

## Evidence News 17/11 – 20<sup>th</sup> July 2011

WELCOME to 'what a week' as we discover our evidence web has a major hassle built in that we just have to find a fix for. PLUS, I have just limped in from a dig after finding a giant Horse Tail Rush fossil about 20m long in Tennessee, (today they are only 1.5m) - then as the rock gave way under me - well I am not evidence in favour of evolution at present and very much proof that natural selection only eliminates. This week's stuff on Irish Polar bears mixed with an atheist's harangue about how we don't understand evolution at all, have really produced a fantastic ENEWS 17/11 (20<sup>th</sup> July 2011) with **lots** to read that we guarantee you will enjoy. So greetings from John Mackay and the Creation Research Team worldwide.

© Creation Research 2011

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

### INDEX

1. **NEW QUESTIONS**
2. **POLAR BEARS WERE IRISH**
3. **DID YOU MISS**
4. **COAL BURNING STOPPED GLOBAL WARMING**
5. **EVOLUTION IS WHAT?**
6. **DONATIONS TO HELP CREATION RESEARCH WORLDWIDE**

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

For ENEWS as email – just scroll down.

#### 1. NEW QUESTIONS:

1. "Fossil DNA" in organisms proves evolution (Sean B.Carroll 2006, Making of the Fittest). Do you have counter arguments? For answer [CLICK](#).
2. FIX FOR DINO PICS to high res for our ask site question: "**HAS A FAMOUS AMERICAN INDIAN DINOSAUR PETROGLYPH BECOME EXTINCT AS EVIDENCE?**" [CLICK](#) to see the evidence and much better pictures for yourself and click on any image for Higher Res picture. Plus Vance Nelson's full research on this accusation.

**CONFIRMING KACHINA comments** from Reader: "My son and I hiked to the Kachina Bridge a year ago (June 2010) and saw (and photographed) the dino petroglyph first hand. As Vance clearly shows, [CLICK](#) anyone (regardless of their supposed credentials) who has the audacity to say this petroglyph is not man-made must have problems with their eyesight (or a theory to protect). It is not difficult to see the "pecked out" surface is of a different texture than the surface that is not disturbed. To call it a mud stain is certainly a show of wilful ignorance." Mark Martin

3. Can we see who does the answers to your Ask web? [CLICK](#).

**2. POLAR BEARS WERE IRISH**, according to articles in BBC News 7 July 2011 and ScienceDaily 8 July 2011. Scientists in the UK, Ireland and USA have studied mitochondrial DNA extracted from the teeth and skeletons of 17 brown bears that were found at eight cave sites across Ireland. Mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) is genetic material carried in cellular powerhouses, separate from the main genome, and is passed from one generation to the next by mothers. Researchers correlated their results with the estimated ages of the bones. They found bears in Ireland with older dates, i.e. between 43,000 and 38,000 years ago, had the same genetic signature as brown bears living today in Eastern Europe, but DNA from bears that dated as 38,000 to 10,000 years ago, have sequences that are the closest match found to modern polar bears. The research team concluded the maternal ancestors of modern polar bears were from Ireland. Polar Bears (*Ursus maritimus*) and Brown Bears (*Ursus arctos*) are considered different species, but the scientists concluded "interspecific hybridization not only may be more common than previously considered but may be a mechanism by which species deal with marginal habitats during periods of environmental deterioration."

Links: [BBC ScienceDaily](#)

ED. COM. The Irish connection is an interesting new finding, but we are not surprised by the genetic similarities between polar bears and brown bears, or the evidence of hybridisation. Polar/brown bear hybrids have been known in the wild and in captivity for many years and we wrote about them in 2006 when Canadian scientists tested the DNA of an unusual bear and found it to be a hybrid between a polar bear and a grizzly bear. Grizzlies are a type of brown bear. [Click](#) for original report.

