

a human ancestor in that timeframe. Now that a supposedly better candidate has appeared, Lucy's large molars may be her undoing.

Evolutionists do not deserve the almost child-like faith that untold millions of people have placed in them. For twenty-five years evolutionists have confidently assured the public that Lucy, *Australopithecus afarensis*, was our ancestor. Yet, one new fossil discovery has revealed how tenuous evolutionary pronouncements are. Dr Meave Leakey states: 'It is impossible to tell whether we are more closely related to Lucy or *K. platyops*. There is simply too much missing from the fossil record since then'.³ With so much missing from the fossil record since then, is it not child-like faith to believe (even if evolution were true) that either one of these fossils represents our ancestor? An old geological proverb states: 'If I hadn't believed it, I wouldn't have seen it'. It works in paleoanthropology, too.

This new discovery should encourage paleoanthropologists to be more cautious in their assessments. One of the most honest statements made recently by a paleoanthropologist is by Daniel Lieberman (George Washington University, Washington, DC) in the same issue of *Nature*.⁴ He writes: 'The evolutionary history of humans is complex and unresolved'. He goes on to say:

'I suspect the chief role of *K. platyops* in the next few years will be to act as a sort of party spoiler, highlighting the confusion that confronts research into evolutionary relationships among hominins.'

Since paleoanthropologists are working on a false paradigm, it is not surprising that each major fossil discovery presents more questions than it does answers.

An interesting footnote to the discovery of this fossil is that one of the authors of the *Nature* article is Louise N. Leakey, age 29. She is completing doctoral studies at the University of London, is the daughter of Richard and Meave Leakey, and is the granddaughter of Louis and Mary Leakey. She thus represents the third generation of

this amazing fossil-hunting family.

References

1. **Hominin** = member of subfamily Homininae so relates to genera including true humans and excluding australopithecines. Often used interchangeably with hominid, the evolutionist term for a species more closely related to humans than to chimpanzees.
2. Leakey, M.G., Spoor, F., Brown, F.H., Gathogo, P.N., Klarie, C., Leakey, L.N. and McDougall, I., New hominin genus from eastern Africa shows diverse middle Pliocene lineages, *Nature* **410**:433-440, 2001.
3. Cohen, P., Who's the daddy, *New Scientist* p.5, 24 March 2001.
4. Lieberman, D.E., Another face in our family tree, *Nature* **410**:419-420, 2001.

What evolution really means

[Most Americans] believe that evolution was a means by which God carried out a plan to create humans. For tactical reasons, Darwinists don't rush to tell all these people that they are *missing the point*, but all in good time. Let people first learn that evolution is a fact. They can be told later *what evolution means* (emphases added).

Phillip E. Johnson
Los Angeles Times,
3 November, 1990.

Did Lucy walk upright?

Michael J. Oard

For over 20 years, Lucy or *Australopithecus afarensis* has been considered one of our first 'ancestors', mainly because it supposedly walked upright.¹ Donald Johanson, the discoverer of Lucy near Hadar, Ethiopia, reflects on the significance of walking upright:

'In 1973, when I was barely out of graduate school, I found a human-like knee joint that proved beyond doubt that our ancestors walked erect close to three and a half million years ago—long before they developed the big brains that had once been thought to be the hallmark of humanity.'²

Evolutionists place great importance in walking upright and use it to define man's ancestors, although the origin of bipedalism is shrouded in mystery:

'Bipedalism has traditionally been regarded as the fundamental adaptation that sets hominids apart from other primates. Fossil evidence demonstrates that by 4.1 million years ago, and perhaps earlier, hominids exhibited adaptations to bipedal walking. At present, however, the fossil record offers little information about the origin of bipedalism ...'³

So it is important to know whether some fossil ape-like creature was bipedal or not.

Regardless of the status of Lucy's knee joint, new evidence has come forth that Lucy has the morphology of a **knuckle-walker**,⁴ which is a distinctly quadrupedal specialization characteristic of some living apes and is quite different than walking upright. Richmond and Strait identify four skeletal features of the distal radius of the living knuckle-walking apes, chimpanzees and gorillas. They also identify similar morphological features on two early 'hominids', including Lucy:

'A UPGMA clustering diagram ... illustrates the similarity be-