

THE CASE OF ARCHAEOPTERYX - 1

This is a fascinating story, which probably is another of the many evolutionary hoaxes. Evolutionary theory is a myth. God created everything; the evidence clearly points to it. This is science vs. evolution—a *Creation-Evolution Encyclopedia*, brought to you by Creation Science Facts.

CONTENTS: The Case of Archaeopteryx - 1

Introduction - Evolutionists claim it is halfway between a reptile and a bird

Archaeopteryx May Be a Bird - It may be just another species of bird

This material is excerpted from the book, *HISTORY OF EVOLUTIONARY THEORY*. (See Order Sheet.) An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not known to be a creationist. Of over 4,000 quotations in the books this *Encyclopedia* is based on, only 164 statements are by creationists.

INTRODUCTION

Evolutionists claim it is halfway between a reptile and a bird.

"Archaeopteryx": This is a big name for a little bird, and is pronounced "*Archee-opter-iks*." It means "early wing." If you have a hard time with it, just call the little fellow "*Archee*." He won't mind.

There are high-quality limestone deposits in Solnhofen, Germany (near Eichstatt), which have been mined for over a century. From time to time, fossils have been found in them, and the sale of these has provided extra income for the owners of the Dorr quarry.

In 1861, a feather was found, and it sold for a surprisingly good price. This was due to the fact that it had purportedly come from late Jurassic strata. Soon after, in the same quarry, a fossil bird was found with the head and neck missing. The name, *Archaeopteryx*, had been given to the bird. The Jurassic specimen was sold for a high price to the British Museum. Finding unusual specimens was becoming an excellent way to bring in good profit. In 1877, a second specimen was said to have been discovered close to the first,—but this one had a neck and head. In that head were 13 teeth in each jaw; the head itself had the elongated round shape of a lizard head. This latest find made an absolute sensation, and was sure to sell for a great amount of money. And it surely did—going this time to the Humbold Museum, in Berlin, as the highest bidder.

Including that feather, there are six specimens of *Archaeopteryx* in the world. All six came from that same German limestone area. In addition to the feather and the first two, three others are quite faint and difficult to use. It is almost impossible to tell what they are. Aside from the feather, the others are located at London, Berlin, Maxburg, Teyler, and Eichstatt—all in Germany. They all came from the same general area.

Only the first fossilized skeleton (the "London specimen"), and the second one (the "Berlin specimen"), are well-enough defined to be usable. Evolutionists declare them to be prime examples of a transitional species. If so, we would have here the only definite cross-species transitions ever found anywhere in the world.

"Evolutionists can produce only a single creature—one single fossil creature—for which it is possible to produce even a semblance of an argument. That creature is, of course, *Archaeopteryx*, of which about five fossil specimens have been found in Upper Jurassic

rocks (assumed by evolutionary geologists to be about 150 million years in age). All have been found in the Solnhofen Pattenkalk of Franconia (West Germany)."—*Duane Gish, Evolution: The Challenge of the Fossil Record (1985), p. 110.*

The evolutionists consider Archaeopteryx to be a transition between reptile and bird. But there are two other possibilities. Some favor the first; others (including the present writer) prefer the second. It could be a real bird or a fake. Here are both; take your pick:

ARCHAEOPTERYX MAY BE A BIRD

If the Archaeopteryx specimens are really genuine, here are reasons why Archaeopteryx could be considered a bird and not a reptile:

1 - Scientists say it is a bird. It is significant that a special scientific meeting was held in 1982, a year before the furor over the Hoyle-Watkins declarations that Archaeopteryx was a hoax (which we will discuss shortly). The international Archaeopteryx Conference was held in Eichstatt, Germany, not far from the limestone deposits where all the specimens were originally found. At this meeting, it was decided that Archaeopteryx is a "bird" and not a reptile or half-bird / half-reptile. It was also decided that Archaeopteryx was not necessarily the ancestor of modern bird.

Therefore, the scientific community now officially declares Archaeopteryx to be only a bird, not a transitional species.

2 - How could scales turn into feathers? Although zealous evolutionists have always claimed that this creature is a descendant of the reptiles and an ancestor of the birds, yet they do not explain how the scales on a reptile can change into feathers.

3 - It has bones like a bird. Archaeopteryx is said to have thin, hollow wing and leg bones—such as a bird has.

4 - It was not earlier than the birds. Archaeopteryx does not predate the bird, because fossils of other birds have been found in rocks of the same period (the Jurassic) in which Archaeopteryx was found.

5 - It has modern bird feathers. The feathers on Archaeopteryx appear identical to modern feathers.

"But in Archaeopteryx, it is to be noted, the feathers differ in no way from the most perfectly developed feathers known to us."—**A. Feduccia and *H.B. Tordoff, in Science, 203 (1979), p. 1020.*

6 - No intermediate feathers have ever been found. Transition from scales to feathers would require many intermediate steps, but none have ever been found.

7 - It had well-developed wings. The wings of Archaeopteryx were well-developed, and the bird probably could fly well.

8 - It had wings designed for flight. The feathers of Archaeopteryx are asymmetrical; that is, the shaft does not have the same amount of feathers on both sides. This is the way feathers on flying birds are designed. In contrast, feathers on ostriches, rheas, and other flightless birds, or poor flyers (such as chickens), have fairly symmetrical feathers.

"The significance of asymmetrical features is that they indicate the capability of flying; nonflying birds such as the ostrich and the emu have symmetrical [feathered] wings."—

**E. Olsen and *A. Feduccia, "Flight Capability and the Pectoral Girdle of Archaeopteryx," Nature (1979), p. 248.*

9 - No prior transitions. There ought to be transitional species from reptile to Archaeopteryx, but this is not the case. It cannot be a connecting link between reptile and

bird, for there are no transitions to bridge the immense gap leading from the reptile to it. It has fully developed wing bones and flight feathers.

10 - Bird-like in most respects. Archaeopteryx gives evidence of being a regular bird in every way except that it differs in certain features: (1) the lack of a sternum, (2) three digits on its wings, and (3) a reptile-like head. But there are explanations for all three points.

[a] - Lack of a sternum. Archaeopteryx had no sternum; but, although the wings of some birds today attach to the sternum, others attach to the furcula (wishbone). Archaeopteryx had a large furcula, so this is no problem.

"It is obvious that Archaeopteryx was very much a bird, equipped with a bird-like skull, perching feet, wings, feathers, and a furcula wishbone. No other animal, except birds, possesses feathers and a furcula."—*Duane Gish, Evolution: The Challenge of the Fossil Record (1985), p. 112.*

[b] - Digits on its wings. Archaeopteryx had three digits on its "wings." Other dinosaurs have this also, but so do a few modern birds. This includes the hoatzin (*Opisthocomus hoatzin*), a South American bird which has two wing claws in its juvenile stage. In addition, it is a poor flyer, with an amazingly small sternum—such as Archaeopteryx had. The touraco (*Touraco corythaix*), an African bird has claws and the adult is also a poor flyer. The ostrich has three claws on each wing. Their claws appear even more reptilian than those of archaeopteryx.

[c] - The shape of its skull. It has been said that the skull of Archaeopteryx appears more like a reptile than a bird, but investigation by Benton says it is shaped more like a bird.

"It has been claimed that the skull of Archaeopteryx was reptile-like rather than bird-like. Recently, however, the cranium of the 'London' specimen had been removed from its limestone slab by Whetstone. Studies have shown that the skull is much broader and more bird-like than previously thought. This has led Benton to state that 'details of the braincase and associated bones at the back of the skull seem to suggest that Archaeopteryx is not the ancestral bird.' "—*Duane Gish, Evolution: The Challenge of the Fossil Record (1985), pp. 112-113.*

"Most authorities have admitted that Archaeopteryx was a bird because of the clear imprint of feathers in the fossil remains. The zoological definition of a bird is: 'A vertebrate with feathers.' Recently, Dr. James Jensen, paleontologist at Brigham Young University, discovered in western Colorado the fossil remains of a bird thought to be as old as Archaeopteryx but much more modern in form. This would seem to give the death knell to any possible use of Archaeopteryx by evolutionists as a transitional form."—*Marvin Lubenow, "Report on the Racine Debate," in Decade of Creation (1981), p. 65.*

11 - A leading ornithologist agrees. *F.E. Beddard, in his important scientific book on birds, maintained that Archaeopteryx was a bird; and, as such, it presented the same problem as all other birds: How could it have evolved from reptiles since there is such a big gap (the wing and feather gap) between the two.

"So emphatical were all these creature-birds, that the actual origin of Aves is barely hinted at in the structure of these remarkable remains."—**F.E. Beddard,*

The Structure and Classification of Birds (1898), p. 160.

12 - Other birds had teeth. It may seem unusual for Archaeopteryx to have had teeth, but there are several other extinct birds which also had them.

"However, the other extinct birds had teeth, and every other category of vertebrates contains some organisms with teeth, and some without (amphibians, reptiles, extinct birds, mammals, etc.)."—*P. Moody, *Introduction to Evolution (1970), pp. 196-197.*

13 - It could be a unique bird. Archaeopteryx could well be a unique creature, just as the duck-billed platypus is unique. The Archaeopteryx has wings like a bird and a head similar to a lizard, but with teeth. There are a number of unique plants and animals in the world which, in several ways, are totally unlike anything else.

The platypus is an animal with a bill like a duck; has fur but lays eggs; in spite of its egg-laying, it is a mammal and nurses its young with milk; and chews its food with plates instead of with teeth. The male has a hollow claw on its hind foot that it uses to scratch and poison its enemies. It has claws like a mole. But, like a duck, it has webs between its toes; it uses sonar under water.

There is no doubt but that the platypus is far stranger than the Archaeopteryx; yet, like the Archaeopteryx, there is no transitional half-platypus creatures linking it to any other species.

14 - Totally unique. There are no transitional species leading to or from it. Thus, if genuine, it would provide no evidence of evolution.