The results described above also confirm what we have said about the origin of polar bears following a question about why polar bears were white. We wrote: “The reason polar bear hair appears white is that it does not have melanin pigment, plus it has cavities filled with air within the hair shafts which scatter light. After Noah's flood, bears and humans spread out through North America and due to degeneration of genes some bears (and humans) lost their ability to make pigment in the hair and became white. But white bears would stand out in green forests and grasslands, and although no other animals would hunt them for food, humans would. Therefore, white bears would be disadvantaged in places where humans live, but could survive in places where humans rarely went as long as they could find food, such as the high arctic. Thus, white polar bears are the result of degeneration, selection, adaptation and survival of fittest, but not evolution.” ([Click](#) for original report.) This new study of bear genes, along with previous findings, all fit into the Biblical history of the world, i.e. God created bears as a separate kind, and they have reproduced after their kind ever since. As the descendents of the bears that got off Noah's Ark spread out over the earth the Bear kind has divided into subgroups but they remain bears and can interbreed when they have the opportunity. The variations between species are from already existing variation or mutations causing degeneration. (Ref. genetics, hybrids, kinds)

**3. DID YOU MISS** – “How can God love the Australian aborigines, if they didn't hear the gospel until Europeans arrived?” Answer [CLICK](#).

**4. COAL BURNING STOPPED GLOBAL WARMING**, according to an article in PNAS 5 July 2011, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1102467108, also reported by Reuters 5 July. Researchers from Boston and Harvard Universities, USA and University of Turku, Finland have sought to explain why the earth did not warm over the decade from 1998 to 2008, in spite of rising carbon dioxide levels. They begin their abstract with this admission: “Given the widely noted increase in the warming effects of rising greenhouse gas concentrations, it has been unclear why global surface temperatures did not rise between 1998 and 2008.” The researchers noted during this time there was a decrease in solar radiation and cyclical shift from an El Niño pattern to a La Niña climate pattern, but they concluded that the cooling effect came mainly from an increase in coal burning, mainly in China, which produced more sulphurous emissions. They also suggest “The post 1970 period of warming, which constitutes a significant portion of the increase in global surface temperature since the mid 20th century, is driven by efforts to reduce air pollution in general and acid deposition in particular, which cause sulfur emissions to decline while the concentration of greenhouse gases continues to rise.”

Link: [Reuters](#)

ED. COM. The decade in question was replete with dire warnings of catastrophic global warming due to increasing man-made carbon dioxide, but as these researchers admit in a mainstream, peer reviewed scientific journal, there was no warming between 1998 and 2008. There has been no more warming since then either. If these researchers' conclusions are correct, what a dilemma for the environmentalists! They loudly proclaim we must do whatever it takes to stop global warming, but they can hardly promote increasing chemical pollution. The solution to the problem is stop thinking that human activity warms and cools the earth and therefore we can control the climate. As the researchers admit solar radiation decreased and ocean currents changed during the decade of their study, but we cannot control these. Climate researchers, environmentalists and politicians need to humble themselves and admit the earth's climate is under the control of the Creator God who does control the sun and the oceans. They can then put their efforts into doing

the things we can control, such as cleaning up chemical pollution, planting trees, and other things that are good stewardship of the earth. (Ref. climate, politics, weather)

**5. EVOLUTION IS WHAT?** We recently received a question from an atheist containing a number of claims that evolution was proven because humans and animals had genes left over from evolutionary ancestors. We sent back some answers (see below) but our atheist questioner responded with: "You clearly don't even know what evolution is".

Therefore, to help everybody out let's tell you what it is! The atheist's full comments as to what evolution is make a good starting point for this discussion: "*Unbelievable - simply unbelievable. As I read through your responses I could not help but be shocked over and over at how little you know about evolution, something you seem to be trying very hard to ignore. It is absolutely stunning that you think you can refute peer reviewed published papers like this (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC152291>).*

*You clearly don't even know what the definition of evolution is so let me make it clear. Evolution is very simply a change in allele frequency in a population of organisms over time. That's it. That definition includes loss of function mutations, lethal mutations, neutral mutations and beneficial mutations because, no matter what you've been told, evolution is not a process by which bigger and stronger and faster and better things "win" over smaller or weaker or slower or worse things. If a single organism in a population dies, that population has evolved. If a single organism lives and has more babies than another organism, that population has evolved. If a population of organisms is wiped out by disease, that species of organisms has evolved. If an entire species of organisms goes extinct, that means life has evolved. Sometimes humans can grow tails which clearly proves that we are apes."*

