



BACKFLIPS GALORE as camels are now claimed to have evolved in the snow, famous Aussie sea fossils now regarded as land plants, fleas become flies and fossil sex reveals all in Evidence News number 04/13 with EDitorial COMment by John Mackay and the Creation Research Team worldwide.

© Creation Research 2013

<http://www.creationresearch.net>

<http://www.askjohnmackay.com>

<http://www.youtube.com/user/askjohnmackay#p/u>

<http://evidencweb.net>

ENews is available in 2 FORMATS – for EMAIL scroll down – for PDF see below index.

#### **INDEX**

- 1. DR DUANE GISH (1921-2013) - THIS EDITOR'S TRIBUTE**
- 2. NEW QUESTIONS**
- 3. GIANT FOSSIL CAMEL IN ARCTIC CANADA**
- 4. DON'T MISS OUR SLIDE SHOWS**
- 5. BACKWARDS BACKBONE**
- 6. FOSSIL LEAVES WERE REALLY INSECTS**
- 7. AUSSIE FOSSIL ANIMALS ARE REALLY PLANTS**
- 8. DINO FLEAS ARE FLIES**
- 9. FROM THE ARCHIVES**
- 10. DONATIONS**

For ENEWS as PDF – CLICK [HERE](#).

**1. DR DUANE GISH (1921-2013) - THIS EDITOR'S TRIBUTE:** Even though I had graduated in geology, specialising in palaeontology, and had ceased being an evolutionist as a result of the lack of evidence presented in my university years – I was yet to take the final steps to full blown Creationist. It was through the activities of members of the old Evolution Protest Movement (EPM) John Woodford to whom I had been introduced by a Brisbane Grammar School Science Staff member - Max Schibrowski (full blown creationist and EPM supporter) that I was introduced to the lectures, books and debates of Dr Gish.

I later got to know Duane very well – listened to the pros and cons of his fossil talks – met with him in the USA – and along with Ken Ham invited him to speak in Australia – endured his FORE – tee or more golf jokes and gasped at his ability to eat buckets of raw chillis combined with raw onion (as you watched) plus noted his debating techniques on how to win.

As a result I really appreciated Dr Gish's positive commendations on one of our most popular and successful debates against Physicist Prof Dr Rev John Polkinghorne, when Duane wrote: *"Yesterday I received the DVD of your debate with John Polkinghorne at Liverpool Cathedral. You gave a superb presentation. You had carefully and thoroughly studied every facet of the question to be debated. You splendidly applied the Word of God just as it should be interpreted. I did not note any flaws in the way you presented the evidence for the Biblical and scientific evidence for creation. You immediately, without hesitation, forcefully refuted every major argument that Polkinghorne offered. Your delivery was outstanding. Your attitude toward your opponent was gentle and your humor was both entertaining and effective. To anyone with an open mind, regardless of his view point, you won the debate handily. Happily, there was a large audience to witness the debate.*

*May God continue to give you good health and wisdom as you present the evidence for His marvellous creation. Your brother in Christ, Duane T. Gish".*

Duane always said his aim was to die with his boots on – faithful to the end.

FINAL RESULT - UNDEBATABLE – JESUS WON – Satan zero.

More details: <http://www.icr.org/article/7318/>.

SEE THIS DEBATE [FREE](#).

**2. NEW QUESTIONS:** PREHISTORY? How do I teach my children where the prehistoric cave men they learn about at school fit into the Bible? [ANSWER](#) by John Mackay.

SCIENCE? Why do you treat the Bible as a science book when there is no way the early chapters of Genesis ever could be scientific? [ANSWER](#) BY John Mackay.

