researchers proved that vestigial organs are very important to the respective organism. Evolutionists claimed that living organisms are greatly similar at their molecular level, which indicates a common ancestry. But according to the current theory, each species is unique in that its base pairs are arranged in different orders that vary from other species. The recent arising of a new species is the contemporary evidence of Darwin's theory/organic evolution. The recent arising of a new species is the contemporary evidence of organic evolution but there is no evidence of a new species either artificially or naturally by any process. Hence, those eight evidences of organic evolution are not valid, which indirectly reject all theories of evolution. If organic evolution/ Darwin's theory is valid, then humans and other living organisms should be immortal. Moreover, Teleology, the laws of thermodynamics, Mendel's law, Hardy-Weinberg's law, Population genetics oppose the idea of organic evolution i.e. oppose Darwin's Theory, Neo-Darwinism, Sociobiology theory, Neutral Theory, Nearly Neutral Theory, Punctuated equilibrium theory and the other theories of organic evolution, which indirectly reject all the evidence of evolution.

Keywords: *Darwin's Theory, Evidence, opposite to, Organic Evolution, Idea of evolution, not valid*

1. Introduction

There are eight (8) evidences of Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution. In the Origin of Species, Darwin masterly summarized some evidence of organic evolution or of his theory (Darwin, 1859), which has been enlarged since his time (Krishnaswamy, 1971). This evidence has been drawn from many areas of biology (Mader, 2000). The evidence overwhelmingly convinces the biologists to the idea of evolution or the theories of evolution (Ritchie and Carola, 1983). However, those eight evidences of Darwin's theory or organic evolution are fossil evidence, artificial selection, taxonomical evidence, embryological evidence, geographical distribution, vestigial organs, biochemical and molecular similarities, and contemporary evidence, which support the idea of organic evolution or the theories of organic evolution i.e. 16 theories of evolution (namely: i. Lamarck's theory, ii. Darwin's theory of natural selection, iii. Darwin's theory of Sexual selection, iv. Haeckel's Recapitulation theory/Biogenetic law, v. Mutation theory, vi. Neo-Darwinism/Synthetic theory, vii. Sociobiology theory, viii. Neutral Theory, ix. Nearly Neutral Theory, x. Punctuated equilibrium theory, xi. Shifting balance theory, xii. Allopatric speciation theory, xiii. Species selection theory, xiv. Goldschmidt theory, xv. Chromosomal speciation theory, and xvi. Oparin's theory of Origin of Life). However, based on the author's himself published article that was published during 2015-2024 in various web science Journals; it would be proved that those eight evidences of Darwin's theory/organic evolution are not valid. Therefore, the introductions (arguments infavour of an evidence) and the abstracts (arguments disfavour of an evidence) of those published articles are placed here; as the reader could take decision, whether those eight evidences are valid or not. This paper would be helpful to biologists, ecologists, anthropologists, geologists, paleontologists, sociologists, psychologists, archaeologists, those who think about evolution and also those believe in God or not.

2. The Fossil Evidence of Darwin's Theory is Opposite to Organic Evolution

The study of the actual course of evolution is mostly based on the fossil evidence/ fossil records/geological succession (Case, 1979). Paleontology (the study of fossils) is the final proof or disproof of evolution (Cockrum and McCauley, 1965). Consequently, fossils provide the most clear-cut, convincing, strongest, verified, and direct evidence of evolution (Hickman, 1970; Kimball, 1965). So, Darwin (1859) declared that "He, who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my whole theory (Origin of Species, 276)." However, the author himself published an article in 2015 a web science journal but by adding more literatures he published another article in 2024 in another journal of web science and proved that fossil evidence is opposite to evolution and their abstracts are placed here:

a) If the obtained fossils (fossilized organisms) would some percent i.e. 70% or 80% etc. be identical to the living organisms, then it supports Darwin's theory or the idea of evolution. However, based on numerous pieces of literature it is proved that all the fossils of invertebrates (such as cockroaches, aphids, cotton bugs, honey bees, wasps, ants, termites, horseshoe crabs, crabs, and *Neoplina* are practically identical to the present-day organisms, those evolved millions and millions of years ago but still unchanged), all the fossils of vertebrates (such as toads, frogs, crocodiles, opossum, *Latimeria* fish, and elephants), and all the fossils of plants (such as conifer leaf, conifer fruit, fern, gymnosperm leaf, *Ginkgo biloba*, and *Psilotum*) are 100% identical to the existing organisms. So, there is no change in fossils throughout millions and millions of years;

though evolution is a continuous process, and now, it is occurring rapidly, which claims that fossils never support the idea of evolution. If extinction is a major feature of evolution of a new species as Darwin claimed, then no need of biodiversity conservation effort/convention/law to prevent extinction of living organisms or wild animals. Again, there is no record that recently extinct organisms produced a new organism; hence, extinct organisms never succeeded a new species. The tail of *Archaeopteryx* that shows a reptilian character and argues that the dinosaur was modified into a bird, but it is an impression of a single feather of its own, but not a tail of dinosaurs. Moreover, logic and literature claim that birds never evolved from the dinosaurs, and the *Archaeopteryx* fossil is a fossil of a true bird. Radiocarbon dating (which estimates the age of fossils and prepares the geological time chart) is not valid; its evidence is that during the estimation of the age of the earth, and the Archezoic era it overlooks 3.5 billion years. Moreover, researchers of the University of Chicago informed that radiocarbon dating can accurately determine the age of organic materials as old as approximately sixty thousand (60,000) years, which claims that the millions or billions of years age of a fossil is not valid and the arising periods of all animals in the geological time table (or time chart) is not valid. Thus, the geological time scale (or time chart) is invalid. The fossils of ancestors of humans are fragmentary bones such as skull fragments, teeth, jaws, and tibia; but not in the original form but modified into stone. However, literature claims that obtained fossils are the fossils of true apes and modern man but not transitional ones. Again, Darwin himself agreed that science cannot explain the evolution of humans. So, the evolution of man is not from the chimpanzee. Fossil records indicate that evolution progress in this way: one-celled (bacteria) → invertebrate → lung fish → amphibian → reptile → placental mammal → higher mammal → human; those organisms evolved during 3500, 404, 355, 310, 181, 65, 25, and 11 million years ago, respectively; but those are still unchanged, which oppose the idea of evolution. Hence, the fossil evidence, arising of birds from the dinosaurs, the radiocarbon method, the geological time scale, and the Descent of Man are opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2024).

