EVOLUTIONARY CONTRADICTIONS AND GEOLOGICAL FACTS†

R. W. MORRELL *

The sweeping claims made by many evolutionists stand in stark contrast with their specific admissions. They claim, in general terms, that evolution is well established. But when the question is that of the origin of some particular creature, doubts and vague speculations abound. Moreover, while they claim that there is abundant evidence for evolution, when pressed for details they have to admit that the fossils show gaps, not continuous variation. As for the other alleged evidence, it is evidence only to someone already determined to believe in evolution.

The primary importance of palaeontology in respect of the theory of evolution was recognized by Darwin in his *Origin of Species*. He knew that the fossil record did not support his speculations, but he was confident that subsequent research would fill the gaps.

Since Darwin first expressed his hopes in 1859 geologists have laboured to fulfill his expectation. Their efforts, however, have been a case of labor in vain, for the hoped-for evidence has not turned up.

In his contribution to *Darwin's Biological Work*, a book published by Cambridge University Press, in 1959 to celebrate the anniversary of the publication of *Origin of Species*, a distinguished geologist, John Challinor, late of the University College of Wales, admits that the fossil record only "partly supports evolution", but it also supports "separate and independent creation". He asks the question: "Is there any positive proof, from any part of the evidence, that evolution has, or has not, occurred?", and answers it negatively ("Palaeontology and Evolution" in *Darwin's Biological Work*, 1959. Republished, 1970, p. 53).

Here, then, we have a professional geologist clearly stating that the fossil record does not demonstrate evolution and in actual fact can be used to demonstrate creation. Dr. Challinor, though, is an evolutionist, despite what his research has revealed, but, aware of the significance of his admissions, goes on to speak of "near proof" being obtained "in some cases". This suggests that "we are justified in assuming that most probably it is universal and we must try to explain the general paucity of evidence as best we may". He then adds,

> someone seriously combating the whole idea of evolution might well ask, in some exasperation, what evidence against evolution the evolutionary palaeontologist could not explain away to his own satisfaction.

In short, Dr. Challinor tells us rather bluntly that evolutionary palaeontologists argue around difficulties rather than answer them.

Continuity versus Gaps

It is a basic evolutionary postulate that continuity exists at all taxonomic levels, and in a review of the palaeontological evidence advanced for evolution, the British palaeontologist, Professor F. H. T. Rhodes, now of the University of Michigan, confidently asserts that it does and can be demonstrated. However, almost immediately after making the claim, he qualifies it by adding the words "only in a limited number of cases". (The Course of Evolution, *Proceedings of the Geological Association*, 1966, 77(1):16).

Presumably Professor Rhodes hoped that nobody would note the fact that he had contradicted himself; for either continuity did exist and was demonstrable, or it did not. As a palaeontologist he is well aware that the chain of continuity for which he argues, is broken almost at the start with a gap between the Precambrian and the Cambrian.

An examination of the standard manual on fossil identification, (British Museum, Natural History, *British Palaeozoic Fossils*), will show that it does not describe or illustrate any Precambrian species, despite the fact that the era has strata ideal for the preservation of the remains of past life. This lack of fossils from the Precambrian has produced a crop of theories in explanation, and while they make for interesting, or entertaining, reading, they shed little if any light upon the problem.

Rhodes admits that the Cambrian abounds in fossils, stating it to have over 900 species representative of nine phyla. Many of these species are both complex and highly specialized and demand an evolutionary history if the theory is to get off the ground. However, neither Rhodes nor anyone else has provided them with one based upon hard facts.