ED. COM. PART 1. So let us define evolution. During the 1960's high school textbooks pictured ape-like creatures progressively standing upright as they evolved into man and this conveyed a non technical idea that man had ascended from lesser creatures, and was not a created being. Evolutionary tree diagrams showed amoebae at one end and man at the other, and these definitely got across the concept of living things changing from simple single celled organisms to complex and different organisms. By the time this editor had finished three years of genetics on top of a degree in geology, the definition of evolution had evolved to be a change in allele (gene variations) frequency. However, this does not explain how living things, with genes, evolved from non-living chemicals, without genes. Neither does it explain how the large complex organisms acquired new genes that are not found in simple single celled organisms. Furthermore, if evolution is merely a change in gene frequency, what word should be used to describe the process of changing a single cell into a worm, or apes into people?

The gene frequency argument is used to confuse people by getting them to admit that because change in gene frequency does occur, therefore they can jump to the conclusion that evolution is true, so therefore creation must be wrong. But despite our atheist friend's definition above, clever people finally figured out that events such as dying will change the gene frequency, but definitely do not cause anything to evolve as they can only leave behind the survivors that already exist. Likewise, to say that life has evolved if some species go extinct is equally absurd since it would mean that life is fully evolved only when everything is dead. Presumably the dinosaurs are now fully evolved.

Finally, due to the sheer unworkability of every suggested definition, the word *evolution* has evolved to mean *change* – any change, with the result that people conclude that if change is true, evolution must be true and therefore creation must be false. This is one more part of a trend in science to define all biological processes as evolutionary, and therefore make evolution true by definition, rather than by observation.

So we will work with the traditional definition of evolution, as understood by the general public and presented in the popular media, i.e. a process by which chemicals turned into living cells and cells then turned into more and more complex organisms, culminating with ape like creatures turning

into humans, which is the real concept our atheist is on about as proved by his final statement: "Sometimes humans can grow tails which clearly proves that we are apes." Showing that his real definition is the same one that Darwin and every evolutionist on the Discovery channel or BBC or the school board really means - that man (a) ascended from lesser creatures and (b) was not a created being.

ED. COM. PART 2. When we asked this questioner what observations or experiments show that whale leg genes, human tail genes etc, are left over from evolution, we received many links to various technical and not so technical sites, which we have examined. Our responses are below.

**Evolutionary Claim about whales having leg genes:** Cetacean (whale) hindlimb genes were selectively inactivated by modification of expression.

Reference: [Pharyngula](#)

**Answer:** Checking the source shows that the description "selectively inactivated by modification of expression" is an interpretation based on a prior belief in evolution, and definitely not a scientific observation of an actual process. The observation is that body form control genes act differently in whales compared with land animals. No-one has observed a land animal's genes undergo modification to become a whale's genes, so any claims about how they came to be different is a matter of belief.

**Evolutionary Claim about human tails:** Humans still have the genes to grow tails but have lost (through evolution) the regulatory sequences needed to control the process.

References: [sfgate](#) [Talk Origins](#)

**Answer:** The so called tail genes we possess are simply genes for bones, joints, muscle, nerves etc. But since genes only function under the control of separate and pre-existent regulatory genes, these genes will not build a tail unless the control genes tell them to. Our human regulatory genes do not work to make these other genes ever form a tail. The human coccyx is sometimes called the "tail bone" and is claimed to be a vestigial tail left over from evolution. In fact, the coccyx is a functional part of the human musculo-skeletal system. Again this is not an actual observation of a process, but an evolutionary interpretation of the facts. For more information about the coccyx see our article *Vestigial Organs*, available as a PDF [CLICK](#).

For more detailed versions of the above two answers [CLICK](#).

**Evolutionary Claim about hen's teeth:** Chickens retain the ability to grow teeth, even though birds lost this feature (through evolution) long ago.

