

## Chapter 5:

# Do Fossils of Early Man Prove Evolution?

David V. Bassett, M.S.



### Why is this Chapter Important?

**T**he pursuit of paleoanthropology (the study of ancient man) is by its very nature an area of heated debate and fierce controversy. This is partly because its subject matter involves biased interpretations of fossil evidence regarding the origin and livelihood of mankind’s ancestors from warring worldview perspectives. More so, however, paleoanthropology generates such deep emotion due to the fact that these contrasting philosophical interpretations of the same scientific evidence both seek to define the core essence of what it means to be human. Are we temporarily “a little lower than the angels” (Psalm 8:5) or is man merely “a little higher than the apes”?

The evolutionary bias would answer the fundamental questions of philosophy: (1) “Who am I?” (Identity), (2) “Where did I come from?” (Origins), (3) “Why am I here?” (Purpose), and (4) “Where am I going?” (Destiny) with the following typical textbook conclusions: (1) We are nothing more than the arbitrary, random product of time, chance, and

natural forces, (2) that ultimately came from nothing through lifeless chemicals through primordial protoplasm through hundreds of millions of years of meandering, amoeba-to-ape ancestry, (3) with our life-purpose only being to pass our “DNA baton” to the next generation, and (4) our death-destiny being solely to enrich the soil and feed bacteria as we rot with worms. Talk about Darwin’s “descent of man”!

The opposing creationary bias (based on God’s written Word, the Bible), however, instead teaches that (1 & 2) the first man and woman were the climax creation of a good and all-powerful Creator in Whose image they were patterned less than 6,200 years ago. Our first parents were not only a unique kind (i.e., *mankind*)—not at all related to the animals—but they, like each of us, were also unique among their/our own kind. (3) This Creator-God loved mankind so much that He made a way for us to spend eternity with Him (John 3:16). This way—*The Way* (John 14:6)—is to accept Jesus Christ (God in the flesh) as our personal Savior to rescue us from sin’s ultimate penalty—eternal separation from this holy God. Our purpose—to be in a covenant relationship with our Creator—is summarized in Micah 6:8 as to “do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God” and in Ecclesiastes 12:13 as “Fear God, and keep His commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.” (4) Our ideal destiny is, therefore, to live forever in Christ’s kingdom and to reign with Him over the universe.

Thus, what one believes about paleoanthropology does have profound implications with everlasting consequences. The fossil evidence, when examined closely, clearly shows that apes have always been apes and man has always been man, just as the Bible says!

## **Introduction**

The origin of humanity, without question, has always been the most controversial aspect of the “molecule-to-man”

evolutionary myth. In 1871, Charles Darwin claimed in his book *The Descent of Man* that mankind gradually evolved upward from a specie(s) of Old World monkey. However, Paul S. Taylor objectively conveys the current evolutionary position in the following statement with the insight that the only “evolution” that has taken place is of Darwin’s proposal and of evolution itself:

Museums and textbooks controlled by believers in Evolutionism have frequently taught that there is abundant evidence that man and ape have evolved from common ancestors. The public is shown imaginative pictures which claim to depict how man’s ancestors looked and behaved. But what are the facts? Did the human beings evolve? *The safest analysis of the evidence seems to indicate all the fossils involved are either of extinct apes—or humans—or hoaxes* (emphasis added).<sup>103</sup>

Indeed, most of the fossils that supposedly prove man’s alleged animal ancestry clearly fit one of these general categories, with none of them undisputedly fitting any “transitional” category:

1. “Misidentified Mammal,”
2. “Wholly Human,” or
3. “Deliberate Deception.”<sup>104</sup>

Let us take a closer look at two of the evolutionist’s prime examples from each of these categories.

## **Misidentified Mammal**

### ***Nebraska Man (Hesperopithecus harlodcookii: “Harold Cook’s Western Ape”)***

Ardent evolutionary paleontologist Henry Fairfield Osborn, then head of the American Museum of Natural History, proclaimed in 1922 that a single molar tooth, found by geologist Harold J. Cook in 1917, to have belonged to the first pithecanthropoid (ape-man) of the Americas, hence the name “western ape.” Meanwhile, in England, the British evolutionist Grafton Elliot Smith was afterward knighted for his efforts in publicizing “Nebraska Man” in the globally-distributed *Illustrated London News*. There, he printed an imaginative “reconstruction” of the tooth’s owner as an erect, naked, club-carrying ape-man with tools, possibly domesticated animals, and a brutish bride (gathering roots, no less)—all derived from the artistic inspiration from this single tooth!

In July 1925, this selfsame lone molar was to be the prime, pro-evolution evidence against creationism in the so-called Scopes “Monkey Trial” held in Dayton, Tennessee. However, excavations in 1927–1928 at Cook’s Nebraska riverbed site revealed that the tooth belonged to *neither hominid* (man or “man-like ape”) *or pongid* (true ape), *but of an extinct peccary—a wild pig!* Back then it was named *Prosthennops serus*, but is now named *Catagonus wagneri*. Its false identity was used to propagate human evolution.<sup>105</sup> Then, in 1972, living herds of this same pig were discovered in Paraguay, South America, and named *Catagonus ameghino*.<sup>106</sup> According to the late renowned creation scientist Duane T. Gish, “this is a case in which a scientist made a man out of a pig, and then the pig made a monkey out of the scientist!”<sup>107</sup>

***Australopithecus afarensis* (“Southern Ape from the Afar Triangle of Ethiopia”): “Lucy”**

Evolutionists claimed Lucy to be descended from *Ramapithecus*—now recognized as resembling an Ethiopian baboon *Theropithecus gelada*—between 3 and 4 million years ago. They promoted Lucy as our oldest-known direct ancestor, and named it after the Beatles’ song *Lucy in the Sky with Diamonds*, which was playing in the base camp at the time of “her” discovery. *Lucy*, or *Australopithecus afarensis*, is the most popularized of the australopithecine fossils. Unearthed by a team led by Donald C. Johanson at Hadar (Ethiopia) in 1974–1975, Lucy was a 40% complete skeleton some 3-1/2 to 4 feet tall that did not include most of the skull, the upper jaw, nor hand and foot bones.

The skeletal evidence that was present, however, seemed to indicate a “real swinger... based on anatomical data, *A. afarensis* must have been arboreal [tree-dwelling]...Lucy’s pelvis shows a flare that is better suited for climbing than for walking.”<sup>108</sup> Later-discovered specimens of *A. afarensis* exhibited both the long curved fingers and toes of tree-dwellers, as well as the restricted wrist anatomy of knuckle-walking gorillas and chimps—anatomy that keeps them from being able to manipulate tools like the uniquely human hand can.<sup>109</sup> Sir Solly Zuckerman, chief scientific advisor to the British government, has emphatically stated regarding the cranium (braincase), “The australopithecine skull is in fact so overwhelmingly simian (ape-like), as opposed to human that the contrary position could be equated to an assertion that black is white.”<sup>110</sup>

In fact, Wray Herbert admits that his fellow paleo-anthropologist Adrienne “Zihlman compares the pygmy chimpanzee (*Pan paniscus*) to “Lucy,” one of the oldest hominid fossils known, and finds the similarities striking. They are almost identical in body size, in stature and in

brain size.”<sup>111</sup> Indeed, according to Albert W. Mehlert “the evidence... makes it overwhelmingly likely that *Lucy was no more than a variety of pygmy chimpanzee*, and walked the same way (awkwardly upright on occasions, but mostly quadrupedal). The ‘evidence’ for the alleged transformation from ape to man is extremely unconvincing”<sup>112</sup> (emphasis added). Creation researcher and author of the book *Bones of Contention* Marvin Lubenow rightly wrote:

... there are no fossils of *Australopithecus* or of any other primate stock in the proper time period to serve as evolutionary ancestors to humans. *As far as we can tell from the fossil record, when humans first appear in the fossil record they are already human.*<sup>113</sup> (emphasis added)

DeWitt Steele and Gregory Parker succinctly conclude, therefore, that “*A. afarensis can probably be dismissed as a type of extinct chimpanzee*”<sup>114</sup> (emphasis added). Last, Lucy-like fossils occur within the same-dated strata as human fossils. If they lived at the same time, then one could not have evolved into the other. Textbook claims and museum displays of Lucy walking on human feet subject fossil and anatomical evidence to evolutionary wishful thinking. Lucy as a human ancestor has been misplaced, since it was actually just an extinct kind of ape.

