ANTHROPOLOGY:
THE EVOLUTION OR CREATION OF MAN?

by
Robert S. Westcott

For many, the issue of evolution or creation is not a scientific question. This issue becomes an emotional-religious issue which people will attempt to solve through dialogue rather than through scientific investigation. Nonetheless, a careful look at the fossil evidence for the evolution of man is necessary before a proper stand can be made either on a scientific or religious basis. The question of the evolution of man is clearly stated by Weiner, the past president of the Royal Anthropological Institute, in the forward to The Guide to Fossil Man by Dr. Michael Day (1965) when he wrote:

"What were our ancestors really like? How far back can we really trace them? Can we discern in the fossil record a continuous sequence of transformation? Questions such as these constitute tests of the theory of evolution as applied to mankind, or more particularly whether the palaeontological record supports the belief that natural selection . . . must have been at work in bringing about the emergence of modern man from some remote ape-like stock. These questions Darwin could not answer positively simply because the fossil material was almost totally deficient in his day."

Many human and human-like remains have been discovered since the days of Darwin. In examining these evidences, it is surprising to many what can be deduced concerning the origin of the human race.

1. Evidences for the evolution of mankind.

What are the evidences for the ancestry of mankind? Do these evidences demonstrate a vertical progression from simpler, more archaic types of ancestors to the sophisticated types of mankind in existence in the world today? Some honest evolutionary investigators have their doubts. Concerning these doubts which arose as a result of an investigation of the claims for the evolution of mankind, Fix states:

"I began my deeper researches into the questions of evolution in a position I described as 'middle of the road'. I was generally inclined to believe that there might be some truth to both creationism and evolution, and so do I now. But my position is not unaltered. So far as the evolution of man is concerned, the direct evidence from the fossil record is even weaker than I had thought, and what there is, is much distorted by wishful thinking and, again, by wild extrapolation." (Fix, 1984, p. xxv).

There should be no problem to a Christian if God had chosen evolution as a process through which He created all living organisms. On the other hand, the theory of organic evolution has so clouded the minds of man that some of these issues need to be answered before spiritual alternatives and responsibilities will be considered by many.

According to those who promote the theory of organic evolution, modern mankind is the product of a natural process where living organisms gradually changed through environmental and genetic effects on successive generations. This proposition assumes that the ancestry of mankind can be traced back through a steady line of increasingly more complex human types. This is what is presented in nearly every museum and biological training program.

The exact ancestral lineage of mankind has some debate among evolutionists and there are some variations to the traced line of human ancestors. In museums, evolutionary textbooks and educational programs the fossil data are arranged in a gradually ascending pattern as they bear more human-like characteristics and appear more like modern human beings.

The lineage of man that is proposed by evolutionists follows the following fossils: (1) Proconsul, to (2) the Australopithecines, to (3) Homo habilis, to (4) Homo erectus, to (5) Neanderthal man, to modern (6) Homo sapiens.

a. **The Proconsul.** The Proconsul is a small and disputed ancestor of mankind that existed in the Miocene period. Beals and Hoijer (1965) speak of the separation of the ancestry of man, apes and monkeys through the radiation of the species of Proconsul when they state:

"At present the evidence seems to suggest a separation of monkeys and Hominoidea from an early common primate ancestor, probably in the Oligocene or even the Eocene...The main line may have given rise to several genera, of which the most important is Proconsul. A species of Proconsul or a very similar form may have been ancestral to the genus Dryopithecus and perhaps other similar undiscovered genera ... Alternatively, it is possible that Dryopithecus is a sidebranch of the family tree without descendants and that the divergence of Dryopithecus, and the pongid (apes) and hominid lines took place at the Proconsul level." (Beals, 1965, p. 47-48).

b. **The Australopithecines**. The Australopithecines were organisms that contained mixed characteristics between apes and men. Their skulls were simian skulls with the brain capacity of about 400 cc. which is similar to the brain capacity of modern apes. The teeth of the Australopithecines, on the other hand, were amazingly like the teeth of humans. Australopithecus afarensis also had a hyoid bone which was the foundation of the voice box,

indicating a possible ability to speak (National Geographic Magazine, November, 2006, p.148-159).

c. **Homo habilis**. Homo habilis means "handy man." The shape of the jaw indicates that this form of man did not have the simian shelf that hinders the movability of the tongue and prevents speech. Homo habilis had a jaw shaped like modern man allowing regular human speech patterns. Homo habilis, furthermore, had a high domed skull very much like modern man with an estimated brain capacity of about 850 cc. in the only nearly complete Homo habilis skull found so far. Homo habilis was the size of modern day pygmies, with a brain capacity at the low end of the brain capacity of modern mankind. Homo habilis also had a modern human foot, with other skeletal comparisons being indistinguishable from other modern human features other than size. Homo habilis also made and used tools.

d. **Homo erectus or egaster**. Starting with the Java man and Peking man, the fossil evidence for Homo erectus has continued to accumulate. This group of fossils was formerly called Pithecanthropus, but has since been recognized by anthropologists as belonging to the Genus Homo. The existing specimens of this group of hominids had low foreheads, supposedly smaller brain capacities on the average for the most part, and massive supra-orbital ridges over the eyes, very much like the apes. The Peking Homo erectus had an average brain capacity of 1225 cc.

e. **Homo neanderthalensis**. Neanderthal man had a low sloping forehead, massive supra-orbital arches over the eyes, a thick boned skeleton. The Neanderthals had two variations of chin; one was underdeveloped and sloped back as in the modern apes and in Peking Man, and the other a fully developed chin that juts forward as with modern Homo sapiens. Neanderthal man was pictured as brutish, hunching down in an ape like walking stance with head thrust forward. Modern studies have demonstrated that Neanderthals stood and walked in an upright position as modern humans walk.

f. **Homo sapiens**. Homo sapiens represents modern man. His average brain capacity is about 1,200 cc. He speaks, walks in an upright stance and is considered the highest developed of all creatures.

