

---

## Creation Answers

Creation Education Materials, P.O. Box 153402, Irving, TX 75015-3402

---

### Who does this newsletter?

This newsletter is produced by Wayne Spencer on a Quarterly basis. Its purpose is to bring creation research within the reach of Christians and provide up-to-date reliable information on creation issues. Wayne Spencer is a creation author and former teacher who has presented papers at the International Conference on Creationism and has published in various creation publications, such as the Creation Research Society Quarterly, Creation magazine, the Journal of Creation (TJ), and Origins (from the Biblical Creation Society, UK).

This newsletter is meant to help people plug into creation resources and get informed about creation and evolution. It is provided free of charge on request. Using the free Adobe Acrobat Reader is necessary for viewing the newsletter. There are no restrictions in copying this newsletter or passing it on to others. To request to be placed on the e-mail list, send a request to [wspencer@creationanswers.net](mailto:wspencer@creationanswers.net).

More information on Wayne Spencer's education and publications can be found on the [creationanswers.net](http://creationanswers.net) web site. You'll also find many other resources. <http://creationanswers.net>

### *In this issue...*

- **The Non-Evolution of Man, Part 2**
- **Mitochondrial Eve - ICC Update**
- **"Expelled" Movie DVD**

### A Personal Note from Wayne Spencer

Greetings,

I'd like to welcome new readers of my newsletter. In this issue I have part 2 of my article on the origin of man. In "The Non-Evolution of Man, Part 2" I explain what the australopithecine fossils are (including Lucy) and deal with issues that even today come back into the news from time to time. Please read Part 1 in the June 2008 issue of my newsletter if you haven't. After I sent my June newsletter out, I actually forgot to upload it to my website for a while, but it is there for download now.

Evolution plays down our uniqueness as human beings by claiming we descended from lower animals and apes. But I think the subject of paleoanthropology, the study of ancient man and man's origins, shows how humans are designed to live above the level of animals. But man must find his way with the help of the God who made him, or man can degenerate to the level of an animal.

The International Creation Conference was a great success in August. Someone told me it was the best attended ICC conference ever, which I believe. I particularly enjoyed speaking with several individual creationists with backgrounds in astronomy and physics that were present. At the conference, new things were sort of unveiled that will enhance creationist research and also provide support to graduate students who are creationists.

Wayne Spencer, M.S., Physics

## The Non-Evolution of Man, Part 2

Part 1 of this article in the June 2008 newsletter addressed what the Bible says on the origin of man and gave background on some of the differences between apes and humans. Part 1 also addressed some controversies of the past about the origin of man, such as Piltdown man and Neanderthal man. Please refer back to Part 1 as needed for background on what follows. The June 2008 newsletter can be downloaded from [creationanswers.net](http://creationanswers.net) from the Newsletters area. In Part 2 we will consider controversies from paleoanthropology that are more recent. Some of these cases are still discussed from time to time in news reports.

### Current Controversies

There are controversies that continue today over various fossils believed to be related to man's ancestry. The most well known of these is about the australopithecines and a particular specimen of australopithecine called Lucy. The general series order believed by evolutionists (though debated) is the following, from earlier forms to later forms with their alleged evolutionary ages in years before the present:

- 1) Australopithecines  
(3.5 to 1 M.Y. before present)
- 2) Homo habilis  
(2 to 1.5 M.Y.)
- 3) Homo erectus (including Java man)  
(1.7 M.Y. to 300,000 Y.)
- 4) Archaic Homo sapiens  
and Homo Neanderthalensis  
(200,000 to 20,000 Y.)
- 5) Cro-Magnon man  
(32,000 to 12,000 Y.)
- 6) Modern Homo sapiens  
(200,000 to present)

