

The Transitional Form Problem

Jerry Bergman*

Abstract

Naturalistic evolutionists often claim that the strongest proof of their theory is found in the science of paleontology. If naturalistic non-life to human life evolution is true, multi-billions of links are required to bridge modern humans with the chemicals which once existed in some primitive “soup” found in the ocean or mud puddles and which were assumed to have given birth to life more than 3.5 billion years ago. Furthermore, these multi-billions of intermediate links would be a prominent part of the fossil record. And multi-millions more links are needed to connect

humans with our primitive apelike ancestors that are hypothesized to have existed eons ago.

Scientists tend to find fossils of comparatively “simple” life forms in the “older” layers of earth strata, and the so called “higher” forms of life are more common in the more “recent” strata. It was therefore assumed that, as new layers were deposited, the fossils being formed in them would reveal a clear picture of life progressively evolving from comparatively simple to complex forms. Unfortunately for evolutionists, this is not what has been found in the record of the rocks.

Introduction

The transitional forms problem has “a high priority to the evolutionists” (Wise, 1995). When evolutionists discuss “missing links” they imply that only a few links are missing in what is a rather complete chain that can connect the chemical precursors of life that existed an estimated 3.5 billion years ago to humans. Standen noted almost 50 years ago that the term “missing link” is misleading because it suggests that only one link is missing and it is more accurate to state that *so much of the chain is missing* that it is not evident whether there was ever a chain (Standen, 1950, p. 106, emphasis mine). This assertion has been well documented by creationists (for example see Rodabaugh, 1976; Moore, 1976).

The situation has not changed since then; scientists have yet to find a *single undisputed link* that clearly connects *any two of the hundreds of major family groups*. Nor have they even been able to produce a plausible starting point for their hypothetical evolutionary chain (Shapiro, 1986). The first link—which is actually the largest gap—is still a missing link (Behe, 1996, p. 154–156)!

The Search for the Earliest Life

Evolution does not even have a proven starting point; theories abound, but no demonstrated beginning of the theoretical evolutionary climb has been discovered. The ancients believed they had the answer in spontaneous

generation of life from inanimate matter: Aristotle taught that “simple animals”—worms, fleas, mice and even dogs—sprang to life “spontaneously” from moist “Mother Earth.”

In 1668, Redi proved that maggots appeared in meat *only* after flies had deposited their eggs in it. When the microscope proved the existence of bacteria in 1683, many scientists concluded that these “simple” microscopic organisms must have “spontaneously generated” to provide evolution with its start. Pasteur’s research, though, soon disproved this idea, and microbiology has since eloquently documented the enormous complexity of these compact creatures.

By the latter half of the nineteenth century, almost all biologists were convinced that spontaneous generation was disproved for all forms of living organisms (Bergman, 1993a). The difficulties of abiogenesis are so great that some evolutionists have even seriously explored the theory that life must have come from another planet via star dust, meteors, comets, or even spaceships (Bergman, 1993b)! This does not solve the origins problem but merely relocates it elsewhere.

Darwin once conceded that all terrestrial organic beings which ever lived descended from some primitive

*Jerry Bergman, Ph.D. Northwest State College, Archbold, OH 43502-9542

Received 12 December 1996; Revised 11 February 1998

form which was first called into life “by the Creator” (1859, p. 306). But to admit the possibility of *one or a few creations is to open the door to the possibility of thousands!* If God made one animal type, He could also make two or many thousands. No hypothesis today has provided a viable explanation for the abiogenesis origin of life or of naturalistic evolution. The problems are so major that the majority of evolutionists today shun the subject of abiogenesis.

Granting a cell as a starting point, how did this cell evolve into humans? Each new explanation that has been advanced was eventually discarded in the face of advancing knowledge. More than a century ago the French evolutionist Lamarck concluded that creatures acquired certain characteristics after interacting with their environment which they passed on to their offspring. Their offspring then further developed these traits and eons of slow changes eventually produced a new species. The fallacy of Lamarck’s theory is that acquired characteristics are *not* inherited. Until 1920 many biologists assumed that some characteristics which both plants and animals acquired from their environment were passed to their offspring. Modern genetics research has disproved this view.

Darwin noted the struggle for existence all around him and incorrectly concluded that only useful variations usually survived while less useful ones perished. While this *tends* to be true in some situations and with some traits, it is a gross over-simplification and over-generalization. As a whole, chance and good luck tend to be far more important in aiding species survival than good genes (Raup, 1991).

The most fundamental objection to the natural selection theory is that it cannot originate traits; it only selects among those already existing. Selection of characteristics already present in an animal line is one thing; to evolve an entirely new organ is something quite different. Selection, whether natural or artificial, does not have the power to create a new structure or organism. It can only change the *frequency* of a trait in the population. The famous French scientist Hugo de Vries long ago noted that although natural selection may explain the survival of the fittest, it cannot explain the arrival of the fittest (1910, p. 185). He proposed that mutations, the copying errors which are responsible for over 4,000 diseases in humans, were the source of the “arrival of the fittest.” Today we know that the gap between variable traits and copy errors is enormous, and it is increasingly being recognized as being unbridgeable (Spetner, 1997).

The Cambrian Era

The fossil record blossoms in rock layers that geologists refer to as the “Cambrian era,” currently estimated to be-

gin some 570 million years or so ago at the beginning of the Paleozoic era. It is in these layers that life first appears in large numbers, suddenly bursting into the record of the rocks in enormous diversity representing every phyla. The Cambrian explosion is “a biological puzzle that confounds the Darwinists” because none of the creatures found here gives a hint of age-long periods of gradual development from simple protoplasm forms (Chien, 1997, p. 1).

The claim that life flourished well over a billion years before the time of the Cambrian strata as required by evolution is also based on a few highly debatable examples of fossil evidence. According to Johnson (1991, p. 54):

The single greatest problem which the fossil record poses for Darwinism is the ‘Cambrian explosion’... Nearly all the animal phyla appear in the rocks of this period, without a trace of the evolutionary ancestors that Darwinists require.

The Precambrian rock layers, those immediately *beneath* the layers where a huge number and variety of fossils are found, *lacks evidence of the multimillions of fossils needed to produce the diversity found in the Cambrian era.* If macroevolution occurred, the stage of development represented by the Cambrian animals and plants require enormous numbers of advanced life forms before the Cambrian.

Also, the estimated 100,000 different human proteins and the multimillions of different plant and animal proteins and other organic compounds used for life also require multibillions of transitional forms. Evidence of these are also completely lacking in the fossil record and in modern animals, a gap even greater than the fossil hard parts commonly preserved (for example see Avancini, Walden, and Robertson, 1996). I have yet to locate even one clear example, although some have been proposed. Extensive studies of putative ancient cells, even DNA located in insects and other life trapped in amber and other preservatives, have found these organisms to be almost identical to those existing today (Schopf, 1993).

Naturalism requires enormously long periods of time to allow non-living matter to evolve into the hypothetical speck of viable pre-protoplasm needed to start the chain, and even more time is needed to evolve the pre-protoplasm matter into the enormous variety of highly organized complex life forms that are abundantly found in the Cambrian rocks. Darwinism requires that life originated over three billion years ago, but a rich fossil record for only less than about a 600 million years is commonly claimed. Consequently, almost all of the record is missing, and evidence for the most critical two billion years of evolution is sparse and highly equivocal. And, the gap between non-life and the simplest cell is illustrated by the bacterium known as mycoplasma which:

is estimated to contain a total of 40,000 protein molecules, of about 600 different kinds [and] is so complex that [why] cells exist at all is a marvel... even the simplest of the living cells is far more fascinating than any human-made object (Alberts, 1992, p. xii).

