

THE FOSSIL RECORD

The Only Direct Evidence

S. M. Stanley, Johns Hopkins, "It is doubtful whether, in the absence of fossils, the idea of evolution would represent anything more than an outrageous hypothesis...The fossil record and only the fossil record provides direct evidence of major sequential changes in the Earth's biota." *New Evolutionary Timetable*, p.72, 1981

Historical – Not Empirical

John H. Horner "...paleontology is a historical science, a science based on circumstantial evidence, after the fact. We can never reach hard and fast conclusions in our study of ancient plants and animals... These days it's easy to go through school for a good many years, sometimes even through college, without ever hearing that some sciences are historical or by nature inconclusive." *Dinosaur Lives*, 1997, p.19

In Their "Beginning: "Sudden," "Complex," "Diverse," "Every Animal Phylum; Assumed History Missing

"Sudden," Richard Dawkins, Cambridge, "And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists. ...the only alternative explanation of the sudden appearance of so many complex animal types in the Cambrian era is divine creation..." *The Blind Watchmaker*, 1986, p229-230

All Designs, Stephen J. Gould, Harvard, "The Cambrian Explosion occurred in a geological moment, and we have reason to think that all major anatomical designs may have made their evolutionary appearance at that time. ...not only the phylum Chordata itself, but also all its major divisions, arose within the Cambrian Explosion. ...Contrary to Darwin's expectation that new data would reveal gradualistic continuity with slow and steady expansion, all major discoveries of the past century have only heightened the massiveness and geological abruptness of this formative event..." *Nature*, Vol.377, 26 10/95, p.682.

"Since the so called Cambrian Explosion... no new Phyla of animals have entered the fossil record." Lecture at SMU, 10/2/1990

Magical, Not Gradual, Mikhail Matz, University of Texas, Austin ... the Cambrian Explosion... "It wasn't a gradual development of complexity," Matz said. "Instead these things suddenly seemed to burst out of a magic box." *MSNBC*, Nov.20, 2008

Evolutionist's Headache, "The fossils from the Cambrian period can cause a real headache for evolutionary biologists. ... "expect simple organisms evolving over time to become increasingly more complex." "However during the Cambrian period there was an apparent explosion of different major groups of animals, all appearing simultaneously in the fossil record. ... -comparable to the morphological variety of their living cousins-when we first encounter them in the Cambrian fossil record." *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 8/10/12

Current Documentation, "The fossil record of early animals has documented an early Cambrian explosion of metazoan body plans, evidenced by the stratigraphic first occurrences of fossils of almost all animal phyla in the early Cambrian." *Geology*, May 2018

"Trees" Contradicted By Fossils

From SOME SIMILARITIES, Ignoring Others, Not From Fossils

Stephen J. Gould, Harvard, "The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of the fossils." *Natural History*, V.86, p.13.

R.H.Dott, U.OF Wis. & R.L.Batten, Columbia, AMNH, "We have arranged the groups in a traditional way with the 'simplest' forms first, and progressively more complex groups following. This particular arrangement is arbitrary and depends on what definition of 'complexity' you wish to choose. ...things are alike because they are related, and the less they look alike, the further removed they are from their common ancestor." *Evolution Of The Earth*, p.602.

Similarity Is Not Genetic, Sir Gavin Debeer, Prof. Embryology, Oxford, Director British Museum of Natural History, "It is now clear that the pride with which it was assumed that the inheritance of homologous structures from a common ancestor explained homology was misplaced; for such inheritance cannot be ascribed to identity of genes. The attempt to find homologous genes has been given up as hopeless." *Oxford Biology Reader*, p.16, Homology an Unsolved Problem

Outdated Similarity Claim:

Richard Dawkins, Cambridge, Chimpanzees and we share more than 99 per cent of our genes," *Blind Watchmaker*, p.263

Latest Estimates: "The Myth of 1%" "studies are showing that [humans and chimps] are not as similar as many tend to believe", "chunks of missing DNA, extra genes, altered connections ... the very structure of chromosomes confound any quantification of 'humanness' versus 'chimpaness.'" *Science*, June 29, 2007. **Now Know, Radically Different.** "...comparison...now reveals that they differ radically in sequence structure and gene content... Chimpanzee genome is 10-15% longer; 50% of the human genes were missing from the chimp; One third more gene categories; Entirely different classes of genes." *Nature* 28 Jan. 2010

