

More Problems for Alleged Human Evolution

Kyle Butt, M.A.

Most of us remember seeing the drawings in science textbooks. The evolution of man depicted in its various “well-documented” stages, from ape-like ancestor to modern *Homo sapiens*. This “ape-like-ancestor-to-man,” gradual progression entrenched in science textbooks for the past four-five decades, posted in museums of natural history and force-fed to several generations, is currently coming under heavy attack—and not just from creationists.

In 2000, renowned paleontologist Meave Leakey and her co-workers discovered two fossils in Kenya. The team reported on the fossil finds in the August 2007 issue of *Nature* magazine (448[7145]:688-691). The fossils Leakey found were of alleged human ancestors named *Homo erectus* and *Homo habilis*. It was supposed by many in the scientific community that *Homo habilis* was the human ancestor that evolved into *Homo erectus* which evolved into humans. Leakey, et al., reported, however, that the skull they found of *Homo erectus* was in walking distance to an upper jawbone of *Homo habilis* (Borenstein, 2007). Thus, the new find suggests that *Homo habilis* did not evolve into *Homo erectus*, eliminating another key character from the evolution-of-man progressionary chart.

What reactions has this new find evoked? Borenstein wrote that it “pokes holes in the chief theory of man’s early evolution—that one species evolved from another” (2007). Fred Spoor, a co-author of the *Nature* article, said the new fossils paint a “chaotic kind of looking evolutionary tree rather than this heroic march that you see with the cartoons of an early ancestor evolving into some intermediate and eventually unto us” (as quoted in Borenstein, 2007). Borenstein also interviewed Bill Kimbel, science director of the Institute of Human Origins at Arizona State University. He noted that the evolutionary scientific community “used to think *Homo sapiens* evolved from Neanderthals. But now we know that both species lived during the same time period and that we did not come from Neanderthals” (2007).

We are supposed to believe that humans evolved over millions of years from knuckle-walking, ape-like creatures into upright, intelligent, talking humans. When we ask for proof of this idea, we are told that the fossil record verifies the various stages of this evolution, and the evolutionary community is gracious enough to provide cartoon-like illustrations depicting the stages that supposedly are documented by the fossil evidence. Yet, when we begin to analyze the data behind the picture, we are told, “Oh, we’re not sure that ape-like creature had anything to do with human evolution.” Or we are told, “Right, well those two lived at the same time so the one could not have evolved into the other.”

What, then, are we told to do with this ever-shifting, elusive human family tree that is continuously rearranged and redefined? We are told to simply trust that humans really did evolve and not worry over the “details” of how it happened. Susan Anton, another co-author of the Leakey report, said that she expects “anti-evolutionists” will use the new information to attack evolution, but she says that would be a mistake. “This is not questioning the idea at all of evolution; it is refining some of the specific points. This is a great example of what science does and religion doesn’t do. It’s a continuous [*sic*] self-testing process” (as quoted in Borenstein, 2007).

We are told that humans evolved from ape-like creatures, given as evidence a series of alleged ancestors, then told that they are not really ancestors at all, but that we still should believe in human evolution. The truth of the matter is, humans did not evolve from lower mammals, and the “evidence” that is constantly being “refined” is so tenuous that a measly skull and jawbone can rewrite an entire family tree that evolutionary scientists have spent millions of dollars, hundreds of thousands of work hours, and half a century concocting. The material in the science textbooks of 50 years ago is useless and obsolete, yet at the time of its printing was touted as **irrefutable evidence for human evolution**. The material in the textbook tomorrow will be in the same lamentable shape in another 40 years. Thus, we have a perpetual, vicious cycle in which the idea of human evolution is based on material that is constantly being refuted, but the most recent is said finally to be “it.” When will the evolutionary community cast an honest look back at the sordid history of their beloved theory of human evolution and recognize the cycle of dishonesty in which they are trapped?

Ms. Anton is right about one thing, however. Unlike modern science, true religion is not continuously “refined on specific points” to completely alter the truthfulness of previous statements. On the contrary, “the word of the Lord endures forever” (1 Peter 1:25).

