



Living organisms (even human) evolve to match with the climate or not and geographical distribution (biogeography) opposite to Darwin's theory or not

Md. Abdul Ahad

Department of Entomology, Faculty of Agriculture Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur, Bangladesh

Abstract

Darwin and his followers' belief is that plants and animals are dispersed away from their places of origins and then became subsequently modified to match with the environment. Therefore, climate plays the key role both for the evolution of organisms (even human) and their geographical distribution. However, living organisms are beautifully adapted with the climate. Furthermore, they migrate to a safe place with the changing climate; if it is not possible, they simply extinct. Cosmopolitan animals, and also places having the same climate do not possess the same type of fauna, which opposes the effect of climate on the evolution. If climate has an effect on the evolution, then only six animals and plant species could be found according to the six climatic zones. Additionally, seven theories of evolution are formulated without the effects of environment on the evolution. Again, evolution is a continuous process but there is no record that living organism has evolved by the effects of the environment. Therefore, living organisms (even human) 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. Gaia theory and Croizat's views oppose the Darwin's vision about evolution and his biogeography.

Keywords: climate, zoogeography, Darwin's theory, seven new theories

1. Introduction

The theory of evolution is central theme of biology and all theories of evolution (Alters, 1996) [3]. According to Darwin evolution progressed in this way → unicellular organism → invertebrate → lung fish → amphibian → reptile → placental mammal → higher mammal → human (Darwin, 1871) [1, 14]. Darwin uses the term "Climate" about 100 times in the Origin of Species (Darwin, 1859) [2], to indicate how a new species evolve by the effect of climate/environments. For example: all organisms have descended from one parent and some have migrated from their places of birth; and when we better know the many means of migration, then, by the light which geology now throws, and will continue to throw, on former changes of climate (Darwin, 1872, Origin of Species, p.481) [25]. In addition, the environment is totally responsible for shaping-up, pictured and driving force of evolution and organisms are rendered passive objects shaped by those autonomous environmental forces (Gerking, 1974; Brooks *et al.*, 1984 and Sober, 1985, Ho, 1987 and Gray, 1988, p.214) [47, 58, 66, 67, 68]. The Oxford research claimed that changing climatic conditions have the direct influences for the adaptive evolution (Merilä and Hoffmann, 2016) [4]. Furthermore, living organisms evolve to match with the environment and thus natural selection is the mechanism to match with the environment for their evolution (Bernstein and Bernstein, 1982, p.139). So, climate is the sole agent for the evolution of living organisms.

Darwin also acknowledged that the climate is also responsible for the geographical distribution of all living organisms such as: i. "Sir C. Lyell in a striking passage has speculated, in language almost identical with mine, on the effects of great alternations of climate on the geographical

distribution "Origin of Species" (Darwin, 1859 p.308). ii. "Looking to geographical distribution, if we admit that there has been much migration during the long course of ages from one part of the world to another one, owing to former climatically and geographical changes, is the most of the great leading facts in distribution (Darwin, 1872, Origin of Species, p.471)" [25]. Moreover, Darwin explained the geographical distribution of animals and plants on the assumption that plants and animals were dispersed away from their places of origins and then became subsequently modified to match with the environment, until a barrier appeared and thus the geographical distribution occurred (Darlington, 1957; Simpson, 1980; Mayr, 1976 and Ghiselin, 1986) [7, 8, 9, 10]. Climate is the central premise of biogeography that exerts a dominant control over the natural distributions of species (Peason and Dawson, 2003) [11]. Additionally, Darwin uses the term "Climate" about 32 times in the "Decent of Man" to indicate how man evolves by the effect of climate/environments and their distribution occurred. For example: It might have been expected that differences of climate would have had a marked influence, as the lungs and kidneys are brought into fuller activity under a low temperature, and the liver and skin under a high one. But this subject will be more properly discussed when we treat of the different races of mankind (Darwin, 1881, p116). Colour of the skin is the most conspicuous and one of the best marked. Differences of this kind, it was formerly thought, could be accounted for by long exposure under different climates; A very damp or a very dry atmosphere has been supposed to be more influential in modifying the colour of the skin than mere heat (Darwin, 1881, p242). It is a still more singular fact that in different nations, under different conditions and climates, in Naples, Prussia,