Precambrian–Cambrian Boundary

The question of the boundary between the Cambrian and the Precambrian is of some interest; and has a direct bearing upon the claims made for some recent discoveries in Australia which have been placed in the late Precambrian. On an international basis, the boundary between the Precambrian and Cambrian is distinguished in terms of a discontinuity. Where found it is argued that the strata above is Cambrian and that below Precambrian. This discontinuity is not present in Britain, and even where it is present in other countries (and it is not always easy to see, or see at all) the actual rocks can tell us nothing about the supposed age difference between the two systems. Thus it can be argued that if a discontinuity can be observed, it simply represents a violent upheaval of short duration, certainly not one of a duration long enough to account for evolutionary change. There is in fact considerable difficulty in determining what is and what is not Precambrian and Cambrian, for comparison of rock samples can demonstrate nothing positive other than their composition. Challinor, in the work already cited, brings this out when he states that

> when strata with a Lower Cambrian fauna are conformably underlain by a great thickness of unfossiliferous strata it must be somewhat uncertain whether these lower strata, particularly the lowest of them, should be classed as Cambrian or Precambrian (p. 70).

Rhodes notes that the method of deciding what belongs to what, is quite arbitrary. He writes:

> The base of the Cambrian is not always a precise stratigraphic horizon. Stratigraphic correlation *is almost always a matter of faith*, done entirely on an intercontinental scale by matching similar faunas. In the case of the lowest Cambrian there is a distinct possibility that our correlation may be tenuous. This means, in short, that fossil material claimed as Pre-

*R. W. Morrell is a geologist and bookseller. His address is 43 Eugene Gardens, Nottingham, England.

†This item was originally published by the Evolution Protest Movement of Great Britain, as a supplement publication. It is reprinted here, in a slightly condensed form, by permission. The material, it is hoped, will be of interest to readers, many of whom do not see publications of the Evolution Protest Movement.–Editor.

cambrian could just as well be ascribed to the Cambrian, and thus the break in continuity becomes not simply a gap but a yawning chasm. (Emphasis added)

Australian Fossils Considered

This brings us to the Australian fossils already mentioned. They were discovered at Ediacara in South Australia, and have been hailed as being one of the most important discoveries of Precambrian material yet made. Personal examination of some of these fossils gave me the impression that an inorganic explanation can be advanced for several.

However, it is clear that a great deal of the material is undoubtedly the remains of long dead creatures. Without exception all are complex, thus posing considerable problems for evolutionists. In appearance they are related to creatures found in formations dated by geologists much younger than the Cambrian, and so it is not without significance when we learn that initially they were ascribed to the Cambrian and not the Precambrian.

They were dropped into the late Precambrian out of stratigraphic considerations, which, as we have seen, both Challinor and Rhodes have pointed out, is a process that abounds in uncertainty and doubt. Thus fossils are claimed as being Precambrian, but which, as everyone well knows, could well be early, middle or even late Cambrian.

Attention to Transitional Links

Transitional links are essential to the theory of evolution, for making the continuity that Rhodes claims. In his paper he asserts that transitional forms exist to link amphibians with reptiles, and reptiles with mammals. The link claimed between amphibians and reptiles is to be found, according to Rhodes, among the Seymouriamorphs, *Seymouria* displaying both amphibian and reptilian characteristics. But is Rhodes correct in his contention?

In a work published only a few weeks before the Rhodes paper, W. E. Swinton, the international authority on fossil reptiles, flatly contradicts Rhodes, and denies that *Seymouria* can be a transitional form. He states that the degree of specialization displayed by it precludes *Seymouria* from the immediate line of reptilian ancestry (*Fossil Amphibians and Reptiles* 1965, pp. 25-27). Swinton also points out that *Seymouria's* systematic position is open to question.

The transitional form between reptiles and the mammals is to be found, according to Rhodes, among the therapsids. Swinton does not agree, maintaining that all they do is to indicate the lines along which evolution took place. Rhodes omits any discussion of the difficulties involved in his claim; for example:

(1) how the reptilian jaw, which differs from that of a mammal in the number of bones present and the articulation with the skull, could have evolved without the transitional forms dying out through their inability to eat; or

(2) how the highly complex organ in the ears of mammals, termed the corti, which is completely lacking in reptiles, could have evolved, and from what.