Many very complex animals appear very early in the fossil record and many “simple” animals thrive today. The earliest fossils known, which are believed to be of cyanobacteria, are structurally and biochemically very similar to bacteria living today. Yet they are claimed to have thrived almost as soon as earth is believed to have formed (Schopf, 1993). Estimated at 3.5 billion years old, these earliest known forms of life are incredibly complex. Further, remarkably diverse types of animals existed in very early earth history—no less than 11 different species have been found so far (Pendick, 1993). A concern Corliss raises is:

why after such rapid diversification did these microorganisms remain essentially unchanged for the next 465 million years? Such stasis, common in biology, is puzzling (1993, p. 2).

Many Fossils Were Once Claimed to be Transitional

In their enthusiasm to prove evolution, scientists also have often grasped at straws which have turned out to be false. For years, one of the most famous human evolution links was “Java Man,” scientifically called *Pithecanthropus erectus*, which means “erect-walking ape-man.” In 1891 Dubois discovered a few skull fragments and some teeth in the river gravel along the Solo River bank in Java. Later he located a femur leg bone at a point 50 feet away.

Although the circumstances of their discovery and other evidence both indicated that the fossil fragments came from different animals, he built from them a creation that he called *Java Man*. For years it was referred to as *Pithecanthropus erectus* but most experts later confirmed that the skull fragment and femur did not belong to the same individual (Lewin, 1987, p. 23). The skull was from a Neanderthal-like race and the femur bone was Caucasian. The fossil records in many other cases are so problematic that it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from them.

One of the more famous fossil fiascoes is the Piltdown hoax which involved Charles Dawson, an antiquary solicitor (a low-level lawyer) and amateur geologist. He claimed that he noticed small pieces of brown flint when workers were digging gravel from a pit to repair a road near the Sussex, England, village of Piltdown. Dawson felt that the flint indicated the site might be rich in hu-

manoid fossils, and so told the workers to contact him if they found any bones.

He later claimed that the men did find some “old bones” and four years later, on December 18, 1912, Dawson introduced to the world what became known as the Piltdown Man. The evidence consisted of skull fragments, a jawbone, and a single tooth. The Piltdown brain capacity was at first estimated to be about half-way between that of humans and apes, but later more detailed research indicated that its brain size was actually 1,400 cubic centimeters, close to modern Piltdown residents. Later called *Eoanthropus dawsoni* in honor of Dawson, the skull was pieced together from fragments that had been deposited during the Pleistocene era, roughly around the last ice age.

Many scientists—and much of the world—were elated at the discovery. For the first time they felt they had empirical proof of human evolution. This creature bridged the gap between us and lower primates and was neither a monkey nor a human but an ape-man link. It became the basis for ideas about the so-called “missing links” discovered since then. A close associate of Dawson, Sir Arthur Smith Woodward who was then head of the geology department at the British Museum, was most enthusiastic about the find.

With the support of this eminent scientist, it was easy to convince many of the experts that a valuable and unique find had been made. Roman Catholic Priest Pierre Teilhard de Chardin helped Dawson with the digs to improve Dawson’s credibility. The Jesuit priest, who was then teaching at a seminary in Hasting, soon uncovered another part of the missing link, this time a canine tooth. With the church on his side and further discoveries to come, major challenges to Dawson’s find were then unlikely. The renown of Piltdown Man rapidly spread throughout the world; replicas of the famous skull made from the original (which was regarded as priceless and kept safe in the British Museum) found their way into many museums and colleges.

To some creationists and critical scientists, though, the skull did not seem right. The jaw was too much like an ape jaw and the cranium too much like an Anglo-Saxon human cranium. Many others came to believe the two did not belong together.

Finally, in 1949, British geologist Kenneth Oakley, who evidently also questioned the Piltdown find, read a 1892 paper by the French scientist Carnot. Carnot demonstrated that the fluorine content of bone generally *increases with age*. Thus, by ascertaining the fluorine content, one can obtain an estimate the age of previously living bone. With this new knowledge, Dr. Oakley decided he would test the famous Piltdown skull. The fluorine content Oakley found showed that the Piltdown

Man had made a monkey out of everyone. According to this technique, Piltdown Man was closer to 10,000 years old and not up to 500,000 years old as was originally claimed. This finding raised serious questions about the Piltdown find which led to its eventual exposure (Gee, 1996).

The skull is now known to be a modern human, and the jaw and tooth both belonged to a recently deceased chimpanzee (Spencer, 1990). These conclusions were published in the 1953 British Museum bulletin by Dr. Oakley and two scientific collaborators in a paper titled "The Solution of the Piltdown Problem." The paper concluded that the canine tooth had been filed down to appear more primitive and was stained, and impregnated with grains of sand so as to "imitate" fossilization. In light of this background, an account written in 1948 is enormously revealing about the tendency to reach sweeping conclusions from a small amount of data:

...Piltdown Man, long considered one of mankind's oldest ancestors, is a mere anthropological infant, not more than 10,000 years old, Dr. K.P. Oakley of the British Museum disclosed to the British Association for the Advancement of Science.... Previously considered to be between 100,000 and 500,000 years old, the jawbone and skull are now proved by analysis of their fluorine content to be definitely of the last interglacial period. Fossil animal bones of known geological age, dating from the Pleistocene or glacial period, unearthed nearby the human bones at Piltdown, England, had the same content of the chemical fluorine picked up from the ground water of the locality ("Old Piltdown," 1949, p.185).

The scientific world was stunned by the Piltdown exposure because one of the more important evidences for evolution had turned out to be a hoax. The only question remaining was: who was the culprit? Blame fell first on the discoverer, Charles Dawson, but his role was difficult to research for he had by then been dead for 37 years. Also accused was Father de Chardin who was well known for his religion of evolution and his research into the putative evolutionary origins of humans. Most early researchers concluded that the distinguished paleontologists and archeologists who originally took part in the investigations of Piltdown were either the perpetrators or the victims of a carefully planned hoax.

Since then a number of other possibilities have surfaced, but none of them has produced conclusive evidence. The latest is Martin A.C. Hinton, a Curator of Zoology at the British Museum in the early 1900s. A trunk that belonged to him was found to contain bones and teeth artificially stained in a way very similar to those of the Piltdown hoax (Gee, 1996, pp. 261-262). This and other evidence have caused some that were close to the case to conclude that the evidence for "Hinton having

been the sole hoaxer is now conclusive" (Gee, 1996, p. 262). To others, though, the case still remains a mystery, an unsolved hoax.

Other Examples of the Reclassification Due to Advancing Knowledge

Many other fossils have also fallen from grace. The Heidelberg Man fossil (called by some Mauer mandible) is now classified as an archaic *Homo sapiens* and is considered a member of a race of modern humans (Fix, 1984). His jaw is similar to that of modern Eskimos. In China, evolutionists once thought a set of fossils called *Sinanthropus* (commonly termed Peking Man) was a clear link, but the original "priceless" bones have since mysteriously disappeared and all we have left are the flawed casts. Fix (1984, p. xii) claims that the human ancestor status of this fossil, discovered by Davidson Black, is "highly questionable" (1984, p. xii).