b) 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 presented 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 fossils are absent. Claimed transitional fossils of *Archaeopteryx* and *Seymouria* are not transitional at all; they are true birds and true reptiles, respectively. Darwin himself declared there are no transitional fossils and transitional existing animals. Additionally, the obtained fossils are fossils of existing organisms or extinct organisms, which formed during the universal floods. Moreover, the origin of the first life, the arising period of other organisms and the age of the earth are determined by the assumptions only, as it overlooks 3.5 billion years. Extinction of living organisms never produces new species; if produced 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 evidence opposes 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' cannot be explained by science but he believes it, as Lamarck, who long ago came to this conclusion. But belief is not science as believing in God is not science. Lamarck's theory is never accepted by modern biologists. Moreover, paleontological evidence indicates that humans has been evolved 4–5 million years ago but recent

genetic research indicates that modern humans emerged about 100–200 thousand years ago only, which again opposes the evolution of humans is not from the lower animal. Consequently, the fathers of modern paleontologists and geologists opposed evolution. King and Wilson, and Sverdlov confirmed their research that the genomes of chimpanzees and humans are very similar and their DNA sequences overall are 98% identical. Their research is accurate and satisfactory. However, it does not indicate evolution of humans is from the lower animal like the chimpanzee. Morris also supports this by many scientific logics. So, why does man unscientifically relate them with the lower animals like chimpanzees/apes as their ancestor, who eats their own excreta (Ahad, 2015)?

c) The author also proved that the fossil evidence opposes the sexual theory of Darwin and the evolution of humans (Ahad, 2024).

d) The fossil evidence opposes the Neo-Darwinism (Ahad, 2022b).

e) Genetic drift represents the Punctuated equilibrium theory, the Shifting balance theory, the Allopatric speciation theory, the Species selection theory (Ahad, 2017; Ahad, 2019b; Ahad, 2020a), the Neutral Theory, and the Nearly Neutral theory (Ahad, 2023a). However, the effects of genetic drift are difficult to observe in fossils, so paleontologists have frequently denied its existence (Birdsell, 1975, 100). Hence, fossil evidence opposes those theories. In addition, the fossil evidence opposes the Punctuated equilibrium theory, the Shifting balance theory, the Allopatric speciation theory, and the Species selection theory (Ahad, 2019b; Ahad2020a).

f) Fossil evidence opposes chromosomal speciation theory (Ahad, 2020a).

g) The fossil evidence of social insects opposes the Sociobiology theory (Ahad, 2022a).

Lastly, fossil evidence opposes all the theories of evolution.

h) It is claimed that a 3.20 billion years-old bacterium (*Eubacterium isolatum*) fossil was discovered from South Africa (Birdsell, 1975) and another one was of 3.5 billion years old from Australia (Wallace, 1990), which indicated that bacteria (one-celled organism) is the Oparin's first organism. Thus, those fossils support the Oparin's theory strongly. But it is proved by the author himself in an article in a web science journal that those bacteria's fossils are not valid and it was discovered intentionally to support the Origin of Life. So, fossils never support Oparin's theory (Ahad and Ferdous, 2016).

3. Evidence of Artificial Selection (Hybridization/ Breeding) of Darwin's Theory is Opposite to Organic Evolution

Natural selection is like an artificial (man's) selection (Darwin, 1859). Darwin was a pigeon breeder, from which he derived the most important evidence and a model for his natural selection (Purves and Orians, 1987). Artificial selection is the process by which humans choose individual organisms with certain phenotypic trait values for breeding (Conner, 2016; Das et al., 2021). It is a form of experimental evolution or controlled natural selection (Etterson and Shaw, 2013, Kawecki et al., 2012). It exhibits rapid evolutionary change (Breed and Moore, 2015). Unlike in natural populations, artificial selection might accelerate speciation processes in domesticated species (Miet al., 2020). So, artificial selection (hybridization) is a principal, and driving force of Darwin's theory (Laetsch, 1979) and Darwin used artificial selection as a model for natural selection (Case, 1979; Starr and Taggart, 1989). So, artificial selection is very important evidence of Darwin's theory, as a new species evolves through artificial selection. However, the author published an article in 2015 in a web science journal but by adding more information he published another article in 2023a in

another web science journal and proved that artificial selection (hybridization/ breeding) is opposite to Darwin's Theory and their abstracts are here:

a) Darwin and his followers declare that artificial selection/ hybridization produces new species and provides a model of natural selection, sexual selection (human evolution). Artificial selection is a skilled sexual selection. Moreover, gene flow, recombination, chromosomal aberration/ chromosome number mutation (macroevolution/ polyploidization) also occurs very smoothly and skillfully through artificial selection. But based on numerous pieces of literature it is proved that breeding (hybridization) between two plants species or animal species is not possible either naturally or artificially; if imposed the fertilization fails, if the fertilization is successful, the embryo may abort, or the young may suffer various abnormalities and at last it may die, if the hybrid survives to maturity, it must be sterile, if fertile it produces varieties/ races. So, breeders have developed some plants and animal's varieties through hybridization between two varieties. Through hybridization between two rice varieties, breeders have developed some rice varieties (such as IR-8, IR-28), etc. but these varieties are lost their genotype just after a few generations. So, chromosomal speciation/ macroevolution/ polyploidy is also impossible. Moreover, cloning (biotechnology/ genetic engineering) neither produces a new species nor produce a new variety, as it produces many identical copies. So, it is confirmed that artificial selection/hybridization (the main fore of evolution) is opposite to Darwin's theory and also opposite to macroevolution through chromosomal aberration/ chromosomal number mutation (Ahad, 2015; Ahad and Ferdous, 2015).

