THERE THEY GO AGAIN!

ANOTHER MISSING LINK

by John D. Morris

Evolutionists deeply yearn for “The Missing Link”—that hypothetical intermediary between man and his supposed ape-like ancestor. That yearning seemingly speaks of more than a desire to solve a scientific mystery. Rather, it seems to belie a desire to firmly establish man’s animal ancestry, that he is not created “in the image of God” (Genesis 1:37), with accountability to his Creator for his choices and actions. He can make his own autonomous choices, including sinful choices, without consideration of the “wages” of those choices.

Only such a perspective makes sense out of the rush to accept paltry and contradictory evidence, as illustrated by the most recent discovery reported formally in *Nature*, 11 July, 2002, but repeated in news reports around the world. “Oldest member of human family found; Newfound skull could sink our current ideas about human evolution” read the explanatory article’s title and subtitle. The articles described the evidence and gave the obligatory evolutionary spin. Let’s look closely, with Biblical glasses on, and see if we agree.

The discovery consisted of a single, partial skull, albeit distorted, broken, and recemented after burial, with no bones below the neck. It has excessively heavy brow ridges, a sagittal crest, and an ape-sized brain. The living creature would have been chimp size, but its (now distorted) face was (probably) flatter than most chimps and its teeth showed wear patterns more typical of *hominids* than chimps. Hominids include the creatures thought to be on the way to human, including the Australopithecines, like “Lucy” which lived much later. Some claimed to see evidence of upright posture where the skull would have attached to the spinal column. The experts for now conclude that it contained a combination of chimp and *Australopithecus* features, and placed it in an entirely new genus and species, *Sahelanthropus tchadeasus*, and nicknamed it “Toumai.”

Dr. Bernard Wood, author of the *Nature* News and Views article, commented on “it’s mosaic nature. Put simply, from the back it looks like a chimpanzee, whereas from the front it could pass for a
1.75 million-year-old *Australopithecus*. . . it plays havoc with the tidy model of human origins.”

That’s because the australopithecines were decidedly chimp-like. “Lucy” was 3’6” tall, with chimp-sized brain and chimp dentation, with long curved fingers and long curved toes for swinging in trees, and had a wrist structure only suited for knuckle-walking when on the ground. The claim for her upright position derives from controversial analysis of the knee and hip. The most the experts claim for Lucy is that she was an ape which stood a little more erect than other chimps.

Unfortunately there is no direct way to date the new specimen. The six–seven million year age came from nearby mammal, reptile, and fish fossils, similar specimens of which are found in Kenya, several hundred miles to the south, and have been dated to six–seven million years old. As readers of *Acts & Facts* know, all radioisotope dates are questionable, but for the moment, let’s play along.

Summarizing the facts, we have one partial, broken, distorted, and recemented skull and a few teeth, which at best, point to a transition between chimp and the chimp-like *Australopithecus*, coupled with a poorly established date.

Predictably, the broad claims are quite different from the bare facts. “The beginning of the human lineage” says discoverer Michael Brunet. “The oldest known relative of modern humans” says MSNBC. “The earliest evidence of the human family” claims CNN. “A very exciting find” opines Ian Tattersall of the American Museum of Natural History. “It’s likely that this is a human ancestor” Bernard Wood of George Washington University.

To be fair, other experts were more cautious. Brigitte Senut of the Paris Natural History Museum said the skull’s features were actually sexual characteristics of female gorillas rather than indications of a human character, and that “the occipital crest (the back of the neck where the neck muscles attach, hinting to some of upright posture) . . . reminds me much more of the gorilla”.

The extraordinary claims for Toumai’s significance can only be understood as we admit an evolutionary bias on the part of the “experts.” For them, the paltry data are accepted without question and interpreted with evolutionary over exuberance, pushing normally serious scientists and reporters into unwarranted claims when it comes to this one issue.

But what if there is another way to interpret the data, one not within the evolutionary “ball park”? In creation thinking, apes and humans are different, although with much variety in both. Some ape varieties and human groups have gone extinct, but there is much difference between the two. The most “ape-like” human is still quite different from the most “human-like” ape. The discovery of a (possible) blend between two ape varieties hardly comprise evidence against creation.

The data better fit the post-Flood filling of the Earth with animal types, in this case the ape and monkey types. As they migrated, much variety occurred, some of which we find as fossils. This discovery does not even address the question of human origins. Once again the creation worldview stands tall, and evolutionary claims are revealed as religious myths.
This has been a banner year for research at the ICR Graduate School. Typically a student will take courses for two or three summer sessions and do his research and write the thesis in his final year, after research skills are honed.