Regarding the Archaeopteryx, Romer, the well-known paleontologist said this:

"This Jurassic bird [Archaeopteryx] stands in splendid isolation; we know no more of its presumed thecodont ancestry nor of its relation to later 'proper' birds than before."—

*A.S. Romer, *Notes and Comments on Vertebrate Paleontology (1968), p. 144.*

From his own study, *Swinton, an expert on birds and a confirmed evolutionist, has concluded:

"The origin of birds is largely a matter of deduction. There is no fossil evidence of the stages through which the remarkable change from reptile to bird was achieved."—*W.E. Swinton, *Biology and Comparative Physiology of Birds, Vol. 1 (1960), p. 1.*

Other scientists agree. Here is an important statement by *Ostrom:

"It is obvious that we must now look for the ancestors of flying birds in a period of time much older than that in which Archaeopteryx lived."—*J. Ostrom, *Science News, 112 (1977), p. 198.*

"Unfortunately, the greater part of the fundamental types in the animal realm are disconnected [from each other] from a paleontological point of view. In spite of the fact that it is undeniably related to the two classes of reptiles and birds (a relation which the anatomy and physiology of actual living specimens demonstrates), we are not even authorized to consider the exceptional case of the Archaeopteryx as a true link.

"By link, we mean a necessary stage of transition between classes such as reptiles and birds or between smaller groups. An animal displaying characters belonging to two different groups cannot be treated as a true link as long as the intermediate stages have not been found, and as long as the mechanisms of transition remain unknown."—*L. du Nouy, *Human Destiny (1947), p. 58.*

15 - Modern birds have been found in the same strata. Bones of modern birds have been found in the same type of rock strata—the Jurassic—in which Archaeopteryx was found. (They have been found in eastern Colorado.) According to evolutionary theory,

this cannot be; for millions of years ought to be required for Archaeopteryx to change into a regular bird. If it was alive at the same time as modern birds, how can it be their ancient ancestor? Birds have also been found in the Jurassic limestone beds of Utah.

16 - Modern birds have been found below it! Not only do we find modern birds in the same strata with Archaeopteryx,—but we also find them below it!

"Perhaps the final argument against Archaeopteryx as a transitional form has come from a rock quarry in Texas. Here scientists from Texas Tech University found bird bones encased in rock layers farther down the geological column than Archaeopteryx fossils."—*Richard Bliss, Origins: Creation or Evolution (1988), p. 46.*

Two crow-sized birds were discovered in the Triassic Dockum Formation in Texas. Because of the strata they were located in, those birds would, according to evolutionary theory, be 75 million years older than Archaeopteryx! More information on this Texas discovery can be found in **Nature*, 322 (1986), p. 677.

THE CASE OF ARCHAEOPTERYX - 2

This is Part 2 of an unusual story, which probably is another of the many evolutionary hoaxes which have been perpetrated over the years. Evolutionary theory is a myth. God created everything; the evidence clearly points to it. This is science vs. evolution—a *Creation-Evolution Encyclopedia*, brought to you by Creation Science Facts.

CONTENTS: The Case of Archaeopteryx - 2

Archaeopteryx Probably Is a Fake - The evidence strongly indicates it is a fake
Conclusion - Either way, there is no evidence pointing to evolution

Page numbers without book references refer to the book, *HISTORY OF EVOLUTIONARY THEORY*, from which these facts are summarized. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not known to be a creationist. Of over 4,000 quotations in the set of books this *Encyclopedia* is based on (see Order Sheet), only 164 statements are by creationists.

ARCHAEOPTERYX PROBABLY IS A FAKE

Now we come to a totally opposite position: Archaeopteryx is not an extinct bird, but rather a planned hoax. At the same time that mounting evidence was beginning to indicate it to be a carefully contrived fake; confirmed evolutionists moved toward the position that Archaeopteryx was only an ancient bird and not a half-reptile / half-bird. By calling it a "bird," they avoided the crisis that struck the scientific world—and the major museums—when Piltdown Man was exposed as a hoax in 1953.

Three initial problems. Before considering the *Hoyle / *Watkins expose, let us first look at some other facets of this overall problem.

You will observe in the following discussion that there are some observational differences between this and the preceding approach to the problem. For example, while some experts consider Archaeopteryx to have had a body like a bird, those who consider it a fake believe the fossilized body to be a reptile. Somebody took a reptile fossil—and carefully added wings to it!

"Like the later Piltdown man, Archaeopteryx seemed a perfect intermediate form . . . There are, however, disturbing analogies between Piltdown man and Archaeopteryx that have come to light with careful study. Both are hodgepodes of traits found in the forms they are supposed to link—with each trait present in essentially full developed form rather than in an intermediate state! Allowing for alterations, Piltdown's jaw was that of an orangutan; Archaeopteryx's skull was a dinosaur skull. Moreover, Piltdown man's cranium was a Homo sapien's skull; Archaeopteryx's feathers were ordinary feathers, differing in no significant way from those of a strong flying bird such as a falcon . . . The lack of proper sufficient bony attachments for powerful flight muscles is enough to rule out the possibility that Archaeopteryx could even fly, feathers notwithstanding."—*W. Frair and P. Davis, Case for Creation (1983), pp. 58-60.*

1 - A profitable business. There are those who believe that Archaeopteryx was a carefully contrived fake. It would be relatively easy to do. The nature of the hard limestone would make it easy to carefully engrave something on it. Since the first Archaeopteryx sold for such an exorbitant price to the highest bidder (The British Museum), the second, produced 16 years later, had a reptile-like head—and sold for a tremendous amount to the museum in Berlin. The owner of that quarry made a small fortune on the sale of each of those two specimens.

