



Why Is One Considered Authentic And The Other One Not?

Jerry D. McDonald

What you see, above, are two pictures; the one on the left is of a human like footprint allegedly made by a hominim a hundred and fifty million years ago. It was discovered in Kenya by Matthew Bennett and was made known to the public on February 27, 2009. As you look at it, we see what looks to be a human footprint. So how do we know that it is a hundred and fifty million years old? “The team dated the surrounding sediment by comparing it with well-known radioisotope-dated samples from the region, finding that the two layers of prints were made at least 10,000 years apart” (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7913375.stm>). They dated the surrounding sediment by comparing it with well-known radioisotope-dated samples from the region: (1) You cannot date sedimentary rock with either carbon 14 dating methods, or radioisotope dating methods. The only rock that you can date with radioisotope dating methods is igneous rock; rock in which you won't find any fossils. (2) Carbon 14 dating methods and radioisotope dating methods are not all that accurate. Those things that you can date with carbon 14 dating can only go back a few thousand years, and radioisotope dating is so unreliable that volcanic rocks that are known to be from the 20th century have been dated much earlier by using radioisotope methods. So, how did they go about getting the date for this foot print? The same way they always do it; they assumed it!

Now the picture that you see on the right is a picture of another footprint allegedly made by a hominin, that is until they found what the footprint was made in. It was made in coal! Thus the problem because coal was formed 250 million years before man came to this planet (according to evolution). This print was found by Dr. Albert Ingalls, State Geologist of Kentucky, and not only in Kentucky, but also in Missouri, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and even west towards the Rocky Mountains. In the January 14, 1940 issue of *Scientific American* Dr. Ingalls was invited to explain all of this. What follows was his response:

“If man, or even his ape ancestor, or even the ape ancestor’s early mammal ancestor, existed as far back as in the carboniferous period in any shape,

then the whole science of geology is so completely wrong that all geologists will resign their jobs and take up truck driving. Hence, for the present at least, science rejects the attractive explanation that man made these mysterious prints in the mud of the carboniferous period with his feet (162:14)” (http://www.apologeticspress.org/pdfs/courses_pdf/hsc0304.pdf).

Did you get that, we cannot accept the print on the right as authentic, not by a human, not even by a mammal because if we do then the science of secular geology is so completely wrong that all the secular geologists might as well resign their jobs and become truck drivers. Now that is a good reason for refusing to accept evidence.

In 2005 and 2006 Glen Kuban wrote a paper on these tracks and used several pictures. The ones he wanted you to see were outlined in chalk. If you will notice in picture number three, there was one that was not outlined in chalk, and that is the picture on the right above:



In picture number three, you can see the outline of a footprint that looks as if the person is running and maybe turning to the left slightly as the large toe leans to the left and the other toes turn right in the soft coal. Yet Mr. Kuban says that these prints were carved, probably by ancient Indian tribes; that they just don't match human footprints. At least the ones he outlined and wanted you to see didn't look a lot like what we would call modern human footprints. However, even early man (and I don't mean prehistoric) would have feet like this because many of them didn't wear shoes and their feet spread out more than ours do. However, I have seen people today with feet just like the ones in picture number two. My mother-in-law has a little toe that (unless she has shoes on) hangs way out to the right, like the one in picture number four. And my little toe on my right foot is much like the one on picture number one, it leans in close to the toe next to it, it has no nail and the toe comes to a sharp end so when I walk barefooted in the mud my little toe doesn't leave much of an impression, just a little bump like thing like in picture one; plus I am flat footed so my feet are wide like that. But no, Mr. Kuban demands that these prints were carved from the coal by ancient Indian tribes. This is what Mr. Kuban says about picture number three: "as the third photo from the right, they don't even show five toes" (<http://www.paleo.cc/paluxy/berea-ky.htm>). Well, that would depend on which print you are looking at, wouldn't it? You can't see the toes on the one with chalk around it, but you can the other one, and it looks pretty normal. I wonder why Mr. Kuban didn't outline it as well? I think we can see the reason why!

Yes, the print in the picture on the left looks like a human footprint, but so does the print in the picture on the right. Why is it that one is considered authentic and the other isn't? It's because if the one on the right is considered authentic then secular geology is completely wrong and that is something that evolutionists are not ever going to admit.