Relatives (Claimed & Unclaimed)

Blood Serum.....**Chimpanzee**
(If "right" antiserum used)
Milk Chemistry... **Cockroach**
Cholesterol.....**Garter Snake**
Teeth.....**Fish**
Foot Structure.....**Glacial Bear**
Tear Enzyme.....**Chicken**
Blood Antigen A.....**Butter Bean**
Brain Hormone.....**Cockroach**

Required Transitional Forms Missing

Darwin's Biggest Problem, "...innumerable transitional forms must have existed but why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth? ...why is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain, and this perhaps is the greatest objection which can be urged against my theory". *Origin Of The Species*, Facsimile of First Edition, 1964, p.172

"Prediction Was Wrong," Niles Eldridge, American Museum Of Natural History, "He prophesied that future generations of paleontologists would fill in these gaps by diligent search. ...it has become abundantly clear that the fossil record will not confirm this part of Darwin's predictions. Nor is the problem a miserably poor record. The fossil record simply shows that this prediction was wrong." *The Myths of Human Evolution*, p.45-46

Myths Busted, Derek Ager, Past President, British Geological Association, "It must be significant that nearly all the evolutionary stories I learned as a student...have now been 'debunked.' Similarly, my own experience of more than twenty years looking for evolutionary lineages among the Mesozoic Brachiopoda has proved them equally elusive." *Proceedings of Geological Association*, Vol.87, p.132

Worse Now, David M. Raup, University of Chicago; "The evidence we find in the geologic record is not nearly as compatible with Darwinian natural selection as we would like it to be. Darwin was completely aware of this. He was embarrassed by the fossil record because it didn't look the way he predicted it would... Well, we are now about 120 years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but the situation hasn't changed much. ...ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time. By this I mean some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as the result of more detailed information." *Field Museum Of Natural History Bulletin*, V.50, p.35.

Proposed Links "Debunked"

Opposite Order: A.S. Romer, Harvard, "In South America the one toed fossil is found below the three-toed fossils." Text Book Deceit, George G. Simpson, "The uniform, continuous transformation of Hyracotherium into Equus, so dear to the hearts of generations of textbook writers never happened in nature." *Life Of The Past*, p.119.

Birds Earlier, "Fossil remains claimed to be of two crow-sized birds 75 million years older than Archaeopteryx have been found...a paleontologist at Texas Tech University, who found the fossils, says they have advanced avian features. ...tends to confirm what many paleontologists have long suspected, that Archaeopteryx is not on the direct line to modern birds." *Nature*, Vol.322, 1986 p.677.

Stephen M. Stanley, Johns Hopkins University, "In fact, the fossil record does not convincingly document a single transition from one species to another." *The New Evolutionary Timetable*, 1981, p.95.

Stasis, Not Evolution

"Stasis" Defined: "...little or no evolutionary change in a species..." *Wikipedia*

Data Falsifies, Stephen J. Gould, Harvard, "...sample a species at a large number of horizons well spread over several million years, and if these samples record no net change, with beginning and end points substantially the same, ...then a conclusion of stasis rest on the presence of data, not on the absence!... Stasis existed in overwhelming abundance, as every paleontologist always knew. ...most common pattern in the fossil record... primary signal of the fossil record, ... Darwin's expectations defined evolution as gradual change. ...In this context, stasis can only record sorrow and disappointment. ...an empirical signal of quite stunning contrariness ... empirical falsification." *Structure of Evolutionary Theory*, p.31, 32 759-760, 2002

Present Consensus, Donald R. Prothero, Professor of Geology, California Institute of Technology (Author of Five Geology Textbooks) "Many paleontologists came forward and pointed out that the geological literature was one vast monument to stasis, with relatively few cases where anyone had observed gradual evolution. As Gould put it, it was the 'dirty little secret' hidden in the paleontological closet. ...paleontologists all over the world saw that stasis was the general pattern, and that gradualism was rare-and that is still the consensus 40 year later." *Skeptic*, Feb. 12, 2015

Blind Faith Believes

A.C. Seward, Cambridge "The theoretically primitive type eludes our grasp; our faith postulates its existence by the type fails to materialize." *Plant Life Through the Ages*, p.561

Summary From Antagonistic Witnesses:

"The Evidence", "Delights" Creationists *** "Embarrassed" Evolutionists ("Headache" – "Magic Box") *** "Sorrow and disappointment" *** "empirical falsification" *** Darwin's Biggest Problem (Worse Now) *** Links "Debunked" *** Still "Monument to Stasis" *** Nevertheless, Blind Faith Believes

Fossils Do Not Support Evolution. Fossils Are Positive Evidence For Creation!