b) If hybridization between two plant species or animal species is possible and produced a fertile, reproductively isolated offspring. However, based on numerous literature it is proved that hybridization between two plants or animal species is not possible due to structural, behavioral differences, and seasonal isolations. If imposed, the fertilization fails, if the fertilization is successful, the embryo may abort, or the young may die. If the hybrid survives up to maturity, it must become sterile. However, in a very rare case, the hybrids become fertile (e.g. Indian cattle *Bosindicus* × European cattle *Bostaurus*, red wolf *Canisrufus* × coyote *C. latrans*, gray wolf *C. lupus* × coyote *C. latrans*, Mallard duck *Anasplatyrnchos* × Pain tail duck *A. acuta* (in custody), Polar bear *Ursus maritimus* × Kodiak bear *Thalarctos Maritimus* produce fertile and it is common in nature); those species produce fertile hybrids must merge into a species (to satisfy the modern definition of species). So, their scientific name is not valid. Moreover, the artificial selection is also a skilled sexual selection, as the breeders choose the fittest, most vigour, and most fertile/productive, beautiful, colorful ornamented organism. But breeders failed to develop a reproductively isolated species/variety/race by Johnson's pure line selection, cloning, genetic engineering, and mutation breeding. Even, a new species is not evolved by the natural hybridization. Consequently, there is no evidence of evolution of a new species either artificially or naturally. So, recent research claims that sexual selection theory is fundamentally flawed and simply wrong. Hence, evolutionary biologists rejected the sexual selection. Thus, sexual selection is opposite to the evolution of humans from the lower animal like a chimpanzee. It is assumed that macroevolution occurs through hybridization; so, such an assumption is not valid (Ahad, 2023a).

4. The evidence of Geographical Distributions (Biogeography) are Opposite to Darwin's Theory/Organic Evolution

Darwin uses the term “Climate” about 100 times in the “Origin of Species” to indicate how a new species evolved by the effect of climate/environment and effect of their distributions (Darwin, 1859). Additionally, Darwin uses the term “Climate” about 32 times in the “Descent of Man” to indicate how humans evolve by the effect of climate/environments and effect of their distributions (Darwin, 1871). Again, Darwin explained the geographical distribution of animals and plants on the assumption that plants and animals were dispersed away from their places of origin and then became subsequently modified to match with the environment, until a barrier appeared and thus, the geographical distributions of animals are occurred (Darlington, 1957; Simpson, 1980; Mayr, 1976 and Ghiselin, 1986). So, living organisms evolve to match with the environment and thus, evolution of living organisms and their geographical distribution (biogeography) are interrelated and vice versa. So, if, it is proved that living organisms did not evolve to match with the environment; then their geographical distributions would be automatically opposite Darwin’s theory/ idea of evolution.

However, based on plentiful literature, it is proved that living organisms are beautifully adapted with the climate and no evolution occurred to change with the climate. Furthermore, animals migrate to a safe place with the changing climate. For example, the migration of birds in winter due to environmental change/coming the winter is widespread. As a result, it is commonly observed that during the winter season, a large number birds are compelled to come far from Siberia to Bangladesh due to change climate/ environmental hazards/coldness. Nearly 50,000 million of land-birds migrate from Europe to Africa in each autumn to avoid the winter. But in each spring those return to the north again. However, if it is not possible to migrate to a safe place, then they simply become extinct. Moreover, cosmopolitan animals, and also places having the same climate do not possess the same type of fauna, which opposes the effect of climate on evolution. If climate affects the evolution, then only six animals and plant species could be found according to the six climatic zones of the world. Again, evolution is a continuous process but there is no record that a living organism has evolved by the effects of the environment. Moreover, plants have a variety of ways to cope with the unfavorable climate such as drought or the coming winter; for example, the shade-tolerant plants have adapted their photosynthesis to function optimally under low-light conditions, whereas, the “Shade-avoiding” plants adapt their growth to perceive maximum sunlight. Moreover, during the drought or the coming winter; simpler plants like lichens and mosses may dry-up and then re-hydrate, but when moist conditions are favorable, those re-grow again. Therefore, living organisms (even humans) not evolve to match with the climate. As the evolution of organisms and their geographical distributions are interrelated and vice versa. So, geographical distributions are opposite to Darwin’s theory/ organic evolution. Gaia theory and Croizat’s views oppose the Darwin’s biogeography, which support that geographical distributions are opposite to Darwin’s theory (Ahad, 2019).

5. Taxonomical Evidence of Darwin’s Theory is Opposite to Organic Evolution

Darwin pointed out that from the first dawn of life, all organic beings are resembled each other in descending degrees so that they can be classed in groups under groups. This classification is evidently not arbitrary like the grouping of the stars in constellations (Darwin, 1859). All biologists use taxonomic information in their research. They attempt to place into a group of an organism

(Weier et al., 1982). The actual practice of classifying is usually called taxonomy or systematics (Scagel et al., 1984). There are many evolutionary classifications systems of plants such as Engler and Prantl systems, Hutchison systems, Bessy systems, Eichler systems, Hallier systems, Thorne systems, Takhtajan systems, Dahlgren systems, Cronquist systems etc., which support Darwin's theory (Lawrence, 1967; Dutta, 2012). So, taxonomical evidence (evolutionary classification of plants and animal) is importance evidence of Darwin's theory.

However, diverse literature confirmed that Darwinian classifications/evolutionary classifications are absent of both in plant and in the animal kingdom. As the claimed Darwinian classifications systems of Hutchinson, Engler and Prantl, Bessy, Eichler, Takhtajan, etc. are not valid as evolutionary classification/phylogenetic classifications; because, those classifications are based on assumptions (based on the belief but not based on observation/practical), as well as modification and similar of Bentham and Hooker's classifications (non-evolutionary classifications). Again, numerous pieces of literature demanded the absence of Darwinian classification both of plant and in the animal kingdom. Because, both plant and animal are classified according to the Linnaean system and this classification still exists in the taxonomical world, even in the classification of microorganisms. Moreover, the Father of taxonomist i.e. Carolus Linnaeus did not believe in evolution (whose classification systems are still universally used), which also support the absence of Darwinian classifications. Additionally, the naming (the goal and heart of taxonomy) of both of plants and animals is completed by the Linnaeus's "Rules and Laws" (non-evolutionary laws). Thus, taxonomical evidence is opposite to Darwin's theory/ organic evolution (Ahad, 2018a).