In this list, note that Archaic Homo Sapiens and Neanderthalensis (the Neanderthals)

are listed together because some Archaic Homo Sapiens are found to be contemporaneous with Neanderthals. It is not that they are considered the same. It seems to me the term "Archaic Homo Sapiens" is a very questionable category that has been a kind of catch-all bin for specimens that did not fit other categories. It is not surprising in a Biblical view of history that there would be people in the past with physical characteristics different than those of anyone alive today. This is at least partly because Noah's Flood so affected the Earth that the climate changed after the Flood, leading to an ice age for a number of generations. Just as God made lower animals able to adapt to a changing environment, he also made human beings able to undergo limited changes to adapt to a changing environment. The Neanderthals were likely very strong and well adapted to ice age type conditions. Most of the parts of the world where they have been found did experience the cold of the ice age. "Archaic Homo Sapiens" are just another group of people but with some features different than Neanderthals. The Archaic Homo Sapiens may not be adapted to ice age conditions however. Cro-Magnon man is believed to have been the successor of the Neanderthals. Cro-Magnon was first found in France in 1868. Cro-Magnon made more complex tools and items like jewelry, they are also well known for the paintings they made on cave walls. They were extremely good hunters and they buried their dead. To me they seem to have been very much like American Indians of the old west, though Cro-Magnon was in Europe.

We must consider the australopithecines. The first fossil of this type was reported in 1924 by Dr. Raymond Dart, a professor from Johannesburg, South Africa. This consisted of a skull from a limestone quarry in a place called Taungs, thus it has been called the Taungs skull. Dr. Dart claimed that the teeth had human-like characteristics. Most other

scientists of the time dismissed Dart's claims and viewed the Taungs skull as probably a chimpanzee. But Dart and colleague (a Dr. Robert Broom) continued searching for evidence of other similar ape fossils with human-like characteristics, to find a potential ancestor of humans. In time there were other fossils found. Dart and Broom argued they were of two types, one a more slender or "gracile" form and one a stronger more robust form. There has been much controversy about these two types. Some argue they should not be considered separate types because their differences are explained as being merely the difference between male and female apes. However, these two forms came to be known as *Australopithecus africanus* and *Australopithecus robustus*.

Dart promoted an idea that some of these australopithecines killed or possibly hunted the others, because of how the skulls were often bashed in with things like tools and clubs present. I think bashed up skulls along with evidence of fire and tools indicates that these were monkeys that were man's meal. Either people were eating the brains or they may have been wanting to get to the bone marrow, which can be a good food. Some scientists would agree with this today. Dart and Broom considered these creatures to be able to walk upright, though at that time there was very little to go on since there were very few bones other than skulls.

Then in the 1970's more information came to light on the australopithecines. In 1971 Richard Leakey found other specimens that were more complete. His comments were published in *Science News*, "the australopithecines were long-armed short-legged knuckle-walkers, similar to existing African apes." So, evidence was pointing more to them not walking upright like humans. There were also very significant studies comparing the

australopithecine bones to human and ape bones in various measurements, including with sophisticated multivariate computer statistical analyses. Well known scientists such as Lord Solly Zuckerman and Charles Oxnard came out with comments to the effect that the australopithecines were clearly apes, not human-like at all, and not a human ancestor. Then it might have been over (for the australopithecines) if it were not for the famous fossil called Lucy.

In 1974 American paleoanthropologist Donald Johanson and French geologist Maurice Taieb found the skeleton that came to be called Lucy. It was generally very ape like and it was given the designation of *australopithecus afarensis*, named after the Afar region where it was found. A year later 13 more sets of skeletal remains were found that were taken to be of the same kind of animal. Lucy was dated with radioactive dating at 2.9 M.Y. old, making it older than all the human-like fossils. Yet, Johanson claimed the knee, leg bones (the femur), and hips implied it could walk upright. Johanson argued Lucy was an ancestor of *australopithecus africanus*. There's been a lot of controversy and some confusion about Lucy's knee joint. Based on comments by Johanson in a lecture, statements circulated among creationists for years that the knee joint was not found with the Lucy skeleton, but was found some distance away in a different rock layer and that knee was put with the Lucy skeleton. This is not quite accurate. What seems to have actually happened was Johanson compared the leg bone of Lucy, to another specimen (call it B). Specimen B, which was found in the other location in a different rock layer, had a more complete leg and knee and to Johanson it looked more human-like. So, Johanson argued that the two specimens, B and Lucy, were the same species and he argued that Lucy could walk upright under the assumption that Lucy's knee would have been like the other knee of specimen B. To

me this methodology and logic are very questionable at best.

