

What About Prehistoric Man?

Terry L. Mabery

Terry Mabery was baptized at age 13 in 1958. As a teenager, preached monthly for two rural Missouri congregations. He was married in 1965 to Mary (Herbst) Mabery. They have two grown children, Shelley (married with four sons) and Brett (still single). Terry is a 1967 graduate of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale with a bachelor's degree in education and did post graduate work in physics at the University of Minnesota, summers of 1969 through 1971 (no degree completed). He taught mathematics and physics in public schools in St. Louis County 1967-1977 and during that time became a deacon of the Lemay church of Christ in St. Louis County, working with youth and evangelism. He was hired part time by the Lemay church in 1975 to work with youth and evangelism and then hired full time by the Lemay church in 1977 to work with youth and evangelism. In 1979 Terry began full time preaching with the Lemay church. In 1997, left the Lemay church of Christ to begin preaching for the Collinsville church of Christ, Collinsville, Illinois, where he now preaches. He has served as an elder of the church in Collinsville since December 1999. Terry has preached in lectureships, gospel meetings and youth rallies in Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Virginia, and West Virginia. He has preached in and directed crusades to Jamaica, West Indies and has also preached and participated in mission trips to Murmansk, Russia, the largest city in the world above the Arctic Circle. He also has taught in the Murmansk Bible College.

INTRODUCTION

A trip to the Museum of Natural History can be very informative. When one comes to the history of mankind, one might very well view a display depicting the evolution and development of man from some prehistoric being.

A study of biology will usually include a study of human ancestry. Textbooks might include pictures depicting the evolution from some ape-like being to human. The text describes how, through the fossil evidence that has been found, one can trace the beginnings of man.

EARLY MAN ACCORDING TO THE EVOLUTIONIST

The evolutionists will tell us that the earth is 4 to 5 billions of years old and that man is a recent newcomer to this earth. What we know about the earliest man, prehistoric man, comes from fossils and artifacts that reveal traces of their life. Human-like beings supposedly first appeared in the Old Stone Age about 3 to 4 million years ago. Since that time man has gone through many stages to supposedly evolve into the human being of today.

Actually the story of the human family began between 5 and 8 million years ago in Africa. It is proposed that a population of ancestral apes evolved into two different lineages. One line eventually evolved into the present day gorillas and chimpanzees. The other eventually evolved into present day man.

That first human-like being would have lived among deer, giraffes, horses, cave lions, sabre-toothed tigers, and other animals, some similar to present day animals and others now extinct. He had both ape-like and human-like qualities. According to the evolutionist, he could walk on two legs, although quite clumsily. He probably spent much of his time climbing in the trees. He had an ape-like brain about the size of an orange. These ape-like creatures became extinct

between 1 and 1.8 million years ago and were probably significant in the evolution of modern man.

The evolutionist says the first true humans appeared on the scene about 1.8 million years ago. He is known as Homo Habilis, or “handy man,” because he was the first tool-maker, fashioning crude tools from stone. He first appeared in Africa. He was taller than his ancestors and had a larger brain. He would set up camp wherever there was a food source of fruits, roots, nuts and vegetables found growing wild. He may have also scavenged meat from animal carcasses. Small groups probably banded together for protection and efficiency. He could not make fire, but he probably learned to use fire for warmth and protection when found from natural causes like lightning strikes.

Evolutionists suggest that the Homo Habilis gave rise to Homo Erectus, or “Upright Man,” about 1.6 million years ago. He was about the same size as modern humans and had a more human-like face. However, his brain was about two-thirds the size of modern man. He was probably the first hunter, used large stone tools, and he developed fire-making skills. Therefore, he was better protected from animals and had more freedom to move about. He also began to cook his food consistently, making him healthier. About a million years ago he began to slowly leave Africa and travel to other continents. He continued until about 300,000 years ago.

