This is a research paper from an 11th grade High School English class written over 30 years ago. By now, many new so-called "proofs" will have probably been "discovered" - and these would *also* have to be shown to be fake or unsubstantiated. But that will have to be someone else's job. There are plenty of resources - especially with the internet available - so it won't be a difficult task. The only requirements would be a mind that was open to *factual* data and a willingness to let go of the fake "science" that many people *religiously* cling to (in spite of the evidence to the contrary) *because they don't want to face the alternatives*.

AN EXAMINATION OF FOSSIL MAN

A Research Paper
Presented to
the English Department of
[#######] High School

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of
English III

---

by
Dennis Hinks

April 1972

OUTLINE

AN EXAMINATION OF FOSSIL MAN

I. Purpose

II. The Fossils Themselves

- A. Early apes
- B. Australopithecus
- C. Homo erectus
- D. Homo sapiens
- E. Rejected fossils

III. Methods of Classification

- A. Brain development
- B. Tooth structure
- C. Dating methods

IV. Conclusion

AN EXAMINATION OF FOSSIL MAN

PURPOSE

Over the past century, scientists have been finding fossils and classifying them as ancestors of man. This has resulted in hundreds of confusing genera and species. Recently, it has been realized that many of these fossils are quite similar, and they have been reclassified under a few primary groups. The purpose of this report is to examine these groups and the methods of classification to see if they actually prove the "descent of man."

THE FOSSILS THEMSELVES

Early apes. The early apes are represented by a diversity of types of fossils. Most of them are represented by only a few fossil fragments. Among the earliest of the apes is Pliopithecus. The most recent finds shows that it resembled a gibbon.[1] Another, Proconsul, whose numerous fragments add up to almost complete skeletons, was a contemporary of Pliopithecus.[2] Oreopithecus was once thought to be ancestral to man, but examination of an almost complete skeleton, found in 1958, has led to the conclusion that it should be placed in an extinct family of its own.[3]

Australopithecus. The Australopithecines were once placed under four different genera. Now they are recognized as one genus, Australopithecus. More than 100 individuals have been found (including single teeth), but there is yet no agreement on the group's position among the primates. The majority of authorities put Australopithecus in a subfamily of its own that has no living representatives. The geological conditions under which the fossils were found make precise dating doubtful. They might have been contemporaries with early man.[4]

Recently, two fossils have been discovered, which were named Zinjanthropus and Homo habilis. Experts disagree whether these should be placed in distinct taxons or with Australopithecus.[5]

---

[1] Howell, F. Clark, Early Man, pp. 36, 41.

[2] Ibid., pp. 36-37, 41.

[3] Coon, Carleton S. and Hunt, Edward E., Jr., eds., Anthropology A to Z, pp. 71-72, 231-232.

[4] McKern, Sharon S., and Thomas W., Tracking Fossil Man, pp. 58-64; Dobzhansky, Theodosius, Evolution, Genetics, and Man, pp. 326-328.

[5] McKern, pp. 65-66, 68.

Homo erectus. Homo erectus is made up of a group of fossils previously known as Java Man (Pithecanthropus), Peking Man (Sianthropus), Heidelberg Man, and many others.[6] These groups are just local varieties with minor differences. Remains from many individuals have been found. Except for the skulls, the remains are very similar to those of modern man.[7]

Homo sapiens. Homo sapiens is divided into two groups: Homo sapiens neanderthalensis (Neanderthal Man) and Homo sapiens sapiens (Cro-Magnon and Modern Men).[8]

Neanderthal Man lived throughout the Eurasian continent. More than 100 fossil remains show that he was of short stature and was ruggedly built. His brain was as large as or larger than that of modern man. There is evidence that he attained a relatively high cultural level and had religious activities.[9]

Cro-Magnon Man replaced the Neanderthal populations. He was, on the average, taller, and had a brain larger than modern man. He made efficient stone tools and left magnificent drawings on walls of caves, which are still admired by man today.[10]

Rejected fossils. Many fossils have been disproved or rejected. For example, Hesperopithecus, once widely publicized as an ape-man, was shown to be an extinct pig.[11] The Piltdown Man was found in textbooks for more than 40 years as one of three main proofs of evolution, until it was proven to be a hoax.[12] Other fossils have been rejected because they looked "too modern" for their age. (See Chart 1.)