Dryopithecus (Gr. *drys* tree, *pithekos* ape) is now recognized as an extinct anthropoid ape of Europe, Africa and Asia from the late Miocene and early Pleiocene period. Another fossil, *Ramapithecus*, a primate similar to *Kenya-pithecus* originally discovered in the Siwalik Hills of northwestern India, is also probably an extinct ape (Johanson and Edey, 1981; Johanson and Shreeve, 1989). Neanderthal Man is yet another race long held to be some sort of link but is now believed to fall within the varieties of present-day humans. They also are no longer considered an evolutionary ancestor of humans but another "race" that was either massacred by their fellow humans during war or feuds or intermarried and blended in with other Europeans long ago.

Many researchers have also concluded that most other so-called ape-men such as *Australopithecus* and *pithecanthropines*, are non-human extinct primates and may not be human ancestors. Many extinct primate bones have been found by the Leakey family and others, some of which scientists argue are evidence of the so-called missing link. The significance of one bone set, the famous chimp-like "Lucy" bones (*Australopithecus afarensis*) discovered a few years ago, is still being debated and may consist of parts of several animal types. Called *Homo habilis*, Latin for "skillful man," the fossil remains of this extinct species were discovered in the Olduvai Gorge, Tanganyika, in 1964.

Evolutionists hoped that research on the latest *Homo habilis* fossils, a species that lived in Africa "almost two million years ago," would at last "settle the dispute that this is an older human fossil than *Telanthropus*," yet the controversy remains as strident as ever. The modern division of Ape-men is still extremely controversial, even among the experts (Fix, 1984). And a major reason for

many views on evolution is at least in part the result of different philosophical approaches. Several other early fossil hominids are now being studied by various researchers, but the word on the paleontology grapevine is that the confusion is likely to get worse before it gets better, if it ever does (Beardsley, 1995, p. 37).

New Fossil Finds Create More Problems

The millions of modern fossil discoveries have not resulted in filling in missing links, but required the need for even more links to bridge the gaps between existing life and the many new animal types found. Arranging *skeletons* according to their outward appearance, from primitive chordates to humans, may give the impression that fossil gaps are few, but multi-thousands of unbridgeable gaps are consistently found everywhere when the *whole animal* organism is carefully examined. Each new discovery results in a more complicated genealogical tree and the new fossils usually form new branches instead of connecting existing groups. The evolution tree increasingly resembles a large set of isolated branches as more and more new groups are found which need to be connected to the tree. This is usually not the story presented to the lay public and science magazines and television science programs often use much artistic speculation to produce a tree. Rensberger states:

Unfortunately, the vast majority of artist's conceptions are based more on imagination than on evidence... a handful of expert natural-history artists begin with the fossil bones of a hominid and work from there... Much of the reconstruction, however, is guesswork. Bones say nothing about the fleshy parts of the nose, lips, or ears. Artists must create something between an ape and a human being; the older the specimen is said to be, the more apelike they make it...skin color [and]... Hairiness is a matter of pure conjecture. The guesswork approach often leads to errors (1981, p.41).

John Gurche, a primate facial anatomy expert and artist (Johanson, Gurche, and Ferorelli, 1996, p.109) even admitted in reference to his *Australopithecus afarensis* work for the National Geographic, "I wanted to get a human soul into this apelike face, to indicate something about where he was headed."

Nevertheless, evolutionary naturalism must infer humankind's relationship to an ape past (or, as it is often explained, humans and the "apes" have a common ancestor) and this belief requires scores of ancestral links. Yet, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from fossils finds limited to a tooth and femur found in one place, and a skull fragment found somewhere else, all of which must be assumed to have belonged to one animal or one

animal type and from which are constructed hypothetical transitional forms.

This problem is one reason paleoanthropologist Everett Olson said that he takes "a dim view of the fossil record as a source of data" (Lewin, 1980, p. 883). Even if the putative evolution path actually occurred, natural selection cannot explain *why* it occurred. Many ape features are far more advantageous for survival than the corresponding human feature, including the apes' larger more protective brow ridges, and more functional massive jaw.

Given the existing scattered, fragmentary and controversial evidence, it is almost impossible to determine much for certain about most extinct creatures. Lewin (1987) convincingly argues that determining what "hominid" fossils are transitional between humans and their alleged primate ancestors is exceedingly difficult. If macroevolution was true, though, what we would expect to find *hundreds of thousands* of unambiguous transitional types in the fossil record. Research on human evolution has increasingly supported the conclusion that the many putative extant transition fossils are clearly fully human such as the Neanderthals, or an extinct or modern type of primate. Virtually all existing fossils fit quite comfortably into these two distinct categories (Lubenow, 1992). Those that do not are typically the subject of endless controversy.

An example of a recent controversy involves "four well preserved foot bones" discovered in a cave near Johannesburg which Beardsley (1995, p. 36) noted rekindled a "long standing dispute." The reconstructed foot, estimated to be 3.5 million years old and dubbed "Littlefoot," appears to be a chimpanzee's and, the author suggests, was probably used to help its owner climb trees. Other foot bones from that time have been described in the literature, but Littlefoot's specimens are unusual for the reason that they fit together exactly. Randall L. Susman a specialist in the behavior and functioning of living apes at the State University of New York at Stony Brook counters that "if they didn't climb trees they wouldn't have tree-climbing bones" (Beardsley, 1995, p. 36). Susman believes australopithecines from this era walked on the ground and would only on occasion climb trees using their curved toes to grip the trunks.

Donald C. Johanson, Institute of Human Origins in Berkeley, CA, has reservations about whether these well-preserved fossil foot bones are as old as assumed. The bones' discoverers were forced to rely on detailed comparisons of other bones found in the cave with bones from elsewhere in Africa for their dating estimate. Johanson is likewise "not terribly convinced there is strong evidence of a highly diverged big toe." On the other hand, Johanson says he is "not opposed to the view that these creatures would have from time to time climbed in trees "

(Beardsley, 1995, p. 36). Similar controversies exist in virtually every area of paleontology.

Difficulties in Proving a Fossil is a Transitional Form

The most direct evidence for evolution consists of fossil remains. Unfortunately numerous problems exist in understanding, interpreting, dating and applying the seriously problematic fossil evidence to a phylogeny. In the words of Lewin:

It is an unfortunate truth that fossils do not emerge from the ground with labels already attached to them. And it is bad enough that much of the labeling was done in the name of egoism and a naive lack of appreciation of variation between individuals: each nuance in shape was taken to indicate a difference in type rather than natural variation within a population. ...applying the correct label is astonishingly difficult, not [the] least because such labels are in a sense arbitrary abstractions; and especially so when the material on which the analysis is being done is fragmentary and eroded. "It is an incredibly difficult problem," says Lord Zuckerman. "It is one so difficult that I think it would be legitimate to despair that one could ever turn it into a science" (1987, p. 27).

Moreover, animals found which are morphologically in between living animals cannot be scientifically proven to be links. Even if a fossil skeleton were exactly intermediate between humans and our hypothetical primate ancestors, this would not prove that the fossil was *in fact* a human evolutionary ancestor. To prove the latter requires a knowledge of *history*, specifically what animal begat which progeny, information which is not possible without personal or reliable direct knowledge of the breeding generations.

