

# Do we really come from 'apemen'?

A book report on  
Marvin Lubenov's  
**BONES OF CONTENTION**  
Baker 1992 ISBN 0-8010-5677-2

## THE EVIDENCE

In his first chapter Lubenov reveals the fact that hardly anyone—including academic researchers in the field of paleo-anthropology—has ever seen an *original* human fossil. The fossils themselves are kept in a tightest security, in deep vaults, in hidden locations, &c. So what does the public see in museums? Answer: plastic replicas! Reason? The originals are extremely fragile and irreplaceable.

## Are the replicas accurate?

Do scholars in this field work with the real data? Or are the 'replicas' inaccurate? In 1984 the Museum of Natural History in New York hosted an exhibition of 40 of these original fossils. (Some countries refused to send their fossils.)

## Why the exhibition?

Apparently the exhibition was an exercise in *anti-creationism!* Here was the evidence of our true origins in ape-like animals. Here was the rational, evidential response to the idea that man was created in the image of God (Gen.1:26). How could anyone visit this exhibition and not be convinced of Darwinism? That was the idea.

## But no real access!

But the fact is that even eminent paleo-anthropologists have never seen more than a fraction of the real data. OK, they write books, hold professorships, and spout on TV to the rest of the world—but *they are not masters of the original data*, because they hardly ever see it and never see much of it. *They work with reproductions!*

## New York 1984

Extraordinarily the New York exhibition showed the limitations of paleo-anthropology. Mounts for the arriving fossils had been made from their replicas—which were held in USA of course. But when the *fossils* got to New York, *they did not fit the mounts!* The replicas were as inaccurate as that—yet they were—for the most part- the 'original' data of US paleo-anthropologists!

## INEXACT 'SCIENCE'

Carl Sagan once said that not all 'scientific statements' had equal weight. The 1st and 2nd laws of thermodynamics are rock solid, because they are tested every day in thousands of ways. So what about the pronouncements of paleo-

anthropologists? Evolutionary processes are too slow to be observed. *In other words you cannot verify the theory by making observations or doing experiments.* So how scientific is the study of human evolution?

## Evolutionary order

It is easy to arrange things in order—in order of size, shape, complexity, colour, &c. *But the arrangement does not necessarily tell us anything about their relationships.* Lubenov argues that evolutionists do not understand the difference between scientific and historical evidence. Did George Washington cross the Delaware? No amount of scientific evidence that he could have done so will tell us that he actually did. For that we need *historical* evidence. Arranging things in order—from the familiar slouch of the ape-man to upright modern man! - is easy, but does not necessarily tell us how these fossils were actually related. *Evolutionary order has to be assumed before arrangement can begin!*

## Scientific doubts

Surprisingly Lubenov quotes various scientists—including paleoanthropologists Richard Leakey and David Pilbeam as well as Lord Zuckermann and Sir Peter Medawar—to the effect that this science has a long way to go before it becomes a real science.

## HOW MANY FOSSILS?

Between 1968 and 1976 the British Museum published a *Catalogue of Hominid Fossils*. This lists 3998 fossils—a large amount of fossil evidence. Yet in spite of that experts complain of the tiny amount of data at their disposal—Lubenov quotes them with references on page 31. For instance the *New Scientist* said that the fossil hominid evidence would just about cover a billiard table! Why such a scarcity when the Catalogue listed such an abundance? Answer: *the fossil evidence generally cannot be made to fit an evolutionary scenario.*

Actually, by 1992 when Lubenov published his book, the number of hominid fossils must have been more than 6000!

## PS. How self-correcting is science?

Here Lubenov has an interesting aside. The great difference between science and Christianity—we are told—is that Christianity is dogmatic, whereas science corrects its mistakes. But how self-correcting is science? Scientists, Lubenov argues, are too busy teaching or researching or just making money to check up on other scientists! So you know what? They just *believe* what their fellow scientists say! Like Piltdown Man and Haeckel's fraudulent drawings, errors can be perpetuated almost indefinitely. The scientific community swallows them hook, line and sinker!

**A book report is no substitute for the real thing!** You are encouraged to buy this book from AiG. You'll find the link on this website.