2. Evidences against the evolution of mankind.

Is this mass of evidence valid? Does this data truly demonstrate that mankind evolved from ape-like ancestors? Since the Australopithecines are genuine fossils, what is there relationship to mankind? Is there a true chain of transition throughout the record of geological history tracing the development of one form of hominid produced from each lower less complex form until modern man emerges? An objective evaluation of the data in proper context will answer many of these questions.

a. **Proconsul**. Proconsul is a primitive ape that lived in the Eocine or Myocene periods and has been proposed as one of the early links to the ancestry of mankind. Speaking of a species of Proconsul as "the missing link" for the ancestry of mankind, Beals and Hoijer state:

"The most interesting, however, are the three species of the genus Proconsul. One species of Proconsul is nearly the size of the gorilla and may be ancestral to this form. The smaller Proconsul may be ancestral to the chimpanzee. The third, or an as yet undiscovered species, may be ancestral to man. In other words, the ancestor of the Proconsul species has been suggested to be the 'missing link'-i.e., the common ancestor of man and the modern African apes." (Beals, 1965, P. 43). No wonder this is referred to as "the missing link". It is a still undiscovered species that is assumed to have existed and is assumed to have been ancestral to mankind.

b. **The geological distribution** If fossil hominids are studied relative to the geological strata where they are found the positions show that the fossil hominids are randomly scattered and shows no developmental pattern where a transitional sequence has been demonstrated. Appearance alone does not prove relationship. In order to demonstrate a true ancestral relationship between the ascending fossils as presented as proof for evolution, these fossils would have to be arranged in ascending order in time as well as complexity. An evaluation of the evidence contradicts this position. Although considerable doubt can be cast on the validity of the dating methods used for determining the age of the fossils, the dates given for this discussion will be the age listed by evolutionists and will be used as a reference point to establish the succession of fossil strata and the age of each fossil discovery relative to all others, and do not mark the actual age. The important thing to remember is that the listed ages of the fossils validly indicate the geological strata in which each fossil was found, not necessarily the actual age of the fossil. Remember that a supposed later fossil cannot validly be found in an earlier strata without eliminating the earlier fossils as true ancestors. A grandson cannot exist before his grandfather. We will discuss the time-line and age issue later.

The paleontological periods involved with the majority of the evidence concerning human fossils are in the chart that follows. The notation after the fossil hominid name indicates Homo sapiens (Hs), Homo neanderthalanensis (Hn), Homo erectus (He), Homo habilis (Hh), and the Australopithecines as (Aust.).

Period	**Time before the present (BP) in years**.
HOLOCENE OR RECENT	RECENT TO 10,000 YEARS BP

Many remains of Homo sapiens (**Hs**) have been discovered worldwide. The average brain capacity of modern man is 1200 cc.

UPPER PLEISTOCENE	10,000 TO 150,000 YEARS BP.
(1) **WURM-WISCONSIN**	10,000 to 70,000 years BP.

(a). **Cromagnon man (Hs).** The Cromagnon man was first discovered in 1868. Its brain capacity was averaging around 1650 cc. Although pictured as brutish by evolutionists at the beginning of its discovery, the Cromagnon man is now recognized as highly intelligent and fitting the category of modern man. The Cromagnon body had been deliberately buried.

(b). Homo floriensis (H?). Remains of small humans have been found in an Indonesian island. They stand about three feet tall and have been affectionately nicknamed "the Hobbits". They hunted dwarf elephants and giant rats. How they arrived on the island is still a mystery. They were dated at 18,000 BP. Homo floriensis is very similar to Australopithecus afarensis in stature and morphology. This branch of Homo is relatively recent and needs much more study related to any comparison to A. afarensis.

(c). **The Neanderthal (Hn).** The Neanderthal or Neandertal was considered a sub-species of human (Homo sapiens neanderthalensis) that inhabited Europe and parts of western Asia from about 29,000 to 230,000 years ago, during the Middle Paleolithic Period. The African fossils dated from 200,000 years ago show a mix of modern and more ancient features. Typically, their skulls are large like ours with a larger than modern brain size for most specimens, but with prominent brow ridges. Below the neck their bodies are more robust than ours but are otherwise modern, having relatively long limbs compared with the Neanderthals who occupied Europe at the time. Their average cerebral capacity was 1,600 cc., about 400 cc greater than the average cranial capacity for modern man.

