

"Old Paths" Baptist Ministries

presents

The Devastating Issue of Dinosaur Tissue



Over the past few years perhaps nothing has stirred the imagination of children and adults alike more than the subject of Dinosaurs. Recently there was an article in our local newspaper's children's pullout section called 'The Mini Page' purporting to give the young people facts about dinosaurs. Some of the information was correct, but as usual, they had to regurgitate the line that dinosaurs lived "65 million years ago."

There is not a shred of scientific evidence that dinosaurs lived millions of years ago, but there is much scientific evidence that the fossils that we uncover periodically are young. The following article has been reprinted verbatim by permission of the author to help people see some of the evidence that does not make headlines. The article may also be found at www.icr.org.

The Devastating Issue of Dinosaur Tissue (#200506)
by Frank Sherwin, M.A.

Abstract

Although it is too early to make definite statements regarding this stunning and wholly unexpected find, the evidence seems to indicate the T. rex fossil is -- well, young.

A recent discovery in the field of paleontology has sent shockwaves through the scientific community. Evolutionist Mary H. Schweitzer of North Carolina State University has discovered flexible blood vessels inside the fossilized thighbone of a "68-70 million year old" *Tyrannosaurus rex*¹ from the Hell Creek formation in eastern Montana. Further investigation revealed round microscopic structures

that look to be cells inside the hollow vessels. Even to the untrained eye, the tissue samples look as if the animal died recently. Fibrous protein material was dissolved with an enzyme called collagenase, indicating that amino acid sequencing could probably be done (amino acids are the building blocks of protein).

Although it is too early to make definite statements regarding this stunning and wholly unexpected find, the evidence seems to indicate the T. rex fossil is -- well, young. Young as in just centuries-old, certainly not an age of millions of years. Indeed, Dr. Schweitzer said, "I am quite aware that according to conventional wisdom and models of fossilization, these structures aren't supposed to be there, but there they are. I was pretty shocked."²

Would evolutionary theory have predicted such an amazing discovery? Absolutely not, soft tissue would have degraded completely many millions of years ago no matter how fortuitous the preservation process. Will evolutionary theory now state -- due to this clear physical evidence -- that it is possible dinosaurs roamed the earth until relatively recent times? No, for evolutionary theory will not allow dinosaurs to exist beyond a certain philosophical/evolutionary period.

This is not the first time that puzzling soft tissue has been unearthed. Nucleic acid (DNA) taken from wet "fossil" magnolia leaves allegedly 17-20 million years old have been discovered.³ Fragments of genetic material up to 800 base pairs long were recovered -- amazing considering it does not take long for water to degrade DNA. A microbiologist in California dissected a 25-to-40-million-year-old Dominican stingless bee from amber.⁴ Spores of bacteria were found inside the insect and actually grew when placed in the proper medium. Dr. Cano, the discoverer, took careful measures to avoid contamination. Analysis of the DNA extracted showed it was very much like the DNA found in bacteria growing in bees today. Just as the creation model predicts, bees have always been bees and bacteria have always been bacteria.

If this is in fact what these various scientific evidences indicate -- soft tissue, bacteria, and DNA ensconced in fossils and amber allegedly millions of years old -- then there needs to be a complete re-evaluation of these evolutionary time spans, especially in light of the advances of the ICR RATE project. As the great English author Charles Dickens said over a century ago, "these are the best of times" -- for creation science!

1. Schweitzer, M. H., et al., *Science*, vol. 307, no. 5717, pp. 1952-1955, 25 March 2005.

2. Boswell, E., *Montana State University News Service*, 24 March 2005.

3. Golenberg, E., et al., *Nature* 344:656-8.

4. Cano, S., *Science*, vol. 268, no. 5213, p. 977, *Research News*, 19 May 1995.

As you can see from the well documented article above the real evidence about this particular fossil is that it must be very young. Perhaps the "...issue of dinosaur tissue" demands a reevaluation of age dating techniques and results. Will we get it from our

scientific community? We seriously doubt that we will get many to take a close look at the purported long age of the earth. The good scientists at The Institute of Creation Research have just finished an eight year long study on the subject of **'Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth' (RATE)** with some amazing results that are very suggestive of a young earth. The evidence that the earth is young just keeps on coming to light, much to the chagrin of scientists who are committed to the 'millions and billions of years' philosophy.

Why won't these men look at the evidence and change their minds? Should we look at what God says on the subject?

2 Peter 3:5 "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water"

This portion of Scripture was written almost 2000 years ago but several years ago it was said in a different way by a committed evolutionist scholar. *Professor Richard Lewontin, a geneticist (and self-proclaimed Marxist), is a renowned champion of neo-Darwinism, and certainly one of the world's leaders in evolutionary biology. He wrote this very revealing comment...It illustrates the implicit philosophical bias against Genesis creation-regardless of whether or not the facts support it. Quoted in:*

[Creation Ex Nihilo](#) 20(3):24

June-August 1998

'We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.'

Richard Lewontin, 'Billions and billions of demons', The New York Review, January 9, 1997, p. 31.

Yes, men who continually promote the religion of evolution must cling to its precepts, because to do otherwise must include the theistic worldview. Again, we must ask, "What does God think of this?"

***Psalm 14:1 To the chief Musician, A Psalm of David.
"The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. They are corrupt, they have done abominable works, there is none that doeth good."***

My suggestion is that evolutionists turn from their wicked ways and trust the Lord Jesus Christ as Saviour. Then it won't be long before the false teachings of evolution will be replaced by the truth of God's Holy word.

John 5:24 "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into

condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."