



What have polar bears, shellfish, crickets and ratites got in common? Well they all have something to do with global warming and they are no help at all to the theory of evolution.

But what does need help at present in Creation Research: finishing the new kids' fossil pit at Jurassic Ark, completing the fossil trailer, covering the cost of the brand new murals on the Ice Age and the violence in Noah's day, plus the ongoing research costs to dig up the exciting items in the week's Evidence News 09/14, with EDitorial COMment from John Mackay and the team around the globe, as we investigate further the evidence pointing to God's wonderful handiwork of Creator in this universe we live in.

HELP NEEDED: We have had a request from a Psychologist for help in finding out why atheists become Christians? Anybody willing to share their conversion from atheism to Christ, send a brief account to info@creationresearch.net

© Creation Research 2014

<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. NEW QUESTIONS
2. HOW TO UNDERESTIMATE POLAR BEARS
3. GLOBAL WARMING WARNING ON SHELLFISH
4. HIDDEN COMPUTER CODE EXPLAINS UNIVERSE
5. CRICKET CONVERGENTLY EVOLVES
6. FLIGHTLESS BIRDS EVOLVED SIX TIMES
7. FROM THE ARCHIVES
8. HOW YOU CAN HELP US WITH YOUR DONATIONS

For ENEWS as PDF click [here](#).

1. NEW QUESTIONS: Did snakes really lose their legs as Genesis implies? [Answer](#) by John Mackay. Expanding Universe? Recent research claims the universe is static. What about the red shift? Barry Setterfield [Click](#)

2. HOW TO UNDERESTIMATE POLAR BEARS, according to Polar Bear Science 30 May 2014. Zoologist and polar bear researcher Susan Crockford reports that the IUCN *Polar Bear Specialist Group* PBSG have added a footnote to their "Circumpolar Polar Bear Action Plan" draft stating: "As part of past status reports, the PBSG has traditionally estimated a range for the total number of polar bears in the circumpolar Arctic. Since 2005, this range has been 20-25,000. **It is important to realize that this range never has been an estimate of total abundance in a scientific sense, but simply a qualified guess given to satisfy public demand.** (bold ours) It is also important to note that even though we have scientifically valid estimates for a majority of the subpopulations, some are dated. Furthermore, there are no abundance estimates for the Arctic Basin, East Greenland, and the Russian subpopulations. Consequently, there is either no, or only rudimentary, knowledge to support guesses about the possible abundance of polar bears in approximately half the areas they occupy. Thus, the range given for total global population should be viewed with great caution as it cannot be used to assess population trend over the long term". Crockford commented:

“All this glosses over what I think is a critical point: none of these ‘global population estimates’ (from 2001 onward) came anywhere close to being estimates of the actual world population size of polar bears (regardless of how scientifically inaccurate they might have been) — rather, they were estimates of *only* the subpopulations that Arctic biologists have tried to count”. (emphasis in original) She goes on to explain that the PBSG have not counted bears in all the regions occupied by polar bears, and “at the last tally (2013), 26% of the world’s polar bear subpopulations are not accounted for by the PBSG and geographically, those subpopulations occupy close to half of the world’s polar bear habitat.”

Link: [Polar Bear Science](#)

ED. COM. You may be wondering why there was a public demand to count polar bears. There provably was a demand from global warming activists, who wanted to use polar bears to attract attention to their cause, but as far as we can find there never was any demand from the general public. Photos of polar bears clinging to fragments of ice have been used to convince the public the bears were an endangered species, and they were officially listed as such by the USA in 2008. However, as Susan Crockford points out in her article, most polar bears do not live in the USA. Most live in Canada and Russia, and we have no data for most Russian habitats. Furthermore, the people who actually live with Canadian polar bears will happily tell you the bears have been flourishing right through the decades of supposed catastrophic climate change. A con job to increase taxes seems a reasonable conclusion. (Ref. *Ursus maritimus*, ecology)