2 - Feathers added to a fossil? In these specimens we find powerful flight feathers on strong wings, shown as faint streaks radiating out from what appears to be a small reptile body. The head and body of Archaeopteryx is similar to that of a small coelurosaurian dinosaur, Compsognathus; the flight feathers are exactly like those of modern birds. If they were removed, the creature would appear to be only a small dinosaur. If you carefully examine a photograph of the "London specimen," you will note that the flight feathers consist only of carefully drawn lines!

It would be relatively easy for someone to take a genuine fossil of a compsognathus—and carefully scratch those lines onto the surface of the smooth, durable limestone. All that would be needed would be a second fossil of a bird as a pattern to copy the markings from,—and then inscribe its wing pattern onto the reptile specimen. That is all that would be required, and the result would be a fabulous amount of income. And both specimens did produce just that!

3 - All specimens came from the same place. Keep in mind that all six of those specimens were found in the Solnhofen Plattenkalk of Franconia, Germany, near the town of Eichstatt. Nowhere else—anywhere in the world—have any Archaeopteryx specimens ever been discovered!

Living in Germany, at the same time that these six specimens were found, was Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919). He would have been in the prime of life at the time both specimens were brought forth. Haeckel was the most rabid Darwinist advocate on the continent; it is well-known that he was very active at the time the finds were made, and he was continually seeking for new "proofs" of evolution so he could use them in his lecture circuit meetings. He loved verbal and visual illustrations, and it is now known that he spent time on the side enthusiastically inventing them!

It is also known that Haeckel had unusual artistic ability, and he put it to work fraudulently touching up and redrawing charts of ape skeletons and embryos so that they would appear to prove evolutionary theory. He had both the ability and the mind-set for the task. You will find more information on his fraudulent artistry in the section on

Recapitulations. There is no doubt that Haeckel had the daring, the skill, the time, and the energy to forge those Archaeopteryx specimens. In those years, he always seemed to have the money to set aside time for anything he wanted to do in the way of lecturing or drawing charts. He even supported a mistress for a number of years. Perhaps some of that came from engraving bird feathers onto reptile fossils and then splitting the profits of Archaeopteryx sales with the quarry owners.

About 35 years ago, the present writer had opportunity to work for several weeks with two of the best nineteenth-century art materials: copper engraving and stone lithography. Both were used in the 19th century in printing, and both were able to reproduce the most delicate marks. This is because both copper and high-quality limestone have such a close grained, smooth surface. Bavarian and Franconian limestone quarries produced the best lithographic blocks. ("Lithos" and "grapho" mean writing.) Our present lithographic process, which uses thin metal plates, is a descendant of the limestone block method (which utilized printing from a flat surface because oily ink in the markings would not mix with the water on the smooth surface between the markings). The other primary method, that of copper engraving, used the intaglio method of fine tracery marks cut into a smooth surface. There is no doubt but that any good engraver could easily superimpose the marks of outward radiating flight feathers over an actual small dinosaur fossil.

"The feathers of Archaeopteryx suggest that there was a skillful flyer or glider at the same time that its skeleton suggests otherwise. Archaeopteryx is a mosaic of characteristics almost impossible to interpret, let alone to base evolutionary theories on!"—*W. Frair and P. Davis, Case for Creation (1963), p. 61.*

The *Hoyle / *Watkins expose. It was not until the 1980s that the most formidable opposition to these Solnhofen limestone specimens developed. Here is the story of what took place:

1 - Background of the investigations. In 1983, *M. Trop wrote an article questioning the authenticity of the specimen ("Is Archaeopteryx a Fake?" in *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 20, pp. 121-122). Two years later a series of four articles appeared in the *British Journal of Photography* (March-June 1985 issues) declaring Archaeopteryx to be a carefully contrived hoax. These articles were authored by some of the leading scientists in England: *Fred Hoyle, *R.S. Watkins, *N.C. Wickramasinghe, *J. Watkins, *R. Rabilizirov, and *L.M. Spetner. And this brought the controversy to the attention of the scientific world.

Keep in mind as we discuss these specimens that, of all six, only the London and Berlin specimens are usable; the rest are hardly recognizable as anything. So all the evidence, pro and con, must come from one or the other of those two specimens. This crisis over the specimens began in 1983 when six leading British scientists, led by *Fred Hoyle and *R.S. Watkins, declared in print that Archaeopteryx was a definite hoax, just as much as Piltdown man had been a hoax. These researchers went to the London Museum and carefully studied and photographed the specimen. That specimen is contained in a slab and a counter slab—thus giving a front and back view of it. Here is what these well-known scientists discovered:

2 - Slab mismatch. The two slabs do not appear to match. If the specimen was genuine, the front and back slabs should be mirror images of one another. A comparison of the present specimen with an 1863 drawing indicates an alteration was later made to the left

wing of the specimen. The 1863 left wing was totally mismatched on the two slabs; the later alteration brought the match closer together.

3 - Artificial feathers. *Hoyle, *Watkins, and others decided that the body skeleton and arms were genuine, but that the feather markings (those shallow lines radiating outward from the forelimbs) were carefully imprinted on the fossil by an unknown hand.

4 - Cement blobs. They also found additional evidence of the forgery: cement blobs used during the etching process.