6. Embryological Evidence of Darwin's Theory is Opposite to Organic Evolution

Haeckel's book entitled "Natürliche Schöpfungs-geschichte", was published in German in German language (in 1868) and in English it was published (in 1876) with the title "The History of Creation" (Grigg, 1996). In this book Haeckel advanced the "Biogenetic law", which is also known as "Recapitulation theory". This theory stated that "Ontogeny" (the development of the organisms/ embryo) recapitulated the "Phylogeny" (the evolutionary history). To illustrate "Biogenetic law", Haeckel (in 1891) provide drawings, which have been widely used in various biology textbooks and ever since. His drawings were also subsequently used (in 1901) in a book entitled 'Darwin and After Darwin' (Thompson, 1956; Pennisi, 1997). According to this theory/law, the human embryo might first resemble a one-celled amoeba, then a one-layered Volvox, then a two-layered coelenterate, and so on, then through fish and amphibian and every embryo repeats the entire history of human evolution (Curtis, 1979). Moreover, the early stages of all vertebrate embryos are markedly similar and it is not easy to differentiate a human embryo from the embryo of a pig, chick, frog or fish and indicates common ancestry (Ville, 1968); the detailed study of embryology reveals that in a generalized way morphological stages characteristic of adults of distantly related ancestral groups occur in early embryonic stages of the mammal (Cockrum, 1965). Thus, embryological evidence (Biogenetic law/Recapitulation theory) strongly supports Darwin's theory/organic evolution.

However, based on various recent literatures, it is proved that the presences of gill slits in vertebrate's embryos are the evidence of Biogenetic law. But except in fishes, other vertebrate's embryos never have gills. Moreover, both the early stage and the tail bud stages (later stages) of

embryos are differing morphologically, instead of similarity. Again, literature claimed that Haeckel manufactured the pictures about the similarities of various vertebrate embryos but not actual. As a result, Haeckel's "Biogenetic Law" is faked during Haeckel's during Haeckel's lifetime as well as Darwin's lifetime. Again, the vertebrate's embryos are observable but this Biogenetic Law is based on three assumptions/beliefs. However, it is proved that those assumptions are not valid. So, recent researchers declared that invalid the "Biogenetic Law." So, Haeckel misstated the evolutionary principle. It is now firmly established that ontogeny does not recapitulate the phylogeny. There is no evidence that entire stages of vertebrate embryos are recapitulated. As an organism cannot move from adulthood back through adolescence into childhood, or a butterfly cannot move from its adult flying stage back through the pupa into its larval stage; such ideas are quite absurd. But how Haeckel claimed that an organism has to pass through the stages of its evolutionary history during its development? In addition, the embryology of plants and echinoderm opposes the Biogenetic Law/Recapitulation theory. So, numerous biologists rejected the "Biogenetics law" by using various languages and terms. Consequently, the publishers of biology textbooks started to remove the Haeckel's drawing from their text biology books and re-write the text. At first evolutionary tree (Phylogenetic tree/Darwinian tree) was drawn by Haeckel—based on the similarity of vertebrate embryos/ based on the recapitulation theory. So, Haeckel's evolutionary tree (Phylogenetic tree /Darwinian tree) is not valid. As Darwin exploited the "Recapitulation theory" for the strong evidence of his theory. Hence, the embryological evidence is opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2018b).

7. The Evidence of Biochemical and Molecular Similarities of Darwin's Theory is Opposite to Organic Evolution

Living organisms are greatly similar at their molecular levels (Noda, 1984). There is a single chemistry of heredity of animals and plants, which indicates a common ancestry (Case, 1979; Khanna, 1970). Again, different biochemical compositions and physiological activities of plants and animals also support that those have come from a common ancestor (Shukla and Chandel, 1988; Rastogi, 1994). Moreover, almost all living organisms have some basic identical biochemical molecules, including DNA, ATP, and many other similar or nearly identical enzymes, which indicate common ancestry (Mader, 2003). It is noted from the compared figures of DNA sequences that 99% similarities are found between humans and chimpanzees (Wilson, and King, 1975), which indicates that humans have evolved from the chimpanzee. Thus, the evidence of biochemical and molecular similarities, and modern evidence (contemporary evidence) strongly support Darwin's theory /organic evolution.

Oppositely. based on numerous literature it is proved that this evidence is not valid. According to the current theory, each species is unique in that its base pairs are arranged in different orders and probably in different proportions that vary from other species. Even DNA base sequence varies as much as between individuals of the same society as between individuals of different societies of human races. Again, each human person has a unique genetic fingerprint and the DNA molecules are completely different from another person, which indicates that other plant and animal DNA molecules are completely different from one another. In 1996, biochemist Michael Behe wrote a book entitled "Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution" the central theme of

this book is that biological systems are irreducibly complex at their molecular as well as cellular levels. So, he claimed that the idea of evolution and attempted to show a specific biochemical system composed of multiple parts could have not evolved. Moreover, if similarities are found among the different kinds of animals and plants at the molecular level, even if there is a single chemistry of heredity of different plants and animals, why are those of different kinds? Those would be of the same kind /species or at least the same group; instead, there are about one million animal species and 0.25 million plant species. Thus, the evidence of biochemical and molecular similarities is not valid (Ahad, 2023b).

8. Evidence of Vestigial Organs is Opposite to Darwin's Theory/ Organic Evolution

Vestigial organs (rudimentary organs) are useless (Darwin, 1859) and it is the evidence of the evolution of Darwin's theory (Naylor, 1982). However, modern research proved that vestigial organs are regarded as important to the respective organism. For example, vestigial organs of humans, such as the tonsil, appendix, terminal vertebrae (tail bone), 3rd eyelid, eyebrow, external ear, body hair, etc. are regarded as medically important but are not useless. Thus, the presence of vestigial organs does not support Darwin's theory/ the idea of evolution (Ahad, 2020; Ahad, 2023b).

9. The evidence of Contemporary Evidence of Darwin's Theory is Opposite to Organic Evolution

The recent arising of a new species is the contemporary evidence of Darwin's theory/ organic evolution (Dodson, 1960, Rastogi, 1994). But there is no evidence that a reproductively isolated species/breed/variety/race ever evolves either artificially or naturally (Ahad, 2011; Ahad, 2022; Ahad, 2023b), which opposes the modern evidence/ contemporary evidence of Darwin's theory/organic evolution.

