

An Unscientific Propaganda Interview By Die Zeit

In relation with the German *Die Zeit* newspaper, *Hurriyet Science* magazine dealt with human evolution scenarios in its March 29, 2003 issue. In an article titled "Where does humanity come from where does it go" the famous evolutionist Phillip Tobias" interview with the *Die Zeit* was partially reprinted.

In relation with the German *Die Zeit* newspaper, *Hurriyet Science* magazine dealt with human evolution scenarios in its March 29, 2003 issue. In an article titled "Where does humanity come from where does it go" the famous evolutionist Phillip Tobias" interview with the *Die Zeit* was partially reprinted. It began with the question as to how recently discovered fossils affected the human evolution scenarios, but soon enough the subject was returned to one of the "musts" of every evolution story worth its salt and pepper, namely the issue of walking upright. As the interview progressed nothing changed and the questions asked revealed that *Die Zeit*'s objective was not to inform on any new discoveries in the search for mankind's origins but to engage in Darwinist propaganda by regurgitating the same old evolution stories. In this article we will deal with Tobias" and *Die Zeit*'s evolution errors and how the discoveries presented as if they were proving evolution, in reality damage the imaginary evolutionary tree of the human species.

Taken from the *Die Zeit*, the magazine *Hurriyet Science* wrote about the *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* and *Orrorin tugenensis* fossils found respectively in 2001 and 2002 and printed pretty pictures depicting primeval man in his various imaginary transitory forms. Tobias states that these two discoveries belong to a period in which no hominid discoveries had been made previously. By speaking of the 5.8 million years old *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* and the 6 million years old *Orrorin tugenensis* fossils as hominid, he portrays these finds as if evidence for evolution.

The evolutionist claims about the *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* fossil had made the cover of the *Time* magazine but soon thereafter these claims were disproved by renowned scientist John Mastropaolo's detailed analysis.

The True Story Of ***Ardipithecus Ramidus Kadabba***

The *Time* magazine had announced to the world that the fossils of the species *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* discovered by the California University anthropologist Yohannes Haile-Selassie in Ethiopia represented the "missing link." In its July 21, 2002 dated cover story entitled "Meet your newfound ancestor, a chimplike forest creature," it discussed the fossil in question in terms of an evolutionary ancestor that walked on two feet. Evolutionists who studied the fossil had claimed the creature was 5.5-5.8 million years old and capable of bipedal walking. However, the bone they based all these claims on was just a single toe. Some 95% of the skeleton was missing, yet evolutionists were still able to come up with the totally unrealistic idea that it could supposedly be seen from this toe that this creature was capable of walking on two legs, which shows in turn that man and apes evolved from a common ancestor.

The evolutionist magazine *Time* felt no need to question whether the claims rested on any scientific foundation and portrayed the evolution tales embellished with pictures of ape-men to the world as scientific fact.



So called evidence of *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* walking upright: a single toe bone

Mastropaolo, regarded as one of the most respected authorities in the world of paleontology, wanted to be sure of the facts by examining the toe himself. He compared the *Kadabba* toe bone to those of man, chimpanzees and baboons. Comparing the anatomic criteria from a mathematical perspective, Mastropaolo arrived at very different results. The toe did not resemble those of chimpanzees or baboons at all. The resemblance between it and the human toe was also insufficient.

Mastropaolo's findings were unveiled at the San Diego Conference held by the American Physiology Society on August 27, 2002. It was made clear in the concluding part of the paper that the idea of an evolutionary ancestor walking upright was a work of pure imagination:

Accordingly, the objective ancestry analyses for fossil bones assert that the conclusions of Haile-Selassie and Robinson were farfetched speculations. (1)

In short the views about the *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* related in *Die Zeit* and *Hurriyet Science* magazine are nothing but forced speculation.

The True Story Of *Orrorin tugenensis*



The 12 small bones making "*Orrorin tugenensis*," claimed by some researchers to have walked upright and to be the ancestor of man by *Die Zeit*.

Orrorin tugenensis is a species reliant on 12 small fossilized items, which were discovered by researchers Martin Pickford (College de France) and Brigitte Senut (National History Of Nature Museum, Paris) who claimed that this was an upright walking species. However this view did not even gain much acceptance among evolutionists, most of whom consider it to be impossible for this species to have walked upright. Professor Leslie Aiello of London University states that the claim of this species walking upright is not sustainable and considers it more probable for this species to have been the ancestor of apes rather than man. (2)

If *Die Zeit* still wants to insist that the *Orrorin tugenensis* fossils are hominid it must discard the Lucy fossils which it used many a time as propaganda material, because the researchers who discovered *Orrorin tugenensis* claim that this species is morphologically closer to the *Homo* genus than the *Australopithecines* or in other words closer to the *Homo* genus than *Australopithecus afarensis* and *A. anamensis* species to which Lucy belongs to. Researchers assert that evolution cannot function backwards and request therefore that the

Australopithecus genus be taken off the evolution tree. (3)

Obviously the fossils claimed to belong to earlier periods of the evolution tree in *Hurriyet Science* are "hominid" by the power of imagination.

The True Story Of *Sahelanthropus Tchadensis*

Another fossil the newspaper *Die Zeit* and accordingly *Hurriyet Science* is wrong about is the *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*. Firstly this fossil was not discovered in East Africa's Rift Valley in Ethiopia as it claims, but the *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* fossil was found 1500km to the west from there in Chad. *Hurriyet Science* states that this was a sensational discovery but is totally mistaken about the location. This contradiction is serious because one of the most important reasons that made fossils discovery sensational was the fact of its location in an area 1500km to the west of East Africa. If *Hurriyet Science* means to be a quality science magazine it must be more diligent.