3. GLOBAL WARMING WARNING ON SHELLFISH: The following headline appeared in the Courier Mail 3 June 2014, p3: “Global warming could wipe shellfish off the menu” with the warning that “oysters, clams and mussels could disappear from menus if their habitats are affected by climate change, researchers warn”. The news item reported a study of the likely changes in geographic distribution of 14 species of shellfish, and included the statement: “Researchers say the animals are unable to shift their habitats and instead will simply die out”. The item gave a reference to the *Journal of Biogeography*. On checking the *Journal of Biogeography*, we found a report about a computer model of mollusc habitat changes using “present-day summaries and future forecasts of climate from the Hadley Centre and known species occurrence data from natural history collections”. The conclusion: “We do not find a coherent pattern of areas with suitable environments expanding at high-latitude range boundaries, with simultaneous contraction at their low-latitude boundaries. Tropical marine molluscs may thus show varied responses as average temperatures warm. These results contrast with trends among terrestrial and other marine species, which are rapidly shifting their ranges to higher latitudes. Conversely, the differing responses of these species to future warming are consistent with responses of species to past episodes of change, as observed in the fossil record”.

Link: [Journal of Biogeography](#)

ED. COM. Note well: the data basis for this drastic warning is not from the real world but from a computer model. Furthermore, it was based on predictions made by the notorious Hadley Centre, whose track record as weather prophets leave much to be desired (see Weathered Predictions on Climate [here](#)). OUR PREDICTION: Since even the researchers admit, molluscs have survived past episodes of change, and we predict they will continue to do so, especially as most oysters, clams and mussels that appear on menus are farmed, rather than harvested in the wild. What’s our basis? Most molluscs simply release their larvae into the sea where the young float around until they find a suitable place to settle, which includes man-made structures in oyster and shellfish farms. Like coral reefs they will simply shift to where the climate is right! (Ref. marine biology, ecology, predictions)

4. HIDDEN COMPUTER CODE EXPLAINS UNIVERSE claims Stephen Wolfram, as reported in BBC Future 29 May 2014. Computing researcher Stephen Wolfram has shown how simple programs called “cellular automata” could reproduce the structure of natural objects like snowflakes or leaves. He has now come up with the idea that similar computational rules may explain the workings of everything in the Universe. Wolfram claims the computer revolution that began last century, may help answer major existential and scientific questions, not just provide us with gadgets and the Internet. According to the BBC this is a controversial idea and is not accepted by most physicists.

Link: [BBC](#)

ED. COM. This idea is not accepted by most physicists, but not because of lack of evidence. It is because everyone knows that a computer program is always the product of a creative mind. Furthermore, if there are any computation rules behind the way the universe behaves, that is a dead set pointer to a rule-maker, and the moral conclusion is that the one who makes the rules has the power and authority to enforce the rules. That is why physicists, and others, do not want to know about any evidence that the universe is not just chance random matter and energy. They don’t want the real Creator God in charge they want to be creative gods themselves. (Ref. cosmology, astronomy, design)

5. CRICKET CONVERGENTLY EVOLVES, as reported BBC News, ScienceDaily and Nature News 29 May 2014 and *Current Biology* doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2014.04.053. Male crickets attract mates with a chirping sound made by scraping

their wings together. The sound is produced when a series of grooves and ridges on their wings rub over one another. Unfortunately for crickets in Hawaii the sound also attracts deadly parasitic flies. In 2003 scientists found that male crickets on the island of Kauai had flat wings that would not produce any sound, thus making it harder for flies to find them. The scientists estimated that 95% of Kauai male crickets were chirpless, but were still able to find a mate by remaining close to any remaining noisy males. Scientists have now also found silent crickets with flat wings on another Hawaiian island, Oahu. The two islands are too far apart for the crickets to have flown there by themselves, but did the insects hitchhike on boats and planes? However, gene studies have shown the flat wings have been produced by different mutations so the flat wings do not have a common chirpless ancestor. The scientists who carried out the study claim this is an example of “rapid convergent evolution” where two different mutations occurred independently but produced the same result. They write in their report: “Divergent wing morphologies linked to different loci thus cause identical behavioural outcomes—silence—illustrating the power of selection to rapidly shape convergent adaptations from distinct genomic starting points”. Nathan Bailey of St Andrews University commented: “There is more than one way to silence a cricket. Evolution by natural selection has produced similar adaptations from different genetic starting points in what appears to be the blink of an eye in evolutionary time”. He also told BBC News, “This is an exciting opportunity to detect genomic evolution in real time in a wild system, which has usually been quite a challenge, owing to the long timescales over which evolution acts”.