About 500,000 years ago the first Homo Sapiens, or wise man, entered the scene. These had skeletons very much like our own. Yet, they had slightly larger brains. This early man was a hunter and gatherer. He created and used stone tools, bone needles, and bone fish hooks. He made clothing from animal skins. One of the best known species of this early man was the Neanderthal man. He was much taller than modern man, and very strong. He was a marvelous hunter and was adept at making fire. He often used caves as a home. He probably communicated with others through a spoken language. He died out about 30,000 years ago.

Modern man appeared before the Neanderthals became extinct. Fossils indicate that modern man was in South Africa and the Middle East about 100,000 to 200,000 years ago and has remained relatively unchanged since then. This early man built permanent homes to shelter himself from the long, harsh winter. In the summer he would follow the herds and lived in a tent. He was a very capable hunter/gatherer. Life was no longer a constant struggle for survival. He went on organized hunts and learned to cure and store food. Clothing was more sophisticated and ornate. Jewelry, pottery, and art were developed. Tools were more skillfully made. Of course, today's human is a highly developed, modern Homo Sapien. The modern Homo Sapien evolved in Africa, and from there spread into the rest of the world. He reached North America some 12,000 years ago.

FALLACIES OF THE EVOLUTIONISTS' VIEW

According to Marvin L. Lubenow, “Evolutionists use several lines of evidence in promoting the concept of human evolution. One is studies of living animals, specifically primates. Another is the arrangement of the fossil material. A third is molecular data” (19).

Studying primates to support human evolution is fundamentally flawed. In these studies the evolutionist must assume that humans and the other primates are related if the study is to help understand human nature and behavior. Then he will turn around and use the study on the other primates to help explain the alleged evolution of humans. This is “begging the question.” Any results would be based upon an original assumption, and therefore invalid.

To illustrate, suppose you come upon someone walking down the street snapping his fingers. Out of curiosity you ask why he is repeatedly snapping his fingers. He replies that snapping his fingers keeps elephants away. When you point out that there are no elephants anywhere near there, he smugly replies, “See? It’s working.”

The man assumed that snapping his fingers kept away the elephants and then used the absence of elephants to prove the effectiveness of his assumption. That is exactly the type of reasoning that takes place with the study of primates to support human evolution (Lubenow 19).

Study of molecular data is also flawed. These are experiments on present-day animals, plants, or biological molecules. Such studies might show the possibility of certain changes taking place in the past, but they cannot prove that those changes took place as assumed and alleged. In order to prove those events took place, one must have historical evidence. There is a difference between scientific evidence and historical evidence (Lubenow 20).

Lubenow illustrates the fallacy in the following manner.

It is believed that in the American Revolution George Washington and his men crossed the Delaware River to attack the city of Trenton. How would one go about proving that event? If one used the scientific method, he would do research on boats, measure the width and flow of the river, do studies on the rowing of boats, and perhaps even row across the Delaware River himself. Would all of this data prove that Washington crossed the Delaware? No. Scientific evidence is not what is needed. Historical evidence, such as records of eyewitnesses or of persons closely associated with those who were involved, is what is needed. All the scientific method could prove is the *possibility* that Washington crossed the Delaware, not that he actually did so (20).

The study of fossil material is the third evidence given for human evolution, and it is the primary basis given for the evolutionist’s view of prehistoric man. Several problems create great difficulty in reconstructing prehistoric man from the fossil record, however.

One problem is that reconstruction often comes from a few bones, teeth, or other fragments found in different strata, great distances apart, at different times. For instance, the famous “Java-man,” discovered in 1891 by Dr. Eugene Dubois, was touted for decades as the “missing link.” He was known as *Pithecanthropus erectus*, or erect ape-man. He was reconstructed from a small piece of the top of a skull, a fragment of a left thighbone, and three molar teeth collected over a range of about seventy feet over the span of one year. There is no assurance, therefore, that these were all of the same being.

Second, the artist's preconceived ideas play a big part in the reconstruction. From a few small fragments we are given a drawing of a creature from the artist's imagination. Different artists give differing views of the creature based upon the same fragments. The view changes greatly when flesh and hair are put to the skeletal view.