The discovery of an exactly intermediate skeleton type would at most prove *only* that an organism morphologically intermediate between humans and apes once existed—not that humans specifically descended from this primate. Although naturalism would cause one to accept that conclusion, it nonetheless is an assumption. Referring to claims that a bacterium found in ancient amber is an evolutionary link because it is in some ways morphologically and genetically in between two other bacterium types, Fischman (quoting Pace) asserts the:

ancient and modern microbes could belong to different strains of *B. sphaericus*... so you can't claim that the modern gene derived from the ancient one, much less conclude anything about the time it takes for such changes to occur. "Unless you know this or-

ganism is a specific ancestor, you can't say anything." (1995, p. 977).

Although the estimated 10 million species can be arranged to appear to support macroevolution, Eldredge argues in a text supporting atheistic evolution that, when looked at closely:

within individual fossil species in both the horse and human lineages, there is little evidence of gradual progressive change of the sort we would expect from the operation of pure natural selection. What we see, again, is persistence of species once they appear—and persistence in a virtually unchanged condition (1982, p.75).

The reason is very *few of the necessary linking fossils have been found*, and the vast majority that are found are modern animal or extinct types of a known animal variety. In Watson's words

The fossils that decorate our family tree are so scarce that there are still more scientists than specimens. The remarkable fact is that all the physical evidence we have for human evolution can still be placed, with room to spare, inside a single coffin! (Watson, 1982, p. 44).

In a review of Leakey's book *People of the Lake*, Peer stated that Leakey's conclusions about human evolution resulted from

...lab studies of language aptitude among chimpanzees, fieldwork with African tribes that are still at the hunting-and-gathering stage and the more than 300 fossil bones that have made the Lake Turkana site in northern Kenya perhaps the richest lode in anthropological history. Still, the evidence is sparse. All known remnants of our ancestors from 1 million to 5 million years ago could be spread out on two large trestle tables. (Peer, 1978, p. 80).

Peer may have made this judgment because many of the estimated over 4,000 "human" fossils (excluding Neanderthal) as of 1978 consist of small fragments. [The over 300 specimens that have been classified as Neanderthal do not help much in understanding the complete record, only in understanding one specific race (see Lubenow, 1992, and 1994, p. 70; Oard, 1994, p. 222).] Evolutionists today find it more difficult to argue for their theory from lack of evidence for at least human evolution because the problem is now a lack of *transitional* fossils, *not a lack of fossils*.

An editorial in *Further Evidence*, the journal of the Foundation for Research in the Origin of Man (Leakey 1978 p. 15) stated "the early days of our past are still quite mysteriously and poorly understood, and it will undoubtedly be [poorly understood for] many years..." One reason this is true is the important finds tend to consist merely of teeth, jaw fragments, and small fragments of

other skeleton parts. These parts are usually extremely damaged, deteriorated, distorted, decayed and generally in very poor condition. Actually, as Gould notes:

An old paleontological joke proclaims that mammalian evolution is a tale told by teeth mating to produce slightly altered descendant teeth. Since *enamel is far more durable than ordinary bone, teeth may prevail* when all else has succumbed to the whips and scorns of geological time. *The majority of fossil mammals are known only by their teeth* (1989, p.60, emphasis mine).

We may never be able to unravel the details of our earliest origins because the earliest days of our past are still quite mysterious and poorly understood and consequently:

...virtually all our theories about human origins were relatively unconstrained by fossil data," observes David Pilbeam. "The theories are...fossil-free or in some cases even fossil-proof." This shocking statement simply means that there is and always has been far more fleshing out of the course and cause of human evolution than can fully be justified by the scrappy skeleton provided by the fossils. As a result... "our theories have often said far more about the theorists than they have about what actually happened (Lewin, 1987, p.43).

Since macroevolution is not supported by the fossil record, evolutionists conclude that the multi-millions of transitional fossils that must have existed were lost to the ravages of time or have not yet been found. Arguing from non-evidence is not science and in science all conclusions are tentative until substantial evidence is located. The evidence involves major gaps that exist everywhere in the fossil record, and it may be years before we understand our earliest history, if we ever do:

At present the trail of fossil humanoids can be followed back with only minor gaps and breaks to about 4 million years ago. There we effectively lose the trail, since virtually no fossilized humanoids are known anywhere from the time period between 5 and 9 Myr [million years] ago. Beyond 9 Myr back to 20 Myr science has acquired from Africa and Eurasia a rich fossil record of fossil humanoids (that is, members of the superfamily that includes humans and apes). Taxa from this time range include *Sivapithecus*, *Gigantopithecus*, *Ramapithecus* and *Dryopithecus*, and so on. However, opinion is divided as to whether any of these forms can with confidence be identified as ancestors of mankind and/or as members of the hominidae.... Filling the 4-9 Myr gap [is]... a clear need in the advance of paleoanthropology (Isaac, 1978, p. 588).

The problem of lack of evidence producing many possible interpretations of the evidence is also a problem with dating fossils. As noted by Isaac:

Problems of chronology continue to hamper discussions of correlation and phylogeny; we do not know with sufficient precision the relative age of the Transvaal and the East African sites, or any of the African sites and the Indonesian sites... (1978, p. 589).

The extant evidence supports the conclusion that the fossil record gaps have not been bridged because evolution never occurred. For human evolution, fossil groups tend to be either distinctly "apelike" and or clearly humanoid, meaning they are closely related to modern humans. This information is generally available only in scientific journals but is common knowledge to scientists specifically studying this question. In the popular literature it is rarely stressed that paleontology has discovered only *more animal types* which have created not less but *many more gaps* in the fossil record. The central evidence for naturalistic evolution is lacking, producing serious problems for the entire hypothesis:

Darwin wrote that our imperfect fossil record is like a *book preserving just a few pages, of these pages few lines, of the lines few words, and of those words few letters*. Darwin used this metaphor to describe the chances of preservation for ordinary hard parts, even for maximally durable teeth. What hope can then be offered to flesh and blood amidst the slings and arrows of such outrageous fortune? Soft parts can only be preserved, by a stroke of good luck, in an unusual geological context—insects in amber, sloth dung in desiccated caves. Otherwise, they quickly succumb to the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to—death, disaggregation, and decay, to name but three (Gould, 1989, p.60).

If Darwinian evolution were true, the fossil record would show a history of life slowly drifting in a continual, gradual stream from one form to another, requiring many millions of years for the multibillions of needed changes to bridge each separate life form. These untold billions of changes would be revealed in the rock strata. Fish would be shown to slowly have become four-legged amphibians which in time evolved into reptiles whose front feet developed into wings and their scales would slowly have become feathers. Other reptiles and amphibians gradually become mammals, then apes and finally humans leaving untold millions more fossil transitional forms. Even the punctuated equilibrium theory calls for multimillions of transitional forms. The major difference between the older and new model is, "is evolution advance generally steady or jerky?" Both views require multimillions of transitional forms.