### ***Ardipithecus ramidus* (“Ground/floor” “Monkey” “Root”): “Ardi”**

Nick-named “Ardi” for short, this fossil was first discovered in the early 1990s and is hailed by some as another evolutionary link to humans. Because Ardi’s remains were so badly damaged, it took 15 years to reconstruct what is now still only a very incomplete fossil that is said to be 4.4

million years old.<sup>115</sup> The first 17 bone fragments (including skull, mandible, teeth, and arm bones) were discovered in 1992 and more fragments were recovered in 1994. When combined, these fragments represent *only 45% of the total skeleton*. Ardi's brain size is estimated to be only about 350 ccs—about the same size of a modern chimp, and much smaller than the average human brain, which is about 1330 ccs.<sup>116</sup>

Brian Thomas, science writer for the Institute for Creation Research (ICR.org) remarks that Ardi was distinctly ape-like:

She had hands for feet, and the long, curved bones of her fingers and toes clearly show that Ardi was adept at living in trees. The *Ardipithecus* foot has its big toe “thumb” projecting strikingly sideways, which is hardly human-like. Nor are its other foot bones like those of chimps and gorillas, which have specially flexible feet that enable them to climb vertical tree trunks. Ardi's feet are like those of some of today's monkeys, which have a stable platform from which to leap, along with a fully developed grasping structure.<sup>117</sup>

If evolution is true, one would expect *countless millions of transitions* from ape-like creatures leading to the incredible human design that we have today. Instead, all the fossil record presents are these occasional ape-like creatures that are only imagined to line-up progressively to humans.

### ***Darwinius masillae: “Ida”***

When *Ida* was first found in 1983, news reports hailed her as “the eighth wonder of the world,” “the Holy Grail,” and “a Rosetta Stone.” Interestingly, this dogmatic hype concerning *Ida* in the May 2009 headlines was quietly rescinded

just three months later (in August of 2009) when scientists admitted that *Ida* was nothing more than an extinct variety of lemur.<sup>118</sup> This cat-sized primate fossil (that supposedly lived 47 million years ago) continued to be met with great uncertainty in the scientific community, mostly due to *Ida*'s quite obvious lemur-like features, including "grasping hands, opposable thumbs, clawless digits with nails, and relatively short limbs."<sup>119</sup>

Viewing this fossil through a "Creationist lens" leads to the following observations and conclusions:

1. Nothing about this fossil suggests it is anything other than an extinct, lemur-like creature. Its appearance is far from chimpanzee, let alone "ape-man" or human.
2. [In general] A fossil can never show evolution. Fossils are unchanging records of dead organisms. Evolution is an alleged process of change in live organisms. Fossils show "evolution" only if one presupposes evolution, then uses that presupposed belief to interpret the fossil. Circular reasoning at its best . . . or worst!
3. Similarities can never show evolution. If two organisms have similar structures, the only thing it proves is that the two have similar structures. One must presuppose evolution to say that the similarities are due to evolution rather than design. Furthermore, when it comes to "transitional forms," the slightest similarities often receive great attention while major differences are ignored.
4. The remarkable preservation is a hallmark of rapid burial. Team member Jørn Hurum of the University of Oslo said, "This fossil is so complete. Everything's there. It's unheard of in the primate record at all. You have to get to human burial to see something that's this complete." Even the contents of *Ida*'s stomach were preserved. While the researchers believe *Ida*



sunk to the bottom of a lake and was buried, this preservation is more consistent with a catastrophic flood. Yet Ida was found with “hundreds of well-preserved specimens.”

5. If evolution were true, there would be real transitional forms. Instead, the best “missing links” evolutionists can come up with are strikingly similar to organisms we see today, usually with the exception of minor, controversial, and inferred anatomical differences.
6. Evolutionists only open up about the lack of fossil missing links once a new one is found. *Sky News* reports, “Researchers say proof of this transitional species finally confirms Charles Darwin’s theory of evolution,” while Attenborough commented that the missing link “is no longer missing.” So are they admitting the evidence was missing until now (supposedly)?<sup>120</sup>

It seems to take a giant leap of faith to believe that such 47-million year lemurs can evolve into modern-day humans. Doesn’t it take *less faith* to believe that this creature was simply a lemur-like animal that was created on Day 6 of Creation Week?

## **Wholly Human**

### ***Neandert(h)al Man***

Neandertal man was named after the Neander Valley near Dusseldorf in west Germany where the first fossils were found in 1856; so called due to the frequent visits there by hymn writer Joachem Neander + *tal*, or *thal* in Old German, meaning “valley.” From true man to “missing link” to variant form of modern human, the taxonomic history of the Neandertals is as interesting as the people themselves.

Originally, “when the first Neandertal was discovered in 1856, even “Darwin’s bulldog,” Thomas Henry Huxley, recognized that it was fully human and not an evolutionary ancestor.”<sup>121</sup> Nevertheless, the evolutionary bias of anatomist William King reinterpreted them as a separate, primitive species of man (*Homo neanderthalensis*), where they remained taxonomically until 1964. Today, with more than 200 known specimens representing 40+ discovery sites in Europe, Asia, and Africa, “Neandertal fossils are the most plentiful in the world (of paleoanthropology).”<sup>122</sup> This mound of data has testified in recent decades to the fact that, “while the Neandertals may not have been as culturally sophisticated as the people who followed, . . . the Neandertal people were not primitive but the *most highly specialized* of all the humans of the past”<sup>123</sup> (emphasis added). “Evolutionists now admit that the Neanderthals were 100% human; they are classified as *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*, designating them as a (subspecies) variety of modern humans.”<sup>124</sup> Their skeletons reveal them to have been superior to modern man both in brawn (being up to 30% larger in body mass) and brains (with a more than 13% larger cranial capacity — nearly 200cc more brain volume)!

However, “the strongest evidence that Neanderthals were fully human and of our species is that, at four sites [3 in Israel and 1 in Croatia], Neandertals and modern humans were buried together,” indicating that “they lived together, worked together, intermarried, and were accepted as members of the same family, clan, and community” since generational “reproduction is on the species level.”<sup>125</sup> Neandertal burials include jewelry and purses, showing they had nothing to do with any ape-kind. Strikingly, the Neandertal burial practice of using caves as family burial grounds or tribal cemeteries exactly parallels that of the post-Babel patriarchs of Genesis, for example Abraham (Genesis 23:17–20), Isaac (Genesis 25:7–11), and Jacob (Genesis 49:29–32.)

The longevity of the Neandertal people also looks astonishingly similar to the lifespan of those living in the post-Flood generations including Peleg (Genesis. 11:12–17). Using recent dental studies and digitized x-rays, computer-generated projections of orthodontic patients have illustrated the continuing growth of their craniofacial bones. These show a Neandertal-like profile of the skull as the patient advances into their 300<sup>th</sup>, 400<sup>th</sup>, 500<sup>th</sup> year of simulated life.<sup>126</sup> Dr. Cuzzo’s analysis of the teeth and jaw development in children, and “studies on aging reveal that the older we get, the more our faces begin to look like those of Neanderthal man. And the most accurate assumption that can be made about these strange-looking skeletons that are not old enough to be fossilized is that they have been alive long enough for their bones to change into those shapes—they are skeletons of patriarchs who lived hundreds of years, but have only been dead for thousands of years, not millions!”<sup>127</sup>

Creation researchers have been saying for decades that Neandertal man was wholly human, with no hint of a single evolutionary transitional feature. Neandertal DNA sequences published in 2010 confirmed this, showing that certain of today’s people groups share bits of Neandertal-specific DNA sequences.<sup>128</sup>

### ***Cro-Magnon Man***

Cro-Magnon Man is known as the “big hole man” in the French dialect local to the initial 1868 discovery site, a cave in the Dordogne area of Les Eyzies in the southwest SW France. Once regarded as our most recent evolutionary ancestors on the “ape-to-man” hominid family tree, “evolutionists now admit that Cro-Magnons were modern humans. Cro-Magnons are classified as *Homo sapiens sapiens* [‘wise, wise man’], the same classification assigned humans today.”<sup>129</sup> Creation writer Vance Ferrell echoes this

consensus with his assessment that “the Cro-Magnons were *normal people, not monkeys*; and they provide no evidence of a transition from ape to man”<sup>130</sup> (emphasis added). With interests ranging from mundane, stone tools, fishhooks, and spears to more sublime activities like astronomy, art, and the afterlife, “every kind of evidence that we have a right to expect from the fossil and archeological record indicates that the Cro-Magnon and Neandertal peoples were *humans in the same ways that we are human*.”<sup>131</sup>

Contrary to popular belief, Cro-Magnon use of caves gives every indication of being only for ritualistic, not residential, purposes. In addition, authenticated etchings on the cave walls at Minetada, Spain (1915), and La Marche, central France (1937), depict Cro-Magnon men with clipped and groomed beards while the women display dresses and elegant hair styles.<sup>132</sup> Advanced not only in manner but also in morphology, “the Cro-Magnons were truly human, possibly of a noble bearing. Some were over six feet tall, with a cranial volume somewhat larger (by 200cc–400cc) than that of man today.”<sup>133</sup> Brain size should not be exclusively used to judge whether or not a given specimen was human or not, but it can, in combination with other skull features, add its testimony. In any case, just as with Neandertal man, Cro Magnon men were men—wholly human.

