

Scientific Problems with Evolution

Mutations and Evolution

"Even though one of the most important requirements for the genetic material is its stability, the capacity for change is also necessary. When this does occur, a mutation is said to have taken place. A mutation then is a sudden heritable change in the structure of the genetic material. This change may lead to a corresponding change in the phenotype. As such, mutations are an extremely important source of genetic variability in living populations. **In fact, mutations are the only source of new genetic information.** Recombination, which is the other major source of genetic variation, simply rearranges already existing genetic information."

Burns, G. W. 1989. *The Science of Genetics*. Macmillian publishing Co. New York. p.261

"When germinal mutations alter an organism, the effect is usually harmful. Many genetic diseases are the results of such mutations. **A mutation will rarely produce a beneficial change.** When this does occur the percentage of organisms with this gene will increase until the mutated gene becomes the norm in the population. In this way, beneficial mutations serve as the raw material of evolution"

Encyclopedia Britannica 1988. *Mutation*. p.457.

"New mutations are... mostly harmful or lethal. Beneficial mutations are so rare that they can be utilized economically only in species with very high reproductive rates. Thus, better strains of *Penicillium* have been raised from artificially produced mutations. Because this method has been done at the expense of discarding thousands of inferior mutants, this method is obviously not suited for farm animals. Nor can it be expected that an increase in mutation frequency, as a result of exposure to ionizing radiation from X-ray machines, artificial atomic disintegration, and radioactive isotopes can have any but harmful effects on the hereditary constitution of the human race."

Encyclopedia Britannica 1988. *Genetics and Heredity* p.737.

Fossil Record and *The Origin of Species*

"For I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived. A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question; and this cannot possibly be here done. "

Darwin, Charles. 1979. *The origin of Species*.
Random House New York. p.66.

"on the sudden appearance of groups of Allied Species in the lowest known fossiliferous strata. (Subheading chapter 9) There is another *and* allied difficulty, which is much graver, I allude to the manner in which number of species of the same group, suddenly appear in the lowest know fossiliferous rocks.. But the difficulty of understanding the absence of vast piles of fossiliferous strata, which on my theory now doubt were somewhere accumulated before the Silurian epoch, is very great The case at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained."

p. 312, 313, 314

"The several difficulties here discussed, namely our not finding in the successive formations infinitely numerous transitional link between the many species which now exist or have existed; the sudden manner in which whole groups of species appear in our European formations; the almost entire absence, as at present known, of fossiliferous formations beneath the Silurian strata, are all undoubtedly of the gravest nature. We see this in the plainest manner by the fact that all the most eminent paleontologists, namely Cuvier, Owen, Agassiz, Barrande, Falconer, Forbes, &c., and all our great geologist, as Lyell, Murchision, Sedgwick, &c,. have unanimously, often vehemently, maintained the immutability of the species."

p.315-6

"One (difficulty), namely the distinctness of specific forms, and their not being blended together by innumerable transitional links, is a very obvious difficulty."

p.291

"Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduate organic chain; and this' perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory. The explanation lies, as I believe in the extreme imperfection of the geological record."

p.292

"Geological research, though it has added numerous species to existing and extinct genera, and has made the intervals between some few groups less wide than they otherwise would have been yet has done scarcely anything in breaking down the distinction between species, by connecting them together by numerous, fine, intermediate varieties; and this not having been effected, is probably the gravest and most obvious of all the many objections which may be urged against my views."

p.307

Sudden Appearance of Vertebrates in the fossil record

"Their (vertebrates) sudden appearance in a variety of forms in the late Silurian (438 mya) and Devonian (408 mya) corresponds with the earliest occurrence of abundant freshwater sediments in the geological record."

Pough, Harvey. 1996. *Vertebrate Life*. Prentice Hall. New Jersey. p.60.