METHODS OF CLASSIFICATION

Brain development. This method is one of the main ways of classifying fossils. One problem is that many fossil men had brains larger than modern man. Actually, the brain size isn't what determines intelligence but the brain structure, which is almost impossible to study in fossil man.[13] (See Chart 2.)

---

[6] Ibid., pp. 84-91; Silverberg, Robert, Man Before Adam, pp. 235-236.

[7] Dobzhansky, op. cit., pp. 328-329.

[8] MeKern, op. cit., pp. 110, 114-115.

[9] Dobzhansky, op. cit., pp. 330-331.

[10] Ibid., pp. 331-333.

[11] Morris, Henry M., et al., Science and Creation, pp. 28-29.

[12] Ibid.; Silverberg, op. cit., pp. 143-153.

[13] Klotz, J. W., Genes, Genesis, and Evolution, pp. 323-325; McKern, op. cit., p. 70.

Chart 1: VARIOUS REJECTED FOSSILS[14]

Site	Sponsor	Evidence for	Reasons suspected	Reason rejected
Eyasi	Weinert	restoration	modern teeth, geology	fluorine
1st Olduvai	Leakey	geology and Chellean implements	burial, filed lower incisors, good chin, modern teeth	fluorine
Wadjak	Dubois	brow ridges, low foreheads, geology, largest palate, jaw like Heidelberg	geology, teeth, chin, nose	geology
Keilor	Keith	"irrefutable Pleistocene age"	large skull, reduced 3rd molars, modern teeth, open metopic suture	radiocarbon
Talgai	Mahoney	appearance, very prognathous, large palate, large canines	unknown geology, modern type	vague geology
Cohuna	Keith	very prognathous, heavy brow ridges, largest canines, palate large as male apes, thick skull	vague geology	vague geology
Aitape	Australian Geological Survey	geology	modern type	vague geology
Galley Hill	Keith and Hooton	very fossilized, thick skull, heavy brow ridges	modern type	fluorine

[14] Shute, Evan, Flaws in the Theory of Evolution, pp. 209-210.

Chart 1 (continued)

Site	Sponsor	Evidence for	Reasons suspected	Reason rejected
London	Keith	geology, characters of occipital region and bone	vague geology	vague geology, fluorine
Bury St. Edmunds	Keith	geology, vault was broad and flat	vague geology	vague geology, fluorine
Foxhall	?	geology	jaw only	modern type, vague geology, jaw has long been lost
Kanam and Kanjera	Leakey	geology	vague geology, (?) modern type	vague geology, modern type
Elmenteita	Leakey	geology	vague geology, modern type	vague geology, modern type
Minnesota	Jenks and Hooton	geology, prognathism, largest molars with crowns wrinkled and 3rd molar is larger than 2nd, upper incisors shovelled	modern type	modern type
Punin	?	geology, large teeth, low vault, retreating forehead	geology	geology
Lagoa Santa	Lund. Acad. Sci. Minas Geraes	geology, brow ridges, keeled vaults	geology	geology
Calaveras		geology, brow ridges	modern type	modern type
Other American Finds		geology, fluorine dating, and so on	modern types	modern types

Chart 2: COMPARISON OF BRAIN SIZES[15]

Largest gorilla	- 650 c.c.
Primitive Australians	- low as 900 c.c.
1st Olduvai man	- not estimated yet
Pithecanthropus 1	- 900 to 914 c.c.
Pithecanthropus 2	- 750 c.c.
Sianthropus	- 850 - 1300 c.c.
Rhodesian man	- 1300 c.c.
Ehringsdorf	- 1480 c.c.
Solo man	- 1035 - 1255 c.c.
Swanscombe	- 1325 - 1470 c.c.
Boskop	- 1630 c.c.
Fontechevade	- 1550 c.c.
Neanderthal	
Gibraltar woman	- 1300 c.c.
Neanderthal type	- 1480 c.c.
La Chappelle	- 1625 c.c.
Mount Carmel - man	- 1518 - 1587 c.c.
- woman	- 1271 - 1350 c.c.
Upper Choukoutien	- 1500 c.c.
Cro-Magnon	- 1472 - 1660 c.c.
Modern man	- 910 - 2100
- Wedda	- 910 c.c.
- Austra1ian	- 1250 c.c.
- Eskimo	- 1480 c.c.
- European	- 1320 c.c.