## **Deliberate Deception**

### ***Java Man (Pithecanthropus erectus: “Erect Ape-man”)***

“Java Man” is based on a small collection of bones found on the Indonesian island of Java by Dutch anatomist and physician Eugene DuBois in 1891. They consisted of a skullcap that looked similar to that of a large ape and three teeth. One tooth was later determined to be human, and the other two teeth to be those of an orangutan. Nearly 150 feet away and

a year later, he also discovered a femur, or thighbone, that later studies showed matched totally human femurs. Some believe the skullcap to potentially indicate a near-human cranial capacity, and have now chosen to classify Java Man as *Homo erectus*—now recognized as 100% human—along with so-called Peking Man (*Sinanthropus pekinensis* = “Chinese man from Peking”), though others believe this to be both unwarranted and undeserved, including Marvin Lubenow, who wrote:

The Java Man skullcap and femur are evidence that the distinction between *Homo erectus* and *Homo sapiens* is an artificial one, that these two forms are both truly human, and that they lived as contemporaries [at the same time]. The differences attributed to evolution are instead evidence of the wide genetic variation found in the human family.<sup>134</sup> (emphasis added)

Interestingly, two definitely human skulls (called the Wadjak skulls) were found by DuBois in strata at the same level as the “Java Man” fossils—a fact which he kept secret for 30 years so that Java Man would be accepted as “the real missing link” by the international scientific community. Near the end of his life, however, DuBois publicly conceded that “Java Man” was extremely similar to—though he believed not identical with—a large gibbon. He himself wrote that “Pithecanthropus was not a man, but a gigantic genus allied to the Gibbons.”<sup>135</sup> Scientific integrity took a back seat to other motives when “Java Man” had its heyday, helping evolutionists convince several generations that man evolved from ape-like ancestors. The real evidence simply shows that some people and some apes were fossilized, as distinct kinds, with no common ancestor.

***Piltdown Man (Eoanthropus dawsoni: “Dawson’s Dawn Man”)***

“Piltdown Man” is a fraudulent composite of fossil human skull fragments and a modern ape jaw with two teeth “discovered” by amateur antiquarian (collector of old things) Charles Dawson in a gravel pit at Piltdown, east Sussex, England. History testifies, as summarized by Pat Shipman, that “the Piltdown fossils, whose discovery was first announced in 1912, fooled many of the greatest minds in paleoanthropology until 1953, when the remains were revealed as planted, altered—a forgery.”<sup>136</sup> Consider also the following deliberate (and desperate) measures some have gone to promote their faith in evolution:

Piltdown Common had been used as a mass grave during the great plagues of A.D. 1348–9. The skull bones were quite thick, a characteristic of more ancient fossils, and *the skull had been treated with potassium bichromate* by Dawson to harden and preserve it... The other bones and stone tools had undoubtedly been planted in the pit and had been treated to match the dark brown color of the skull. *The lower jaw was that of a juvenile female orangutan. The place where the jaw would articulate with the skull had been broken off to hide the fact that it did not fit the skull.* The teeth of the mandible [lower jaw] were filed down to match the teeth of the upper jaw, and the canine tooth had been filed down to make it look heavily worn... The amazing thing about the Piltdown hoax is that at least twelve different people have been accused of perpetrating the fraud... what has been called *the most successful scientific hoax of all time.*<sup>137</sup> (emphasis added)

In closing, consider Marvin Lubenow's conclusion after researching the ape and human fossil record literature for over 25 years:

... the evidence is strongly in favor of a morphological [rather than an evolutionary] continuum, both horizontally across species and vertically over time. The horizontal continuum shows that *anatomically modern Homo sapiens, Neandertal, archaic Homo sapiens, and Homo erectus all lived as contemporaries over extended periods of time.* The vertical continuum shows that as far back as the human fossil record goes *the human body has remained substantially the same and has not evolved from something else. This condition is what the creation model would predict. It is what we would expect if creation were true... new fossil discoveries have only strengthened the creationist position.*<sup>138</sup> (emphasis added)

Why do scientists continue to insist that man evolved from animals when no undisputed or convincing evidence aligns with this philosophy? None of the so-called "ape-man" fossils fit into any evolutionary progression; instead, they were either apes (extinct ape kinds, or modern-looking), wholly human, or tied to deception.

## Endnotes



- <sup>1</sup> Ken Ham, “Culture and Church in Crisis,” AnswersInGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n1/culture-church-crisis> (January 1, 2014) and survey data: [http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n1/aig-poll \(data\)](http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v2/n1/aig-poll%20(data)) (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>2</sup> Results for this USA Today/Gallup poll are based on telephone interviews conducted May 10–13, 2012, with a random sample of 1,012 adults, aged 18 and older, living in all 50 U.S. states and the District of Columbia.
- <sup>3</sup> Frank Newport, “In U.S., 46% Hold Creationist View of Human Origins: Highly Religious Americans most likely to believe in Creationism,” Gallop.com: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/155003/hold-creationist-view-human-origins.aspx> (June 1, 2012).
- <sup>4</sup> Kenneth R. Miller & Joseph S. Levine, *Biology* (Boston, Mass: Pearson, 2010): 466.
- <sup>5</sup> Introduction and Table from: “The Bible and Science Agree,” Creationism.org: <http://www.creationism.org/articles/BibleSci.htm> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>6</sup> Ken Ham & T. Hillard, *Already Gone: Why your Kids will Quit Church and what you can do stop it* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2009).
- <sup>7</sup> S. Michael Houdmann, “How and when was the Canon of the Bible put together?” Got Questions Online: <http://www.gotquestions.org/canon-Bible.html> (November 7, 2013).



- <sup>8</sup> The reader is encouraged to review these additional resources: Henry Halley, *Halley's Bible Handbook* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1927, 1965); Arthur Maxwell, *Your Bible and You* (Washington D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1959); Merrill Unger, *Unger's Bible Handbook* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1967).
- <sup>9</sup> For example, in 1946 the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, which included over 900 manuscripts dating from 408 B.C. to A.D. 318. These manuscripts were written mostly on parchment (made of animal hide) but with some written on papyrus. Because these materials are fragile, they have to be kept behind special glass in climate controlled areas.
- <sup>10</sup> Josh McDowell, *The New Evidence that Demands a Verdict* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers).
- <sup>11</sup> McDowell, *The New Evidence that Demands a Verdict*, p.38.
- <sup>12</sup> McDowell, *The New Evidence that Demands a Verdict*, p.38.
- <sup>13</sup> Most of the 11 verses come from 3 John. See: Norman Geisler & William Nix. *A General Introduction to the Bible* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 430.
- <sup>14</sup> Geisler & Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, p. 430.
- <sup>15</sup> Theophilus ben Ananus was the High Priest in Jerusalem from A.D. 37 to 41 and was one of the wealthiest and most influential Jewish families in Iudaea Province during the 1st century. He was also the brother-in-law of Joseph Caiaphas, the High Priest before whom Jesus appeared. See Wikipedia and B. Cooper, *The Authenticity of the Book of Genesis* (Portsmouth, UK: Creation Science Movement, 2012).
- <sup>16</sup> B. Cooper, *Authenticity of the New Testament, Vol. 1: The Gospels*. Electronic book (2013).
- <sup>17</sup> The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls Online, Directory of Qumran Dead Sea Scroll: <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/isaiah> (December 10, 2013).
- <sup>18</sup> Source for DSS: Fred Mille, "Qumran Great Isaiah Scroll," Great Isaiah Scroll: <http://www.moellerhaus.com/qumdir>.

- htm; Source for Aleppo Codes JPS: “Mechon Mamre” (Hebrew for Mamre Institute): <http://www.mechon-mamre.org/p/pt/pt1053.htm> (December 10, 2013).
- <sup>19</sup> Norman & Nix. *A General Introduction to the Bible*.
- <sup>20</sup> Samuel Davidson, *Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*, 2d ed. (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1859), 89.
- <sup>21</sup> Mary Fairchild, “44 Prophecies of the Messiah Fulfilled in Jesus Christ,” About.com: <http://christianity.about.com/od/biblefactsandlists/a/Prophecies-Jesus.htm> (December 18, 2013).
- <sup>22</sup> See: Genesis 7:19 (“all the high hills under the whole heaven were covered”); Genesis 7:21–22 (“all flesh died that moved upon the earth...all that was in the dry land”); Matthew 24:39 (“The flood came, and took them all away”); and 2 Peter 3:6 (“By these waters also the world of that time was deluged and destroyed.”). God also promised in Genesis 9:11 that there would be no more floods like the one of Noah’s day.
- <sup>23</sup> Ken Ham, “They Can’t Allow “It”!” AnswersinGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/au/cant-allow-it> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>24</sup> Eva Vergara & Ian James, “Whale Fossil Bonanza in Desert Poses Mystery,” Science on msnbc.com: [http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/45367885/ns/technology\\_and-science-science/](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/45367885/ns/technology_and-science-science/) (November 20, 2013).
- <sup>25</sup> D.A. Eberth, D.B. Brinkman, & V. Barkas, “A Centrosaurine Mega-bonebed from the Upper Cretaceous of Southern Alberta: Implications for Behaviour and Death Events” in *New Perspectives on Horned Dinosaurs: The Ceratopsian Symposium at the Royal Tyrrell Museum* (September 2007).
- <sup>26</sup> Michael Reilly, “Dinosaurs’ Last Stand Found in China?” Discovery.com: <http://news.discovery.com/earth/dinosaurs-last-stand-found-in-china.htm> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>27</sup> Michael J. Oard, “The Extinction of the Dinosaurs,” *Journal of Creation* 11(2) (1997): 137–154.

