

The Stage And Backstage In The Supposition Of Man's Evolution -Samples From The Scientific The Scientific American

Much of the evolution material confronting us frequently in newspapers and on TV screens is to do with humankind. There is a fair amount of speculation on the transitions of the supposed ancestors of man, the hominoids, in terms of anatomy and culture and the causes of and reasons for human qualities like a large brain and upright walking. Speculating on feeding habits by looking at fossil teeth and how this could have affected the evolution of the species or going by the geographical distribution of discovered fossils, speculating on where on earth mankind originated from and by what ways they spread around is common practice

STAGE AND BACKSTAGE

Much of the evolution material confronting us frequently in newspapers and on TV screens is to do with humankind. There is a fair amount of speculation on the transitions of the supposed ancestors of man, the hominoids, in terms of anatomy and culture and the causes of and reasons for human qualities like a large brain and upright walking. Speculating on feeding habits by looking at fossil teeth and how this could have affected the evolution of the species or going by the geographical distribution of discovered fossils, speculating on where on earth mankind originated from and by what ways they spread around is common practice.

These assumptions are relayed by newspapers and TV channels with an air of certainty, using expressions containing not a trace of ambiguity and thus leaving no room for discussion. Phrases like 'Darwin's theory has been proven', 'the missing link in the evolution of man has been found' or, 'man's 4 million years old ancestor has been discovered' are commonly used. These catchphrases appear as if they are conveying the ultimate truth when they are in reality propagating the human evolution propaganda to the masses. The speculations of an evolutionist from a distant corner of the earth are relayed to us as if they were undisputed scientific facts.

Science magazines on the other hand confront us with an altogether different language when reporting on the same issues. There, we are faced with a more questioning style of reporting on issues like fossils, scenarios of the transition to an upright walking species, dexterity or the evolution of the brain. We see that contrary to what we are told by TV channels or newspapers, that evolutionist scientists are not agreed on the various scenarios and discoveries. An article in the Discovering Archeology magazine sums up this situation:

Perhaps no area of science is more contentious than the search for human origins. Elite paleontologists disagree over even the most basic outlines of the human family tree. New branches grow amid great fanfare, only to wither and die in the face of new fossil finds.[1](#)

The man's evolution propaganda propagated by TV channels and newspapers is, behind the scenes, totally controversial, inconsistent and based on speculation. Much of the information disseminated is thought to be scientific facts by most people whereas they are controversial suppositions merged with yet other disputed suppositions. The scenes of man's evolution are broadcast by TV channels in a cause-effect kind of style, appearing to be plausible to the viewer, whereas the same issues, when dealt with in science magazines, appear like the backstage where conflicting speculations are at war with one another creating a chaotic scene.

The two mediums interact continuously, where one represents the backstage from where new speculations emerge onto the stage or the screens of TV channels and newspaper pages, cleansed of all disputes and dressed up as scientific facts. In this fashion, new discoveries and speculations follow one another. Fossils, initially proclaimed as the missing links, are in time taken off the evolution tree, forgotten and replaced by newly discovered fossils. Day after day new scenarios, new stories emerge along with new scientists. The discoveries, scenarios and scientists emerging from behind the scenes may change in time but the play on stage is never disrupted and always the same: The tale of man's evolution.

EXAMPLES FROM AN ARTICLE (SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN)

A noticeable example illustrating the contradictions between the front and backstage is an article titled 'AN ANCESTOR TO CALL OUR OWN' published in the January issue of the Scientific American. Written by Kate Wong, it lets various evolutionists and their views on some recently discovered controversial fossils come to word. Wong claims that controversial new fossil discoveries could bring scientist closer to man's origins than ever before and states that these new fossils are discoveries, which could illuminate the era in which man is supposed to have evolved. However when reading the article, it becomes apparent that these fossils, never minds supporting the evolution scenarios, in fact create more confusion and cause even more disputes. These can be summarized as follows:

The article says on the newly discovered oldest fossils (*Orrorin tugenensis*, *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba*, *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*):

Not surprisingly, they have also sparked vigorous debate. Indeed, experts are deeply divided over where on the family tree the new species belong and even what constitutes a hominid in the first place... The conflicting views partly reflect the fact that researchers disagree over what makes the human lineage unique. "We have trouble defining hominids," acknowledges *Roberto Macchiarelli*, also at the University of Poitiers.²

This passage summarizes nicely the controversy and bigotry existing behind the scenes. Not even the scientists themselves know where or on what branch of the imaginary family tree and according to what anatomical features to place these fundamental fossils, claimed to stretch to our own kind. In reality, the above is an admission in disguise of a point we have always made: The only basis for the fossils on the family tree to be acknowledged as hominoid is the evolutionist bias. Evolutionists interpret and classify the fossils belonging to extinct species of apes and bygone races of humans from an evolutionist perspective and portray them as proof for evolution. Evidently, this represents a vicious circle: Evolutionists resort to supporting their hypotheses' with their own biased suppositions.