What was Lucy? The Lucy skeleton, replicas of which are found in many museums, was of the size to be a small ape, its brain case looked like an ape, and its jaw and teeth looked like an ape. This was acknowledged by Johanson. But Johanson argued Lucy had completely abandoned life in trees. However, other scientists later pointed out evidence on the australopithecines that argued all of them including Lucy-like specimens were ape like. The rib cage was of a shape more like apes than like humans, the shoulder was better adapted to be like apes that spend time hanging on tree limbs, and there was other evidence suggesting they were apes. In recent years new evidence related to the fingers, toes, and wrists came to light regarding the afarensis specimens. The afarensis specimens (like Lucy) had wrists that "locked" like apes that spend a lot of time walking on the knuckles of their hands. This seems likely also because of the proportions of the arm and leg bones. Lucy had long arms and short legs similar to chimpanzees or other apes. So, though it may be that Lucy could walk upright some, it was still an ape and it probably walked using its hands most of the time. There are other apes that do the same today. An interesting article in Creation magazine from 1996 explains how Dr. David Menton pointed out that the St. Louis Zoo had a display with a reconstruction of Lucy that showed Lucy's feet as very human looking, which is now known to be incorrect. Museum officials were not willing to change the display, even if it was inaccurate (see the article at <http://creationontheweb.com/content/view/596>). Lucy could have been a variety of ape that is now extinct. The australopithecus fossils that have been found can all be understood as varieties of apes. So there's no substantial evidence of the

australopithecines being related to man's ancestry.

Evolutionists consider the fossils known as Homo habilis and Homo erectus to be our ancestors. There have also been many controversies about these cases. Homo habilis is now viewed by most creationist researchers as an invalid taxon. This means that it is an invalid category because cases that don't belong together have been miscategorized and placed in it when they should be separated as either ape or human. Some specimens in the category of Homo habilis are likely apes and some are likely human. In both the habilis and the erectus categories there has also been dating controversies about various fossil cases, which I am not addressing here. It is not uncommon for dates of the various fossils to contradict what is believed about the sequence of creatures in human evolution. There has also been confusion in that sometimes different evolutionist researchers have categorized certain specimens in different ways. Thus one researcher might consider a particular fossil to be Homo erectus and another researcher may consider it to be Homo habilis. A well known example of Homo habilis would be a skull known by its number in a sample collection, KNM-ER 1470. The 1470 skull (discovered in 1972) has been much debated. From the early reconstructions of the skull, it seemed to many as an intermediate form between the australopithecines and Homo erectus. The earlier reconstructions made the skull look more human. But in the mid 1980's more study of the skull included new reconstructions and new arguments that it was like the australopithecines, though somewhat larger. Some paleontologists in recent years have reclassified it as Homo habilis or even as a separate class of its own. Neither evolutionists nor creationists have a clear consensus on the 1470 skull. It seems to be unclear to me because we lack more of the skeleton and because of uncertainties in

how to do the reconstruction. Though I would reserve judgement to some extent on the 1470 skull because of these uncertainties, I would lean toward viewing it as a large ape skull. It's possible there were larger apes in the past that are now extinct. I would recommend the following article from 2005 by creationist Peter Lines that goes into more detail on the *Homo habilis* fossils, <http://creationontheweb.com/content/view/4450>.

*Homo erectus* fossils are human in characteristics and have been found with stone tools. Some have argued that *erectus* used fire. Some specimens also had CT scans done of the inner ear area and this showed human characteristics. However, *erectus* fossils have small skulls (with brain capacities averaging about 970 cc) but humans with similar skull sizes have been known. A legitimate question to ask is why would evolution favor larger and larger skulls anyway? Larger skulls among human beings does not indicate higher intelligence, as already mentioned. So the whole idea of humans evolving larger and taller over time from their early ancestors is questionable in terms of its evolutionary advantage. For both apes and humans there were likely varieties in the past that no longer exist. This is completely reasonable in a Biblical view of history considering Noah's Flood and its aftermath. To evolutionists, *Homo erectus* is considered to be the ancestor of Neanderthal. Evolutionary scientists have had difficulty being able to define what distinguishes *Homo erectus* from *Homo sapiens*, so it's probably safe to say they are human, though they could be an extinct variety.