Westphalia, France and England (Darwin, 1881, p302). Again, the “National Research Council (US) Committee on the Earth system Context for Hominin Evolution” confirmed that the earth's geological record suggests that the evolution of human or dispersals from Africa to other continents due to substantial changes of climate in African and Eurasian (National Research Council, 2010). Those literatures indicated that both the evolution of living organisms (even human) and their geographical distributions 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. Hence, there is a great chance to work on the objective/title whether “Living organisms (even human) evolve to match with the climate or not and geographical distribution (Biogeography) opposite to Darwin's theory or not.”

Nevertheless, there are numerous criticisms on the effects of climate of evolution of organisms and their geographical distributions. For instance, the effects of climate on the evolutionary process are largely unknown (Gotanda, 2017) [12]. If all organism are come from the same ancestor and the environment controls the process of evolution; so, why are some living animals, some plants and some single celled organisms and others are humans (La Pointe, 1995)? Moreover, Croizat rejected Darwin's ideas. Alternatively, he suggested that the earth and the life evolve together and also proposed the “Panbiogeographic method” for the geographical distributions of organisms (Craw and page, 1988 and Gray, 1988) [15, 68] and it is the generally accepted views (Craw 1984). Besides, Gaia's theory (Lovelock, 1995) opposed Darwinian biogeography. So, it is essential to remove those contradictions for the benefit of the modern biological sciences.

Moreover, there are many works against Darwin's theory and also the evidences of Darwin's theory. For example: Darwin's theory is the mixture of Malthus's theory and Lyell's theory and Darwin used the wrong theory of Lamarck for the mechanism of evolution (Ahad, 2014) [16]. The fossil evidences are opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2015) [17, 18], artificial selection is opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2015) [17, 18], Darwinian classifications of plants and animals (taxonomical evidences) are opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2017) [60] and embryological evidences are opposite to Darwin's theory (Ahad, 2018) [20]. Additionally, Biogenetic law (Recapitulation theory) and Haeckel's evolutionary tree is valid or not (Ahad, 2018) [20]. But the reviews of literatures reveal that there is no such type work more especially on the title/ objective “Living organisms evolve (even human) to match with the climate or not and geographical distribution (Biogeography) opposite to Darwin's theory or not.” As science searches which is the truth? Therefore, there is no alternate way but to work on the title/objective. So, working on the above objective is very essential for the benefit of the biological sciences.

2. Plants and animals beautifully are adjusted with the changing environment but those did not evolve

Plants and animals are adjusted with the new environment but those did not evolve and its documents are placed here:

i. 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 (Ruberti, 2012) [21]. 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. Some vascular plants may die back to the ground and then re-grow during the most favorable season. Other loses their leaves during an unfavorable period and those re-grow again (Purves and Orians, 1987, p.1125) [22]. Similarly, other plants adjusted with their ecosystems various ways but not evolve to match in the changing environment. ii. Animals of various ecosystems also adapted themselves in various ways in their respective ecosystems. For example, marine and brackish animal inhibit the loss of water by osmosis through the body wall to prevent an accumulation of salts in the system. But invertebrates get around the problem by possessing body fluids with the same osmotic pressure as seawater (Smith, 1990, p.91) [23]. Similarly, other animals adjusted with their ecosystems in various ways but not evolve to match with the environment. As a result, two world renowned US biologists Sinnott and Wilson acknowledged that plants and animals are beautifully adjusted with their environment. As the environment is constantly changing in both soil and air; so, the existence of plants and animals in their own form/species in the changing environment is questionable about the “Living organisms evolve to match with the environment.” If living organisms were evolved to match with the environment, then those must have to react with the changing environment in an adaptive way. But there is no evident that a plant and an animal are changing in an adaptive way. Thus, the evolution through the Darwin's theory is questionable (Sinnott and Wilson, 1963, p.314) [24].