Fossil Man

APES FROM? Donald Johanson, "At any rate, modern gorillas, orangs and chimpanzees spring out of nowhere, as it were. They are here today; they have no yesterday..." *Lucy*, p.363. **Richard Leakey**, "Unfortunately, the fossil record is somewhat incomplete as far as the hominids are concerned, and is all but blank for the apes." *Making Of Mankind*, 43

AMOUNT OF EVIDENCE? **David Pilbeam** [Harvard] comments wryly, "If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meager evidence we've got he'd surely say, 'Forget it; there isn't enough to go on.'" *The Making Of Mankind*, p.43

FROM APES, **Charles Darwin**, "But a naturalist undoubtedly would have ranked as an ape or a monkey...however much the conclusion may revolt our pride, that our early progenitors would have been properly designated." *The Descent Of Man*, p.520. **Earnst A. Hooten**, Harvard, "If we are descended from apes our remote ancestors ought to look their part. You may not be willing to admit that you resemble an ape;... But if that thousandth ancestor's forebearers become progressively more simian as you trace back the genealogical lines you will have to admit that somewhere in your family tree there squats an ape." *Up From The Ape*, p.289. **George Gaylord Simpson**, Harvard "On this subject, by the way, there has been way too much pussyfooting. Apologists emphasize that man cannot be the descendant of any living ape—a statement that is obvious to the verge of imbecility—and go on to state or imply that man is not really descended from an ape or monkey at all, but from an earlier common ancestor. In fact, that earlier ancestor would certainly be called an ape or monkey in popular speech by anyone who saw it. Since the terms *ape* and *monkey* are defined by popular usage, man's ancestors were apes or monkeys (or successively both). It is pusillanimous [cowardly—DP] if not dishonest for an informed investigator to say otherwise." (emp. in orig.) *This View Of Life*, p. 12

Reconstructions Are Unscientific

RECONSTRUCTIONS? **Earnst A. Hooten**, Harvard, "To attempt to restore the soft parts is an even more hazardous undertaking. The lips, the eyes, the ears, and the nasal tip, leave no clues on the underlying bony parts. You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthaloid skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely only to mislead the public.... So put not your trust in reconstructions." *Up From The Ape*, p.332. **W. Howells**, Harvard, "A great legend has grown up to plague both paleontologists and anthropologists. It is that one of these wondrous men can take a tooth or a small and broken piece of bone, gaze at it, and pass his hand over his forehead once or twice, and then take a sheet of paper and draw a picture of what the whole animal looked like as it tramped the Tertiary terrain. If this were quite true, the anthropologists would make the F.B.I. look like a troop of Boy Scouts." *Mankind So Far*, p.138.

OBJECTIVE? **David Pilbeam**, Yale, "I am also aware of the fact that, at least in my own subject of paleoanthropology, 'theory' - heavily influenced by implicit ideas - almost always dominates 'data.' ...Ideas that are totally unrelated to actual fossils have dominated theory building, which in turn strongly influences the way fossils are interpreted." *Bones Of Contention*, p.127. **Lord Z. Zuckerman**, "We then move right off the register of objective truth into those fields of presumed biological science, like extrasensory perception or the interpretation of man's fossil history, where to the faithful anything is possible - where the ardent believer is sometimes able to believe several contradictory things at the same time." *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, p.19