10.The extinction of old forms is the almost predictable consequence of the production of new forms are not valid idea

Extinction is the death/disappearance of every member of a species or group of species and not exists anywhere on the earth. the extinction of old forms is the almost predictable consequence of the production of new forms (Darwin, 1859). 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 (Dodson,1960). Extinction fit into the evolutionary process by opening opportunities for the rapid diversification of new species and higher taxonomic groups (Wolfe, 1983). 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. However, conservation of biodiversity law is 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 (Ahad,2015; Ahad, 2024). So, this biodiversity law cannot be neglected. In addition, it has been pointed out that at present 24 to 100 species are losing per day due to human activities (Mader, 1997). Over the past three and a half centuries, nearly 200 animal species have become extinct in the United State alone and over 100 species of plants are becoming extinct

everyday day from the forests of South America, Africa and Asia (Kaskel,1992). Furthermore, almost every year for the past 40 years, at least one species of mammal has been become extinct (WBES, 1994a). But there is no evidence/literature that those very recently extinct animal species produce any new animal species or superior species during or after their extinction. Consequently, 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 all are extinct (Ahad,2015; Ahad, 2024).

In addition, all existing organism evolve from the previous organism but all the previous organism are extinct. A series of fragment fossils of 20 species of human's progenitor are found in fossils but all are extinct and each extinction of a species is succeeded by another unrelated new form progenitor/precursor of human, which is reasonably absurd; as how an extinct organism produced a new species, which absence in the present world? As a result, there is no evidence that an extinct species produced/ succeeded any new species, even a new breeds/variety/race during or thereafter extinction. So, 'Bio-diversity conservation law' is developed to protect the extinction of wild and domestic species. This law is practiced worldwide, which clearly indicated that no new species had evolved from the extinction of living organisms (Ahad, 2024a, Ahad, 2024b). It clearly opposes the Darwin's theory and the idea of organic evolution/ theories of evolution i.e. indirectly reject all the evidence, even all the theories of evolution.

11. Organism evolved millions of years ago but still unchanged though Evolution is a continuous process

Evolution is a continuous process, and at present, it is occurring rapidly (Birdsell, 1975). But according to geological time chart- fish arose 404 million years ago (during the Devonian periods), amphibians arose 355 million years ago (during the Mississippian periods), reptiles arose 310 million years ago (during Pennsylvanian periods), bird arose 181 million years ago (during the Jurassic periods), placental mammal arose 65 million years ago (during the Paleocene periods), ape (Chimpanzee, Gorilla) arose 25 million years ago (during the Miocene periods), Man arose 11 million years ago (during Pennsylvanian periods) (Wallace, 1990). But those organisms still existing their own respective and unmodified forms, though evolution is a continuous process, and at present, it is occurring rapidly, which not only oppose the idea of evolution and evolution of all other organisms but also oppose the descent of Man (human evolution) from a lower animal (Ahad, 2024a, Ahad, 2024b). Thus, the Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution is not valid, which indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory or the idea of organic evolution (i.e. theories of organic evolution) is not valid.

12. If organic evolution/ Darwin's theory is valid, then humans and other living organisms should be immortal

If the idea of organic evolution/ Darwin's theory is valid, then humans and other living organisms should be immortal. As, according to all religions, humans and other living organisms are created by the creator. Consequently, their "Souls" are taken by the creator, when He wishes. As a result, humans and other living organisms must have to die. If organic evolution/ Darwin's theory is valid, then nobody takes the "Souls" of humans and other living organisms, as their soul come

automatically, so nobody takes it. Consequently, humans and other living organisms would be immortal. But not so happen. Thus, the Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution is not valid, which indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory or the idea of organic evolution is not valid.

13. Darwin's theory (organic evolution) violates the laws of thermodynamics and thus Darwin's theory or organic evolution is not a valid idea

The most powerful and fundamental generalization that can be made about the universe is the laws of thermodynamics. These laws are fully appreciated and universally accepted by all the branches of sciences from material to spiritual world (Pitzer and Brewberk, 1961; Bernstein and Bernstein, 1982). Nonetheless, Darwin's theory and the other theories violates the laws of thermodynamics and the documents are placed in subheading in a) and b):

i) Violation of the first law of thermodynamics

The first law of thermodynamics stated that the total amount of energy in the universe remains constant. More energy cannot be created and the existing energy cannot be destroyed; but can only undergo conversion from one form to another one (Starr and Taggart, 1989; Wallace, 1990). However, all living organisms and nonliving things are some forms of energy (Ranganathan, 1988). Conversely, according to Darwin a one-celled organism has been transformed into about 10 million animals and about 2.5 million plants Species. So, a one-celled organism is transformed into infinitive amount of energy and such infinitive amount energy would produce in future also. This is an enormous violation of the first law of thermodynamics.

ii) Violation of the second law of thermodynamics

The essential feature of the second law is that every system left to itself change rapidly or slowly to definite final state (Pitzer and Brewber, 1961; Bernstein and Bernstein, 1982). But living worlds are constantly evolving without any goal or final state (Purves and Orians, 1987)." Again, the second law of thermodynamics is also known as the law of increasing entropy or disorganization (Pitzer and Brewber, 1961). Oppositely, life is very complex, very ordered, non-random and negative entropy, which apparently possesses a problem for Darwin's theory and the other 16 theories of organic evolution (Fitch and Upper, 1988).

Hence, Darwin's theory and the other 16 theories of organic evolution violates the laws of thermodynamics; whereas, the laws of thermodynamics are universally accepted by all the branches of sciences from material to spiritual world. But how a theory violates such type of a universally accepted law? Thus, the Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution is not valid, which indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory, even the idea of organic evolution is not valid idea.

14. Organic evolution violates the laws of "Teleology" and thus organic evolution is not a valid idea

Darwin's theory and the other 16 theories of organic evolution violates the laws of "Teleology" and the evidences are:

Teleology (*Telos* means direction, purpose or goal) is a form of reasoning that finds a goal and a design in nature (Laetsch, 1979). Teleology as well as all known natural processes, living or otherwise a starting condition directed toward a given terminal condition; because the starting object has built into a supernatural fore-knowledge of what the end condition is to be. For example, developing eggs behave as if they knew what the adult is to be. A chicken embryo soon produces two wings, as if it knew that these appendages are to be part of an adult. Clearly, this and all other forms of teleology explain an end state by simply declaring it is given at the beginning and thus in putting the future into the past, effect before the cause, teleology works against times (Weisz, 1968).

