

HUMAN FOSSILS

Langer's section on the "Origin of Man" is ^{NO LONGER} out of date. You should read a modern work on the subject. For laymen, the best book would be William Howells' Man-kind So Far. Carlton Coon is another very interesting writer; his book is The Origins of Mankind which is in the college library. But he would not normally be accepted.

Most geologists and anthropologists assume that all the human family derives from one ultimate source—that man was man before he sub-divided. C. Coon says that it is not possible to conceive of this, that we have to assume that there were at least three strains that led to man. And that these three strains have given rise to the primary RACES.

In reality, C. Coon is much more right in terms of the problem; and that problem is simply defined this way: that, ultimately, the origin of the races must go back to a creative act of God because there is no possible way to actually explain how the races arose in the areas they now did if they came from only one primary source—if we assume, as archaeologists and anthropologists do, that color and character is all due to environment.

If we attribute it to environment completely as having chosen certain types to survive and not others, you cannot explain how in northern climates there are Eskimos, American Indians, Siberians, and Scandinavians. Or why, in tropical regions, you have Africans and Orientals; or why, in Temperate Zones, you have the two primary non-Negroid races. All these things cannot be wholly explained if mere environment requires one or the other people within a given period of time. In other words, there are too many misplaced peoples to explain the story. And Carlton Coon has a major point.

Another important book by Carlton Coon is The Races of Europe which he has given us personal permission to reproduce in xeroxed form.

Yet another major work is Fossil Men by two Frenchmen, Boule and Vallois.

A very important caution in relation to selection of books in this area: If you want to know what is believed to day, you must read a work that must have been written—must have been written—probably after 1955, certainly after World War II. You must note that 22 years have elapsed since the end of the war, and in this 22 years it is quite clear that an entire new generation of thinking has arisen—because there was nothing during the war. So, from 1937 on to '67 we have 30 years—that's an entire generation of individuals who have grown up now with new finds, and every generation has new ideas. Sometimes there are improvements, and since an immense amount of material has been found since WW II, probably all your best books will be copyrighted or revised in the 1960's when you are dealing with the subject of EARLY MAN. And even then there are facts yet missing.

That doesn't mean that there are not special studies, as by von Konigswald and Weidenreich, two German writers who wrote in English Apes, Giants and Man on the subject of giant fossil finds. These are in the library; they have been quoted in articles in the Plain Truth in the article "There Were Giants on Earth in those Days." There is always something more to be found—I'm not sure whether the present printing of that article even includes the latest find of Atlantipus (check spelling) in North Africa. This find of Atlantropus in North Africa is very interesting and should be mentioned in our publication.

You can go back and read the earlier material and you can see the changes that have occurred, and the concepts of dating that have occurred. But just remember this overall policy of the period from which the material came; then you will at least understand what is accepted today.

Which Fossils are Human?

Normally the facts in the newer books will be much more thorough, perhaps even a bit more accurate, today than before—the interpretation not necessarily so. The question that you face is: How do you distinguish the two—the facts from the interpretation?

Normally, we could say, the facts represent what was found. The interpretation is any description that pertains to the biological origins of such, or to the time element supposedly represented by such early finds. Naturally, because, the little piece of bone that was found—the thigh bone or the jaw—does not have inscribed on it, "I am so-and-so, and I lived at such-and-such a time." In other words, all that is accurate is the measurement of what was found. Anything else is deduced! And most people, in reading the deduction, are seduced!

There is a very useful work in this connection by Ruth Moore, Man, Time, and Fossils, that you should know about and read—a very interesting work on this topic!

Now, I am not sure of my author—and I am sorry about that for the moment because it's a book that was recently done and I have never written it up—but I think again it was by von Konigswald, which has to do with FOSSIL MAN. This is a small volume. The library should have the copy that I had for awhile.*

This book is the only book to my knowledge which deals with the story of how you could tell from a skeleton whether it was human or not.

Now the point is obvious to us, but not to these men, that a person is either a human or he is not a person! Then it is something else! But, if evolution is true, then there must be a time when you couldn't be sure whether it was a human or not. There was a time that the creature might have been born not a human being but, according to evolution, conceived of something that made it human. Because somewhere along the line, somebody had to start it.

They don't even know today how you distinguish human beings from chimpanzees, or creatures like that in terms of culture, because they ^{first} discovered that a tool-making creature—but they discovered that ape-like creatures make tools too, little primitive tools! But, nevertheless, they work—but that's all they can ever do, that's the difference. So right now they don't know how to distinguish the border-line between man and non-man, the thought being that man is a thinking ape—or a "thinking anthropoid" is a better term. And yet, clearly, they have an anthropoid that does the work and has the characteristics of man before, supposedly, he's thinking. This is more the reflex of instinct.