3. Living organisms do not evolve to match with the changing environment/climate; those migrate to a safe place and again return to their original home or take various mechanisms to adapt with

No new species evolve with the changing environment; as when living organisms are unable to tolerate the changing environment, those simply migrate to a safe place and again return to their original home or those take various mechanisms to adapt with the environment. There are numerous evidences but a few are mentioned here:

i. Migration of birds in winter due to environmental change/coming the winter is widespread (Purves and Orians, 1987) [22]. As a result, it is commonly observed that during the winter season, large number birds are compelled to come far from Siberia to Bangladesh due to environmental hazard/coldness (Ahad, 2006) [26]. Nearly 50,000 millions of land-birds migrate from Europe to Africa in each autumn to avoid the winter (Moreau, 1972) [27]; some birds migrate southward to avoid the winter making trips up to 6000 km each way in the USA (Wallace, 1990) [28]; even birds of the Arctic tern nests close to the North Pole in the summer and in the autumn, those fly 12600 km south all the way to Antarctica to avoid winter. But in each spring those return to the north again (Anonymous, 2018) [29]. ii. Many invertebrates pass unfavorable periods as eggs and pupae. Moreover, if the unfavorable period is cold, the invertebrates may simply crawl to a safe place (Purves and Orians, 1987, p.1125) [22]. iii. Annually earthworms make a vertical migration deeper into the soil to spend winter and move back to the upper soil in spring and summer (Smith,

1990, p.334) ^[23]. Similarly, other organisms take various mechanisms to adapt with their respective environment or migrate to the safest place and again return to their original home.

Therefore, it is evident that with the changing environment, living organisms migrate to the safest place and again return to their home or take various mechanisms to avoid unfavorable climate.

In supporting: i. as the temperature becomes cooler, the mammoths became woolly. Is it then reasonable to predict that elephants would get woolly, if the climate became colder in Africa today too? But the answer is quite negative for several reasons; because the elephants might adapt to colder weather in different ways: (a) those could migrate. (b) those might not be able to adapt at all, and could simply be extinct; (c) if the climatic changes are not exceptionally severe, those phenomenon would not happen at all (Bethell, 1976 and Tamarin, 2002, p.590) ^[30, 31]. ii. At the Chicago conference (1980) on the “Wister Destroys Evolution”, it is declared that Darwinian gradual evolution is the change within a species, it is an adaptation and but not adaptive evolution. Small changes from generation to generation within a species could never produce a new species (WDE, 1980, p.4) ^[32].

4. If it is impossible for animals to migrate due to the changing environment, then those simply extinct but do not evolve

If it is impossible for animals to migrate due to the changing environment, then those simply extinct and its evidence is that due to climate change (Global Warming), a species is threatened to extinction and is documented here very briefly.

The earliest global studies estimated that by 2050 due to climate change 15-37% of species are committed to extinction under intermediate climate warming (Thomas *et al.*, 2004) ^[39]. By the study of the vulnerability of 25 major biodiversity hotspots, it is found that the extinctions of endemic species could reach 39-43% loss of 56,000 endemic plant species and 3,700 endemic vertebrate species (Malcolm *et al.*, 2006). The local losses of plant diversity in Europe ranged from 2-84% of species lost per pixel (Thuiller *et al.*, 2005). Consequently, the IUCN forecasted that about 35% of the world's birds, 52% of amphibians and 71% of the warm-water reef-building corals are particularly susceptible to climate change on the coral reefs (Foden *et al.*, 2008). As a result, by the investigation of the 136 topics on the effects of climate change, it is predicted that the major extinctions of species would be in the next 100 years (Cahill *et al.*, 2013) ^[41]. So, the future of biodiversity is alarming leading to extinction rates, which would qualify as the sixth mass extinction in the history of the earth (Bellard *et al.*, 2012) ^[40].

Thus, it is proved that if it is impossible for animals to migrate due to the changing environment, then those simply extinct but do not evolve. So, it is trying with heart and soul to manage the “Global Warming” by the “Earth summit”, the “World summit” and other related efforts.