"Family Trees" Are Unscientific

BASIS, **Roger Lewin**, Ed., Research News, *Science*, "The key issue is the ability correctly to infer a genetic relationship between two species on the basis of a similarity in appearance...can be deceptive, partly because similarity of structure does not necessarily imply an identical genetic heritage: a shark (which is a fish) and a porpoise (which is a mammal) look similar..." *Bones Of Contention*, 1987, p.123. **ANCESTORS?** **Richard C. Lewontin**, Harvard, "Look, I'm a person who says in this book [Human Diversity, 1982] that we don't know anything about the ancestors of the human species. All the fossils which have been dug up and are claimed to be ancestors - we haven't the faintest idea whether they are ancestors. ...All you've got is Homo sapiens there, you've got that fossil there, you've got another fossil there...and it's up to you to draw the lines. Because there are no lines." *Harper's*, 2/84. **UNRELIABLE J. Lowenstein & Adriene Zihlman**, "But anatomy and the fossil record cannot be relied on for defining evolutionary lineages. Yet, paleontologist persist in doing just this. ...the subjective element in this approach to building evolutionary trees, which many paleontologist advocate with almost religious fervor, is demonstrated by the outcome: there is no single family tree on which they agree." *Nature*, 1992, Vol.355, p.78. **LINE UP?** **Bernard Wood**, Prof. Of Human Origins, George Washington U. "There is a popular image of human evolution that you'll find all over the place. ...On the left of the picture there's an ape... On the right, a man... Between the two is a succession of figures that become ever more like humans... Our progress from ape to human looks so smooth, so tidy. It's such a beguiling image that even the experts are loath to let it go. But it is an illusion." *New Scientist*, 10/26/02. **MARY LEAKEY'S CONCLUSION**, According To Associated Press, "Since scientists can never prove a particular scenario of human evolution, Leakey said "all these trees of life with their branches of our ancestors, that's a lot of nonsense." 12/9/1996

Australopithecus Is An Ape

LEAKEYS DENY, **Roger Lewin**, Ed., Research News, *Science*, Richard and his parents, Louis and Mary, have held to a view of human origins for nearly half a century now that the line of true man, the line of Homo - large brain, toolmaking and so on - has a separate ancestry that goes back millions and millions of years. And the ape-man, Australopithecus, has nothing to do with human ancestry." *Bones Of Contention*, 1987, p.18. **DEFECTION**, "Dr. Leakey bases his repudiation of Darwin on the results of his long search in East Africa for the remains of the original man. The generally accepted post-Darwin view is that man developed from the baboon 3 to 5 million years ago. But Leakey has found no evidence of a spurt in development at that time." *Chicago American*, 1/25, 1967

DISMISSED APE, **Lord Solly Zuckerman**, "His Lordship's scorn for the level of competence he sees displayed by paleoanthropologists is legendary, exceeded only by the force of his dismissal of the australopithecines as having anything at all to do with human evolution. 'They are just bloody apes', he is reputed to have observed on examining the australopithecine remains in South Africa. ...Zuckerman had become extremely powerful in British science, being an adviser to the government up to the highest level. ...while at Oxford and then Birmingham universities, he had vigorously pursued a metrical and statistical approach to studying the anatomy of fossil hominids. ...it was on this basis that he underpinned his lifelong rejection of the australopithecines as human ancestors." *Bones Of Contention*, 1987, p.164, 165. "The australopithecine skull is in fact so overwhelmingly simian as opposed to human (figure 5) that the contrary proposition could be equated to an assertion that black is white." *Beyond The Ivory Tower*, p.78

FEET LIKE APE, **A. afarensis**...The recent description of four articulating foot bones from 3-3.5 Myr deposits in the South African cave site of Sterkfontein support this. ...the divergent big toe indicates some degree of prehensile grasping as in apes. Developmental patterns were also more ape-like...ecologically they may still be considered apes." *Nature*, 376, 8/17/1995, p.556. **LIKE APE,** **William Howells**, Harvard, "...the pelvis was by no means modern, nor were the feet: the toes were more curved than ours; the heel bones lacked our stabilizing tubercles; and a couple of small ligaments that, in us, tighten the arch from underneath, were apparently not present. The finger bones were curved as they are in tree-climbing apes. ...Here is something of an enigma. Excellent evidence of a very modern foot from the hominid footprints at Laetoli. Excellent evidence of hominid but not fully modern feet from the Afar bones. Russel Tuttle of the University of Chicago, a leading expert on hominoid gaits and limbs, finds that all aspects of the footprints, especially toe proportions, are remarkably like modern human feet and that the Afar feet are significantly less than human." *Getting Here*, 1993, p.79. **LIKE ORANGUTAN,** **Charles E. Oxnard**, Dean of Graduate School, Prof. of Biology & Anatomy, USC, "...conventional wisdom is that the australopithecine fragments are generally rather similar to humans...the new studies point to different conclusions. The new investigations suggest that the fossil fragments are usually uniquely different from any living form: when they do have similarities with living species, they are as often as not reminiscent of the orangutan, ...these results imply that the various australopithecines are really not all that much like humans. ...may well have been bipeds...but if so, it was not in the human manner. They may also have been quite capable climbers as much at home in the trees as on the ground." *The American Biology Teacher*, Vol.41, 5/1979, pp.273-4. **LIKE PYGMY CHIMP,** **Adrienne L. Zihlman**, U.C. Santa Cruz, "Zihlman compares the pygmy chimpanzee to 'Lucy', one of the oldest hominid fossils known, and finds the similarities striking. They are almost identical in body size, in stature and in brain size... These commonalities, Zihlman argues, indicate that pygmy chimps use their limbs in much the same way Lucy did..." *Science News*, Vol.123, 2/5. 1983, p.89

