

Post-Flood man is becoming smarter and more human

Michael J. Oard

It is typical for evolutionists to attempt to make post-Flood man, such as Cro-Magnon Man, Neandertal Man, and *Homo erectus*, primitive. Their paradigm demands that these ancient men from the post-Flood, Ice Age period had recently evolved upward from an ape-like creature. But there has been a steady stream of archeological, geological, and paleoanthropological finds over the years that indicate ‘primitive’ man was smarter and more human than previously thought. This trend continues with a number of recent discoveries.

Acheulian tools now older

Acheulian tools are supposed to be some of the earliest types of tools used by our ancient ‘ancestors’ of the ‘Lower Paleolithic’, a little more than a million years ago on the evolutionary timescale. It is claimed that these are ‘index tools’ for *H. erectus*—a type of human that lived during the Ice Age.¹ The only earlier type of tool, or supposed tool, is the Oldowan industry attributed to *H. habilis* (handyman). Scientists are now finding Acheulian

tools older than expected, back to 1.76 Ma.² So, now the Acheulian tools are found to overlap with the Oldowan ‘tools’. Man was using more sophisticated tools earlier than previously thought.

H. habilis being scrubbed as our first ancestor

However, the supposed users of the Oldowan tools, *H. habilis*, the first-in-line human candidate that is said to have evolved from the ape-like ancestor, is taking a beating as an ancestor and as a taxon. Ann Gibbons reports in *Science*:

“But in the past decade, the handyman’s status has been undermined. Newer analytical methods suggested that *H. habilis* matured and moved less like a human and more like an australopithecine, such as the famous partial skeleton of Lucy. Now a report in press in the *Journal of Human Evolution* finds that *H. habilis*’s dietary range was also more like Lucy’s than that of *H. erectus*, which many consider the first fully human species to walk the earth.”³

Furthermore, over the years paleoanthropologists have been putting diverse, fragmentary fossils into the category of *H. habilis*, making the taxon a ‘waste bin’ or ‘grab bag’ with little validity.⁴ So, *H. habilis* really is not a valid ancestor, which begs

the question of whether his tools, the Oldowan industry, really are tools. If they are, then another possibility is that they are from man. It is even possible that modern types of people lived at that ‘time’ and used the Oldowan tools, but evolutionists of course reject this idea because of their evolutionary bias.

Neandertal tools come under challenge

And speaking of stone tools, Mousterian tools have been assumed to be the exclusive claim of the Neandertal people, who mainly inhabited Europe (figure 1). But just recently archeologists discovered Mousterian or Mousterian-like tools in a cave in the foothills of the western Ural Mountains, just south of the Arctic Circle.^{5,6} Apparently Neandertals were smart enough to live in what is believed to be a very cold location during the Ice Age.

However, human remains have not been found, which has caused a stir among paleoanthropologists of whether the occupants were really Neandertals. The automatic designation of Mousterian tools as Neandertal by most archeologists reveals that they simply pigeonhole supposed ancestors and/or tools into an evolutionary time slot, a form of circular reasoning. This is like index fossil dating for sedimentary rocks.

To upset the simple pigeonholing of data into preconceived slots, some



Figure 1. Depiction of a Neandertal domestic scene from Gamal Cave, northwest Israel.

archeologists have disputed whether Neandertals were capable of living in a cave that far north during the Ice Age, which they think was much colder than today. (A post-Flood Ice Age would have started out with cool summers and mild winters and ended with mild summers and very cold dry winters,⁷ so it may not have been bitter cold in the foothills of the Urals during the Ice Age.) In the process of disputing the assumption that the tool makers must have been Neandertals in the Russian cave, the investigators argued over whether tools really can pin-point the man—a sacred cow of European archeology.

Some archeologists take issue with this practice, claiming that modern-looking ancient humans in Africa, the Near East, and western Asia made Mousterian-like tools. Others contend that there are no exceptions in Europe for the Mounsterian tools = Neandertals equation, so why wouldn't this be the case elsewhere.

Pressure flaked tools pushed back 55,000 years

Ice Age man's abilities are improving with more data. For instance, pressure flaking of stone tools was thought to be a development of the Upper Paleolithic, about 20,000 years ago after man had evolved far enough. But recently, pressure flaked stone tools have been discovered at Blombos Cave, South Africa, and ascribed to the Middle Paleolithic and 'dated' about 75,000 years old.⁸ So, this stone tool industry has been pushed back 55,000 years further than previously believed.

Post-Flood man processed plants earlier than thought

Because of evolutionary assumptions, scientists have presumed that European Paleolithic food was meat and fat, with infrequent plant consumption. But they have discovered plant starch grains from various wild plants on the surfaces of grinding stones in Italy, Russia, and the

Czech Republic.⁹ So now vegetal food processing, and possibly the production of flour, was a *common* practice across Europe at least 30,000 years ago on the evolutionary timescale.

What lessons can creationists learn?

It is truly amazing how human post-Flood man is becoming with further discoveries. I am sure that with many more discoveries, say over another hundred years, Ice Age man will be as smart as us but without technology. Ice Age man is, and will continue to be, clearly distinguished from apes, supporting what the Bible teaches against evolution—that organisms were created after their kinds in Genesis 1.

It also shows that evolutionists speculate way too much on meager evidence and jump to wild conclusions based on wishful thinking. Henry Gee, reviewing a new book on early human fossils, states:

"We have all seen the canonical parade of apes, each one becoming more human. We know that, as a depiction of evolution, this lineup is tosh. Yet we cling to it. ... Almost every time someone claims to have found a new species of hominin [ape-like ancestor], someone else refutes it. ... Dart's original paper on *A. africanus* was, it is true, long on waffle and short on substance."¹⁰

Gee is saying that that icon of ape-to-man evolution shown in so many biology and evolutionary books is false, but they still use it anyway (probably for propaganda purposes). This is exactly as claimed by Jonathan Wells in *Icons of Evolution*.¹¹ Why can't the evolutionists be honest with the data?

It also warns us creationists not to jump to conclusions with meager data and little analysis. There are so many claimed 'slow processes' and other contradictions to biblical earth history and the Flood from the evolutionary establishment. Such claims need to be thoroughly evaluated by examining

the data first, making sure that the data isn't theory laden and that data has not been left out. After a thorough data check, I have found that with patience I can usually find a reasonable solution to a challenge, for instance the problem of how dinosaurs can make tracks, lay eggs, and scavenge dead dinosaur bone beds early in the Flood.¹²

References

1. Lubenow, M.L. *Bones of Contention: A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils*, revised and updated, Baker Publishing Group, Grand Rapids, MI, 2004.
2. Lepre, C.J., Roche, H., Kent, D.V., Harmand, S., Quinn, R.L., Brugal, J.-P., Texier, P.-J., Lenoble, A. and Fiebel, C.S., An earlier origin for the Acheulian, *Nature* **477**:82–85, 2011.
3. Gibbon, A., Who was *Homo habilis*—and was it really *Homo*? *Science* **332**:1370, 2011.
4. Gibbon, ref. 3, p. 1371.
5. Balter, M., Did Neandertals Linger in Russia's far North? *Science* **332**:778, 2011.
6. Slimak, L., Svendsen, J.I., Mangerud, J., plisson, H., Heggen, H.P., Bruguère, A. and Pavlov, P.Y., Late Mousterian persistence near the Arctic Circle, *Science* **332**:841–845, 2011.
7. Oard, M.J., *Frozen in Time: The Woolly Mammoth, the Ice Age and the Biblical Key to Their Secrets*, Master Books, Green Forest, AR, 2004.
8. Mourre, V., Ville, P. and Henshilwood, C.S., Early use of pressure flaking on lithic artifacts at Blombos Cave, South Africa, *Science* **33**:659–662, 2010.
9. Revedin, A., Aranguren, B., Becattini, R., Longo, L., Marconi, E., Lippi, M.M., Skakun, N., Sinityn, A., Spiridonova, E. and Svoboda, J., Thirty thousand-year-old evidence of plant food processing, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **107**(44):18815–18819, 2010.
10. Gee, H., Craniums with clout: A look at two early human fossils reveals the prejudices in ideas about human evolution, *Nature* **478**:34, 2011.
11. Wells, Jonathan, *Icons of Evolution, Science or Myth?: Why Much of What We Teach about Evolution is Wrong*, Regnery Publishing, Washington, D.C., 2000.
12. Oard, M.J., *Dinosaur Challenges and Mysteries: How the Genesis Flood Makes Sense of Dinosaur Evidence—Including Tracks, Nests, Eggs, and Scavenged Bonebeds*, Creation Book Publishers, Powder Springs, GA, 2011.