Oppositely, according to Darwin's theory and the other 16 theories the living world is constantly evolving without any future goals or prediction (Purves and Orians, 1987). As a result, the word teleology has left a bitter taste in the mouths of evolutionary scientists. Perhaps the most difficult issue of organic evolution is the problem of teleology (Christian, 1977). Therefore, the followers of Darwin were far from having done away with teleology (Ho and Fox, 1988).

Hence, the Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution is not valid, which indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory or organic evolution is not a valid idea.

15. Mendel's law opposes which indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory

Mendel's law only explains how genotypic and phenotypic characteristics pass from parents to offspring generation to generation as unmodified forms and express a different ratio (Smith, 1990). As a result, if a red-flowered plant is crossed with a white-flowered one, all the F₁ plants become red-flowered but both of these characters (red and white flowers) reappear in the F₂ generation. In all successive generations, only these two colors appear (Sinha and Sinha, 1997). Hence, Mendel's Laws (Mendelian genetics) opposes any kinds of evolution i.e. opposes 16 theories of organic evolution. It clearly opposes the Darwin's theory and the idea of organic evolution/ theories of evolution i.e. indirectly reject all the evidences of evolution.

16. Hardy-Weinberg's law indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory

Hardy-Weinberg's equilibrium stated that the gene frequencies remain constant for generation after generation unless it is not disturbed by the agent of population genetics (recurring mutations, natural selection, migration, non-random mating, or genetic drift) (Hickman et al., 2008; Johnson, 2000). But it is repeatedly proved that those agents are unfit to change the genotypic and phenotypic features of an organism (Ahad, 2023a) and thus those factors are unfit to disturb Hardy-Weinberg's equilibrium. So, Hardy-Weinberg's law is universal, as any agent cannot disturb its equilibrium. As a result, Hardy (1908) acknowledges, "I have, of course, considered only the very simplest hypotheses possible. Hypotheses other than [*sic*] that of purely random mating will give different results, and, of course, if, as appears to be the case sometimes, the character is not independent of that of sex, or has an influence on fertility, the whole question may be greatly

complicated. But such complications seem to be irrelevant to the simple issue raised by Mr. Yule's remarks." So, it is documented that Hardy-Weinberg's law opposes any kind of evolution.

Thus, Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution is not valid, which indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory or organic evolution is not valid.

17. Population genetics indirectly reject all the evidence

Population genetics (evolutionary genetics) is the study of natural selection, genetic drift, mutation, gene flow, and recombination, which change an organism's genotypic and phenotypic frequencies (Bernstein and Bernstein, 1982; Johnson, 2000).

But it was proved natural selection, genetic drift; mutation, gene flow, and recombination are opposite to any kind of evolution (Ahad, 2023). Thus, population genetics is opposite to any kind of evolution. As a result, it is declared that "Of course, population genetics is a fruitful subject but it is quite apart from its relation to the study of evolution. Since evolution is a change in the genetic composition of a population, the mechanisms of evolution constitute a problem of population genetics (Saunders, 1988)." Therefore, population genetics (evolutionary genetics) opposes all the theories of organic evolution. Thus, the Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution is not valid, which indirectly demanded that claimed eight evidences of Darwin's theory or organic evolution is not valid.

18. Both random and non-random mating is a great problem of evolution of new species which indirectly reject the eight evidences of Darwin's theory

If a new type/race/variety of plant/animal evolves by the agents of theories but this new type returns to the original type/parental type by random mating (its best example is albino baby returns to normal man). Hence, it is drawing attention that hornless cattle, pacing horses, double-toed cats, mule-footed swine, albino rats, and other new and distinct type have appeared through spontaneously by the other agents of theories of evolution (Sinnott et al., 1998) but those organisms not yet developed a single race/variety; because, by non-random mating those become homozygous organisms and extinct over time (its best example is Ancon breed of sheep and American heath hen). Consequently, Wallace (Co-author of natural selection) drew concentration that quickly fattening pigs, short-legged sheep (Ancon sheep), pouter pigeons, and poodle dogs could never have come into existence in a state of nature (Wallace, 1886). So, both random and non-random mating is a problem of the evolution of new species through any theories of evolution (Ahad, 2023), which indirectly demanded that eight evidences of Darwin's theory or organic evolution is not valid.

20. Conclusions

The study indicated that evidences of Darwin's theory and the other theories of organic evolution are the fossil evidence, artificial selection, taxonomical evidence, embryological evidence, geographical distribution, vestigial organs, biochemical and molecular similarities, and contemporary evidence are not valid /i.e. those evidences do not support the idea of evolution, which indirectly reject all theories of evolution (i.e. rejects Darwin's Theory, Neo-Darwinism, Sociobiology theory, Neutral Theory, Nearly Neutral Theory, Punctuated equilibrium theory and the

other theories of organic evolution). However, this article provides concise information both in favour (introduction) and dis favour (abstracts of various published articles) about the eight evidences of Darwin's theory. So, this article would be very helpful to the researchers and the students of biologists, ecologists, anthropologists, geologists, paleontologists, sociologists, psychologists, archaeologists, and those who think about evolution and those who believe in God or not. Thus a article is needed whether theories (16 (sixteen) theories of organic evolution, namely: Lamarck's theory. Darwin's theory of natural selection, Darwin's theory of Sexual selection, Haeckel's Recapitulation theory, Mutation theory, Neo-Darwinism/Synthetic theory, Sociobiology theory. Neutral Theory, Nearly Neutral Theory, Punctuated equilibrium theory, shifting balance theory, Allopatric speciation theory, Species selection theory, Goldschmidt's theory, Chromosomal speciation theory, and Oparin's theory of Origin of Life of organic evolution is valid or not.

21. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to Professor M. A. Baqui (Dept. of Zoology, Jahangir Nagar University, Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh) and late professor TMT Iqbal (Dept. of Horticulture, HSTU, Dinajpur, Bangladesh) for critical reading and suggestion for the preparation of manuscript. The author is obliged for the great help of the Research Gate (RG), Acamedia.edu, Google, and Google Scholar for the data used in this article. The author is also very thankful to the writers and the publishers that mentioned in the reference section for using their valuable information in this article.