5. Cosmopolitan animals and plants oppose the effects of environment on the evolution

Cosmopolitan fauna and flora strongly oppose the effects of environment on the evolution of new species; because, if living organisms evolve to match with the environment,

then all the cosmopolitan organisms should evolve to other organisms to match with their respective environment (at which climate those live) and thus no cosmopolitan organism would be found. But There are numerous cosmopolitan (those are found at every climate and in every region of the world) animals such as : “i. Cosmopolitan mammals: Cow, horse, pig, chicken, dog, cat, killer whale, the house mouse, brown rat, the common domesticated mammals etc. ii. Cosmopolitan birds: Peregrine, falcon, osprey, barn owl, gull-billed tern, cattle egret, great egret, house sparrow, rock pigeon etc. iii. Cosmopolitan arthropods: Housefly, fruit fly, Green Stink bug, woodlouse spider. iv. Cosmopolitan plant: Daisy, creeping wood sorrel, shepherd's-purse etc. (Wikipedia, 2018a) ^[45].”

6. Places with the similar climates do not possess the same kind of fauna, which oppose the idea of Darwin about the effects of environment on the evolution

Places with the similar climatic conditions do not possess the same types of fauna, which affirmed that environment has no effect on the evolution of new species. A few references are placed at this point:

The climatic conditions in Africa, India and Brazil are identical but elephants are found in Africa and also in India but not in Brazil (Jordan and Verma, 1990, p.1019 and Grove and Newell, 1994, p.817) ^[43, 44]. If living organisms evolve to match with the environment, then elephants could also be found in Brazil. Again, “The Great Britain and New Zealand have the same climate but their fauna are dissimilar. Furthermore, the climatic conditions of the North and the South poles are almost identical, yet penguins are limited to the South Pole, while polar bears are found only in the North Pole. Moreover, the Great Britain and New Zealand have the same climate but their fauna are dissimilar (Jordan and Verma, 1990, p.1019 and Grove and Newell, 1994, p.817) ^[43, 44]. If the climate effects on the evolution, then the Great Britain and New Zealand should have the same kinds of fauna. Moreover, the penguins and the polar bears should also be found at both the Poles.

Thus, places with similar climates do not possess the same kinds of fauna which indicates that the environment has no effect on the evolution.

7. If Living organisms evolve to match with the changing environment/climate, then only six plant and six animal species would be found according to the six climatic zones of the world

If living organisms evolve to match with the changing environment/climate, then only six plant and six animal species would be found according to the six climatic zones of the world. It could be mentioned that there are six climatic zones in the world, viz. i) Polar (very cold and dry all year), ii) Temperate (cold winter and mild summer), iii) Arid (dry, hot all year), iv) Tropical (hot and wet year round), v) Mediterranean (mild winter, dry hot summer), and vi) Mountains or Tundra (very cold year round) (Wikipedia, 2018) ^[42].

8. Evolution is a continuous process but there is no example that a species evolves from another species to match with the environment

Evolution occurs by the effects of environment. However, though evolution is a continuous process and at present it is occurring rapidly (WBE, 1992, p.406) ^[46]; but there is no

example that a species evolves from another species to match with the environment. Darwin was unable to show that a species changes to another one to matching with the new environment (Cockrum and McCauley, 1965 and Morris, 2017) [48, 49]. However, it is claimed that the white moth (*Biston betularia*) (Fig.1b) has been evolved to the black moth (*B. carbonaria*) (Fig.1a) to match with the environment in the industrial area in England. It is the best and a dramatic example (Kettlewell, 1959) [50].



Fig 1: (a) Black moth could not see easily in black bark, but (1. b) white moth could seen easily



Fig 2: Black moth and white moth interbreeds

Oppositely, the white moth (*Biston betularia*) was evolved to the black moth (*B. carbonaria*). It is a fluctuation in the abundances of the white moths and the black moths due to predation by the birds. To support it, a few arguments are placed here:

1. In England, before the “Industrial revolution”, trees were often covered with the white lichens. As a result, the white moths could hide themselves easily and were hardly detected on the bark of trees. But the black moths could not hide themselves and those were easily detected by the predatory birds. So, the birds had eaten the black moth voraciously. But during the worst years of the “Industrial Revolution”, the air was very sooty and the bark of the tree was black, because of soot. Hence, the dark moths are hardly identified; whereas, the white moths are easily observed by the predatory birds. Therefore, bird ate the white moths voraciously. Thus, the black moths became more abundant than the white moths (Purves and Orians, 1987, p.1033) [22]. So, the white moths were not modified to black moths. Rather that was the fluctuation of abundances of white moths and black moths due to predation by the birds.
2. When industrial melanism began to reverse due to enactment of the “Clean Air Legislation” in 1956, the frequency of black moth was dropped from a high level of 94% in 1960 to a low one of 19% only in 1995 (Johnson, 2003, p.269, 275). Again, the white moths are still common in the unpolluted areas in the Western and