Often, this column reports and amplifies student research. Many of the projects listed and briefly described below will receive individual treatment in the months ahead. All are nearing completion. For now, be encouraged by the multiplicity and breadth of answers being derived, and be admonished to pray for these students as they take their place among professional scientists and educators:

**Sharon Cargo**—Science Ed. “Geographic Distribution of the Torrey Pine.”

**Sonya Contreras**—Biology. “Carbon-14 Impact of Drosophila Longevity.”

**Darren Grant**—Science Ed. “Beliefs and Teaching Practices of Kansas High School Science Teachers in Relation to Creation and Evolution Worldviews.”

**David Hillaker**—Biology. “Repression of Sterol Regulatory Genes.”

**Susan Horiuchi**—Biology. “Contrast Sensitivity after Lasik Surgery.”

**Bert Johnson**—Science Ed. “A Comparative Study of Pharyngeal Arch Development and Function in Vertebrates.”

**Monica Lindsey**—Biology. “Cranial Capacity Potential in Canis familiaris.”


**Thorsten Strom**—Geology. “The Allocthonous Origin of the Paradise Coal Bed of Kentucky Confirmed by the Internal Structure of the Coal.”

**Heath Wagher**—Science Ed. “A Comparison between the Number and Function of Organ Systems in the Human Body with the Number of the Spiritual Gifts Given to the Church.”

---

**From Oregon**

I greatly enjoy *Days of Praise* and *Acts & Facts* publications. Thank you for your ongoing work to get the creation word out to those who need to hear it. It was through one of your creation seminars that I was able to truly see how secularism is tainting the world through their macro-evolutionary teaching and was finally able to put to rest any doubt that had invaded my mind during my [elementary] and high school years as to how God created everything. Praise be to God for godly men and women on staff at ICR, who devote their lives to proclaiming this great message!!! God bless you all!

---

**ICR Granted Right to Offer Charitable Gift Annuities**

After years of a very demanding application and evaluation procedure, ICR has qualified to issue one of the more helpful tax-sheltered instruments, called the Charitable Gift Annuity. It provides the donor with a guaranteed income stream. It is truly beneficial, particularly for those who want the stability of a steady income.

Here’s how it works. The donor(s) transfer cash, securities, or property to ICR, and receive a guaranteed payment for one or both, usually at an interest rate that exceeds what may be otherwise available. A portion of the gift is tax deductible and a portion of the income is tax-free.

In most cases, a donor can turn a low or non-income producing asset into a favorable and guaranteed income stream for the rest of their life. If ICR can serve you in this way, please let us know. The Stewardship article on page 7 gives more details and contact information.
Ontario, Canada

What do light, color, air, water, seas, soil, sun, moon, feathers, fish, and land animals have in common? They were all created by God during the Creation Week and they were all studied by campers at the Community Pentecostal Church in Orléans, Ontario, Canada. The “True Science Camp” was held July 2–5, 2002, for 46 campers in grades 1 through 7 under the instruction of ICR graduates, Cindy Carlson and Debbie Brooks (pictured below).

The campers (most of whom attend public school) had hands-on activities enriched by discussions about the creation interpretation of the scientific evidence in contrast to the evolutionary interpretation. The discussion included the six days of creation as well as the Fall and the Flood.

Camp concluded with the “Beasts of the Field Treasure Hunt,” which involves looking for any signs of the animal kinds that God created on Days 5 and 6. It was held at Mer Bleue, a raised bog, a unique wetland located south of the city. A meandering 1.2 km boardwalk kept the students from sinking through the sphagnum moss and thereby being preserved for decades to come in the acidic soil found there. The acidic soil is perfect for cranberries, blueberries, and carnivorous plants, such as the sundew (*Drosera rotundifolia*) that captures insects on sticky dewdrops that hang from hairs on the edges of its leaves. The campers discovered many birds, insects, amphibians, a muskrat house, and groundhogs.

Some members of Community Pentecostal Church are also members of C.O.R.E., Citizens of Origins Research and Education. This excellent creation science group will be a big help to these young Christians as they continue to serve God and face the naturalistic theories that they will encounter in school.

Santee, California

Dr. Duane Gish conducted the fifth ICR Debate Workshop on Saturday, June 15, at the ICR Headquarters in Santee, California. Those requesting attendance at the workshop held in January, exceeded seating capacity, so a second workshop was scheduled for June. In addition to California, students attending the workshop were from New York, Louisiana, Texas, Oregon, Washington, and Alberta, Canada.
In 1859 the western world was struck by the publication of an English naturalist named Charles Darwin. The book was *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. It became popular—and still is—because it explained creation without the Creator, putting in His place something called natural selection (or “survival of the fittest”). Today if a theist and atheist were together viewing a beautiful flower, or the amazing flight of a hummingbird—they would have quite different ideas regarding the origin of these organisms.

The atheist would have no choice but to recognize the unlimited power of natural selection, saying, “Selection, acting on the genetic variability in natural populations, is responsible for the wondrous diversity of animals and plant life that is so apparent as we look around us.”

But these assertions are not without serious problems, voiced by modern Darwinists (neo-Darwinists) themselves. In a refreshing admission, a noted evolutionist stated, “However, in 1859 when [Charles Darwin] published the *Origin*, he actually did not have a single clear-cut piece of evidence for the existence of [natural] selection.” (See also: Margulis & Sagan, *Acquiring Genomes*, Basic Books, 2002.)

A professor at Nottingham Trent University asks, “. . . even if the neo-Darwinians are correct, at what level is natural selection supposed to work?” Certainly it’s not on the very small level, “How natural selection operates at the molecular level is a major problem in evolutionary biology.” The late S.J. Gould described the limits of this supposed creative process, “Natural selection is therefore a principle of local adaptation, not of general advance or progress.” And that’s our point! Creation scientists have no problem with Gould’s evaluation of natural selection, adding that selection has nothing to do with the origin of species (macroevolution). Four other evolutionary biologists agree, “Natural selection can act only on those biologic properties that already exist [creation]; it cannot create properties in order to meet adaptational needs [macroevolution].”

To conclude, while the evolutionist views the living world and gives credit to a mysterious, impersonal process, the creationist can simply give glory and honor to the One who created it—by the work of His fingers (Psalm 8:3–4).

**References**

Jonathan Park News Flash! The action packed radio drama continues! Volume 6 of the Jonathan Park series, “The Return to Hidden Cave” is now available on CD or cassette. Join the Parks and the Brenans for fun, action, science, and strong Biblical lessons. To order through customer service call 800/628-7640 or visit our website at www.icr.org/store.

This month on “Science, Scripture, & Salvation”:

Weekend of: Title/Topic:

Sept. 7 How Fossils Form
Evolutionists claim it took millions of years for fossils to form, while creationists believe fossils were formed rapidly during Noah’s Flood. Which side does the fossil record support? Find out by tuning in!

Sept. 14 How Caves Form
Some of the most spectacular sights in creation are found underground in limestone caves. Did it take millions of years for these caves to be carved, or were they created quickly? Join us and find out!

Sept. 21 Autumn and the Creator
The different seasons arrive on time, every year, without fail. Autumn, or fall, is the Lord’s season of preparation for winter’s shorter days. What does this season of rest and death reveal about our wonderful Creator? Tune in!

Sept. 28 Electricity
Electricity is an amazing creation of God. So many aspects of our world rely on it. But does electricity have anything to do with creation itself? Listen in and find out!


This magnificent full-color production is by a leading creationist. Suited to young secondary age (and bright primary), this will nevertheless be welcome to most young people. The five illustrated pages on dating of rocks cover more ground with greater clarity than many far longer adult treatments.

Tabernacle Bookshop (England)


No where else have I ever read commentaries on Solomon that are so concise and clearly explained. . . . Morris has truly managed to plumb the depths of the wisdom of Solomon and expose a gold far more meaningful than that of the fabled mines.

This work is also a rarity in that it is an interesting read and not at all a dull history of the times. This is a book that you can read from cover to cover in a couple of sittings and come away from it with a new understanding of these three books of the Bible, the man who wrote them and the people they were to and about. It is also a book you keep as a reference to be used as you study any one or all of these books sharing the author’s insights.

Christian Times
Part of our responsibility as “Stewards” (I Corinthians 4:2) is to be faithful with the financial assets that the Lord has allowed us to use. Normally, the more secure an instrument is, the lower the return; but to get a higher yield, the trade-off is usually higher risk. One privilege available to us that enables us to increase return and maintain security is the Charitable Gift Annuity. Fortunately we live in a country that encourages charitable giving.

This flexible Gift Annuity is very attractive:

- A guaranteed, nonfluctuating income for life.
- Usually, a greater return than is currently available on savings or securities.
- Substantial income tax savings.
- Possible savings on capital gains taxes and gift and estate taxes.
- The option of having another beneficiary receive the annuity for life as your survivor.
- The pleasure of knowing that your gift will ultimately serve and benefit the Lord’s Kingdom.

Here’s a recent example: a retired couple (he is 78 and she is 75) had $150,000 in a low interest security. By purchasing a two-life Gift Annuity with ICR, they will receive $10,800 annually (considerably more than current interest rates) for the remainder of both of their lives. $6,350 of that is tax free each year, and they qualify for a $52,856 charitable deduction for 2002. The expected dollar payout to the couple will likely exceed the $150,000—not including savings from the tax deduction and the on-going tax free income portion.

They are pleased with the increase in income and delighted that they can assist ICR in the process. This way we are both able to “serve one another” as required by the Lord (Galatians 5:13).

If you are interested in evaluating your particular possibilities, please call or e-mail.

Dr. Henry Morris III, ICR Strategic Ministries, P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021. Phone: ICR, 619/448-0900; E-mail: hmorrisiii@icr.org
Donations can be made on-line at www.icr.org/contribute.html