Third, most studies are done, not on the actual fossils, but on casts of the fossils, or even on papers written about the fossils or casts. This is because of the extreme value and delicate nature of the fossils themselves. Casts are very good, but they are still not the real thing. A classic illustration of this problem is the Piltdown Man hoax. Fossils supposedly found in the early 1900's in a gravel pit at Piltdown, Sussex, England, were actually faked. The hoax was not revealed until about forty years later. When attempts were made to study the fossils, casts would be given instead. These casts did not reveal file marks and other defects on the original "fossils."

A fourth problem is the inexact science of dating the fossil record. The evolutionist needs millions of years for the view given of prehistoric man. Each category of the prehistoric man must fall into a preconceived time period for evolution to be true. Most paleontologists, therefore, have already been prejudiced about the fossil record. Fossils that seem to be less human or more human must fall into certain time periods. Otherwise, they are viewed with suspicion. Reasons are then sought to put them into the "correct" time frame or to change what is thought about the fossil itself. Actually, different dating methods reveal a much different picture of the fossil record. There are scientifically based dating methods that give a young view of the earth, thousands of years instead of billions of years. These greatly alter the view of the fossil record.

Even if these problems are overlooked and overcome, paleontology in itself is an inexact science. Most everyone has seen a sequence of pictures depicting the supposed evolution of man. These usually begin with some small, primitive creature evolving into prehistoric man, characterized as a stooped brute of a creature. The sequence eventually shows that these evolved into modern humans. These pictures are based upon the fossil record. According to Dr. Lubenow:

What is not generally known is that this sequence...is a very artificial and arbitrary arrangement because (1) some fossils are selectively excluded if they do not fit well into the evolutionary scheme; (2) some human fossils are arbitrarily downgraded to make them appear to be evolutionary ancestors when they are in fact true humans; and (3) some nonhuman fossils are upgraded to make them appear to be human ancestors...At this point I merely want to emphasize a phenomenon that seems almost universally unrecognized: *Any series of objects created by humans (or God) can be arranged in such a way as to make it look as if they had evolved when in fact they were created independently by an intelligent being* (21).

Lubenow went on to illustrate this by telling of a graduate course he took on Paleontology. The professor was attempting to teach the concept of taxonomy and the construction of the familiar evolutionary family trees. Each student was given a package of metal objects, such as nails, tacks, and paper clips. Using the rules of evolutionary taxonomy, the students were to arrange the objects in evolutionary order. When finished, each student had created an evolutionary tree of nails, tacks, and paper clips. Of course, no two students arranged their objects in exactly the

same manner, though they were similar. The fact is, there was and is no actual evolutionary relationship between the objects. The only relationship was in the mind of the arranger. So it is with the fossils. There is no way to determine conclusively genetic relationships of fossils. Such relationships are in the mind of the arranger, and the preconceived ideas of the evolutionist has helped him arrange the fossil record to “prove” his evolutionary theory and give us the view of prehistoric man as is usually depicted (21-23).

It was that preconceived idea of evolution that for decades gave an improper view of prehistoric man. One of the most well known of the “prehistoric men” is the Neanderthal man. In the early 1900's Marcellin Boule, a famous paleontologist, was given the task of reconstructing the Neanderthal man from the most complete Neanderthal skeleton that had been found in Western Europe at the time. Boule reconstructed a rather apish looking brute that did not walk upright. He was sort of hunch backed. His head was thrust forward. Supposedly, he could not extend his legs fully, walking with a bent-knee gait. Boule ignored the pathological evidence that showed the skeleton had been deformed due to arthritis and rickets. That was the picture given for forty-four years until there was a re-examination of the Neanderthals. It has now been determined that they appeared much as we do today.

From all this, one should easily see that it is the prejudice and the preconceived ideas of evolution that have directed the popular view of prehistoric man. This view cannot be proven by the fossil record, by a study of the molecular data, or by a study of living primates.

AN ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATION

Granted, there have been some frauds dealing with the fossil record. Otherwise, the fossil record is correct. It is not a matter of incorrect data, it is the interpretation of that data that is questionable. As has been seen, the fossil record has been stretched, bent, and otherwise compromised at times to fit the evolutionist's preconceived ideas. However, there is an alternative view of mankind that is consistent with the fossil record. That will now be considered.