(d). **La Chapelle aux Saints (Hn).** The Chapelle aux Saints fossil was Neanderthal in type. This skeleton was discovered in France in 1908. Its cranial capacity was 1620 cc. or well above the average cranial capacity of modern man. This individual suffered from severe deforming osteoarthritis, causing anthropologists to picture this man as very brutish, a view which has since been corrected by other Neanderthal finds. The age of this skeleton was assigned at 32,000 years BP during the Upper Pleistocene.

(e). **Wadjak man (Hs).** Found in 1889 in central Java, the Wadjak man was dated in the late Pleistocene. Although the Wadjak skulls bear Australopithecine features, the cranial capacity was 1550 cc. for one skull and 1650 cc. for the other skull. Debate concerning the classification of this fossil type finally conceded that they were Homo sapiens.

(f). **Solo man (Hs).** Found in Java in 1931-1933, these eleven skulls had massive supra-orbital arches with low sloping foreheads. The cranial capacities of these samples ran from 1035 to 1255 cc. or well within the range the cranial capacity of modern man. Although debate raged for a time concerning the classification of these individuals, they were finally conceded to be Homo sapiens.

(g). **La Farrasse (Hs).** Six specimens were found between 1909 and 1921 in France, including an adult male, an adult female, three infants and a fetus. These fossils were dated in the upper Pleistocene. The skull type was Neanderthal, with an adult cranial capacity of 1641 cc., well above the average for modern man.

(h). **Florisbad man (Hs).** Dated to about 41,000 years BP, the Florisbad man was found in 1932 in the Union of South Africa. The cranium was large but rather flattened with no supra-orbital ridge. It is classified as Homo sapiens.

(i). **Tabun man (Hs).** This was an almost complete adult female skeleton, with a small and low vaulted cranium. It was found in Israel between 1929 and 1934. Its cranial capacity is 1271 cc. The dating of this find was placed about 45,000 years BP in the Third Interglacial Period.

(j).**Skuhl man (Hn)**. Although appearing primitive with a low forehead and a massive supra-orbital ridge, the cranial capacity of these skulls are 1518 cc. Found in Israel in 1929 through 1934, these specimens were dated to 45,000 years BP during the Third Interglacial Period. They were of classic Neanderthal type.

(2) **RISS-WURM SANGAMON** 70,000 to 150,000 years BP.

(a). **Rhodesia man (He).** Found in 1921 in Zambia, the Rhodesia man has massive supra-orbital ridges and a low sloping forehead. The cranial capacity is, however, 1280 cc. Debate concerning its classification runs between Homo erectus and Homo sapiens of the Neanderthal type. The dating of this fossil is placed in the Upper Pleistocene.

(b). **Montmaurin man (Hn).** Found in France in 1949, this specimen consisted of a Neanderthaloid jaw. Because of the cave filling, this sample was dated to either the Riss-Wurm or the Mindel-Riss Interglacial Period.

(c). **Saldanha man (Hs).** This specimen is gradually being recognized as Homo sapiens, even with the sloping forehead and massive supra-orbital arches. This skull was found in 1953 in the Republic of South Africa. Its cranial capacity is 1250 cc. or well within the range of the cerebral capacity of modern man. This man was also dated in the Upper Pleistocene.

(d). **Krapina man (Hn).** Found in 1899 and 1905, these badly fragmented skeletons of at least 13 men, women and children were located in Yugoslavia. The dating of the Krapina fossils was placed during the Third Interglacial Period. Being too fragmented to accurately measure the cranial capacity, these skeletons are noted to be of classic Neanderthal types. The Krapina man is estimated to have had a modern brain capacity.

(e). **Casablanca man (He).** This small fragment of jaw was found in 1954 in Morocco. The tooth structure identifies it as Homo erectus. It is dated at the Third Interglacial in the Upper Middle Pleistocene Period.

MIDDLE PLEISTOCENE 150,000 TO 500,000 YEARS BP.

---

(1). **RISS-ILLINOISAN** 150,000 to 200,000 years BP.

Fontechevade man (Homo praesapiens). Found in France in 1947, this skull cap was of the low vaulted type, yet without the massive supra-orbital ridges found in the Homo erectus and in the Neanderthals. These samples were dated at the Third Interglacial period or about 150,000 years BP. The cranial capacity was about 1470 cc. or well within the cranial capacity of modern man (Day, p. 52-55).

(2). **MINDEL-RISS YARMOUTH** 200,000 to 400,000 years BP.

(a). **Heidelberg man (He).** Found in Germany in 1907, this specimen consists of a large jaw with a receding chin. It has been dated at the First or Second Interglacial Periods, at either 300,000 or 500,000 years BP. This specimen has been classified as Homo erectus. (Day, p. 65-69).

(b). **Swanscombe man (Homo praesapiens).** This skull cap was discovered in sections in 1935, 1936 and in 1955. The sutures of each section fitted together perfectly, demonstrating that the sections came from the same skull. This skull was dated to the Second Interglacial of 300,000 years BP. The skull was classified as Homo praesapiens and had a cranial capacity of 1325 cc. (Day, p. 31-36).