the Northern Great Britain (Smith, 1990, p.300) [23]. Therefore, the entire populations of white moths were not modified into black moths. As, the “Modern concept of evolution is that an individual does not evolve; rather the entire population of a particular species evolves (Ritchie and Carola, 1983,p.505) [52]”; so the white moths were never evolved into black moths.

3. A species very rarely interbreed with the other species, but never produces fertile offspring. Whereas, Macken (1976 p.205) declared that the black moths interbreed (Fig.2) with the white moths and produce fertile offspring, which proved that the black moths and the white moths belong to the same species i.e. white moths were not evolved into black moths.

Therefore, though evolution is a continuous process but there is no example that a species evolves from another species to match with the environment.

9. Strong document about the no effect of environment on the evolution is that seven theories of evolution are formulated without the effects of environment on the evolution

When Mendel’s scientific work was rediscovered in 1900, it was viewed as an antagonistic concept to Darwin’s theory. Consequently, during the early part of the 19th century, the popularity of Darwin’s theory continued to decline and it was an antagonistic period of evolution (Dodson, 1960; Hickman, 1984) [54, 55]. Furthermore, history suggests that Darwinian paradigm will in turn be modified or even replaced by other, but the form will be new and when it will emerge is unknown to us (Parves and Orians, 1987, p.19). So, many biologists called for search a theory for new biology. For example, Mae-Wan Ho has called for search of a theory for new biology (Ho, 1987, 1988 and Craw and page, 1988, p.184) [67, 57, 15]. As a result, 7 theories of evolution are formulated without the effects of environment on the evolution. Those theories are based on the pure genetics and those theories are placed briefly:

9.1.) *Modern* synthetic theory emerged around the middle of the 20th century. This theory is based on the pure genetics (Gardner *et al.*, 1991 p.583) [56]; “This theory is on the based conceptual separation between the organism and its environment (Ho, 1988, pp. and 125) [67]”. Moreover, the sociobiology theory is based on the synthetic theory (Saunders, 1988, pp.1, and p.277) [59]. Therefore, it could be argued easily that sociobiology is also based on the theoretical separation between a organism and its environment.

9.2) Four theories of evolution are formulated without the effects of environment on the evolution. Those theories are: i) the punctuated equilibrium theory, ii) the shifting balance theory, iii) the allopatric speciation theory, and iv) the species selection theory. Those theories advocate that new species evolves in a small and isolated population by the effects of genetic drift (Ahad, 2017). Therefore, those four theories of evolution are formulated without the effects of environment on the evolution.

9.3) The “Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution” advocates that the rate of evolution is completely determined by the force of mutations. For this reason, this theory is sometimes called the non-Darwinian theory of evolution (Gardner *et al.*, 1991, p.586) [56].

Thus, the “Neutral theory” is based upon the pure genetics and avoids the effects of environments on evolution. Hence, it is proved that the seven theories of evolution are formulated without the effects of environment on the evolution.

10. The processes of evolution of organisms and their geographical distributions is based on the assumptions (beliefs) of Darwin but not experimental

The processes of evolution of organisms and their geographical distributions are based on the assumptions/beliefs of Darwin but not experimental. It's document is that “Darwin and his followers believed that living organisms were dispersed away from the places of their origins and successively evolved to match with the climate/environments, until a barrier appear and thus their geographical distributions occur (Darlington, 1957; Simpson, 1980; Mayr, 1976 and Ghiselin, 1986) [7, 8, 9, 10].” Additionally, it is authenticated that Darwin applied unscientific idea ‘I believe’ and similar theme 372 times in the “Origin of Species” and 264 times in the “Descent of Man” (Ahad, 2014,p.1) [16]” to explain how living organisms evolved and their geographical distributions occurred. However, “Believe is not science, as believe in God is not science (Ahad, 2014, p.1 and Ahad, 2018, p.112) [16, 20].”