The paleontologists, Martin Pickford and Brigitte Senut, who discovered the *Orrorin tugenensis* fossil, dated to be 6 million years old, aim to destroy the paleoanthropological dogma by asserting that the ancestor of the Homo species is not *Australopithecus afarensis (Lucy)* but their own fossil. They claim that Lucy should be removed from her place she occupies in the evolution scenarios of man.

Lucy represents a species claimed for decades to be the most direct relative of man and became one of the most recognizable symbols of the evolution propaganda. Wong states that it is dogmatic to acknowledge Lucy as our ancestor and that evolutionists themselves object to this dogma. Unreported by Wong, Richard Potts too (Chief of the Smithsonian Museum's Department of Human Origins), investigating the *Kenyanthropus platyops* discovery, proposes that it is time for Lucy to be removed from the evolution tree.³ To put it bluntly, Lucy, after decades on the scene, is about to be demoted to a common ape species and knocked off stage.

On stage, we are told that hominoids learned to stand upright in the savannah looking out for predators and over time, they became an upright walking species. At the bottom of this claim lie geological presumptions to the effect that at the time of man's evolution, Ethiopia's Rift valley, where man is supposed to originate from, was arid and deforested. Wong's article states that this presumption had lost its meaning and goes on to say that the older so-called hominoids *Orrorin tugenensis* and *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba*, claimed to have walked upright, had in fact lived in densely forested areas. *C. Owen Lovejoy* from *Kent University*, on the other hand, rejects the scenario of the transition to *Homo erectus* outright and states that choosing to stand upright would not lead to becoming upright walkers. Again, the disputes behind the scenes expose yet another act on stage for decades to be nothing but a tale.

The Scientific American's article reveals a general contradiction in its concluding parts. The seasoned paleontologist Michell Brunet who discovered the *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* skull after spending the best part of 26 years in the desert searching for fossils to prove man's evolution, says on his discovery, celebrated by evolutionists as the find of the century: '*This is only the beginning of the story*' thereby stressing the need for much more hard work in the search for new fossil discoveries. This situation exposes the claims of man's evolution imposed on the people by TV channels and newspapers as blindly continued dogma devoid of scientific substance.

The contradictions listed above show that the evolution reports by TV channels and newspapers are comparable to stage magic, which quickly loses its effect when seen from behind the scenes. The evolution of man scenarios are full of contradictions and are easily recognizable as pointless arguments.

THE BIGGEST CONTRADICTION: EVOLUTIONISTS RESEARCHING THE ORIGINS OF MAN

Probably the most significant contradiction revealed by the man's evolution scenarios is the one inherent in the evolutionists themselves who are dedicated to proving man's evolution. These are people who have

dedicated their lives to proving that man evolved from some kind of primates and spend their lives excavating in deserts, but the family tree created by all their efforts does not provide any evidence for their theory. As we have seen from Wong's article the fossils forming the basis for the family tree are so controversial that not even evolutionists themselves know whether they actually benefit the claims of man's evolution (whether they are hominoid) or not. In short, evolutionists continue their work in an illusionary world. They have strong views which can never be proven. These efforts, continuing now for over a century, did not yield man's supposed evolutionary origins and did not go beyond some sort of a mix and match game played with bones.

If these researchers want to know the true origins of man, they should stop playing mix and match and digging for bones and begin to reflect on man's development in the womb and the subsequent birth. Could blind coincidences turn a cell into a human being consisting of 220 different types of tissue, with complex organs like eyes, ears, brain, kidneys and lungs, with blood circulation and nervous systems, a skeleton, muscles and other complex features? Could blind coincidences form faculties like language, speech and thought?

Clearly, these complex structures could not form by blind coincidences, and neither could the perfect development plan with its faultlessly functioning program. No computer chip, left to its own devices, would accidentally become a complete computer. When we see a computer, we realize that it was consciously designed by an engineer. Likewise, the fact that man is created by the division of a single cell and the complexity of the inherent systems show the existence of a conscious designer, a Creator. This Creator is the All-Powerful and All-Knowing God. He relates in the Quran the creation of man:

""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!"" (Qur'an, 23: 12-14)

1. "Family Fights: The search for human ancestors gives more heat than light," Discovering Archaeology, July - August 1999, p.36
2. "An Ancestor to Call Our Own," Kate Wong, Scientific American, January 2003
3. "Discovery rocks human-origin theories", Tim Friend, 21 March 2003: <http://www.usatoday.com/news/science/2001-03-21-skull.htm>

<https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/the-stage-and-backstage-in-the-supposition-of-mans-evolution-samples-from-the-scientific-the-scienti>