- <sup>28</sup> J.R. Horner & J. Gorman, *Digging Dinosaurs* (New York: Workman Publishing, 1988), 122–123.
- <sup>29</sup> John Woodmorappe, “The Karoo Vertebrate Non-Problem: 800 Billion Fossils or Not,” *CEN Technical Journal* 14, no.2 (2000): 47.
- <sup>30</sup> R. Broom, *The Mammal-like Reptiles of South Africa* (London: H.F.G., 1932), 309.
- <sup>31</sup> Steven Austin, “Nautiloid Mass Kill and Burial Event, Redwall Limestone (Lower Mississippian) Grand Canyon Region, Arizona and Nevada,” in Ivey Jr. (Ed.). *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism* (Pittsburg, Pennsylvania: Creation Science Fellowship): 55–99.
- <sup>32</sup> Andrew Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation & the Flood*, Vol. 2 (Dallas, TX: Institute for Creation Research, 2009), 537.
- <sup>33</sup> Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation & the Flood*, p. 537.
- <sup>34</sup> David Cloud, *An Unshakeable Faith: A Christian Apologetics Course* (Port Huron, MI: Way of Life Literature, 2011).
- <sup>35</sup> Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation & the Flood*, p. 538.
- <sup>36</sup> Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation & the Flood*, p. 539.
- <sup>37</sup> Andrew Snelling, “The World’s a Graveyard Flood Evidence Number Two,” *AnswersinGenesis*: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v3/n2/world-graveyard> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>38</sup> Cloud, *An Unshakeable Faith: A Christian Apologetics Course*.
- <sup>39</sup> Cloud, *An Unshakeable Faith: A Christian Apologetics Course*.
- <sup>40</sup> N. O. Newell, “Adequacy of the Fossil Record,” *Journal of Paleontology*, 33 (1959): 496.

- <sup>41</sup> Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, p. 298.
- <sup>42</sup> Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma* (Arkansas: Master Books, 1998), 129.
- <sup>43</sup> Cloud, *An Unshakeable Faith: A Christian Apologetics Course*.
- <sup>44</sup> Photo by Ian Juby. Reproduced with permission. Tas Walker, "Polystrate Fossils: Evidence for a Young Earth," Creation.com: <http://creation.com/polystrate-fossils-evidence-for-a-young-earth> (January 3, 2014).
- <sup>45</sup> John D. Morris, "What Are Polystrate Fossils?" *Acts & Facts*, 24 (9) (1995).
- <sup>46</sup> Tas Walker & Carl Wieland, "Kamikaze ichthyosaur? Long-age Thinking Dealt a Lethal Body Blow," *Creation Magazine*, 27 (4) (September 2005). See: Creation.com: <http://creation.com/kamikaze-ichthyosaur> (December 31, 2013).
- <sup>47</sup> Walker & Wieland, 2005 (figure reproduced with permission: Creation.com).
- <sup>48</sup> Carl Wieland, *Stones and Bones* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1984).
- <sup>49</sup> Andrew Snelling, "Transcontinental Rock Layers: Flood Evidence Number Three," Answers Magazine.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/am/v3/n3/transcontinental-rock-layers> (December 17, 2013).
- <sup>50</sup> David Catchpole, "Giant Oysters on the Mountain," *Creation*, 24 (2) (March 2002): 54–55.
- <sup>51</sup> Richard F. Flint. *Glacial Geology and the Pleistocene Epoch* (New York: Wiley, 1947), 514–515.
- <sup>52</sup> Humans lived much longer before the Flood due to both changes in human DNA (from sin entering the world through the fall of Adam) and climate changes in the post-flood world. See D. Menton & G. Purdom, "Did People Like Adam and Noah Really Live Over 900 Years of Age?" in Ken Ham. *The New Answers Book 2* (Green Forest: AR Master Books), 164; David Menton & Georgia

- Purdom, “Chapter 16: Did People Like Adam and Noah Really Live Over 900 Years of Age?” (May 27, 2010). AnswersinGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab2/adam-and-noah-live> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>53</sup> There is no conflict regarding the estimated age of these trees and the estimated time of Noah’s Flood. See: Mark Matthews, “Evidence for multiple ring growth per year in Bristlecone Pines,” *Journal of Creation*, 20 (3) (2006): 95–103.
- <sup>54</sup> D.E Kreiss, “Can the Redwoods Date the Flood?” *Institute for Creation Research Impact* (Article #134, 1984).
- <sup>55</sup> Michael Oard, “The Remarkable African Planation Surface,” *Journal of Creation* 25 (1) (2011): 111–122.
- <sup>56</sup> Dr. Hong earned his Ph.D. degree in applied mechanics from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- <sup>57</sup> S.W. Hong, S.S. Na, B.S. Hyun, S.Y. Hong, D.S. Gong, K.J. Kang, S.H. Suh, K.H. Lee, and Y.G. Je, “Safety investigation of Noah’s Ark in a seaway,” Creation.com: <http://creation.com/safety-investigation-of-noahs-ark-in-a-seaway> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>58</sup> John Whitcomb, *The World that Perished* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1988), 24.
- <sup>59</sup> See John Woodmorappe, *Noah’s Ark: A Feasibility Study* (Dallas, TX: Institute for Creation Research, 2009).
- <sup>60</sup> Woodmorappe, *Noah’s Ark: A Feasibility Study*, 2009.
- <sup>61</sup> Readers are encouraged to study where the water went after the Flood at the AnswersinGenesis.com website.
- <sup>62</sup> Humans lived much longer before the Flood due to both changes in human DNA (from sin entering the world through the fall of Adam) and climate changes in the post-flood world. See D. Menton & G. Purdom, “Did People Like Adam and Noah Really Live Over 900 Years of Age?” in Ken Ham. *The New Answers Book 2* (Green Forest: AR Master Books), 164; David Menton & Georgia Purdom, “Chapter 16: Did People Like Adam and Noah

- Really Live Over 900 Years of Age?" (May 27, 2010). AnswersinGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab2/adam-and-noah-live> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>63</sup> There are several resources for this topic of study. See, for example: "Michael Oard, "Chapter 7: The Genesis Flood Caused the Ice Age," (October 1, 2004), AnswersinGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/fit/flood-caused-ice-age> (January 6, 2014).
- <sup>64</sup> Ken Ham, "What Really Happened to the Dinosaurs?" (October 25, 2007), AnswersinGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/nab/what-happened-to-the-dinosaurs> (January 6, 2014).
- <sup>65</sup> Miller & Levine, *Biology*, p. 466.
- <sup>66</sup> Gunter Faure, *Principles of Isotope Geology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (John Wiley & Sons, 1986), 41, 119, 288.
- <sup>67</sup> A.O. Woodford, *Historical Geology* (W.H. Freeman and Company, 1965), 191–220.
- <sup>68</sup> Judah Etinger, *Foolish Faith* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2003), Chapter 3.
- <sup>69</sup> Larry Vardiman, "The Age of the Earth's Atmosphere, a Study of the Helium Flux through the Atmosphere," *Institute for Creation Research*, 1990.
- <sup>70</sup> C.S. Noble & J.J. Naughton, *Science*, 162 (1968): 265–266.
- <sup>71</sup> Data compiled and modified after Snelling (1998): Andrew Snelling, "The Cause of Anomalous Potassium-Argon "ages" for Recent Andesite Flows at Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand, and the Implications for Potassium-argon Dating," in Robert E. Walsh (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Creationism* (1998), 503–525.
- <sup>72</sup> J. Hebert, "Rethinking Carbon-14 Dating: What Does It Really Tell Us about the Age of the Earth?" *Acts & Facts* 42 (4) (2013): 12–14.
- <sup>73</sup> Modified from: J. Baumgardner, "Carbon-14 Evidence for a Recent Global Flood and a Young Earth." In *Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth: Results of a*