THE PROPAGANDA, "...this human ancestor blurred the lines between ape and human. For example... her femur from knee to hip is close to that of a modern human, implying she walked efficiently on two legs." *National Geographic*, 11/2006, p.151. **The Actual Evidence**, "...incisors are larger...and their overall morphology is similar to that of juvenile apes. The gorilla-like scapula and long and curved manual phalanges raise new questions..." The shape of the scapula resembles the scapulae of juvenile and adult gorillas... "Now that the scapula of this species can be examined in full for the first time, it is unexpected to find the strongest similarities with Gorilla...weight-bearing and terrestrial knuckle-walking... these australopithecines can be accommodated within the range of intraspecific variation of African apes" *Nature* 443 (9/2006), p.296

LAETOLIE FOOTPRINTS "...belonged to the genus Homo (or true man), rather than to man-apes (like Australopithecus, who was once a thought to be the forerunner of man but is now regarded as a possible evolutionary dead end)...they were 3.35 million to 3.75 million years old. ...in Mary Leakey's words, be people 'not unlike ourselves.'" *Time*, 11/10/1975, p.93

LUCY'S FEET, "A. afarensis...The recent description of four articulating foot bones from 3-3.5 Myr deposits in the South African cave site of Sterkfontein support this. ...the divergent big toe indicates some degree of prehensile grasping as in apes." *Nature*, 376, 8/17/1995, p.556

SHRIVELED STATUS, **Matt Cartmill**, Duke; **David Pilbeam**, Harvard; **Glynn Isaac**, Harvard, "The australopithecines are rapidly shrinking back to the status of peculiarly specialized apes..." *American Scientist*, July-August 1986, p.419; **David Pilbeam**, Harvard, Ed., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 4/10/2007, Mandibular ramus morphology on a recently discovered specimen of Australopithecus afarensis closely matches that of gorillas... The presence of the morphology in both the latter and Au. afarensis and its absence in modern humans cast doubt on the role of Au. afarensis as a modern human ancestor."

NEWEST ANCESTOR? "Workers at the zoo say that's when she started walking upright exclusively. ...A zoo veterinarian says he's not sure why she has altered her behaviour, speculating that the illness could have caused brain damage." *CBC Health & Science News*, 7/22/04

Failed Links: Piltdown Man, Nebraska Man, Java Man, Peking Man

BELIEVE A SEE, Roger Lewin, Ed. Re. News, *Science*, "How is it that trained men, the greatest experts of their day, could look at a set of modern human bones - the cranial fragments - and 'see' a clear simian signature in them; and 'see' in an ape's jaw the unmistakable signs of humanity? The answers, inevitably, have to do with the scientists' expectations and their effects on the interpretation of data. ...It is, in fact, a common fantasy, promulgated mostly by the scientific profession itself, that in the search for objective truth, data dictate conclusions. If this were the case, then each scientist faced with the same data would necessarily reach the same conclusion. But as we've seen earlier and will see again and again, frequently this does not happen. Data are just as often molded to fit preferred conclusions." *Bones Of Contention*, p.61, 68

FRAUDULENT, Ales Hrdlicka, Smithsonian (Re: Java Man) "None of the published illustrations or casts now in various institutions is accurate." *Science*, 8/17/1923

EVIDENCE MISSING, William Howells, Harvard, "Java Man went into Dubois' locker for a time. But Peking Man seems to have gone into Davy Jones' locker, and for good. He disappeared, one of the first casualties of the war in the Pacific, half a million years after he had died the first time." *Mankind In The Making*, p.165

CONTEMPORARY, "[H. erectus] would have been alive when modern human and Neandertals roamed the earth. ...If the dates are right, we have three different species coexisting at the same time..." *Science*, V.274, p.1841, 12/13/1996

Homo erectus=Homo sapien, S.C.Anton, Anthropologist, U. of FL, "Anthropologist **Milford H. Wolpoff** of the University of Michigan...argue[s] that *H. erectus* fossils actually belong to an anatomically diverse form of *H. sapiens*... 'The proper way to define both a living and a fossil species is the \$64,000 question,' Anton states." *Science News*, V.150, p.373, 12/14/1996

Neanderthal, Cro-Magnon Are Men

BAD IMAGE, Ian Tattersall, Head Dep. of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, "But quite as important as new Neanderthal finds in the 50's was the recognition, finally, that the stooped-shoulder, bent-kneed, stereotype of these humans created by Marcellin Boule was totally false." *The Fossil Trail*, 1995, p.101

EVOLUTION OR VARIATION? "...a Neanderthal is a model of evolutionary refinement. Put him in a Brooks Brothers suit and send him down to the supermarket for some groceries and he might pass completely unnoticed. He might run a little shorter than the clerk serving him but he would not necessarily be the shortest man in the place. He might be heavier-featured, squattier and more muscular than most, but again he might be no more so than the porter handling the beer cases back in the stock room." *EVOLUTION*, Time-Life Nature Library.

REHABILITATED, Richard Leakey "...to refer to someone as 'Neanderthal' was and still is to some extent, an intended insult. Rehabilitation, however, began in the mid-50s when two anatomists, William Straus and A.J.E. Cave, undertook a second reconstruction ... a body which, though somewhat stocky, was essentially like modern man's. ...The brain is slightly larger than that of modern humans... The Neandertals average height was around 1.67 meters (5 feet 8 inches). ...is unquestionably *Homo sapiens*. ...The arrangement of flowers was not random: they were carefully placed around the body... A concern for the fate of the human soul... ritual burial, they speak clearly of a deep feeling for the spiritual quality of life..." *Making Of Mankind*, 1981, p.148, 153

LARGER BRAIN, William Howells, Harvard, "The Neanderthal brain was most positively and definitely not smaller than our own; indeed, and this is a rather bitter pill, it appears to have been perhaps a little larger." *MANKIND SO FAR*, p.165

"FULLY HUMAN," Mat Cartmill, Duke U., President, American Association of Physical Anthropology, "I tend to think they [Neanderthals] had fully human language. After all, they had larger brains than those of most modern humans, made elegant stone tools, and knew how to use tools." *Discover*, 11/98, p.62

MODERN CAME FIRST, O. Bar-Yosef, Peabody Museum, Harvard, B. Vandermeersch, U. Bordeaux, "Modern *Homo sapiens* preceded Neanderthals at Mt. Carmel. ...modern looking *H. sapiens* had lived in one of the caves some 50,000 to 100,000 years ago, much earlier than such people had been thought to exist anywhere. ...The results have shaken the traditional evolutionary scenario, producing more questions than answers." *Scientific American*, p.94, 4/1993

DNA, "The genetic variation seen between the modern and Neanderthal sequences is within the range of other single species of primates..." *Science*, V.277, 7/11/1997, p.177
"But some researchers believe the data can be interpreted differently. ...The amount of diversity between Neanderthals and living humans is not exceptional." *Scientific American*, 1/1998

PROTEIN, "...extracted and sequenced protein from a Neanderthal from Shanidar Cave, Iraq..." *Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences*, March 8, 2005, p.62

NEANDERTAL FLUTE, Matches Do, Re, Mi scale, *Science*, 5/97 p.203; *Scientific American*, 9/7

Man "Older" Than Proposed Ancestors

RUINED FAMILY TREE, "Either we toss out this skull [1470] or we toss out our theories of early man," asserts anthropologist Richard Leakey of this 2.8-million-year-old fossil, which he has tentatively identified as belonging to our own genus. "It simply fits no previous models of human beginnings." The author, son of famed anthropologist Louis S. B. Leakey, believes the skull's surprisingly large braincase "leaves in ruins the notion that all early fossils can be arranged in an orderly sequence of evolutionary change." *National Geographic*, 6/1973, p.819

HUMAN BRAIN, "Leakey further describes the whole shape of the brain case [1470] as remarkably reminiscent of modern man, lacking the heavy and protruding eyebrow ridges and thick bone characteristics of *Homo erectus*." *Science News*, 102, 4/3/72, p.324

HUMAN BRAIN, Dean Falk, S.U. of N.Y. at Albany, "...KNM-ER 1805 [*Homo habilis*] should not be attributed to *Homo*... the shape of the endocast from KNM-ER (basal view) is similar to that from an African pongid, where as the endocast of KNM-ER 1470 is shaped like that of a modern human." *Science*, 221, (9/9/83) p.1073

HUMAN BRAIN "The foremost American experts on human brain evolution - Dean Falk of the State University of New York at Albany and Ralph Holloway of Columbia University-usually disagree, but even they agree that Broca's area is present in a skull from East Turkana known as 1470 Philip Tobias...renowned brain expert from South Africa concurs." *Antbro Quest: The Leakey's Foundation News*. No.43 (Spring 91) p.13

"THE OLDEST MAN" "[African Footprints] ...they belonged to the genus *Homo* (or true man), rather than to man-apes (like *Australopithecus*, who was once a thought to be the forerunner of man but is now regarded as a possible evolutionary dead end). ...they were 3.35 million to 3.75 million years old. ...they would, in Mary Leakey's words, be people 'not unlike ourselves'..." *Time*, 11/10/1975, p.93

TOO HUMAN - TOO OLD, Russel H. Tuttle, Professor of Anthropology, U. of Chicago, Affiliate Scientist, Primate Research Center, Emory U., "In sum, the 3.5-million-year-old footprint trails at Laetoli sight G resemble those of habitually unshod modern humans. ...If the G footprints were not known to be so old, we would readily conclude that they were made by a member of our genus ...In any case we should shelve the loose assumption that the Laetoli footprints were made by Lucy's kind..." *Natural History*, 3/90, p.64.

MODERN & TALL, Richard Leakey, "...the boy from Turkana was surprisingly large compared with modern boys his age; he could well have grown to six feet. ...he would probably go unnoticed in a crowd today. This find combines with previous discoveries of *Homo erectus* to contradict a long-held idea that humans have grown larger over the millennia." *National Geographic*, p.629, 11/1985 "...we now conclude that the Turkana boy was about nine years old when he died, and not eleven, as I'd initially supposed." *Origin of Humankind*, 1994, p.51

Man Even "Before" Lucy

Charles E. Oxnard, Dean, Grad. School, Prof. Bio. and Anat., USC, "...earlier finds, for instance, at Kanapoi...existed at least at the same time as, and probably even earlier than, the original gracile australopithecines... almost indistinguishable in shape from that of modern humans at four and a half million years..." *American Biology Teacher*, Vol.41, 5/1979, p.274. **Henry M. Mchenry**, U. of C., Davis, "The results show that the Kanapoi specimen, which is 4 to 4.5 million years old, is indistinguishable from modern *Homo sapiens*..." *Science*, Vol.190, p.428.

WILLIAM HOWELLS, Harvard, "...with a date of about 4.4 million, [KP 271] could not be distinguished from *Homo sapiens* morphologically or by multivariate analysis by Patterson and myself in 1967 (or by much more searching analysis by others since then). We suggested that it might represent *Australopithecus* because at that time allocation to *Homo* seemed preposterous, although it would be the correct one without the time element." *Homo Erectus*, 1981, p.79-80.

Racism

DARWIN WAS A RACIST, "At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes... will no doubt be exterminated.. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla." *The Descent of Man*, p.178

HAECKEL WAS A RACIST, "African Man-like Apes are black in colour, and like their countrymen, the Negroes, have the head long from back to front... The Asiatic Man-like Apes are, on the contrary mostly brown, or yellowish-brown in colour, and have the head short from front to back, like their countrymen, the Malays and Mongols." Haeckel, 1876, Vol.II, p.180

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS **Stephen J. Gould**, Harvard, "Biological arguments for racism may have been common before 1850, but they increased by orders of magnitude following the acceptance of evolutionary theory." *Ontogeny and Phylogeny*, 1977, pp.127-128

"Recapitulation provided a convenient focus for the pervasive racism of white scientist; they looked to the activities of their own children for comparison with normal adult behaviors in lower races. [Quotes Henry Fairfield Osborne of American Museum of Natural History] The standard of intelligence of the average adult Negro is similar to that of the eleven-year-old of the species *Homo sapiens*." *Natural History*, 4/1980 p.144

Variation within kind is observed - Evolution is not observed!