**3. GIANT FOSSIL CAMEL IN ARCTIC CANADA**, according to Wired Science 6 March 2013 and Fossil Science 9 March 2013. Canadian and British scientists have studied 30 fragments of the leg bone found on Ellesmere Island in Canada's High Arctic. The fragments were in rocks dated 3.4 million years old – a time designated as the "Mid-Pliocene warm-period" in the earth's history. The researchers identified the fragments as belonging to a giant camel by using a 3D digital reconstruction of the bones, and by analysing the remains of collagen (a fibrous protein) extracted from the bones. The digital reconstruction identified the fragments as being part of camel tibia, and they calculated it was 29 percent larger than that of a modern day camel. This makes it similar in size to a previously known extinct giant camel *Paracamelus gigas*. Analysing the collagen involved adding chemical markers to pick out the different peptides (strings of amino acids) and comparing them to collagen from known animals. They found it most closely matched the dromedary (one humped) camels and also another extinct camel species found in the Yukon. The site where the bone was found also contains fossils of leaves and wood, and the research team wrote: "The results suggest that the evolutionary history of modern camels can be traced back to a lineage of giant camels that was well established in a forested Arctic". Natalia Rybczynski, a vertebrate palaeontologist at the Canadian Museum of Nature, commented: "We now have a new fossil record to better understand camel evolution, since our research shows that the Paracamelus lineage inhabited northern North America for millions of years, and the simplest explanation for this pattern would be that Paracamelus originated there. So perhaps some specialisations seen in modern camels, such as their wide flat feet, large eyes and humps for fat may be adaptations derived from living in a polar environment."

Links: [Fossil Science](#), [Wired Science](#)

ED. COM. Several important points to make here!

1. Did you catch the swift evolution of the camel story? It used to read they evolved big flat feet for walking across hot desert sand and a huge hump for storing moisture/food against the harsh desert environment. Now a quick flip and the flat feet are for padding across snow and the hump is fat storage against future cold arctic winters, despite the glaring presence of fossil trees everywhere on Ellesmere (we have specimens). Ain't evolution wonderful – there's nothing it can't explain due to its willingness to ignore all relevant facts. But in truth this discovery does nothing to help "better understand camel evolution". The bone fragments were identified as being camel, because their shape and collagen composition matched living camel bones, therefore it tells us that from the time these bones were buried until the present day, camels have been camels. **This is just as** Genesis states – all creatures were created as fully functional animals according to their kinds, and designed to reproduce after their kind. Camels still do it efficiently enough to keep camel traders in business.
2. "Intelligent Design-ers" beware when you try to argue "the camel is evidence of creation because it is so well designed to survive in a desert!" It wasn't! – any more than mosquitoes were designed to suck your blood or carry malarial parasites. Make sure your starting point is the **very good world that God originally created. That means no frozen wastelands in the Arctic, and no Sahara (or other) deserts**, and not the world you live in now.
3. The only notable change is that camels were once larger, and now seem to have shrunk, which is evidence camels originally lived in a better environment than the harsh arctic environs you find on Ellesmere today, which could not support Giant Camels. Both the camels and the environment have been degenerating compared to the Eden, where it all began **and** which had neither snow nor harsh summers. The reality is that camels can survive in extremely arid environments (cold dry or hot dry) because they already had wide flat feet, humps of fat, etc. This is a good example of "survival of the fittest" but it is not evolution. If camels did not already have these features before there were cold or hot deserts they would not have survived.
4. Finally, collagen peptides tell us the maximum age of the bone. How? Peptides are strings of amino acids held together by chemical links named peptide bonds. According to Ronald Raines of Department of Biochemistry and Department of Chemistry, University of Wisconsin–Madison "a peptide bond has a half-life of 400 years". (*Adv Exp Med Biol.* 2009; 611: xci–xcviii). This means peptide bonds should have all fallen apart long before the claimed 3.4 million years, and there should be no peptides to compare with living animal collagen if the fossil really was that old. Another great Data Free Time Tale from the evolutionists. (Ref. mammals, fossilisation, biochemistry, arteriodactyls)

See synthetic chemist Prof. Ed Neeland explain this last point further in the Creation Research DVD *Time's Up, Darwin*. Also, see fascinating rock solid evidence the earth is young, and the evolutionary millions of years do not exist. DVD available from Creation Research [webshop](#). Free preview [here](#).