This means they're trying to find a way by which they can decide whether the bone is human or not. To us there would be no problem. We could look at a bone, if we were anthropologically trained, and come to a proper decision, because there is not a bone in the ape's body that is exactly like any human structure. And anybody who was investigating a grave, who was in the field of criminology, could tell whether it was human or not! But if you're in the field of anthropology, you can't—because there is a theory that comes in the way, the theory of evolution! A criminologist could tell whether it were human or not, an anthropologist could not.

~~What he is saying~~ Von Konigswald ~~is~~, the author in this case, has a little book discussing fossil man and he points out, in his estimation, the distinction between what is human and what is not. His conclusion is that there is, if the skeleton is sufficiently complete, one little guide that should be sufficient to tell you that this has to be human. You've heard birds sing, dogs bark, and cats meow but, strangely enough, apes are essentially silent except for some signalling which they do on rare occasion—otherwise maybe a form of chest-beating among the male gorillas! But human beings are different: We symbolize our thoughts; animals only signal. This is the basic definition: Animals signal, human beings symbolize. For a human being

34 * THE EVOLUTION OF MAN. G.H.R. VON KOENIGSWALD. U. OF MICH. PRESS, ANN ARBOR, 1962.

to symbolize his thoughts, he must be able to communicate. That means his tongue must be able to speak.

For the tongue to be able to do so, it must be attached in a certain way. And the very interesting thing is that apes' tongues are not attached as human tongues are: There is a three-point projection on the inside of the lower jaw to which are ultimately attached the muscles that guide the tongue. (And because this particular muscular structure may not always be properly formed at birth, there are some people who are tongue-tied.) So this little projection is very important. And von Konigswald concluded, in his very small book, a thin work, that, when this projection occurs as part of the skeleton, the creature must speak and therefore must be human. And I think that this is absolutely right.

Therefore, the only conclusion we can come to is that when this part of the skeleton is there, and there were no such projections to start with--not because they were worn away but because they just don't exist--then it was not human because a man has to talk. Man has to talk or he is not man! If the creature could speak, as illustrated by this unique little projection--no other creature in the world has it, only man--then we may safely conclude it is human.

Humans and Anthropoids

All of this leads to an amazing conclusion. We used to be told that there were two classes of anthropoids: humans and the true anthropoids.

Now, when Ruth Moore wrote her book--and I didn't understand this when she wrote it because I didn't know that this was the thinking at the time but I do now (because it was not clearly explained and I had never heard it): Normally most people grow up with the idea that there are only Homo Sapiens as a result of deriving from one stock or the other from the anthropoids. And then they thought that the direction of development was this: That when the brain increased man would gradually learn to stand upright because, with a greater brain, he could do more things now and he could think better, could conceive of the use of his hands--or its hands--and it would want to stand up. So the idea originally was that the human brain first developed, and then the rest of the body followed suit. This is the general, original picture that most of you probably grew up with in high school biology.

Then it was discovered before the Second World War (but it really didn't hit the books till afterward) that, according to the theory, there were creatures that stood almost upright, for all practical purposes upright, before their brain capacity had ever increased! So then the idea came forth that the anatomy became human before the brain! And therefore we have what is known as another class of creatures that used to be grouped with Homo Sapiens--that is, this was formerly believed to be early man--but now they call it HOMO ERECTUS. This is a very important point to note--it is not really homo as we shall see. But they call it Homo Erectus. The idea is, it's an upright-walking ape-like creature!

Now, in reality there is no doubt that there is a creature that did walk upright. I do not think this was "The Abominable Snowman" or any such tradition! But there is plain evidence of such a creature. One is Sinanthropus from China (Man, Time, and Fossils, Ruth Moore, pp. 263-281). Another might well be considered "Java Man" (Fossil Men, Boule and Vallois, pp. 398-399; Ruth Moore, pp. 243-257) or other terms that are applied to certain types like that, and certain varieties in Africa. I used to wonder for a long time whether so-called "Java Man" or Sinanthropus in China ("Peking Man") were really men. It turns out now that these may all properly be defined as Homo Erectus. Their skeletons tend to be erect, they have a brain capacity normally less than man and normally greater than an anthropoid.

Is this evolution or is it not?

Well, von Konigswald points out that in every case Homo Erectus has two characteristics that are non-human: All anthropoids of this level (that don't walk upright but can stretch) have a SAGITTAL CREST—and also a RIDGE at the back of the skull. NO HUMAN BEING HAS EITHER.

Now, in the case of Homo Erectus, there are two characteristics that are obvious: One, the creatures could never speak! "Java Man" did not speak; "Peking Man" did not speak! Therefore it is not "Java MAN"—it is not "man!" It's "Java something-or-other" but it's not man and it's "Peking something or other" but it's not man. So it turns out that they could not speak and, two, all of them have a ridge on the back of the skull characteristic of anthropoids!