"They suggested the following procedure for creating the feather impressions: 1) The forgers removed rock from around the tail and 'wing' (forelimb) regions. 2) They then applied a thin layer of cement, probably made from limestone of the Solnhofen quarries, to the excavated areas. 3) They impressed feathers on the cement and held them in place by adhesive material (referred to as 'chewing gum' blobs). Attempts to remove the blobs from the rock were obvious—the slabs were scraped, brushed, and chipped. However, an oversight remained in the cleaning process: one 'chewing gum' blob and fragments of others were left behind."—*Venus E. Clausen, *"Recent Debate over Archaeopteryx."*

5 - Museum withdraws specimen. After their initial examination of the London specimen, they requested permission for a neutral testing center to further examine the blob area, utilizing an electron microscope, carbon-14 dating, and spectrophotometry. Three months later, museum officials sent word that the specimen was being withdrawn from further examination.

6 - History of forgeries. *Hoyle, *Watkins, and the others then checked into historical sources and declared that they had discovered that, dating back to the early 18th century, the Solnhofen limestone area was notorious for its fossil forgeries. Genuine fossils, taken from the limestone quarries, had been altered and then sold to museums. These fossils brought good money because they appeared to be strange new species.

7 - Discoveries follow prediction. *Thomas H. Huxley, Darwin's British champion, whom he called his "bulldog," had predicted that fossils of strange new species would be found. *Hoyle and others believed that, thus encouraged, the forgers went to work to produce them.

8 - The Meyer connection. Of the six Archaeopteryx fossils, only three specimens show the obvious feather impressions. These three specimens were sent to *Hermann von Meyer, in Germany, who, within a 20-year period, analyzed and described them. *Hoyle and company suggest that they came in as reptiles and left with wings! It just so happens that Meyer worked closely with the Haberlein family, and they acquired his two best feathered reptile fossils—and then sold them to the museums. It was the *Haberlein family that made the profit—not the quarry owners. It would be relatively easy for them to split some of it with Meyer.

You can find all of the above material in four issues of the **British Journal of Photography* (March-June 1985). Also see *W.J. Broad, "Authenticity of Bird Fossil Is Challenged," in *New York Times*, MY 7, 1985, pp. c1, c14; *T. Nield, "Feathers Fly over Fossil 'Fraud' " in *New Scientist* 1467:49-50; *G. Vines, "Strange Case of Archaeopteryx 'Fraud,' " in *New Scientist* 1447:3.

9 - Aftermath. As might be expected, a torrent of wrath arose from the evolutionary community as a result of these four articles. Defenders of evolutionary theory went into an absolute rage, but the six scientists held their position.

This brought still further uproar. It had been the same British Museum which had been duped into the Piltdown Man hoax ("found" from 1908 to 1912, only a few miles from Darwin's old home, publicly announced that same year and shown to be a hoax in 1953). For a time, the British Museum refused to relent, but the pressure was too great; so the museum arranged for a special committee, composed of a select variety of scientists, to review the matter. They examined the slabs and, in 1986, reported that, in their opinion, Archaeopteryx had no blobs. With this, the British Museum announced that the case was closed and the slabs will be unavailable for further examination.

CONCLUSION

Either way, there is no evidence of evolution.

Is Archaeopteryx a flying reptile, just another bird, or a fraud—a reptile with wings added? Take your pick; whatever way, it is definitely not a transitional species, and has no transitions leading to or from it.

"No doubt it can be argued that Archaeopteryx hints of a reptilian ancestry, but surely hints do not provide a sufficient basis upon which to secure the concept of the continuity of nature. Moreover, there is no question that this archaic bird is not led up to by a series of transitional forms from an ordinary terrestrial reptile through a number of gliding types with increasing developed feathers until the avian condition is reached."—*M. Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 176.

"Nothing is known with certainty as to how birds arose from reptiles or from what reptilian stock."—*E. Russell, *The Diversity of Animals* (1962), p. 118.

"Although Archaeopteryx was generally considered the earliest bird on record, a recent find suggests that the creature, which lived some 130 million years ago, may not have been the only bird alive then. A new fossil found by James Jenson, of Brigham Young University, dates back to the same period—the Late Jurassic—and appears to be the femur (thighbone) of a bird. If this proved to be the case, then a re-examination of the postulated role of Archaeopteryx as the evolutionary link between reptiles and birds may be in order."—*J. Marx, "The Oldest Fossil Bird: A Rival for Archaeopteryx?" in *Science*, 199 (1978), p. 284.

"The age of origin of some modern group of birds is very old, in the Early Cretaceous if not before. This places them very nearly as old as Archaeopteryx, and raises the possibility that Archaeopteryx is not the temporal benchmark of a vain evolution we so often assume."—*J. Cracraft, "Phylogenetic Relationships and Monophyly of Loons, Grebes, and Hesperomithiform Birds," *Systematic Zoology*, 31 (1982), p. 53.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

FAIRY TALES FOR BIG PEOPLE

The facts of nature cannot be explained by the simplistic theories of evolutionists, but they keep trying. Here are some of the funniest stories you have ever heard. But you are not supposed to laugh. For this is evolutionary "science." This is science vs. evolution—a *Creation-Evolution Encyclopedia*, brought to you by Creation Science Facts.

CONTENTS: Fairy Tales for Big People

Introduction - Alice in Wonderland stories are still being invented

Where the Whale Came from - *Charles invented this one

How the Elephant Got Its Long Nose - We slipped in one here from a child's story book. But it remarkably matches the next one

How the Giraffe Got Its Long Neck - The giraffe really had to stretch in order to get where he is today

How the Catfish Learned to Walk - Oh, not really! Yes, it really happened. Just ask any evolutionist. That fish became grandpa to all the land animals!