- Young-Earth Creationist Research Initiative*. Vardiman, L., A. A. Snelling, and E. F. Chaffin, eds. (San Diego, CA: Institute for Creation Research and Chino Valley, AZ: Creation Research Society), 605 (Table 2).
- <sup>74</sup> M.J. Walter, S.C. Kohn, D. Araugo, G.P. Bulanova, C.B. Smith, E. Gaillou, J. Wang, A. Steele, S. B., Shirey, “Deep Mantle Cycling of Oceanic Crust: Evidence from Diamonds and Their Mineral Inclusions,” *Science*, 334 no. 6052 (September 15, 2011): 54–57.
- <sup>75</sup> Walter et al., 2011.
- <sup>76</sup> Modified from Baumgardner, 2005, Table 6, p. 614.
- <sup>77</sup> Baumgardner, 2005.
- <sup>78</sup> Brian Thomas, “*The Incredible, Edible ‘190 Million-Year-Old Egg,’*” Institute for Creation Research Online: <http://www.icr.org/article/7415/> (December 8, 2013).
- <sup>79</sup> M.H. Schweitzer, L. Chiappe, A. C. Garrido, J.M. Lowenstein, & S.H. Pincus, “Molecular Preservation in Late Cretaceous Sauropod Dinosaur Eggshells,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, Volume 272 (1565) (2005): 775–784.
- <sup>80</sup> Brian Thomas, “Published Reports of Original Soft Tissue Fossils” Institute for Creation Research Online: <http://www.icr.org/soft-tissue-list/> (December 20, 2013).
- <sup>81</sup> Brian Thomas, “A Review of Original Tissue Fossils and Their Age Implications,” in M. Horstemeyer (ed.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Creationism* (2013).
- <sup>82</sup> Data compiled and simplified from Tables 1 and 2 in Austin and Humphries (1990): Stephen Austin & D. Humphreys, Russell, “The Sea’s Missing Salt: A Dilemma for Evolutionists,” in R. E. Walsh & C. L. Brooks (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Creationism* (1990), 17–33.
- <sup>83</sup> Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past*.
- <sup>84</sup> Snelling, *Earth’s Catastrophic Past*.

- <sup>85</sup> Don DeYoung, *Thousands..Not Billions* (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2005).
- <sup>86</sup> Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth?—Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2000), 35, 37.
- <sup>87</sup> The coelacanth is supposedly an ancestor to amphibians that dates back 300 million years; however, the coelacanth appears “suddenly” in the fossil record, and modern coelacanths “were also found to give birth to live young (like some sharks), unlike their supposed descendants, the amphibians.” See: K.S. Thomson, *Living Fossil* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991), 137–144.
- <sup>88</sup> Creationwiki.com: <http://creationwiki.org/Archaeopteryx> (January 3, 2014).
- <sup>89</sup> Percival Davis, Dean H. Kenyon, & Charles B. Thaxton (ed). *Of Pandas and People: The Central Question of Biological Origins*, 2d ed. (Dallas, TX: Haughton Publishing Company, 1989), 22–23.
- <sup>90</sup> John D. Morris, *The Young Earth: The Real History of the Earth, Past, Present, and Future* (Colorado Springs, CO: Master Books, 1994).
- <sup>91</sup> Jerry Adler & John Carey, “Is Man a Subtle Accident?” *Newsweek*, 8, no. 95 (Nov. 3, 1980), 96.
- <sup>92</sup> Stephen J. Gould & Niles Eldredge, “Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered,” *Paleobiology*, 3, no. 2 (April 1977), 115–151.
- <sup>93</sup> Brian Thomas, “150 Years Later, Fossils Still Don’t Help Darwin,” Institute for Creation Research Online: <http://www.icr.org/article/4546/> (December 20, 2013).
- <sup>94</sup> Carl Werner, “Evolution the Grand Experiment,” *The Grand Experiment*: <http://www.thegrandexperiment.com/index.html> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>95</sup> Carl Werner, *Living Fossils. Evolution: The Grand Experiment* (Vol. 2) (Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Press, 2008), 242.



- <sup>96</sup> Carl Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment* (Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Press, 2007), 86.
- <sup>97</sup> Chart adapted from: Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (Bethesda: Adler & Adler, 1985).
- <sup>98</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (New York: The Modern Library, 1859), 124-125.
- <sup>99</sup> Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth?—Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong*, pp. 41–42.
- <sup>100</sup> Robert F. DeHaan & John L. Wiester, “*The Cambrian Explosion: The Fossil Record & Intelligent Design*,” *Touchstone* (July/August 1999), 65–69.
- <sup>101</sup> Wells, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth?—Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong*, 42.
- <sup>102</sup> DeHaan & Wiester, 1999, p. 68.
- <sup>103</sup> Paul S. Taylor, *The Illustrated ORIGINS Answer Book*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Mesa, AZ: Eden Productions, 1992), 97.
- <sup>104</sup> A fourth category also exists: Those findings that are unknown or unidentified.
- <sup>105</sup> William K. Gregory, “Hesperopithecus Apparently Not an Ape nor a Man,” *Science*, 66 (1720) (December 16, 1927): 579-581.
- <sup>106</sup> Ralph M. Wetzell, et al., “Catagonus, An ‘Extinct’ Peccary, Alive in Paraguay,” *Science*, 189 (4200) (Aug. 1, 1975): 379.
- <sup>107</sup> Duane T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say NO!* (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1995), 328.
- <sup>108</sup> Herbert Wray, “Was Lucy a Climber? Dissenting Views of Ancient Bones,” *Science News*, 122 (August 21, 1982): 116.
- <sup>109</sup> Brian G. Richmond & David S. Strait, “Evidence That Humans Evolved From a Knuckle-Walking Ancestor,” *Nature*, 404 (6776) (March 23, 2000), 339–340, 382–385.
- <sup>110</sup> Sir Solly Zuckerman, *Beyond the Ivory Tower* (London: Taplinger Publishing Co., 1970), 78.

- <sup>111</sup> Wray Herbert, “Lucy’s Uncommon Forbear,” *Science News*, 123 (February 5, 1983): 89.
- <sup>112</sup> Albert W. Mehler, “Lucy—Evolution’s Solitary Claim for an Ape/Man: Her Position is Slipping Away,” *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 22 (3) (December, 1985): 145.
- <sup>113</sup> Marvin L. Lubenow, *Bones of Contention* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1992), 179.
- <sup>114</sup> DeWitt Steele & Gregory Parker, *Science of the Physical Creation*, 2d ed. (Pensacola, FL: A Beka Book, 1996), 299.
- <sup>115</sup> “NewstoNote” (October 3, 2009). AnswersinGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2009/10/03/news-to-note-10032009> (January 5, 2014).
- <sup>116</sup> B. Asfaw, R.T. Kono, D. Kubo, C.O. Lovejoy, T.D. White, “The Ardipithecus Ramidus Skull and its Implications for Hominid Origins,” *Science* 326 (October 2, 2009): 5949.
- <sup>117</sup> Brian Thomas, “Did Humans Evolve from ‘Ardi’?” Acts and Facts (October 6, 2009), ICR.com: <http://www.icr.org/article/4982/> (January 6, 2014).
- <sup>118</sup> Kate Wong, “Weak Link: Fossil Darwinius Has Its 15 Minutes: Skepticism about a fossil cast as a missing link in human ancestry,” *Scientific American*: <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=weak-link-fossil-darwinius> (January 6, 2014).
- <sup>119</sup> National Geographic News, “Missing Link Found: New Fossil Links Humans, Lemurs?” National Geographic News: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2009/05/090519-missing-link-found.html> (January 5, 2014).
- <sup>120</sup> “Ida (*Darwinius masillae*): the Missing Link at Last? Does Ida Deserve the Attention? A Preliminary Comment,” AnswersinGenesis.com: <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2009/05/19/ida-missing-link> (January 5, 2014).
- <sup>121</sup> Marvin L. Lubenow, “Recovery of Neandertal mtDNA: An Evaluation,” *CEN Technical Journal*, 12 (1) (1998): 89.

