

found in the Early Tertiary were either considered 'reworked' from the Cretaceous or the sediment suddenly 'redated' and found to be 'Cretaceous' after all.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup>

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.<sup>1</sup> These 'primitive' stone 'tools' were unearthed near Calgary and Peace River, Alberta, Canada.<sup>2,3</sup> 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*.<sup>4,5</sup>

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

gigantic submarine landslides during the Genesis Flood—see my book *Ancient Ice Ages or Gigantic Submarine Landslides?*).<sup>6</sup>

Driver rejects the belief that the experience of the analyst is important for distinguishing between artefacts and geofacts. In fact, Driver claims that the supposed diagnostic criteria distinguishing between naturally- and humanly-flaked rocks have not been tested but are held **by faith**. Although he seeks to reduce the Alberta ‘tools’ to the status of geofacts, he still believes that the stone ‘tools’ from Olduvai Gorge, Africa, similar to those in Alberta but supposedly a million years old or older, are really human artefacts. Why? Because, he says, they were found in fine-grained sediments, which precludes natural abrasion by high-energy water flow.

### Between a rock and a hard place

Chlachula and Leslie respond to most of Driver’s points, insisting that their chipped quartzite cobbles from Alberta really are Early Paleolithic artefacts. In so doing they divulge further information, reinforcing my opinion that they are not artefacts at all. It is clear from their response that much **circular reasoning** occurs in distinguishing artefacts from geofacts. If the evidence fits the establishment view of the evolution of man, then the cobble or chip is considered an artefact, but if it does not fit, it is simply considered a product of nature, not man. (Much of this probably goes on behind the scenes and is never published.) They state that there is a tendency:

‘... to question records, which may be genuine, by means of selectively applied and occasionally simplified arguments about the capacity of natural processes to generate them, because they [the records] simply differ from the established pattern of cultural manifestations.’<sup>5</sup>

They also object to Driver’s use of evidence for a high-energy environment to claim their finds are only geofacts. If such a criterion were to be applied to judge between artefacts and geofacts universally, then the



number of Paleolithic sites around the world would be greatly reduced. Besides, Chlachula and Leslie point out that the energy criterion doesn’t work for all their Alberta sites. One of their sites is within fine-grained lacustrine clay. Turning their argument around, if their Alberta rocks are interpreted as geofacts, then those from Olduvai Gorge should also be interpreted as geofacts too.

### Chipped in a watery catastrophe

One point of the discussion is clear; the paleoanthropologists agree that **high-energy water processes** can chip rocks to look like primitive ‘tools’. This being the case, is there any evidence for the catastrophic water transport of the many millions of quartzite rocks strewn over large portions of southern and central Alberta, as well as surrounding areas? Indeed there is—strong evidence.<sup>7</sup> These rocks were not derived locally, but transported over 700 km from the Rocky Mountains. They are strewn over a large geographic area. And individual boulders display abundant percussion marks indicating impact collision during a catastrophic transport regime. Those quartzite chips found in lacustrine clays could simply be reworked after this catastrophic process, possibly being picked up and dropped by floating ice or icebergs in a lake adjacent to an ice sheet. Clearly the stone ‘tools’ from Alberta are not tools at all, but pieces of rock chipped in a catastrophic water flow. Likewise

the stone ‘tools’ from Olduvai Gorge have likely been fashioned by high-energy water flows and finally deposited within fine-grained sediments.

### References

1. Oard, M.J., Did ‘Old World Early Paleolithic’ people travel to North America? *CEN Tech J.* **14**(3):3–5, 2000.
2. Chlachula, J., Geology and Quaternary environments of the first preglacial palaeolithic sites found in Alberta, Canada, *Quaternary Science Reviews* **15**:285–313, 1996.
3. Chlachula, J. and Leslie, L., Preglacial archaeological evidences at Grimshaw, the Peace River area, Alberta, Canada, *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences* **35**:871–884, 1998.
4. Driver, J.C., Preglacial archaeological evidence at Grimshaw, the Peace River area, Alberta: Discussion, *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences* **37**:871–874, 2000.
5. Chlachula, J. and Leslie, L., Preglacial archaeological evidence at Grimshaw, the Peace River area, Alberta: Reply, *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences* **37**:875–878, 2000.
6. Oard, M.J., *Ancient Ice Ages or Gigantic Submarine Landslides?* Creation Research Society Monograph No. 6, Creation Research Society, St Joseph, 1997.
7. Klevberg, P. and Oard, M.J., Paleohydrology of the Cypress Hills formation and Flaxville gravels; in: Walsh, R.E. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Creationism*, Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, pp. 421–436, 1998.