(c). **Steinheim man (He).** Found in 1933 in West Germany, this skull was distorted through pressure. The skull had a medium vaulted forehead with a medium sized supra-orbital ridge. It has been dated at the Second or Third Interglacial period, between 300,000 and 500,000 years BP. Its cranial capacity was measured at 1,175 cc. or well within the range of modern man. (Day, p. 70-75).

(d). **Peking man (He).** Found in excavations in China between 1921 and 1964, the majority of this group of fossils was dated through the potassium-argon method as being from around 400,000 years BP through the Riss-Wurm Sangamon of about 100,000 years BP. Peking man is classified as Homo erectus. With a pronounced supra-orbital ridge and a low vaulted forehead, the cranial capacity was measured at between 915 cc. for a juvenile skull to 1,225 cc. for adult skulls, well within the range of modern human cranial capacities. Often one encounters depictions of many of these types of men as being primitive and ape-like. The reality of the measurements indicate that they would fit perfectly within our modern day society and would be indistinguishable from many other racial types and individual variations that are found today. (Day, p. 250-261).

(e). **Rebat man (He).** Found in Morocco in 1933, this specimen consists of a mandible and maxilla. The dating of this man was placed at the Middle Pleistocene, about 400,000 years BP. The fragments came from a male adolescent of about 16 to 17 years of age. (Day, p. 110-113). No cranial capacities could be measured.

(3). **MINDEL KANSAN** 400,000 to 500,000 years BP.

(a). **Java man (He).** Found in Java between 1891 and 1939, this type of skull was low vaulted with a massive supra-orbital ridge. The cranial capacity was between 850 to 940 cc. somewhat low but still within the range of human cranial capacities today. The dating of this hominid type ranged from the early Middle Pleistocene at about 500,000 years BP to Upper Pleistocene. (Day, p. 220-233).

(b). **Kromdrai man (Aust).** Found in the Republic of South Africa in 1938 to 1941, this specimen consisted of the left half of the cranium, the left maxilla, zygoma, part of the left sphenoid, the left temporal along with other parts to the skeleton. The cranial capacity was estimated as being 650 cc. Although some of the skeletal parts were human-like, the skull was ape-like. There is also debate concerning whether any of the other skeletal parts contain any characteristic human traits. This fossil type was dated at the Basal Middle Pleistocene or around 500,000 years BP. (Day, p. 178-184).

LOWER PLEISTOCENE 500,000 TO 2,000,000 YEARS BP.

(1). **GUNZ-MINDEL AFTONIAN**

(a). **Meganthropus man (Aust).** Found in central Java in 1939 through 1953, this specimen was only sufficient to demonstrate that there were giant hominid forms living at the same times as Homo habilis. (Day, p. 238-241).

(2). **GUNZ-JERSEYAN**

(a). **Sangiran man (He).** Found in central Java in 1937, this fossil consists of the complete top of the skull, showing a low vaulted forehead with a massive supra-orbital arch. The dating was placed at 550,000 years BP in the Middle Pleistocene Period. Its cranial capacity was estimated at 850 cc. (Day, p. 226-233).

(b). **Modjokerto man (He).** Found in 1936, this skull was discovered in a lower strategraphic level than the Tranil remains of the Java man. The age dating on this specimen was set at 500,000 to 600,000 years BP. This skull was of a child of about two years of age and had the cranial capacity of a two to three year old modern child. Although this child had a sloping forehead, the cerebral capacity was the same or better than children of the same age today. (Day, p. 234-237).

(c). **Vertesszollos man (Hs).** Found in Hungary in the mid 1960's, part of a skull was found relating the segment of skull to similar skulls with a cranial capacity of 1516 cc. This find was dated to Mindel II or roughly 400,000 to 700,000 years BP. This find is so chaotic to the theory of the evolution of man that the evidence is resisted by statements from anthropologists stating that "We know that Vertesszollos cannot be modern man because it is too old. Therefore it must be the type of creature that we find elsewhere who lived at this time-namely Homo erectus". (Fix, 1984, p. 102-105).

(d). **Petralona man (Hs)**. Found in Petralona, Greece, in a stalagmitic cave, the Petralona skull was dated to 700,000 years BP by the Uranium-Thorium method and the Electron Spin Resonance method. The cranium has a cerebral capacity of 1220 cc. This is an embarrassing find along with the Vertesszollos skull because these two skulls had modern brain capacity and demonstrate that the Australopithicenes were not the ancestors of humans.

(e). **Tuang man (Aust).** Found in Botswana, South Africa in 1924, and was dated at the Upper Villafranchian about one to one and a half million years BP. This sample was a juvenile of unknown age, with a cranial capacity measured at 500 cc. The head was high

vaulted with no marked supra-orbital ridge. Being a child, the 500 cc. cranial capacity would not be a measurement of the adult cranial volume. (Day, p. 162, 167).

(3). **VILLAFRANCHIAN BLANCAN**

(a). **Sterkfontein man (Aust).** Found in the Republic of South Africa from 1936 through 1948, This fossil has been dated to the Upper Villafranchian Period of 1 to 1.5 million years BP. The skull had a low vaulted cranium with a massive supra-orbital ridge. The cranial capacity was measured at 482 cc. or roughly the same as that of modern apes. (Day, p. 168-177).

