

evolutionism, *TJ* 11(2):199–201, 1997; New vistas of space-time rebut the critics, *TJ* 12(2):195–212, 1998; Humphreys replies, *TJ* 13(1):50–55, 59–62, 1999; Starlight and Time: a response, *TJ* 14(2):73–78, 81, 2000; Russell Humphreys replies, *TJ* 15(2):47–48, 2001; Our galaxy is the centre of the universe, ‘quantized’ redshifts show, *TJ* 16(2):95–104, 2002; D. Russell Humphreys replies and clarifies cosmology, *TJ* 16(3):76–78, 2002; Humphreys clarifies cosmology again, *TJ* 17(1):60–62, 2003.

## Microevolution or microdevolution

Some creationists, thinking it to be fact, are conceding microevolution, while pointing out that there is no way to get from it to macroevolution. Just what changes in nature are they accepting as evolution? Outward changes in colour, shape and size that confer a survival benefit and may even signal the arrival of a new species, may certainly seem like ‘upward’ changes indicative of the term microevolution.

However, the effect of these very same changes, inward, at the genetic level must be recognized. Only the ongoing loss, (as natural selection culls more genes, shrinking gene pools), and corruption (as mutations occur and accumulate progressively over generations, increasing defective gene loads), of genetic information is observed. Since the outward is encoded by the inward, then this direction of change in genetic information is decisive in revealing, in reality, it is not microevolution, but microdevolution that is occurring throughout nature.

This downward trend, amplified by time, is marching all of nature inextricably towards extinction (macrodevolution), the very opposite of what evolutionists theorize, proving evolution to be a complete myth. So microdevolution shows anyone using the term microevolution is, in fact, saying that nature’s becoming genetically poorer and degeneration is evolutionary. Or, simply calling a downward trend, an upward one, which must be

reason enough why the term microevolution needs to become extinct.

For creationists to use the term microevolution is to compromise with a lie, because microevolution says evolution is observed fact. This deceives the public into logically believing that, with enough time, macroevolution would occur. The truth is not that it is impossible to get from microevolution to macroevolution, but that microdevolution will never give rise to macroevolution.

Brett Scott Kunkle  
Mitchells, Virginia  
UNITED STATES of AMERICA



## Dinosaur eggs

I read with interest the discussion between Paul Garner, Michael Garton, Richard Johnson and David Tyler (Garner *et al.*)<sup>1</sup> on the one hand, and John Woodmorappe and Michael Oard<sup>2</sup> on the other, regarding the Flood evidence of dinosaur eggs and footprints. Garner *et al.* claim that mechanisms to account for this have not yet been presented, but Woodmorappe and Oard offer in response, ‘*who knows under what conditions dinosaurs could occasionally build nests ... ?*’ While I would broadly agree with Woodmorappe and Oard on the geologically late Flood/post-Flood boundary, and the complexity of the deluge, I believe that there is an opportunity to offer a solution to the highlighted problems in a respectful manner. However the immense problems found in accounting

for the Mesozoic layers as being deposits from the post-Flood period, have already been addressed by McIntosh *et al.*,<sup>3,4</sup> so they will not be addressed again here. It would appear though that dinosaur nests are rare below the Cretaceous.<sup>5</sup>

Amongst the marine-reptile fossils are crocodiles and other reptilian animals such as giant turtles etc. Evolutionary scientists today examine the life of the crocodile and other large reptiles to try to gain an understanding of how dinosaurs lived.<sup>6</sup> In order to understand how the dinosaurs might have left footprints and eggs in nests in the sand and mud during the Flood it is therefore appropriate to examine the behaviour of living reptiles.

Firstly we need to question just what reptiles made it onboard the Ark. Places were reserved for air-breathing land animals, (Gen. 6:20) with sea creatures expected to survive the deluge. Clearly there would have been a cut-off boundary, but it is not too hard to imagine that many land dinosaurs close to this cut-off would also have been excellent swimmers, and survived the Noachic deluge for many days. Many reptiles, such as some snakes, turtles, crocodiles and alligators live predominantly in the sea or rivers and lakes, but use the soft river banks or sea shore to lay their eggs in shallow dug holes. As they do so, they leave behind a trail of muddy or sandy footprints. Even the land-living Komodo dragon or monitor is able to swim between islands in its native Indonesia, but lays its eggs in holes in the soft ground.

The Komodo monitor today breeds from May to August, but lays its eggs in the cooler months of September. It would appear that these reptiles are able to hold their eggs inside the body until favourable climatic conditions arrive.<sup>7</sup> However if eggs are held for too long they develop a second shell and the embryo cannot breathe. Some dinosaur eggs have been found with double shells, and in this and other respects they are considered very similar to modern crocodile eggs.<sup>8</sup>

It is not too hard to imagine that during the Flood year many dinosaurs