- <sup>122</sup> Jack Cuozzo, “Buried Alive: The Truth about Neanderthal Man,” *Truths That Transform Action Sheet* (Radio Program, aired on March 14–15, 2000).
- <sup>123</sup> Lubenow, 1992, p. 63.
- <sup>124</sup> DeWitt Steele & Gregory Parker, *Science of the Physical Creation*, 2nd ed (Pensacola, FL: A Beka Book, 1996), 301.
- <sup>125</sup> M.L. Lubenow, “Recovery of Neandertal mDNA: An Evaluation,” *CEN Technical Journal*, 12 (1) (1998): 89–90.
- <sup>126</sup> Jack Cuozzo, *Buried Alive: The Startling Truth About Neanderthal Man* (Green Forest, AZ: Master Books, 1998), 162, 163, 203.
- <sup>127</sup> Cuozzo, *Buried Alive: The Truth about Neanderthal Man* (2000).
- <sup>128</sup> Green, R. E. et al. A Draft Sequence of the Neandertal Genome. *Science*. 328 (5979) (2010): 710–722.
- <sup>129</sup> Steele & Parker, *Science of the Physical Creation*, pp. 301–302.
- <sup>130</sup> Vance Ferrell, *The Evolution Cruncher* (Altamont, TN: Evolution Facts, Inc., 2001), 529.
- <sup>131</sup> Lubenow, 1992, p. 235.
- <sup>132</sup> Ian Taylor, “Fossil Man” Creation Moments Online: <http://www.creationmoments.com/content/fossil-man> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>133</sup> Vance Ferrell, *The Evolution Cruncher* (Altamont, TN: Evolution Facts, Inc., 2001), 529.
- <sup>134</sup> Lubenow, 1992, p. 99.
- <sup>135</sup> Eugene DuBois, “On the Fossil Human Skulls Recently Discovered in Java and Pithecanthropus Erectus,” *Man*, 37 (January 1937): 4.
- <sup>136</sup> Pat Shipman, “On the Trail of the Piltdown Fraudsters,” *New Scientist*, 128 (October 6, 1990): 52.
- <sup>137</sup> Lubenow, 1992, pp. 42–43.
- <sup>138</sup> Lubenow, 1992, pp. 139–140.
- <sup>139</sup> Richard Dawkins, *River out of Eden* (Basic Books, 1995), 98.

- <sup>140</sup> John D. Morris, “Does ‘The Beak of the Finch’ Prove Darwin Was Right?” ICR.org: <http://www.icr.org/article/1135/> (January 1, 2014).
- <sup>141</sup> This orchard model was developed by Dr. Kurt Wise and has been refined by many creation scientists over the years.
- <sup>142</sup> Miller & Levine, *Biology*, pp. 466-467.
- <sup>143</sup> Other translations, such as the NIV, translate this section as “great creatures of the sea.” The Hebrew phrase used for “great sea creatures” is hattannînim haggədôlîm (תַּנִּינִים גְּדוֹלִים מִן הַיָּם). The lemma gadôl (גָּדוֹל) certainly means big or great great. Tannîm (תַּנִּינִים) is often translated “sea monsters” or “dragons.” Thus while the KJV translates this as “great whales,” the term is broader. It would also include living large sea creatures like the great white shark and the whale shark. Surprising as it is to those used to faulty “millions of years” claims, the term would also include many famous extinct sea creatures. These include ichthyosaurs (from the Greek for “fish lizard”), somewhat like reptilian versions of dolphins; some grew huge, such as the 21-m (69-foot)-long *Shastasaurus sikanniensis*. Other creatures included in the term tannîm would be the short-necked long-headed pliosaurs, such as *Liopleurodon*, 6.4 (21 feet) long, although the 1999 BBC series *Walking With Dinosaurs* portrayed it as 25 m (82 ft.) long, far larger than any known specimen. There were also the long-necked plesiosaurs such as *Elasmosaurus*, 14 m (46 feet) long, half of it the neck. Other tannin created on Day 5 were mosasaurus, like marine versions of monitor lizards, the largest of which was *Hainosaurus*, at 17.5 meters (57 ft.) long.
- <sup>144</sup> Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, p. 40.
- <sup>145</sup> N.D. Pyenson, et al., “Discovery of a Sensory Organ that Coordinates Lunge Feeding in Rorqual Whales,” *Nature* 485 (7399) 2012: 498–501. J. Sarfati, “Baleen

- Whales have Unique Sensory Organ,” *Creation* 35 (4) (2013): 38–40.
- <sup>146</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* 1st ed. (1865): Chapter 6, p. 184.
- <sup>147</sup> Francis Darwin, *More Letters of Charles Darwin* (London: J. Murray, 1903): 162.
- <sup>148</sup> Leigh Van Valen, “Deltatheridia, a New Order of Mammals,” *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 132 (1966): 92.
- <sup>149</sup> Philip D. Gingerich & D. E. Russell, “Pakicetus inachus, a new archaeocete (Mammalia, Cetacea) from the early-middle Eocene Kuldana Formation of Kohat (Pakistan),” *University of Michigan Museum of Paleontology*, 25 (1981): 235–246.
- <sup>150</sup> University Of Michigan, “New Fossils Suggest Whales And Hippos Are Close Kin,” *Science Daily* (September 20, 2001); University Of California, Berkeley, “UC Berkeley, French Scientists Find Missing Link Between The Whale And Its Closest Relative, The Hippo,” *Science Daily* (February 7, 2005); Patricia Reaney, “Fossil Finds Show Whales Related to Early Pigs,” Greenspun: [http://www.greenspun.com/bboard/q-and-a-fetch-msg.tcl?msg\\_id=006QvI](http://www.greenspun.com/bboard/q-and-a-fetch-msg.tcl?msg_id=006QvI).
- <sup>151</sup> Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, p. 40.
- <sup>152</sup> Casey Luskin, “Nice Try! A Review of Alan Rogers’s The Evidence for Evolution,” (October 18, 2011), *Evolution News*: [http://www.evolutionnews.org/2012/04/a\\_review\\_of\\_ala058641.html](http://www.evolutionnews.org/2012/04/a_review_of_ala058641.html) (December 25, 2013).
- <sup>153</sup> “Debate on Origins of Life,” *Discovery Institute*: <http://www.discovery.org/v/1711>, (December 25, 2013).
- <sup>154</sup> Luskin, 2011.
- <sup>155</sup> Miller & Levine, *Biology*, p. 466.
- <sup>156</sup> Philip D. Gingerich, NA. Wells, Donald Russell, S.M. Shaw, “Origin of Whales in Epicontinental Remnant

- Seas: New Evidence from the Early Eocene of Pakistan,” *Science* 220 (4595) (April 22, 1983): 403–406.
- <sup>157</sup> Phillip Gingerich, “The Whales of Tethys,” *Natural History*, (April 1994): 86.
- <sup>158</sup> P.D. Gingerich, “Evidence for Evolution from the Vertebrate Fossil Record,” *Journal for Geological Education*, 31 (1983): 140-144.
- <sup>159</sup> Christian de Muizon, “Walking with Whales,” *Nature* 413, (September 20, 2001): 259–260.
- <sup>160</sup> G.M. Thewissen, E.M. Williams, L.J. Roe, & S.T. Hussain, “Skeletons of Terrestrial Cetaceans and the Relationship of Whales to Artiodactyls,” *Nature* 413 (September, 2001): 277-281.
- <sup>161</sup> David Quammen, “Was Darwin Wrong?” *National Geographic*, 206 (5) (November, 2004): 2–35.
- <sup>162</sup> Fossilworks Paleobiology Database: <http://fossilworks.org> (December 25, 2013).
- <sup>163</sup> Miller & Levine, *Biology*, p. 466.
- <sup>164</sup> Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, (Bethesda: Adler & Adler, 1985), 210-211,
- <sup>165</sup> Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, pp. 137–138.
- <sup>166</sup> Fossilworks Paleobiology Database: <http://fossilworks.org> (December 25, 2013).
- <sup>167</sup> J. G. M. Thewissen & E. M. Williams, “The Early Radiations of Cetacea (Mammalia): Evolutionary Pattern and Developmental Correlations,” *Annual Review of Ecological Systems*, 33 (2002): 73–90.
- <sup>168</sup> Miller & Levine, *Biology*, p. 466.
- <sup>169</sup> Working Group on Teaching Evolution, “National Academy of Sciences Teaching about Evolution and the Nature of Science, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1998): 18.
- <sup>170</sup> Carl Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment* (DVD) (Based on interview conducted on August 28, 2001),

- (Green Forest, AR: New Leaf Publishing Group/Audio Visual Consultants Inc.).
- <sup>171</sup> “Basilosaurus,” Celebrating 100 Years: Explore Our Collections, Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History: <http://www.mnh.si.edu> (February 10, 2012).
- <sup>172</sup> Phillip Gingerich, *The Press-Enterprise*, (July 1, 1990): A-15.
- <sup>173</sup> Philip Gingerich, B. Holly Smith, & Elwyn L. Simons, “Hind limbs of Eocene Basilosaurus: Evidence of Feet in Whales,” *Science*, Vol. 249, (July 13, 1990): 156.
- <sup>174</sup> “Whales with ‘non-feet,’” Creation.com: <http://creation.com/focus-142#nonfeet> (December 26, 2013).
- <sup>175</sup> Jonathan Sarfati, “Science, Creation and Evolutionism: Response to the Latest Anticreationist Agitprop from the US National Academy of Sciences (NAS),” Creation.com: <http://creation.com/science-creation-and-evolutionism-refutation-of-nas> (December 26, 2013).
- <sup>176</sup> D.T. Gish, *Evolution: The Fossils still say no!* (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1985): 206–208.
- <sup>177</sup> Jonathan Silvertown (ed), *99% Ape: How Evolution Adds Up* (University of Chicago Press, 2009), 4.
- <sup>178</sup> Various sources will show minor differences in these comparisons. They are for example only.
- <sup>179</sup> Silvertown, 2009.
- <sup>180</sup> PBS NOVA, “Darwins’ Predictions,” PBS: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/id/pred-nf.html> (December 11, 2013).
- <sup>181</sup> This comes from comparing the total base pairs to the “golden path length” in the Ensemble database ([http://useast.ensembl.org/Homo\\_sapiens/Info/StatsTable?db=core](http://useast.ensembl.org/Homo_sapiens/Info/StatsTable?db=core)) (January 1, 2014). These numbers should be the same. As long as they are different, there is uncertainty in the number of base pairs in the genome.
- <sup>182</sup> Jeffery P. Demuth, Tijn De Bie, Jason E. Stajich, Nello Cristianini, & Matthew W. Hahn, “The Evolution of Mammalian Gene Families,” *PLOS ONE*, 10 (2006).