This lack of transitional forms is not due to a shortage of fossils. These changing creatures supposedly lived and died for hundreds of millions of years as geological strata were being deposited; yet of the millions of fossils that have now been unearthed, *not one* unequivocally fills the requirement for even one of the billions of necessary transitional forms (Lubenow, 1992). Some fossils are assumed to be transitional and a few appear to fit the requirements, but none, even the most famous example, *Archaeopteryx*, has been demonstrated to fill the gap with a high level of scientific confidence (Benton, 1983).

Many putative transitional forms are not intermediate between two basic types, but often are a *mosaic* as is the duck-billed platypus. Darwin's 1859 conclusion is still very true today:

Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graded organic chain; and this perhaps is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory [of evolution]. The explanation lies, however, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record (1859, p. 49).

Actually, the record today suffers from far *greater* "extreme imperfection" in spite of a century of world-wide paleontological digs by multithousands of highly dedicated researchers. The multimillions of fossils uncovered since Darwin reveals the same pattern as it did in Darwin's time. The most obvious gaps are at the critical points where baramin must be bridged, yet the record tends to be perfectly adequate within each baramin. This problem with the fossil record is well known among paleontologists. In the words of Lewin most paleontologists believe that

...the principle feature of individual species within the fossil record is stasis, not change... for the most part, the fossils do not document a smooth transition from old morphologies to new ones. "For millions of years species remain unchanged in the fossil record," said Stephen Jay Gould, of Harvard, "and they then abruptly disappear, to be replaced by something that is substantially different but clearly related" (1980, p. 883).

The earth has preserved, in fossil form, millions of creatures from both extant and extinct forms, but very few of these are even claimed to be transitional forms. Of the roughly 25,000 extinct animal and plant types so far discovered, virtually none of them provides any evidence of a transitional or intermediate form. That this 25,000 is only a small percent of the 10,000,000 species estimated to be living today indicates a small percent of all species that have ever existed have become extinct, as few as a mere 0.1%. A summary by Morris based on data compiled by Harvard trained paleontologist Kurt Wise found:

...95% of all [existing] fossils are shallow marine invertebrates, mostly shellfish. For instance, clams

are found in the bottom layer, the top layer, and every layer in between. There are many different varieties of clams, but clams are in every layer and are still alive today. There's no evolution, just clams! The same could be said for corals and jellyfish and many others. The fossil record documents primarily marine organisms buried in marine sediments which (as discussed elsewhere) were catastrophically deposited. Of the 5% remaining fossils, 95% of them are algae and plant fossils (4.75% of the total). In that left over 5% of the 5% insects and all other invertebrates make up 95% (0.2375% of the total). All of the vertebrate fossils considered together, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals, comprise only 0.0125% of the entire fossil record, and only 1% of these, or 0.000125% of the total, consist of more than a single bone! Almost all of them come from the Ice Age...Where we have a good record, no evolution can be seen. For the very scanty vertebrate record an evolutionary story can be told, but the facts don't support it, and certainly don't prove it. (Morris, 1994, p.4).

Further, many of these extinct animal fossils have not produced evidence that supports the gradual evolution of the cell or organs. At best evidence exists of bone variations which prove little about the most critical evolution, that of molecular biochemistry and anatomy. This is the heart of evolution, not minor bone morphology variations. Likewise a conspicuous total absence of good fossil evidence (or contemporary observation) exists of scales changing into fur and feathers, fish fins evolving into feet, or gills developing into lungs. What is found in the fossil record is:

...stasis—nonchange—is the dominant evolutionary theme in the fossil record. It is characteristic of most species that have ever lived. Adaptive change is relatively rare, and usually associated with speciation, thus typically rather rapid. Once a species appears, if it is successful at all, the fossil record shows that it will tend to hang on unchanged for vast stretches of time. And this, we saw, destroyed the backbone of the major argument of the modern "synthetic theory" of evolution—the argument maintaining that absolutely all the features of the history of life could be seen as constantly on going adjustments to ever-changing environmental conditions (Eldredge, 1985, p.128).

And this is not due to a shortage of fossils: for dinosaurs alone over 2,200 skeletons world wide, and 325 types are known to exist. Fully half of these were found in the past quarter century. In spite of the billions of fossils found, "good examples of slow, progressive change from an ancestor into its descendant are few and far between" (Eldredge, 1982, p.75).

An examination of the entire fossil record therefore does not provide clear evidence for a slow evolution from family to family, but most often stasis and new families appearing suddenly with no hint of any of them having evolved through long periods of gradual development. The many exceptions to the standard fossil record generalization also include the fact that the order found in the fossil record is sometimes the opposite of that expected. Over a half-century ago Rogers et al. admitted that:

...in some regions, beds of almost unaltered Proterozoic sedimentary rocks [the layer just under the Cambrian] have been preserved. Here, if anywhere, we may expect to find the evidence of Pre-Cambrian life, and many able paleontologists have searched long and carefully for fossils in these rocks. The results have so far been discouraging.... Because of this scarcity of fossils, the whole of the vast period of time represented by Archeozoic and Proterozoic rocks have been called the *cryptozoic eon*, or the *age of hidden life* (1942, p. 352-353).

The situation is worse today because the discovery of thousands of more animal types since then have produced many more gaps that need to be filled in. The meager and wholly inadequate record of so-called Precambrian fossils is so unimpressive for more than three-fourths of the alleged history of the earth that the existence of a record at all is called into question and argues that the examples that exist must be reinterpreted. Extremely weak evidence for one view and very strong evidence for another indicates that the evidence for the former view has been misinterpreted.

A major assumption in geology has been the doctrine of uniformitarianism, the theory that earth history was dominated almost totally by slow, gradual geological changes. This dogma has also now all but been overthrown:

We [once] preferred to believe that what was important in geohistory was nature's long-term, gradualistic processes. The Grand Canyon was entirely a result of the Colorado River's daily removal of x soil-grains over millions of years. Sedimentary strata formed in a marine environment were interpreted as the little-by-little accumulation of particles raining down on the sea bed over aeons of time. What seemed to matter was the ceaseless tick-tock of the natural clock. That the sound of the ticking was occasionally drowned by a ringing of the clock's alarm seemed immaterial.

Now all is changed. *We are rewriting geohistory. Where once we saw a smooth conveyor belt, we now see a stepped escalator. Upon that escalator the treads are long periods of relative quiescence when little happens. The risers are episodes of relatively sudden change when the landscape and its inhabitants*

are translated into some fresh state. Even the most staid of modern geologists are invoking sedimentary surges, explosive phases of organic evolution, volcanic blackouts, continental collisions and terrifying meteoroid impacts. We live in an age of neocatastrophism...

Catastrophism was originally born during the seventeenth century in an attempt to cram some inkling of the complexity of geohistory into the pint pot represented by biblical chronology... catastrophists of that distant age might well find themselves far more at home in our modern departments of geology than would their uniformitarian successors in the nineteenth century (Davies, 1993, p. 115, emphasis mine).

Further, many of the fossils labeled transition forms, a term that has meaning only within the evolution model, can be explained from a creationists worldview (Wise, 1995).

What the Fossil Record Actually Tells Us

The record in the rocks indicates that enormously complex life forms appeared suddenly and whole new families abruptly came into existence without any apparent predecessors. The fossil record testifies that life never crosses the boundaries of family groups or "kinds" though it varies widely within these boundaries. Paleontological research has found that the first bats were very similar to modern bats, and the first birds including *Archaeopteryx* had perfectly formed feathers as well as most other avian traits. Even the early insects were very well developed according to the over one-quarter of a million known examples that have been preserved in amber, many complete down to their smallest body hairs (Fischman, 1995). This is also true of all animals.