11. Darwin was very doubtful about the geographical distribution of living organisms

Darwin was very doubtful about the processes of geographical distribution of living organisms. Because, Darwin's (1859) acknowledged: “Turning to geographical distribution, the difficulties encountered on the theory of descent with modification are grave enough (Origin of Species, p.373)”. [So,] “I think, explain all the facts in regard to insular productions. I shall no remarks confine myself to the mere question of dispersal, but shall consider some other facts, which bear on the truth of the two theories of independent creation and of descent with modifications (Origin of Species, p.315)”.

12. Many biologists directly reject Darwin's theory, which indirectly indicates that climate, has no effect on the evolution

Many biologists directly reject Darwin's theory, which indirectly indicates that climate has no effect on the evolution. For example: “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. The symbol of natural selection was derived from the dominant socioeconomic ideology of the Victorian era, now rejected by nearly all humanity. The mechanistic conception of life, which it inspires, is equally outmoded and inappropriate. Why should one still cling to this metaphor when it can serve no other purposes than to support those injustices, which gave it birth (Ho, 1988, p. 117) [57].” Similarly, Ruse (1981, p. 828) [61], Ho and Fox (1988, p.2) [57], Gould and Eldredge (1977, p.122) and Johnson (1991 p.84) [64], also directly reject the Darwin's theory. Their confirmations indicate that climate has no effects on the evolution.

13. Conclusions

It is proved in the introduction: “As the evolution of living organisms (even human) and their geographical distributions 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.” But It is proved in the entire article that living organisms not evolve to match with the climate; so, the “Geographical distribution is opposite to Darwin's theory.” Croizat's views and Gaia theory also opposes the Darwinian views, which is strongly support to the present conclusion. Again, Starr and Taggart (1989, p.22); Castro and Hubner (1997, p.16) and Weisz and Keogh (1982, p.15) confirmed that any theory and it its evidences might be overturned at any time by the findings of new evidences. Consequently, the conclusion “Living organisms (even human) evolve to match with the climate or not and geographical distribution (Biogeography) opposite to Darwin's theory,” is genuine.

14. Acknowledgements

The author is very thankful to Prof. Dr. Md. Abdullah Baqui (Dept. of Zoology, Jahangir Nagar University, Dhaka) and Prof. TMT Iqbal (Dept. of horticulture, Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science & Technology University, Bangladesh) for their suggestion for preparing the manuscript and English correction. The author is sincerely appreciative for the great help of the Google and “Research Ggate (R^G), “Academia.edu” and “Scribd” for the data used in this paper. The author is also grateful to the writers, and the publishers which are mentioned in the reference section for using their information in this article.

15. References

1. Darwin C. The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. John Murray, London, 1871.
2. Darwin C. On The Origin of Species. Oxford University Press, London, 1859.
3. Alters S. Biology, Understanding of Life (2nd Edn.). Mosby, St. Lois, 1996.
4. Merilä J, Hoffmann AA. Evolutionary Impacts of Climate Change, 2016. [Environmental science. oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/.../acrefore9780199389414 -e-136].
5. National Research Council. Understanding Climate's Influence on Human Evolution. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2010, [https://www.nap.edu/catalog/.../understanding-climates-influence-on-human-evolution].
6. Bernstein R, Bernstein S. Biology: The Study of Life. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., Philadelphia, 1982.
7. Darlington P.J. Zoogeography: The Geographical Distribution of Animals. John Wiley, New York, 1957.
8. Simpson GG. Why and How: Some Problems and Methods in Historical Biology. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980.
9. Mayr R. Evolution and the Diversity of Life: Selected Essays. Belknap, Cambridge, Mass, 1976.
10. Ghiselin MT. The assimilation of Darwinism in developmental psychology. Human Dev. 1986; 29:1-35.
11. Peason R, Dawson T. Predicting the effect of climate on the distribution of species: are bioclimate envelope models useful? Global Eco. and Biogeography. 2003; 12:361-371.
12. Gotanda K. Can climate change affect evolutionary processes? —Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, 2017.https://www.zoo.cam.ac.uk/news/precipitation].

