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1. The Missing Link

In my estimation—which I estimate to be very estimable—Eugene Dubois is an example of a special case of confirmation bias, which for want of a better term I will call confirmation bias. I’m sure there is another term out there that will work better in describing it, but let someone else go look for it.

Eugene Dubois was born in 1858—when he was a baby, as it is unlikely that such an event would take place at any other stage of his life—and he was raised a Catholic. However, very early on he was exposed to the evolution controversy in 1868.¹ That was a day when Darwinists could go around and say just about anything they wanted to say, no matter how preposterous, in defense of their theory. In fact we are still living in that day, but at least back then it was an original sort of preposterousness—when it still had that fresh new theory smell.

As Eugene reached his tenth year, Karl Vogt came wandering into town and lectured on, among other things, the closeness of man to the apes. Now, if you’ve read our essay “The Great Chain of Being,” you may remember Vogt. He was the sage who said the “Negro” was very close to the ape-type. As noted, Darwinists could get away with that sort of thing, for it was all a part of their theory in those days. Since the 1960s, however, that kind of talk is pretty much verboten.

Dubois absorbed Vogt’s views uncritically, and it never occurred to him to raise any doubts, for even as a boy he was already well on the way to rejecting the religion of Roman Catholicism and embracing the religion of Darwinism. By the time he began his teaching career he was already well-versed in the mysteries of the new religion, and the dream of finding the “missing link” consumed him. And it really was a dream for him.

I too had dreams in my younger days. I used to wish upon stars because the song said if you wished upon a star your dream would come true. When my first wish failed to materialize, I was disappointed. I determined to carry out a general experiment and sought the support of many stars. Each one was properly catalogued, and a recording was made of how long or involved

each wish was. A system was devised in which a degree of difficulty could be assigned to each wish with reference to how likely its fulfillment would be given the strength of the star and what part of the universe it was situated in.

Unfortunately, despite all of my efforts, I was never able to obtain any good results. The stars would invariably inquire as to who I was to wish upon a star. I replied that according to the song, it makes no difference, but they thought it did make a difference—said they weren’t going to accommodate some song they hadn’t written and upon which they received no royalties. I told them I thought this was unfair, but they laughed and said I should register to vote and put into office someone who cared.

Dubois had better luck. He managed to find a way to Java where he could search the country-side. He was after the “missing link,” an imagined transitional form between man and the apes, and like the true believer, he put all other things behind him and set sail. Nothing could interfere with his dream.

I think the important thing to note is that Dubois assumed that a “transitional form” existed in the first place, then he set out to find it. One is reminded of Constantine’s mother, Helena, by all accounts a pious woman and regarded as a saint by most denominations. But she had one failing. Whenever some holy site or holy relic needed to be found in the Holy Land, she would go out there and make inquiries. Before long, where others had invariably failed to “hook” a relic or holy site and bring back a respectable catch, she never failed of fetching one in. She was very remarkable in that regard.

Dubois was like that, too. He was a dreamer at heart, and the theory of evolution was more of a dream than a reality, a matter of genuflection and ritual, and a willingness to believe in anything, no matter how unlikely, if it supported current Darwinian orthodoxy. “[Dubois] did not yet know it,” says Shipman, “but part of the attraction he felt to evolutionary theory resulted from its ability to upset the old order. The other part was the sheer scientific power [sic] of the theory. He was drawn to it with an almost religious fervor.”
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In her biography, Shipman tells the story of Dubois from his earliest years to his struggles in Java. It is interesting to note that in his later years he turned his attention to young ladies. Living in an apartment by himself in Haarlem, he advertised in the following way: “Wanted a servant-girl, not older than 25 years, for a gentleman living on his own.” Shipman comments: “This advertisement did not attract the wholly respectable. [Dubois] chose the prettier applicants, especially if they seemed to indicate by their look or their manner that they would not be averse to a little romance.”

Since he was no longer searching for homo-erectus, he could now spend his time searching for pliable young women for sexual favors: “Now that he was separated from Anna, he thought, it was not so wrong to seek his comforts elsewhere. After all, he brought the girls from Limburg to the big city, Amsterdam, which was what they desired, and he gave them a comfortable home and a decent wage. Was it so terrible that they wish to show their gratitude? He knew he was no longer young, but he still thought himself attractive: he was powerful, knowledgeable, and still handsome.”

Alas, many of the girls stole from him and then quit. The last was a fair-haired country girl, who recoiled in horror after Dubois had given her a “little squeeze.” “It was a debacle,” says Shipman. “His servants changed so frequently, and were so good-looking and lazy, that the neighbours began to talk behind his back. No wonder his wife refused to live with him any longer!”

After the country girl left, Dubois turned to his assistant for help: “Finally, he begged Antje Schreuder to help him find an honest housekeeper, which she did. Schreuder’s embarrassment was acute when, after only a few weeks, the woman came to her saying she had to leave the post with Dr Dubois. ‘It seems,’ the woman said, holding herself very upright and stiff, ‘that you do not know him very well’. . . . With a hollow feeling in her stomach, [Schreuder] recalled all the rumours about Dubois’s appreciation of pretty women, rumours that she had dismissed as untrue. Now she saw that his moral rectitude was nothing but a hypocritical sham.”

So the famed discoverer of Homo-erectus turned out to be an old lecher.

But what of his bad qualities you may ask? In my opinion, the one bad quality that stands out above all is Dubois’ egotism, which led to paranoia and eventually isolation. The fact of the matter is, his over-large ego became a hindrance to science. It first manifested itself in his relationship to his teacher Max Fürbringer, a widely known anatomist and former student of
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Ernst Haeckel. In 1881 Dubois accepted the position of assistant to Fürbringer, who would eventually want Dubois to succeed him as professor of anatomy at Amsterdam.

In 1885, Dubois prepared his first paper for publication in a scientific journal. It was the usual sort of Darwinian tripe attempting to show that the human voice box evolved from the gill cartilage of fishes. Before publishing the article, however, Dubois had a meeting with Fürbringer in which the latter offered suggestions, including the idea that Dubois should reference Fürbringer’s own work on the subject. “‘You know, Dubois,’” said Fürbringer, “‘this work is very important. It completely confirms what I have been saying since about 1880: that the thyroid cartilage of the human larynx is derived from the fourth branchial arch. Of course, you have heard me mention this idea in lectures. I think that you ought to add a few sentences acknowledging my work on that matter, as it is so closely related to your topic. It will strengthen your claim about the derivation of the mammalian larynx in general.’”

Of course, the idea that any of this has something to do with fish gills is completely false. During the few moments when he isn’t ranting against creationists, evolutionary biologist PZ Myers admits that the notion of embryological recapitulation was fraudulent:

“Haeckel's theory was rotten at the core. It was wrong both in principle and in the set of biased and manipulated observations used to prop it up. This was a tragedy for science, because it set evolutionary biologists and developmental biologists down a dead-end, leading to an unfortunate divorce between the fields of development and evolution that has only recently been corrected [sic].”

Aside from the silliness of the recapitulation idea, Fürbringer’s request was perfectly reasonable. Dubois had learned what he knew about anatomy under Fürbringer’s guidance, and even if he had come up with some new anatomical discovery on his own, it was bad form not to give some credit to his teacher. In addition, being associated with a well-known scientist such as Fürbringer would certainly have enhanced his own reputation. Dubois acquiesced and revised his paper in order to mention Fürbringer, but his egotism blinded him to the benefits of this, and fueled resentment instead. Even his promotion to Lecturer the next year failed to quell the hostility he now felt toward Fürbringer.

When Dubois was asked to contribute a paper to a scientific volume prepared by a fellow scientist, he did everything he could to block Fürbringer’s access to his work: “The more Fürbringer tried to help, the more furtive Dubois grew. Soon he was reluctant to discuss his
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ideas or work with any of his colleagues. He became withdrawn, touchy, almost feverish, as if he were being literally poisoned with suspicion.”

Shipman refers to Dubois’s problem as an “obsession with priority.” With the discovery of more Neanderthal remains in 1887, and their (false) interpretation as a primitive race that confirmed human evolution, Dubois was suddenly taken with the idea of finding Haeckel’s imaginary missing link. That combined with his (false) belief that fish gills developed into larynxes, led him to break completely with Fürbringer in order to “go in search of greater scientific glory.”

This penchant for combining false ideas with an egotistical obsession with priority would lead Dubois not only to reject scientific criticism of his homo-erectus finds, but also later to isolate such finds from scientific scrutiny. In the former case, Dubois was so wedded to his missing link idea, he could not accept its denial by other scientists such as English paleontologist Richard Lydekker, or zoologist Paul Matschie, or dean of German science Rudolf Virchow, who used his research to undermine racism, and was both an opponent of Darwinian dogma and a defender of the freedom of scientific inquiry. The criticisms of other scientists such as Herman ten Kate, Rudolf Martin, and Daniel Cunningham were also rejected. In Dubois’ view, their criticism only reflected their resentment of his being the Man Who Found the Missing Link. It was Fürbringer all over again.

During his later years, Dubois’s increasing paranoia led him to make the homo-erectus fossils unavailable for scientific inspection. Virchow had complained about this early on, but Dubois dismissed such criticism: “Does he want me to hand my baby over to him, lifting her out of her very cradle? Shall I entrust her to him, the man who above all others has doubted my word and impugned my scholarship? Virchow is too used to having his own way in everything in Germany, that is what is wrong with him. He can be rude and insulting to German scholars and they still kowtow to him and defer to his opinion. Well, I am under no
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such obligation to him, and I shall not do it.”\(^\text{13}\)

This is ironic because a month later Dubois would go to Liege and study the Neanderthal fossils, which were available for scientists to study. He discovered to his chagrin that his homo-erectus skull was similar to the Neanderthal skulls from Spy. He had previously rejected the view that homo-erectus was just another Neanderthal. Shipman says, “It was a revelation. He was surprised by their appearance, for all that he had read the descriptions and studied the published photographs closely. There was indeed a similarity in overall skull shape to his P.e., a compelling one.”\(^\text{14}\)

Incidentally, this is why fossils should be readily accessible to scientists. Written descriptions and photographs sometimes leave out crucial information. Dubois’s priority obsession, however, would not let him see that his homo-erectus material should be equally available to scientists.\(^\text{15}\)

It got worse. By the turn of the century, Dubois was so afraid some other scientist would “steal his glory” that he refused to allow anyone access to the homo-erectus fossils. He had resented the fact that the anatomist Gustav Schwalbe, one of his own supporters, had filled up his new Darwinist rag, *Journal of Morphology and Anthropology*, with a long description and analysis of the homo-erectus skull. Dubois’s egotism reared up again. He could not stand anyone else sharing the spotlight with him regarding homo-erectus, so he was filled with the usual resentment: “It was his, and Schwalbe had stolen it. Dubois would never forgive him, nor ever trust another so naively.”\(^\text{16}\)

So Dubois turned his back on science and refused to allow anyone to see the fossils: “There was no more to do with those few, wonderful fossils, and he knew from bitter experience that if he allowed someone else to study them, that man would attempt to steal his glory. That would not happen again, he vowed: never. He put the bones away in their special cases and locked them away in their own special cabinet at the Teyler Museum. He rarely took them out, only sometimes in the afternoons if he was feeling melancholy.”\(^\text{17}\)

Dubois took a supercilious attitude to the Selenka expedition, a two-year attempt to find more homo-erectus material at Trinil, the original find site of the fossils.\(^\text{18}\) In addition, Aleš Hrdlička, the skeptic of the
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Piltdown finds, attempted to reach Dubois in person and ask about studying the homo-erectus fossils, but was rebuffed. This led Hrdlička to write the following about homo-erectus, a virtual echo of Virchow’s previous complaints:

“On account of the peculiar circumstances an attempt to describe first hand the important pieces under consideration met with serious difficulties. It would surely seem proper and desirable that specimens of such value to science should be freely accessible to well qualified investigators and that accurate casts be made available to scientific institutions. . . .”19

By 1915, paleontologists were attacking Dubois’s restrictions on access to the fossils. American Henry F. Osborn led the way, with Frenchman Marcellin Boule adding his voice as well. A letter from Osborn to Bolk, of the Royal Academy of Science of the Netherlands, brought the latter to scold Dubois, that he was tarnishing the reputation of Dutch science. The Academy instructed Dubois to make the fossils of homo-erectus accessible to fellow scientists.20

To fulfill this obligation Dubois eventually invited Hrdlička and his students to study the original fossils. Osborn’s student J. H. McGregor was next, then Dubois made casts for Osborn’s exhibit the “Hall of the Age of Man.”

We started out by saying Dubois provides a good example of confirmation bias, and now I think you can see why. He began with preconceived ideas, was obsessed with the glory of priority, suspected that his colleagues were trying to steal his ideas, refused to take criticism seriously, and finally horded scientific information until forced to release it. In short, Dubois exhibited all that a scientist shouldn’t be.

Now, I’m not saying that scientists shouldn’t have large egos. I wouldn’t say that I shouldn’t have a large ego. In fact, in my case, I’ve recently discovered that I may be descended from French royalty on my mother’s side. For that reason, I’ve determined it is not proper for me to associate with common folk as if there were no distance between us. It is a general maxim that royalty cannot associate with the common folk or there is a loss of that essential respect for a hallowed institution which has always restrained the masses, and has given them a light to lighten their path. It has not yet been established with certainty that I’m descended from royalty—and my mother is somewhat doubtful—but I don’t see the need to take chances.

2. Finding Homo-erectus
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After wasting a lot of time in Sumatra and catching malaria for his troubles, Dubois loaded up his family and moved to Java. As he settled into his new home he bought a large, ugly stork that liked to walk around in a stately manner and peer down its long beak at everything. Dubois called it the “Adjutant” because it reminded him of a pompous colonel in Batavia.21

With the blessings of the bird, Dubois spent the years 1890 through 1892 excavating in Java, and he and his men were able to find the fossils of what would later be classified as “homo-erectus.” The find site delivered up some teeth, part of a jaw, a skullcap, and a thigh bone that was found 49 feet away from the skullcap [“about 15 metres,” said Dubois in 1892].

Dubois made it a point to associate the thigh bone with the rest of the finds: “Taking this view of the thigh bone, one can say with absolute certainty that *Anthropopithecus* of Java stood upright and moved like a human.”22 Additionally, Dubois said, “The Javanese *Anthropopithecus*, which in its skull is more human than any other known anthropoid ape, already had an upright, erect posture, which has always been considered to be the exclusive privilege of humans. Thus this ancient Pleistocene ape from our island is the first known transitional form linking Man more closely with his next of kin among the mammals.”23

Now here is something I find to be very odd. Dubois originally measured the cranial capacity of the skull as 700 cc, which is close to the brain capacity of gorillas, about 650 cc. Thus, by taking the “modern”-looking thighbone and correlating it to the skull, Dubois seemed halfway home in realizing his desire to find the “missing link.”

I have it on good authority, however, that the Adjutant played no small part in convincing Dubois to make other plans. The stork sagely advised Dubois that he had “flubbed it.” That is, he may have said that, for the stork failed to preserve his notes, and we are left with surmises as to what his exact words were. I therefore cannot stress enough just how important it is for researchers to make detailed recordings of their work in the field, and to publish it as soon as practically possible. It is a great disservice to science to neglect this duty.

Here is what happened from what I’ve been able to discover. Dubois rechecked his calculations, and suddenly realized he had made a mistake in his measurements. After gaining a greater understanding of how to measure cranial capacity, he re-measured the skull of homo-erectus, and
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found it to have a cranial capacity of 1000 cc—a 300 cc difference! It’s a capacity considerably larger than any known ape’s by a long shot. Now here is the interesting question: Did this change of measurement lead to a change of mind regarding the “missing link” status of homo-erectus? Oh, no, not at all. In revising his measurement of the cranial capacity of homo-erectus, Dubois wrote: “The brain of this transitional form was considerably larger than one would gather from the report... nearly 1000 cc.”

Shipman, relaying Dubois’s thought processes, says, “This Javan skull was comparable in brain size to some human races, like the Andaman Islanders or the Australian Aborigines.” Further, “This fact tipped the balance of the creature from ape to... almost human. This had to be [sic] something very like the missing link: an upright-walking ape with a brain as big as some humans.”