French biologist Lecomte du Nouy concluded a half-century ago that each group, order, or family seems to be born *suddenly* and we hardly ever find reasonable candidates to link a modern with an ancient one (1947, p.79). In 1929, Dr. Austin Clark observed that no links have been found to connect the major groups of animals, and that "every developmental line has certain gaps, which are not due to a deficiency in the record." In the same year Funk stated the following about Clark's conclusions:

Instead of evolution by a process of gradual developments... [Dr. Clark] believes it has come about by a series of jumps from one major form of life to another. "So far as concerns the major groups of animals," he says, "the creationists seem to have the better of the argument. There is not the slightest evidence that any one of the major groups arose from any other. Each is a special animal-complex,

related more closely to all the rest and appearing, therefore, as a special and distinct creation." According to Dr. Clark's belief "man appeared in the Pliocene age... suddenly and in substantially the same form as he is in to-day. There is not the slightest evidence of his existence before that time.... Dr. Clark holds that there are no missing links. "Missing links he says—"are misinterpretations." (Funk, 1929, p. 7).

This is largely still the situation today, two-thirds of a century later (Lubenow, 1992). Evolutionists now often explain this relatively sudden appearance of basic animal groups as a result of *mega-mutations* or *punctuated equilibrium*. Many evolutionists also recognize that it is "amazing" that their theory could produce a human:

...it also *fills us with a new kind of amazement* (also a *frisson* for the improbability of the event) *at the fact that humans ever evolved at all*. We came this close (put your thumb about a millimeter away from your index finger), thousands and thousands of times, to erasure by the veering of history down another sensible channel. *Replay the tape a million times from a Burgess beginning, and I doubt that anything like Homo sapiens would ever evolve again*. It is indeed, a wonderful life! (Gould, 1989 p. 289, emphasis added).

The Many Difficulties in Evaluating Fossil Evidence

Among the many problems in interpreting the fossil evidence is distinguishing juvenile and adolescent animals from adult types. It is not uncommon to identify an adolescent type as a new species because adolescent animals can vary in significant ways from the adult type. This fact confuses paleontologists making it more difficult "to identify new species from an imperfect and hard-to-read fossil record" (Seachrist, 1996, p. 1056). Seachrist cites a case of a new species of lemur that turned out "to be an old species with a previously unrecognized pattern development" (p. 1056).

The mandible was from the lemur genus *Mesopropithecus* which is believed to have become extinct about 2,000 years ago. The lower jaw, though, was morphologically different from an adult *Mesopropithecus* jaw which is not only longer but also deeper and of different proportions. Instead of a new species, researcher Laurie Godfrey concluded she had found the jaw of a juvenile *Mesopropithecus*. Fortunately, many clear examples of this fossil existed, and consequently it could be confidently determined that the jaw was not that of a new species but a juvenile of a well established species.

For many animals, though, it may not be so easy to distinguish juvenile from adult forms, and this problem has historically produced much confusion in classifying fossils. Part of the difficulty was the juveniles develop their adult teeth at a very early age, making judgments more difficult. This example illustrates the difficulties in determining much about evolution from fossils, especially because virtually the only parts that are fossilized are the bone fragments and teeth.

The fact is, as Lewin and the authorities whom he quotes admit, "virtually all of our theories about human origins were relatively unconstrained by fossil data" and are "...fossil-free or in some cases even fossil-proof" (1987, p. 43). As long ago as 1929 Smithsonian biologist Dr. Austin Clark concluded that all of the extant "missing links are misinterpretations" (Funk, 1929, p. 27). The results of paleontology since then still have not supported the gradualist record as Darwinism predicted, but

...the certainty so characteristic of evolutionary ranks since the late 1940s, the utter assurance not only that natural selection operates in nature, but that we know precisely how it works, has led paleontologists to keep their own counsel. Ever since Darwin, as philosopher Michael Ruse (1982) has recently said, paleontology has occasionally played the role of the difficult child, stirring up trouble and muddying evolutionary waters. But our usual mien has been bland, and we have proffered a collective tacit acceptance of the story of gradual adaptive change, a story that strengthened and became even more entrenched as the synthesis took hold. We paleontologists have said that the history of life supports that interpretation, all the while really knowing that it does not (Eldredge, 1985, p.144).

The enormous level of controversy in this area vividly illustrates both the influence of preconceived ideas and the sparseness of evidence which allows numerous interpretations. The conflicts and ego which researchers have invested in their work in this field are legion. In Lewin's words, many scientists possess their own ideas like a jealous lover, and regards one who disagrees with their interpretation as a personal enemy (1987, p. 23). The arguments, debates, and endless squabbling among paleontologists soon become incredibly tedious and the controversies tiresome. One researcher even concluded on the basis of molecular evolution:

Chimpanzees may have once walked upright, but lost the ability and returned to the trees, [and]... that humans diverged from chimpanzees between 3.6 and 4 million years ago, much later than the 5 million years or earlier that anthropologists generally believe. Simon Easta... of the Australian National University in Canberra arrived at

their conclusions after conducting a broad based recalibration of the “molecular clock” in a number of mammalian species . . . If Easteal is right, then *Australopithecus afarensis*, assumed to be an early hominoid, is possibly the ancestor of both chimpanzees and humans. *A. afarensis* was a biped, so early chimpanzees must have walked upright. “We didn’t come down out of the trees,” they went up into the trees,” says Easteal. The earliest fossils that appear to be human are about 4.4 million years old. But if Easteal is right, these “human” fossils are not human after all. His results also suggest that *Australopithecus africanus*, a descendant of *A. afarensis*, did not die out, as most anthropologists believe, but was the ancestor of chimps. Another descendant of *A. afarensis*, *Australopithecus robustus*, which anthropologists believe also died out, could be the ancestor of gorillas. This would also explain why there are no fossil records of ancient chimpanzees and gorillas. . . Thomas Loy of the University of Queensland in Brisbane is supportive. “When it comes to morphology, the molecular approach will be more accurate than the fossil record,” he says. He hopes anthropologists will reexamine the fossil record in the light of Easteal’s work (da Silva, 1997, p. 18).

The relatively small number of fossil families discovered are usually extremely damaged and distorted by time, permitting the endless debates and disagreements to continue (Lewin, 1987). This is even true for relatively well-preserved fossils such as Lucy, the most complete putative human fossil ancestor discovered to date. Even here only 40 percent of the skeleton has been recovered. As a result Jones notes paleontologists still

do not agree about where modern humans came from... The fossil record is so incomplete that a cynic might feel that the main lesson to be learned from it is that evolution usually takes place somewhere else. The origin of humanity has been claimed as being in Asia, Africa and even the whole world at the same time. The human record has been investigated as intensively as any, but there are still enormous holes in it. Even the best known deposits are very incomplete. The area around Lake Turkana in East Africa is almost never off the television screen. Guesses about population size from the food available suggest that perhaps seventy million people lived there over its two-and-a-half-million-year history. Remains of only about two hundred have been found, mostly as small fragments. The fossil record will never provide the complete history

of human evolution, but it can give dates and places which genes can only hint at (1993, p. 102).

