

Fish That Talk

by Frank Sherwin*

Darwinists teach that humans are the most highly evolved animals, with fish in our distant ancestry. John G. Maisey (of the American Museum) takes this a step further, giving us the first of four kinds of fish that talk—

1. People . . . yes, people!

In cladistic analysis, *humans are osteichthyans*, because tetrapods—craniates with arms and legs—evolved from a group of lobe-finned fishes that in turn evolved from the true bony fishes, the osteichthyans. Humans have been happy to classify themselves as primates . . . but they intuitively shy away from *regarding themselves as bony fishes*. Why omit this intermediate stage from our pedigree? . . . We should come to terms with the idea that we belong to a highly specialized group of bony fishes (emphasis mine).¹ (Note: Cladistics is a school of taxonomy. Those involved in this field have a unique way of hypothesizing relationships among organisms and they frequently clash with individuals who compose macroevolutionary sce-

narios. For example, cladists maintain [much to the irritation of evolutionary biologists] that a common ancestor cannot be identified in the fossil record, only hypothesized.

Although systematics based on morphological characters has been revitalized by cladistic methods, incongruent [unlike] results have been obtained for most relationships.²

No wonder S. J. Gould of Harvard cautions fellow macro-evolutionists not to become “. . . intoxicated with the victory of cladistics. . . .”³)

Not only are we to believe that we evolved from fish, but according to Maisey, “we are fishes [sic], whether we like it or not” (p. 217). This idea is mainly based on an evolutionary concept called homology, the study of a structure that bears detailed resemblance to another structure in development and form. However, in 1997, secular science writer Richard Milton said:

. . . humans—and other four-limbed vertebrates—have hind limbs which are exactly homologous in structure to their forelimbs. Yet this cannot pos-



*Mr. Sherwin is a biologist and lecturer for ICR.

sibly be taken as evidence of common descent. Human hind limbs cannot have descended from human forelimbs. Moreover, if vertebrate limbs have evolved from fish anatomy, then they must have evolved from different precursors: the forelimbs from the pectoral fins of the fish, the hind limbs from the pelvic fins. Yet today they are identical, apparently homologous, structures.⁴

Milton provides a logical argument as to why there is no homologous (evolutionary) connection between man and fish, despite what Mr. Maisey says about the “highly modified pectoral and pelvic fins” (arms and legs) of people!

Muscle homology is an even greater problem. The late Dr. Charles K. Weichert wrote: “Attempts to homologize the fin musculature of fishes with conditions in tetrapods have led only to confusion.”⁵ Not surprisingly, Milton said: “Ultimately, however, it is homology that has provided the greatest stumbling block to Darwinian theory, for at the final and most crucial hurdle, homology has fallen.”⁶

In the meantime, University of Vermont zoologist John A. Davison said: “Creationists are missing an opportunity for their case since nonhomology means separate origin, which *prima facie* might be interpreted to mean special creation.”⁷

2. The Darwin Fish

One doesn't have to be on the road very long before he sees a symbol that seems to be a Christian fish on the back of a vehicle. A closer look, however, shows that this fish has feet and Darwin's name emblazoned in its center. This Darwin fish is a secularist's jibe at those who use the classic fish (Ichthus) to align

themselves with the Christian faith. Is it acceptable to publicly corrupt a traditional religious symbol this way? Hardly.

In Daniel 5 we read of a drunken celebration led by the inebriated Babylonian King Belshazzar. He and others drank from the gold and silver goblets taken by his father, Nebuchadnezzar, from the sacred temple in Jerusalem. These objects were dear to the Jews, but the revelers flagrantly misused them in an open act of defiance toward God and His people. Similarly, one wouldn't dare to defile, for example, the Star of David, and place it on the back of their car for all to see.

These are days when it's politically correct to accept all minorities and all points of view, where the ultimate sin is that of intolerance except, perhaps, to Christianity. Why, then, since the Darwin fish demonstrates such prejudice to a specific minority, is there silence from the civil libertarians who should be protesting the loudest?

Science has the last laugh when it comes to this blasphemous emblem. Neo-Darwinism (also known as the synthetic theory) predicts that the fossil record should abound with examples of creatures very much like this chrome entity with feet. Instead, what we find is distinctly un-Darwinian:

... none of the known fishes is thought to be directly ancestral to the earliest land vertebrates. Most of them lived after the first amphibians appeared, and those that came before show no evidence of developing the stout limbs and ribs that characterized the primitive tetrapods.⁸

Additionally, pelvic bones of such an imaginative creature would have to slowly strengthen to support the amphibian's weight, and gills would have to transform to lungs.

No specific species of fossil has been identified as an ancestor of amphibians. The Darwin fish speaks not “the words of truth” (Acts 26:25), but an ominous message of hostility and intolerance.