You see, Dubois had formulated his initial viewpoint of homo-erectus as half-ape, half-man on the basis of a wildly erroneous measurement of the cranial capacity of homo-erectus. Now when he realized his error, he, of course, sought advice from the stork. “Dubois,” said the Adjutant, “this new data, as you call it, does not falsify your earlier view. No, it marvelously confirms it. Your half-ape, half-man, which you call Anthropo-something or other, may have a cranial capacity comparable to some modern humans, but it’s still a half-ape, half-man missing link. You take my word for it, Dubois, this new data, as you call it, will go along fine. You just touch it up and get it to hopping, and it’ll jump down the road and plop itself right where it’s supposed to be. You take that as the truth Herr Doctor. You just let it go, and you’ll see the results go your way.”

So Dubois listened to the stork’s advice, at least as far as we can determine, and things haven’t been the same since. Dubois started with the theory that homo-erectus was an ape-man, and ended up with the new and improved theory that homo-erectus was an ape-man. Thus does science correct itself.

Let not the ignorant and the doubters mock, for this is the power and the magic of Darwinism—a theory in which even failures, frauds, and falsifications can become confirmations of the theory. It took me some time to write that sentence and to find the words beginning with “f”, so the reader will please be kind enough to stop and admire it for a moment before moving on to other exhibits.

Dubois also had a personal motivation. Many thought he had gone off on a fool’s errand and the finding of the “missing link” would vindicate him against all the doubts of the naysayers. When he found homo-erectus, Shipman has him saying, “But I have it, Anna [his longsuffering wife], I
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have found the missing link. Everyone will see now; everyone will understand I am not just a crazy man who ran off to the Indies in search of an idea.”

As Dubois informed scientists and the public of his discoveries, some of them objected to the association of the thigh bone with the skull. An early critic was P.A. Daum, publisher and editor of an opposition newspaper. Writing in 1892 he said, “I fear . . . that this time the Darwinian outlook of the esteemed Mr. Dubois has played a trick on him, a danger that an impartial observer would have escaped.” He then went on to relate what Dubois had found (based on reports published by Dubois) but questioned the association of the skull, teeth, and leg bone. “A non-Darwinist would scratch himself through his fur before he would propose a genetic link between the monkey skull and the monkey molar and the femur, which has a close speaking acquaintance with a human femur. Not so the esteemed Mr. Dubois.”

Daum’s misunderstanding of the nature of the skull and teeth is not the important thing. What’s important is that Daum was one of the first to question any linkage between the skull and the human femur (leg bone). He continued: “No, I am afraid that the esteemed Mr. Dubois, prejudiced because he has completely swallowed Darwinism, has gone too far, and has constructed a connection between the human femur and the monkey skull and molar where none has ever existed.”

Daum thought that a volcanic eruption had killed humans along with the “monkey” and other animals. He then recommended an impartial viewing of the facts by experts before the government put its stamp of approval on Dubois’s report. He signed his article as “Homo erectus”! Dubois liked the joke, but criticized Daum (rightly) for thinking the skull belonged to a monkey. He then fell into what would become a familiar dogmatic insistence that the human femur must be associated with the skull. “When there is only a handful of fossil primates in all of Asia, I have the good fortune to find a site with three species, one of which has left only its head, one its leg, and one its tooth.”

But Daum was not the last critic. A little later Pieter Vincent van Stein Callenfels challenged the correlation between the leg bone and the skull, criticized Dubois’s handling of the excavations, and doubted that Dubois had ever found the missing link. In addition, G. H. R. von Koenigswald also challenged Dubois’s view of his Trinil finds, but as Shipman comments “Dubois admitted no correct opinion on matters Javanese except his own.” However, in 1937 Koenigswald attended a major scientific conference in Philadelphia (which Dubois could not
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attend) and restated the view that the leg bone belonged to a different individual, and even asserted that the homo-erectus skull cap was from a Neanderthal.\textsuperscript{30}

From 1931 to 1933, Koenigswald (and W. F. F. Oppenoorth) had found more fossil skulls in Java, close to where homo-erectus had been found. One of the skulls (Skull V) had large brow ridges, the sort one finds in homo-erectus and Neanderthal Man, but also a cranial capacity of 1300 cc.\textsuperscript{31} In addition, Koenigswald found a new skull at Modjokerto, Java, which has been named the Modjokerto Boy, and it was thought to be another homo-erectus. Dubois dismissed the find and claimed it was as a real human child of the “Wadjak” race, not an example of homo-erectus.\textsuperscript{32}

Dubois’s response to Koenigswald was fairly typical. He could never give up his \textit{idée fixe}, that his Java Man was old Haeckel’s imaginary half ape, half man. Even when other fossils of the same type were found, Dubois resisted the comparison. And though he had seen the Spy Neanderthal skulls first hand, and saw the similarity, he refused to relate the two types. Java Man had to stay by itself, such was Dubois’s desire to retain his own status as the finder of the Missing Link. Anything else would undermine his lifelong worship of both the Darwinist creed, and more importantly, his own ego.

To his dying day, Dubois continued to make comparisons of his homo-erectus skull with the skull of a gibbon so as to maintain the uniqueness of his find. Many thought he actually went back on his former beliefs about the skull being transitional, and adopted the view that it was in fact a gibbon. This is not what he did, but Dubois is to blame for leaving this impression, so eager was he to differentiate his “missing link” from all other fossils of homo-erectus, such as Peking Man, and other finds in Java.

“[Dubois’s] \textit{P.e.}” says Shipman, “was losing some of her uniqueness. He tried steadfastly to maintain her ‘missing link’ position, emphasizing the primitive, even apelike features \textit{[sic]} of her anatomy. In 1935, Dubois published a paper entitled ‘On the Gibbonlike Appearance of \textit{Pithecanthropus erectus},’ an astonishing move for the man who had so vehemently fought Virchow’s early suggestion that \textit{P.e.} was naught but a big gibbon. But now things were different and he needed to emphasize the gibbonoid features of \textit{P.e.} to make sure that \textit{P.e.} remained distinct from \textit{Sinanthropus} [Peking Man]. His fossil was apelike. . . . He added his morphological observations to the results of his research into the proportions of brain weight and body weight. . . . Once again, the calculations reinforced
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Dubois’s main conviction: *Pithecanthropus* was an apeman. . . .”\(^{33}\)

The calculations turned out to be misleading, as Stephen J. Gould would point out: “Dubois never said that *Pithecanthropus* was a gibbon . . . ; rather, he reconstructed Java Man with the proportions of a gibbon in order to inflate the body weight and transform his beloved creature into a direct human ancestor—its highest possible status—under his curious theory of evolution.”\(^{34}\)

Dubois had wasted away much of his later scientific life by a) chasing skirts, and b) making overlong efforts to understand the correlation between brain and body weight. The pro-Darwinist TalkOrigins website says this of Dubois’s efforts:

“He eventually came up with a complicated scheme in which all animals had a certain degree of encephalization, which increased in jumps of two (so humans were 1, apes were 1/4, cats and dogs were 1/8, etc.). It was a pioneering approach, but Dubois’ results were hopelessly flawed, based on a small amount of real data and a large amount of speculation and special pleading. Under this scheme, Java Man, especially if reconstructed with gibbon-like body proportions, had an index of 1/2, which placed it nicely in the gap between apes and humans.”\(^{35}\)

Hah! “Small amount of real data and a large amount of speculation.” That’s a phrase that could very well sum up just about everything said by Darwinists. I’m afraid, however, that Mark Twain already used a similar remark, so I’ll have to drop it, as I only like retailing original creations rather than wholesaling in bulk.

Now, here is what I think really happened in Java. Our homo-erectus friend needed a leg, and she borrowed one from a “modern” man while he was preoccupied with his business concerns. Latterly, when the man had closed up his shop, he noticed the departed member and was not pleased about it. He made inquiries, and it was not long before he found homo-erectus and convinced the latter to return payment on the leg. Homo-erectus did so, but the interest was prohibitive, consisting of most of her body parts, and during the meeting with the “modern” man, she died of undercapitalization. And so, Dubois, prying into matters that were really none of his business, came along and found the result. I got this story from the stork, who was always full of useful information of that sort, so there is no reason outside of prejudice to doubt its veracity.

Dubois always resisted the idea that homo-erectus was a type of Neanderthal. Nevertheless, when it came to describing Peking Man (now recognized today as part of the homo-erectus family), Dubois said: “The shape and the major features of the *Sinanthropus* [Peking] skull, on
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the contrary, are those of a full-grown male Neanderthaler. . . . It is difficult to estimate the capacity of this very incomplete cranium; however, 1150 cc will probably not be too high an estimate. In proportion to such a female capacity a normal adult male of the same race should have about 1300 cc capacity.”

He went on: “I may express my opinion that the adolescent Sinanthropus is a human male, belonging to the Neanderthal group of mankind. . . .”

This is an interesting point, for creationists maintain that homo-erectus (of which Peking Man is certainly a member) was only a smaller version of Neanderthal Man. Since Neanderthal Man is now regarded as fully human, there does not seem to be any reason why we cannot jettison the homo erectus moniker and speak instead of homo sapiens erectus.

In any case, when we look at all of Dubois’s work and his discoveries, it is remarkable that on the basis of so little data, Dubois could actually believe he had proof for such an enormous metaphysical claim as that man evolved from ape-like creatures. The enormity of this doctrine is breathtaking in its implications, even if it is altogether ho hum in its evidential foundations. Dubois was nothing if not a man of great faith—strong enough to move mount—I mean dirt, strong enough to move dirt, lots and lots of it. Or at least it looked like dirt.

3. The Discovery and Loss of Peking Man

In the 1920s, the site of Dragon Bone Hill (near Zhoukoudian, China) delivered up many fossils, and in 1929 and the early 1930s even coughed up some skulls that were originally thought to be a brand new species of early man but turned out to be old, boring homo-erectus. I cannot confirm any of this, not having been alive at the time, and therefore not having any reason to be interested in the subject. J. Gunnar Anderson, a Swedish geologist who was in China from 1914 to 1926, discovered the site of Dragon Bone Hill and recognized that the so-called “dragon bones” of traditional Chinese lore were in fact fossils of mammals. I think this was premature, as it is well known that fire-breathing dragons inhabit caves of this sort in China,
especially during the winter season, when knights take advantage of them in their sleepy state. Of course, I realize that not all dragons stay in caves, and I don’t mean to suggest otherwise. In fact, some of them have been known to wander into human areas, where they are encouraged to linger by people who foolishly feed them, and thus create a social nuisance. So there’s good, sound scientific reasons to reject the view that all those bones found on Dragon Bone Hill came from mammals. In fact, all the probabilities suggest otherwise.

Davidson Black, supposedly the head of the Rockefeller-funded Cenozoic Research Laboratory, followed up with his own work. Two fossil teeth from Zhoukoudian had been touted as the basis for the new fossil man, labeled “Peking Man” but it was rather slim pickings upon which to base such an identification. Teilhard de Chardin—supposedly a Catholic priest, or maybe an astronaut—criticized the researchers for not establishing their case. Black had published a paper regarding this new man, Peking Man, for Nature, and was risking his reputation if Teilhard was right. Given that Black was a Darwinist, he had also written a paper for the Bulletin of the Geological Society of China in which he described a part of a jaw that was found and “emphasized how apelike the profile of the . . . juvenile Sinanthropus chin region was.”

Eventually, Black’s reputation would be saved by the work of Wenzhong Pei, who in 1929 found the first skull: “Pei had just delivered Black from scientific limbo and had ensured Black’s apotheosis in the firmament of paleoanthropology.” Black did not have long to enjoy it. He died in 1934, allegedly, and his work was continued by Franz Weidenreich, a likely name. Because of his Jewish ethnicity, Weidenreich had been among those who were dismissed from their academic posts following Hitler’s 1933 edict. In 1934 Weidenreich took a post at the University of Chicago, and never brought it back. In 1935 he was appointed by the Rockefeller Foundation—as yet an unconfirmed institution—as the head of the Cenozoic Research Laboratory up until the Japanese invasion of China in 1941. From 1941 to 1948 Weidenreich was employed at Henry Osborn’s old American Museum of Natural History, and during this time wrote up a definitive account of the Zhoukoudian fossil men. So he said.

Before leaving China, Weidenreich failed to take the original fossils with him but left them at the Peking Union Medical College. Their fate after that is very uncertain. Peking Man was
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deliberately hiding, in my opinion. Here are the facts: The Japanese invaded China in 1937. Weidenreich decided to wrap up the fossils and place them in crates, and the fossils were eventually placed in the Peking Union Medical College. Casts were made of all the important fossils, and Ralph von Koenigswald joined Weidenreich to help analyze the fossils. Two Chinese technicians wrapped the fossils in white tissue paper, played cricket with them for awhile, then stuffed the packages with cotton and paper. These were placed in wooden boxes, which were taken to Controller Trevor Bowen’s office, whereupon Bowen placed them in a car in 1941. They were then handed over to the U.S. Marine Corps, who some say, loaded them onto the SS President Harrison, which sank, along with the fossils. Neither the Japanese, nor the Americans, nor the Chinese, were ever able to find them. The only reasonable explanation as to why so many could not find Peking Man is that he did not want to be found. Everything else is mere speculation.

I am reminded in this connection of a fish I once met at a large walk-through aquarium.

Now in their book, The Story of Peking Man, Jia Lanpo and Huang Weiwen claimed that Dubois went back on his claim that Java Man was an example of a half-ape, half-man transitional form, but was instead a “giant gibbon.” We have seen that this is incorrect. Dubois continued on with his theory that his homo-erectus really did represent the hypothesized missing link. Nevertheless, Lanpo and Weiwen tell us that despite Dubois’s (supposed) retreat from his earlier claims, Peking Man came to the rescue of Darwinism:

“The discovery of Peking Man once again confirmed the ape-to-human scientific hypothesis. . . . The skeptics opposing Dubois were thus silenced.”

Lanpo and Weiwen’s book is a rather strange one. They spend much of it in a straightforward recounting of the discovery of Peking Man and its loss during World War II. It is evident from their account that the bones were either hidden or lost prior to the Japanese takeover of China, since the Japanese would have used them as a trophy if they could have found the fossils. The book ends with an account of the 1953 display of the available Zhoukoudian fossils which “provide evidence of evolutionary processes of ape to man.” We are further informed in a rather jaw-dropping understatement regarding the Chinese “cultural revolution” that things “took a tragic turn.”

According to Wikipedia’s entry on the so-called Cultural Revolution:
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“Millions of people were persecuted in the violent factional struggles that ensued across the country, and suffered a wide range of abuses including torture, rape, imprisonment, sustained harassment, and seizure of property. A large segment of the population was forcibly displaced, most notably the transfer of urban youth to rural regions during the Down to the Countryside Movement [now known as the Lost Generation]. Historical relics and artifacts were destroyed.”

Nevertheless, the Peking Man exhibit was apparently in line with the Mao’s “continuous revolution.” Its proprietors managed to have it “correspond to the socialist economic base,” so that it could “facilitate the consolidation and development of the socialist system.” So in 1972 it opened with three sections, one showing the “evolutionary process of vertebrates ‘from fish to human’”; two, “the development of the human species, focusing on the theme that ‘labour created man’”; and three, major archaeological finds since the founding of the Communist state in China.

The reason the Communists allowed this new exhibit was because the old exhibit was “too specialized” and “served only the experts,” while the new one was “meant for the general public and was ‘closely related to politics’ to ‘serve the workers, peasants, and soldiers.’” In other words, it sufficiently toed the Maoist line. In 1979, after the Cultural Revolution, the Peking Man exhibit was replaced with a more specialized, less political display, but it still presented everything through an evolutionary bias. Even the saintly old ape Ramapithecus was touted as the “nearest precursor of Homo sapiens.”

I am reminded of the scene in Airplane II: The Sequel, in which the Russian news anchor (played by Leon Askin, General Burkhalter of Hogan’s Heroes fame) read the news about the impending crash of a space shuttle: “A four-alarm fire in downtown Moscow clears the way for a glorious new tractor factory,” he said. “And, on the lighter side of the news, hundreds of capitalists are soon to perish in shuttle disaster.” During this reading, an arm extended from off-camera and held a gun to Askin’s head. In a similar manner, I can just see Lanpo and Weiwen leavening the last few pages of their book with Marxist jargon, while a Communist arm extends out from the background, holding a gun to their heads as they write.