Proof of evolution requires the existence of, not four or five links, but a series of multi-millions of intermediate types between modern humans and our alleged primate ancestors. Ironically though, the arguments invariably focus on whether a certain fossil discovery is a human or an ape, causing researchers to dichotomize according to the stasis assumption. Because the fossil evidence is “very incomplete,” meaning it does not support any possible Darwinism scenario, enormous disagreements exist which are rarely even hinted at in the textbooks. One review of *Braindance* by Dean Falk at the State University of New York at Albany, said:

Drawing on new research (much of it the author’s) a leading paleoanthropologist... reexamines new and old assumptions (some passionately held) about our origins and evolution. The results are astonishing. The fossil that sparked the search for our beginnings—the celebrated hominid Tuang baby—turns out (on close inspection by Professor Falk) to have had an apelike brain. Likewise, Donald Johanson’s much heralded common ancestor, the putative “missing link” named Lucy, is shown to be neither the mother of us all nor even a member of the genus *Homo*. If bipedalism and brain evolution were linked, as science suggests, how can we explain Mary Leakey’s spectacular discovery of fossilized footprints of hominids that lived 3.5 million years ago? The footprint makers were bipedal long before brain size began its dramatic increase in *Homo*... employing new techniques to examine brain lateralization in humans, the author points out remarkable differences between the genders to indicate that female and male brains are not shared with other primates. It is not that the human brain has developed new structures markedly different from those of our relatives—past or present—rather it’s the overall choreography: the braindance, not the individual steps that define us (From publishers description).

As the evidence now stands, we cannot confidently trace modern humans directly back to any existing extinct types. Naturalism requires human evolution from lower primates, and therefore in the fossils record must be evidence for evolution—and no other interpretation can be considered. Interpretation problems are eloquently illustrated from the fact that in the past “racism of a particularly pure, intellectual form was a persistent theme of American and British anthropology” (Lewin, 1987, p. 55).

The Behavior Gap Between Animals and Humans

Evolutionists now generally believe that all humans are monophyletic because their differences are non-essential superficial traits such as skin color, facial variations and different gene frequencies of many traits. Hence, Chase's half-century old conclusion is still valid:

The story of Adam and Eve in the book of Genesis has been vindicated, in part at least, by science. Its main point is now generally accepted as true: namely, that there is only one human family... with a common origin (1948, p. 30).

The most recent genetic evidence has concluded that modern men are closely related genetically and share genes with one male ancestor, dubbed Y-chromosome Adam and that humans have very shallow genetic roots which go back very recently to one ancestor (Hammer, 1995). Actually, much evidence exists for the position that humans are devolving, and consequently are *less* fit and more imperfect today than in the past. A half-century ago Mackintosh noted:

Human remains have been disinterred by archaeologists, almost certainly pre-Flood, having characteristics that indicate longevity far greater than anything we can at present conceive. The most striking indication is the extraordinary way in which the teeth are worn right down into their sockets by long usage.... Actually there is ample secular evidence to show that there once existed on this earth of ours a race of men of magnificent physique, splendidly muscled, with a brain capacity exceeding that of modern man, and having all the signs of extreme longevity (Mackintosh, 1946, p. 342).

In contrast to evolution's teaching that humans evolved from some primitive ape-like animal, no evidence exists for the evolution of human speech from grunts and growls to our present complex communication system:

...older forms of the languages known today were far more difficult than their modern descendants; and the languages of primitive and barbaric peoples are frequently harder to learn and more complex than Latin, Greek, or Sanskrit. ...man appears not to have begun with a simple speech, and gradually made it more complex, but rather to have gotten hold of a tremendously knotty speech somewhere in the unrecorded past, and gradually simplified it to the modern forms (Hunt, 1948, p. 63).

In the innumerable varieties of life below humans exists little evidence of mental ability other than "instinct." No evidence of gradual evolution of mind, intelligence, or conscience exists to bridge the tremendous mental gulfs that exist between humans and the most intelligent ani-

mal. The instinct that the lower animals manifest sometimes shows a wisdom *greater* than humankind's typical behavior. This wisdom is not consciously exercised, though, but rigidly confined within very narrow bounds and void of reasoning power to cope with most novel or unique emergency situations.

Humans have progressed intellectually only because of their brain capacity and the accumulated knowledge gathered by previous generations, whereas animals will forever remain at the mental level of their ancestors. Only humans know that someday they may die, and humans alone have a conception of a Supreme Creator that was given by revelation. Only humans have ever felt the impulse to call upon a higher power for guidance and help. The theory of evolution, as Darlington put it, "released thinking men from the spell of a superstition, one of the most overpowering that has ever enslaved mankind" (1959, p. 60).

That "superstition," a belief in God as the Creator, has now been largely replaced in academia by another one which lacks most of the critical evidence or uses contrived evidence. Called *evolutionary naturalism*, it has caused many to lose their powers of objective thinking and base their faith in the vagaries of time, chance, natural selection, and random mutations as the creator of all life. What we see is only extinction, a loss of a life form in harmony with the second law of thermodynamics, not the creation of life:

Given a change in its environment, a species will be more likely to move out or to become extinct, rather than undergo the kind of transformation necessary to enable it to continue living there (Eldredge, 1982, p.75)

Conclusions

The term *Genesis kind* refers not to species, but is more comparable to the modern term *family* such as the cat, dog, or human families (Mehlert, 1995). Wide variation within each kind allows many races and species to breed from one pair of the originally created kinds, and many of the various forms within the kind or family are cross-fertile. No variation, though, has been clearly shown to cross the Genesis kind boundary, and individuals from different kinds or families cannot "cross breed" to reproduce. Breeding experimentation has created many types of "new" animals but has not yet achieved any clear links to another kind. Nor have animals that are clearly in between a domestic cat and an amphibian, or even a cat and a chicken, been produced.

Although some extinct animals such as *Archaeopteryx* have been claimed to be evolutionary links, further research has shown that these putative links are, at best,

unusual animals and not clearly transitional forms. When we use the term “links” we are referring to clear bridges between basic family kinds, such as dogs and cats (or insects and birds) beyond the tremendous variation that exists within an animal family. The extant paleontological evidence is sketchy and open to numerous interpretations. Referring to a major new discovery, Lemonick noted “Will this discovery win over the few who still think dinosaurs and birds are only distantly related? Probably not. Paleontology is much like politics: passions run high, and it’s easy to draw very different conclusions from the same set of facts” (1996, p.62).

Today, most evolutionists have retreated from pure Darwinism just as they previously had to retreat from the theories of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, spontaneous generation, and pure mutational selection. Hence, recent theories try to use megamutations or sudden major changes to explain evolution. On examination, though, even these theories fall apart. Trying to explain the creation without a creator has proved an exercise in futility. Although we have learned a great deal in our search, this journey has often resulted in many wrong turns. An accurate picture of reality would be far more fruitful in expanding humankind’s understanding of our world, yet most scientists reject a creator *a priori* world view (Bergman, 1996). They recognize that a watch requires a human watchmaker but reject the corollary that the human watchmaker also needs a human maker.

