



**DINGO SCIENCE!** The ultimate tragic triumph of science over common sense, of misplaced trust in scientific theory versus actual witnesses, occurred several decades ago when Australian Lindy Chamberlain was condemned to life imprisonment for murdering her daughter at Ayers Rock now called Uluru. It has taken some three decades to undo much of the damage done by a stupid reverence for science combined with apparent prejudice from Northern Territory police and law makers. Lindy Chamberlain and her now, ex-husband, Michael, have finally received a death certificate from Officialdom stating the real cause of her baby's death was not murder, but death by dingo.

When the courts originally listened to so-called scientific evidence of baby blood in the car – what they were really doing was revering the god of science whose religion demands that interpretation by a scientist in the present outweighs the words of witnesses who were there in the past - when the event actually happened. Not one witness had observed Lindy Chamberlain guilty of anything.

It's relevance to this issue is very simple. Many scientists make outlandish claims about the origin of life and the evolution of one kind into another, none of which have ever been observed by any witnesses in either present or past, and that includes the testimony from the God of Creation who gave us the original record and described how the planet would actually behave. The fact that it is behaving exactly in the predictable manner is regarded as totally ignorable by the little 'gods' and 'goddesses' of modern science who revere their own multiple contradictory pronouncements with amazed awe. The time has come for such people to go and their pronouncements to be reversed officially!

At the same time there is a little light in the tunnel as our newly elected slightly right of centre government in Queensland Australia has just quashed the legitimacy of Civil Unions for homosexuals and lesbians and looks set to ban homosexual and lesbian adoptions. The fact that they won a stunning majority the last election means they don't need to fear the less than 5% homosexuals who are driving the agenda upon the majority with false claims about being born that way. We for one wish to put it on record that we totally agree with what the secular government is doing, but of course our authority is not that they won the election. Our authority is that the God who created male and female is just as opposed to homosexual union as He is to murder, rape, theft etc. As a consequence homosexual adoption must also go!

All this certainly makes for yet another provocative Evidence News 15/12 from John Mackay and the Creation Research Team world wide as we deal with Michale Majerus' final observations on Melanic Moths, Aussie flowers and fossil bees, and an absolutely stunning Norwegian protista.

FOR ALL CREATION RESEARCH PREDICTIONS [click](#).

© Creation Research 2012

<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. **BRISBANE PUBLIC MEETINGS**
3. **DEBATE YOUNG EARTH OLD EARTH?**
4. **DINGO SCIENCE**
5. **PEPPERED PROOF PUBLISHED**
6. **PARALLEL EVOLUTION IN AUSSIE PLANTS**
7. **MICROBE WON'T FIT ON TREE OF LIFE**
8. **FROM THE ARCHIVES**
9. **DONATIONS**

For ENEWS as PDF [CLICK](#)

For ENEWS as email – just scroll down.

### 1. **NEW QUESTIONS**

1) “Did Jesus believe in 6 day creation and Noah’s flood only because he was fully man and therefore ignorant of what modern science has discovered since his time?” [ANSWER](#) by Simon Turpin.

2) SNAIL UPDATE on “What is the Snail Evolution project in British Schools, and what does the evidence show?” As our slug and snail expert Simon Terry writes a new article with more information on snails, the Snail Evolution project and what the evidence shows. To download new PDF article click [here](#). For his original answer click [here](#). The question also has a link to the new article.

2. **BRISBANE PUBLIC MEETINGS IN JUNE SEE [www.creationresearch.net](http://www.creationresearch.net) HOME PAGE.**

3. **DEBATE YOUNG EARTH OLD EARTH?** Hugh Ross & Ken Samples vs Andy Macintosh & Steve Lloyd view on <http://www.gunnersburybaptistchurch.org/news/viewnews.php?id=64>.

4. **DINGO SCIENCE** <http://www.abc.net.au/am/content/2012/s3523826.htm>.

5. **PEPPERED PROOF PUBLISHED** in *Biology Letters*, online 8 Feb 2012, doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2011.1136. The various coloured peppered moths living on trees which had been heavily polluted during the industrial revolution around Manchester UK, have been used as an example of evolution in many biology textbooks for around 60 years. The story has been that birds preyed on moths that rested on trees during the day. Moths whose colour matched the trees, e.g. black peppered moths on soot blackened trees, survived, whilst those whose colour contrasted with the trees, e.g. black moths on lichen covered trees, were eaten by birds. As the colour of trees changed the numbers of light and dark moths changed. The increase in the percentage of black moths in regions where trees were blackened by soot from factories was called “industrial melanism” and this was claimed to be proof of natural selection, and therefore, evolution in action.