[15] Shute, op. cit., pp. 212-213.

Tooth structure. This method compares the fossil's dentition with that of primates and man. Critics of this method point out that:

> . . . early human types may have had some teeth that are indistinguishable from those of apes and vise versa. Dentitions that at one time would have been confidently assigned to early humans . . . have now been found in the crania of apes.[16]

Dating methods. The two most widely used methods for dating early man are Carbon-14 and Potassium-Argon dating.[17]

Carbon-14 is used for dating organic material. It is produced by cosmic radiation. It was assumed that (1) cosmic ray flux has been essentially constant, and (2) the rate of the production of C-14 is the same as the rate of decay.[18] Unfortunately, it has been shown that the earth's magnetic field has varied in the past few thousand years, causing the amount of C-14 to vary between one-half and one and one-half times the amount produced today.[19] Also, at present, the production rate is greater than the rate of disintegration.[20]

Potassium-Argon is used for dating volcanic rocks and any fossils associated with them. The radioactive Potassium-40 decays into Argon-40. Two problems with this method are (1) there is too much Ar-40 in the earth to have been generated in even several billion years, and (2) the ratio of Ar-40 to Ar-36 (another isotope of Argon) has to remain "exactly as it was the day the rock was formed,"[21] and it can be shown that Ar-36 is the probable product of cosmic radiation (as is Carbon-14), resulting in an increase in the amount of Ar-36 in comparison to the amount of Ar-40.[22]

---

[16] Klotz, op. cit., pp. 325-326.

[17] Howell, op. cit., p. 26.

[18] Morris, Henry M. and Whitcomb, John C., The Genesis Flood, pp. 371-372; Whitelaw, Robert L., "Time,. Life and History in the Light of 15,000 Radiocarbon Dates," Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 7, June, 1970, p. 63.

[19] Armstrong, Harold, "Comments on Scientific News and Views," Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 4, March, 1968, p. 135.

[20] Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 63.

[21] Cook, Melvin A., "RadiologicaL Dating and Some Pertinent Applications of Historical Interest," Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 5, September, 1968, p. 74; Whitelaw, Robert L., "Radiocarbon Confirms Biblical Creation," Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 5, September, 1968, p. 82.

[22] Whitelaw, op. cit., p. 82.

One other dating method is by the measurement of the amount of fluorine absorbed by the bones. Only the relative age, compared with other bones in the same strata, can be determined.[23]

CONCLUSION

In this report, I have shown that the fossil record doesn't support the "descent of man" as will as many would like it to. The fossils often seem to be either too much like modern man or belonging to an extinct race of their own. Besides that, the methods used to classify them do not always work, and sometimes they even contradict each other. Because of this, I believe that such a theory is ridiculous.

---

[23] McKern, op. cit., p. 17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, Harold, "Comments on Scientific News and Views," Creation Research Society Quarterly, 3:21-23, January, 1967.

_____ "Comments on Scientific News and Views," Creation Research Society Quarterly, 4:135-137, March, 1968.

Cook, Melvin A., "Radiological Dating and Some Pertinent Applications of Historical Interest," Creation Research Society Quarterly, 5:69-77, September, 1968.

Coon, Carleton S. and Hunt, Edward E., Jr., eds., Anthropology A to Z, New York, Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., 1963.

Dobzhansky, Theodosius, Evolution, Genetics, and Man, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

Howell, F. Clark, Early Man, New York, Time Inc., 1965.

Klotz, J. W., Genes, Genesis and Evolution, Saint Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1970.

McKern, Sharon S. and Thomas W., Tracking Fossil Man, New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Morris, Henry M., et al., Science and Creation, San Diego, Creation-Science Research Center, 1971.

Morris, Henry M. and Whitcomb, John C., The Genesis Flood, Nutley, The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1961.

Shute, Evan, Flaws in the Theory of Evolution, Nutley, Craig Press, 1969.

Silverberg, Robert, Man Before Adam, Philadelphia, Macrae Smith Company, 1964.

Whitelaw, Robert L., "Radiocarbon Confirms Biblical Creation," Creation Research Society Quarterly, 5:78-83, September, 1968.

_____ "Time, Life and History in the Light of 15,000 Radiocarbon Dates," Creation Research Society Quarterly, 7:56-71, June, 1970.