(b). **Makpansgat man (Aust).** Found between 1947 to 1962 in the Republic of South Africa, this specimen was dated as Upper Villafranchian in the Lower Pleistocene Period. This sample was very similar to the Sterkfontein types. No cranial measurements were given. (Day, p. 198-206).

(c). **Zinjanthropus man (Aust).** Found in 1964 in Tanzania, the skull is amazingly apelike except for the human type dentition. It was dated at 1.3 to 1.7 million years BP. The cranial capacity of 530 cc. is more in line with the anthropoid apes than with mankind. The other humanoid skeletal parts found in conjunction with this skull may not have belonged with it but could have been from Homo habilis who lived at and before the Zinjanthropus. (Day, p. 119-124).

(d). **Pre-Zinjanthropus remains (Hh).** In the early 1960's a series of skeletal remains were discovered that were very close to the characteristics of modern human structure. These people were named Homo habilis, meaning "handy man" after the fact that the Homo habilis made and used tools, The jaw structure was similar to Homo sapiens, without the simian shelf that hinders speech. This hominid type also had fully developed human feet, which is more distinctive in identifying mankind than is the cranial capacity. The skull was crushed and the estimated cranial capacity was placed at 723 cc. This figure could be assumed to be the basal figure with the capacity increasing as the skull chips were reconstructed in the proper curvature. (Day, p. 125-139).

PLEIOCENE 2.000.000 TO 11.000.000 YEARS BP.

(1). **PLAISANCIAN**

(a). **KNM-ER 3733 (He).** Placed about 1.7 to 2 million years BP was the skull of a Homo erectus ergaster found in Tanzania numbered by the Kenya National Museum as KNM-ER 3733. Homo erectus had cranial capacities equal to modern mankind, as indicated by many finds throughout the years. This skull had a higher vaulted forehead with a massive

supra-orbital ridge. This find was intensely disturbing to the evolutionists because it discredited the Australopithecines as ancestors of mankind. It firmly established that Homo erectus, a valid human being, existed as a contemporary with the earliest Africans. (Fix, 1984, p. 53-55).

(b). **KNM-ER 1470 (Hh or Hs).** Found in Tanzania in the 1960's, the find of skull 1470 was a further shock to evolutionists. This individual had a smooth, vaulted head with no supra-orbital ridge, very similar to modern man. Although this skull was crushed and fragmentary, the cranial capacity was estimated at 835 cc. The dating of this skull was placed at 2.8 million years BP, being found under a layer of volcanic ash dated to this time. (Fix, 1984, p. 50-61). The finding of this skull caused Richard Leaky to state:

"This remarkable skull [1470] confirmed two things. First, that the human ancestral line, Homo, originated much earlier than most people suspected. . . . Second, because the history of Homo goes back that far, it means that the individuals were living at the same time as some of the earliest australopithicines, making it unlikely that our direct ancestors are evolutionary descendants of the australopithecines-cousins, yes, but descendants, no. Up to that time (when 1470 was discovered) workers in this field believed that...Australopithecus africanus was certainly marching along the main route, eventually to give rise to the Homo line." (Quoted in Fix, 1984, p.55-56).

(2). **HEMIPHELIAN**

(a). **Lucy (Australopithecus afarensis).** Found in Etheopia in 1974, this find was affectionately named Lucy. Lucy is dated at about 3 million years BP, and is the new hopeful for the position as the ancestor of man. Lucy was only 3 to 3 1/2 feet tall, with long arms and other simian like features. If 1470 was indeed dated at 2.8 million years BP or older, then Lucy would have to be listed as a contemporary of other species of fully developed human beings during that period. (Fix, 1984, p. 62-66). The gender of Lucy is also under debate. Lucy is very much like the Flores man recently found in Indonesia. Flores man is much more recent. Perhaps the skull of Lucy was constructed to have more ape-like features in order to fit into the evolutionary argument, and should be restudied and reconstructed more like Flores man. Australopithecus afarensis also had a hyoid bone which is the foundation for the larynx, and therefore, possibly possessing the ability for human speech (National Geographic, November , 2006; Sloan, 2006).

(b). **Modern human footprints in volcanic ash**. Since the human foot can be the determining factor in the classification of a specimen as human, the finding of human footprints can be very significant. Around 1977, a series of footprints were found in a volcanic ash bed in Tanzania. The prints were about the size of a five year old child, and

were dated by the particular volcanic eruption as 3.7 million years BP. This set of footprints predates any other so called forms ancestral to man. (Fix, 1984, p. 67).

MYOCENE PERIOD

Miocene Period Skeletons: There were two human skeletons supposedly found in Miocene limestone around 1802, when Guadalupe was a colony of the French. In 1804, during the Nepolionic wars, the British captured Guadalupe. One of the skeletons had already been shipped to the French National Museum, the Louvre. The remaining skeleton was redied for shipping and was taken aboard a British man of war and shipped to the British Museum of Natural History, where it remains today. The skull is in South Carolina, at the Columbia Historical Society of Columbia, SC.

CRETACEOUS PERIOD 64 TO 135 MILLION YEARS BP.

