

Natural Comparisons: Dead Ringer

In this program Animal Planet devoted space to exceedingly deceptive statements frequently employed among evolutionists in popular accounts. These accounts lacking any scientific value can be regarded as being no more than fairy tales.

In this program Animal Planet devoted space to exceedingly deceptive statements frequently employed among evolutionists in popular accounts. These accounts lacking any scientific value can be regarded as being no more than fairy tales.

The following statement was used in the context of dolphins, which, according to the theory of evolution, evolved from land-dwelling mammals:

'The ancestor of the dolphin declined to live on land some 60 million years ago.'

Animal Planet here refers to the evolution of dolphins as if it were an undisputed fact. The fact is, however, that there is no scientific evidence to back that assumption up. In addition, the assumption that sea mammals such as the dolphin and the whale moved to the sea from the land faces considerable obstacles. There is no mechanism to account for such enormous changes as these creatures losing their legs and acquiring fins, the way their noses moved up over their heads, their acquisition of a skin structure to prevent them freezing in the oceans and the hydrodynamic development of their bodies. Animal Planet adopts these Darwinist assumptions, based solely upon imagination, because of its own preconceptions, and puts them forward as established facts.

This, of course, is not the kind of approach one should find in an objective, scientific channel. This blind support rests on a most inconsistent logic. For instance, Animal Planet portrays the way that dolphins surface every six minutes as evidence for the claim that they evolved from land-dwelling mammals. The way this behaviour is described as a transitional trait is solely due to preconceptions. Animal Planet rejects the idea that dolphins could have been created right from the outset, and engages in a logic which is blindly devoted to Darwinism. If Animal Planet were free itself of its preconceptions and look at the design in dolphins objectively it would see that their origin lies in creation.

Animal Planet, which claims that dolphins abandoned life on land, adopts the same approach with regard to the origins of the bat:

"Bats abandoned life on the ground and turned into aerial acrobats."

This claim is a complete fantasy, because there is not one scientific finding to show how wings could have emerged through evolution. Wings serve no purpose unless all their structures are in being. This means they cannot be accounted for by gradual evolution. A half-wing will provide no advantage for an animal, and will actually restrict its movements and make it harder for it to find food and protect itself from predators. That being the case, according to the logic of the theory of evolution this half-wing which is of no use to the organism should become vestigial and disappear. This means that the wing is a structure which cannot be accounted for by evolution, and the condition that all its components have to be together and fully formed shows that it is created, in its entirety, by God.

Furthermore, the oldest known bats emerge all of a sudden in the fossil record. Their anatomies are no different to those of present-day bats. This palaeontological fact shows that bats came into being by creation, not by evolution. (See *Darwinism Refuted*, Goodword Books, 2003 by Harun Yahya.)

Animal Planet's evolutionist ravings continue in the sections that follow, and fairy tales regarding how such complex structures as the vertebrate eye or the sonar systems in the bat and the dolphin emerged by means of evolution are put forward:

"Vertebrates began developing the pupil in order to make their vision sharper 35 million years ago ... Night-hunting mammals needed to develop powerful eyes possessing large lenses. Their eyes are so large they roll with difficulty. That is why owls developed the ability to rotate their heads 270 degrees."

As we have seen, Animal Planet carries evolutionist claims regarding the complex structures in living things, but offers no scientific evidence to back them up. Telling fairy tales, too provides no support for evolution, since there is nothing that cannot be adapted to the fairy tale format. For example, if Animal Planet were to be asked 'Why do birds have wings?' its reply would be, 'Because they wanted to fly.'

Similarly, asked "Why do elephants have trunks?" it would respond "In order to feed from the ground." Yes, that is the function of the elephant's trunk, but it does not explain the origin of the organ.

It is clear that evolution accounts for none of these things. Animal Planet is actually exhibiting an unscientific attitude by airing such tales, which are frequently criticized even by evolutionists themselves.

<https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/natural-comparisons-dead-ringer>