



G'day again from Downunder where Gillard's Carbon tax to fix global warming must surely be working, as its only been in operation for a few weeks and we have had some of the coldest temps in ages. Sound fishy? Well fish, both living and fossil is what this great Evidence News 18/12 18th July 2012 with EDitorial COMment from the whole lot of us at Creation Research including John Mackay is about. Meanwhile don't miss John Mackay in Victoria this week. [www.creationresearch.net](http://www.creationresearch.net) HOME PAGE centre and see those of you in Tennessee USA in just a few weeks.

© 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 QUESTION**
2. **DID YOU MISS?**
3. **FISH EYE STORY**
4. **FOSSIL FISH STORY**
5. **FISHY EVOLUTION**
6. **FROM THE ARCHIVES**
7. **DONATIONS**

For ENEWS as PDF [CLICK](#)

For ENEWS as email – just scroll down.

**1. NEW QUESTION:** “TRANSPOSONS? Why do you persist in pushing creation when surely you can see that Transposons allow evolution to occur in the present despite your fossilised arguments against it?” [Answer](#) by Diane Eager.

**2. DID YOU MISS?** “Human Blood Groups: How did so many blood groups (A, B, AB, O, & Rh) come from only 2 people Adam & Eve? What blood group were they?” [Answer](#).

“SNAKES: If the world was created good, why are creatures like snakes so well designed to hunt prey?” [Answer](#).

**3. FISH EYE STORY** in LiveScience 28 June 2012 and PhysOrg 29 June 2012. Scientists studying the Elephant Nose fish, a strange looking fish that lives in “dark, slow-moving, heavily vegetated waters in central and west Africa” have found it has a most unusual arrangement of photoreceptors in its eyes.

## Evidence News 18/12 – 18th July 2012

Photoreceptors are the cells that convert light into electrical signals, which are then sent to the brain. Like most vertebrates the fish has two kinds of photoreceptors: rods and cones. Rods are able to function in dim light, but do not function in bright light. Cones work in bright light, but not dim light. The Elephant Nose fish retina has hundreds of cup-like structures lined with layers of guanine that act as photonic crystals (a complex of mirrored surfaces) directing the light at the base of the cup, where there is a group of cones. The reflective cups concentrate the light, so that even in the dim light of the murky water where the fish lives, the cones can function. The rods are located behind the cups and they pick up any light that passes right through the cups without being reflected. This arrangement means the fish uses both types of photoreceptors together, and means that the fish can make the most of all the light that penetrates the water. It also means the fish cannot see fine details, but as it lives in turbid waters this is an advantage, as it can see large objects well, but is not distracted by bubbles or sediment in the water.

Andreas Reichenbach, of Leipzig University, Germany, one of the researchers explained: “That’s the advantage the retina brings to the fish. If you or a hawk with its excellent eyesight would be where this fish lives you would see virtually nothing, but the fish can detect what they need to see”. The research team concluded their report: “We conclude that their grouped retina, as a unique type of retinal specialization, has emerged to provide the optical prerequisite to detect large, fast-moving predators as an adaptation to the survival demands of the fish’s habitat. It might be expected that similar evolutionary advantages rationalize the grouped retina found in other species”.

Links: [Live Science](#), [Phys.org](#)

ED. COM. Did you note their argument – the fish has this unusual retina – it uses it for seeing big fish – it catches big fish – it therefore evolved the retina to do this. Only the first three statements are the testable science. The fact: this is a useful retina for a fish that lives in turbid water. However, that does not tell you how the retina came to have this structure. If it didn’t have it before the water went turbid, then it died out if it depended on seeing prey in turbid water. To believe that it just “emerged” to provide the fish with the ability to see large, fast moving predators requires a great deal of ‘blind’ faith if you can forgive the pun. Murky water and large predators have never been observed to change the genes of a fish without this retinal structure into genes required to make this retina.

The study of this fish retina is a good illustration of how easily we can recognise design. The reports about this fish described its retina as “unique”. That does not mean it has components no other fish retina has. Rods and cones are cells found in all vertebrate eyes, and the crystals in the cups are made of guanine – a chemical that exists in many other places. It is the organisation of the parts that makes this retina work – not the parts themselves. As part of their research into this retina the scientists came up with a mathematical model of how the crystal cups worked. This research and conclusion required intelligent scientists and a computer. Therefore, to believe the fish’s retina was designed and created by a smarter and more powerful Creator is anything but a Blind faith. Try and make a copy of this retina if you are still having trouble accepting the argument for design. You will find it requires tremendous creative design and technical expertise. (Ref. ichthyology, optics, vision)

**4. FOSSIL FISH STORY** reported in ScienceDaily and ScienceShots 25 June 2012. Flatfish, such as sole and flounder, have both eyes on the same side of their head. When they first hatch out they have eyes on either side of the head like any other fish, but as they develop into adults they begin to lie on their side on the bottom of the sea. This should mean that one eye would become useless as it would be buried in the sea floor. However, as they grow and develop into adults the eye on what will become the “down side” of the fish migrates to the other side of its head.