(a). There were **human footprints** found in 1911 in the Paluxy River bed in Glen Rose, Texas. The strata in this river bed is Cretaceous and contains tracks of many species of dinosaur, including sauropods and trachodonts. The human prints were clear. Many tracks showed the toes, ball, arch, and heel. One of the human footprints was positioned diagonally in the middle of a trachodont track, witnessed by James Ryals, professor of agriculture at Texas A & M University. Another series of human footprints pass within 52 inches in the same strata as a trachodont series. To counter charges that the human footprints were carved, the river bank was cut away with a bulldozer, exposing the human tracks continuing into the river bank. Although greatly eroded, the human tracks are still visible and old photographs are available for corroborating evidence (Creation Research Society Yearbook, ; Field Records of Westcott, G. and Westcott, R., 1971.

(b). **The Moab, Utah, Skeletons** in Cretaceous deposits. The skeletons of 19 modern humans were found in Morison Formation Cretaceous strata near Moab Utah. They were buried in a soft white sand like fill without any sign of burial or the interruption of the strata. The Copper Sulfate in the fill replaced the bones, making them a beautiful Malachite green.

PALEOZOIC ERA 280 THROUGH 500 MILLION YEARS BP.

(a). Joseph Meister discovered what appeared to be human **shoe prints stepping on trilobites**, an extinct marine organism which appeared in the Ordovician Period and died out in the Permian Period.

(b). **The London Hammer**. In 1934 a man from London, Texas, found a rock from an Ordovician or Silurian deposit that had a piece of petrified wood protruding from it. Since hard wood trees were not supposed to have evolved until the Cretaceous Period the man who found this rock was interested and took the rock home. The rock was used as a door stop for many years until his teenage son hit the rock with a hammer. The rock split open and an unusual hammer was found. The hammer was submitted to the Battel Laboratories for a chemical analysis. The Battel Labroatories analyzed the moon rocks for NASA. They reported that the hammer handle was agatized (replaced by stone), and that the handle had a part that had turned to coal. The metal of the hammer head was not rusted although submerged at one time in sea water. There was a char on the outside of the hammer head. The metal did not contain any Carbon which is found in all metal smelted since the beginning of secular history. It did not contain Iridium which is found in all meteoric iron and no Silicon, found in all smelted iron throughout history. There was a 2.7 % concentration of Chlorine which would be expected of a tool which was immersed in sea water.

Some of the data presented so far may be questioned, but the greater part of the evidence is merely factual and not subject to debate. When dealing with science it is imperative that the facts are sought and presented in a way that is unbiased, preserves the integrity of the data, and reflects the actual reality of what the data presents as fact, not subject to the manipulation of the opinions of those who are trying to prove their dogma. This objectivity applies to the scientific study of history as well as forensics as applied to law. This principle also applies to theological matters and should be limited to what is actually stated in the Scriptures. All else is merely conjecture. The warping or misuse of data to try to shade the meaning, or to leave out crucial information to try to support a position is dishonest and poor scholarship. Evaluate the evidence carefully and form your own conclusion with integrity and tolerance.

When the hominid fossils are arranged in the order of ascending complexity as is displayed in the average museum it appears that there is a smooth transition from ape-like ancestors to modern man. When arranged in the order where they appear in the geological stratum where they actually were found they present an entirely different picture.

The data presented previously in this discussion is long and tedious. When following this type of investigation a collection of all available data must be collected and studied. This presentation of factual discoveries, and the characteristics of these finds and the relationship of each in both time and characteristic is necessary in order to understand the implications for all the data. This is necessary to reach valid conclusions for the implications from actual, observable facts. The information concerning fossil human remains and their age relative to each other is summarized by the following chart. Again, let me point out that the ages in the chart do not necessarily represent the age of the fossil, but are listed only to

indicate which fossil is older and which is younger. By this approach we can establish the sequence in which fossil was left, by the assigned age of the strata where the fossil was found.

Paleoanthropological Human Distribution Chart

DATES	ERA	Date of Fossil	Found In		Name	Brain
To 10,000 BP	Holocene			Hs	Modern man	1250 cc
10 M to 150 M BP	Upper Pleistocene					
10 M to 70 M BP	Wurm Wisconsin					
			Europe	Hs	Cromagnon	1650 cc
		29-230 M BP		Hn	Neanderthal	1600 cc
		32,000 BP	France	Hn	La Chapelle aux Saints	1600 cc
		Late Pleistocene	Java	Hs	Wadjak man	1650 cc
		41, 000 BP	South Africa	Hs	Florisbad man	No data
			Java	Hs	Solo man	1255 cc
		Upper Pleistocene		Hs	La Farrasse man	1641 cc
					Tabun man	1271 cc
70 to 150, 000 BP	Riss Wurm Sangamon					
		Upper Pleistocene	Zambia	He	Rhodesian man	1280 cc
	Mindel Riss Interglacial		France	Hn	Montmaurin Jaw	No data
	Upper Pleistocene	Upper Pleistocene		Hs	Saldanha man	1250 cc
	3rd. Interglacial		Yugoslavia	Hn	Krapina man	Est-mod
	Upper middle Pleistocene	Upper middle Pleistocene	Morocco	He	Casablanca Jaw	No data
150 to 500,000 BP	Middla Pleistocene					
150 to 200,000 BP	Riss Illinoisan	Middle Pleistocene, 150 M	France	Hprae	Fontechavad	1470 cc
200 to 400,000 BP	Mindel-Riss Yarmouth	300 to 500,000 BP	Germany	He	Heidelberg Jaw	No data
	2nd. Interglacial	300,000 BP	England ?	H prae	Swanscomb Man	1325 cc
		300 to 500,000 BP	Germany	He	Steinheim	1175 cc
		400,000 BP	China	He	Peking Man	1225 cc
		400,000 BP	Morocco	He	Rebat Man	No data
400 to 500,000 BP	Mindel-Kansan	500,000 BP	Java	He	Java Coulat	850-940 cc
		500,000 BP	South Africa	Aust	Kromdrai Man	650 cc
500 M to 2 million BP	Lower Pleistocene					
	Gunz-Mindel Aftonian	500,000 BP	Java	Aust	Meganthropus	No data
	Gunz-Jerseyan	500,000 BP	Java		Sangiran Man	850 cc
		500 to 600,000 BP	Java		Modjokorto Child	Modern
	Mindell II	700,000 BP	Hungary	Hs	Vertesszellos	1560 cc

