Back to Genesis

No. 215

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Genesis 1:1).

November 2006

If Apes Evolved into Humans, Why Do We Still Have Apes?

by John D. Morris, Ph.D.*

This question often crops up among evolution disbelievers. And while it underscores the truth that most people truly don't believe man came from rats, fish, and single-celled organisms up through the primates, it ignores the fact that evolutionists have a ready answer to it.

First, evolutionists strongly deny the idea that men came from the apes. They insist that both man and the apes came from a hypothetical ape-like ancestor, the evidence for which has not yet been discovered.

Secondly, evolution does not propose that all members of a type evolved into another type, but that only a small group of individuals, genetically isolated from the others, evolved, leaving the others to remain the same.

A perceptive person will recognize that both of these points are nothing more than story telling. The hypothetical ape-like ancestor does not exist, and there is no evidence that it ever did. The "peripheral isolates" claim may sound reasonable, and there are recent examples of isolated groups acquiring new traits through adaptation, but none of any group acquired new suites of functioning genes through random mutation, such as production of either an ape or a man from an ape-like ancestor would require.

Instead of asking why we still have apes, we should be asking why don't we have the hypothetical ape-like ancestor, the real missing link? Or, why don't we have the required intermediate forms? How can such change happen? The claim that transitional individuals were few in number, and thus unlikely to be fossilized and discovered, rings hollow. The fact is, we don't have them! The evolution claims are only stories. In their story, man and apes diverged from the imaginary ancestor some seven million years ago. Surely some would be fossilized.

We should also ask, how could such a transition happen? The only way we know to acquire new genes is to alter existing genes through random mutation. The best alteration science has observed has produced only novel recombinations—most deteriorate the genetic information and thus harm the offspring. Many mutations are fatal. Evolution requires *trillions* of innovative mutations to produce man from lower forms, and at least millions to produce man or apes from an ape-like ancestor. None have been observed.

Evolution tales are pseudo-scientific stories about an imaginary history. Evolution is best understood as an anti-God origins myth, attempting to explain man's existence without a Creator. We can do better.

*Dr. John D. Morris is the President of the Institute for Creation Research.

Walking the Walk

by Frank Sherwin, M.A.*

One of many problems in anthropology is how and why man's alleged ancestors decided to walk erect. Evolutionists see "the origin of bipedalism [as] central to understanding hominid evolution."[1] Darwinism states humans began walking because forests supposedly dried up and they had to survive on the plains. But the details are unclear:

> Fossil evidence demonstrates that by 4.1 million years ago, and perhaps earlier, hominids exhibited adaptations to bipedal walking. At present, however, the fossil record offers little information about the origin of bipedalism, and despite nearly a century of research on existing fossils and comparative anatomy, there is still no consensus concerning the mode of locomotion that preceded bipedalism.[2]

Three years later, an evolutionist from Duke University said, ". . . because of the paucity of the fossil record, the fragmentary nature of fossil remains, and the difficulty of inferring behavior from fossils, significant questions remain unanswered concerning the evolution of human bipedalism."[3] This is not the case at all, of course. There are plenty of fossils.[4] The problem is attempting to *interpret* them within the strange evolutionary paradigm.

The famous Laetoli footprints in East Africa, which appear to be quite human-like, continue to be a challenge for the evolutionary timeline of man. Specifically, an upright walking human could not have made these prints because they are too old. But evolutionist Russell Tuttle does not agree that *A. afarensis* (supposedly our ancestor) made these human-looking prints.[5] He maintains an unknown hominid made them. Creationists suggest the unthinkable: modern man made these prints.

Recently, evolutionists were excited to discover that a Kurdish family in southern Turkey[6] had a number of members that are palm walkers (gorillas and chimps knuckle walk). Finding humans with ape-like behavior certainly seems to be something that evolutionists were waiting for, although there is, according to the *Times* story, "fierce debate" among them. Creationists point to tragic "genetic faults" (mutations), as the culprit, that "their genes have triggered brain damage." The siblings have been determined to be severely mentally retarded possibly due to family inbreeding. This hardly sounds like evidence for human evolution.

While Darwinists continue to strongly disagree among themselves, "How and why natural selection favored the transition to bipedal posture and locomotion are likewise ongoing subjects of scholarly debate and conjecture"[7]—the model of our origin stands (so to speak) on Genesis 1:26–27.

References

1. Stanford, C. B., 2006. Arboreal bipedalism in wild chimpanzees: Implications for the evolution of hominid posture and locomotion. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology,* 129:225.
2. Richmond, B., and D. Strait, March 23, 2000. Evidence that humans evolved from a knuckle-walking ancestor. *Nature*, 404:382–385.
3. Schmitt, D., 2003. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 206:1437–1448.
4. Solomon, E., L. Berg, and D. Martin, 2002. *Biology*, Brooks/Cole, p. 455.
5. Tuttle, R., 1990. Pitted pattern of Laetoli Feet. *Natural History*, 99:64.
6. Lister, S., March 7, 2006. Walking on all fours with the ancestors. See: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,3-2072832,00.html
7. Stanford, C. B., op cit., p. 225.

*Frank Sherwin is a zoologist and seminar speaker for ICR.

Mudcracks and the Flood

by William A. Hoesch, M.S.*

Some people have an intellectual problem with the Flood because of mud cracks. We have all seen cracks that form in a dried (or "desiccated") mud puddle. But did you know mud cracks are also found in sedimentary rocks that are interpreted as Flood strata? Were there "droughts" during the Flood?