Any creatures undergoing the changes involved in the evolutionary formation of such structures as the corti, or major anatomical variation in their jaw structure, would become extinct, because they could not have survived over the period demanded by evolutionists for such changes to have taken place. The late Sir Gavin de Beer recognized the difficulties involved in postulating mammalian evolution and hinted strongly that the essential transitional forms demanded by the theory of evolution will never be forthcoming, when he wrote that "fossils which might be regarded as ancestral to the existing mammals have not yet been found" (*Advancement of Science*, 1954, XI(42):167).

The American authority on dinosaurs, Professor E. H. Colbert, refers to the fact that "we can obtain no direct evidence on these changes (the establishment of constant body temperature, insulating coat of hair, reproductive organs, etc.) . . ." (*Scientific American Reprint*, The Ancestors of Mammals. March, 1949, p. 4). One assumes that evolutionists are aware of such difficulties, and so must know that, without the required evidence, his claims amount to wishful thinking as distinct from hard scientific fact.

Evolution and Structural Differences

The great bulk of the fossil evidence advanced for evolution consists of examples of structural differences. Thus fossil sea urchins are said to display evidence for evolution on the basis of changes seen in specimens collected in sequence. Changes in structure (body size, shape and size of beaks) is advanced as evidence of evolution among finches on the Galapagos Islands, and in a recent paper entitled Divergence and Evolution in Darwin's Finches (*Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 1973, 5, pp. 289-295), Ford, Parkin and Ewing present material on the differences displayed by various finches, and the advantages given to some by the shape of their beaks.

Yet such differences are not, as the authors assume, evidence for evolution anymore than are the reasons why they came about. Thus when they write of such differentiation as illustrating "the importance of these finches in the development of our knowledge or evolution" (p. 295), they simply display on their own part a confusion between evolution and development within the species. For, after all, the finches remain finches in the same manner that the differentiation in the sea urchins still leaves them as echinoderms.

I commenced with the observations of Dr. John Challinor expressed in a volume eulogistic of Darwin. His conclusions as to what evidence the various fossil groups display for the theory of evolution, contrast markedly with the assertions of Professor Rhodes, and are certainly deserving of careful consideration. He stated:

Foraminifera: "As the evidence stands, the morphological series shown do not always seem to have very strong claims to being evolutionary series" (p. 79).

Anthozoa: "Any suggestion is welcome in the attempt to find some evolutionary scheme into which the corals may be fitted" (p. 80).

Echinoidea: "Their number (the unanswered questions) is a measure of our ignorance" (Challinor is quoting another writer) (p. 81).

Brachiopoda: "Such is the imperfection of the geological record of evolution" (p. 82).

Mollusca: "No very coherent picture emerges when we trace the lammelibranchs and gastropods through the stratigraphical systems" (p. 82).

Trilobita: "The Cambrian record . . . reveals very little of the evolutionary paths they followed" (p. 86).

Graptolithina: "The links in the supposed evolutionary chains are not so secure as was thought" (p. 87).

Vertebrates: "The origin of the vertebrates is no more clearly revealed than the origin of any other phylum . . ." "The frailty of the palaeontological evidence" (pp. 88 & 89).

Plants: ". . . meagre evidence . . . ." (p. 89).

Conclusions

In the light of such conclusions, the self-confident claims by Huxley and others of "the fact of evolution", take on a rather hollow ring. Yet, when we are regaled in the press or over TV and radio concerning evolution, the weakness of the case for it, as revealed by the quotations given above (which are just a few), is never mentioned.

Yet the facts are there for all to see, and indicate that due consideration should be given to alternative ideas; and scientists, who object to this, appear to be more concerned with upholding a particular dogma than seeking for the truth.