13. Lapointe D. Top Evidence against the theory of evolution. Calvary Academy East Country Line Road Lakewood, New Jersey, 2016. [www.jesus-is-savior.com/Evolution%20Hoax/Evidences/4.htm]. Last visited 12.09.16.
14. Darwin C. The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. John Murray, London, 1871.
15. Craw R, Page R. Panbiogeography: method and metaphor in the new biogeography. In: Mae-Wan, Ho and Fox, S.W (eds). Evolution Process and Metaphores. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1988, 163-179.
16. Ahad MA. Darwin's theory is the mixture of Malthus's theory and Lyell's theory and Darwin use wrong Lamarck's theory as well as believe as a mechanism of evolution. Am.J. Life Sci. 2014; 2(3):128-137.
17. Ahad MA. Artificial selection/hybridization (the main force of evolution) opposite to Darwin's theory and also opposite to macroevolution through chromosomal aberration/ chromosomal number mutation. Martinia, 2015a; 6(2):53-67.
18. Ahad MA. 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. Am. J. L. Sci. Res. 2015; 3(1):56-76.
19. Ahad MA. Darwinian classification of plant and animal (taxonomical evidences) opposite to Darwin's theory J. Ent. Zool. Stud. 2017; 5(3):06-12.
20. Ahad MA. Embryological evidences are opposite to Darwin's theory: Biogenetic law (Recapitulation theory) and Haeckel's evolutionary tree is valid or not. J. Entom. and Zool. Studies. 2018; 6(5):2492-2499.
21. Ruberti I, Sessa G, Ciolfi A, Possenti M, Carabelli M, Morelli G. Plant adaptation to dynamically changing environment: the shade avoidance response. Biotechnol. Adv, 2012; 30(5):1047-58.
22. Purves WK, Orians GH. The Science of Biology, 2ndedn. Sinauer Associates Inc. Snderland, Massachusetts, 1987.
23. Smith RL. Ecology and Field Biology, 4th edn. Harper Collins Publishers, New York, 1990.
24. Sinnott WE, Wilson KS. Botany: Principle and Problems, 6thedn. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1963.
25. Darwin C. On line 'Origin of Species', 6thedn , 1872.(<http://www.literature.org/authors/.../the-origin-of-species-6th-edition/>)
26. Ahad MA. Criticisms of organic evolution and its evidences. PhD. Thesis, Department of Zoology, Jhangir Nagar University, Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 2006.
27. Moreau RE. The Palaortic-African Bird Migration System. Academic Press, New York, 1972.
28. Wallace RA. Biology: The World of Life, 5thedn. Harper Collins Publishers Inc., New York, 1990.
29. Anonymous. How do animal survive winter- Science Made Simple Inc, 2018. [www.science.madesimple.com/animals.html].
30. Bethell T. Harpar's Magazine, 1976, 70-75.
31. Tamarin R. Principles of Genetics, 7thedn. Wadsworth Publishing Co., Belmont, California, 2002.
32. WDE. Wister Destroys Evolution – Pathlights, 1980, [www.pathlights.com/ce_encyclopedia/Encyclopedia/20hist12.htm]. Last visited 05.04.2018.
33. Malcolm JR, Liu C Neils RP, Lara H. Global Warming and Extinctions of Endemic Species from Biodiversity Hotspots. Conserv. Biol. 2006; 20(2):538-48.
34. Foden W, Midgley GF, Hughes G, Bond WJ, Thuiller W, Hoffman MT, *et al.* A changing climate is eroding the geographical range of the Namib Desert tree aloe through population declines and dispersal lags. Diversy Distrib. 2007; 13:645-653.
35. Jetz W, Wilcove DS, Dobson AP. Projected impacts of climate and land-use change on the global diversity of birds. PLoS Biol. 2007; 5:1211-1219.
36. Darwin C. The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. John Murray, London, 1882.
37. Sekercioglu CH, Schneider SH, Fay JP, Loarie SR. Climate Change, Elevation Range Shifts, and Bird Extinctions. Conservation biology. 2008; 22:140-150.
38. Thuiller W, Lavorel S, Sykes MT, Araújo MB. DiversyDistrib. 2006; 12:49-60.
39. Thomas CD *et al.* 2004. Extinction risk from climate change. Nature. 2004; 427:145-148.
40. Bellard C, Bertelsmeier C, Leadley P, Thuiller W, Courchamp F. Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity. Eco. Lett. 2012; 15:5-377.
41. Cahill AE, Aiello Lammens ME, Fisher Reid MC, Hua X, Karanewsky CJ, Yeong Ryu H, *et al.* How does climate change cause extinction? A Review. Proc. R. Soc. B, 2013.
42. Wikipedia. Category: Cosmopolitan species, 2018. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Cosmopolitan_species]. Last visited 07.03.18.
43. Jordan EL, Verma, PS. Chordate Zoology and Animal Physiology, 11thedn. S. Chand and Co., New Delhi, 1990.
44. Grove AJ, Newell GE. Animal Biology, 9thedn. Universal Book Stall, New Delhi, 1974.
45. Wikipedia. Climate, 2018a. [<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate>]. Last visited 07.03.18.
46. WBE. The World Book Encyclopedia, Int. ed. World Book Inc., London. 1992; 6(E):406-410.
47. Gerking SD. Biological Systems, 2ndedn. W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1974.
48. Cockrum EL, McCauley WJ. Zoology, Saunders Student edn. W.B. Saunders Co., London, 1965.
49. Morris HM. The Scientific Case against Evolution. The Institute of Creation Research, USA, 2017.
50. Kettlewell HBD. Darwin's missing evidence. Sci. Amer. 1959; 200(3):48-53.
51. Johnson GB. The Living World, 3rdedn. McGraw Hill New York, 2003.
52. Ritche DD, Carola RG. *Biology*. Addison-Wiley Publishing Co., Inc., California, 1983.
53. Mackean DG. Introduction to Biology, new trop. edn. John Murray, London, 1976.
54. Dodson EO. Evolution: Process and Product, east-west student edn. Affiliated East West Press Pvt. Ltd., New Delh, 1960.
55. Hickman CP Jr, Robert LS, Hickman FM. Integrated Principles of Zoology, 7th edn. Time Mirror, Mosby College Publishing, Saint Lois, 1984.
56. Gardner EJ, Simons MJ, Snustad DP. Principles of Genetics, 8thedn. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1991.
57. Mae Wane Ho. Process and metaphor of evolution. In: Mae-Wane Ho and S.W Fox. (eds.). Evolution process

