



Atheist claim divine rape, Monogamy originated by murder, Neanderthal had great tools, shoes make our feet go ape and whether you are mice or men, don't miss today's radio spectacular on UCB Vision with Ken Ham and John Mackay as you enjoy today's Evidence News 17/13 with EDitorial COMment from the Creation Research Team across the globe.

© 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. NEW QUESTION**
- 2. DON'T MISS**
- 3. KEN HAM / JOHN MACKAY DVD NOW AVAILABLE IN AUSTRALIA**
- 4. GOOD NEWS ABOUT OUR FACT FILE**
- 5. X CHROMOSOME IN MICE AND MEN**
- 6. INFANT MURDER DROVE MONOGAMY**
- 7. APE-LIKE FEET: EVOLUTION OR SHOES?**
- 8. FROM THE ARCHIVES**
- 9. DONATIONS**

For ENEWS as PDF – [CLICK](#).

1. NEW QUESTION: "DIVINE RAPE? How can you believe in the Old Testament God who would order young girls raped in Numbers 31? Why don't you at least replace him with the much nicer New Testament Jesus!"
[Answer](#) by John Mackay.

2. DON'T MISS today WEDNESDAY DOWNUNDER <http://www.vision.org.au/featured/creationists-visit-vision>
Karen and Matty interview the Creation Guy John Mackay and AiG's one and only Ken Ham.





3. KEN HAM / JOHN MACKAY DVD NOW AVAILABLE IN AUSTRALIA: GROUND BREAKING, REVEALING, FASCINATING, CHALLENGING are the words which best describe the new DVD, filmed at the Creation Museum in Kentucky featuring John Mackay and Ken Ham as they show and discuss: “The Museum, The Ark, The Evidence, The Results, The Opposition, The Victories, The Blessings, The Future”. Available [here](#).

4. GOOD NEWS ABOUT OUR FACT FILE. Over the last few months Dr Diane Eager has moved nearly 2,000 archived items from 14 years of sending out Evidence News. This is a fabulous resource. These have been relocated to our much more searchable [Creation Research site](#), click **Archives** then choose **Fact File**. This will take you to the search page, where you can insert topic of interest.

AND we have also moved our **Topical Articles** to the [Creation Research site](#). These are available as PDFs. To find articles go to the [Topical Articles](#) page to see a list of titles, and click on the title of your choice to download the PDF. We will continue to add items to this archive, so make use of this great resource.

5. X CHROMOSOME IN MICE AND MEN, reported in articles in The Scientist, ScienceNOW and ScienceDaily. David Page, a geneticist at the Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and colleagues have carried out a detailed study of the X chromosome in order to fill in gaps left when the chromosome was first sequenced over a decade ago. The X chromosome is considered to be the female chromosome, although it has long been known to carry genes for general body functions needed by both males and females. They found that many genes on the chromosome existed as single copies, but there were also regions containing long palindromic sequences, i.e. mirror image copies of genes. These regions are called ampliconic regions.

Page’s team also wanted to test “Ohno’s law”, an idea proposed in the 1960’s by Susumu Ohno, which, according to the researchers, “states that the gene content of X chromosomes is conserved across placental mammals”. This means it has not evolved as much as other chromosomes, and therefore human X chromosome should be very similar to that of mammals, such as mice. The research team compared the results of their detailed sequence of the human X with the mouse X. The X chromosome contains approximately 800 genes and the researchers found some 340 genes that were not shared between mice and men. According to ScienceNOW: “There are 144 human X chromosome genes with no counterparts in mice, and 197 such mice genes are unique. Of the 144 human ones, 107 exist in multiple copies in the newly sequenced duplicated regions of the X and seem to be changing rapidly. Based on such evidence, Page concludes that these genes have appeared since the ancestors of mice and humans split off from each other”. Jianzhi Zhang, an evolutionary geneticist at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, commented: “I am surprised by the large number of unshared genes between the human X and mouse X. The finding suggests that X chromosome gene content is probably changing all the time”. The other interesting thing about the genes in the ampliconic regions is that some of them are expressed in distinctly male tissues, and are not expressed at all in females, and some even seem to have a role in sperm production.

Links: [ScienceDaily](#), [The Scientist](#)

ED. COM. The fact that the X chromosome has some genes needed in male tissues is not all that surprising when you consider the Biblical origins of man and woman. The X chromosome is currently regarded as the female chromosome, because females have two X’s, and they need both to develop female reproductive organs and to be fertile. Males have one X chromosome, but also need a male determining Y chromosome. Therefore, Adam was created with one X and one Y, and needed both to function normally. Since God made Adam first and equipped him with both X and Y chromosomes needed to exhibit maleness, then followed up by making the woman from Adam’s tissue, He had all necessary components needed to make a human female. He just had to give Eve a duplicate X, instead of the Y. Thus, Eve with two copies of the X was a unique creation, but still one flesh with Adam. It is therefore not so strange that the supposed female X

chromosome carries genes needed for male function, because from Adam's time onwards males would inherit their one X chromosome only via their mothers. The newer discovery of genes that are not shared between mice and men does not prove any genes have changed. It does prove they are different, and it is consistent with the Biblical teaching that mice and men were never related, but were separate created kinds, each with an appropriate X chromosome genes built by the Creator. Perhaps Ohno's Evolution law should be revised to "Evolution - Oh no!" (Ref. genetics, gender)

6. INFANT MURDER DROVE MONOGAMY reports ScienceNOW and ScienceDaily 29 July 2013 and ABC News in Science 30 July 2013. Two groups of scientists have been investigating why social monogamy, i.e. living in pairs, evolved. Quentin Atkinson of the [University of Auckland](#), and colleagues, gathered data on 230 primate species and plotted them on an evolutionary tree and then used statistical methods to "re-run evolution millions of times across the family tree to discover whether different behaviours evolved together across time, and if so, which behaviour evolved first".