According to the Bible, the first humans were not like brute beasts, but were intelligent with reasoning powers and a language. God brought the beasts and the birds unto Adam to be named, and he named them (Genesis 2:19-20). When the woman was brought to Adam, he said, “This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man” (Genesis 2:23 — ASV). Later, Adam took of the forbidden fruit when he “hearkened unto the voice of [his] wife” (Genesis 3:17 — ASV). They also reasoned intelligently regarding the forbidden fruit, choosing to disobey God's command. Later they reasoned about their nakedness before God and one another (Genesis 3:1-13).

The first men of the Bible were gatherers (Genesis 1:29). It was only after the great flood that man began to eat of the beasts of the field (Genesis 9:3), and in the second generation after Noah departed from the ark, Nimrod was known as a mighty hunter (Genesis 10:8-9).

In just the second generation of man, Cain was skilled enough to build a city. One should not conjure up, however, an image of a large city. “In Genesis 4:17 (the first occurrence), the word

`ir means a 'permanent dwelling center' consisting of residences of stone and clay ... `ir simply represents the 'place where people dwell on a permanent basis'" (Unger, White 58). Later, there is a record of Cain's descendants who were nomadic, dwelling in tents near where their cattle grazed (Genesis 4:20). Yet, it must not have been uncommon for some to dwell in caves, even as late as the days of Abraham. For when Lot and his daughters fled Sodom, they dwelt in a cave in the mountains (Genesis 19:30).

There were also skillful people among the descendants of Cain, both in the arts and in tool making. There was "the father of all such as handle the harp and pipe" (Genesis 4:21 — ASV) and "the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron" (Genesis 4:22 — ASV).

Is the Bible record, however, consistent with the fossil record? The answer to that question is an unequivocal "yes."

Adam and Eve were to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth (Genesis 1:28). They had sons and daughters (Genesis 5:4). Conditions prior to the flood were much different and much better for life than now. Men lived hundreds of years because the atmosphere gave protection from the harmful ultraviolet rays of the sun and because the atmospheric pressure would have increased the amount of oxygen in the atmosphere (Cates 98-99). This would have been very beneficial to the health of man and animal. Man could marry close relatives because there had not been the causes nor the time for genetic deterioration that now causes problems when near relatives intermarry. It has been estimated that there were less than four million people at the time of Noah (Murphy 193). As would be expected, then, there are few fossils found in layers of deposits considered to be pre-flood. Most of the human fossils have been found in the Pleistocene deposits, which are considered to be post-flood. This too, makes sense. It has been estimated that by the tenth generation after Noah, the days of Abram, the population of the earth was over fifteen million people (Murphy 252). In addition, because of the changes in the conditions on earth after the catastrophic flood, the life span decreased rapidly so that many others had already died. Hence, there would be more fossils in those respective deposits.

In the fifth generation after Noah, the earth's population was still somewhat localized in the land of Shinar (Genesis 11:1-2). There they attempted to build a great city and a great tower (Genesis 11:3-4). However, God confused their language so that there was a multiplicity of languages and they could not communicate one with another. This event caused a migration into the various parts of the world (Genesis 11:5-9). Conditions after the flood would have caused great glaciers (Cates 94-96) that allowed travel into all continents.

As this migration took place, the world population would have been dispersed into small groups that were geographically isolated. Each of these more isolated groups would carry with it only a fraction of the genetic characteristics of the total population. Traits that were pretty much suppressed due to being diluted in the larger population now emerged rapidly with the in-breeding which occurred within the smaller, geographically isolated groups. As a result, differences in skeletal structure and other features, such as skin pigmentation, became pronounced from group to group (Gish 324-325). For instance, considering skin color alone, Duane T. Gish wrote the following.