"Central to Darwin's theory was the idea that evolution proceeded by the accumulation of small, heritable changes, not large, sudden changes and that selective forces acted on the individual. Furthermore, it was Darwin's contention that evolution acted with design heritable traits accumulated randomly and natural selection depended on prevailing conditions.. Recently, the hypothesis that evolution proceeds through a slow, constant rate of accumulation of small genetic mutations and/or gene recombinations has been challenged by several biologists.. Underlying their forcefully presented viewpoint is the fact that a gradual change or transition from one species to another is often missing in the fossil record. The competing theories of micro- and macro-evolutionary processes of speciation have become popularly referred to as gradualism and punctuated equilibrium.. Punctuated equilibrium provides an explanation for the existence of a recognizable species through time. If species arise suddenly through rapid genetic structural adjustments and then remain in stable equilibrium until the next punctuation, they represent distinct entities with a proscribed structure and period of existence."

Vertebrate Life p.11-12.

"The first animals that can be called vertebrates probably evolved in Cambrian seas. Although this sequence of events is not proven it is a good example of how biologist build evolutionary hypotheses from comparative studies of living and fossil animals."

Vertebrate Life p.61.

"Indirect evidence must be used to infer evolutionary relationships between the vertebrates and other animals."

Vertebrate Life p.45.

Fossils that don't fit

Laetoli footprints:

"Beginning in 1978, associates of Mary Leakey discovered a series of what appear to be human footprint trails at site G, Laetoli, thirty mile south of Olduvai Gorge, in northern Tanzania, The strata above the footprints has been dated at 3.6 mya, while the strata below them has been dated at 3.8 mya (K-Ar). These footprint trails rank as one of the great fossil discoveries of the twentieth century... These footprint trails have produced a large body of literature. Virtually everyone agrees that they are strikingly like those made by modern human, in spite of that fact the evolutionist community has ascribed them to the Lucy-type hominid know as *Australopithecus afarensis*. This taxon includes mandibles found elsewhere at Laetoli by Mary Leakey as well as fossils found by Donald Johanson in the Afar region of Ethiopia. The assumption, based upon the somewhat similar ages of the fossil in the two different localities and the belief that *afarensis* was bipedal is that the *afarensis* fossils represent the type of individual who made the Laetoli footprint trails, Obviously, this is totally unprovable."

Lubenow, Marvin. 1992. *Bones of Contention*. Baker Books, Grand Rapids, Michigan. p.173

"Make no mistake about it, say Tim (Tim White, one of the discoverers of the Laetoli footprint trail). They are like modern human footprints. If one were left in the sand of a California beach today, and a four-year-old were asked what it was, he would instantly say that somebody had walked there, He wouldn't be able to tell it from a hundred other prints on the beach, nor would you. The external morphology is the same. There is a well-shaped modern heel with a strong arch and a good ball of the foot in front of it. The big toe is straight in line. It doesn't stick out to the side like an ape toe, or like the big toes in so many drawings your see of *australopithecines* in books."

Johanson, Donald 1981. *Lucy the Beginnings of Humankind* Simon and Schuster. New York. p.250

"If the Laetoli footprints are so much like those of modern humans.. why not ascribe those footprints to humans? Tuttle (One of the footprint investigators) is honest enough to give us the reason."

"If the G footprints were not known to be so old, we would readily conclude that they were made by a member of our genus, *Homo*."

"The real problem--the only problem---is that to ascribe those fossil footprint to *Homo* does not fit the evolutionary scenario timewise. According to the theory of evolution, those footprints are too old to have been made by true humans. It is a classic case of interpreting fact according to preconceived philosophical bias."

Bones of Contention. p.175.

The Kanapoi Elbow Fossil

"This fossil, known as KP 271, is the lower end of an upper arm bone (distal end of the humerus). It was found in 1965 by Bryan Patterson (Harvard Univ.), and is in an excellent state of preservation. The most recent dating of the fossil gives it an age of 4.5 mya. It thus becomes virtually of the oldest hominid fossil ever found - older than Lucy and all of the *australopithecines*. The question is, What is it?"