This means that just as there is a great difference between an ape and a monkey, so—and a baboon, you know, or a lemur (I mean, you have these varieties—you have a lemur, you might have a baboon, you might have a monkey, and then you have the ape)—in this case there is one variety that has died out presumably at the Flood, and this is Homo Erectus. That is, I don't know of any evidence of this creature existing later. It appears that Homo Erectus may have died out at the Flood—essentially this was an upright-walking ape, a creature that must have needed to walk upright to feed (??—see?), instead of a creature that normally walked on all fours (or at least bent over), and could do so when necessary. The bone structure was such in the hips that there is no question but what this creature walked upright. What anthropologists have assumed, therefore, is that this must be evolution. That's just an assumption because nobody can prove it—I mean, there isn't any creature around to tell you.

But this creature clearly had every characteristic that is non-human: A human being does not have A RIDGE AT THE BACK OF THE HEAD, does not have A SAGITTAL CREST, and does have THE THREE-POINTED PROJECTION FROM THE INSIDE OF THE LOWER JAW TO WHICH THE TONGUE IS ATTACHED FOR SPEECH.

Homo Erectus, in most instances, may have even had a slight crest but very possibly it was extremely minor. Really I think this depends on the variety of it; but at least the other [I take it he is referring to the ridge at the back] was there in every case.

Then there is also the idea that primitive human beings were weird-looking, ape-like creatures: If you look at the skull of so-called "Java Man" or "Peking Man," you would discover that there is not sufficient brain capacity in the confines of the skull even to be human; that is, the pattern is wrong. You understand, you could have a great big ape that might have, indeed, more brain volume than some pygmy human beings in Java today where there are microcephalic people. The difference is in the FORM of that BRAIN. These creatures, the non-humans we have been discussing, have a skull that tends to drop back right from the top of the brow ridge—it does not rise up. Therefore these creatures were just not human. In other words, instead of Homo Erectus being placed in the human category, we should put it on a level down along with monkeys and baboons and lemurs—and a few humans who have fallen to that level! Because any human being who thinks he came from this level rightly belongs there!!

The SAGITTAL CREST is located right through the center of the skull at the top, and it joins a ridge that runs the other way. It is not something that protrudes way up—it is the fact that it comes to a kind of point here, it is not smooth on apes. You can see these skeletal structures upon examination.

Now, this is as far as I want to go today, but this will give you an idea, when you read this material, how to approach it. When I found out these things from von Konigswald's work it relieved me a great deal because there were always these problems of how to explain this positively—I wondered, "Was it man or was it not?" The answer is, "It was not" and, in this case, DuBois, the finder of "Java Man" was right when he said that, in the end, he concluded his find could not have been human.

These creatures classified Homo Erectus are all from the Pleistocene or the pre-Flood world.

MAN'S PLACE IN NATURE

*Present and former designation of the main groups
of fossil hominids*

	<i>Modern designation</i>		<i>Former designation</i>
Pleistocene	<i>Homo sapiens</i>	<i>sapiens</i>	<i>Homo sapiens</i>
Upper	<i>Homo sapiens</i>	<i>neanderthalensis</i> <i>rhodesiensis</i> <i>soloensis</i> <i>steinheimensis</i>	<i>Homo neanderthalensis</i> <i>Homo rhodesiensis</i> <i>Homo soloensis</i>
Middle	<i>Homo erectus</i>	<i>africanus</i> <i>heidelbergensis</i> <i>javanensis</i> <i>pekinensis</i>	<i>Pithecanthropus africanus</i> or <i>Australopithecus africanus</i> <i>Pithecanthropus heidelbergensis</i> <i>Pithecanthropus erectus</i> or <i>javanensis</i> <i>Pithecanthropus pekinensis</i> or <i>Sinanthropus</i>
Lower	<i>Australopithecus</i>	<i>robustus</i> <i>boisei</i> <i>africanus</i>	<i>Paranthropus</i> <i>Zinjanthropus</i>
		<i>Homo habilis?</i>	

The genus Homo

In recent years it has been widely agreed that forms of hominid other than the Australopithecines should be classified under the single genus *Homo*. This means that the numerous fossils from localities in Africa, Europe, North China and Indonesia formerly grouped within the genus '*Pithecanthropus*' or even accorded separate generic status have now been transferred to form a new species of man, *Homo erectus*. Another concept to be discarded is that Neanderthal and other more or less closely related forms showing characteristics that mark them off from the living races of men qualify as a distinct species. The modern view is rather that they form sub-specific varieties of *Homo sapiens*, such as *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis* or *soloensis*, and that modern man *Homo sapiens sapiens* is merely the sub-species that happens to have been living during the last thirty thousand years or so.

Homo erectus
since they
were first
further sp
living the
large of
during the
at the m
implant
pits. Mo
Australopithecus
equally
the most
a mandib
ence age
increase
in a pale
Chick
less inter
the other
man of
is a low
the of
is in
showing
ally th
the most
for them
can to a
the man
ment of
and wa
likely