It can be a difficult task to piece together fragments of bone and determine what type of creature it represents. The evolutionary view says that modern humans and modern apes both evolved from ancient apes. Some of the many "hominids" as they are

called are considered to be groups that went extinct. Others are considered by evolutionists to be ancestors of humans. However I believe the facts do not show evidence of apes transitioning into human forms. Evolutionists have had a strong tendency to let their biases influence the way they collect the data, the way they interpret it, the way they reconstruct skeletons, the way they date the fossils, and the claims they make in writing about the fossils. Considering the problems introduced by all of this in the subject of paleoanthropology, I would say it is more reasonable to believe the Bible. According to the Bible, there is ape kind and there is human kind. Human beings are not related to apes, in spite of how they may sometimes behave.

### ***Mitochondrial Eve - ICC Update***

In my June 2008 issue of *Creation Answers* I made a statement that creationists should probably not use the Mitochondrial Eve argument because of problems that have been identified by evolutionary researchers. At the International Conference on Creationism in August there were some important papers related to genetics presented, one of which pertained to the evidence for the Mitochondrial Eve hypothesis. The recent research from young age creationists seems to reaffirm that mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) points to there being one human mother of all of us in the not-too-distant past. This new evidence strongly suggests that the Biblical time scale is correct because mutations have evidently had limited effects on the Mitochondrial DNA.

As mutations occur over time, the mutable sites in a DNA sequence can take on one of several different nucleotides (these are called alleles). The more time (or the more generations) that humans have lived on the Earth, the more variation there should be in the mitochondrial DNA mutation sites. A

group of creationist researchers presented a paper at the 2008 ICC called "*The 'Eve' Mitochondrial Consensus Sequence*." This paper shows the amount of variation in the mtDNA is very limited. The ICC researchers carefully chose DNA sequences used in the study to avoid various difficulties with the data. (There are many errors in some published sequence sets.) Then computer simulations were run with a new computer program developed by creationist scientists for doing research on the genetics of populations. The computer studies calculated statistics on the amount of variation within modern human mitochondria. The following is a quote from the paper abstract, "Not only is more than 83% of the mitochondrial genome invariant, but in over 99% of the variable positions, the majority allele was found in at least 90% of the individuals." These results regarding mutations are consistent with a time scale of 150 generations since Noah's Flood around 4,500 years ago, but not consistent with 10,000 generations as in an evolutionary time scale for the evolution of mankind. In other words, the mtDNA doesn't show the variation that would be expected if the Earth is old and humans evolved hundreds of thousands of years ago. Current evolutionary thinking makes unrealistic assumptions about the mtDNA, such as that mutations happen at similar rates in all genetic lines. The problems pointed out in my previous article regarding the evolutionists arguments are still a problem for evolutionists. But this new research implies the Mitochondrial DNA evidence will support a young age creation view and not evolution.

### ***The "Expelled" Movie DVD***

Many of you may be familiar with the movie that was in the theaters this past April, called "Expelled - No Intelligence Allowed." The movie documents cases

in which people have been discriminated against because they questioned evolution or they wrote or spoke out about intelligent design or creation. This movie does a great job of exposing this problem in the scientific and academic worlds. Even journalists have been treated badly just for writing about the issue of intelligent design.

The DVD of the movie *Expelled* will be released on October 21, 2008. The DVD may be preordered now from Answers in Genesis, Amazon.com, or from the American Family Association. There is a link to Answers in Genesis' website from [creationanswers.net](http://creationanswers.net). I'd encourage you to get a copy of this DVD and show it to friends. It could be a great means to spark conversation about spiritual things.

The *Expelled* movie has generated a lot of critical attacks from evolutionary scientists and from many others. These attacks stem from the hatred of faith and of any idea that shows that faith is rational. Yoko Ono attempted to sue the movie producers over their use of the song "Imagine" from John Lennon. She lost the case I understand. Evolutionists have tried to argue that the cases of people losing their job or being denied tenure are cases where the person really didn't do a good job or weren't competent. So there were other legitimate reasons for these dismissals. This is demonstrably not the case. A new book will be released soon that does very detailed documentation of these cases of discrimination. There will be more about this to come in future issues.