

occurred 4.5 billion years ago, as well as their subsequent evolution.¹⁴

Now, astronomers need

'... to rethink their theories of Jupiter's formation and the nature of planetary evolution processes. . .' due to this '... series of startling discoveries ...'¹⁵

Already, scientists are developing *ad hoc* explanations for the chemical surprises. Although the data are said to be of high quality, one investigator even suggested that the mass spectrometer may have given discrepant measurements.¹⁶ Maybe the real reason for so many surprises from

the observational data of Jupiter's atmosphere is because the solar system was not formed from a collapsing dust cloud but was specially created.

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous, 1996. Galileo probe suggests planetary science reappraisal. Internet public information statement, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Pasadena, California, pp. 1-4.
2. Anonymous, 1996. Galileo probe mission 'quick-look' science summary. Internet communication from NASA's Ames Research Center, Mountain View, California, pp. 1-9.
3. Monastersky, R., 1995. Inside Jupiter: probe's early results. *Science News*, 148:420.

4. Beatty, J. K., 1996. Into the giant. *Sky and Telescope*, 91(4):22.
5. Cowen, R., 1996. Revised Galileo results pose Jovian puzzle. *Science News*, 149:199.
6. Cowen, Ref. 5.
7. Cowen, Ref. 5.
8. Anonymous, Ref. 1.
9. Beatty, Ref. 4, pp. 20-22.
10. Stevenson, D. J., 1996. The subtle taste of Jupiter. *Nature*, 379:495-496.
11. Beatty, Ref. 4, p. 21.
12. Anonymous, 1996. Helium myth. *New Scientist*, 149:13.
13. Anonymous, Ref. 12.
14. Anonymous, Ref. 2, p. 2.
15. Anonymous, Ref. 1, p. 1
16. Kerr, R.A., 1996. Galileo hits a strange spot on Jupiter. *Science*, 271:593-594.

M. J. Oard

Latin Lizards: Logos vs Lottery

Today, the various species of *Anolis* lizard on Puerto Rico include ones small enough to forage for insects at the ends of branches, also a greenish variety better able to hide in the leaves, and a brownish version well camouflaged on tree trunks and the ground. Just as for Darwin's finches, it can reasonably be inferred (and creationists could agree) that all the present-day species descended from an original species (possibly only one pair) invading the island.

It is not difficult to conceive of how such specialisation occurred, with the lizards adapting via selection acting only on the genetic information present in the original population. The originally less-specialised 'ancestor' *Anolis* lizard was most likely medium-sized and able to forage for insects both on the trees and on the ground, with the information for both green and brown colouring already present in varying degrees.

The splitting off of such daughter populations, each with less information (as a whole population, not necessarily as individuals), does not involve any 'evolution' in the sense of new genetic information arising. For a smaller number of kinds

on the Ark to give rise to the more numerous descendant species of today, processes like this would have had to be operative on a substantial scale.

It becomes very interesting when one discovers that exactly the same pattern as on Puerto Rico is found for lizards of the *Anolis* genus on the island of Jamaica. This presents a *prima facie* problem for current evolutionary theory; how can evolution, if it is a largely unguided lottery depending on chance mutations, take exactly the same paths independently? The two islands '... have important differences in their plants, predators and climate.'¹ Even if the selection pressures were identical, it would still require the same mutations to arise by chance over large stretches of time. Could they have evolved in one place and then independently migrated as separate populations to the other? Work on mitochondrial DNA by Jonathan Loso of Washington University in St Louis, Missouri, suggests that this was not so — the ancestor *Anolis* species was somewhat different for each island (perhaps the consequence of prior speciation in the creationist view).

However if, as the creationist assumes, the genetic potential for at

least most of such adaptive change was already present by design, it is no surprise to find the same sorts of changes. For example, if the ancestral lizard species had the information enabling both green and brown colouration, then whatever the other ecological pressures might be (so long as there were trees), it would not be unlikely for both green and brown daughter species to arise. Similar arguments would obtain for all the other parameters.

The *Anolis* lizards of Puerto Rico and Jamaica therefore are more consistent with the creationist/pre-adaptationist viewpoint. Commenting on this situation, Oxford zoologist Paul Harvey is reported as telling the prestigious British Association recently that '*Lizards don't seem to respect evolutionary theory..*'²

REFERENCES

1. Cohen, P., 1995. Reptiles don't leave evolution to chance. *New Scientist*, 147(1995):10.
2. Cohen, Ref. 1.

C. Wieland