4. A Boy in Africa

45 Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, "Decision Concerning the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" or “the 16 points.”
46 Lanpo & Weiwen, pp. 216, 217.
47 Lanpo & Weiwen, p. 226.
An almost complete skeleton of *homo-erectus* was found in 1984 by Kamoya “Mac” Kimeu, the foreman for the Richard Leakey dig in Kenya. I was amazed to learn that Kimeu was considered so good in finding the bones of our long-dead and embarrassing relatives that he received a Medal in 1985 from none other than President Ronald Reagan.

The story goes like this: Right before the find, the camp was about to break and Kimeu’s team of native Kenyans had so far found only some crocodile and giraffe fossils, and an alien spaceship or two, but failed to come up with anything of interest. The team was made up of Kimeu’s “people”—brothers, cousins, friends of brothers and cousins, cousins of friends of brothers, and more. This was a highly trained crew and had encamped next to Lake Turkana at a place called Nariokotome. Everyone but Kimeu was lolling about lazily trying to avoid any excavation work. They were either doing their wash, or writing letters for the home—asking the folks for money likely—or taking some time to read Romance, or worrying over their investments, or agitating to form a Union. Kimeu, however, decided to walk around, because other people were “resting”—and it was well he did, for he soon happened upon the bones of a “hominid.”

Soon thereafter, Richard Leakey, Alan Walker, and others dug up the place and got some schoolboys to do all the work of sifting and sieving through a lot of excavated dirt while Leakey and crew got drunk on champagne (or so I was not told). This eventually led to more of the skull, which was glued back together by Walker and Meave Leakey. As the days wore on, an actual skeleton of *homo-erectus* turned up. No one had asked him to turn up, but he did just the same.

In their book *The Wisdom of the Bones*, Walker and his co-writer and wife Pat Shipman, summarized the significance of the excavation at Nariokotome: “When we closed down the site for the season, on September 21, 1984, we found more of *Homo erectus*—the classic missing link—than anyone had ever seen. . . . [The] Nariokotome boy, as we took to calling the specimen, grew from a fragment of skull to the most complete early hominid skeleton ever found. By 1988, for the first time in history, we were able to look at an almost complete skeleton—not just a scrap of skull, a handful of teeth, or a portion of an arm, but a bony record of one individual’s life. It was an extraordinary opportunity.”

---

I suppose they mean it was an extraordinary opportunity for the researchers, not necessarily for the Nariokotome boy. Walker and Shipman went on to describe the Nariokotome boy (or Turkana boy) and how it overturned many of their expectations about homo-erectus. “Who could have guessed the boy would overturn long-held beliefs, bulwarks of paleo-anthropology’s implicit paradigms?”

The researchers do not know what caused the boy’s death but theorize he died when he was twelve or thirteen, “lying face down in this swampy little pond.” That would do it.

We’ve seen that earlier Darwinists thought homo-erectus was very “primitive” and ape-like, lower down on the evolutionary scale, a half-way point between man and ape. It’s interesting to note that Walker was not too interested in homo-erectus for precisely the opposite reason. Homo-erectus, says Walker, “is entirely too human for my tastes. At one point, I remember thinking what a shame it wasn’t the skeleton of a more interesting species.”

Even though the cranial capacity of homo-erectus is within the range of modern homo-sapiens, the new Nariokotome boy was regarded as “not very clever, an assumption that the stone tools of erectus (which I have always found rather boring and repetitive) seemed to support.” Further, “He was an animal as big as a human, who must have looked rather like a human, but he did not have our brains and almost certainly didn’t act like a human.”

We are happy to report that such broad generalizations are based on the firm and unshakable foundation of groundless conjecture. We should also note that homo-erectus was a tall human being, not ape-like at all. “What had happened,” asked Walker & Shipman, “to the well-established truism that Homo erectus was a short, stocky, muscular species?” Further, “If they were so tall, why hadn’t anyone noticed before? And, if they weren’t, what sort of prehistoric basketball player had we excavated at Nariokotome?”

The reason for the bias: “One reason for our error was that before studying Homo erectus we had been studying australopithecines, who were genuinely small in stature. Lucy . . . was only about three feet six inches as an adult. . . . We simply expected erectus to be short too and ignored the evidence of the partial bones in front of us.”

This reminds me of something I experienced a few years ago. I had joined some folks at an out-of-the-way restaurant in upstate New York, above Lake Champlain. I was advised they had
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something on the menu called “wolf meat” and since the guests insisted I should try it, and as I was inclined to encourage friendliness, I went along.

We all sat down at the long table and before long piping hot plates of “wolf meat” were set before us. The other patrons dug in immediately and with satisfied eagerness but I held back. One man to my right, named Abbott said, “Go ahead, eat it. It’s delicious.”

I eyed the meat for a moment, looked at Abbott questioningly and he nodded. “Yes, go on.”

I gingerly took up a knife and began to cut the meat that had been set before me. But the moment my knife began to slice into the meat I was frozen by the most pitiable howl I’d ever heard, as if it were from a veritable fount of sorrows. I thought it was a wolf, but wasn’t sure. It sounded like a wolf.

I didn’t hear any more howling, so I looked at Abbott and the others to see if they’d heard anything, but they were busy at their plates. Abbott looked at me and saw I hadn’t cut any of the meat. “Go ahead,” he insisted, “it’s not going to cut itself. Hurry, eat up before it gets cold.”

I took up the knife and somewhat hesitantly began to cut into the meat again. Another howl, longer and more pitiable than before. I dropped the knife and tried to say something. I gasped and gasped and tried to speak. My consternation was heightened when I noticed that none of the others seemed to have heard anything at all.

Abbott looked over at me, “Come now buddy,” he said, “what are you waiting for? It’s good for you.” He reached over with his fork and prodded the meat. Nothing happened, not a sound. “See there’s nothing wrong with it. Now hurry up and eat before dinner’s over. What’s the matter with you? Dig in, dig in!”

I hesitated.

“Go ahead.”

“But Abbott. . . .”

“Never mind about it, just dig in.”

I took up my knife and fork again, then closed my eyes and dug in with a will. But while I was doing that there arose such a caterwauling of growling and howling as to wake the dead. I stood up, threw my utensils down, and said, “Now that is enough of that. What have you got here?”

“Sit down,” said Abbott. “What are you talking about?
“The howling!” And then I fainted dead away.

I didn’t know it at the time but the restaurant was situated next to a dog kennel. There were some pretty large dogs around there, as I saw later, the sort that pull sleds across the snow, and of course the howling and racket was because it was feeding time, but I didn’t know that.

The moral of this story is that Darwinists—as in the case with homo-erectus—should beware of associations and expectations. I’m sorry that I couldn’t come up with a more spectacular moral. Most of my morals have already fizzled out, from general neglect. I once went to Washington DC in order to buy some morals, for I had been told they were cheap there. When I arrived, however, I discovered that I could not afford to pay for them at the going price. I inquired into this and asked if there had been a run on morals to drive the price up. I was told, “No, it was because morals were scarce in the city and no one could afford them.” They said the city had squandered its morals in times past and now had to rely on the charity of others to supply it. So the scarcity drove the price up. I thought this was a sad thing, so I tried from that point on to stock up as many morals as I could afford at the going rates, then depreciate them on a yearly basis. Nevertheless, hard times have led to a general liquidation, and that’s why my maxims and morals may disappoint the reader, as they tend to be refurbished morals, not direct.

I need to discuss something before going on to a general discussion of homo-erectus. I believe the new find has pretty much done away with an earlier creationist theory regarding the nature of homo-erectus.

The O’Connell-Gish Theory: Preliminary Remarks:

In 1985, Duane Gish, a biochemist and debater for creationism, said: “Whatever the status accorded to other specimens found in other parts of the world which have been attributed to Homo erectus, it is very likely that Dubois’ final assessment of his Pithecanthropus erectus may be the correct one—a very large primate of some kind within the generalized group called apes, possessing no genetic relationship to Man whatsoever.”

Gish provided a similar conclusion with regard to Peking Man. He did, however, mention the 1984 discovery of the Turkana boy by the Leakey team, but says that not enough information was available in scientific journals at the time of the writing of his book. Gish held that homo-erectus, in the form of either Java Man or Peking Man, was really from the ape family, and that

---


55 Gish, p. 196.
in other cases, such as with the Turkana boy, homo-erectus was likely a Neanderthal or even homo-sapiens.\textsuperscript{56}

Ten years later, with the republication of his book on fossils, Gish did not materially change his position. “At this time,” said Gish, “it is our opinion that some specimens attributed to \textit{Homo erectus}, such as Java Man and Peking Man, are definitely from the ape family. . . . In other cases . . . specimens have been attributed to \textit{Homo erectus} which otherwise would have been attributed to Neanderthal Man if the authorities making this decision had not believed that the fossil creature was too old to have been Neanderthal Man. In these instances, as for example, the very recent find by Walker and Leakey near Lake Turkana, it may be that the creature was fully human, \textit{Homo sapiens}.”\textsuperscript{57}

Gish was not alone among creationists in challenging the human status of the earlier homo-erectus finds (\textit{pithecanthropus erectus} and Peking Man). Francis Nigel Lee, a Reformed theologian, regarded Java Man as a fraud similar to Piltdown Man: “As to man’s origin, he is a special monophyletic creation of God. . . . Investigation of scientific evidence . . . as opposed to evolutionistic hypotheses . . . or downright deceptions (such as the fraudulent so-called \textit{eoanthropus dawsoni} or \textit{pithecanthropus erectus}) tends to corroborate the Biblical account, a priori.”\textsuperscript{58}

Earlier in 1977, Malcolm Bowden made arguments that were similar to Gish’s. I should note here that both Gish and Bowden depended to a great extent on the work of Father Patrick O’Connell, who in 1959 published a book critical of the Peking Man investigations.\textsuperscript{59} O’Connell was a Roman Catholic priest, and was not trained in anthropology or paleontology, nor did he visit the site where Peking Man was discovered. The main argument offered by O’Connell, and seconded by Gish and Bowden, for his claim to be taken seriously on the subject is that he was in China at the time of the excavations and read all the newspaper reports about Peking Man.

I regard it as unfortunate the Gish and Bowden relied on O’Connell for some of their conclusions. It is my opinion that when it comes to describing the raw data of science, non-scientists should never take it upon themselves to contradict professional scientists. If you are like me, you may do so. However, most of you have not yet reached the particular level that I am working at, and that just can’t be helped. It is a burden I have.

\textsuperscript{56} Gish, pp. 200ff.
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It is different when it comes to the interpretation of data, and anyone may challenge any interpretation they like. Nevertheless, when it comes to the basic work of describing or classifying scientific data, amateurs should not be questioning the work of scientists. I rarely do so myself and when I do, I go out on the town and get drunk—because, you know, I am always sorrowful when I take advantage.

Now compare the O’Connell-Gish theory with the 2004 assessment by creationist writer Marvin Lubenow: “My conclusion on Dubois and Java Man are as follows: (1) Java Man is not our evolutionary ancestor but is a true member of the human family, a postflood descendant of Adam, and a smaller version of Neandertal; (2) Dubois seriously misinterpreted the Java Man fossils. . . .”\(^\text{60}\)

In the next essay, the O’Connell-Gish theory will be examined at length. If we can find our way through all the words that have been expended on this theory, for and against, we may come to a better understanding of homo-erectus. Perhaps the boy from Nariokotome may still have a few things to teach us—though I am sure he’d rather have been doing other things with his time.

I was once visiting a farm where some of my relatives work. I will never forget a conversation I had with a cow whom I’d met there, and even now I can remember the cow’s last words to me as I was leaving: “Homo-erectus was a better man than Sam Gompers!” These eloquent words echoed down the corridors of time and have haunted me ever since—going on about three months now.

---

5. The O’Connell-Gish Theory

In this paper I want to discuss Father O’Connell’s (and Dr. Gish’s) theory regarding Peking Man. O’Connell tells us what has agitated him so much: “Serious doubt exists among some Catholics about what exactly the Church binds them to believe and what is a matter for free discussion in the account of the creation of the world and of man, found in the first two chapters of Genesis.”\(^\text{61}\)

I noticed that O’Connell mentions serious doubts among Catholics. It may be thought that with such an emphasis on Catholic doubt it would mean that the book is of interest only to Protestants—but not necessarily. There’s something about O’Connell’s book that reminds me of Juana La Loca, the daughter of Isabella and Ferdinand of Spain (Recall “She’s a-round, like-a my head”; “She’s flat, like your head”—in the Bugs Bunny

---

\(^{60}\) Lubenow, *Bones of Contention*, p. 87.

Princess Juana was so besotted with her husband “Philip the Handsome,” she nearly went mad with jealousy at his lack of interest in her. (Their marriage had been arranged, after all.) When they became the new king and queen of Castile, Juana must have been as happy as she had ever been before in her life. Yet it was not to last, for Philip got sick and died a couple of months later. Queen Juana went mad, and took Philip’s coffin everywhere with her until old Ferdinand had her locked up in the fortress at Tordessillas. From the young age of twenty-nine the beautiful young queen stayed locked away in that cold, dark place until she had grown quite old and withered. Finally, it came to pass that she died. Now, Queen Juana died in a comfortless and dirty room at the fortress, where no light could enter, and they say she was still mourning for her young handsome king who would never return. And she passed into that realm where she could no longer be afflicted by the torments of her own heart, and where all true love is ever and anon requited in the holiness of perfect bliss.

I am not quite sure how this reminds me of O’Connell’s book but I thought it was a lovely story, full of pathos, one that could provide a wholesome respite from all the mental labor that the reader has so far been required to perform. Rumor also has it that when Queen Juana died, her last words were a simple request that her letters to the editor and her political tracts should all be collected and published, proceeds going to the Granger societies. And these words fell from her lips at the last: “Don’t use my letters to pad the bird cages boys, for they don’t sleep proper unless they’ve got their nests situated comfortable.”

At the time O’Connell wrote, back in the 1950s, Protestants could find a lot of the arguments against evolution in the writings of Douglas Dewar, former Secretary and President of the Evolution Protest Movement. O’Connell borrowed heavily from Dewar and is not sparing in his praise for him: “While Mr. Dewar was a specialist in ornithology, he was also one of the greatest all-around living authorities of modern times on all the aspects of the problem of evolution.”

It is appropriate to point out, however, that Dewar was neither an anthropologist nor a paleontologist, but was an authority on birds. He was also the auditor general of India from 1946 to 1957. I am not suggesting that his general critique of evolution is wrong, but his evaluation of Peking Man must be treated with proper caution. Why? Well, because I just don’t think you can expect an authority on birds to be an authority on human evolution. I grant that his work as an auditor general gives him that authority, but it was diluted by the admixture with ornithology.
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Another aspect of O’Connell’s book is the theory that the biblical Flood took place at the “Hiatus”—which he defines as taking place at the end of the Mousterian period (and the disappearance of the Neanderthals), and just before what he regards as the time of the post-Deluge Cro-Magnon men. O’Connell is bold in stating that the Flood “did not cover the whole world, and that all the animals did not perish.”63 His local Flood is supposed to have covered the low-lying plain of Mesopotamia, also Palestine and Egypt, and “even to the high plateau of Iran 5,000 feet above the plain of Mesopotamia.”64

Much of the argument of the book is directed against Fr. Teilhard de Chardin, but more about that later. The heart of O’Connell’s book is his discussion of the “Origin of Man.” Here we will have to pass over his comments about Neanderthal Man, Java Man, the Australopithecines, the Piltdown hoax, and other matters. We will focus, instead, on Peking Man.

In my opinion, O’Connell was heavily influenced in his treatment of Peking Man by the then recent revelations of fraud with respect to Piltdown Man. He believed that Peking Man, in the sense of being a man undergoing evolution, was “just another forgery.”65

This is O’Connell’s basic mistake. Influenced by all the brouhaha over Piltdown Man, O’Connell apparently believed he could be like Sherlock Holmes. He, too, could uncover the same sort of fraud with respect to Peking Man that previous investigators had uncovered with respect to Piltdown Man. Unfortunately, O’Connell reversed Sherlock’s maxim. Sherlock had said that some see but do not observe; that is, they could look at a set of facts and circumstances and draw no relevant conclusions. But the reverse was true for O’Connell—he observed, but did not see. In other words, he drew all sorts of inferences and conclusions about the nature of Peking Man, but did not really see or perceive the true facts of the case.

