

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 survived for many days adrift in the floodwaters. Some of these were pregnant females, and held their eggs

inside themselves until a suitable time for laying. During quieter spells, these dinosaurs crawled onto any available land and laid their eggs in nests quickly dug out of the ground. This process may well have happened a number of times as fresh sediment was laid down, with other dinosaurs coming onto the land to lay their eggs and leave footprints in higher sedimentary layers. In fact the evidence from footprints, and so many *unhatched* dinosaur eggs in different layers, and from multi-shelled eggs, some containing partly grown embryos, provides good evidence for this process.

Bearing this in mind, I do not see the problems that Garner *et al.* raise as being insurmountable. But by placing the Flood/post-Flood boundary much lower down the stratigraphic column only creates a lot more difficult problems to solve. I would respectfully urge those who struggle to come to terms with evidence from dinosaur footprints and eggs to reconsider their views in light of the evidence from living reptiles.

Andrew Sibley  
Cardiff  
UNITED KINGDOM

## References

- Garner, P.A., Garton, M., Johnston, R.H., Robinson, S.J. and Tyler, D.J., Dinosaur footprints, fish traces and the Flood, *TJ* 17(1):54–57, 2003.
- Woodmorappe J. and Oard M., Letter, reply to Garner *et al.*, Dinosaur footprints, fish traces and the Flood, *TJ* 17(1):57–59, 2003.
- McIntosh, A., Edmondson, T. and Taylor, S., The Floods as the major biblical cataclysm, *TJ* 14(1):101–109, 2000.
- McIntosh, A., Edmondson, T. and Taylor, S., Letter, reply to Garner *et al.*, Flood models, *TJ* 14(3):79–82, 2000.
- Bristol University UK, <[www.palaeo.gly.bris.ac.uk/palaeofiles/eggs/Evolution.html](http://www.palaeo.gly.bris.ac.uk/palaeofiles/eggs/Evolution.html)>, 28 May 2003.
- BBC UK Walking with Dinosaurs, <[www.bbc.co.uk/dinosaurs/howdoweknow/index.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/dinosaurs/howdoweknow/index.shtml)>, 3 June 2003.
- Scientific American article on the Komodo dragon, <[www.sciam.com/article.cfm?articleID=000EFE16-865C-1CD6-B4A8809EC588EEDF&pageNumber=3&catID=2](http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?articleID=000EFE16-865C-1CD6-B4A8809EC588EEDF&pageNumber=3&catID=2)>, 1 June 2003.
- BBC UK Walking with Dinosaurs, <[www.bbc.co.uk/dinosaurs/howdoweknow/q6.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/dinosaurs/howdoweknow/q6.shtml)>, 3 June 2003.

## The landing place

I have enjoyed reading Bill Crouse's *The landing place* in *TJ* 15(3). One ancient reference that wasn't mentioned is that written by the Christian chronographer Julius Africanus (AD 160–240). Africanus had completed a 5 volume history of the world in AD 221.<sup>1</sup>

The following is an excerpt from chapter IV of Africanus' chronography, which survived in fragmented portions because of the work of George Syncellus, who died about AD 814.

'And when the water abated, the ark settled on the mountains of Ararat, which we know to be in Parthia [that is, in Armenia]; but some say that they are at Celaenae of Phrygia [for there was a hill Ararat in Phrygia, from which the Marsyas issued, and the ark was declared to have rested there by the Sibylline oracles] and I have seen both places. And the flood prevailed for a year ... ?

I came across this reference when writing my booklet on ancient non-Christian sources referring to Jesus.

Could either of these locations (Parthia and Phrygia) possibly be located near Cudi Dagh?

Jonathan Clerke  
Brisbane, Queensland  
AUSTRALIA

## References

- English translations of his extant fragments can be found in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writing of the Fathers down to AD 325, Vol. VI*; Roberts, A. and Donaldson, J. (Eds), W.B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids MI, 1978–1979. Notes in parentheses are supplied by A. Cleveland Cox as featured in the English book.

## Wisdom teeth

I read, with a great deal of interest, your article on wisdom teeth.<sup>1</sup> Since I am a retired dentist I wanted to comment on this article in a couple of respects.

I graduated from Dental School in 1973. I was taught that it was unnecessary to remove wisdom teeth unless there was a specific health reason to do so; i.e. there had to be an impaction, pericoronitis, etc.

However, it has been very common for orthodontists to insist on their removal for reasons of providing more room for re-alignment of the teeth, reducing forces that would push teeth forward, etc. As your article pointed out, these ideas have been somewhat discounted today.

One idea that wasn't really explored is the genetic selection problem. Our Western ideals of beauty tend toward the heart shaped face, at least in women. This will tend to select for people with smaller mandibles and therefore less space for the 3<sup>rd</sup> molars. I have had the opportunity to work with Eastern European and African individuals and they generally have more of a square face with (usually) more room for the third molars.

I would like to say that (at least in my practice) keeping the third molars was very useful for a number of reasons. Many parents often don't do much to take care of their children's teeth, and as a result, permanent six year molars are often lost at an early age.

In some cases, (with the help of an excellent oral surgeon) we were able to transplant the third molars into the space where the six year molars had been lost. This negated the need for more expensive treatments such as bridgework. (Just an example of one reason to keep those 'unnecessary' teeth.)

Name and address withheld on request  
Pennsylvania,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA