

It is disturbing to contemplate the many people who have been misled by pictures of *Homo habilis* ('handy man') walking upright and using tools.

The following summarizes the situation to-date in relation to the semi-circular canal evidence:

**HUMAN PATTERN**  
(*True upright walking — 'obligatory bipedalism'*)

- \* Modern people
- \* *Homo erectus* (a post-Flood racial variant of modern man)

**APE-LIKE PATTERN**  
(*Basically quadrupeds — tree-climbing, knuckle-walking*)

- \* All modern apes
- \* All known extinct apes
- \* Australopithecines regarded as later than 'Lucy'
- \* '*Homo*' *habilis* (pattern even further from the human than the apes)

**GROUPS NOT STUDIED, BUT NOT REALLY IN DOUBT**

- \* *Australopithecus afarensis* (for example, 'Lucy')  
Since these are supposed to have come earlier than the australopithecines studied, there is no reason in evolutionary theory to expect that these walked upright, but their descendants did not.
- \* Archaic humans (archaic *sapiens*, Cro-magnon, Neanderthal)  
There is no reason for evolutionists to suppose these did **not** have the upright-walking labyrinthine pattern, since in evolutionary theory they come after *erectus* which already has it. In any case, all agree that the post-cranial skeleton in all these is totally of the modern 'upright' kind.

**NOT STUDIED YET, AND OF INTEREST**

Leakey's skull KNM ER 1470 Various classified as an australopithecine/habiline, there is some divergence of opinion between those modern creationist writers on the subject, who accept *erectus* as true man. For example, Lubenow argues that 1470 is true *Homo*,<sup>7</sup>

whereas Mehlert says it is merely a large-brained *A. africanus*,<sup>8</sup> If the labyrinth of 1470 is ever CAT-scanned, this will be an ideal test between the two positions. If Lubenow's view is confirmed with an 'upright' result (all creationists would predict that it will be one or the other, not transitional), then because other *africanus* specimens have been the opposite, evolutionists would need to seriously consider a reclassification to *erectus/sapiens*.

**REFERENCES**

1. Lubenow, M., 1992. **Bones of Contention: A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils**, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

2. Bower, B., 1992. *Erectus* unhinged. **Science News**, **141**(25):408 409, 411 (especially p. 409).
3. Shipman, P., 1993. On the origin of races. **New Scientist**, **137**(1856):34 37 (especially p. 34).
4. Oxnard, C., 1987. **Fossils, Teeth and Sex — New Perspectives on Human Evolution**, University of Washington Press, Seattle, Washington, p. 227.
5. Shipman, P., 1994. Those ears were made for walking. **New Scientist**, **143**(1936):26 29.
6. Spoor, F., Wood, B. and Zonneveld, F., 1994. Implications of early hominid labyrinthine morphology for evolution of human bipedal locomotion. **Nature**, **369**:645 648.
7. Lubenow, Ref. 1, p. ?
8. Mehlert, A. W., 1994. Homo erectus 'to' modern man: evolution or human variability? **CEN Tech. J.**, **8**(1):105 116.

C.W.

## The Eye, the Fly and I

Studying the enormous structural differences between the compound eyes of flies and the camera eyes of vertebrates has naturally led evolutionists to insist that these eyes evolved quite independently.

Evolutionary phylogenies also add weight to this. Even where there are great similarities, such as that between the eye of the squid (an invertebrate) and our own, this has been attributed to remarkable convergent (or parallel) evolution, rather than common ancestry.

In fact, 'phylogenetic studies of the structure and development of eyes led to the proposal that eyes have evolved independently many times (perhaps as many as three or four dozen).'<sup>1</sup>

A surprising gene has now been discovered in fruitflies. This *Pax-6* gene is a remarkable homologue of the same gene in vertebrates, and both are key regulators of eye development.

Obviously, from an evolutionary point of view,

'the finding of a highly homologous molecule functioning as a key regulator of eye

*morphogenesis in flies and vertebrates strongly argues for a common developmental origin.*'

It appears as if more than one of the genes regulating early developmental patterns are the same in flies and vertebrates, too much for evolutionists to pass off as 'convergence'.

For the evolution model, the evidence now points in two different directions. Creationists can view this with ease as mounting evidence for a mosaic pattern of similar structures and mechanisms being used in a wide variety of creatures, that is, common design features **not** restricted to a pattern of distribution consistent with common ancestry (evolution).

It looks as if evolutionists will be forced to conclude that something as different as my eye, that of a fly, and that of a squid have evolved from a common ancestral 'eye'.

**REFERENCES**

1. Zuker, C. S., 1994. On the evolution of eyes: would you like it simple or compound? **Science**, **265**:742 743.

C.W.