O’Connell admitted that while in China, he never visited the Peking Man site, but that he read all the papers, both native and foreign, which “convinced him that the whole facts of the case had not been given to the public and that no ‘missing link’ had been found.”66

So far O’Connell’s methodology of reading newspapers cannot be faulted, for all the best theories are proved this way. Nonetheless, I must admit that the weight that should be placed on
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the value of his research was greatly diminished by his failure to examine back issues of philosophy journals.

He went on to support his allegations of fraud by pointing out that all of the original fossils had disappeared, that Dr. Wenzhong Pei “had very good reason to destroy the fossils.”\(^{67}\) I suppose it must have been a good reason, certainly not one involving financial gain. No one expecting a financial reward would so much as look crossly at such priceless fossils, much less destroy them. So Pei must have junked them for the sheer reward of doing good, not for benefit.

Unfortunately, in the attempt to support his views, I think we would not be moving too far outside the realm of empirical knowledge if we concluded that Father O’Connell was somewhat deficient with respect to his facts. One of his worst characteristics was his penchant for mangling quotations. Here is his quotation from Weidenreich:

“In Choukoutien, skeletons of macaques (large monkeys) and baboons had been found in the same district that yielded the Peking Man; these monkeys do not differ from the living forms except for their greater size.”\(^{68}\)

Here is what Weidenreich actually wrote:

“In Choukoutien, skeletons of macaques and baboons have been found in the same locality that yielded Peking man, but these monkeys do not differ from living forms of the same family except for their greater size.”\(^{69}\)

Notice the differences: (1) the parenthetical term “large monkeys” is O’Connell’s addition; (2) the word “had” is substituted for “have”; (3) the word “district” is substituted for “locality”; (4) the article “the” is placed in front of “Peking Man”; (5) the article “the” is placed in front of “living forms”; (6) upper case “Man” is substituted for lower case “man”; and (7) the expression “of the same family” is left out.

O’Connell even got the publication date of Weidenreich’s book wrong. He has it published in 1945, whereas the copyright is actually 1946. O’Connell has confused the date of the lectures (which were given in 1945) with the date of the book (copyrighted in 1946).\(^{70}\) In another place, O’Connell has the book published in 1940.\(^{71}\)

I realize that people make mistakes in copying, and that it would be pedantic to hold someone responsible for every uncrossed “t” or undotted “i.” Nevertheless, the above mistakes cannot be passed off as mere
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copying errors. The fact that seven mistakes were found with reference to only one quote shows a general carelessness on O’Connell’s part in dealing with the writings of others.

This carelessness runs into what almost looks like deception. Here is an example of a quotation from Weidenreich where O’Connell leaves out a crucial phrase:

“From the *so-called Upper Cave of Choukoutien* which yielded the remains of Sinanthropus, three well-preserved skulls, several fragments of some more and skeletal bones of about ten individuals have been recovered. . . .”\(^72\)

Here is what Weidenreich actually wrote:

“From the so-called “Upper Cave” of Choukoutien, situated at the top of the hill which yielded the remains of Sinanthropus, three well-preserved skulls, several fragments of some more, and skeletal bones of about ten individuals, altogether, have been recovered. . . .”\(^73\)

Notice the differences: (1) The phrase “so-called Upper Cave of Choukoutien” was not italicized in the original; (2) the quotation marks around Upper Cave are missing; (3) the phrase “situated at the top of the hill” is missing; (4) a comma is left out after “some more”; and (5) the term “altogether” is missing.

There are five errors in all, showing that O’Connell never learned the subtle scholarly skill of giving accurate quotations. Again, it may be thought that these are small mistakes, but the omission of the phrase “situated at the top of the hill” happens to be a very crucial error, one that will lead O’Connell into a much larger error (which we will discuss later).

Here is another example of O’Connell’s mangled quotation from Boule:

““To this fantastic hypothesis (of Abbe Breuil and Fr. Teilhard de Chardin), that the owners of the monkey-like skulls were the authors of the large-scale industry, I take the liberty of preferring an opinion more in conformity with the conclusions from my studies, which is that the hunter (who battered the skulls) was a real man and that the cut stones, etc., were his handiwork.”\(^74\)

Darwinists (such as Frank Zindler) questioned this quotation. Zindler said that Boule’s original French in the article in *L’Anthropologie* did not use the term “monkey-like” nor did it refer to a “large-scale industry.” Here is the actual translation (per Zindler):

“To this hypothesis, as fantastic as it is ingenious, I may be permitted to prefer this one which seems to me to be just as satisfactory, being simpler and more in conformity with the totality of what we know: the hunter was a true man, whose stone industry has been found and who made Sinanthropus his victim.”\(^75\)
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As can be seen, O’Connell provided not only a careless quotation, but also inserted phrases within the quotation that he would use to support his theory. The added expressions were (1) “of Abbe Breuil and Fr. Teilhard de Chardin”; (2) “owners of the monkey-like skulls”; (3) “large-scale industry”; and so on. Aside from the faulty translation, the notion of “monkey-like” skulls is a fundamental assumption of O’Connell’s theory, so he should not have added the expression to the very thing he was using in an attempt to prove his theory.

Lest one think Zindler was biased in his translation, here are Boule’s words in his book Fossil Men, where he says pretty much the same thing as in Zindler’s translation, though co-writer Vallois has made some small modifications:

“To this hypothesis, other writers preferred the following, which seemed to them more in conformity with our whole body of knowledge: the hunter was a true Man, whose stone industry has been found and who preyed upon Sinanthropus.”

The only difference between the Fossil Men quotation and Boule’s L’Anthropologie quotation is that Vallois edited the quotation from first person (“I may be permitted to prefer”) to a third person point of view (“other writers preferred”). The term “other writers” is Vallois’s way of referring to Boule, thus indicating that he may not have agreed with Boule’s view on the matter. In any case, the Fossil Men quotation supports Zindler’s translation over O’Connell’s.

I must report that on the basis of such quotations, Darwinists have not been shy about questioning O’Connell (and Gish’s) honesty. Nevertheless, as one who was trained in the art of lying from an early age, I can say right off that neither O’Connell nor Gish bear in their flesh the stigmata of liars. Gish was merely repeating O’Connell, and merely repeating lies is not necessarily a culpable misdeed, else we’d have to arrest politicians and journalists. Lying actually requires talent and years of study, as well as years of meditation, and in some cases mentoring by more experienced liars. Normally, one doesn’t get a chance to take front and center stage during a good lie, but one must wait until the main liar is out sick, and then jump at the opportunity. If the talent is there, the lie will go on for the whole season. If it is not, then the lie will have to close down only after a short run. Now, lying yields its fruits only with constant practice. People who try it without training cannot pull it off and are quickly yanked from the scene before they bring the whole profession into disrepute. So my expertise tells me that neither O’Connell nor Gish ever learned how to tell an honest lie, and it shows.

Nevertheless, even if O’Connell was not strictly a liar, he can certainly be faulted for a remarkable proneness for exaggeration and carelessness. Those who suffer from these traits are part of a lesser profession, one that provides a place for liars who have grown old and decrepit,
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and have dropped into the second ranks and need sustenance. O’Connell, however, did not start out as a liar and work his way down to the merely error-prone, but rather came up through the ranks and achieved his high error rate in the old-fashioned way through ordinary pluck.

O’Connell wrote that Marcelin Boule visited the site of Zhoukoudian, but there is no evidence that he did and Darwinists have questioned this claim. In *Fossil Men*, Boule relied heavily on the primary investigators at the site—Black, Pei, Teilhard and Weidenreich, and referenced them heavily—*but* he never made any reference to having visited the site nor to having inspected the fossils first hand. Gish, unfortunately, repeated O’Connell’s error and has received a lot of artillery shelling in the way of insults from Darwinists as a result.

Aside from these problems, O’Connell also claimed that Davidson Black had two versions of Peking Man. In the first version, Peking Man represented the most primitive of hominids and in the second, he represented an “advanced” hominid. O’Connell says that Teilhard de Chardin’s earliest descriptions of Peking Man agreed with Black’s, that the cerebral capacity was “probably small” and that it resembled Java Man, that Sinanthropus resembled the “great apes closely.” O’Connell summarized their early view of Peking Man: “This skull of Sinanthropus as here described had no resemblance to the skull of the Neanderthal Man or of any other man. It was the skull of a baboon or monkey, for no fossils of apes have been found in China.”

Black’s alleged second version of Peking Man was that Peking Man was more advanced than Java Man but inferior to Neanderthal Man. O’Connell claimed that Black’s 1931 article published in *Palaeontologia Sinica* now measured the cranial capacity of Peking Man as 960, much larger than his earlier view would have suggested. O’Connell further claimed that the original descriptions of the skull showed that there was a hole in the top of the skulls but that subsequent models published by Black lack this trait.

In fact, the idea of two versions of Peking Man is easy to explain. When Darwinists want to emphasize the evolutionary significance of human fossils, they emphasize what they regard as the “primitive” traits of the fossils. When Darwinists want to show that a human-like fossil was not an ape, they emphasize what they regard as its “advanced” traits. We’ve seen this happen with Neanderthal Man, and with Java Man, so it’s not surprising that it also happened with Peking Man. In addition, Darwinists have pointed out that the holes referred
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to by O’Connell were at the base of the skull, the occipital region, not at the top, which is why O’Connell did not see them. In other words, he was looking in the wrong place.

Speaking of Neanderthal Man, we should note that O’Connell liked Neanderthal Man. He described the brain of Neanderthal Man as larger than that of modern man, and that the skull of Neanderthal Man was “dolichocephalic” or long-headed and that this trait is “no indication of inferior intelligence. . .”.80

There’s no need to keep trying to pronounce “dolichocephalic.” It’s a gauche, awkward word and it can’t be rescued, so it’s a waste of time to bother with it. Neither can the word for moderate-headedness (mesaticephalic) or short-headedness (brachycephalic). In my opinion, whoever came up with these terms must have been flat-headed (which I will call planoccephalic).

Because O’Connell liked Neanderthal Man so much, he objected to comparing him with “monkey-like” homo-erectus: “There was no point then in instituting a comparison between the skull of the mythical Sinanthropus and that of the Neanderthal Man; there was even less point in comparing it to the skull of the Java Man, for the skull of the Java Man of Dr. Dubois has been pronounced by Marcellin Boule to be that of a large gibbon, and was acknowledged to be such by Dr. Dubois himself more than once before his death.”81

The last statement is not true, as we have seen, and Boule’s judgment on the subject of Peking Man is open to question, as we will see later. It is odd that O’Connell relied on Boule so much for his case against the humanity of homo-erectus given that Boule treated Neanderthal Man in much the same way he treated homo-erectus. If O’Connell was willing to accept Boule’s negative judgment on the humanity of homo-erectus, why didn’t he also accept Boule’s negative judgment on the humanity of Neanderthal Man?

I would say that neither homo-erectus nor Neanderthal Man were ape-men, nor were they man-apes, i.e., halfway between stops on their way up the scale of being. They were simply human beings adapted to their particular environments in much the same way that today’s Australian aborigines adapted to their own environment. That such adaptation might result in a heterodox structural morphology is no evidence that all of these men were half-simian. It is evidence that the human genetic code was created with great potential for structural change (within limits).

Now, O’Connell also spoke of a third version of Peking Man, this one allegedly invented by Weidenreich and Teilhard de Chardin. The skulls in question were X, XI, and XII discovered in

80 O’Connell, p. 139.
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Locus L at Zhoukoudian. These were found when digging resumed in 1936. The larger cranial capacity of these skulls does not fit the monkey theory, so O’Connell’s response to these finds was simply this: “The evidence points to the conclusion that the finding of the three skulls of large brain capacity in December, 1936 is a pure invention.”

Say what?

O’Connell gave a lot of weight to Boule’s views, so why didn’t he accept Boule’s conclusion regarding these three skulls? “The three other skulls,” says Boule, “discovered in 1936 and belonging respectively to an adult man and woman and a ‘young adult’, came from Locus L. They lay in the same stratum, which was devoid of animal bones or worked stones. Unlike the earlier finds, they retained parts of the face. . . . The capacities of the skulls from Locus L are appreciably higher: 1,015 c.cm. for the woman, 1,030 and 1,225 c.cm. for the men.”

That doesn’t sound like pure invention to me. Because the cranial capacity of these skulls of Peking Man was well within the modern human range, O’Connell perhaps realized they undercut his theory that Peking Man was a mere tribe of monkeys killed by true men. Indeed, the 1,200+ brain capacity of one of these skulls was a reason offered by Teilhard against Boule’s theory of an outside agent as the producer of the tool industry. So O’Connell had a theoretical incentive to cast doubt on these fossils, to regard them as a “pure invention.”

Contrary to O’Connell, you can see pictures of the excavations of these skulls, including at least one of the skulls, showing familiar homo-erectus features. How did O’Connell make such an egregious mistake? I believe it was a simple matter of confusing Peking Man Skulls X, XI, and XII with the skulls of the “real men” found in the Upper Cave. O’Connell opined: “[Teilhard] tells us that in December, 1936 Dr. Pei ‘found’ three complete skulls of Sinanthropus and portions of others; that one of these skulls was that of a great male, the other two of females. These may be presumed to be the skulls of real men found in 1934. . . .”

In fact, it wasn’t “three complete skulls” that were found in the Upper Cave in the 1933-34 excavations, but rather seven or eight individuals who were unearthed in the Upper Cave. There were two male adults, two adult females, one adolescent, and two children. These skulls were found with post-cranial fossils (pelvis, thighbone, shoulder blade) as well as ornamentation
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(marine shells, red ochre) that dated the fossils to Late Paleolithic. The racial types of some of these individual skulls were presumed to be Mongolian, Melanesian, and Eskimo-like in appearance.

Contrary to O’Connell, these “real men” or Upper Cave skulls are not the three Peking Man skulls X, XI, and XII. The latter skulls were found in the main deposit, not in the Upper Cave. The Upper Cave is a separate area at Zhoukoudian from the main deposit.

What could have led O’Connell into this error? I believe it may be due to the fact that he left out a very crucial phrase from Weidenreich’s description of the Upper Cave finds. Earlier we provided this quotation from Weidenreich:

“We from the so-called “Upper Cave” of Choukoutien, situated at the top of the hill which yielded the remains of Sinanthropus, three well-preserved skulls, several fragments of some more, and skeletal bones of about ten individuals, altogether, have been recovered. . .”

We noted that O’Connell, among other things, did not include “situated at the top of the hill” in his quotation. When this is restored, it is clear that Weidenreich was not saying Sinanthropus skulls were found in the Upper Cave. Rather, he was saying that the Upper Cave itself was what was “situated at the top of the hill.” The location of the cave was at the top of the Zhoukoudian complex, and it was in the Upper Cave that the skulls of O’Connell’s “real men” were found. So Weidenreich’s main thoughts can be illustrated using brackets:

[From the so-called “Upper Cave” of Choukoutien]

[situated at the top of the hill which yielded the remains of Sinanthropus]
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As you can see, these are two different thoughts here, each self-contained. Weidenreich was not saying that the remains of Sinanthropus were found in the Upper Cave. Rather, he was saying that the whole Upper Cave complex was situated at the top of the hill.

It makes one wonder if this seemingly small error on O’Connell’s part is the source of all of his other large errors regarding the alleged contemporaneity of the “real men” of the Upper Cave with the Peking Man skulls found in the main deposit. To repeat: the Upper Cave men are examples of “modern” man, not of Peking Man. All those classified as Peking Man, including skulls X, XI, and XII, were found in the main deposit at Zhoukoutian. The classical Peking Man fossils were not found within the Upper Cave.

As I said before, I think O’Connell has fallen into such a large error because he was trying to play Sherlock Holmes in a recreation of the case of “The Missing Fossils of Peking Man.” He was so impressed regarding how investigators brought Piltdown Man in for questioning, leading to his arrest and incarceration, that O’Connell believed the same could be done with Peking Man. O’Connell compounded his errors. At one point, he claimed that Weidenreich denied the existence of a cave at Zhoukoudian, including the Upper Cave: “The existence of any natural cave at either the lower or the upper level is denied categorically by Weidenreich. . . .”

O’Connell did not provide a reference for this claim, but I surmise it’s based solely upon Weidenreich’s use of the term “so-called” to modify the term “Upper Cave.” There is no question that there is an upper cave at Zhoukoudian, so O’Connell is reading too much into Weidenreich’s unenthusiastic designation of the site. It is equally important to note that Weidenreich gave the location of the Upper Cave, so he was certainly not denying its existence. He was merely expressing a certain dislike for the name “Upper Cave.”

Once Weidenreich had identified the location of the Upper Cave skulls, he then went on to describe them not as the same type as Peking Man, but as more “modern” in appearance, and inhabiting an “upper-paleolithic melting-pot.” In Weidenreich’s view, the old man was Neanderthalian and Mongolian-like, the young woman was Melanesian-like, and the middle-aged woman was Eskimo-like. Weidenreich concluded from this: “The surprising fact is not the occurrence of paleolithic types of modern man which resemble racial types of today but their
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assemblage in one place and even in a single family, considering that these types are found today settled in far remote regions.”

This reminds me of a time when I and my immediate supervisor, Louis Cristillo, or Louie for short, were on business in Maine a while back. We were eating dinner at a seaside restaurant that advertised the freshest seafood on the coast. Louie didn’t believe it, and as he was not feeling very well anyway, he just had some bread and vegetables for dinner. I, however, ate just about everything on the menu, and rounded it up with fish soup.

After finishing his vegetables, Louie sat back to read his paper, contentedly. At that moment, a bowl of hot fish soup was placed in front of me. I was still hungry so I didn’t hesitate. I began to put my spoon into the soup, but something very strange happened. A fish raised its head out of the soup and grabbed my spoon and I swear that for the space of thirty seconds, I was playing tug of war with that fish. The reader may suspect that I am exaggerating, but I am not one who is given to that sort of thing. I rapidly grew tired of pulling against so great a force as the fish commanded, so I finally let go, but as I did so it caused me to fall over in my chair.

Louie lowered his paper and said, “What’s the matter with you?”

“Louie!” I said, after sitting back down again. “Did you see that?”

“See what?”

“There’s a fish in my soup.”

“Well of course there’s a fish in your soup. It’s fish soup isn’t it? Now go ahead and eat it up while I finish the paper.”

Louie’s head hid behind his paper again. I looked at him and then at the soup, wondering what to do. I began to exam the soup again, poking at it gingerly with the spoon. I began to feel better, so I inched my head closer to the bowl, trying to peer into it, as if a minute examination of the soup might solve the mystery. I got closer and closer, until my nose was nearly touching the soup.

Suddenly, the fish bit my nose!

Louie heard me cry out in pain and peered at me from around his paper. “What are you doing there? We’ve got to be going pretty soon. Go on, eat your soup. I’ve never seen anyone as slow as you about eating his soup. Now go on!”
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I nodded in frustration while Louie put his head in his paper again. I examined the soup—from a distance—and wasn’t sure what to do next. Pretty soon I had an idea. In my pocket was a paperclip and some string. I formed the paperclip into a hook and attached it to the string, then gently lowered the “hook” into the soup with the intention of catching the fish. Again, the reader might think I’m making this up, but as I said, it is not in my make to do something like that.

I continued to cast the line into the soup. There was a tug. Then another. Now, I knew that the fish was playing the line, trying to get me to pull up prematurely, but I had this fish’s number. I waited patiently, then finally a bite. I wasted no time but pulled up as hard as I could, but nothing happened. At least nothing at first. Suddenly, however, the fish pulled the hook and the string and my whole arm into the soup bowl, and the rest of me nearly followed. I had to pry my face out of the bowl before it was over.

After I’d gotten clear of the bowl Louie must have heard something and he put down his paper and said, “Now look at yourself. Clean up this mess, will you. Say, where did you learn table manners like that? I’ve never seen such a thing in civilized company and I won’t stand for any excuses. All right, since you won’t eat the soup, let’s be on our way. Come on, hurry up.”

We started to leave but then I looked back. The fish’s head was out of the soup, jeering at me, and grinning, too, in that way a fish does when it lays down a straight flush. But like I said, I had the fish’s number. I had carried a salt shaker with me, expecting that very thing from the fish. As soon as the fish began to dance around in a self-satisfied way and wasn’t paying attention, I let loose with a curve ball over home plate. It knocked the grin off the fish and placed it on top of his head. I folded my arms in triumph and observed rather wisely that, “It’s a hard field, but as long as you mind your loss carry-forwards, as well as your carry-backs, I anticipate a good investment season this year.”

But the fish had my number, too. As I was about to go out the door, the fish let loose with a plate that hit the back of my head and knocked me into tomorrow. I decided from thenceforth to keep my wise sayings to myself until such time as the trenches were cleared and a general armistice was agreed to.

This leads me right into my next point. O’Connell mentioned the death of Davidson Black as if something untoward had happened to him: “On the 15th of March, 1934, Dr. Black, in white overalls, went to his laboratory at Peking to examine the human skulls and bones that Dr. Pei had brought in from Choukoutien, and was later found dead among the human fossils.”93
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All along, O’Connell had implied that Dr. Pei had something to do with the “fraud” at Zhoukoudian, and here he puts Pei’s name in conjunction with a report on Dr. Black’s death. O’Connell supplied the italics, and thus leaves the impression that some skullduggery was at work in the death of Black. But it’s another fish story, this time told by O’Connell. In reality, Black had earlier collapsed at the cave site in 1933, and was told by doctors that he had suffered a mild heart attack. He was hospitalized for three weeks.94 Despite this, and despite the fact that his father had died at the age of 49 of a heart attack, Black decided to continue his work to the very end. That is the reason he died near his desk flanked by two of the fossil skulls from Zhoukoudien. It had nothing to do with any conspiracy to assassinate Black, as ever so slyly implied by O’Connell.

Another point: O’Connell criticized Weidenreich as “credulous” because of his gigantism theory of human evolution. Weidenreich, on the basis of the fossils of Meganthropus and Gigantopithecus (which he renamed Gigantanthropus), postulated the theory of what he regarded as a “continuous line of gigantic and nearly gigantic human forms characterized by a gradual reduction in size. . . .”95 Over the years, scientists have generally come to believe that Meganthropus was simply a variation of homo-erectus, but due to lack of post-cranial material, cannot say how tall he was. Gigantanthropus is really Gigantopithecus after all. Scientists have found more fossils of this type of creature and have concluded it was a giant ape. Thus, Weidenreich’s theory of human descent from giants has not been confirmed.

And yet this theory did not mean Weidenreich was so credulous that he believed in his theory no matter what, which is what O’Connell implies. Weidenreich admitted straight up that he was making the assumption that the fossils of Gigantanthropus were older than Java Man. Nevertheless, of this assumption, which is crucial to his theory, he also admitted “no evidences.” In addition, Weidenreich made the following comment with respect to his hypothesis: “In view of the difficulties in the case of the new Java finds, it seems hopeless to say anything regarding the age of the giant Chinese teeth. The only definite thing we know concerning their provenance is that they were picked up out of a cabinet. This is certainly not a reliable geological horizon.96

These comments do not sound all that “credulous.” Weidenreich did what any scientist should do: he put forth a hypothesis, supported it as much as he could, admitted what the hypothesis was still lacking in terms of evidence, then applied for a grant. That’s how it’s done. Accordingly, I see no reason to doubt Weidenreich’s credibility when it comes to the descriptions of the Peking
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Man fossils found at Zhoukoudian simply because he offered an unusual theory about human descent. O’Connell’s *ad hominen* against Weidenreich was thus out of place.

It was also out of place with respect to Teilhard de Chardin. O’Connell mentioned a) Teilhard’s role in the Piltdown excavations, b) that he was conscripted for World War I, c) that after the war, he became a Professor of Geology at a catholic university, and d) that he then became involved with Peking Man. Says O’Connell: “[Teilhard’s] claim to be considered an authority on ancient human fossils has rested almost completely on his connection with the cases of the Piltdown Man and the Peking Man. In neither case did he give any indication whatever of critical ability or independent judgment. He was just a child that never grew up. He had a marvelous knowledge of all the technical terms used by geologists and paleontologists, but that was all. . . . It is tragic, however, that the opinions of such a man, which are utterly worthless, should have influenced the teaching of prominent Catholic scholars. . . .”

As a creationist who has read Father Teilhard’s scientific work, I believe O’Connell’s evaluation of it is more than a little misdirected. It may be fashionable in some quarters to accuse Teilhard of being the culprit behind the Piltdown fraud, but as was discussed in our paper on the Piltdown Mystery, the evidence for Dawson’s sole guilt is practically overwhelming. Moreover, Teilhard was not a trained scientist at the time of the Piltdown finds but was only an enthusiastic amateur who was studying to be a priest.

It’s my belief that the most remarkable, the most learned, the most brilliant men in the world in all ages would have been fooled by Dawson at Piltdown. Galileo Galilei would have been fooled by Dawson. Isaac Newton would have been fooled by Dawson. Albert Einstein would have been fooled by Dawson. I would have—but let us move on.

Before arriving in England, Teilhard had gained a little scientific experience when he was put in charge of the Jesuit museum in Cairo, and he also gained some more knowledge of chemistry and physics when the Jesuits assigned him to teach those subjects in their secondary school. Nevertheless, he was still only a man studying for the priesthood, and O’Connell would be right that Teilhard’s opinions *at that time* were of no more value than those of (say) a Catholic priest who formed his scientific conclusions on the basis of what he read in newspapers.

Teilhard went to England to finish his theological studies before entering the priesthood (1908-1912). While there he met Charles Dawson and the two hit it off. Dawson must have seen the value of having a Catholic and a Frenchman on his team: it would lend more credibility to his
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reputation—providing a religious and an international imprimatur on his fraudulent fossils. Teilhard, for his part, must have been flattered as a theology student to be allowed to work with a locally famous archaeologist. During this time, Teilhard also came under the influence of Henri Bergson’s book *Creative Evolution*, which interestingly enough, also influenced the famed Catholic philosopher and critic of Bergsonian philosophy, Jacques Maritain.\(^9^9\)

After Teilhard gained some notoriety from the Piltdown excavations, the Jesuits, not wanting to look a gift-horse in the mouth, allowed him to pursue his paleontological studies at the Institut de Paléontologie in Paris. During this time, Marcellin Boule, who questioned the relation between the skull and the jaw at Piltdown, probably influenced Teilhard in the same direction so that he would write an article in 1920 questioning the correlation.

Between 1914 and 1919, Teilhard was a stretcher-bearer in World War I—a war which Paul Fussell aptly described as “industrialized ghastliness.” Because of his services during the war, including providing priestly services for the wounded and the dying, Teilhard was awarded the Medaille Militaire, and became a member of the Legion d’Honneur.

After the war, Teilhard continued his scientific studies and field work, and achieved a doctorate. He became an assistant professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris, but later, due to conflicts with his Catholic superiors, he was assigned to China, and would later become an adviser to the Zhoukoudian excavations.

None of the facts presented above provide any hint that Teilhard was lacking in scientific or paleontological competence. He may have started out as an amateur, but he gained a real doctorate and a real professorship, and was thus eminently qualified to be a paleontological adviser with respect to the Peking Man finds. Indeed, the only real doubts expressed regarding the excavations at Zhoukoudian were by Weidenreich, and these were directed against the Chinese workers there. After several visits, however, Weidenreich realized that the Chinese excavators were carrying out the work with great care.\(^1^0^0\)

Now don’t get me wrong. I am not defending Teilhard’s philosophy. From my reading of it, Teilhard’s philosophy appears to be a blend of Bergson’s philosophy, some Hinduism added in for interest, and a dose of Roman Catholicism to make it go down more easily.\(^1^0^1\) Mostly,

\(^{9^9}\) See Jacques Maritain, *Bergsonian Philosophy and Thomism*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1955, [1914]. Bergson’s philosophy fit in well with the Progressivism of the age and was a critique of Herbert Spencer’s materialistic, social Darwinist conception of the theory of evolution.

\(^{1^0^0}\) Lanpo & Weiwen, p. 145.

\(^{1^0^1}\) See, Doran McCarty, *Teilhard De Chardin*, pp. 29, 31, 68.
Teilhard’s philosophy is baptized Bergsonianism. I cannot take the time to discuss Bergson’s philosophy in depth, but in summary, it’s an evolutionary philosophy. Curiously, the first part of Bergson’s book, Creative Evolution, published in 1911, provides a devastating critique of the theory of evolution. Bergson found the problem of what we would today call “irreducible complexity” so great that he denied that Darwin’s theory of insensible variation, or the saltationist idea of very sensible variation (“hopeful monsters”), or the neo-Lamarckian conception of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, that any of these theories could really account for evolution. He thought evolution needed more, an impetus, a vital principle that directed matter to organize itself, that is to say, an élan vital.\textsuperscript{102}

Teilhard also accepted the Bergsonian élan vital but called it the “withinness of things.” He could not conceive of evolution happening in a mechanistic manner and was thus driven to posit an inner energy driving things to a final convergence. Sadly, he also confused the growth of the world into greater complexity with the movement of the world into greater collectivity, and thus has been accused of being in sympathy with totalitarianism, including Marxism.\textsuperscript{103} Additionally, unlike Bergson, Teilhard accepted the neo-Lamarckian conception of evolution.\textsuperscript{104}

All in all, Teilhard’s philosophical speculations are not original, and some of them may be positively dangerous. He was caught up in the wake of Bergson’s metaphysics of flow and never understood how philosophically empty it was.\textsuperscript{105} Despite this, Teilhard’s scientific work is above reproach and does not deserve to be lumped in with the rest of his thought, nor should he be dismissed as a mere “charlatan” (Peter Medawar) or as a “child that never grew up” (O’Connell). Rather, he was a scientist first and foremost. All the rest is dross.

\textit{Gish Steps Into It}

The late Duane Gish, Ph.D., was a biochemist who has done research for Cornell University Medical College, the Virus Laboratory at Berkeley, and was employed for eighteen years with the Upjohn Company, a pharmaceutical manufacturing firm now owned by Pfizer. Gish was certainly an expert in the biological and chemical sciences. Nevertheless, he had no special expertise in the fields of anthropology or paleontology. For that reason, he should have been more cautious in his approach to the subject.

Unfortunately, Gish followed O’Connell in accepting Boule’s theories about Peking Man, and also presented O’Connell’s conclusions as if they should be taken seriously. Gish acknowledged that O’Connell lacked any scientific expertise but he then pushed it aside by comparing him to biblical David: “To pit the evaluation of a priest against those of
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eminent evolutionary paleontologists seems akin to pitting David against Goliath.” Gish thinks this is an apt comparison because he believes that this Catholic David has found a “weak spot” in the evolutionary Goliath.\(^\text{106}\)

Gish was involved many years ago in the salutary but often thankless task of debating evolutionists. Because of these debates, Gish and his colleague Henry Morris did much to revive the fortunes of creationism in the twentieth century. However, as with Virchow (and Richard Owen), their work in reviving a true science of origins has gone unappreciated except by a small group of fellow creationists. Even ID theorists generally refuse to mention Gish or Morris so as to avoid the supposed taint of six-day creationism. Despite his services to the cause of Christianity, it is important to admit at this point that the views of Dr. Gish on Peking Man were largely a disservice to the cause he espoused. Let us examine the issue a little further.

In his book on fossils, Gish summarized O’Connell’s claims: (1) Dr. Pei deliberately destroyed the fossils because he knew they didn’t correspond to the models; (2) there was no cave at Zhoukoudian; (3) “lime-kilns” at the site indicate a large-scale quarrying of limestone and that “houses” were being built (and this accounts for the “stone industry” at Zhoukoudian); and (4) the stone tool industry was Upper Paleolithic, ruling out an earlier date for Sinanthropus.

Then further: (5) very little attention has been paid to the “real men” of the upper level, and that these “real men” were killed when their quarrying operations undermined the cliff, and the resulting “landslide” buried the Peking Man skulls; (6) there was no “cave-filling”; (7) earlier descriptions of Sinanthropus do not correspond to later models, that later descriptions depict Peking Man as becoming more and more man-like (says Gish: “Perhaps this is the only evolution involved in this whole affair!”); (8) Peking Man really consisted only of large monkeys or baboons (or some ape-like creature), who were killed and eaten by the ancient quarry-workers at Zhoukoudian; and finally (9) Peking Man is a fraud akin to Piltdown man.\(^\text{107}\)

I don’t think I would be exaggerating if I said every one of these claims is false. It’s not like me to criticize another man’s exaggerations, but I have no choice in this case. Show me a man who has never exaggerated or lied a time or two, and I’ll show you an elephant that can dance a polka.

There is no evidence that Dr. Pei destroyed any of the fossils found at Zhoukoudian. O’Connell neglected to bring forth any credible evidence to substantiate such a charge, unless of course Pei—the wily mastermind—destroyed that too. In fact, so esteemed was Pei for his researches at Zhoukoudian that he would later become the Chairman of the Chinese Association of Natural

---
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Science Museums, and then a director of the Beijing Museum of Natural History. Until his death he worked at the Institute for Vertebrate Paleontology and Paleoanthropology of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and is regarded as the founding father of Chinese archaeology. Now, you don’t get that kind of a reputation if you go around and toss out important stuff, so I just think it’s more in the nature of character assassination to accuse Pei of sabotage when there isn’t any evidence to back up such a far-fetched claim. In my opinion, this is Father O’Connell at his worst.

Furthermore, I see no reason to deny the existence of a cave at Zhoukoudian, unless the goal was to deny it for no reason. There are all kinds of reasons for denying things for no reason, but I don’t think this is one of those reasons. What could O’Connell have possibly hoped to gain from such an absurd denial? After all, there were plenty of pictures of the fissure at Dragon Bone Hill just as there are today. So the denial of a cave appears quixotic to me, but I guess it means O’Connell was just trying to play his Sherlock Holmes role again—badly.

The lack of a roof over the cave today only means that the cave roof collapsed from time to time over the span of years, leaving Peking Man out in the rain. The result was cave-filling that excavators had to remove in order to reach lower levels of the cave. Large scale quarrying at the site was done in Medieval and modern times, and O’Connell’s “large scale industry” at Zhoukoudian was simply the stone tool industry carried out by Peking Man over the life of the cave.

Since O’Connell confused the Upper Cave men (who were Upper Paleolithic) with the three Peking Man skulls found in 1936, he was required to date all the tools to the Upper Paleolithic levels. This, however, is not really possible, for Peking Man lived during the Middle Pleistocene levels and used Lower Paleolithic tools. I should note that these tools were earlier than the tools used by the “real men” of the Upper Cave, so in my opinion if the “real men” ever used Peking Man’s tools, they did not sign out for them, on account of not wanting to be “remarked” upon by their peers for using old equipment. Therefore, Upper Paleolithic Men borrowed in secret.

The claim that very little attention has been paid to the Upper Cave individuals is belied by frequent discussions of them in the literature regarding Zhoukoudian. Perhaps O’Connell did not see discussions of such individuals because he had confused the Upper Cave “real men” (regarded as homo-sapiens) with the Peking Man Skulls X, XI, and XII found in the main deposit.

---
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There was no “landslide” at Zhoukoudian. O’Connell merely invented this, probably from drink, but also because of a false understanding of the archaeology of the site. The real fill at the cave is from roof cave-ins and this is attested to by the archaeologists at the site. It is true that the descriptions of Peking Man changed over time, but this was due in part to the fact that excavators were finding more material, and also because science was winning out, to some extent, over interpretive bias. So Gish was misdirected in claiming that this growth and correction was just Darwinian skullduggery. In addition, Gish was influenced by O’Connell’s mistaken view that the Peking Man skulls with large cranial capacity were the same as the Upper Cave men.

Finally, the idea that Peking Man was really a monkey is preposterous given the cranial capacity of the Peking Man skulls. The fact is, O’Connell just invented a conspiracy theory about the discovery of Peking Man, and once entangled in such a theory, it is as hard for the conspiracy theorist to give up his “histories” and “connections” as it is for an elephant to sing an aria. There are a lot of things elephants can’t do, and there are reasons to believe this is one of them.

This reminds me of a time when a rather stubborn, irascible man named Smith tried his hand at farming. One day he bought a farm that was up next to one of the Great Lakes—Lake Michigan I believe. He planted and watered and the first season was good, providing bountiful crops. Only one thing dampened his enthusiasm for the farm. Very near the waterline of Lake Michigan was a stand of tall sturdy oaks and pines that ran the length of the coastline parallel to the farm. They were so tall and dense they obstructed his view of the lake. He had to go around the trees, or further along the coast, to see the lake in its native beauty.

The next season he talked about cutting the trees down but a wise old farmer—Jones was his name—shook his head and said, “It wouldn’t be a good idea. Those trees are there for a reason or the previous farmers wouldn’t have let ‘em stay.”

“What possible use could they be?” replied Smith. “They only get in the way. I shall remove them soon enough, for I believe in rational farming, not in old traditions and folklore.”

Jones shook his grizzled head, “Well, you do what you like, but I don’t like tampering with traditions, you know. Some’s might be ignorant, I grant. Others might be smart, too. You wait and see if what I say isn’t true.”

He went away, his head tilted in a philosophical way, as if pondering great matters. Smith laughed derisively and said, “Well, these old farmers know a lot, but they’re just wedded to how their fathers did it. They don’t know the value of rational, modern farming, so I’ll remove those trees and that’s that.”

Next day, he had the trees removed—took several days actually. Finally, when the ground was cleared, a beautiful view of the lake opened up right before the farm, and Smith was satisfied.
Then he set about planting crops for the up-coming season, and soon the seeds began to sprout and it looked to be a good year.

Smith went to sleep one night very happy and thinking the farming life was not a very bad life at all. The next day, he woke up and went out eagerly to survey his new crops, expecting to see a cornucopia of corn, beans, sprouts, watermelons, and all manner of vegetables and fruits and tubers. But as he looked out upon the fields, there arose in him a holler that brought the birds of the air and the beasts of the field out to see what was the matter, and to render assistance, if needed.

Overnight, the whole crop had died. You see, a cold wind had come from the lake and froze the whole crop in the space of one evening. Smith found out that those trees had served a purpose. They had blocked the freezing wind that was coming off the lake in the early morning, and by chopping them down, their only protection against the cold wind had been taken away.

Smith was very angry, and he cussed and swore so much that it thawed out an old tree that hadn’t been chopped down, and had been minding its own affairs. It chanced, however, that the tree fell right on top of Smith, knocking him into the ground, and as a result he was plowed so far under they had to wait until the next season to harvest him.

*Boule’s Theory:*

O’Connell and Gish (and earlier Dewar) adopted the “monkey” interpretation from the French paleontologist, Marcellin Boule. The Frenchman had not accepted the hypothesis that Peking Man was the tool maker, creator of fire, and cannibal at Dragon Bone Hill. Instead, he regarded Peking Man as the victim, not the victimizer, and suggested that “true man” did the cannibalizing, not Peking Man.

How reliable was Boule in his interpretation of Peking Man? If you’ve read our discussion of Neanderthal Man, you’ll see that Boule is regarded by modern Darwinists as “responsible for having confused our picture of Neanderthal man for many years.”

On the basis of the LaChapelle finds Boule read Neanderthal Man out of human ancestry, treating him as a primitive side branch that did not lead directly to humans. It is never a good idea to be a primitive side branch, in my judgment, for it leads to a place that is not really going anywhere.

---

We recall that Boule described Neanderthal Man as having “many characters of inferiority,” of having a “bestial appearance,” “simian character,” of being on “the lowest rung of the human ladder,” “strikingly resembles the Anthropoid Apes,” with “muzzle-like form of the face,” “resembling . . . the skulls of chimpanzees, of gorillas,” and who “approaches the Apes more than any other Man,” with a “bestial appearance of the face,” “very primitive in appearance,” “vestiges of simian structure.”

And so on and on. However, this “classic” Neanderthal was just an old man suffering from arthritis. As Ian Tattersall said, “But quite as important as new Neanderthal finds in the 1950s is the recognition, finally, that the stoop-shouldered, bent-kneed stereotype of these humans created by Marcellin Boule was totally false.”

Since homo-erectus, including both Java Man and Peking Man, was very similar to Neanderthal Man, it is no wonder Boule’s mental template would have him shuttle these types off on an evolutionary dead-end. As with Neanderthal Man, Boule was happy to read Peking Man out of the human family. Because Dewar, O’Connell, and others failed to understand Boule’s particular bias against Neanderthal Man, they could not see that he was bringing similar baggage to his analysis of Peking Man.

In a section of his book on fossil men, “A New Discussion of the Facts,” Boule put forward his view that Peking Man “are creatures with physical characters intermediate between the group of Anthropoid Apes and the group of Hominians.” This is the Haeckel paradigm again, with its unholy grail of “intermediateness.” In fact, a main proof for this claim was one of those familiar Haeckel-type line-ups where the skull of Peking Man is placed between the skull of a gorilla and the skull of a “modern” human. The skull of Peking Man is made out to be larger than the gorilla skull but smaller than the human skull. Undoubtedly, for those who needed help for their unbelief, this provided all the proof that was necessary. As an aside, the use of such preposterous lineups can also be seen in Nott and Gliddon’s book, *Types of Mankind*, published in 1868, where the lineup is: Greek on top, chimpanzee on the bottom, and “Negro” in the middle!

Boule’s faith that Peking Man was midway between ape and man, however, did not lead him to accept the view that Peking Man was a tool-maker. He granted that the Zhoukoudian site contained indicia of man’s presence, e.g., hearths with ashes and stone tools, but he questioned whether Peking Man was the originator of the tools and of the ashes. In addition, Boule believed

---

the absence of any other parts of the skeletons except the head indicated that these Peking Man individuals had been hunted:

“How are we to explain the almost complete absence of long bones and this kind of selection of bony parts all belonging to the skull, in which lower jaws predominate? Weidenreich believed that these selected parts . . . must have been brought there by hunters . . . . In itself, this explanation is thoroughly plausible. But the problem is to name the hunter. To Weidenreich’s mind, this was Sinanthropus himself, that is to say a cannibal, the first cannibal.”

The idea of Peking Man as the first cannibal is what Boule referred to as a “fantastic hypothesis.” It was more likely, in Boule’s view, that Peking Man was not a cannibal, much less the first cannibal. Instead, he was the hunted, and the hunter and cannibal was true man. Boule noted an obvious objection: “To this concept the objection will inevitably be raised that, if such a Man, contemporaneous with our Chelleans [Peking Man], had lived at Choukoutien, he would be bound to have left all or part of his skeleton there.”

Boule went on to deny that such men would necessarily have left their bones at the site, but in doing so, he at least admitted that there was no evidence for them. His conclusion: “We may therefore ask ourselves whether it is not over-bold to consider Sinanthropus the monarch of Choukoutien, when he appears in its deposit only in the guise of a mere hunter’s prey, on a par with the animals by which he is accompanied.”

In response to Boule’s theory, Teilhard de Chardin said: “The weakness of this theory appears in the fact that after many years of digging, neither fossils nor remains of any other species of human being have been found in the same area as Peking man. . . .” In an earlier paper, Teilhard had acknowledged that one couldn’t rule out Boule’s theory, but that the simplest theory, and one in accord with the facts, was to regard Peking Man as the intelligent agent of the tool industry.

From our perspective, either theory could be true. The problem for Teilhard and most evolutionists is that they regard man as having evolved at different stages, one stage after the other, and such a stage theory rules out contemporaneity. Under this view, the Zhoukoudian Peking individuals would represented a distinctive stage of human evolution and could not have been killed by anyone other than members of the Peking Man stage of development.
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Now, since we do not accept a stage theory of human evolution, we do not have to rule out Boule’s view of a different race of man as the killer of the Peking individuals. That might in fact be the case. A tribe of “modern”-looking people may have migrated into the area and attended a prayer meeting with the Peking individuals, and during the meeting, several Peking individuals played a rather small but still significant role in helping the modern people adopt a new diet. On the other hand, it could very well have been another denomination of Peking folk who went “visiting” on a Sunday, and didn’t like the pot-luck offered up by the Zhoukoudian denomination. This encouraged dissension and acrimony among the wives, and some poor and unhealthy souls must have expired from excesses of religious excitement.

There is no need to reject our view simply because no scientist has ever offered it as an explanation. After all, no one ever thought that Christopher Columbus would discover America, but Ferdinand and Isabella did; said so right to his face. And was he grateful? Hardly. He didn’t name any one of his ships after the monarchs, and he never tagged any island or land he found with either one of their names. No, he was satisfied with “America,” and said it was “macaroni” from which we get our song.

Since in my experience most cannibals do not leave a calling card, we will probably never know who came up with this innovative idea.

Douglas Dewar was one of the first creationists to accept Boule’s view. O’Connell probably learned of Boule’s view from Dewar, but went well beyond Dewar in accusing those involved of being part of a conspiracy to defraud the public (a view later popularized by Gish in his books and in his debates).

Almost as if personally addressing Dewar, O’Connell, and Gish, Teilhard argued that the theory of a race of “real” men taking advantage of an inferior Peking Man people was possible but not very probable: “But is there not then a disproportion between a culture relatively so advanced and the anatomically primitive [sic] characteristics of its presumed author? Is it really Sinanthropus who did this? A doubt may arise; and it has already been expressed. ‘Are you quite sure,’ some prehistorians (and not minor ones) have said, ‘that two very different things do not coexist at Choukoutien, and should these not be separated? Here are the remains of a completely inferior hominian, Sinanthropus; and there are hearths left by a true man (let us call him X) whose remains have not yet been found, but whose presence is vouched for by the tools and ashes. Don’t attribute to the bones of one the intelligence of the other. Man X

---

must have killed Sinanthropus and brought back the spoil. As for Sinanthropus, he is quite incapable of lighting a fire or cutting anything. Look at his skull.”

Teilhard went on to point out that the idea that other (mysterious) men were responsible for culture was not new. It had been invented years before in Belgium in an attempt to explain the association of the supposedly unintelligent Neanderthal Man with the production of chipped flints, which seemed to require some intelligence to make. Teilhard acknowledged that Boule’s hypothesis of “Man X” was so lacking in any foundations, and was so negative, that it could not be ruled out as a theory, even though it was very improbable. “On the other hand,” said Teilhard, “the remains of Sinanthropus are so regularly found in the neighbourhood of tools and ashes that this cannot be a chance association. And on the other hand, his osteological and endocranial characteristics tend increasingly, as we have said to place him among the true men.”

My final opinion on O’Connell and Gish is that they were in over their heads on this matter. Obviously, Father O’Connell was no expert on Peking Man but then again neither was Dr. Gish. While Gish did not support O’Connell’s theory all the way, he still helped popularize it, and gave it a credence that it really did not deserve. It is true that O’Connell and Gish were right in their main conclusion, that Peking Man was not an evolutionary missing link, but they were wrong on how they arrived there. Their handling of the facts in this case was more akin to how non-scientists such as myself would have handled them. I don’t mean to suggest that these men are like me. They were not born infallible, for instance. But given their education and training, these men should have turned in a much better product than they did, whereas now it has to be discounted or taken out of rotation entirely.

As noted in our previous paper, the Turkana boy had an impact on Gish’s theory, but did not significantly affect his views on Peking Man or Java Man. While he accepted the humanity of the Turkana boy, he still could not bring himself—perhaps under the influence of O’Connell—to regard Peking Man and Java Man as fully human. For Gish they remained apes while the Turkana boy was probably a Neanderthal. To quote him again: “At this time, it is our opinion that some specimens attributed to Homo erectus, such as Java Man and Peking Man, are definitely from the ape family. . . . In other cases . . . specimens have been attributed to Homo erectus which otherwise would have been attributed to Neanderthal Man if the authorities making this decision had not believed that the fossil creature was too old to have been Neanderthal Man. In these instances, as for example, the very recent find by Walker and Leakey near Lake Turkana, it may be that the creature was fully human, Homo sapiens.”