					Man	
		700,000 BP	Greece	**Aust**	Petraloma Man	1220 cc
	Upper Villafranchian	1 to 1.5 million BP	South Africa	**Aust**	Tuang Child 2 yr. approx.	500 cc
		1 to 1.5 million BP	South Africa	**Aust**	Sterkfontein Man	482 cc
		1 to 1.5 million BP	South Africa	**Aust**	Mappansgat Man	No data
		1.3 to 1.7 million BP	Tanzania	**Aust**	Zinganthropus	530 cc
		1.3 to 1.7 million BP	Tanzania	**Hh**	Pre Zinj Homo Habalis	Crushed
2 to 11 million BP	Pleiocene	2 million BP	Tanzania	**He**	Plaisancian Man	No data
		2.8 million BP	Tanzania	**Hh**	KNM-ER 1470 (Crushed)	835 cc est.
		2.8 million BP	Etheopia	**Aust**	Lucy	No data
		3.7 million BP	Tanzania		Laetoli human footprints	
11 to 25 million BP	Miocene		Guadalupe	**Hs**	Guadalupe Skeleton	
135 to 64 million BP	Cretaceous		**Glen Rose, TX**		Human footprints w/ dinosaurs	
					Human Tooth	
					Human finger	
			Moab, UT	**Hs**	19 Skeletons (Modern)	
280 to 600 million BP	Paleozoic					
	Pennsylvanian- Permian		Pennsylvania		Iron pot in coal	
	Ordovician		Utah		Shoe prints on trilobites	
			London,Texas		London hammer	

Summary of Significance of distribution Data.

When displayed in order of apparent developing complexity the evidence appears to demonstrate the evolution of mankind from more primitive stock. On the other hand, the actual fossil evidence presented in the order in which they were deposited demands an entirely different conclusion. Since the Homo habilis was a near contemporary with the earliest Australopithecines, and the Australopithecines were removed as possible ancestors of mankind, we must conclude that there is no evidence yet discovered for the emergence of mankind from the genetic stock of earlier and less developed ancestors claimed so far and presented as evidence for the evolution of man.

(2). **Argument From Tooth Structure**

Generally, specific traits are linearly transmitted from generation to generation. Traits that are isolated in restricted gene pools are bred true for the populace in the isolated area. This gives rise to specific ethnic and tribal characteristics that are identifiable for the groups in which these traits are found. The people who possess these characteristics are no less human than other human beings. This does not make them a separate specie from other humans.

One of the interesting genetic variations in the human race is the difference in tooth structure. These are lineally transmitted traits passed on from generation to generation. A specific trait can also be used to determine the lineage of specific groups of people. People who descend from African or European stock have a flat side in back of their incisor teeth (the Occidental tooth shape). These include Middle Eastern peoples. People who came from Asia, or the Homo erectus or Homo ergaster of Africa, on the other hand, for the most part have a hollowed out scoop-like pattern (Sinodental pattern) on the back of their incisor teeth. People who migrated from Asia in the past and populated various parts of the earth can be recognized for this feature.

The real way to define species is the ability to breed with the production of viable offspring that can reproduce. Species can not be scientifically defined from minor variations within groups of individuals found in a population. These traits can be passed on to the next generations without changing their specie. In this way any human being (Homo sapiens) can mate with any other human being and bear perfectly normal children that can also breed true.

Homo habilis had the flat tooth structure or the Occidental pattern in the back of the incisors. This suggests that the people of Europe descended from this branch of the hominid line. That way the people of Europe, Africa, northern Asia and the Middle East can trace their lineage from the Homo habilis.

The teeth from Homo ergaster and Homo erectus had of the Sinodental tooth pattern. Homo ergaster appears to have migrated to southern Asia and were synonymous with Homo erectus. They developed into the Asiatic varieties of the hominid line found among the Chinese, people of India, Mongols, Japanese, and the people from Asia who populated the Pacific islands. The Native American can be identified by the Sinodental tooth structure and can be traced as having come over from Asia.

Consider the following facts. (1). Homo habilis had the Occidental incisor teeth. (2). Homo erectus or ergaster had the Sinodental scooped teeth. (3). Homo habilis and Homo erectus or ergaster lived at the same times at the same locations. (4). Homo erectus seems to

have migrated north and to Asia. (5). People of African and European origin have the Occidental, flat incisor teeth. (6). People of Asian extraction have Sinodental scooped teeth. (7). The Sinodental and Occidental patterns of incisor tooth shape are linearly transmitted traits that are passed from generation to generation. (8). Asian people can mate with any other human being and have viable offspring that can reproduce human offspring. (9). There is only one species of humankind today, Homo sapiens. (10). If there was an evolutionary separation where isolation was to allow development of different species of mankind, there would be no ability of generating viable offspring with even small variations in the genetic structure of the groups. Therefore, we can conclude that these facts would indicate that the Homo habilis and the Homo erectus were really one specie, Homo sapeins, with tribal variations just as seen today.

- **How about the Australopithicines?**

(1). The person of skull KNM-ER 1470 lived near or at the same time as Lucy (Australopithecus afarensis). (2). Skull KNM-ER 1470 had a relatively modern human head. (3). The majority of Australopithecines lived after the person of skull KNM-ER 1470 . Therefore, the Australopithecines were not the ancestors of the human race and were not our primitive forerunners or ancestors.

- **Australopithecine tooth structure**.

Can we derive important information from the tooth structure of the Australopithecines to demonstrate if or where they fit in the human race? If the Australopithecines do fit into the human race, where do they fit, and what caused this variation? If the Australopithecines had the variations of tooth structure that their contemporary humans had, then we might assume that they were also part of the human race?

Australopithecus afarensus had the Sinodental pattern in their teeth. This would tend to indicate that the Australopithecus afarensus was closer related to the Homo erectus part of the human family. Australopithecus boisei (Zunjanthropus) had the Occidental pattern in its tooth structure. This would tend to indicate that this branch of the human family was related to the Homo habilis, and therefore, to the European-African side of the human family. These facts would tend to indicate that they may have been in the lineage of the Homo erectus, although living after Homo erectus was fully developed. This also indicates that Homo erectus was not produced as an improved version of Australopithecus afarensis.

- **How are the Australopithecines related to man?**

To answer that question we must consider the following facts. (1.) True mankind existed before or contemporary with man’s so-called ancestors, the Australopithecines. (2). True

mankind had both the Occidental and Sinodental pattern in their teeth. (3). Australopithecus boisei had the Occidental pattern of teeth. (4). Australopithecus afarensis had the Sinodental pattern of teeth. This would suggest that the Australopithecines were a genetic variation of Homo sapeins. Although we cannot be sure, this also suggests that the Australopithecines were produced through inbreeding or other genetic errors.

This data suggests that there has been no evidence of mankind evolving from primitive stock. The evidence so far demonstrates that it is far more plausable to believe the account of the creation of man in the Bible than to believe in the theory of evolution.

While it is true that there have been some observable changes in the human race throughout time, these changes appear to be lateral in developing sub species or tribal variations, rather than showing a smooth transition between primitive apelike ancestors. The study of the hominid fossils would draw us to conclude:

(1) that evolutionists do not rank fossil man in relation to their chronological position in the geological strata but, rather, they rank them by appearance to attempt to demonstrate relationship,

(2) that when ranked chronologically, fossil man does not demonstrate a smooth progression from ape-like ancestors to the modern human,

(3) that modern humans existed as contemporary species with the other fossil discoveries that have been promoted as the ancestors of modern man,

(4) that the cranial capacities of most human fossils had cranial capacities within the range of modern man or higher.

(5) that modern man is not a product of primitive ancestors, but is produced through a line of other human beings only,

(6) that there is no valid evidence for the evolution of man, and

(7) that it takes far less faith to believe that God created man than it is to believe in the contrived evidence that the evolutionists have proposed for the ancestry of man.

Remember that proof alone will not persuade individuals to accept the truth if these people have an emotional-spiritual block which causes them to reject the truth for the more comfortable position of spiritual complacency or the position of active rebellion. Our responsibility is to produce the evidence of what actually happened. God's responsibility is to convince the individuals to whom we have witnessed. Their responsibility is to evaluate

the facts presented, correct the error of their thinking to bring it into harmony with the evidence, and then to bring themselves into a proper relationship with God through faith in Christ

Bibliography:

Beals, Ralph L. & Hoijer, Harry, An Introduction to Anthropology. New York, N. Y.: MacMillan Co. 1965.

Burenhult, Goran, Ed. The First Humans: Human Origins and History to 10,000 BC, San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco, 1993.

Day, Michael, Guide to Fossil Man: A Handbook of Human Palaeontology. New York, N. Y.: World Publishing Company, 1965.

Fix, William R. The Bone Peddlers Selling Evolution. New York, N. Y.: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1984.

National Geographic Magazine, Tampa, FL, November, 2006,

Sloan, Christopher P. *The Origin of Childhood*. National Geographic, Washington, DC: The National Geographic Society, November, 2006. p. 148-159.

Westcott, G. & Westcott, R. Field Notes of an Investigation of Human, Sabertooth Tiger and Megathere Tracks in Cretaceous Limestone of the Paluxy River, Glen Rose, Texas, 1971.

With numerous data from the Internet.