22. REFERENCES

- [1] Ahad, M.A. & Ferdous, A.S.M.A, (2016). Invalid Oparin-Haldane's theory (soup theory) of Origin of Life and useless of Miller experiments. *Martinia*, 7 (1),1-19.
- [2] Ahad, M.A. 2011. Molecular Evolution of New Species without Modern Synthetic Theory (neo-Darwinism). *International Journal of Bio-Resource and Stress Management*, 2 (2)131-136.
- [3] Ahad, M.A. 2015a. Artificial selection/hybridization (the main force of evolution) opposite to Darwin's theory. *Martinia*, 6 (2), 53-67.
- [4] Ahad, M.A. 2017. Punctuated equilibrium theory represents shifting balance theory (of macro and quantum evolution) and invalid Darwin's theory. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 5 (3),06-12. doi:<https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2017.v5.i3a.1778>.
- [5] Ahad, M.A. 2018a. Darwinian classification of plant and animal (taxonomical evidences) opposite to Darwin's theory. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 6(1), 111-115. doi:<https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2018.v6.i1b.2942>.
- [6] Ahad, M.A. 2018b, Embryological evidence opposite to Darwin's theory: Biogenetic law (Recapitulation theory) and Haeckel's evolutionary tree is valid or not. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 6(5): 2492-2499. doi:<https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2018.v6.i5ac.4434>.
- [7] Ahad, M.A. 2019a. Living organisms (even human) evolve to match with the climate or not and geographical distribution (biogeography) opposite to Darwin's theory or not. *International Journal Botany Studies*, 4 (2); 28-34.
- [8] Ahad, M.A. 2022a. Darwin's theory (current version), human evolution (Physical anthropology) and population genetics are opposite to Hardy-Weinberg's Law and Mendel's Laws. *Journal of*

- Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 10 (3), 40-54. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2022.v10.i3a.9010>.
- [9] Ahad, M.A. 2022b. Evolution without Wilson's Sociobiology: Is Sociobiology a special branch of Entomology that deals with social insects? *International Journal of Entomology Research*, 7 (12), 161-173.
- [10] Ahad, M.A. 2023a. The Neutral Theory (Theory of Genetic Drift) and the Nearly Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution are Opposite to Evolution. *International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management* 14 (7), 1016-1027. doi: [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.23910/1.2023.3455a](https://doi.org/10.23910/1.2023.3455a).
- [11] Ahad, M.A. 2023b. The Practical Model and Evidence of Organic Evolution Opposite to Darwin's Theory of Natural Selection and Sexual Selection (Human Evolution). *International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management* 14(4):512-522. doi: [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.23910/1.2023.3360a](https://doi.org/10.23910/1.2023.3360a).
- [12] Ahad, M.A. 2023c. The evidence of biochemical and molecular similarities, modern (contemporary) evidence, and vestigial organs are opposite to Darwin's theory. *International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management*, 6(6), 1-13. doi: [10.51386/25815946/ijms-v6i6p101](https://doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijms-v6i6p101).
- [13] Ahad, M.A. 2024. Challenging Darwin's theory of sexual selection and the Descent of Man from the lower animal like a chimpanzee. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 12(3), 142-153. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2024.v12.i3b.9327>.
- [14] Ahad, M.A., 2015. The direct evidences (paleontology/ fossils) of evolution opposite to Darwin's theory and even opposite to human evolution (descent of man) from the lower animal like chimpanzee. *American Journal of Life Science Research*, 3(1):56-76.
- [15] Ahad, M.A., 2020. The survival of the fittest is not valid: Darwin's theory of natural selection, the origin of species and the descent of man opposite to evolution. *International Journal of Entomology Research*. 5(3), 57-64.
- [16] Ahad, M.A., 2020b. Seven non-Darwinian theories opposite to evolution. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 8(5): 1212-1220. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2020.v8.i5q.7677>
- [17] Ahad, M.A., 2022. Darwin's theory (current version), human evolution (Physical anthropology) and population genetics are opposite to Hardy-Weinberg's Law and Mendel's Laws. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 10 (3), 40-54. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2022.v10.i3a.9010>.
- [18] Ahad, M.A., 2024. The fossils evidence, arising of bird from the dinosaurs, radiocarbon method, and the descent of man opposite Darwin's theory. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies*, 12(5), 85-108. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22271/j.ento.2024.v12.i5b.9384>.
- [19] Ahad, M.A., Ferdous, A.S.M.A. 2015. Impossible of macroevolution of new species via changing of chromosome number mutation and structural mutation (Invalid chromosomal speciation Theory): Darwin's Theory and Neo-Darwinian Theory Oppose it. *Martinia* 6(2), 68-74.

- [20] Ahad, M.A.,2019. Punctuated equilibrium theory, shifting balance theory, allopatric speciation theory and species selection theory for macroevolution valid or not. *International Journal Botany Studies* 4(3),92-99.
- [21] Bernstein, R, and S. Bernstein. 1996. *Biology*. Wm. C. Brown Publishers, England.
- [22] Birdsall, J.B.,1975. *Human Evolution: An Introduction to the New Physical Anthropology*, 2ndedn. Rand Mc. Naly College Publishing Co., Chicago.
- [23] Breed, D., Moore, J., 2015. *Animal behavior* (2nd Edn.). Elsevier[<https://educate.elsevier.com/book/details/9780128015322>].
- [24] Case, J.F.,1979. *Biology*, 2ndedn. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., New York and Collier Macmillan Publishers, London.
- [25] Christian, J.L., 1977. *Philosophy, an Introduction to the Art of Wandering*, 2ndedn. Halt, Rinchart and Wiston.
- [26] Cockrum EL, WJ McCauley. *Zoology*, Saunders, Student ed. W.B. Saunders Co., London; 1965.
- [27] Conner, J. K., 2016. Artificial Selection in Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Biology. Elsevier Available at<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/artificial-selection>] Accessed on 18.09.22.
- [28] Curtis H., 1979. *Biology*, 3rd edn. Wardsworth Publishing Co., Inc New York.
- [29] Darlington, P. J., 1957. *Zoogeography: The Geographical Distribution of Animals*. John Wiley, New York.
- [30] Darwin, C., 1859. *On The Origin of Species*. Oxford University Press, London.
- [31] Darwin, C., 1871. *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. John Murray, London.
- [32] Das, D.N. Gnanasekaran, S., 2021. Genomic selection in Animal breeding. ScienceDirect,141-163 Available at<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/artificial-selection>] Accessed on 18.09.22.
- [33] Dodson, E.O.,1960. *Evolution: Process and Product*, (East-West Edn.). Affiliated East West Press Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- [34] Dutta, A.C., 2012. *Botany: For degree students*, 6thedn. (31st impression). Oxford University Press, India.
- [35] Etterson, J.R. Shaw, R.G., 2013. Evolution in Response to Climate Change in Encyclopedia of Biodiversity (Second Edition). Elsevier Available at<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/artificial-selection>] Accessed on 18.09.22.
- [36] Fitch, W.M., and Upper, K., 1988. The Evolution of life- an overview of general problems and a specific study of the origin of the genetic code. In M.W.
- [37] Ghiselin MT. The assimilation of Darwinism in developmental psychology. *Human Dev.* 1986; 29:1-35.
- [38] Grigg R., 1996. Ernst Haeckel: Evangelist for evolution and apostle of deceit. *Creation.* 18(2):33-36.
- [39] Hawkes , 1967. designated as Haeckel "An Embryonic Liar 13".
- [40] Hickman CP. *Integrated Principles of Zoology*, 4thedn. The C.V. Mosby Co., Saint Lois; 1970.