Reference: [Scientific American](#)

**Answer:** Soon after this report appeared in Scientific America in 2006 we wrote about it in Evidence News - see our original item [CLICK](#). The report described the formation of tiny conical protuberances on the jaws of developing chicken embryos that contained a mutation named "talpid2". These growths were claimed to resemble alligator teeth. The growths did not develop into teeth, mainly because the mutation is fatal and embryos with it normally all die before they are 12 days old. Such a lethal mutation cannot contribute anything to the evolution of either reptiles or birds. Since this experiment no-one has shown that chickens can grow teeth. Therefore, hen's teeth are still as rare as ...

**Evolutionary Claim about hen's teeth 2:** Although broken (during evolution), genes for the development of enamel are still present in the chicken genome.

Reference: [Biomed Central](#)

**Answer:** Chickens do have one (amelogenin, AMEL) of four genes thought to be involved in enamel formation, and this alone is insufficient to grow teeth. Some fossil birds do have teeth, so if modern birds have lost enamel forming genes there has been degeneration, not evolution. In the same way some people are born without arms or legs. Mum and dad had the genes to make them

but they have become defunct in their offspring. This is degeneration, not evolution. We still do not know what every gene in the chicken genome does so the simple situation is more research is needed to find out why they lost genes and devolved, and what these genes actually do in the living chicken genome.

**Evolutionary Claim about Cave Fish:** The Mexican Blind Cave Fish has the genes to produce eye sockets even though it has lost its eyes (through evolution).

Reference: [Journal of Hereditary](http://jhered.oxfordjournals.org/content/96/3/185.short) <http://jhered.oxfordjournals.org/content/96/3/185.short>

**Answer:** This fish does have genes to produce eyes and eye sockets, but they don't function because they don't get the right stimulation during embryonic development. The fish need light to start the process of growing eyes. This was shown in an experiment where scientists were able to induce eye development in the cave fish by transplanting tissue from fish that lived in light and had eyes. We have written about this in a previous Evidence News ([CLICK](#)) and in the *Vestigial Organs* article ([CLICK](#)).

**Evolutionary Claim about human smell genes:** Humans can't smell as well as we could because we lost (through evolution) some specific olfactory receptor genes.

Reference: [PNAS](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC152291) <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC152291>

**Answer:** It is true that human sense of smell is a lot less sensitive than many animals, and this is partly due to loss of functional genes. This is change, but again it is degeneration, the opposite of evolution. The original very good world would have been filled with good smells, but we know our current sin-corrupted world is full of bad smells, so who would like to perceive the world as being smellier than we can sense now? Let's give thanks for small mercies.

**Our concluding statement:** All of the above studies actually show either differences in gene function between different living things, or a real loss of gene function. The conclusion that the differences or losses are the result of evolution is a belief by blind faith without any observed process of evolving at all – who are assuming evolution to interpret present day situations which are then claimed as proof of the very thing they have assumed and amount to no more than lots of noise from evolutionists.

Since geneticists can only observe how genes function in the present, any claims about what such genes may or may not have done in the past are beyond the limits of science unless such scientists are willing to accept valid historical data on the origin and history of life. But then that's what this debate is about – the only authority scientists are trained to accept is their own and God is ruled out by definition – sad but true!

But if you are willing to accept God the Creator has given us a real history of the world, surprise surprise, you will find the observations described above can be better explained by the Biblical record that God created separate kinds of creatures with the differences in gene function built in, and some of these genes have degenerated as part of the overall degeneration of living things since man sinned and God judged the world.

(Ref. devolution, fall, macro evolution, micro evolution)

**6. DONATIONS TO HELP CREATION RESEARCH WORLDWIDE** can be sent to the following addresses or use our secure Web site: <http://www.creationresearch.net> and click DONATIONS. Donations in USA/UK are tax deductible. See instructions online.

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

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

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/>

AUSTRALIA: P.O. Box 260 Capalaba Qld 4157

**Evidence News 17/11 – 20<sup>th</sup> July 2011**

CANADA: Westney Heights Baptist Church 1201 Ravenscroft Rd Ajax Ont. L1T 4K5

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

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)