- <sup>183</sup> Richard Buggs, “Chimpanzee?” RD.NL: [http://www.refdag.nl/chimpanzee\\_1\\_282611](http://www.refdag.nl/chimpanzee_1_282611) (December 11, 2013).
- <sup>184</sup> Jeffrey P. Tomkins, “Comprehensive Analysis of Chimpanzee and Human Chromosomes Reveals Average DNA Similarity of 70%,” *Answers Research Journal* 6 (2013): 63–69.
- <sup>185</sup> Mary-Claire King & A. C. Wilson, “Evolution at Two Levels in Humans and Chimpanzees,” *Science* 188 (1975): 107–116.
- <sup>186</sup> R.J Rummel, “Statistics of Democide: Genocide and Mass Murder Since 1900,” *School of Law, University of Virginia* (1997); and Transaction Publishers, Rutgers University (2013).
- <sup>187</sup> J. Bergman & J. Tomkins, “Is the Human Genome Nearly Identical to Chimpanzee? A Reassessment of the Literature.” *Journal of Creation* 26 (2012): 54–60.
- <sup>188</sup> Bergman & Tomkins, 2012.
- <sup>189</sup> J. Tomkins, “How Genomes are Sequenced and why it Matters: Implications for Studies in Comparative Genomics of Humans and Chimpanzees,” *Answers Research Journal* 4 (2011): 81–88.
- <sup>190</sup> I. Ebersberger, D. Metzler, C. Schwarz, & S. Pääbo, “Genomewide Comparison of DNA Sequences between Humans and Chimpanzees,” *American Journal of Human Genetics* 70 (2002): 1490–1497.
- <sup>191</sup> Chimpanzee Sequencing and Analysis Consortium, “Initial Sequence of the Chimpanzee Genome and Comparison with the Human Genome,” *Nature* 437 (2005): 69–87.
- <sup>192</sup> J. Tomkins, “Genome-Wide DNA Alignment Similarity (Identity) for 40,000 Chimpanzee DNA Sequences Queried against the Human Genome is 86–89%,” *Answers Research Journal* 4 (2011): 233–241.
- <sup>193</sup> J. Prado-Martinez, et al. “Great Ape Genetic Diversity and Population History,” *Nature* 499 (2013), 471–475.



- <sup>194</sup> J. Tomkins, & J. Bergman. “Genomic Monkey Business— Estimates of Nearly Identical Human-Chimp DNA Similarity Re-evaluated using Omitted Data,” *Journal of Creation* 26 (2012), 94–100; J. Tomkins, “Comprehensive Analysis of Chimpanzee and Human Chromosomes Reveals Average DNA Similarity of 70%,” *Answers Research Journal* 6 (2013): 63–69.
- <sup>195</sup> Tomkins & Bergman, 2013.
- <sup>196</sup> Tomkins, 2011.
- <sup>197</sup> Tomkins, 2013.
- <sup>198</sup> Tomkins, 2011.
- <sup>199</sup> E. Wijaya, M.C. Frith, P. Horton & K. Asai, “Finding Protein-coding Genes through Human Polymorphisms,” *PloS one* 8 (2013).
- <sup>200</sup> M. J. Hangauer, I.W. Vaughn & M. T. McManus, “Pervasive Transcription of the Human Genome Produces Thousands of Previously Unidentified Long Intergenic Noncoding RNAs,” *PLoS genetics* 9 (2013).
- <sup>201</sup> S. Djebali, et al. “Landscape of Transcription in Human Cells,” *Nature* 489 (2012): 101–108.
- <sup>202</sup> M. D. Paraskevopoulou, et al. “DIANA-LncBase: Experimentally Verified and Computationally Predicted MicroRNA Targets on Long Non-coding RNAs,” *Nucleic Acids Research* 41 (2013): 239–245.
- <sup>203</sup> G. Liu, J.S. Mattick, & R. J. Taft, “A Meta-analysis of the Genomic and Transcriptomic Composition of Complex Life,” *Cell Cycle* 12 (2013), 2061–2072.
- <sup>204</sup> J. J Yunis & O. Prakash, “The Origin of Man: A Chromosomal Pictorial Legacy,” *Science* 215 (1982): 1525–1530.
- <sup>205</sup> J. W. Ijdo, A. Baldini, D.C. Ward, S. T. Reeders & R. A. Wells, “Origin of Human Chromosome 2: An Ancestral Telomere-telomere Fusion,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 88 (1991): 9051–9055.

- <sup>206</sup> J. Bergman & J. Tomkins, “The Chromosome 2 Fusion Model of Human Evolution—Part 1: Re-evaluating the Evidence,” *Journal of Creation* 25 (2011): 110–114.
- <sup>207</sup> J. Tomkins, “Alleged Human Chromosome 2 ‘Fusion Site’ Encodes an Active DNA Binding Domain Inside a Complex and Highly Expressed Gene—Negating Fusion,” *Answers Research Journal* 6 (2013): 367–375.
- <sup>208</sup> Y. Fan, E. Linardopoulou, C. Friedman, E. Williams & B.J. Trask, “Genomic Structure and Evolution of the Ancestral Chromosome Fusion Site in 2q13-2q14.1 and Paralogous Regions on other Human Chromosomes,” *Genome Research* 12 (2002): 1651–1662; Y. Fan, T. Newman, E. Linardopoulou, & B.J. Trask, “Gene Content and Function of the Ancestral Chromosome Fusion Site in Human Chromosome 2q13-2q14.1 and Paralogous Regions,” *Genome Research* 12 (2002): 1663–1672.
- <sup>209</sup> Y.Z. Wen, L. L. Zheng, L.H. Qu, F. J. Ayala & Z.R. Lun, Z. R, “Pseudogenes are not Pseudo Any More,” *RNA Biology* 9 (2012): 27–32.
- <sup>210</sup> J. Tomkins, “The Human Beta-Globin Pseudogene Is Non-Variable and Functional,” *Answers Research Journal* 6 (2013): 293–301.
- <sup>211</sup> M. Y. Lachapelle, & G. Drouin, “Inactivation Dates of the Human and Guinea Pig Vitamin C Genes,” *Genetica* 139 (2011): 199–207.
- <sup>212</sup> J. Sanford, *Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Genome*, 3rd ed. (FMS Publications, 2010).
- <sup>213</sup> J. Tomkins & J. Bergman, “Incomplete Lineage Sorting and Other ‘Rogue’ Data Fell the Tree of Life,” *Journal of Creation* 27 (2013): 63–71.
- <sup>214</sup> P. Senter, “Vestigial Skeletal Structures in Dinosaurs,” *Journal of Zoology*, 280 (1) (January 2010): 60–71.
- <sup>215</sup> Thomas Heinze, *Creation vs. Evolution Handbook* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1973).

- <sup>216</sup> Isaac Asimov, *1959 Words of Science* (New York: Signet Reference Books, 1959), 30.
- <sup>217</sup> J. Bergman, "Are Wisdom Teeth (third molars) Vestiges of Human Evolution?" *CEN Tech Journal*. 12 (3) (1998): 297–304.
- <sup>218</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (London: John Murray, 1871), 21.
- <sup>219</sup> Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* (New York: Modern Library, 1859), 346–350.
- <sup>220</sup> S. R. Scadding, "Do Vestigial Organs Provide Evidence for Evolution?" *Evolutionary Theory* 5 (1981): 173–176.
- <sup>221</sup> Robert Wiedersheim, *The Structure of Man: An Index to his Past History* (London: Macmillan, 1895, Translated by H. and M. Bernard).
- <sup>222</sup> David Starr Jordan & Vernon Lyman Kellogg, *Evolution and Animal Life* (New York: Appleton, 1908), 175.
- <sup>223</sup> Wiedersheim, 1895, p. 3.
- <sup>224</sup> Darwin, 1871, p. 29.
- <sup>225</sup> Cora A. Reno, *Evolution on Trial* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1970), 81.
- <sup>226</sup> Diane Newman, *The Urinary Incontinence Sourcebook* (Los Angeles, CA.: Lowell House, 1997), 13.
- <sup>227</sup> Warren Walker, *Functional Anatomy of the Vertebrates: An Evolutionary Perspective* (Philadelphia, PA: Saunders, 1987), 253.
- <sup>228</sup> Catherine Parker Anthony, *Textbook of Anatomy and Physiology*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (St. Louis, MO: Mosby, 1963), 411.
- <sup>229</sup> Anthony Smith, *The Body* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1986), 134.
- <sup>230</sup> Henry Gray, *Gray's Anatomy* (Philadelphia: Lea Febiger, 1966), 130.
- <sup>231</sup> Dorothy Allford, *Instant Creation—Not Evolution* (New York: Stein and Day, 1978), 42; Saul Weischnitzer, *Outline of Human Anatomy* (Baltimore, MD: University Park Press, 1978), 285.

