

# *Homo Erectus* — A Fabricated Class of 'Ape-Men'

**MALCOLM BOWDEN**

Several articles have been written in creationist magazines that refer to the *Homo erectus* and other classifications of 'ape-men' that are much quoted in evolutionary books. These are sometimes referred to as though they were real groups into which fossils can be classified. What is forgotten is that these are classifications that are artificially fabricated by evolutionists so that they can claim that there is a continuous chain of groups that link man with his ape ancestors.

Creationists must be extremely careful when they use ANY concept that has been manufactured by evolutionists, for they are often unwittingly adopting views that fundamentally conflict with their creationist basis. This can result in considerable confusion when one or more articles use these groups and skulls in different ways to prove a particular point. It is in the hope of clarifying this situation that this note is presented.

It must be emphasised that where there is sufficient evidence, ALL skulls can be identified as being either ape or human. There are NO other classes, for they are all the imaginings of the evolutionary paleoanthropologists who insist on concocting a string of links between man and apes. In order to fill this enormous gap, any ape skull is greatly enlarged and the fossil's 'human' features exaggerated (e.g. Pekin man and 'Lucy'), whilst human skulls are decreased and their 'ape' features are similarly emphasised (e.g. 1470 Man). With this firmly held in mind, let us look briefly at not only the class of **Homo erectus** but others such as **Homo habilis**, and where there is sufficient evidence, attempt to put the fossils they contain in one or other of the two real groups.

Many fossils look distinctly human in general shape, but as I have shown in my book,<sup>1</sup> skulls are often 'reconstructed' to produce the shape that the expert wants for publicity reasons. This makes it difficult for the creationist to determine whether it is actually human or ape. Furthermore, there are sometimes hints in the records of reconstruction that some of the fragments were 'missing' or not used.<sup>2</sup> More often however, the size of the skull fragment is so small that no clear decision could be made on

whether it is that of an ape or human, and I have indicated this with the obvious question mark.

## THE CLASSIFICATIONS

The *Homo erectus* class first came into being by putting Java man (*Pithecanthropus erectus*), which consisted of the skull of a giant gorilla (or similar) and a human leg bone, together with Pekin man (*Sinanthropus pekinensis*), composed entirely of ape skulls. To this was subsequently added a number of other skulls that were generally too human and too early a dating to class as apes, and therefore were put in this intermediate group.

The fragments of *Homo habilis* skulls etc. are too small to say if they are fully human or not. They were often found in the presence of tools, however, which shows that men occupied these sites. They are probably parts of apes skulls broken for food as were the Pekin man skulls.

The class *Homo habilis* was created by Louis Leakey for some skull fragments he found. This classification was disputed, and the group ignored by many experts. His son, Richard, found 1470 Man which he first rejected as being a *Homo habilis* fossil. He claimed that this well publicised discovery 'would change our ideas of human evolution'. As it was embarrassingly human however, he later reclassified it as *Homo habilis*. In the British Natural History Museum, however, it is even omitted from this class. The latest comment that I heard was in a lecture by his mother, Mary Leakey, who said that Richard wanted to 'kill off the habilines'. Presumably in so doing he would be rid of 1470 Man! This class of *Homo habilis* seems to be a conglomerate of small pieces of African fossils that they are unable to classify or put in any other group. The fossils are quite small and have not received as much publicity as some of the other major finds. Whether this class will once more fall into disrepute probably depends upon whether the evolutionists have any further use for it.

Johanson carried out excavations in the Hadar area of Ethiopia, and after five years had found several hundred bones representing at least thirteen

and possibly more individuals. He called the group *Australopithecus afarensis*. Amongst them was the famous 'Lucy' skeleton which is nothing more than an ape. Johanson claimed there was evidence that it walked upright, but the line of reasoning was extremely weak. I doubt if this classification will have many fossils added to it over the years, as it was only created for publicising Johanson's work in America.

With all this in mind, I would like to suggest that the following skulls that are placed by evolutionists in the *Homo erectus*, *Homo habilis* or similar classes should be provisionally reclassified as follows:

#### HUMAN BONES — [*Homo sapiens*]

Java man's leg bones.  
Vertesszollo skull fragment.  
Swanscombe skull pieces.  
Fontchevade skull pieces.  
1470 Man  
Piltdown skull  
(Cro-Magnon Man was fully human)  
Pekin man upper cave skulls.  
Pekin ten skeletons<sup>3</sup>  
Solo man  
Dubois' Wadjak skulls  
Rhodesian man  
Chellean man's skull?  
R. Leakey's KNMER 3733 skull  
Kow Swamp *Homo erectus* skeletons  
All Neanderthal skeletons (a degenerate form of *Homo sapiens*)  
Laetolil (footprints)

#### APE FOSSILS

*Homo habilis*?  
Pekin man skulls.  
Piltdown jaw (modern fossil)  
All Australopithecenes  
*Australopithecus afarensis* ('Lucy')  
Von Koenigswald's *Pithecanthropus II, III and IV* (*rohustus*)

Knowing the way in which evolutionists obtain their evidence for man's ancestry, I would suggest that the following rough guidelines might be of use in trying to determine whether a fossil is human or ape from the smokescreen that arises when a fossil is first presented for the public's edification.

It is likely that a skull is human if it has a fairly large brain capacity, say over 1,000 cc's, and does not consist of a lot of plaster of Paris to make up the 'missing' fragments. The shape should also look human with the mouth line almost vertical under the

nose. Apes have a protruding muzzle, but this can be 'adjusted' to look more human if this is the reconstruction desired. If it is a human skull or skeleton, the experts will be at pains to emphasise any small 'ape-like' features, such as tooth shape or formation etc. The reverse of this is also applicable to any ape skulls found. They will have a small brain capacity but this will be enlarged with the help of much plaster, and any human features will be emphasised. By a careful study of more accurate reports in say **Nature**, one can usually sense whether the fossil is human or ape from the cautious or strange wording used when certain features are being described or suggested as being present. That the conclusion of a report may contradict the previous description is a not uncommon occurrence.

It will be noticed that in the list above, I have not mentioned the classification group to which these fossils are usually attributed. This is simply because some of the fossils are put into different groups by various experts who wish to prove their particular view of how man arose from apes. For the creationist however, these intermediate groups are both confusing and irrelevant to the real picture that he should retain of man being created perfect in the beginning and quite separate from any of the animals that God instructed him to 'rule over'.

#### REFERENCES

1. Bowden, M, 1981. **Ape-Men — Fact or Fallacy?** Sovereign Publications, Bromley, Kent, England.
2. Ref.1, pp.95,155,157,202.
3. Ref.1, p.95.