- [41] Ho, Mae-Wane, Fox, S.W., 1988. On not holding nature still: Evolution by process, not by consequence. In: Mae-Wane Ho, SW. Fox. (eds.). *Evolution process and Metaphores*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 117-144.
- [42] Kaskel, A., Hummer, P. J. Jr, & Daniel, P. J., 1992. *Biology, On Everyday Experience*. New York: Glencoe, division of McGraw-Hill publishing Co.
- [43] Kawecki, T.J. Lenski, R.E., Ebert, D., Hollis, B., Olivieri, I, Michael C Whitlock. 2012. Experimental evolution. *Trends of Ecology and Evolution* 27(10):547-60.
- [44] Khanna, S.S. *Genetics and Evolution*, 4thedn. Central Book Depot, Allahabad, India.
- [45] Kimball JW. *Biology*, 3rd edn. Ameind Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New York, 1974.
- [46] King, M.C., Wilson, A.C., 1975. Evolution at two levels in humans and chimpanzees. *Science* 188(4184):107-16.
- [47] Krishnaswamy, S., 1971. *Biology, an Inquiry into Life*. Vol.1. Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Co., New Delhi.
- [48] Laetsch, W. M., 1979. *Plants: Basic Concepts in Botany*. Little Brown and Co., Boston, Toronto, 524.
- [49] Lawrence, G.H.M., 1967. *Taxonomy of Vascular Plants*. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. PVT. LTD. New Delhi.
- [50] Lawrence, G.H.M., 1967. *Taxonomy of Vascular Plants*. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co. PVT. LTD. New Delhi.
- [51] Mader, S., 1997. *Inquiry into Life*. England: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- [52] Mader, S. S. 2000. *Human Biology*, 6thed. McGraw-Hill Higher Education, New York.
- [53] Mader, S.S., 2003. *Biology* 3rdedn. McGraw-Hill Higher Education, New York.
- [54] Mayr, R., 1976. *Evolution and the Diversity of Life: Selected Essays*. Belknap, Cambridge, Mass, 10.
- [55] Mi J, Li G, Xu C, et al., 2020. Artificial Selection in Domestication and Breeding Prevents Speciation in Rice. *Molecular Plant* 13(4), 650-657.
- [56] Naylor, B.G. 1982. Vestigial organs are evidence of evolution. *Evolutionary Theory* 6: 91-96.
- [57] Noda, H., 1984. Ontogeny and phylogeny in the evolutionary biochemistry space. *Origins Life Evolution Biosphere* 14, 681-684.
- [58] Pennisi, E., 1997. Haeckel's Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered. *Science*. 277(5331):1435-45
- [59] Pitzer, K. S. and Brewer, L., 1961. *Thermodynamics*, 2nd edn. McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., New York.
- [60] Purves, W. K., Orians, G. H., 1987. *The Science of Biology* (2ndEdn.). Sinauer Associates Inc. Publishers, Sunderland, Massachusetts, 1270.
- [61] Rastogi, V.B. *Organic Evolution*. Kedernath Ramnath, India, 1994.
- [62] Ritchie, D.D., Carola, R.G., 1983. *Biology*. Addison-Wiley Publishing Co., Inc., California.
- [63] Scagel, R.F., Badoni, R.J., Maze, J.R., Rouse, G.E., Schofield, W.B, Stein, J.R., 1984 *Plants: An Evolutionary survey*. Wadsworth Publishing Co., California.
- [64] Shukla, R.S., Chandel, PS., 1989. *Cytogenetics, Evolution and Plant Breeding*. S. Chand and Co. Ltd, New Delhi, 1988.

- [65] Simpson, G.G., 1980. *Why and How: Some Problems and Methods in Historical Biology*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- [66] Starr, C., Taggart, R., 1989. *Biology: the Unity and Diversity of Life (5thEdn.)*. Wards worth Publishing Co. Belmont, California, 29,189.
- [67] Thompson, W.R., 1956. *The Origin of Species*, Introduction by Thompson, W. R. E.P. Dutton and Company, New York.
- [68] Ville, C.A., Walker, W.F., Smith, F.E., 1968. *General Zoology*. W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia.
- [69] Wald, G., 1963. Phylogeny and ontogeny at the molecular level. In: A.I. Oparin, edn. *Evolutionary Biochemistry*. Macmillan, New York.
- [70] Wallace, R.A., 1990. *Biology, the World of Life*, 5thedn. Harper Collins Publishers Inc., New York.
- [71] WBES. 1994a. *The World Book Encyclopedia of Science (Animal Kingdom)*. London: World Book, Inc.
- [72] Weier, T.E., Stocking, C.R., Barbour, M.G., Rost, T.L., 1982. *Botany: Introduction to plant biology*, 6th edn. John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York.
- [73] Weisz, P.B., 1968. *Elements of Zoology*. McGraw Hill Book Co., New York.
- [74] Wolfe, S. L., 1963. *Biology, the Foundations*. 2nd edition. Belmont, California: Wards worth Publishing Co.