A Living Creature Emerges from the Dust - Let's compare the evolutionists' theory about the origin of living creatures—with a tall tale which won a prize

How the Fish Got Its Shape - It is old-fashioned Lamarckian inheritance all over again: the inheritance of acquired characteristics

When the Whale Got Back into the Water - The stories get funnier all the time

This material is excerpted from the book, *HISTORY OF EVOLUTIONARY THEORY*. (See Order Sheet.) An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not known to be a creationist. Of over 4,000 quotations in the books this *Encyclopedia* is based on, only 164 statements are by creationists.

INTRODUCTION

"Rudyard Kipling, in addition to his journalism, adventure stories and chronicling of the British Raj in India is remembered for a series of charming children's tales about the origins of animals. The Just-So Stories (1902) are fanciful explanations of how . . . the camel got his hump (rolling around in lumpy sand dunes). Modeled on the folktales of tribal peoples, they express humor, morality or whimsy in 'explaining' how various animals gained their special characteristics.

" 'Not long ago,' writes science historian Michael Ghiselin, 'Biological literature was full of 'just-so' stories and pseudo-explanations about structures that had developed 'for the good of the species.' " Armchair biologists would construct logical, plausible explanations of why a structure benefited a species or how it had been of value in earlier stages."—*R. Milner, *Encyclopedia of Evolution* (1990), p. 245.

Times have not changed; in fact things are getting worse. *Darwin's book was full of just-so explanations, and modern theorists continue in the tradition of ignoring facts and laws as they search for still more implausible theories about where stars, planets, and living organisms came from.

When they are written for little people, they are called fairy stories; but when prepared for big people, they are called "the frontiers of evolutionary science."

In this section, we will read together from stories put together by Uncle Charlie and Friends. For purposes of comparison, the first and third stories will be by Uncle Charlie, and the second will be by a well-known fiction writer for very small children. See if you can tell the difference:

1 - WHERE THE WHALE CAME FROM

*Charles Darwin explains how the "monstrous whale" originated:

"In North America the black bear was seen by Hearne swimming for hours with wide open mouth, thus catching, like a whale, insects in the water. Even in so extreme a case as this, if the supply of insects were constant, and if better adapted competitors did not already exist in the country, I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by natural selection, more and more aquatic in their structure and habits with larger and

larger mouths till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale."—*Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* (1859; 1964 edition), p. 184.

2 - HOW THE ELEPHANT GOT ITS LONG NOSE

We have slipped one story in here that was written for children, not for adults. But, really now, there isn't much difference.

Once a baby elephant was not staying close to his mamma as he was supposed to. Wandering away, he saw the bright shiny river and stepped closer to investigate. There was a bump sticking out of the water; and, wondering what it was, he leaned forward to get a closer look. Suddenly that bump—with all that was attached to it—jumped up and grabbed the nose of the little elephant. Kipling continues the story:

"`Then the elephant's child sat back on his little haunches and pulled, and pulled, and pulled, and his nose began to stretch. And the crocodile floundered toward the bank, making the water all creamy with great sweeps of his tail; and he pulled, and pulled, and pulled.'"—*Rudyard Kipling, *children's story, quoted in Wayne Frair and Percival Davis, Case for Creation* (1983), p. 130. *And that is how the elephant got its long nose.*

3 - HOW THE GIRAFFE GOT ITS LONG NECK

The giraffe used to look just like other grazing animals in Africa, but while the other animals were content to eat the grasses growing in the field and the leaves on the lower branches, the giraffe felt that the survival of his fittest depended on reaching up and plucking leaves from still higher branches. This went on for a time, as he and his brothers and sisters kept reaching ever higher. Only those that reached the highest branches of leaves survived. All the other giraffes in the meadow died from starvation, all because they were too proud to bend down and eat the lush vegetation that all the other animals were eating. So only the longest-necked giraffes had enough food to eat. All the other giraffes starved to death. Sad story; don't you think? But that is the story of how the giraffe grew its long neck.

Picture the tragic tale: Dead giraffes lying about in the grass while the short-necked grazers, such as the antelope and gazelle, walked by them, having plenty to eat. So there is a lesson for us; do not be too proud to bend your neck down and eat. Oh, you say, but their necks were, by that time, too long to bend down to eat the grass! Not so; every giraffe has to bend its neck down to get water to drink. Darwin's giraffes died of starvation, not thirst. So that is how the giraffe acquired its long neck, according to the pioneer thinkers of a century ago, the men who gave us our basic evolutionary theories. "We know that this animal, the tallest of mammals, dwells in the interior of Africa, in places where the soil, almost always arid and without herbage [not true], obliges it to browse on trees and to strain itself continuously to reach them. This habit, sustained for long, has had the result, in all members of its race, that the forelegs have grown longer than the hind legs and that its neck has become so stretched that the giraffe, without standing on its hind legs, lifts its head to a height of six meters."—*Jean-Baptist de Monet* (1744-1829), *quoted in Asimov's Book of Science and Nature Quotations*, p. 87.