Sahelanthropus tchadensis

For the magazine to include this fossil in its evolution propaganda is an unsustainable approach because despite the fossils being 7 million years old it resembles, according to evolutionary criteria, fossils from 1.5 - 2 millions years ago, which then totally destroy the illusionary evolution tree. Evolutionists were forced by the discovery of the *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* fossil to admit the collapse of the evolution tree they had barely managed to keep alive and also that the missing link idea was only a tall tale.

The well-known *Nature* magazine's editor and paleontologist Henry Gee wrote in an article published by the Guardian newspaper:

Whatever the outcome, the skull shows, once and for all, that the old idea of a "missing link" is bunk... It should now be quite plain that the very idea of the missing link, always shaky, is now completely untenable. (4)

Hurriyet Science disregards cunningly the problems the age of the *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* fossil poses for the evolution theory. With the discovery of this fossil the timing of the branching out of man and chimpanzee claimed by evolutionists to have happened 6 million years ago revealed itself to be inconsistent. Tobias refers to the Swedish Ulfur Arnason's research and states that with the *S.tchadensis* fossil, Arnason's dating method must be adopted. Arnason puts the age at between 10 - 13 million years. *Hurriyet Science* might believe that it has bypassed this problem easily enough but when Arnason's research is considered it becomes apparent that the magazine resorted to cheating on behalf of evolution, because its dating of the branching out of man and chimpanzee is based on the molecular clock system which is wholly a product of imagination and prejudice. Arnason opposes the previous dating and "resets" the molecular clock, which interestingly, uses whales as the life form when "setting" the molecular clock to time human evolution. The contradictions are clearly visible in the dating efforts in support of evolution and evolutionists use the "setting" of the molecular clock that suits their purpose. Evolution is not a fact proven by scientific discoveries but is a dogma which misconstrues scientific discoveries for its ends.

The Two Feet Tale And The Truth

The article in *Hurriyet Science* reveals another forced maneuver by evolutionists. As we know they have been telling the same old story for decades about the two feet business: Apes descend from trees and begin to live in the savannah. To detect predators in the long grass they stand tall upright and so we begin to be an upright walking species. But as Tobias points out, the area where man supposedly originates from has been exposed to have been densely tree lined. So the story about the apes becoming "two-footers" in the savannah had to be binned and instead the thesis of apes learning to stand on two feet whilst balancing on trees was adopted whereby they were already able to walk upright when they descended from the trees. Robin Crompton, one of the greatest opponents of this thesis shows as evidence one species of chimpanzees in Uganda's Bwindi jungle area that were able to walk on two legs. In the Scotsman that covered the story under the headline "Chimps On Two Legs Run Through Darwin's Theory," it is claimed these chimpanzees refute this old thesis.

All these demonstrate that evolutionists actually abandon their allegations on the face of scientific findings but never leave behind the idea of "evolution."

The interview printed in *Die Zeit* magazine was nothing other than the repetition of Darwinist thesis without any scientific value, proven to be false many a time and speculation without evidence. The questions asked in the interview were not seeking scientific answers anyhow and one of the last asked questions made the purpose of the interview very much obvious: "if you go back in time and put yourself in Australopithecus" place, what would you leave to Homo sapiens?"

We are confronted here with a question asked by an evolutionist who blindly "believes" in Darwinism and Australopithecus to be his ancestor. If someone sought a scientific answer in a scientific subject, he would not ask such a superfluous question. Obviously Tobias' reply was as irrelevant as the question itself. He remarks that it is important not to lose the faculty of speech. It is all irrelevant not least because there is consensus among all evolutionists that Australopithecus did not possess the faculty of speech. Evidently this approach is totally unscientific and shows just how the Darwinist dogma aims to condition people. Big mistake by *Die Zeit* and eventually *Hurriyet Science* magazines to portray this interview as science to its readers.

Conclusion

This interview published in *Die Zeit* does not have any scientific value whatsoever. *Die Zeit* and *Hurriyet Science* magazines propose in "evidence" of the assumed evolution of man, fossils that are not even by evolutionists regarded to be hominid. As we have demonstrated these fossils in reality are damaging to evolutionist scenarios.

We expect the magazine to abandon its mistaken beliefs about the origins of mankind and to acknowledge the reality of its true origin, creation. Modern science reveals that life is not produced by coincidences but by creation. The answer to the question *Hurriyet Science*'s title "Where does humankind come from and where does it go?" is straight forward: God has created man and he will be returned to him after death. In the Surat Al-Muminun in the Quran this truth is revealed:

We created man from the purest kind of clay; then made him a drop in a secure receptacle; then formed the drop into a clot and formed the clot into a lump and formed the lump into bones and clothed the bones in flesh; and then brought him into being as another creature. Blessed be God, the Best of Creators! Then subsequently you will certainly die. Then on the Day of Rising you will be raised again. (Qur'an, 23: 12-16)

1- EurekaAlert.com: "Oldest Human Ancestor is (Again) Called into Question", August 27, 2002

2- http://www.versiontech.com/origins/news/news_article.asp?news_id=18

3- <http://www.columbia.edu/~rk2143/web/orrarin/Otungensis1.html>

4- Henry Gee, "Face of Yesterday", 11 July 2002 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/story/0,3605,752778,00.html>

<https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/an-unscientific-propaganda-interview-by-die-zeit>