For decades biology textbooks have used results obtained by a series of moth release and recapture experiments done by Bernard Kettlewell in the 1950s, but Kettlewell’s experimental method came in for much criticism in the late 1990s. In response to this criticism Cambridge University entomologist Michael

Majerus repeated the experiment in clean unsooted Cambridgeshire, but correcting the experimental design. Majerus found that birds were preying on moths that were less camouflaged, and this was enough to change the relative numbers of dark and light forms in succeeding generations. The combination of camouflage and bird predation on moths was therefore proven to be a real example of natural selection. Majerus died in 2009, but his colleagues have now published his results. They conclude their report with: “The new data, coupled with the weight of previously existing data convincingly show that ‘industrial melanism’ in the peppered moth is still one of the clearest and most easily understood examples of Darwinian evolution in action”. (Quote from Majerus, M. E. N. 2009, *Evol.: Educ. Outreach* 2, 63–74. doi:10.1007/s12052-008-0107-y)

ED. COM. Since these moths have still only been observed to remain moths of exactly the same species, and since all that has changed is the number of light and dark forms of the same species, all of which existed prior to both Majerus’ and Kettlewell’s observations, what has been observed may be a genuine example of natural selection, but it is definitely not an example of evolution. When Majerus started this project he admitted his real motivation was to campaign against creationism. He claimed: “To have people believe the biology of the planet is controlled by a Creator, I think that’s dangerous”. (*Science*, 25 June 2004) Now that Majerus has departed this planet he has discovered how much more dangerous it was to reject the Creator of both moths and men. (insects, ecology, Britain)

See our previous reports on Majerus and the peppered moth controversy [here](#).

CHECK PREVIOUS QUESTION “Fossil DNA in living things proves evolution. What counter arguments do you have?” [Answer](#).

**6. PARALLEL EVOLUTION IN AUSSIE PLANTS** reported in ScienceShots 5 June 2012 and ABC News in Science 6 June 2012. Flowering plants attract pollinating insects with their bright colours and, according to ScienceShots: “Scientists have even shown that, in the Northern Hemisphere, flowers' coloring patterns evolved specifically to meet the nuances of insect vision”. However, the same scientists also believe Australian plants have been geographically isolated for 34 million years, which they claim is before flowers evolved colour, so they cannot assume Australian plants have also evolved colour to suit insects. A group of researchers have now studied 111 species of Australian flowers and compared the light reflected by the flowers with the spectrum of light that native bees are sensitive to. This includes ultra-violet light as well as visible light. Insects can see ultra violet light and many flowers that look very plain under white light only have distinctive patterns when viewed with both white and ultra-violet light. The scientists concluded that Australian flowering plants have independently evolved to suit the photoreceptors of bees, just as the northern hemisphere plants have. This is an example of parallel evolution across the two hemispheres. According to Adrian Dyer, a vision researcher who led the study, all bees detect colour in a similar way and this proves the flowers evolved to suit the bees and not the other way around. He explained: “We know that bees' ability to detect colour links back to a common ancestor around 300-400 million years ago, and there's no evidence at all that bee vision has changed since then to suit flower colours - it's been a one-sided evolution in both the Northern Hemisphere and Australia”.

Link: [ABC](#)

ED. COM. It is worth noting the story above is being told by vision researchers who claim vision evolved first. When the story is told by botanists, they claim that plants drove the evolution of bees. (See “How to Grow a Planet” Episode 2: The Power of Flowers, BBC 2.) All of which tells us that we are not dealing with facts here but the presuppositions of whoever is making the story fit their priorities. Our advice? Always ask what would it take to prove such stories wrong. In this case the answer is threefold. First - finding a fossil flower in the wrong layer since all the above stories assume they have all the fossil data.