Lecomte du Nouy concluded a half-century ago that the reason evolutionists reject creationism is because belief in a Creator God is now heresy in science. Evolutionists often refuse to consider any and all evidence for creation even though evolution is unproved and unprovable and is believed only because the only alternative, special creation, is deemed outside of science by the scientific elite. Watson put it best when he said almost 70 years ago: “Evolution itself is accepted by zoologists not because it has been observed to occur or...can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible.” (1929 p. 231, 233).

References

- CRSQ—*Creation Research Society Quarterly*
 CENTJ—*Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*
- Alberts, Bruce. 1992. Introduction in Karl Drlica, *Understanding DNA and gene cloning*. John Wiley and Sons. New York.
- Avancini, R.M, H.M. Walden, and H.M. Robertson. 1996. The genome of most animals have multiple members of the Tc1 family of transposable elements. *Genetics* 98(2):131–140.
- Beardsley, Tim. 1995. These feet were made for walking—and. *Scientific American* 273(4): 36–37.
- Behe, Michael. 1996. *Darwin’s black box*. Basic Books. New York.
- Benton, Michael. 1983. No consensus on *Archaeopteryx*. *Nature* 305: 99–100
- Bergman, Gerald. 1996. Religious beliefs of scientists: A survey of the research. *Free Inquiry* 16(3): 41–454.
- Bergman, Jerry. 1993a. A brief history of the theory of spontaneous generation. *CENTJ* 7(1): 73-81.
- . 1993b. Panspermia—The theory that life came from outer space. *CENTJ* 7(1): 82–87.
- Chase, Stuart. 1948. How different are you? Here’s what science has to say about race. *Science Illustrated* 3(9):30–31, 71–72.
- Chien, Paul. 1997. Explosion of life. *The Real Issue* 15(3): 1–10.
- Corliss, William. 1993. *Science Frontiers* 1(88):2.
- da Silva, Wilson. 1997. Human origins thrown into doubt. *New Scientist* 153 (2075):18.
- Darlington, C. D. 1959. The origin of Darwinism. *Scientific American* 200(5): 60–66.
- Darwin, Charles. 1859. *Origin of the species*. Reprint of 6th edition, 1895. A. L. Burt. New York.
- Davies, Gordon L. 1993. Bangs replace whimpers. *Nature* 365:115.
- deVries, Hugo. 1910. *The mutation theory*. Open Court. Chicago.
- Drlica, Karl. 1992. *Understanding DNA and gene cloning*. John Wiley and Sons. New York.
- du Nouy, Pierre Lecomte. 1947. *Human destiny*. Longmans, Green. New York.
- Eldredge, Niles. 1982. *The monkey business*. Washington Square Press. New York.
- . 1985. *Time frames*. Simon and Schuster. New York.
- Falk, Dean. 1994. *Braindance*. Henry Holt. New York.
- Fischman, Joshua. 1995. Have 25-million-year-old bacteria returned to life? *Science* 268:1061.
- Fix, William R. 1984. *The bone peddlers: Selling evolution*. Macmillan. New York.
- Funk, Willard. 1929. New theory of man in the making? *Literary Digest* 100:27–28.
- Gould, Stephen. 1989. *Wonderful life*. W. W. Norton. New York.
- Gee, Henry. 1996. Box of bones ‘clinches’ identity of Piltown paleontology hoaxer. *Nature* 381: 261–262.
- Hammer, Michael. 1995. A recent common ancestry for human Y chromosomes. *Nature* 378:376–378.
- Hunt, Morton. 1948. On the origin of species. *Science Illustrated* 3(7):26–29, 63–65.

- Isaac, Glynn. 1978. Early man revisited. *Nature* 273: 588–589.
- Johanson, Donald and Maitland Edey. 1981. *Lucy, the beginnings of humankind*. Simon and Schuster. New York.
- and James Shreeve. 1989. *Lucy's child: The discovery of a human ancestor*. William Morrow. New York.
- Johanson, Donald, John Gurche and D. Ferorelli. 1996. Face-to-face with Lucy's family. *National Geographic* 189(3):96–117.
- Johnson, Phillip. 1991. *Darwin on trial*. Regency Gateway. Washington, D.C.
- Jones, Steve. 1993. *The language of genes*. Anchor Books. New York.
- Leakey, Richard. 1978. Ethiopia contributes important evidence for human evolution. *Further Evidence* 1(1): 4–15.
- Lemonick, Michael. 1996. Parenthood, dino-style. *Time* 147(2): 62.
- Lubenow, Marvin. 1992. *Bones of contention*. Baker Book House. Grand Rapids, MI.
- . 1994. Human fossils. *CRSQ* 31: 70.
- Lewin, Roger. 1980. Evolutionary theory under fire. *Science* 210: 883–887.
- . 1987. *Bones of contention*. Simon and Schuster. New York.
- Mackintosh, Hugh. 1946. Longevity. *British Medical Journal* 1(9): 342.
- Mehlert, A.W. 1995. On the origin of cats and carnivores. *CENTJ* 9(1):106–120.
- Moore, John. 1976. Documentation of absence of transitional forms. *CRSQ* 13(2):110–111.
- Morris, John. 1994. Does the geologic column prove evolution? *Acts and Facts* 23(7): 1–4 (ICR “Back to Genesis” insert 67).
- Oard, Michael J. 1994. Review of *Bones of contention*. *CRSQ* 30(4): 222–223.
- Old Piltown Man is only about 10,000 years old. 1949. *Science News Letter* 56(23):185.
- Peer, Elizabeth. 1978. Review of *People of the Lake*. *Newsweek* 92:80.
- Pendick, D. 1993. Fossils show early diversity of life. *Science News* 143:276.
- Raup, David. 1991. *Extinction; bad genes or bad luck?* W.W. Norton. New York.
- Rensberger, Boyce 1981. Ancestors: A family album. *Science Digest* 89(3):34–43.
- Rogers, J. Speed, T. Hubbell, and C. Byers. 1942. *Man and the biological world*. McGraw-Hill. New York.
- Rodabaugh, David 1976. Probability and missing transitional forms. *CRSQ* 13(2):116–118.
- Schopf, J. William. 1993. Microfossils of the early archaean, Apex chert: New evidence of the antiquity of life. *Science* 260:640–646.
- Seachrist, Lisa. 1996. Chewing up the fossil record. *Science* 271:1056.
- Shapiro, Robert. 1986. *Origins: A skeptic's guide to the creation of life on earth*. Summit Books. New York.
- Spencer, Frank. 1990. *Piltown: A scientific forgery*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Spetner, Lee. 1997 *Not a chance! Shattering the modern theory of evolution*. Judaica Press. New York.
- Standen, Anthony. 1950. *Science is a sacred cow*. E. P. Dutton. New York.
- Watson, D.M.S. 1929. Adaptation. *Nature* 124:231–233.
- Watson, Lyall. 1982. The water people. *Science Digest* 90(5):44.
- Wise, Kurt. 1995. Towards a creationist understanding of “transitional forms”. *CENTJ* 9(2): 216–222.

Announcement of Proposed Constitutional Change

In accord with Article VII, Amendments, of the CRS Constitution, the following change is proposed to Article III, Section 3, Other Categories:

Add the following to paragraph a: Fellow:
 “Nominations of candidates for consideration as Fellows must include a biographical sketch of the candidates to

be submitted by a Board member to the Secretary for distribution to the entire board in advance of the annual meeting”

This provision for designation as Fellow was voted unanimously by the 1975 Board of Directors.