Links: [BBC](#), [Nature News](#), [ScienceDaily](#)

ED. COM. The change from noisy grooved wings to silent flat wings is a change brought about by a degenerate mutation, and propagated by natural selection, but it is not evolution, convergent or otherwise. The flat wings have a selective advantage ONLY in the presence of parasitic flies *and* ONLY as long as there are some remaining CHIRPING crickets with normal wings. When either the flies or the chirping crickets disappear, so will the chirpless ones because they won't be able to attract mates. The fact that there is more than one way to silence a cricket, merely proves there is more than one way for genes to degenerate, and is a good reminder of what mutations really do – they destroy genetic information. In this case they have destroyed the information for grooved wings. Here we see how the processes that supposedly drive evolution are really degenerative processes that eventually destroy living things. The real history of the world is from created perfection to degeneration, change yes, evolution NO! Finally, the term convergent evolution is often used to explain why creatures that live in similar environments have similar features, but this does not explain how they got these features. (Ref. insects, ecology, mutations, selection)

6. FLIGHTLESS BIRDS EVOLVED SIX TIMES, according to New Scientist 22 May 2014, an ABC News in Science and Dominion Post News, 23 May 2014. Flightless birds are collectively known as ratites, which includes the ostrich of Africa, the emu and cassowary of Australia, the rhea of South America, and the kiwi of New Zealand (NZ). It has always been assumed these, along with the now extinct Madagascan elephant bird and NZ moa, evolved from a flying ancestor when all these continents, along with Antarctica, were joined as one supercontinent, named Gondwana. When Gondwana began to break up 130 million years ago the now grounded ratites were separated into subgroups, and continued to evolve into their current and extinct forms. Because Australia is closest to NZ it was assumed the kiwi was derived from an Australian ancestor. Alan Cooper, of University of Adelaide, have sequenced mitochondrial DNA from the bones of Madagascan elephant birds, and compared it to the DNA of other flightless birds, and came to the surprising conclusion that the diminutive kiwi is more closely related to the enormous elephant bird. Cooper commented: “It's about as bizarre a finding as you can get”. Cooper's team drew up an evolutionary tree for ratites and concluded the kiwi and elephant bird lineages separated about 50 to 60 million years ago. However, that is after Gondwana is believed to have split up. So how did they end up on opposite sides of the world, if they couldn't fly or swim? According to Cooper: “The kiwi lineage had to get from Madagascar and clearly it must have flown because those two places were never joined. Clearly the ratites were flying when they dispersed”. This means flightless ratites must have independently evolved six times from a flying ancestor. The Dominion Post (a NZ publication) commented: “Our national bird has been rescued from the clutches of the Australians, thanks to advances in DNA technology”. Cooper agrees with this sentiment. He commented: “The New Zealanders will be much more comfortable with that. It's their worst nightmare to be a derivative of Australia”.

Links: [ABC](#), [Dominion Post News](#), [New Scientist](#)

ED. COM. Here is another reminder that evolutionists have more faith than creationists – in this case six times as much. The distribution of non-flying birds is no more a problem than the distribution of other non-flying creatures, provided you start in the right place. There is as yet no fossil bone evidence ratites were ever flying birds. The fossil and living evidence is that ratites have always been non-flying, and have either reproduced after their kind or died out. (There are birds such as flightless ducks and others that are known to have lost the ability to fly.) As land dwelling, air breathing creatures, ratites would have been on Noah's ark, left the Middle East with the general dispersion of ark animals, and would have crossed continents via land bridges that existed when sea levels were lower, and possibly survived on rafts of vegetation and debris, just as other land dwelling creatures did. (Ref. biogeography, genetics, birds)

7. FROM THE ARCHIVES: [Polar Bear Numbers](#), [Global Warming](#), [Flatwing Crickets](#), [Origin of Flightless Birds](#), [Convergent Evolution](#).

8. HOW YOU CAN HELP US WITH YOUR 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.

AUSTRALIA: P.O. Box 260 Capalaba Qld 4157

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

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 [here](#)).

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).