Bones of Contention p.53

"The humeral fragment from Kanapoi, with a date of about 4.4 mya could not be distinguished from *Homo sapiens* morphologically or by multivariate analysis (computer) by Patterson and myself (Clark Howells an evolutionist and researcher) in 1967 (or by much more searching analysis by others since then). We suggest that it might represent *Australopithecus* because at that time allocation to *Homo* seemed preposterous, although it would be the correct one without the time element."

Bones of Contention. p.57.

"It is obvious that looks isn't everything. Even though KP 271 is shaped exactly like *Homo sapiens*, the time element is wrong. What determines that? The concept of human evolution. The concept of human evolution decrees that it is impossible for true humans to have lived before the australopithecines—even though the fossil evidence would suggest otherwise—because humans are supposed to have evolved from the australopithecines.

According to the basic principle of the philosophy of science, a theory must be falsifiable if it is a legitimate scientific theory. How could the theory of evolution be falsified? Supposedly if fossil are found that are woefully out of order from what evolution would predict. Many such fossils have been found. KP 271 is just one of them. However, evolutionist ignore the morphology of fossils that do not fall into the proper evolutionary time period. They wave their magic wand to change the taxon of these fossils. Thus, it is impossible to falsify the concept of human evolution. It is like trying to nail jelly to the wall. That evolutionist resort to this manipulation of the evidence is a confession on their part that the fossil evidence does not conform to evolutionary theory. It also reveals that the concept of human evolution is a philosophy, not a science."

Bones of Contention. p.57

The Morphology of Neanderthal Man

Because of the richness of the Neandertal fossil record, we do have a general idea of what they looked like. There is a distinct Neandertal morphology: (1) large cranial capacity the average being larger than the average for modern humans. (2) skull shape low, broad, and elongated, (3) rear of the skull rather pointed, with a bun, (4) large, heavy browridges, (5) low forehead, (6) large, long faces with the center of the face jutting forward, (7) weak, rounded chin, and (8) postcranial skeleton rugged with bones very thick.

Bones of Contention p.61

One of the most characteristic features of the Neanderthals is the exaggerated massiveness of their trunk and limb bones. All of the preserved bones suggest a strength seldom attained by modern humans. Furthermore, not only is their robustness present among the adult males, as one might expect, but it is also evident in the adult females, adolescents, and even children.

Trinkaus 1978

Neanderthal was far more powerful than modern humans. Whereas archeologist can experimentally duplicate the wear pattern on tools such as were used by people from the Upper Paleolithic (the people that followed Neanderthal...), the wear patterns on Neanderthal's tools cannot be duplicated. We do not have the strength to do it Neanderthal skeleton reflects a supremely powerful musculature.

Geist, 1981

The evidence indicates that Neanderthals were people of incredible power and strength far superior to all but the most avid bodybuilders of today.

Bones of Contention p.62

The vertebral columns of the Shanidar Neandertals are similar to those of modern man but with a marked tendency to robustness. The ribs are thick. The upper limb bones disclose a pattern of morphology close to that of other Neandertals of the Near East and of Europe. This pattern includes powerful shoulders, arms and hands built for grasping, pulling and lifting. The lower limb remains conforms to the pattern of Neanderthal man in that they are robust, powerfully muscled and in keeping with upright posture and bipedal gait. In addition it seems that the distribution of muscularity is such that powerful acceleration would have been possible in running, jumping or climbing.

Day, M. H. 1993. *Guide to Fossil Man*. Univ. Chicago Press. p.137

The limb bones are of rugged construction, having stout tuberosities and impressive muscular markings. The humeri are straight and cylindrical, but the radius is curved with an internal concavity. The radial tuberosity is very large, adumbrating a powerful biceps muscle.

Guide to Fossil Man. 69