## Evidence News 15/12 – 13th June 2012

WE PREDICT that fossil flowers containing traces of colouring material will be found in all the wrong strata, just as fossil pollen has been found in Precambrian layers and been almost totally ignored. (See *Nature* 210, 292 - 294 (16 April 1966); doi:10.1038/210292a0 Occurrence of Pollen and Spores in the Roraima Formation of Venezuela and British Guiana R. M. Stainforth Asociación Venezolana de Geología, Minería y Petróleo, Apartado 4400, Chacao, Estado Miranda, Venezuela.)

Secondly it pays to remember that the presence in bees of green, blue and UV receptors will never in any way insert new genes into plants that cause them to firstly produce flowers or force the production of colours and patterns. The plants would die out long before they evolved such things. Neither would evolving coloured flowers somehow ever produce new genes for photoreceptors in bees. These evolutionist stories explain neither how flowers developed their colours, nor how the bees got their photoreceptors. And thirdly you can find both negative and positive information about such claims only by obtaining an eye witness account on the origin of bees and flowers. It is still a much more logical explanation that bees and flowers were created to complement one another as the eyewitness account from the actual Creator reveals in Genesis, and therefore plants had all the correct features from the beginning, and this is why they have survived in both the northern hemisphere and Australia. (Ref. pollination, insects, angiosperms, botany)

FOR ALL CREATION RESEARCH PREDICTIONS [click](#).

**7. MICROBE WON'T FIT ON TREE OF LIFE**, according to an article in ScienceDaily 26 April 2012.

Biologists are studying the genetics of protozoan, a single celled organism considered to be mankind's remotest ancestor, in a lake near Oslo, Norway. It is considered to be near the root of the tree of life for eukaryotic organisms, i.e. organisms which have structures contained in membranes within their cells. These include animals, plants, fungi and single celled organisms such as amoebae and algae. According to Kamran Shalchian-Tabrizi, one of the researchers "The micro-organism is among the oldest, currently living eukaryote organisms we know of. It evolved around one billion years ago, plus or minus a few hundred million years. It gives us a better understanding of what early life on Earth looked like". However, when they compared the genes of the Norwegian protozoan with other eukaryotes they found it did not fit on any of the main branches of the evolutionist tree of life. The protozoan is not a fungus, alga, parasite, plant or animal. Kamran Shalchian-Tabrizi commented: "We have found an unknown branch of the tree of life that lives in this lake. It is unique! So far we know of no other group of organisms that descend from closer to the roots of the tree of life than this species. It can be used as a telescope into the primordial micro-cosmos".

Link: [ScienceDaily](#)

ED. COM. The study described above is a reminder that the evolutionary tree of life, where all living things are arranged as physically descended from one single cell, is an idea in the minds of evolutionists, rather than an observed reality. It's an artificial human construct, and is not evidence of anything other than the creativity of man. Over the years the tree has been changed many times, as evolutionists have tried to fit newer discoveries into it. It was originally drawn up on the basis of the structure of living things, but now we have detailed genome studies, evolutionists are having to move organisms from one branch to another, because the newly observed genes don't conform to the hypothetical tree pattern. During all this rearranging most people miss the glaringly obvious. The actual living things remain the same, and show no signs of evolving from one kind to another. This Norwegian microbe may well be proof of the existence of a new Kind of creature unrelated to anything else on planet earth.

WE PREDICT that the genome studies will result in the standard evolutionary tree devolving into separate clusters, each group of which are unrelated to any other group. Anyone who claims this Norwegian

## Evidence News 15/12 – 13th June 2012

protozoan's genetics has remained unchanged for a billion years is providing a most underwhelming evidence for evolution and gloriously overwhelming evidence that creatures do reproduce after their kind as Genesis says God made them to do! (Ref. Protista, taxonomy, classification)

FOR ALL CREATION RESEARCH PREDICTIONS [click](#).

**8. FROM THE ARCHIVES:** Each week we publish links to previous items related to this issue's topics: [Evolution in Action](#), [Evolutionary Tree Problem](#), [Colour Vision in Australia](#)  
Remember also, all our news items and quotes are archived as individual items in the Fact File on our Evidence website [here](#). Make the most of this useful resource.

**9. 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: [CLICK](#) 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: Westney Heights Baptist Church 1201 Ravenscroft Rd Ajax Ont. L1T 4K5

TAX DEDUCTIBLE SUPPORT FOR OUR COLLEAGUES click [HERE](#).

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)