3. The Bizarre-Looking Fish

Thought extinct for 80–100 million years and used as an index fossil, the coelacanth (*Latimeria*) was found, alive and well, off South Africa. Recently, this “progenitor of the human race” has also been found off Sulawesi, Indonesia. Evolutionists had maintained that the coelacanth, with its four lobed fins, resembled primitive tetrapod limbs and was the forerunner to the first land animals. The living specimens were investigated. What researchers found proved disappointing for their cause. The fins are ordinary fish fins with cartilage, not bone. Furthermore, the fins are structured in such a way that they couldn’t possibly become legs. In 1986 and again in 1996 (*Copeia*, v. 3, p. 607) the coelacanth was filmed using its fins only for swimming, just as creationists predicted. Soft tissue anatomy, such as the brain, heart, and intestine, were not what evolution theory predicted would be found. This fish speaks of no change, stasis, in the face of Darwinism that demands transition.

4. The Jesus Fish

Since the first century one fish has spoken of loyalty to its Creator, to “God’s only begotten Son” (John 3:16). This fish symbol speaks of hope, love, and salvation through Christ, a message Americans need to hear.

The Ichthus, or fish, is an anagram for the title, “Jesus Christ, Son of God,” using the Greek first letters IXOYC. The fish symbol was a unique means for Christians to identify each other in the first century. During this time of intolerance, the Ichthus represented a secret sign for believers, for example, as

shown in a scene from the 1951 film *Quo Vadis*. If a follower of Christ happened upon a stranger, the Christian would casually draw an arc in the dirt. If the stranger completed the fish by drawing a reverse arc, each knew they were in the presence of a fellow-Christian. However, their belief that we should “love one another as Christ loved you and gave Himself for you,” was enough to bring wrath and condemnation from both the secular and religious community.

Judging from the alarming rise of intolerance toward Christians as evidenced by the plethora of Darwin fish, as well as many prominent people in the media insisting that Christians be blamed for the recent spate of hate crimes, such a way of identifying fellow Christians may be needed again.

References

- 1 Maisey, J. (1996) *Discovering Fossil Fishes*, Henry Holt & Co., p. 121.
- 2 Raff, Marshall & Tuberville, “Using DNA sequences to unravel the Cambrian radiation of the animal phyla,” *Annual Review of Ecology & Systematics*, 25:351–75.
- 3 Gould, S. J. (1991). The disparity of the Burgess Shale arthropod fauna and the limits of cladistic analysis: why we must strive to quantify morphospace. *Paleobiology* 17(4), 411–423.
- 4 Milton, R. (1997) *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*. Park Street Press, pp. 181–182.
- 5 Weichert, C. (1970) *Anatomy of the Chordates*, 4th ed. McGraw-Hill, p. 518.
- 6 Milton, p. 179.
- 7 Davison, J. A. “The ‘blind alley’: its significance for evolutionary theory.” *The End of Evolution*. Nov. 18, 1998, evolution.html at www.uvm.edu.
- 8 Stahl, B. (1985) *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*, Dover Publications, Inc., NY, p. 148. 🐟

Could Evolution and Creation Be Telling the Same Story in Different Ways?

by John D. Morris, Ph.D.

Often those who call themselves “theistic evolutionists,” who claim that evolution was the method God used to create, offer the platitude that the order of creation given in Genesis is the same as the order of evolution as determined by the fossils. Thus, they say if we ignore the issue of time, we can believe in both evolution and Genesis. Sounds good, but this works only if you don’t look too closely. While there is general agreement (such as fish preceding land mammals), there is much disagreement in the details.

For instance, in evolution, fruit trees are among the most recent things to have evolved—long after the land was populated with grasses and other plants as well as animals. But in Genesis 1, fruit trees and other seed-bearing plants were created at the beginning of Day Three. Animal life in the oceans wasn’t created until Day Five, with land dwellers created on Day Six.

A favorite evolutionary claim these days is that land-dwelling dinosaurs

evolved into birds. What does the Bible say? Birds on Day Five and land animals on Day Six.

Another favorite “just so” story is that land-dwelling creatures (some say perhaps it was cow-like, others say it was more wolflike, or perhaps a hippopotamus) wandered into the ocean, and over many generations, evolved into the whales. In other words, that land animals preceded whales. But again, in Genesis, whales preceded land animals. Many, many other examples could be given. The point is, the two stories are irreconcilably different. They cannot be made to say the same thing.

Listed below are some of the most obvious contradictions in order between the two systems. The list could be considerably extended. There is no excuse for theistic evolutionists and other old-earth advocates to claim that the evolutionary system is compatible with Scripture. Either Scripture contains allegory only, or evolution is wrong.

Contradictions Between Evolution and the Bible

Evolutionary Order

1. Life in ocean before land plants
2. Simple plants before fruit trees
3. Land animals before flowering plants
4. Small animals first land life
5. Dinosaurs evolved into birds
6. Land reptiles evolved into pterosaurs
7. Land reptiles evolved into plesiosaurs
8. Land mammals evolved into bats
9. Land mammals evolved into whales
10. Death of the unfit produced man

Biblical Order

1. Land plants before life in ocean
2. Fruit trees, the first plants
3. Flowering plants before land animals
4. Cattle before creeping things
5. Birds before land animals
6. Flying animals before land animals
7. Marine animals before land animals
8. Flying animals before land animals
9. Whales before land animals
10. Man, the cause of death



SINGLE COPIES 10¢

ORDER FROM: INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH © 1999 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

P.O. BOX 2667, EL CAJON, CA 92021