#### **4. DON'T MISS OUR SLIDE SHOWS ON:**

[Flowers - Why are They Beautiful?](#)

[Flowers are Hot](#)

[Funny \(Peculiar\) Flowers: Stanhopea Orchid](#)

**5. BACKWARDS BACKBONE** reported in BBC News 14 June 2013, ABC News in Science 15 January 2013 and *Nature*, vol. 494, 226 doi:10.1038/nature11825 14 January 2013. A new study using high energy x-rays of the spine of a fossil creature name *Ichthyostega* has revealed that previous reconstructions of the animal's spine got it back to front. Stephanie Pierce, of the University of Cambridge's Department of Zoology explained: "For more than 100 years, early tetrapods were thought to have vertebrae composed of three sets of bones — one bone in front, one on top, and a pair behind. But, by peering inside the fossils using synchrotron x-rays, we have discovered that this traditional view

literally got it back-to-front”. The scientists also discovered the creature had a string of bone in the middle of the front of the chest forming a structure like a sternum (breastbone) which would have reinforced the ribcage. The x-ray study enabled scientists to reconstruct the bones in three dimensions, and then use this to work out how the creature moved. Pierce explained: “By understanding how each of the bones fit together we can begin to explore the mobility of the spine and test how it may have transferred forces between the limbs during the early stages of land movement”. *Ichthyostega* is considered to be a transitional form between water dwelling and land dwelling animals. John Hutchinson of the Royal Veterinary College commented: “All of that anatomy [from these early land animals] was handed down to later animals. It influenced the future evolution of the spine in everything on land. It tells us about our own development and why our own backbones developed the way they did”. The research team suggest that *Ichthyostega* moved on land something like a seal, supported on its forelimbs.

Links: [ABC](#), [BBC](#)

ED. COM. In 2005 scientists studying *Ichthyostega's* spine concluded it could only move in a “desperately awkward” fashion like an inchworm, and therefore it died out when amphibians developed a more efficient way of moving on land and out-competed the struggling *Ichthyostegas*. One palaeontologist took out his frustration with creationists when he commented “It's not a very intelligent design”. (Science Shots 1 September 2005) However as this new study suggests, if it could move about like a seal, then the way it moved on land can't have been the cause of its demise. After all, seals are still here.

This new study is a good example of how creation-based thinking is a better basis for scientific investigation than evolution. Instead of scornfully dismissing this animal's spine as “not a very intelligent design”, a creation basis says here is something that looks odd, but it must have started very good (Genesis 1:31) and may have degenerated, therefore, we should do more research and find out how it worked. That may mean waiting for better technology, as in the high energy x-rays used on this fossil. The contrary evolutionary basis assumes that living things evolved by chance random processes, therefore lots of half-baked, badly functioning animals have been produced, then been eliminated in the struggle for life, so poor backwards *Ichthyostegas* was just another evolutionary dropout. The new research is a good example of investigation carried out in spite of the theory of evolution, not because of it, so we make the claim again that evolution is no use to scientific research and should be abandoned. (Ref. vertebrates, locomotion, amphibians)

**6. FOSSIL LEAVES WERE REALLY INSECTS**, according to articles in Wired Science and PNAS doi: 10.1073/pnas.1205517109 26 November 2013, and Smithsonian News 5 December 2013. Scientists in USA and China have found “a case of mixed identity between a particular plant and an insect in the laboratory and the field”. The plant is a ginkgo, the insect is a hangingfly, and its fossil wings were originally thought to be lobes of a ginkgo leaf. Living hangingflies have four elongated wings, and, as their name suggests, spend their time hanging from the undersides of leaves. If this fossilised insect had held its wings spread whilst hanging in a ginkgo tree, the pattern of veins and shape of its wings would have resembled the multilobed ginkgo leaf. The researchers excuse their confusion as “a case of leaf mimesis” i.e. where the wings of an insect evolved to mimic the appearance of the ginkgo leaf, making them hard to tell apart. The evolutionists research team also concluded: “This documentation of mimesis is a rare occasion whereby exquisitely preserved, co-occurring fossils occupy a narrow spatiotemporal window that reveal likely reciprocal mechanisms which plants and insects provide mutual defensive support during their preangiospermous evolutionary histories”.

Links: [Wired Science](#), [Smithsonian News](#)

ED. COM. Can you spot the flaws in the assumptions being used? To have leaf shaped fly wings certainly would have been a great disguise against animals that might have wanted to eat hangingflies, or a brilliant cover to catch insects that hangingflies may want to eat, and both would certainly have benefited the ginkgo if the hangingfly preyed on leaf-eating insects as the evolutionists claim, BUT when you throw in a Biblical basis from the God who was there, that all creatures, flies included, were vegetarian (Genesis 1:26-31), then you have to congratulate the evolutionists, who were not there, on their blind faith story-telling ability only.