---
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This bifurcation between Java Man and Peking Man on the one hand, and the Turkana boy on the other, is not an acceptable conclusion. Of course, I don’t think bifurcations are really acceptable in a general sense because they tend to divide things, and they separate them, too. Nevertheless, in the specific sense too, today’s creationists by and large reject Gish’s bifurcation and are in favor of the full humanity of homo-erectus, which admission is very homo-sapiens of them. Marvin Lubenow’s views on homo-erectus have been the major influence bringing about this change of opinion.

An interesting aspect of Lubenow’s view is that he emphasizes the overlap of homo-erectus with “modern” human populations: “There has always been evidence that Homo erectus was both very old and very young—spanning the entire time range of humans. . . . [N]ow there are at least 140 Homo erectus fossil individuals dated younger than 400,000 ya and 32 dated older than 1.5 Mya.”121 Christopher Stringer says: “Even more puzzling was the discovery, in 1936, from deposits of the Solo River at Ngandong, of twelve braincases and a couple of leg bones that look unmistakably like those of erectus people. Incredibly, recent dating suggests they may be less than 100,000 years old.”122

Lubenow does not accept the reality of these dates in absolute terms, but he uses them to emphasize the long range of the homo-erectus time span, one that overlaps the time of other fossil types such as so-called homo-habilis and “modern” homo-sapiens. If homo-erectus evolved from homo-habilis, how is it that he existed during the homo-habilis stage of ostensible human evolution? Moreover, if homo-sapiens evolved from homo-erectus, how is it that “modern” men were living during the homo-erectus stage of ostensible human evolution? For Lubenow, a Darwinian explanation of human evolutionary progress requires that one human species had a better advantage in a changing environment, and that less complex human species became extinct.

It follows that a Darwinian explanation of human evolution is therefore not compatible with contemporaneousness, despite modern Darwinists who claim otherwise. You just cannot have two humans representing different stages of human evolution living at the same time—not that there’s anything wrong with that—and still claim you are representing a Darwinian explanation of human evolution. You would, in fact, be undermining a Darwinian explanation, which would require you to demonstrate how such an undermining is to be explained.

7. The Morphology of Homo Erectus
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The following section discusses some images that show the skull of homo-erectus in comparison with the skull of Neanderthal Man, and also in comparison with “modern” skulls.

The first comparison is between a Neanderthal skull and a “modern” looking Cro-Magnon man. With respect to Neanderthal Man, notice the swept back, flattened forehead and the elongated skull, where the brain case is placed further back behind the eyes instead of above the eyes as in a “modern” skull. Notice also the heavier eyebrows and the less pronounced chin region compared to the “modern” looking Cro-Magnon. Recall also that Neanderthal Man is now regarded as fully human, not as a half ape, half man creature.

This change of view regarding Neanderthal Man puts me in mind of how things can change. I once went up to Sedona a few years ago. Now Sedona is a town in Arizona just south of Flagstaff and is a tourist destination, especially for people who believe in paranormal phenomena. Accordingly, Sedona is not only famous for its picturesque red mountains but also for its mystical vortexes. I was up there during a time when some vortexes got loose and wandered down into the town. This is not unusual. Mystical vortexes frequently get out onto the roads or crowd the roundabouts and create a traffic hazard. In order to prevent anyone from getting hurt, a lot of Sedona volunteers get their old horses out and round up the vortexes and shoo them back into their pastures. Then they repair all the broken fencing that allowed the vortexes to escape. These pastures are owned by vortex barons, who jealously guard their ranges. Sometimes, when someone is caught stealing a vortex, the thief is taken out and hanged without trial. The ranchers don’t have to worry about the law because no witnesses will ever come forth to testify against them, so strong is their grip on the politics of the town. Still, vortex rustling is profitable and it is not unusual for rustlers to cut the fences deliberately so that herds will jump through the wiring and become free ranging vortexes. These can then be rebranded, and it takes some expertise to make out the original brand.

Similarly with respect to ancient men, these folk have been misrepresented so much over the last century as to turn them into half-apes, half-monkey creatures—and it is hard to see these men as human beings again once they’ve got that simian brand etched into their hides.

Now here is the skull of homo-erectus (right). Notice the same type of swept back forehead, the elongated skull, the heavier eyebrows and the less pronounced chin region that one can see in Neanderthal Man. I see a lot of similarity between these skull types, so it doesn’t really make a lot of sense to me to place Neanderthal Man and homo-erectus in different species, unable to interbreed, each representing different stages of
human evolution. There are a lot of things that don’t make sense to me—Hegelianism, health food stores, rap, Richard Simmons—but putting Neanderthals and homo-erectuses into different human categories makes even less sense. Therefore, I think it is nonsense to see them as anything other than different races of man.

Let us compare another set of skulls. These skulls represent a modern day human skull and the skull of an Australian aborigine (left). While not as pronounced as they are in Neanderthal Man or homo-erectus, notice with respect to the Australian aborigine the same type of swept back forehead, the elongated skull, the heavier eyebrows and the less pronounced chin region in comparison to the “modern” human.

It seems the only real difference between these ancient men and the modern Australian is that the ancient men had a more pronounced Australian accent.

Here is my take on things. I believe this structural change was a function of the extreme environments that ancient man lived in, which favored the more horizontal, swept-back morphology. Take dogs for instance. They usually have elongated heads, and it comes from sticking their heads out of car windows and putting their faces into the wind. This is what happened to homo-erectus, too. During windy days, he would sometimes stick his head out of his cave, because he liked the feel of the wind on his face, and therefore his head got long. This is a perfectly reasonable explanation, and is consistent with all of the facts in the case.

Personally, I think that instead of being “primitive” the skulls of these ancient men were simply more specialized and hence more “advanced” than their ortho-sapien counterparts. Look at it this way. Let us imagine a situation where no one knew about Australian aborigines. They had not been discovered yet. Now let’s say that an Australian aborigine skull—or at least a skull of the same type—was found in a cave and was dated to an early Paleolithic period.

How would a Darwinist classify the skull? Remember, in our thought experiment no one knows anything about Australian aborigines yet, so the Darwinist has nothing to compare it with. He notices the swept back forehead, the heavy eyebrows, and the elongated skull; and he sees that the brain would have been farther down behind the eyes than in “modern” man. Can you guess what the Darwinist would say? I think I can. He would undoubtedly classify the skull as “simian” in appearance, as an example of a half-ape, half-man, though more “advanced” than other Paleolithic skull types, but “less advanced” than modern man.

I know he would say something like this because Darwinists have already said that sort of thing about Australian aborigines. Here is what old Haeckel said: “The lower races—such as the
Veddahs or Australian Negroes—are physiologically nearer to the mammals, apes and dogs, than to the civilized European. We must, therefore, assign totally different value to their life.”

But that was always like Haeckel. He never could bring himself to stick with stable intellectual stock, and that is why his truth dividends were always so irregular. Not only did Haeckel compare the Veddahs (a people from Sri Lanka) and the Australian Negroes (aborigines) with apes, he also managed—somewhat like the Savior did with the Syrophoenician woman—to work in a comparison with dogs. Jesus was at least teaching that salvation was for the Jew first, then for the Gentiles (the dogs), but in Haeckel’s evolutionary world-view, the Veddahs and Australian aborigines would never be eligible for the crumbs falling from the Darwinist table. Their lives must be assigned a “different value”—meaning no real value at all.

Obviously, Darwinists of today wouldn’t say that Australian aborigines are apes or dogs, but they had no trouble at all in speaking of “lower races” prior to the Fall of Carleton Coon. You may not remember Carleton Coon, but he has become something of a byword (among Darwinists at least) for what not to say about human evolution. Merely mention the name “Carleton Coon” and you can frighten all the little academic children into silence.

There is an argumentative fallacy out there that has become so common that it has received its own name, the argumentum ad Hitlerum. This fallacy involves attempting to defeat an opponent’s views by comparing them to what Adolf Hitler might have said or done (breathing air?). Similarly, a Darwinist’s comparison of an opponent’s views to something Carleton Coon might have said or done can be described as a similar fallacy. As with the ad Hitlerum argument, this fallacy should be assigned a name, and I propose we call it the fallacy of argumentum ad Coonum. (We will discuss Coon and the issue of racism in a later chapter.)

---
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Since on our view, homo-erectus and homo-sapiens were just different races of true humans, not different species of mankind, you might wonder what Paleolithic men of the homo-erectus variety would have looked like? In answer, let us look at this comparison between the heads of a modern European and a modern Australian aborigine. The structural differences between these two races are clearly discernible, but in no sense can the modern Australian aborigine be “simianized” as is the wont of Darwinists when it comes to describing men of the ancient past who were of a similar anatomical structure to the Australians.  

So homo-erectus would have looked more like the man on the right, who is a modern Australian and fully human.

It is not hard to imagine that homo-erectus and Neanderthal Man probably looked very similar to today’s Australian aborigines. There should be no worry here over comparing a modern race with an “inferior” less intelligent race of ape-men. For us, since Neanderthal Man and homo-erectus were as fully human as we are, and were also much closer to the source, they were probably far superior physically and intellectually to us washed-out, Tofurkey-eating, reality TV-watching, homo-sapiens.

The next picture (right) shows a normal Australian aborigine, and this is probably similar to what Neanderthal Man, Java Man, and Peking Man looked like. These latter would undoubtedly have been more robust in appearance than modern Australian aborigines, since modern aborigines have homo-sapiens characteristics as well. Of course, there is no way of knowing whether Paleolithic men had black skin or excesses of facial or bodily hair. They are normally depicted as hairy and dark-skinned simply because Darwinists use apes as a conceptual model for reconstructing Paleolithic fossil men. The actual paleontological record, however, does not preserve skin color nor hair color. Our guess is that black pigmentation or white pigmentation are specialized or adaptive characteristics, and that early men were probably somewhere in the middle of the spectrum.

There is a story in Greek mythology that Phaeton, Apollo’s son, was flying his father’s chariot all over the place, and when he got too high, the world froze, and when he got too low, the world burned. Now it is said that when Phaeton was too close to the earth he happened to be flying over Ethiopia and because of that he burned the people living there. Ever since then, these
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125 Some Egyptians from ancient Egypt show the swept back profile, so the type is not limited to modern Australian aborigines. There are also some American Indians who have elongated skulls, and in some case practiced skull modification to achieve an even longer skull profile.
people have had black skin and their county was turned into a desert—and that’s the origin of dark-skinned pigmentation. I believe this is a reasonable explanation of the facts, and no one has yet provided a more plausible theory at this stage of scientific inquiry.

In addition, there has been a lot of “clinal” interaction between Australian aborigines and nearby races over the years, so it is no surprise that Australians would not be pure Java or Peking Man types, but only resemble them in some ways. The same goes for just about any other “race” one could name. As Darwinists like to remind us, there are no “pure” races—races that have never mixed with other human populations in the past. That is not to say that there aren’t any pure individuals, but I will say no more on the subject lest one think I am violating the sacred canons of humility and modesty. Such rules have provided a light for our steps and have hastened our journey along the road of piety and moral habitus, and I will keep strictly to them under the circumstances.

8. Homo-Erectus as Slacker

G. Philip Rightmire provided a discussion of homo-erectus, including their dating. At the time Rightmire was writing, he thought that the earliest date was 1.78 million years ago from Koobi Fora in the Turkana basin. I don’t accept this absolute date of 1.78 million years, for the simple reason that I don’t like dates that are absolute. I also don’t like dates with decimals, and I don’t like squash either, or tomatoes. I guess one could say it’s a failing in me, but there it is. However, such dates can be helpful in terms of ordinal dating (first, second, third, etc.). If something is dated to 1.78 million years, and another thing is dated to 1.77 million years, there’s a good chance that the latter followed the former in time, and perhaps even in space. I cannot prove it in a mathematical way—not being conversant with that mode of demonstration—but it is often the case that previous events do take place before subsequent events.

Rightmire also noted the overlap with early humans: “A complicating factor is that some early Homo specimens overlap in time with Homo erectus.” Rightmire goes on to note that the
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“morphology of the species seems to have changed little over more than a million years”\textsuperscript{128} and that “the pace of technological and cultural advance seems to have been slow in most regions.”\textsuperscript{129}

This is an interesting point. Rightmire says that the morphology, culture, and technology (or tool industry) of homo-erectus were stagnant. In other words, it took a million years just to get a call back from homo-erectus. This tardiness in development could be called \textit{hominid conservatism}. Such stagnation is difficult to reconcile with the idea of Darwinian transformism, for if a species fails to transform, in what sense is there any real evolution?

In addition, a human type—other than myself—that uses the same tools for thousands of years, or a million years, makes little sense. If a “hominid” (such as homo-erectus or Neanderthal Man) had the intelligence to invent tools to begin with, one would think he would also have had the intelligence to change the design plan once in a while over such a long period of time. Even I could have done that, for it is in me to live a life of change and growth, a life that is always improving and is spontaneously combustible. Homo erectus, however, preferred the old paths and the familiar, and he therefore put his vote in for incumbency.

This reminds me of a time when I was walking outside to my car early in the morning and disturbed a dog that was going through its toilet in my yard. The dog appeared annoyed with me and barked at me, and looked like he was trying to summon up his courage to run over and bite me. I was very sorry for aggravating the dog in that way, and I understand very well why he would be upset. When we are busying ourselves with our toilet in the morning, we think rightly that it is our little world, and we are likely to become angry with anyone who unashamedly disturbs the peaceful calm of our privacy.

If I had not disturbed the dog so, I am sure we could have become friends, and we might even have talked politics and delivered ourselves of theological opinions. But it was not to be. The dog finally decided it was better if he forgot this shameful moment and moved on. So he took off down the street, and barked occasionally, which is what one would expect of a dog that had been so put out of countenance. The lesson here is that we ought to be very careful when we walk outside in the morning, lest we disturb individuals that are not disposed to conversation at so early an hour.

And so, Paleolithic men were like that dog. They were used to doing things in a certain way, and would not change for anything, and became irritated if anyone disturbed their normal routine, or suggested they try something else every 500,000 years or so.

\textsuperscript{128} Rightmire, p. 204.
\textsuperscript{129} Rightmire, p. 204.
Still, I’d like to point out that Darwinists have managed to acknowledge the problem of lack of cultural innovation over the Paleolithic period, though they haven’t understood its full implications. Tattersall and Desalle say: “The invention of the cutting flake was probably the most fateful and important human cultural innovation ever, and it was followed by a long period of monotony in stone tool production. For over a million years there was no significant technological advance, and these basic tools continued to be made even after a radically new kind of hominid came on the scene.”\(^{130}\)

This “new kind of hominid” was the hapless Turkana Boy, whom we last found on the banks of a big lake, regretting he had gone out fishing that day. Tattersall and DeSalle advise us that even though the Turkana Boy species had a different lifestyle from that of the Australopithecines, it took a very long time for it to develop a tool industry: “Within the million-year period of technological stasis, there is evidence for considerable local variation in the kind of environmental challenge faced by the tool makers, whoever they were, and evidently they responded to these challenges by using the old kinds of tool in new ways.”\(^{131}\)

I don’t condemn these men for developing good habits, and sticking with them, for stability in one’s ways is always to be preferred. This is especially true among our youth, who are easily led into novelties.

However, a million years of using the same tools is a long time by any measure, and there’s only so long one can be stuck in reverse. Almost sounding relieved, Tattersall and DeSalle point to the invention of the hand-axe “when Homo ergaster [the Turkana Boy species] had already been on the scene for a longish time” and they speculate that the new “mental template” used by the hand-axe makers implied a “major advance in cognitive complexity.”\(^{132}\) Well, it was about time.

Unfortunately, the full nature of this problem is only hinted at by Darwinists. I quote at length:

“Interestingly, stone tools found in the same deposits as both Ethiopian specimens [of early homo-sapiens] are pretty unimpressive; the few examples reported along with the Omo Kibish 1 cranium have been described as ‘unremarkable,’ while those from the same deposits as the Herto cranium are notably archaic and include some of the latest recorded African handaxes. They also embrace some Middle Stone Age elements, prepared-care tools roughly equivalent to the productions of Neanderthals. So we find an old pattern repeated again: here is evidence of a physically new kind of hominid (indeed, radically so), in the absence of any suggestion whatever of any technological advance. This might on the face of it seem a bit counterintuitive, but in fact it’s not unexpected: any
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\(^{131}\) Tattersall & DeSalle, p. 108.