Atkinson claimed: "We found that the only thing that cropped up regularly before you get the emergence of social monogamy is a high level of infanticide. That's the evidence we use to argue the risk of infanticide might have been what drove social monogamy in primates". The researchers suggest social monogamy evolved because males would guard their own infants from any murderous intentions by other males who desired the infant's mother, and would kill the offspring so the desired female would be ready to breed again, because she no longer had an infant to nurture. Males could best be sure the infant they were protecting was theirs only if living in a mutually monogamous pair.

Meanwhile, University of Cambridge zoologists Dieter Lukas and Tim Clutton-Brock collected data on more than 2,500 mammalian species and found that "nine per cent of mammals are socially monogamous, including a few rodents, a number of primates, and some carnivores, like jackals, wolves, and meerkats". They concluded that this monogamy developed in situations where males could not guard more than one female from other males, as occurs where there is a low density of females, with little overlap of home ranges. Clutton-Brock explained: "Where females are widely dispersed, the best strategy for a male is to stick with one female, defend her, and make sure that he sires all her offspring. In short, a male's best strategy is to be monogamous".

The study did not include humans and Clutton-Brock commented, "It is debatable whether humans should be classified as monogamous. Because all the African apes are polygamous and group living, it is likely that the common ancestor of hominids was also polygamous. One possibility is that the shift to monogamy in humans may be the result in the change of dietary patterns that reduce female density. While another is that slow development of juveniles required extended care by both sexes. However, reliance by humans on cultural adaptations means that it is difficult to extrapolate from ecological relationships in other animals".

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

ED. COM. The basis of human monogamy is clearly summed up by the Creator Christ who told the religious leaders of his day, "he who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'". (Matthew 19:4-5). Therefore, we can firmly state that human monogamy works because that is how the Creator designed human beings to function. It also means human beings have no right to re-define marriage, as has happened in many societies that sanctioned polygamy, and in current western countries who are busily redefining marriage to include homosexuality. It is possible that animals and birds were once all monogamous as well. When God sent the animals to Noah to go on board the Ark God told Noah: Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female: and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female. Of fowls also of the air by sevens, the male and the female; to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth. (Genesis 7:2-3) The brutish violent behaviour between male animals who just want to eat, fight with

other males and have sex with as many females as possible is a degenerate behaviour, resulting from toughing it out in the fallen degenerate world, that has existed since man sinned and God judged the world. That kind of behaviour would have no place in the original “very good” world that God created. And one last point needs to be made: animal behaviour, especially degenerate animal behaviour can never be used to explain, or excuse, human behaviour because humans are not mere animals. Man alone was separately and uniquely created in God’s image. (Ref. marriage, gender)

7. APE-LIKE FEET: EVOLUTION OR SHOES? asks the headline in the Daily Mail 30 May 2013 about a study on human feet also reported in New Scientist and Wired Science 30 May 2013 and BBC News 31 May 2013. Human feet are very different from ape feet. The most obvious difference is that apes have long flexible toes with the big toe being opposed to the other toes, like a thumb. Another significant difference is that human feet have a stiff arch, but ape feet are flat and bend in the middle. This bend is called a “mid tarsal break” and gives ape feet the flexibility needed for tree climbing. Jeremy DeSilva and Simone Gill of Boston University took videos of the feet of people walking bare foot over a carpet fitted with pressure sensors, and then analysed the results to see how much bending occurred in the midfoot. They found 13 of the 398 people they studied had some flexibility similar to a mid-tarsal break in apes. In spite of this, there was no significant difference in the way they walked, although they did have flatter feet than average and a tendency to roll the feet inwards as they were walking. Robin Huw Crompton at the University of Liverpool, UK, who has also studied flexible feet, suggests they are a relic of our tree-dwelling days. Tracy Kivell, a palaeoanthropologist from the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, told BBC News: “The research has implications for how we interpret the fossil record and the evolution of these features. It’s good to understand the normal variation among humans before we go figure out what it means in the fossil record”. However, De Silva suggests that flexible feet would have been a disadvantage when human ancestors came down from the trees, but is a trait that has reappeared recently. He commented: “My guess is that we are getting more variation than ever before, perhaps because shoes have impacted foot anatomy”. The Daily mail summarised the research as: “One in 13 of us share the same bendy, tree-climbing feet as chimps but scientists can’t decide if it’s down to evolution or our SHOES!” (emphasis in original)

Links: [BBC](#), [Daily Mail](#), [New Scientist](#), [Wired Science](#)

ED. COM. This evidence will help interpret the fossil record, as very few foot bones are preserved in the record, and they certainly cannot walk. The shape of the bones alone will not tell scientists if their owners had flexible or stiff feet. The people who had the flexible feet in the Boston study had the same foot bones as those with stiffer feet. Having some extra flexibility in the mid-foot will not enable humans to climb trees in the way apes do, and it is not evidence that our feet were once ape feet. It just means some people have some loose ligaments, and as anyone who has really flat feet will tell you it is not an advantage. There is no evidence it can be blamed on shoes either. In fact, it is a sign that human feet, like the rest of our bodies, are degenerating downwards, not evolving upwards. (Ref. anthropology, gait)

8. FROM THE ARCHIVES: [Neanderthal Tools](#), [Foot Bones](#), [Male Chromosomes](#), [Monogamous animals](#)

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](#), 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)

Evidence News 17/13 – 21st August 2013

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).