The Wired Science article also asks an important question that links to the researchers hidden assumptions: “The hangingfly does resemble the ginkgo, that much is clear, but how can we tell whether or not the insect’s anatomy was a form of camouflage or just coincidentally similar?” It goes on to comment: “The span of time between us and the Jurassic forest prevents us from knowing – such tantalizing traces of prehistoric interactions only come to life in our imaginations”. We couldn’t have said it better! So what’s the actual data? 1) Fossil ginkgo leaves and fossil hangingfly wings have similar shapes; and 2) their fossils were found in the same rocks.

Those who believe the story that an insect evolved to look like a leaf for the purpose of camouflage have yet to explain how changes in the shape of tree leaves (as the ginkgo evolved) could influence genes in an insect to make it have leaf-shaped wings. Otherwise, it’s time for evolutionists to admit they simply have faith that the same random processes that make trees evolve leaves, also happen to be able to change insects in just the right way at the right time. Now that is too much blind faith for us. Furthermore, ginkgoes are the first, and classic, example of a “living fossil”, i.e. a living organism whose fossil examples are very similar to their living forms, which means they have not evolved since their fossils were buried, irrespective of how long ago you believe the rock layers were formed. Since the fossil hangingfly was also recognised because it looked like a living hangingfly, neither of these fossils shows any evidence in support of evolutionary history.

Finally, did you notice the description of the fossils as “exquisitely preserved”? As we have said many times, this is always evidence that fossils were rapidly and deeply buried, and so this is one more case where the vast amounts of time used by evolutionists are not deduced from the rocks, but read into them. (Ref. foliage, arthropods, trees)

**7. AUSSIE FOSSIL ANIMALS ARE REALLY PLANTS**, claims University of Oregon scientist, according to articles in ScienceNOW 12 December 2012 and ABC News in Science 13 December 2012. The Ediacaran fossils are imprints of creatures found in the rocks in South Australia dated as 635 to 542 million years old, i.e. before the Cambrian explosion. They have been interpreted as being soft bodied animals that lived on the sea floor long before there was any life on land. Gregory Retallack, a paleobotanist (expert in fossil plants) at the University of Oregon claims that some of the frond-like and sack-like fossils are more like land dwelling lichens, and the rocks in which they are formed were once soils rather than sea floor deposits. This claim is controversial because, according to the ABC, “If true, the finding would push back life’s transition from sea to land by tens of millions of years—and possibly by 100 million years or more”. Furthermore, Retallack commented: “This discovery has implications for the tree of life, because it removes Ediacaran fossils from the ancestry of animals”. Ediacaran creatures are believed to be the evolutionary ancestors of the numerous marine invertebrates that rapidly evolved in the Cambrian explosion. However, according to ScienceNOW, “If Retallack is correct, it means that Ediacaran fossils represent an independent branch on the tree of life, and that life on land during this time may have been more complex than life in the sea”.



Jim Gehling of the South Australian Museum is critical of the claims because if the approximately 600 million year old Ediacaran fossils were not the ancestors of animal life, then the Cambrian explosion would have come from “nowhere”. He commented: “I’m sorry, I’m not a creationist. I do not believe that the Cambrian animals popped into existence out of the blue at the beginning of the Cambrian”. Paul Knauth, a geochemist at Arizona State University is open to Retallack’s claims because he says some of the Australian strata “are dead ringers for paleosols”. He commented: “We’re trying to interpret what happened long ago, and none of the evidence so far is unequivocal. The truth is, we just don’t know.”

Link: [ABC](#)

ED. COM. What is most interesting about this report is the reason the expert at the South Australian Museum uses for rejecting the claim. As stated above from Jim Gehling: if the Ediacaran fossils were not the ancestors of animal life, then the Cambrian explosion would have come from “nowhere” ... “I’m sorry, I’m not a creationist. I do not believe that the Cambrian animals popped into existence out of the blue at the beginning of the Cambrian”. And people say scientists are open-minded, willing to investigate all options? What a lie – most scientists operate exclusively in the atheistic naturalistic framework, and live and write in public denial of it.