- <sup>232</sup> J. D. Ratcliff, *Your Body and How it Works* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1975), 137.
- <sup>233</sup> Lawrence Galton, “All those Tonsil Operations: Useless? Dangerous?” *Parade* (May 2, 1976): 26.
- <sup>234</sup> Martin L. Gross, *The Doctors* (New York: Random House, 1966).
- <sup>235</sup> Jacob Stanley, Clarice Francone, & Walter Lossow, *Structure and Function in Man*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1982).
- <sup>236</sup> Alvin Eden, “When Should Tonsils and Adenoids be Removed?” *Family Weekly* (September 25, 1977): 24.
- <sup>237</sup> Syzmanowski as quoted in Dolores Katz, “Tonsillectomy: Boom or Boondoggle?” *The Detroit Free Press* (April 13, 1966).
- <sup>238</sup> Katz, 1972, p. 1-C.
- <sup>239</sup> N. J. Vianna, Petter Greenwald & U. N. Davies, “Tonsillectomy” In: *Medical World News* (September 10, 1973).
- <sup>240</sup> Katz, 1972.
- <sup>241</sup> Darwin, 1871, pp. 27–28.
- <sup>242</sup> Peter Raven & George Johnson, *Understanding Biology* (St. Louis: Times Mirror Mosby, 1988), 322.
- <sup>243</sup> Rebecca E. Fisher, “The Primate Appendix: A Reassessment,” *The Anatomical Record*, 261 (2000): 228–236.
- <sup>244</sup> R. Randal Bollinger, Andrew S. Barbas, Errol L. Bush, Shu S. Lin and William Parker, “Biofilms in the Large Bowel Suggest an Apparent Function of the Human Vermiform Appendix,” *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 249 (4) (2007): 826–831; Thomas Morrison (ed.). *Human Physiology* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967).
- <sup>245</sup> Loren Martin, “What is the Function of the Human Appendix?” *Scientific American Online* (1999).

- <sup>246</sup> Thomas Judge & Gary R. Lichtenstein, "Is the Appendix a Vestigial Organ? Its Role in Ulcerative Colitis," *Gastroenterology*, 121 (3) (2001): 730–732.
- <sup>247</sup> Rod R. Seeley, Trent D. Stephens, & Philip Tate, *Anatomy and Physiology* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2003).
- <sup>248</sup> Ernst Haeckel, *The Evolution of Man: A Popular Exposition of the Principal Points of Human Ontogeny and Phylogeny* (New York: D. Appleton, 1879), 438.
- <sup>249</sup> Wiedersheim, 1895, p. 163.
- <sup>250</sup> O. Levy, G. Dai, C. Riedel, C.S. Ginter, E.M. Paul, A. N. Lebowitz & N. Carrasco, "Characterization of the thyroid Na<sup>+</sup>/I<sup>-</sup> symporter with an anti-COOH terminus antibody," *Proceedings from the National Academy of Science*, 94 (1997): 5568–5573.
- <sup>251</sup> Albert Maisel, "The useless glands that guard our health." *Reader's Digest* (November, 1966): 229–235.
- <sup>252</sup> John Clayton, "Vestigial Organs Continue to Diminish," *Focus on Truth*, 6 (6) (1983): 6–7.
- <sup>253</sup> Seeley, Stephens, & Tate, *Anatomy and Physiology* (McGraw-Hill Education, 2003), 778.
- <sup>254</sup> Maisel, 1966, p. 229.
- <sup>255</sup> Arthur Guyton, *Textbook of Medical Physiology* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1966): 139.
- <sup>256</sup> Helen G. Durkin & Byron H. Waksman. "Thymus and Tolerance. Is Regulation the Major Function of the Thymus?" *Immunological Reviews*, 182 (2001): 33–57.
- <sup>257</sup> Durkin & Waksman, 2001, p. 49.
- <sup>258</sup> Benedict Seddon & Don Mason, "The Third Function of the Thymus," *Immunology Today*, 21 (2) (2000): 95–99.
- <sup>259</sup> Maisel, 1966.
- <sup>260</sup> Joel R. L. Ehrenkranz, "A Gland for all Seasons," *Natural History*, 92 (6) (1983): 18.
- <sup>261</sup> Stanley Yolles, "The Pineal Gland," *Today's Health*, 44 (3) (1966): 76–79.

- <sup>262</sup> David Blask, "Potential Role of the Pineal Gland in the Human Menstrual Cycle," Chapter 9 in *Changing Perspectives on Menopause*, Edited by A. M. Voda (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982), 124.
- <sup>263</sup> A. C. Greiner & S. C. Chan, "Melatonin Content of the Human Pineal Gland," *Science*, 199 (1978): 83–84.
- <sup>264</sup> Esther Greisheimer & Mary Wideman, *Physiology and Anatomy*, 9<sup>th</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972).
- <sup>265</sup> Rosa M. Sainz, Juan C. Mayo, R.J. Reiter, D.X. Tan, and C. Rodriguez, "Apoptosis in Primary Lymphoid Organs with Aging," *Microscopy Research and Technique*, 62 (2003): 524–539.
- <sup>266</sup> Sharon Begley & William Cook, "The SAD Days of Winter," *Newsweek*, 155 (2) (January 14, 1985): 64.
- <sup>267</sup> Sainz, et al., 2003.
- <sup>268</sup> G.J. Maestroni, A. Conti, & P. Lisson, "Colony-stimulating activity and hematopoietic rescue from cancer chemotherapy compounds are induced by melatonin via endogenous interleukin," *Cancer Research*, 54 (1994): 4740-4743.
- <sup>269</sup> B.D. Jankovic, K. Isakovic, S. Petrovic, "Effect of Pinealectomy on Immune Reactions in the Rat," *Immunology*, 18 (1) (1970): 1–6.
- <sup>270</sup> Lennert Wetterberg, Edward Geller, & Arthur Yuwiler, "Harderian Gland: An Extraretinal Photoreceptor Influencing the Pineal Gland in Neonatal Rats?" *Science*, 167 (1970): 884–885.
- <sup>271</sup> Ehrenkranz, 1983, p. 18.
- <sup>272</sup> Philip Stibbe, "A Comparative Study of the Nictitating Membrane of Birds and Mammals," *Journal of Anatomy*, 163 (1928): 159–176.
- <sup>273</sup> Darwin, 1871, p. 23.
- <sup>274</sup> Henry Drummond, *The Ascent of Man* (New York: James Potts and Co., 1903).

- <sup>275</sup> Richard Snell & Michael Lemp, *Clinical Anatomy of the Eye* (Boston: Blackwell Scientific Pub, 1997), 93.
- <sup>276</sup> Eugene Wolff (Revised by Robert Warwick), *Anatomy of the Eye and Orbit* 7<sup>th</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: W B. Saunders, 1976), 221.
- <sup>277</sup> John King, Personal communication, Dr. King is a professor of ophthalmology at The Ohio State School of Medicine and an authority on the eye (October 18, 1979).
- <sup>278</sup> E. P. Stibbe, "A Comparative Study of the Nictitating Membrane of Birds and Mammals," *Journal of Anatomy* 62 (1928): 159–176.
- <sup>279</sup> Wiedersheim, 1895.
- <sup>280</sup> D. Peck, "A Proposed Mechanoreceptor Role for the Small Redundant Muscles which Act in Parallel with Large Prime movers" in P. Hinick, T. Soukup, R. Vejsada, & J. Zelena's (eds.) *Mechanoreceptors: Development, Structure and Function* (New York: Plenum Press, 1988), 377–382.
- <sup>281</sup> David N. Menton, "The Plantaris and the Question of Vestigial Muscles in Man," *CEN Technical Journal*, 14 (2) (2000): 50–53.
- <sup>282</sup> Herbert DeVries, *Physiology of Exercise for Physical Education and Athletics* (Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown, 1980), 16–18.