\(^{132}\) Tattersall & DeSalle, p. 109.
technological innovation has to start with an individual, who is necessarily a member of an established species, however much Woodger might have agonized about it.”

This latter reference is to someone named Joseph Woodger. He was a biologist who had the not-so-bright idea of trying to apply an axiomatic method to biology in the same way Russell & Whitehead applied it to logic and mathematics in *Principia Mathematica*. Woodger’s Paradox was a type of sorites paradox that Woodger liked to persecute his colleagues with in faculty lounges and narrow hallways—at least from what I’ve been able to gather from people who were not acquainted with him, nor had any idea who he was, and therefore cannot be accused of having any personal bias against him.

Now, a sorites paradox is one of those annoying sort of things that arises because our words aren’t always precise. If I have a heap of wheat, or perhaps the wool of a sheep, and I take one grain of wheat, or one fluff of sheep, from the heap, can I still call it a heap? How about if I take another away? And another? Finally, when I’ve got only one grain or one fluff left, do I still have a heap? At which point did the heap become a non-heap? Which particular grain of wheat, or fluff of sheep, conferred the title “heap” on the heap, and which took the title of “heap” away from the heap? Would you be able to leap over this heap, or this fluff of sheep?

Words admit of degrees or perspectives, the most familiar being “hot” or “cold.” We pretty much know it when it’s hot, and when it’s cold, but to say precisely where the one begins and the other ends is not quite as straightforward. Hence, new terms may be invented to deal with the issue: “warm” or “cool,” for instance; but in this case, the so-called paradox is merely reintroduced into another set of degree terms.

Of course, these terms would only seem to be paradoxical if we think that degree terms were *meant* to be precise terms. We might say of those who use degree terms as precise terms that they are bumpkins who do not know how to use language. It’s like the celebrated high school student—I know not whether such an one ever existed—who had just learned about similes or metaphors, but did not know quite how to use them, and thus wrote: “He was as tall as a six foot, three inch tree.”

---

133 Tattersall & DeSalle, p. 115.
The Woodger Paradox involves the issue of the taxonomic principle. Now, taxonomy is the science of organization, and in biology it refers to ranking and grouping various plants or animals into species, families, kingdoms, and so on. The taxonomic principle in biology teaches us that no individual can belong to more than one biological unit. For instance, classifying a cat as part of the Felis genus and as part of the elephant genus Loxodonta violates the whole notion of hierarchical organization in biology, i.e., taxonomy. That’s something only I can do, since I do not follow any rules of classification; just whatever suits me.

The problem for Darwinists, however, is how one is supposed to reconcile the taxonomic principle with Darwinism? If Darwinism is true, then at some point a macro-evolutionary step must be taken, and this means an individual must step out of one biological unit and into another biological unit, contrary to the taxonomic principle, and to fairly standard principles of morals legislation. In a sense, the taxonomic principle is the biological equivalent of the logical Law of Excluded Middle, or perhaps more aptly described as the Law of Excluded Muddle.

Medawar & Medawar describe it this way: “If an organism belonging to phylum [or class, genus, or species] A evolves into an organism belonging to phylum C, there can be no intermediate form B that is a member of both A and C nor, alternatively, can it be that organism B is in a taxonomic limbo—a member of no phylum—for both suppositions flout the taxonomic canons. . . . There is no alternative, then, but to suppose that A as a member of one phylum must have evolved directly into organism C that belongs to another phylum. Thus the progression from one phylum to the next, being without intermediates, must take place from one generation to the next.”

Simply put, Darwinism requires the transformation of A into B into C. However, per the rules of taxonomy, A has to get to C without stopping to linger at B. “If true,” says Tattersall and DeSalle, “this means that if we could take a look at the very brief slice in time where speciation happens, a mother would be in one species and her daughters in another. Not only is this unimaginable, if it did happen, it would raise the classic question of the ‘hopeful monster’ hypothesized by the geneticist Richard Goldschmidt: who would the poor monster mate with?”
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135 Tattersall & DeSalle, p. 71.
I’m rather astonished that the solution provided by Darwinists to this puzzle is to deny the truthfulness of Darwinian-type genealogical trees. A contrast is set up between this “old-fashioned” way of looking at evolution on the one hand, and the new sophisticated way of looking at evolution through “population genetics.” Woodger’s Paradox is “solved” because the Darwinist trees fail to take into account that it is not individuals who evolve, but their genes. Medawar and Medawar say: “[I]t is not one organism that evolves into another, but one population characterized by some distinctive pattern of gene frequency that evolves into another population.”

I have to shake my head at how these contemporary Darwinists confidently set aside the old Darwinist genealogical trees, seeing as how these fraudulent trees—much like Haeckel’s lying embryos—have misled schoolchildren for a hundred and fifty years or so into believing in the theory of evolution. No apologies for that, of course. But I wouldn’t expect any, for schoolchildren need a thorough grounding in falsehoods and the twisting of facts in their early years, or who are we going to find who has the necessary training and experience to sit in Congress or on the Supreme Court? That’s a very important question that critics of Darwinism haven’t asked themselves, but I don’t see any real progress in our understanding of these topics if such questions are shirked.

It is not hard to see that the new, “sophisticated” Darwinism just evades the problem by substituting the biological equivalent of warm for hot and cool for cold, i.e., merely reintroducing the Woodger Paradox at a different level, at the genetic level. At some point, gene and son-of-gene are going to exist at the same time in two reproductively isolated populations (i.e., species).

The real solution—if it be thought of as a solution—is to recognize that under Darwinism, the taxonomic principle cannot be true. The way I see it, the very idea of the taxonomic principle is a paradox under Darwinism, for the concept of the unilinear gradation of continuous being should admit of no unique, novel, or even weird physical or biological demarcations. And yet we see such systematic and sometimes bizarre demarcations in everything around us: rocks, trees, birds, bears, Dennis Rodman, atoms, electrons, molecules, Ultimate Fighting, and even with regard to the letters in our words, or in regards to the words in our sentences. How does such systematic differentiation make sense in a Darwinist world? How for instance is tweeting possible in a Darwinist world, and I ask, is it desirable?

136 Medawar & Medawar, p. 282.
The Darwinists can only answer that species are nominal rather than real. The “species” we see are species in name only, mere accidents of survival—both today and in the fossil record—and discontinuity is only an illusion. For instance, there were many versions of basketball player Dennis Rodman, all of them leading up to our version of this strange and unique creature who once dressed up in a wedding gown and wanted to marry himself. Said Rodman in 1997: “I'm the guy who's showing people, hey, it's all right to be different.” In principle, taxonomy is therefore only a way of talking, not a real structural element of the world. Such linguistic idealism is the inevitable result of the Darwinist paradigm.

It is also the case that for Darwinism the very idea of micro-evolution (intra-species change) is ultimately a contradictory concept since at bottom all change must be macro-evolutionary (extra-species change). On this viewpoint, micro-evolution would just be macro-evolution-lite, a matter of degree rather than of kind, since there are no “real” species to begin with. Yet the physical world provides just the exact opposite situation, doesn’t it? Micro-evolutionary change is the reality and macro-evolutionary change is an extrapolation not confirmed by any empirical data. This was a problem even Huxley recognized:

“[T]here is no positive evidence, at present, that any group of animals has, by variation and selective breeding, given rise to another group which was, even in the slightest degree, infertile with the first.”

Lest one think the problem only existed “at present” in Huxley’s day, modern Darwinists, when it suits them, sometimes provide an honest assessment of the factual situation regarding the theory of evolution. I know it hurts them to do so. Getting the truth out of a Darwinist about the theory of evolution is sort of like that movie Alien, where a baby alien took up residence inside the human host (played by the aptly named John Hurt). Eventually, the baby alien was feeling cramped and needed some fresh air and new challenges, so chose to pop out of Hurt’s stomach at a convenient point. Likewise as in the movie, truth will sometimes emerge from a Darwinist, but the results are, I suppose, rather messy and not altogether pleasing to the host.

Tattersal & DeSalle admit that there is no evidence for macro-evolutionary speciation, and it’s amazing that such an admission did not wind up on the cutting room floor before their book was published:

“We know [sic] that speciation occurs, or life could never have diversified in the way it has. . . . Yet, although a huge amount of energy has been expended on theoretical considerations of the nature of species . . . we don’t know nearly as much as we would like about speciation itself. For, even using intensive breeding, short of genetic engineering nobody has been able to produce new reproductive entities in the laboratory—even though weird and wonderful morphological variations are pretty easy to obtain by selective breeding. So, while in the lab we can
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easily mimic the forces of natural selection as envisaged by Darwin, in a very real sense speciation remains the ‘black box’ of evolutionary biology.”

This admission is also rather remarkable given how often we hear about the “fact” of evolution. In fact, “we know that speciation occurs” is really a statement of faith, a creedal dogma of the Darwinian religion. In addition, the “black box” terminology is question-begging. A black box involves a thing or situation that is real but is unknown, or that has no good current explanation. Nevertheless, we do not grant that the theory of evolution has any corresponding reality in the first place, so ultimately evolutionary speciation is not a black box, but rather an empty box.

Still, Tattersal & DeSalle manage to blame those of us who want to see proof of the process of macro-evolutionary speciation, whereas in their view we can only see the finished product:

“Perhaps this is in part because we tend to seek a unitary ‘process’ of speciation, when in fact new species are more likely simply a result that we observe in hindsight—a result that may come about through the operation of a whole variety of different factors, ranging from shifts in gene timing and expression, through mutations in structural genes, to chromosomal rearrangements, and even to random behavior changes.”

So we cannot see evolution except by its results, and these results come about by evolution. Even though none of the evolutionary “factors” has led to evolutionary speciation in the lab, we are still supposed to assume that it happened. But not to worry, even though we cannot see evolutionary speciation, the evolving animals certainly could:

“There is, in fact, a trend among some evolutionary biologists nowadays toward admitting that it’s what the animals think (or at least, what they do) that counts. The ‘recognition’ theory of species puts the emphasis on the reproductive signals they send out to each other, rather than on the things that make sense to human taxonomists. It’s for them to know and for us to find out—on their terms.”

I suppose this biological know-nothingism is the sad end of the theory of evolution, a truly dark night of the soul for Darwinists, to see their faith reduced to such depths of mindlessness. How bleak and sorrowful it must be for them! Now, when people are troubled and sorrowful, and do not know what the future may bring, and spend each day enduring a dark night of the soul, and worrying what new sadness the world will bring, I tell them the answer to their problem is booze. I offer this advice for the benefit of Darwinists. They should drink up, for tomorrow their theory dies, or rather it has already died, and now just wanders around like a . . . like a . . . a zombie trying to get service for an old Trash-80! The reader must understand that this is the only simile that I could find after hours and hours of digging and panning and shaking out all of the intellectual slag and impurities. And due to my straitened literary circumstances, I just could not afford a system of hydraulics to shake out any finer materials. It will have to do for now.

Now when I tell people that booze is their friend, it is as though the heavens have opened before them, and they saw a great light—of some kind. From that day on many of them—not all, but
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some, a few—lived lives of great holiness, albeit not unmixed with a certain level of good cheer. I won’t say what level, but it was noticeable.

This reminds me of a curious circumstance—a while ago I sat next to a man on a plane to Los Angeles. He smelled like a beer factory, and was so pickled you could have put him in a jar and preserved him for the holidays. Now, from time to time, he displayed the odd trait of “commenting” to no one in particular, as if he had an imaginary companion he talked to. What a very sad life, I thought to myself . . . I mean, sad for me, inasmuch as I can never get that sloshed and meet imaginary companions—never get to discuss philosophy or the Woodger Paradox with them—no matter how much I try. It’s enough to drive one to drink—some more.

I would say the Woodger Paradox is a mere child’s puzzle compared with the greater problem of systematic and universal discontinuity in the scale of being. Such a thing should not exist if the Darwinian picture of the world were true. In my judgment, the Darwinian picture of the world is deeply counter-intuitive, but not a few men are willing to make the *sacrificium intellectus* in service to their faith. I know, too, that if I had put my faith in such a theory, and if I had any intellect to sacrifice, I would find it difficult not do the same thing.

In my opinion, the lack of innovation with respect to tool technology appears to undermine the Darwinian concept of deep time. One would think that if an individual within a species took a Woodger-like macro-evolutionary step into another species, he would have taken his tool kit with him. I know I would have. I have always said that a man without tools is like a man who lacks implements for, you know, turning screws and things.

Now, this tool kit stagnation would be formally similar to the Woodger paradox, and we might not go far wrong in calling it the “Tool Kit Paradox”—an individual (or gene) would be using a different set of tools from what his parents were using. This doesn’t seem to make any more sense than an individual morphing into a different species while his parents remain in the previous species. One would expect continuity between parent and child, both in morphology and in technology. However, such continuity would undermine the concept of a macro-evolutionary transition that is at the heart of the Darwinian theory of the transmutation of species.

I was going to break out into a song at this point, and the music was primed to play, but I was advised against it. Therefore, let us continue.

Interestingly, while noting the problematic character of hominid conservatism, Darwinists have not hesitated to use it as an explanation for another puzzle—what they call tool kit *convergence*. Tool kit convergence supposedly happened when two different human species representing two
different stages of evolution wound up using the same tool industry. Christopher Stringer was aware of the problem:

“[A]rchaeologists can find virtually no dissimilarity in types of tools used by Neanderthals or Homo sapiens in the Levant at the time. . . . Exactly how they were used by others species, we cannot say. All we can point to is the enigma of their universal use at that time and locality. . . .”

Here we have Neanderthal Man and homo-sapiens, presumably two different species of humans, and traditionally thought of as representing a lower and a higher stage of evolution, using the same tool types. Stringer was at a loss for an explanation, but acknowledged the criticisms of Multiregionalists that this usage of the same tool tradition by two different species of humans had serious consequences for his Out of Africa theory. It would show continuity between the separate human species whereas Out of Africa posits a discontinuity between pre-sapiens (such as homo-erectus or Neanderthal Man), and homo-sapiens.

In an attempt at a solution to the problem of tool kit convergence, Stringer claimed that the similar tool kits that were used by different species of humans were simply a reflection of common ancestry:

“Both had evolved separately since that period [150,000 ya], but in those days of sluggish cultural innovation, their tool technology had progressed slowly and in parallel. And that, very simply, is why they share the same level of implements.”

Sluggish cultural innovation? I’d say there is either something wrong with the Darwinian time-scale, or else these people were sleepwalking through history. According to Stringer, the reason two species of humans only used one type of tool kit is that the two human species had not evolved separately for a long enough time. Here then we have the notion of hominid conservatism invoked as an explanation for technological dullness. It should be noted that Stringer makes no appeal to populations vis-a-vis individuals. In this situation, the gene population has already “evolved” from the Neanderthal gene pool to the homo-sapiens gene pool, so the transition from parent gene to descendant gene had already taken place. Yet these genes decided to use the same old tool kit.

I was going to break out into a song again, and the music was once again revving up for it, but I was told in no uncertain terms that it was not allowed, and now the reader will have to get along as best as he can without it. (Royalties for this joke go to *Monty Python*, but only after I take my cut of 100%, after which they can divide up the rest as they see fit.)
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An additional problem is that the supposed transition from the less intelligent Neanderthal to the more intelligent homo-sapiens had no “liberalizing” effect on their technology. Yet isn’t the area of technology precisely where one would expect higher intelligence to have had its greatest impact? If the added intelligence created no additional technological benefit, why would natural selection select for such unused intelligence? Why not stick with the dumb-and-dumber types?

Our view is that the origin, growth, and transition, of tools industries took place over not much more than six or eight hundred years. There was thus no “stages” of human morphological development, but continuous technological development combined with isolated migratory movements, leaving for the most part gaps in the tool traditions. However, there were still some intergroup connections between Neanderthal populations and homo-sapiens populations, thus leaving a few examples of tool continuity.

I cannot help quoting the words of that great man . . . well, I can’t remember his name right now, but he said that . . . well, I can’t remember what he said, but I know it was very important, and as soon as I can think of who he was and what he said, I shall provide this information to the reader for his edification.