

Many Experts Contend that Scientists' Missing Link Fossil Not Worth the Media Hype

Contributed by Administrator
 Wednesday, 27 May 2009
 Last Updated Wednesday, 27 May 2009

Many Experts Contend that Scientists' Missing Link Fossil Not Worth the Media Hype
 by Stephen Yulish PhD

It never ceases to amaze me how far people will go to deny the truth. I have written about this unique phenomenon many times before in many different contexts. People do not want to believe the Bible, for if they do they will have to acknowledge their sin. As noted evolutionist, Thomas Huxley, once said he did not read the Bible because he would have to give up all his women and he was not ready to do that. Even though it often takes more blind faith to believe that humans or even god originated on a distant planet in a galaxy far away or than it does to believe that we evolved from ancient, primitive, primate ancestors than it does to believe that "God made man in his own image" (Genesis 1:27), people still do not want to go there to safeguard their sins. Why, I ask, is it such monumental earthshaking news to find out that we all descended from primates rather than were created by God? That should be bad news not good news unless your aim is to discredit the Bible which it usually unfortunately seems to be.

While I usually can and do attack such machinations by relying on the ultimate authority of the word of God, this time I will use other scientists to challenge these outlandish claims of a "missing link". I think that I have a certain modicum of veracity in this area as well. I have a BA in Human Paleontology from Case Western University in 1969 and my senior thesis Anterior Tooth Reductions in Ramapithecus was published in 1970 in the prestigious journal Primates, vol.11, no.3, September 1970, pages 255-263 by the Japan Monkey Center. In it, I measured dozens of teeth on the ancient pre hominid Ramapithecus skulls and compared them to teeth of apes, gorillas and humans to try and show that Ramapithecus was a transitional creature, a so called "missing link". My efforts and data proved otherwise. So I know of what I am asserting.

I ran across an excellent article which came out on May 21, 2009 in Life Sciences by Clara Moskowitz entitled Scientists Missing Link Fossil Not worth the Media Hype and that article is the basis of my analysis. All the media hype began May 19, 2009 at a press conference at the American Museum of Natural History in New York where we first heard about this 47 million year old primate fossil that researchers said was the "missing link". They alleged that this "scientific discovery will ultimately revolutionize how we understand our own evolution." Even NYC Mayor Michael Bloomberg called it an "astonishing discovery." Later, the History Channel revealed that there was also a book involved and they ran a special on May 25 hyping the discovery.

The origins and eventual custody of this fossil are immediately suspect. While apparently originally discovered in 1983, it bounced around dealers and back rooms until its supposed discovery many years later. It was named Darwinius Masillae in honor of Charles Darwin, and the Norwegian paleontologist who announced this find nicknamed it Ida after his daughter. While noted British naturalist Richard Attenborough was convinced that this was indeed the "missing link" between primates and humans, how did other scientists react?

Stoneybrook University paleontologist, John Fleagle, when asked what does this find tell us about human evolution that we don't know, answered "precious little!" The fossil, he said, "is certainly significant for what it cannot tell us about early primate evolution." While most paleontologists agreed that the fossil was an exceptional presentation because 95% of the fossil was still intact which is extremely rare, most also agreed that saying that it was an early precursor of humans was unlikely. Chris Gilbert a paleoanthropologist at Yale said that "on the whole, I think that the evidence is less than convincing." "They make an intriguing argument but I would definitely say the consensus is not in favor of the hypothesis by those proposing it."

Its teeth, toe, and ankle bones resemble monkeys and apes more than primitive lemurs said Paleontologist Richard Kay of Duke University who commented that the researchers on this find "failed to cite a body of literature that beginning in 1984 provides evidence that contradicts their claims." Anthropologist Matt Cartmill of Duke also commented that "the public relations campaign on this fossil is I think more of a story than the fossil itself. It is a very beautiful fossil but I didn't see anything in this paper that told me anything decisive that was new." Chris Beard, curator of vertebrate paleontology at the Carnegie Museum of Natural History in Pittsburgh commented that "it is not a missing link. It is not even a terribly close relative to monkeys, apes or humans. It has been hailed as the 8th wonder of the world but I have ten more of these in my basement."

The fact that Ida lacks a grooming claw and lacks a tooth comb is similar to some other monkeys and these are only minor variations according to scientists.

The bottom line is that while many have said that my Russian ancestors were ugly, none has ever said that they looked like Ida pictured above Thank God!