It is possible...for a man and woman of appropriate genetic mix to have sixteen children, one of whom could be black, one of whom could be white, and the other fourteen children could be of various mixed shades of color. A report documenting an occurrence of somewhat the same nature was published in *Parade*, a newspaper weekly magazine [1983]. According to this report, Tom and Mandy Charnock of Leigh, a city near Manchester, England, had parented fraternal twin boys, one of whom has white skin, blue eyes, and blond hair, and the other has dark skin, brown hair, and brown eyes. The mother was the daughter of a Nigerian father and a white English mother, while the father was of white English parents (326).

In addition, as these smaller groups of the population dispersed from one another, some of their original skills may have been lost from group to group. A smaller population in a larger geographical area meant that there was a reduced need for weapons and protection. Food would be more plentiful, meaning that some agricultural practices would no longer be needed as simple gathering of food would suffice. There would be less interchange of ideas with other groups. Thus progress would be retarded. It would be possible that even more primitive states would come about. As population centers developed more rapidly in some areas, such as portions of Europe and Asia, civilization developed as well. Where population was more sparse, such as the Americas, Australia, southern Africa, and parts of Europe, a more primitive state existed (Gish 324-25). "The Tasaday people of interior Mindanao are a modern-day example of this process. They became separated about 500 to 1000 years ago. Today they possess no knowledge of agriculture, have few tools, and no weapons" (Huse 139-40).

CONCLUSION

The different skeletal human fossils that supposedly indicate human evolution do not occur in nice, chronological order in the deposits of the earth as would be the case if evolution were true. Rather, the different kinds of fossils can be found in different strata of the earth's deposits. Some supposedly earlier fossils, by evolutionary ideas, have been found in later deposits and later ones in earlier deposits. Different kinds of fossils have been found in the same layer of deposits. This, however, is consistent with the alternative, Biblical view.

What, then, can be said about prehistoric man? "Prehistoric" indicates that which is prior to written history. Since the Bible gives us the written history of the first man, there is no true "prehistoric" man. Prehistoric man is a figment of the evolutionist's imagination. He has been developed from the evolutionist's view of the fossil record as he attempts to place that record into his preconceived ideas of what it should show. Therefore, as one views the displays in the museums and reads the pages of biology textbooks, one should realize that the displays, the pictures, and the descriptions cannot be proven to be true by science. On the other hand, there is nothing in the Bible that is inconsistent with the scientific evidence.

Works Cited

- Ankerberg, John, and Weldon, John (1998). *Darwin's Leap of Faith*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers.
- Biology: A Journey Into Life*. (1994). Orlando, FL: Sounders College Publishing.
- Biology: The Dynamics of Life*. (1998). Westerville, OH: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill
- Cates, Curtis A. (1994). *The Noahic Flood*. Memphis, TN: Cates Publications
- Cuozzo, Jack (1998). *Buried Alive*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books
- Donn, Lin & Don (1998). *The Life and Times of Early Man*. Website:
<http://members.aol.com/Donnpages/EarlyMan.html>
- Frair, Wayne, and Davis, Percival (1994). *A Case for Creation*. Lewisville, TX: Accelerated Christian Education, Inc.
- Gish, Duane T. (1995). *Evolution: the Fossils Still Say No!* El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research
- Huse, Scott M. (1997). *The Collapse of Evolution*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books
- Jackson, Wayne (1983). "Questions and Answers." **Reason & Revelation**, Volume III, Number 10. Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press, Inc.
- Lubenow, Marvin L. (1992). *Bones of Contention*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books
- Major, Trevor (1996). "Human Evolution: The Molecular and Fossil Evidence — Part I." **Reason & Revelation**, Volume XVI, Number 9. Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press, Inc.
- Major, Trevor (1996). "Human Evolution: The Molecular and Fossil Evidence — Part II." **Reason & Revelation**, Volume XVI, Number 10. Montgomery, AL: Apologetics Press, Inc.
- Morris, Henry M. (1998). *Scientific Creationism*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books
- Murphy, James G. (1998 reprint). *Barnes Notes: A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books
- Unger, Merrill F., and White, Jr., William. (1980). *Nelson's Expository Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers