

The supposed consistency of evolution's long ages

Michael J. Oard

Perhaps the most challenging aspect of the theory of evolution is the apparent consistency of its corollary, the long-age geological system. Evolutionists and other long-agers challenge critics with such statements as: 'You may disbelieve the results of one dating method, but how can you disbelieve when several independent dating methods all arrive at approximately the same date?' 'The radiometric dates and the age of the fossils generally agree.' 'Evolution shows such consistent change of organisms with time, how can you doubt such a precise pattern?' 'All dinosaurs died at the end of the Cretaceous Period.' It appears initially that they have a very strong case. But, a deeper look gives a different picture when we ask, 'How is this uniformity achieved?'

Crudely put, consistent dates are obtained by fudging data that have a high degree of variability or error. I believe most of this adjustment is internal and worked out before publication, but enough has been published to indicate that this practice is pervasive.

I was reminded of this tendency when reading a recent *Science News* article on trace fossils.¹ In discussing boreholes left in fossil mollusc shells by unknown drilling organisms, Sid Perkins relates:

'Although some marine fossils more than 500 million years old sport holes, many paleontologists have been hesitant to say these are signs of predators, says Audrey Aronowsky, a paleoecologist at University of California, Berkeley. That's because the modern-day snails that drill similar holes didn't evolve until about 110 million years ago.'²

The supposed age difference between the mollusc and the most likely candidate for hole drilling is 400 million years within the uniformitar-

ian geological time scale. This is not acceptable to evolutionists. So they just assume that some as-yet-unidentified borer drilled the holes. For a creationist, such data does not present a problem since molluscs and shell drillers all lived before the Flood and were buried in the Flood (the holes could have been drilled either before or during the Flood).

This example is not an isolated case. Dating methods are not all that dependable and can be manipulated to agree with index fossils. The best-documented example of this is found in the appendix to Marvin Lubenow's book: *Bones of Contention*.³ The appendix, appropriately named 'The dating game', documents from evolutionary literature how manipulation of four radiometric dating methods and two fossil index systems (elephants and pigs) all agreed that Richard Leakey's supposed fossil man, skull KNM-ER 1470, was about 2.6 million years old. However, paleoanthropologists could not believe such a modern looking skull could be that ancient. Again, the assumption of evolution motivated this concern. To keep the evolutionary story consistent, the volcanic tuff associated with the skull was redated. Lo and behold, 'redating' by various methods again came up with another 'consistent' date of about 1.6 million years. Finally, they arrived at a date they could all agree with. During this 10-year controversy, it was revealed that some dates came out as old as 230 million years. What does this say about the independence of these dating methods?

In regard to radiometric dating, John Woodmorappe has documented in his book, *The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods*,⁴ the count-

less manipulations invoked to produce 'consistent' radiometric dates. Once in a while, I come across statements of how radiometric dates are simply geared to the fossil dates. In my study of the geology of the northwest states, I happened upon the following admission in *Cascadia: The Geological Evolution of the Pacific Northwest*:

'One might imagine that direct methods [radiometric dating] of measuring time would make obsolete all of the previous means of estimating age, but these new "absolute" measurements are used more as a supplement to traditional methods [index fossils] than as a substitute. Geologists put more faith in the principles of superposition [strata are younger upwards] and faunal succession [evolution] than they do in numbers that come out of a machine. If the laboratory results contradict the field evidence, the geologist assumes that there is something wrong with the machine date. To put it another way, "good" dates are those that agree with the field data [fossils, superposition, etc]' (brackets mine and quotes his).⁵

I have documented in other writings how dinosaur remains first



Fossil skull KNM-ER 1470 found in Kenya near Lake Turkana by Richard Leakey—a 10-year dating controversy.

found in the Early Tertiary were either considered 'reworked' from the Cretaceous or the sediment suddenly 'redated' and found to be 'Cretaceous' after all.⁶ Such procedures automatically reinforce the belief that dinosaurs died out by the end of the Cretaceous Period in the mind of the public as well as other scientists. This is just one of many examples of the reinforcement syndrome, a type of circular reasoning in which a hypothesis is repeatedly reinforced with further selected data, especially if that hypothesis originates from a prominent scientist.⁷

Bias, consciously or unconsciously, has compelled scientists to ignore important evidences of inconsistency in data; creating an apparent uniformity of dates and reinforcing previously held theories. To the unsuspecting, this consistency seems like truth, but it is simply an outgrowth of the evolutionary/uniformitarian long-age paradigm.

References

1. Perkins, S., Beyond bones: trace fossils yield important clues to ancient life, *Science News* 159:362–364, 2001.
2. Perkins, Ref. 1, p. 363.
3. Lubenow, M.L., *Bones of Contention: A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1992.
4. Woodmorappe, J., *The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods*, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, 1999.
5. McKee, B., *Cascadia: The Geologic Evolution of the Pacific Northwest*, McGraw-Hill, New York, p. 25, 1972.
6. Oard, M.J., The extinction of the dinosaurs, *CEN Tech. J.* 11(2):137–154, 1997; p. 148.
7. Oard, M.J., *Ancient Ice Ages or Gigantic Submarine Landslides?* Creation Research Society Monograph No. 6, Creation Research Society, St. Joseph, pp. 11–17, 1997.

Controversy over 'Early Paleolithic stone tools' in Canada continues

Michael J. Oard

Have you ever wondered about those stone 'tools' that evolutionists discover? Sure, some of them are obviously of human origin—even works of art. Others look more questionable. Last year I reported on a controversy over the discovery of what are claimed to be Early Paleolithic stone tools in North America.¹ These 'primitive' stone 'tools' were unearthed near Calgary and Peace River, Alberta, Canada.^{2,3} The 'artefacts' consist mainly of various chipped quartzite cobbles interpreted as choppers. These 'tools' are similar to 'Early Paleolithic tools' commonly found in Europe and Africa, including the lower portion of the Olduvai Gorge, East Africa. The Alberta 'tools' have presented several nasty difficulties for evolutionists. The magnitude of the problem was re-emphasized in a recent exchange of opinion on the subject in the *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*.^{4,5}

Evolutionists have devised an elaborate classification system for stone tools ranging from the most primitive Early Paleolithic (Old Stone Age) to the youngest, exquisitely crafted tools. This classification is based on the idea of the evolutionary development of man over several million years. The first people to enter the United States, passing southeast through Alberta from Alaska and the Yukon Territory, were the Clovis people who manufactured sophisticated stone tools. In the uniformitarian geological time scale this was supposed to have happened about 11,000 years ago.

However, if the chipped quartzite cobbles from Alberta are really 'tools', then the Early Paleolithic must have occurred much earlier than 11,000 years ago. Indeed, it would mean that the timing of man's entry into the New World was perhaps more than 100,000 years ago. The problem is

that there is little evidence for the Early Paleolithic in North America within the uniformitarian system, except for a few disputed sites. Thus, the Alberta 'tools' confuse not only the New World chronology, but also the Old World chronology. One possible solution is that the sophisticated Clovis people entered the New World along with what evolutionary theory would brand as primitive people. However, this scenario would muddy up the neat tool classification system. Or else, the 'tools' could simply be geofacts, products of nature and not man. But this would cast doubt on all those other Early Paleolithic 'tools' found elsewhere in the world. Whichever way they turn, the paleoanthropologists have problems.

Products of nature

In the recent exchange of opinion in the *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*, Jonathan Driver from the Archaeology Department of Simon Fraser University near Vancouver, British Columbia, seeks to solve these problems by claiming that the Alberta 'tools' are not tools, but products of nature. In the spirited exchange, some obscure information was divulged that reinforces my suspicions that practically all, if not all, of these 'Early Paleolithic stone tools' are geofacts. Thus man never was so primitive over such a large area of the Earth for a lengthy time.

Driver points out that nature can chip rocks to produce markings similar to those found on 'Early Paleolithic tools'. He cites as an example three artefact-looking stones eroded out from an 'ancient tillite' that was formed long before man was supposed to have come on the scene within the evolutionary time-frame. He also cites some basalt cobbles flaked by percussion as a result of falling into a gorge on the Zambezi River. (A 'tillite' is supposedly consolidated glacial debris, mostly dated 200 million to 2 billion years old. I have previously made a case that these particular rocks are better explained as resulting from