Mud is the familiar wet and sloppy stuff that children love to play in. Geologists give it a more formal definition: a mixture of water, silt, and clay that may be either semi-fluid or soft and plastic. The conversion of mud to mudstone involves, primarily, a loss of water. Loss of water, in turn, results in shrinkage cracks. Water expulsion from mud is actually a matter of intense interest to oil explorationists, whose job is to try to track the history of fluid movements in the subsurface (including both water and hydrocarbons). There is much that is not understood about the process. "Shrinkage cracks" that form when muds give up their water can form in at least three kinds of settings:

1. *Mud cracks that form under the open atmosphere ("sub-aerial").* These are the common cracks of dried mud puddles: they are called "desiccation cracks." Shrinkage takes place when water is driven into the atmosphere by evaporation. The resulting cracks often form a polygonal pattern (individual polygons may reach 300 meters across) and are typically v-shaped profile (can be 15 meters deep). In some cases, but certainly not all, mud curls (either upward or downward) can form between the cracks; these can be picked up and redeposited if the surface is flooded.

2. *Mud cracks that form underwater (sub-aqueous).* Syneresis is a term used by chemists to describe the separation of liquid from a gel (as in cheese making). Its importance as a process for dewatering muds has been known by geologists for over 70 years. "Syneresis cracks" are known to form in the muddy bottoms of some lakes, settling ponds, and even in lime muds beneath shallow marine waters in the Bahamas. Water loss is driven by osmosis, and so it is especially known to occur in saline lakes (immerse your hands long enough in a salty brine and you will get cracks of the same kind). Unless mud curls are present, these are extremely difficult to distinguish from desiccation cracks.

3. *Mud cracks that form while buried (sub-stratal).* This kind of crack is generated when a mud loses its water while in a buried state. Water can be pressed from the mud layer gradually by compaction from above, or released suddenly by earthquake shock. The resulting cracks tend to form a polygonal pattern (when exposed from above), they may be either lens-shaped or straight-sided in profile view, and they may penetrate upward, downward, or both. Syneresis can also play an important role in some sub-stratal cracks when one layer differs from another in the salinity of its inter-particulate water. Sub-stratal cracks have been positively identified in multiple levels in the Hermit Shale and Hakatai Shale in Grand Canyon.

Mud cracks can certainly form in a variety of environments and distinguishing them in the field is rarely easy. It is a gross error to assume by default that mudcracks in ancient strata formed by desiccation when we know they can form both sub-stratally and sub-aqueously. Mud cracks provide no evidence of "droughts" during the Flood.

*William A. Hoesch, M.S. geology, is Research Assistant in Geology.

Enceladus: A Cold, Youthful Moon

by David F. Coppedge*

One year ago, one of the most startling discoveries in the history of solar system exploration was announced. One of Saturn's little moons, Enceladus, less wide than Arizona erupted and continues erupting. Plumes had been suspected months earlier, but by November 2005, the evidence was unmistakable: up to 375 kilograms of water per second is being ejected at temperatures up to 180 kelvins. Enceladus joins Earth and Io as actively erupting solar system objects. Even more surprising, the eruptions are all at the south pole—normally the coldest region of a planet or moon. The reactions of scientists are nearly as interesting as the observations themselves.

Enceladus was known to be unusual. The brightest object in the solar system, it reflects nearly all the light that hits it. In 1981, Voyager saw half-melted craters and resurfaced regions. Early on, it was a prime target for the Cassini mission (launched October 1997). Since Enceladus orbits in the densest part of Saturn's E-ring, scientists expected it might be a source for this broad, diffuse band, outside the main rings, composed of microscopic ice grains. This ring could not survive more than centuries without constant replenishment.

Cassini made its first three passes near Enceladus in early 2005, each one increasingly spectacular. On July 14, the orbiter skimmed only 100 miles above the surface and immediately found remarkable things. A set of parallel cracks about 130 kilometers long and half a kilometer wide, which the Cassini team dubbed "tiger stripes," appeared centered on the craterless south pole.

The infrared spectrometers measured the highest temperatures inside these cracks. Crystalline ice detected there cannot be more than decades old. In addition, ice and dust ejections peaked in this region. The November backlit image finally showed a dozen plumes coinciding with the tiger stripes. Water is being ejected with substantial force from these plumes, like in a Yellowstone geyser. Freezing immediately, some of it escapes Enceladus and feeds the E-ring.

The findings were reported in a special issue of *Science* 3/10/2006. It wasn't long until scientists began wondering how to fit the observations into 4.5 billion years, the assumed age of the solar system. At current eruption rates, Enceladus would have ejected 1/6 of its mass and recycled its entire mass in that time. Neither radioactivity nor tidal flexing appear sufficient to sustain the activity. Apparently Enceladus also gets hyperactive. A huge surge in the E-ring was observed in early 2004 on approach. It is unlikely Cassini just happened to be present if this were a rare event.

Planetary scientists are actively reworking their models in light of these surprises. The simplest explanation, that Enceladus might be young, does not even enter the mind of most of them. It's a sure sign of dogma when no observation, no matter how anomalous, challenges an accepted belief. The assumed age of the solar system has become a thought prison. Creation scientists, unhindered by such notions, should go forth and discover the fountains of youth.

*David F. Coppedge works in the Cassini program at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.