"So under nature with the nascent giraffe, the individuals which were the highest browsers and were able, during dearths, to reach even an inch or two above the others, will often have been preserved . . . By this process long-continued . . . combined no doubt in a most important manner with the inherited effects of increased use of parts, it seems to

me almost certain that any ordinary hoofed quadruped might be converted into a giraffe."—*Charles Darwin, *Origin of the Species* (1859), p. 202.

Gather around and listen; we're not finished with giraffes yet. The story goes something like this: "Once long ago, the giraffe kept reaching up into the higher branches to obtain enough food to keep it from perishing. But, because only those giraffes with the longest necks were fittest, only the males survived—because none of the females were as tall! That is why there are no female giraffes in Africa today." End of tale. You don't believe it? Well, read on:

"This issue [of how the giraffe got its long neck] came up on one occasion in a pre-med class in the University of Toronto. The lecturer did not lack enthusiasm for his subject, and I'm sure the students were duly impressed with this illustration of how the giraffe got its long neck and of the power of natural selection.

"But I asked the lecturer if there was any difference in height between the males and the females. He paused for a minute as the possible significance of the question seemed to sink in. After a while he said, 'I don't know. I shall look into it.' Then he explained to the class that if the difference [in male and female giraffe neck lengths] was substantial, it could put a crimp in the illustration unless the males were uncommonly gentlemanly and stood back to allow the females to survive as well.'

"He never did come back with an answer to my question; but, in due course, I found it for myself. According to Jones, the female giraffe is 24 inches shorter than the male. The observation is confirmed by Cannon. Interestingly, the *Reader's Digest* publication, *The Living World of Animals*, extends the potential difference to 3 feet!

"Yet *Life* magazine a while ago presented the giraffe story as a most convincing example of natural selection at work."—Arthur C. Custance, "Equal Rights Amendment for Giraffes? in *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, March 1980, p. 230 [references cited: 8F. Wood Jones, *Trends of Life* (1953), p. 93; *H. Graham Cannon, *Evolution of Living Things* (1958), p. 139; **Reader's Digest World of Animals*, 1970, p. 102].

Sunderland compares the tall tale with scientific information:

"It is speculated by neo-Darwinists that some ancestor of the giraffe gradually got longer and longer bones in the neck and legs over millions of years. If this were true, one might predict that there would be fossils showing some of the intermediate forms or perhaps some living forms today with medium-sized necks. Absolutely no such intermediates have been found either among the fossil or living even-toed ungulates that would connect the giraffe with any other creature.

"Evolutionists cannot explain why the giraffe is the only four-legged creature with a really long neck and yet everything else in the world [without that long neck] survived. Many short-necked animals, of course, existed side by side in the same locale as the giraffe. Darwin even mentioned this possible criticism in *The Origin*, but tried to explain it away and ignore it.

"Furthermore it is not possible for evolutionists to make up a plausible scenario for the origination of either the giraffe's long neck or its complicated blood pressure regulating system. This amazing feature generates extremely high pressure to pump the blood up to the 20-foot high brain and then quickly reduces the pressure to prevent brain damage when the animal bends down to take a drink. After over a century of the most intensive exploration for fossils, the world's museums cannot display a single intermediate form

that would connect the giraffe with any other creature."—*Luther D. Sunderland, Darwin's Enigma (1988), pp. 83-84.*

4 - HOW THE CATFISH LEARNED TO WALK

There is a fish or two known to walk on land for a short distance, and then jump back into the water. But there are none that stay there and change into reptiles! In an appendix section at the back of our book, *Fossils and Strata* (see Order Sheet), several interviews with leading fossil experts are discussed. In these interviews, each paleontologist is asked about that great evolutionary "fish story"—the first fish that began walking on land—which then became the grandpa of all the land animals! Although this is a basic teaching of evolutionary theory, none of the interview experts knew of any fossil evidence proving that any fish had ever grown legs and feet and began walking on land!

The Kingston Whig-Standard for 7 October 1976, on page 24, had a brief account from Jonesboro, Tennessee, of the U.S. National Story-telling Festival held there. One particular tall story was as follows:

"`The storyteller, as a boy, while fishing one day caught a catfish, but he threw it back. The following day he caught it again. This time he kept it out of the water for a little longer, and then threw it back. And so it continued all summer; the fish staying out of the water for longer and longer periods until it became accustomed to living on land.

"`At the end of the summer, as the boy was walking to school, the fish jumped out of the water and began following him like a dog. All went well until they started across an old bridge with a plank missing. Then the catfish, alas, fell through the hole in the bridge into the water below and drowned.'"—*Harold L. Armstrong, News note, Creation Research Society Quarterly, March 1977, p. 230.*

5 - A LIVING CREATURE EMERGES FROM THE DUST

We have another story for little children. Gather around and listen closely, for only the gullible could find it believable:

"Long ago and far away, there was a pile of sand by the seashore. It looked just like regular sand, and so it was. Water was lapping at the shore. It looked just like regular water, and so it was. Then a storm arose and lightning flashed. Nothing ran for cover, for nothing was alive. Then the bolt of lightning hit the water—and a living creature came into existence. It swam around for a time, had children and, later, descendants. Thousands of years later it gradually figured out how to invent various organs necessary for survival (such as the heart and kidneys). And they eventually learned how to reproduce and bear young."

That story would only work for children below the age of six. Above that, they would reply, "Come on, now, you're just fibbing!" A competent geneticist would die laughing. Yet that is essentially what evolutionary theory teaches.