Evolutionists have puzzled how this could evolve from a fish with eyes in their normal place. Several years ago Matt Friedman a graduate student at Department of Geology, Field Museum, Chicago found

### Evidence News 18/12 – 18th July 2012

some adult fossil fish in a museum collection that had one eye in the normal place and the other up near the top of its head. These partially asymmetrical fish, named *Amphistium* and *Heteronectes*, were originally found in rocks in Italy and are dated at 50 million years old. Friedman has now published a detailed description of a well-preserved whole specimen of *Heteronectes* from Bolca in Northern Italy. According to ScienceDaily “*Heteronectes*, with its flattened form, shows the perfect intermediate stage between most fish with eyes on each side of the head and specialized flatfishes where both eyes are on the same side”. John Long of the Natural History Museum of LA County commented: “This is a profound discovery which clearly shows that intermediate fossil forms, which according to certain creationist theories shouldn't exist, are regularly turning up as scientists keep looking for them”.

Link: [ScienceDaily](#)

ED. COM. When this fish was first reported in 2008 Friedman commented in his report “*Amphistium* and *Heteronectes* are contemporaries of the earliest members of many derived pleuronectiform (flatfish) lineages, including the oldest known sole”. This means *Heteronectes* cannot be the ancestor of flatfish, because fossils of flatfish with fully asymmetrical eyes already existed. The fact that *Heteronectes* is now extinct whilst soles are still living is not evidence *Heteronectes* evolved into a flatfish. It simply means it is dead. See our previous report [here](#). Given the fossil data of what fish existed at the same time, if we line up all the coexistent fish fossils according to their similarities and differences in structure, - yes - you could put this one between the fully symmetrical and fully asymmetrical fish, and the result is you definitely can classify this fish as “intermediate”, but only because of your method of organising our knowledge of fish. BUT the fact that it co-exists with all the other varieties tells you for sure it is not the ancestor or descendant of the fish on either side in your arbitrary arrangement. They all lived at the same time. Using the fossil as evidence of an evolutionary “transition” is purely based on a pre-existing belief in evolution, not an observation of an actual process. (Ref. ichthyology, palaeontology)

**5. FISHY EVOLUTION** reported in Nature News 2012 and Proceedings of the Royal Society B 11 July 2012. Every Spring salmon migrate from the ocean into rivers and streams in order to breed. Daily records of numbers of salmon migrating up Auk Creek, Alaska have been kept since 1971. These show that in the 1970s there were two peaks in the numbers within one migration season, but by 2011 there has been a marked decline in the numbers in the later migration. In 1979 some genetic researchers bred a genetic marker into the late migrating fish so they could be distinguished from the early migrating population. A team of scientists in Alaska have used genetic data from migrating salmon collected over 30 years and have shown a significant decrease in the frequency of the gene marker. Ryan Kovach, a population ecologist at the University of Alaska in Fairbanks, claimed: “We show that there has been a genetic shift towards earlier migration timing through what appears to be natural selection against the late-migrating individuals in the population”. Over this same period there has been an increase in the average temperature of the water in the stream by approximately one degree Celsius, and this is believed to have selected against the late migrating fish. The researchers also noted the overall population of salmon has not decreased, and according to Nature News this is “genetic evidence of climate-change adaptation”. The Nature News article is entitled “Pink salmon evolve to migrate earlier in warmer waters”. In their original report in Proceedings of the Royal Society B the research team wrote: “Although microevolution may have allowed this population to successfully track environmental change, it may have come at the cost of a decrease of within-population biocomplexity—the loss of the late run. This is not a surprising result; by definition, directional selection will decrease genetic variation”.

Link: [Nature News](#)

ED. COM. We are pleased to see these scientists admit something we have been saying for a long time: natural selection decreases genetic variation, i.e. causes genetic loss. The Alaskan biologists with their evolutionary mindset may call this “microevolution” but what has happened is actually the opposite of evolution. The Auk Creek salmon are still the same species of salmon, and having warm water act against the gene marked late arrivers, has not made the other salmon change into anything else.

## **Evidence News 18/12 – 18th July 2012**

Evolution requires new genes to be added to living things, but as these researchers correctly point out, they added a gene marker and natural selection is definitely taking it out. Natural selection is a real process, but it can never produce evolution. Whatever has happened to these salmon, they have not evolved, but they have produced their own kind as Genesis says they were created to do. (Ref. ichthyology, population genetics)

**6. FROM THE ARCHIVES:** Each week we publish links to previous items related to this issue's topics: [Blind Cave Fish](#), [Fish Evolution](#), [Fossil Fishes](#).

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.

**7. 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)**