- and Metaphores. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1988; 1-16.
58. Brooks DR, Le Blond PH, Cummings DD. Information and entropy in a single evolution model. *J. Theor. Biol.* 1984; 109:77-93.
 59. Saunders PT. Sociobiology: A house built on sand. In M.-W. Ho and S.W. Fox (eds.) *Evolution Process and Metaphores*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1988, 275-279.
 60. Ahad MA. Punctuated equilibrium theory represents shifting balance theory (of macro and quantum evolution) and invalid Darwin's theory. *J. Ent. Zool. Stud.* 2017; 5(3):06-12.
 61. Ruse M. Darwin's Theory: An Exercise in Science," in *New Scientist*, 1981, 828.
 62. Mae-Wane Ho, Fox SW. On not holding nature still: Evolution by process, not by consequence. In: Mae-Wane, Ho and S.W. Fox. (eds.). *Evolution process and Metaphores*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1988, 117-144.
 63. Gould SJ, Eldredge N. Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered. *Paleobiology*. 1977; 3(2): 115-151.
 64. Johnson P. Darwin on Trial. Regnery. Gateway, Washington, D.C, 1991, 84.
 65. Lovelock J. *The Ages of Gaia: A Biography of Our Living Earth*. W. W. Norton & Co, 1995.
 66. Sober E. Darwin on Natural Selection: A Philosophical Perspective. In: C.D. Kohn (ed.). *The Darwinian Heritage*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1985, 867-899.
 67. Mae Wane Ho. Genetic fitness and natural selection: Myth or metaphore? In Proc. 3rd. T. C. Schnierla Conference. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Hillsdale, New Jersey, 1987.
 68. Gray RD. Metaphors and methods: Behavioural ecology, Panbiogeography and evolving synthesis. In M.-W. Ho and S.W. Fox (eds.) *Evolutionary Process and Metaphores*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd., New York, 1988, 209-234.