

The BEACON

Published by the Newton church of Christ
Meeting at: St. James Church St and Glendale Rd

Vol. 24, No. 4

Edited by John Cripps

April, 2010



Fraud and Forgery in Paleoanthropology

by Jerry Bergman, Northwest State College - December 23, 2009 - Part 3

He even discussed in detail the relationships between the eolith and the Paleolithic people, which he determined were two different races. He concluded the inferior race, the eoliths creators, became extinct. His stone examples caused Rutot to conclude that the eolith and other inferior races lacked the “progressive mutations” of the white race, and eventually followed the Tasmanian example and became extinct. Furthermore Pygmies, Bushmen, Fuegians, and North American Indians were next on Rutot’s list, and he made it clear that racial competition would eliminate many other groups as well. Like many other nineteenth-century anthropologists, Rutot stated that their extinction was a corollary of their social and biological primitivity. This was the “natural game of the laws of limitation, combined with the ever-extending development of the so-called civilized peoples.” Violent colonialism was just part of natural progress . . . Time served only as function of natural selection in which the mentally superior eventually massacred the inferior . . . In Rutot’s world there existed two options, “to evolve or to perish,” and both outcomes were direct results of biological determinism (Bont 2003, p. 619). A major confirmation of the existence of the eolith race was Piltdown man that, in Rutot’s mind, proved his theory because Piltdown was not only the old human fossil that the *éolithophiles* had been waiting for; it was even “excavated” in immediate association with Eolithic tools. Furthermore, most scientists interpreted the relatively developed skull as an argument in factor of parallel evolution, making Neanderthal a primitive dead-end side branch—a hypothesis Rutot had favored for some years. With regard to the dating, Rutot initially endorsed the claim of the influential Scottish anatomist Arthur Keith (1866–1955) that the cranium pieces were the remains of “Tertiary man.” Woodward and Dawson had more cautiously presented it as a Lower Quaternary find, but Rutot eagerly agreed with the English *éolithophiles* that the producer of the Pliocene Sussex tools had been discovered

(Bont 2003, p. 621). Rutot was later forced to change his mind about Piltdown man as new research proved his ideas wrong. Bont notes that both the Piltdown man and eoliths were “inextricably bound up with” efforts to find putative missing links to document evolution by the “believers . . . to prove their views” (Bont 2003, pp. 621–622).

Rutot’s Theory Disproved

The main evidence against the eolith theory was the discovery that perfect eoliths could be produced by natural forces such as pressure and temperature changes that caused rock flaking. Water movement could also produce the eolith pattern, which resembled a stone tool that had one or two chips, as opposed to a human made stone tool that had 20 to 100 flacks to produce a definite shape, such as a sharp edge that could be used for cutting or scraping. Hazzledine Warren extensively researched the fracture of flint for five years to evaluate the Eolithic theory, concluding that no clear evidence has been produced that proved the existence of eoliths (Hazzledine Warren 1905, p. 337). In his words, the eoliths “must be due to intelligent design on the part of man” but the evidence for this conclusion, “though attractive on the surface, is unscientific to the core” ending the three-decade-long debate (Hazzledine Warren 1905, p. 338). The famous paleoanthropologist Professor Marcellin Boule also came to the same conclusion (O’Connor 2003).

Charles Dawson’s Many Forgeries

Although most well known for his connection to the Piltdown fraud, Charles Dawson was also involved in numerous other questionable paleoanthropology finds that relate to human evolution (Bergman 2003; Russell 2003; Walsh 1996). Dawson “achieved recognition as a great, if not *the greatest*,” British paleoanthropologist of his day (Russell 2003, p. 10). Although Dawson earned a living as a solicitor, since his youth he spent much time exploring in search of, and collecting, fossils. He worked with Samuel Beckles, a distinguished geologist (Russell 2003, p. 13). Dawson eventually amassed a considerable collection of

reptilian and mammalian fossils that “aroused the interest of the Natural History Museum, which promptly bought it” (Walsh 1996, p. 16). So great were his achievements that in 1885 he was elected a fellow of the Geological Society at the young age of 21! Russell documents Dawson’s enormous productivity, enabling him to sell his many fossil discoveries to the British Museum’s “Dawson Collection” throughout the late 1880s to the early 1900s for large sums of money. His many important finds included three new species of dinosaur, one of which was named *Iguanodon dawsoni* by the palaeontologist Richard Lydekker. Later discoveries included the finding, in 1891, of teeth from a previously unknown species of Wealden mammal, later named *Plagiaulax dawsoni*. Dawson periodically continued his fossil-hunting activities up until 1911, at times working with Marie-Joseph Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, a young Jesuit priest and keen amateur geologist, discovering more unique remains, including a new species of mammal named *Dipriodon valdensis* and two new forms of fossil plant, *Lycopidites teilhardi* and *Salaginella dawsoni* (Russell 2003, p. 14).

Another problematic example was *Plagiaulax dawsoni*, a new mammal species and an “important missing link” in the evolutionary tree leading to humans. The find, a single tooth discovered in 1891, was submitted and evaluated by the curator of the British Museum of Natural History, Arthur Smith Woodward (Walsh 1996, p. 16). Woodward’s conclusion, based on the single tooth, was that the tooth was of a “transitional form between reptile and mammal” (Walsh 1996, p. 182). Then, 20 years later, Dawson discovered two more teeth, and soon after, Teilhard de Chardin found another tooth, all which they concluded confirmed their original conclusions. Since then, no more evidence of *Plagiaulax dawsoni* has come to light (Russell 2003, pp. 28–29).

As was true of many of Dawson’s finds the “date and location of the discovery are both vague” (Walsh 1996, p. 183). Research has now conclusively shown that *Plagiaulax dawsoni* is a fake (Russell 2003, p. 30). Dawson was an avid collector of fossils and likely modified some of the teeth in his collection to make them look more like those of the hypothetical missing link. All of the major persons involved in the *Plagiaulax dawsoni* fake were also involved in the Piltdown affair, and Dawson was the likely hoaxer. Dawson also used some of the same deception techniques used in perpetuation of the Piltdown hoax. All of his fossil and other finds eventually came under suspicion, causing a careful re-evaluation that proved many, if not most, of his discoveries questionable, if not outright forgeries.

Weiner concluded that the fieldwork that brought Dawson to the notice of paleontologists, from his first discovery, *Plagiaulax*, to his last, Piltdown, were evolutionary links (Russell 2003, p. 167). The scientific method is an ideal approach to gaining knowledge, but it is an especially difficult way to “prove” certain scientific hypotheses, such as those involving human origins. A good example of this difficulty is “the theory of evolution [which] is . . . a theory highly valued by scientists . . . but which lies in a sense too deep to be directly proved or disproved” (Broad and Wade 1982, p. 17).

Honest Paleoanthropologists

Evolutionists are at times very candid about the state of human evolution, such as Johanson’s admission that “nobody really places a great deal of faith in *any* human [evolution] tree” now (from interview with Johanson quoted in Morell [1995, p. 546] emphasis his). Yet, many of their arguments are over this tree, which seems to change with each new fossil find. The reason is that these trees are based on evidence so fragmentary that a variety of plausible interpretations are possible—which is a major reason for the many heated conflicts that the various participants in paleoanthropology have been involved in since the field originated over a century ago.

Conclusions

In a field based on little empirical evidence, many assumptions, and strong personalities, the bone wars illustrate the conflicts common among scientists in this area. The unprofessional and at times even fraudulent behavior of the leading participants is far from what one would expect from highly trained professionals. Holden concluded that the problem in paleoanthropology is the fact that this field naturally excites interest because of our own interest in our origins. And, because conclusions of emotional significance to many must be drawn from extremely paltry evidence, it is often difficult to separate the personal from the scientific in disputes raging within the field. . . . The primary scientific evidence is a pitifully small array of bones from which to construct man’s evolutionary history. One anthropologist has compared the task to that of reconstructing the plot of *War and Peace* with 13 randomly selected pages. Conflicts tend to last longer [than in other fields] because it is so difficult to find conclusive evidence to send a theory packing (Holden 1981, p. 737).

The fact that paleoanthropology is an “unexacting kind of science” (Medawar quoted in Hill 1986, p. 209). Tattersall and Schwartz even debated if paleoanthropology is a science (Tattersall and Schwartz 2002, p. 239). And, although the field is more sophisticated today “modern as

the undertaking has become, it continues to be riddled with controversies and dominated by personalities” (Holden 1981, p. 737). This brief survey supports Holden’s conclusion that the very nature of paleoanthropology encourages divisiveness. . . . Louis Leakey’s personal ideas about the extreme antiquity of the *Homo* line . . . continue to divide the field years after his death (Holden 1981, p. 737). Fraud and new discoveries are forcing so much revision in the paleoanthropology field that the *Time* magazine senior science editor stated that so many facts he once believed as a former science teacher to be true in evolution have been found to be false that he was forced to concede “just about everything I taught them [his students] . . . was wrong” (Headland 1997, p. 605).

References

Bergman, J. 2003. A history of the Piltdown hoax. *Rivista di Biologia/Biology Forum* 96, no. 3:457–484.

Bergman, J. 2006. The history of Hesperopithecus: The human-ape link that turned out to be a pig. *Rivista di Biologia/Biology Forum* 99, no. 2:205–224.

Bont, R. D. 2003. The creation of prehistoric man: Aimé Rutot and the eolith controversy, 1900–1920. *Isis* 94:604–630.

Broad, W. and N. Wade. 1982. *Betrayers of the truth: Fraud and deceit in the halls of science*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Coyne, J. 2009. *Why evolution is true*. New York: Viking Books.

Culotta, E. 2005a. Battle erupts over the ‘hobbit’ bones. *Science* 307:1179.

Culotta, E. 2005b. Discoverers charge damage to ‘hobbit’ specimens. *Science* 307:1848.

Cuozzo, J. 1998. *Buried alive: The startling truth about neanderthal man*. Green Forest Arkansas: Master Books.

Dalton, R. 2005a. Fossil finders in tug of war over analysis of hobbit bones. *Nature* 434:5.

Dalton, R. 2005b. More evidence for hobbit unearthed as diggers are refused access to cave. *Nature* 437:934–935.

Dalton, R. 2006. The history man. *Nature* 443:268–269.

Feder, K. L. 2006. *Frauds, myths, and mysteries: Science and pseudoscience in archaeology* 5th ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Fix, W. R. 1984. *The bone peddlers: Selling evolution*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Gardner, M. 2000. *Did Adam and Eve have navels? Discourses on reflexology, numerology, urine therapy, and other dubious subjects*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Gee, H. 2001. Return to the planet of the apes. *Nature* 412:131–132.

Harding, L. 2005. History of modern man unravels as German scholar is exposed as fraud. *The Guardian*, February 19.

Hazzledine Warren, S. 1905. On the origin of ‘Eolithic’ flints by natural causes, especially by the foundering of drifts. *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 35:337–364.

Headland, T. N. 1997. Revisionism in ecological anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, 38, no. 4:605–630.

Hill, A. 1986. The gift of taungs. *Nature* 323:209.

Holden, C. 1981. The politics of paleoanthropology. *Science* 213:737–740.

Hooper, J. 2002. *An evolutionary tale of moths and men; The untold story of science and the peppered moth*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Judson, H. F. 2004. *The great betrayal: Fraud in science*. New York: Harcourt.

Klaatsch, H. 1923. *The evolution and progress of mankind* (ed. and enlarged A. Heilborn, trans. J. McCabe). New York, New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company Publishers.

Kohn, A. 1988. *False prophets: Fraud and error in science and medicine*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books.

Lewontin, R. C. 1995. *Human diversity (Scientific American library series)*. New York: W. H. Freeman & Company.

Lieberman, D. E. 2009. *Homo floresiensis* from head to toe. *Nature* 459:41–42.

Morell, V. 1995. *Ancestral passions the Leakey families and the quest for humankind’s beginnings*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

O’Connor, A. 2003. Geology, archaeology, and the raging vortex of the ‘Eolith controversy.’ *Proceedings of the Geologists’ Association* 114:255–262.

Russell, M. 2003. *Piltdown Man: The secret life of Charles Dawson & the world’s greatest archaeological hoax*. Gloucestershire, Great Britain: Tempus Publishing.

Tattersall, I. and J. H. Schwartz. 2002. Is paleoanthropology science? Naming new fossils and control of access to them. *The Anatomical Record* 269:239–241.

Walsh, J. E. 1996. *Unraveling Piltdown: The science fraud of the century and its solution*. Random House: New York.

Weiner, J. S. 2003. *The Piltdown forgery*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wong, K. 2009. Rethinking the hobbits of Indonesia. *Scientific American* 31, no. 5:66–73.

WATCH THE WORD AND THE SWORD EVERY 1st and 3rd TUESDAY OF THE MONTH

WHKY 14 Out of Hickory NC USA
The Theme For The Broadcasts Is CREATION versus EVOLUTION.
8pm - 10pm
Your Host - John Cripps

Was Adam The First Human? (Kent E. Heaton Sr.)

The curiosity of man is an active mind that seeks to

know the unknown. These qualities have helped our world achieve many discoveries and through the thirst for knowledge, have made our world a better place to live. Man is not satisfied if he cannot find an answer and will strive to uncover every rock and explore every cave to find the answer. Many times the answer cannot be found and man has to wait until new technology is created to help him seek those answers. There are many times that man will never be able to know the answer as it is hidden from his knowledge. This is especially true when man approaches a study of the Bible. The evidence of the Bible itself in many ways can only be determined by internal revelation and belief in those things that man cannot see. While there are myriad's of evidences the Bible is true and accurate in details proven outside the pages of God's Word, many must be taken with faith. As the Hebrew writer described the essence of faith in **chapter 11**, he said: "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen ... By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which are visible." (**vv 1,3**) The only knowledge we have about the beginning of the world is found in the Bible. With all the science of man and his abilities to discover new things, he is limited in habitation to know and understand more than the Bible reveals about how the world was formed. This has raised many questions in his mind and he has sought to justify his thirst for answers with speculation and theories. One such problem is found in **Genesis 4:17**, "And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Enoch. And he built a city, and called the name of the city after the name of his son-- Enoch." The age old question has been, "Where did Cain get his wife?" It has been suggested that there was another "human race" on the earth at the time and existed prior to Adam. This would help to explain where all the wives came from and how the earth was populated in the beginning. In concert with this question is whether Adam and Eve were the first 'humans' or not. There is an answer to these

difficult questions - not a full answer that would satisfy all men - but for those who believe in God (**Genesis 1:1**), an answer that is solid and proven. As with any question such as this, the first thing that must be undertaken is whether one will accept the Bible as the inspired word of God. The Bible is the complete and full revelation of God's will to man and it is complete in its authority ... it must be the basis of all answers given. God has revealed to man everything he needs to know about His will. The Bible teaches that Adam was the first man and Eve was the first woman. "Then the LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to tend and keep it ... Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned according to the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come ... And so it is written, The first man Adam became a living being ... For Adam was formed first, then Eve." (**Genesis 2:15; Romans 5:14; 1 Corinthians 15:45; 1 Timothy 2:13**) Luke's account of the genealogy of Jesus shows the humanity of the Son of God when he concludes in **Luke 3:38**: "the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God." In **Deuteronomy 32:8**, it reads: "When the Most High divided their inheritance to the nations, when He separated the sons of Adam, he set the boundaries of the peoples according to the number of the children of Israel." Adam was the first man and Eve the first woman. The wives that came to their sons came from the loins of Adam and Eve as was accepted by God in propagating the earth at that time. There is harmony and wisdom in God's design as the earth was filled with men. To a large degree this happened again many years later when Noah's sons repopulated the earth. In all things, Adam was the first man - the conclusions from thereon are evident.