REFERENCES

- Borenstein, Seth (2007), “Fossils Challenge Old Evolution Theory,” [On-line], URL: http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070808/ap_on_sc/human_evolution;_ylt=Ar1IbU5rxrwuu0f7YDcSgCWs0NUE.
- Leakey, Meave, et al. (2007), “Implications of New Early Homo Fossils from Ileret, East of Lake Turkana, Kenya,” *Nature*, 448[7154]:688-691, August, [On-line], URL: <http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v448/n7154/full/nature05986.html>.

Evolutionists are notorious for speaking authoritatively, decisively, and vehemently on the alleged “proof” of evolution. Yet, time and time again, through the years, evidence has forced evolutionists to recant their assertions, correct their premature conclusions, and alter the very claims that they formerly insisted **proved** their case and disproved God and the Bible account of creation. The arguments for evolution advanced during the infamous Scopes trial have been repudiated by evolutionists themselves. Indeed, from Darwin forward, evolutionary theory has manifested a precarious, century-plus-long history of modification, alteration, abandonment, correction, and endless speculation. From so-called “vestigial organs,” peppered moths, and Haeckel’s alleged embryonic recapitulation to Neanderthal, Java, Nebraska, and Piltdown man—all debunked decades ago. About the time their half-baked conjuring filters down to the school textbooks where their ideas are implanted into young minds as fact, the evolutionists already have changed their minds and are advocating alternate conclusions with the same certainty and fervor with which they advanced their now discredited views. And this process has been repeating itself for over a century!

There’s an old saying: “Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me.” An honest person with reasonable intelligence cannot be fooled

forever. Sooner or later he will shake his head and conclude that what is touted as “science” is, in fact, superstition. What is asserted as “certain” is, in reality, merely speculation. And what is promoted as “fact” is actually simple bias and personal opinion. If, after 150 years of ongoing efforts by the scientific intelligentsia to validate the theory of evolution, the proof continues to go wanting, hasn’t the time come to abandon the notion as hopelessly, inherently, and irrevocably flawed? Hasn’t the time come to return to the only sane, plausible, scientifically harmonious explanation for the existence of the Universe and everything within it? “The fool has said in his heart, ‘There is no God’” (Psalm 53:1). The fact remains that “[t]he heavens are telling of the glory of God; and their expanse is declaring the work of His hands” (Psalm 19:1, NASB). “For He commanded and they were created” (Psalm 148:5). “Know that the Lord, He is God; It is He who has made us, and not we ourselves” (Psalm 100:3). “For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse” (Romans 1:20).

Dave Miller

QUESTION & ANSWER

Q Were plants or humans created first?

A Most knowledgeable Christians read this question and immediately recall what Genesis 1 teaches: plants were created on day three (vss. 9-11) and humans on day six (vss. 24-31). Skeptics, however, have long criticized Genesis 1 and 2 as being contradictory. According to Bible critic Dennis McKinsey, “God made the fruit trees on the third day and created man three days later” in Genesis 1, but in Genesis 2 “God made man **before** the fruit trees” (1984, 22:1, emp. added). McKinsey’s criticism centers on Genesis 2:8-9a: “The Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden, and there He put the man whom He had formed. And out of the ground the Lord God made every tree grow that is pleasant to the sight and good for food.” Allegedly, these verses contradict the chronology of Genesis 1:9-11,24-31.

The main reason that skeptics see disharmony in the events recorded in the first two chapters of the Bible (especially regarding the order of God’s creation of vegetation and man) is because they fail to realize that **Genesis 1 and 2 serve differ-**

ent purposes. Chapter one (including 2:1-4) focuses on the **order** of the creation events; chapter two (2:5-25) simply provides more detailed information about some of the events mentioned in chapter one.

Consider a basketball announcer who, from beginning to end, tells of every point that each player scores in a particular game. After the game, however, the statistics are tallied, and the announcer informs the audience who scored all of the points, from most to fewest. Whereas earlier, the points were all announced in the precise order in which they were scored (and by whom), later, the results are presented non-sequentially.

Similar to a post-game summary that never is intended to be a regurgitation of what previously was announced sequentially, Genesis 2 never was meant to be a chronological accounting of the Creation. Whereas Genesis 1 is arranged chronologically, Genesis 2 is arranged topically.

Eric Lyons

REFERENCE

McKinsey, Dennis (1984), “The Creation Accounts,” *Biblical Errancy*, 22:1-3, October.