Here is another story of life arising out of the soil, where no life had been before. This tale was originally told not to young moderns, but to ancient ones. It is a pagan myth:

"Phoenix was a fabulous eagle-like bird which existed in the folklore of ancient Egypt. It is said that no more than one of these great birds ever lived at any one time. The solitary nature of Phoenix naturally presented a problem from the standpoint of procreation.

Reproduction, however, was solved in a rather unique way. At the end of its life span of

no less than 500 years, the bird would construct a nest of combustible materials and species, set the nest on fire, and it would be consumed in the flames.

"Then, lo and behold, from the inert ashes would spring a new Phoenix!

"In the history of mythology, the story of Phoenix is one of the few instances, if not the only one, in which something complex is constructed from lifeless matter, completely unaided."—*Lester J. McCann, Blowing the Whistle on Darwinism (1986), p. 101.*

Concern not yourself with foolish prattle by men of science about DNA and amino acid codes, concentrated chemical compounds, continuing need for energy, food requirements, necessity for complex male and female reproduction systems, cell contents, bone construction, hormones, gastrointestinal system, brain, heart, nerves, circulatory system, lymphatics, and all the rest. Be content with the tale as it reads: "Lightning hit some seawater and changed it into a living organism, and then that organism had enough brains to continually redo its DNA coding so it could gradually change into transitional forms and make itself into ever-new species." Ignore the fact that it never happens today, and no evidence is available that it has ever occurred in the past. Those enamored with the story give no thought to scientific facts which forbid it.

6 - HOW THE FISH GOT ITS SHAPE

We could cite many more examples from evolutionary literature, but a couple should suffice. First, here is how the fish got its shape:

"The fish has assumed its present shape through many millions of years of natural selection. That is, the individuals of each species best suited for their particular environment had a better chance to survive long enough to produce and pass on their genetic material to their offspring, who then did the same. Those less suited neither moved to more suitable environments or died before reproducing and passing their genes to offspring."—**Ocean World of Jacques Cousteau, Vol. 5, The Art of Motion, p. 22.*

In the above book, a wide variety of fish shapes are described. But the reader is told that each fish shape was, in effect, the result of Lamarckian inheritance. Each fish subtly changed its DNA code, passed these changes on to its offspring, and by environmental effects, one species changed itself into another. That is Lamarckian evolution. The book tells of fast fish and slow fish, all doing well in the water. But the claim is essentially made that the fast fish made themselves fast or they would have perished, and the slow fish made themselves slow or they would have perished. The changes were made by each fish, with genetic alterations passed on to its immediate children.

We know that gene shuffling can produce some changes within species, but none across species, and not the kind of radical changes suggested here. This fish story is akin to the giraffe's long neck. Just as a giraffe cannot grow a longer neck, so a fish cannot change its shape. Such dramatic changes would be equivalent to a change in species.

7 - WHEN THE WHALE GOT BACK INTO THE WATER

Adapting *Darwin's theory that a land animal, the bear, changed itself into a whale, evolutionists went ahead and made it an even more complex fish story. With serious face, they declare that after that fish got out of water and began walking, it then changed itself into a land animal. But this one stepped back into the water and became a whale!

"The cetaceans, which include the whales, dolphins, and porpoises, have become adapted to a totally aquatic life since their ancestors, but most people consider them to have been omnivorous animals, possibly like some hoofed animals today . .

"The most important changes were those having to do with the way the animals moved and breathed. They reassumed the fusiform [torpedo-like] shape of early fish. The bones in their necks became shorter until there was no longer any narrowing between head and body. [Their necks disappeared.] With water to support their weight, they became rounded or cylindrical in body shape, reducing the drag irregularities. From limbs adapted by becoming broad, flat, paddle-like organs . . The tails developed into flukes [horizontal tail fins] . .

"Another change the cetaceans underwent in adapting to their re-entry to the sea was the position of their nostrils. From a position on the upper jaw as far as possible, the nostrils moved upward and backward until they are today located atop the head, sometimes as a single opening, sometimes as a double opening. And these returned-to-sea mammals became voluntary breathers, breathing only upon conscious effort—unlike man and other mammals who are involuntary breathers. The development or return of a dorsal fin for lateral stability was another change that took place in some of the cetaceans upon their return to the sea."—**Op. cit.*, pp. 26-27.

This story is even more stretched than Kipling's story about the crocodile stretching the elephant's nose! A mammal walked into the ocean and—instead of drowning—continued to live for the rest of its life as it swam around in the ocean! THAT is really a fish story! Gradually it and its offspring made changes so that they could get about easier in the ocean. But how did it survive until those changes were made?

"Particularly difficult to accept as chance processes are those prolonged changes which lead to a new life-style, such as the evolution of birds from reptiles or—perhaps odder—the return of mammals to a life in the sea, as in the case of dolphins and whales."—**G.R. Taylor, Great Evolution Mystery (1983), p. 160.*

Even Gould classifies them as children's stories:

"What good is half a jaw or half a wing . . These tales, in the `Just-So Stories' tradition of evolutionary natural history, do not prove anything . . concepts salvaged only by facile speculation do not appeal much to me."—**Stephen Jay Gould, "The Return of Hopeful Monsters," Natural History, June / July 1977.*