SINKING CONTINENTS

JAMES R. HONEYMAN *

Mt. Ararat is an extinct volcano, and there are signs that it erupted and built up under water. It seems possible that this happened at the time of the Flood, when the continents were below the sea level. At the present time the crust of the earth is depressed in the areas occupied by the nothern and southern ice caps, as is learned by tracking artificial satellites. The weight of the two ice caps, it is suggested, would cause excessive internal pressure in the earth; and the ocean floors, being thinner than the continents, would rupture and then be uplifted. Displaced ocean water, added to the loads of ice, would cause the continents to sink, further uplifting the ocean floors. Magma from the rifts would heat the oceans, gradually melting the ice caps. Then, when the load of ice was mostly gone, equilibrium was restored.

The Problem Related to the Flood

Numerous mechanisms for the Flood have been advanced, but serious questions remain. The proposal offered here is an outline for study, not a conclusive answer. An attempt is made to suggest forces which are capable of producing two well established phenomena: (1) depressed areas of the crust, and (2) the mid-ocean rifts. That the rifts may have been caused by immense loads of ice on land has not previously been proposed, to the writer's knowledge.

Initial investigation of this possibility resulted from the geological study of Mt. Ararat by Burdick.[1] In a personal conversation, he stated that every piece of lava examined anywhere on the mountain had obviously hardened under water. Other indications that it had once been submerged consisted of some sedimentary rock and several examples of pillow lava. Since the peak reaches nearly 17,000 feet elevation and the base is 3,000 to 4,000 feet above sea level, here is powerful evidence that the entire area was at one time below sea level.

Moreover, working with Burdick, Read[2] demonstrated that lava samples from Ararat had only very small vesicles (gas pockets), or none at all. In this characteristic these samples matched lava samples dredged up from very deep water around the Hawaiian Islands. All magma contains gases, mostly steam, which usually expand and leave pockets as the lava hardens.

Apparently under the pressure of a great depth of water, vesicles are not able to form. Burdick and Read concluded that Ararat had erupted and had built up most of its height during the Flood. It is certainly not unusual for volcanoes to develop under water, as there are hundreds located on the ocean floors today.

Thickness of Crust

From consideration of very simple facts, it is commonly believed the continents are somewhat thicker than the sub-ocean strata. The crust of the earth "floats" on the plastic interior, according to the theory of isostasy. If a log floats on water, the major part is under the surface with only a few inches protruding. If the log is held upright however, several feet may be above water.

Following the analogy, geophysicists assume that the thickness of the continents must be somewhat greater than the under-ocean strata. Since great mountain ranges have no tendency to sink, it is further assumed that extensive "roots" must penetrate deep into the magma to maintain their elevation.

Extensive research by oceanographers using seismic shooting techniques provides measurements for the difference in thickness of the suboceanic crust and the continents. Ewing and Engel[3] report:

> These showed that the undersea crust in both the Atlantic and Pacific is only four to six kilometers thick, compared with the 25-to-40 kilometer thickness of the crust beneath the continents.

Of course, both ocean and continent are underlain by the mantle, which would add some tensile strength to each. The difference in this characteristic probably favors the continents by no more than a factor of two to one.

In *Physical Geology*, by Longwell, Knopf and Flint,[4] the authors state another difference between continents and ocean floors:

> Examination of the rocks that make up the Earth's crust has brought out a highly significant fact. Under the continents, rocks that approximate granite in their composition are predominant. In islands that rise from the floors of the oceans, however, the rocks characteristically have the composition of dark basalt . . . .
>
> Volume for volume, granitic rock is about 10% lighter in weight than basaltic rock. Therefore, an obvious hypothesis is suggested: great blocks in the crust made of low-density rocks, if they are to rest in balance with adjacent blocks that have higher density, must have larger volume and hence will rise to greater height.

A rather simple experiment can be described here, with quite predictable results, which serves to illustrate the proposed theory. The purpose of the experiment is to show, on a small scale, what might happen if great loads of ice accumulated near both poles.

Simple Experiment Described

An ordinary cardboard globe may be used to represent the crust of the earth. Because the continents are thicker than the ocean floors, it would be desirable to reinforce all

*James R. Honeyman is Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Creation-Science Research Center. His address is 2610 Upper Terrace, La Crescenta, California 91214.