

## God Made The World

### FOSSILS AND ANIMAL LIFE – Genesis 1:20-24

#### “Most Important Evidence?”

“The most important evidence for the theory of Evolution is that obtained from the study of paleontology. Though the study of other branches of zoology such as Comparative Anatomy of Embryology might lead one to suspect that animals are inter-related, it was the discovery of various fossils and their correct placing in relative strata and age that provided the main factual basis for the modern view of Evolution.” G.A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution*, Chap. 9.

#### What would you expect to find in the fossil record if evolution is correct?

The evidence the EVOLUTIONIST needs to establish his claims is fossils showing a gradual step by step development of lower animal life into more and more complex forms.

The evidence needed to support CREATION is fossils showing complex life appearing suddenly, with no fossil evidence of lower animals developing into new and complex forms of life.

#### Notable Features of the Fossil Record: Filled with fossils which encapsulate information but no logical, consistent progression from lower to higher life-forms.

“Data from continents and ocean basins show that the ten systems are poorly represented on a global scale. Approximately 77% of the earth’s surface area on land and under the sea has 7 or more of the strata systems missing beneath, 94% of the earth’s surface has 3 or more systems missing beneath, and an estimated 99.6% has at least one missing system.” (Dr. Steven A. Austin, “Ten Misconceptions About the Geologic Column,” Impact #137, Institute For Creation Research, 1984.”

Geologic Column Does Not Exist. The Problem: The placement of fossils in the Geologic Column was based upon the presumption that the Darwinian model was correct. While there may be some allowance for land-sliding, overthrust faulting, overturning of the earth, etc., the widespread global lack of a consistent

Geologic Column is devastating to the position.

**Notable Features of the Fossil Record: Cambrian Explosion... Early origin of the phyla; no logical progression; fossils fully formed when they appear.**

There are 52-54 phyla; 40-42 originate in the Cambrian period; sudden appearance of a huge number; great variety of organisms; all during the same period; 12 other phyla also believed to have originated in this period; when these are added, then all but one phyla known to originate in the Cambrian period

“The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils.” (Steven J. Gould, “Evolution’s Erratic Place,” *Natural History*: May, 1977, p. 12,14.)

**Notable Features of the Fossil Record: Progression to man flawed.**

Grolier *Prehistoric* progression from apes to man pure theory.

Neanderthal Skull: now considered as a branch of modern man...non-transitional; early fossils were diseased (rickets); now over 300 different individuals.

Java Man Skull Cap: “We should either admit that the Homo Erectus/Homo Sapiens boundary is arbitrary and we should use non-morphological criteria for determining it, or Homo Erectus should be sunk into Homo Sapiens.” (Martin L. Lubenow on Homo Erectus).

Australopithecus Robustus Skull: “And as it turned out, it was only a matter of time, before this doubtful ancestor was also exposed as yet another embarrassing case, in which the specimen had been embraced ‘solely because it fell within preconceived wishes and could be used to support all manner of convenient hypotheses.’” (William R. Fix, *The Bone Peddlers*, 1984).

Zinjanthropus: “This was not only a true man, but the earliest known stone-tool-making man.” (Louis Leakey). Now 20 years later no one believes this idea, including the Leakeys: “The simple pebble tools are now attributed to higher forms that have since been discovered in the same deposits, and today Zinjanthropus has been classified as Australopithecus boisei. Today there is very broad consensus among anthropologists that both boisei and robustus were dead ends and they became extinct about a million years ago.” (Martin Lubenow).

Time-Life on Ramapithecus: “The earliest manlike primate found so far, Ramapithecus is now thought by some experts to be the oldest of man’s ancestors in a direct line. This hominid status is predicated upon a few teeth, some fragments of a jaw and a palate unmistakably human in shape.”

Scientists on Ramapithecus: “Among other things, Ramapithecus, traditionally viewed as the earliest known hominid in the human family, was not an hominid at all, but rather an ancient, indirect ancestor of the orangutan.” (David Pilbeam, Science News, Feb. 1982). “Ramapithecus can no longer be considered part of the human lineage, but as a part of the Orangutan lineage.” (Peter Andrews of the British Museum of Natural History).

Australopithecines – Lucy and Black Skull (KNMWT 17000). “The Australopithecines are rapidly sinking back to the status of peculiarly, specialized apes.” (Pilbeam of Harvard University). “Despite the excited and optimistic claims that have been made by some paleontologists, no fossil hominid species can be established as our direct ancestor. . . All the fossils which have been dug up and are claimed to be ancestors we haven’t the faintest idea whether they are ancestors.” “Because all you’ve got, and the cladists are right (tapping on board)

all you've got is Homo sapiens there, you've got that fossil there, you've got another fossil there . . . this is time here. . . and it's up to you to draw the lines.

Because there are no lines." "I don't think any one of them is likely to be the direct ancestor of the human species. But how would you know it's that one?"

The only way you can know some fossil is the direct ancestor is that it's so human that it is human. There is a contradiction there. If it is different enough from humans to be interesting, then you don't know whether it's our ancestor or not. And if it's similar enough to be human, then it's not interesting." "Look, we're not ever going to know what the direct ancestor is." (Lewontin). "Perhaps generations of students of human evolution, including myself, have been flailing about in the dark; that our data base is too sparse, too slippery, for it to be able to mold our theories. Rather the theories are more statements about us and ideology than about the past." "Paleoanthropology reveals more about how humans view themselves than it does about how humans came about." (Pilbeam).

### **Differences between Humans and Other Creatures**

We can think and reason about our origin

We can create and appreciate aesthetically beautiful things

We have a moral sense providing a conscience.

We pass on acquired knowledge through generations in complex forms

### **WHERE DID YOU COME FROM? Evolution or Design?**

**C. G. "Colly" Caldwell**