Knauth is very correct about the problem of working out what happened long ago – scientists can only directly study the present. The Ediacaran fossils are a curious collection of organisms, which this editor has personally investigated on site. Some can be identified as jellyfish because they look like living jellyfish. Others, such as the ones Retallack refers to, don’t look like any currently living creature, so Retallack’s suggestion is as good as any. One thing we can be dogmatic about is that all the jellyfish fossils in our collection from Ediacaran type strata are easy to recognise, and are no help to any theory that says they evolved from something lower down the evolutionist life chain. But then we stress that as a usually winning point in debates, much to the frustration of the evolutionists. (Ref. Precambrian, invertebrates, fossilisation)

**8. DINO FLEAS ARE FLIES**, according to reports in ABC News in Science and PhysOrg 21 February 2013, and *Nature* doi:10.1038/nature11898 20 February 2013. Palaeontologists have changed their minds about some fossil insects originally identified as giant fleas that infested feathered dinosaurs. The original argument they were fleas, was because they had pincer-like hind legs that could have been used to grasp their host, and mouthparts suitable for piercing skin. But now the scientists who originally studied the fossils have found more specimens, including two in the act of mating. Some of the new specimens had wings, indicating they did not need a host to move around, and only the males had pincer legs, which were used for clasping females. Furthermore, the male specimens had abdominal respiratory gills. The research team now suggest these fossil insects had a life cycle similar to living modern water flies, beginning as larvae living in water, then becoming adults with wings, but later shedding their wings and returning to the water to mate, reproduce, and then die.

Links: [ABC](#), [PhysOrg](#)

ED. COM. We wrote about these fossils when they were identified as fleas, and made the cautious comment “if these have been correctly classified as the oldest fossil fleas, then they provide no evidence for evolution of fleas from any other kind of insect. The fact they are extinct is evidence there were once more kinds of fleas than there are now”. (See Giant Fossil Fleas [here](#)) Although we were happy to accept the original identification of these fossils as fleas, we have no problem accepting them as water flies, now that more specimens are available for study, and they are still no use to the evolutionist. Note that included in the new specimens is a pair fossilised in the act of mating (which in all present day water flies occurs in a very short period of time) so this specimen informs us these fossilised flies were buried alive and rapidly – no long time involved. That fact is additionally supported by the preservation of fine

## Evidence News 04/13 – 13th March 2013

detail of tiny structures such as the abdominal gills. In fact, this is a catastrophic deposit, and that's a comment you can make about all well preserved fossil remains. Time is not in the fossils. Time destroys – only rapid process preserves – a point we make great use of in our latest DVD *Time's Up Darwin*. See free preview [here](#). (Ref. Insects, arthropods, Diptera, fossilisation)

**9. FROM THE ARCHIVES:** [Ichthyostega](#), [Ediacaran Fossils](#), [Ginkgo Symbiosis](#), [Oldest Flying Insect](#), [Giant Camel](#)

**10. DONATIONS:** Get involved in sharing the cost and the blessings of the research and teaching by becoming part of the worldwide support team today via our secure [Web Site](#), or send gifts to the following addresses:

Donations in USA/UK are tax deductible. See instructions online.

AUSTRALIA: P.O. Box 260 Capalaba Qld 4157

CANADA: C/- Martin Legemaate 12919 Warden Ave Stouffville ON L4A 7X5

TAX DEDUCTIBLE SUPPORT FOR OUR COLLEAGUES

<http://www.creationtruthministries.org/donatepayments.html>.

NEW ZEALAND: P.O. Box 40480 Glenfield 0747, Auckland

UK: P.O. Box 1 Ashton under Lyne Lancs. OL6 9WW (Donations in UK payable to Creation Research Trust are tax deductible - a Gift Aid Declaration is required - available from

<http://www.amen.org.uk/cr/trust/>

USA: P.O. Box 281 Hartsville TN 37074 (Donations in USA are tax deductible. Make checks to Creation Education Society)

IF YOU no longer wish to receive our updates please reply with REMOVE EN in the subject. To assist us please include your name as well as e-mail address (and organisation name, if any).

[www.askjohnmackay.com](http://www.askjohnmackay.com)

[www.evidencweb.net](http://www.evidencweb.net)

**[www.creationresearch.net](http://www.creationresearch.net)**