

# Eve or Ape

Genes do not explain life – something else is happening

=====

Our present situation is more clearly understood if we see that the platform for the "anti-human" program is Humanist philosophy! Humanist philosophy is based on the theory of chance evolution and that theory relies entirely on 'plausible' explanations of how evolution creates life by chance mutations and natural selection.

When we understand this we see where comes the need for fanatical defence of this frail non-scientific, theory.

Large donations to leading Universities (encouraged by government tax concessions), gave private interests power to direct research. Thus human culture became open to corruption! As specialists in various disciplines are usually too involved in their speciality to see life's big picture, the matter of whether life may be a chance creation or a creation of intellectual design, seems rarely considered by most.

Fanatics go to great lengths to defend their projects. A University department head is said to have removed pages from a magazine to avoid challenging argument. That stupidity failed and served the culprit poorly, but more sophisticated censorship, backed by money, disinformation and given plausibly disguised alternative, works very well.

Blanket censorship on public research is not clever; but a showing of matters few people understand or appreciate, on 2nd level TV, cause no problems. If seen by some who are concerned they find it difficult to challenge or dissect from a single viewing. To further minimise danger of challenge, copies may only be available to approved educational facilities or have some form of security agreement.

Once set up, all DVD sales are profitable. So this slight-of-hand (deceit of mind) form of censorship is obviously not about profit!

Junk needs no ban! Ban of research findings invites suspicion and is dangerously ineffective. But, put it on some public media; make it available to education facilities; no one can say it's banned.

What education facility is going to publicise it? Public education has indoctrinated Humanist philosophy over generations. Educators do not like challenge to what they teach and don't invite rocking the boat.

Christian schools feel under siege! Their attitude is that if they restrict belief of their followers to dogma they need make less effort to defend themselves against science. Who cares about truth? What religion has the faith to enter research for discovery of truth? Never mind claim of scripture, truth becomes just what each sect teaches its faithful followers.

So the security against public exposure of the fact that the theory of chance evolution was never scientifically accepted has worked perfectly – to now.

Luckily some areas of research, challenging to evolution dogma, have been noticed. They are practical; they fit logical perception better than chance evolution does; would it be surprising if, when intellect is free to openly seek truth, the alternatives will find common ground?

Homo Futurus, a documentary about a new, non-evolutionary theory of human creation - origins and future – was displayed; 7th May '07. SBS TV. Copies not available but points from the Internet support memory.

Quote: *"What made early humans stand up and take their first steps? What is the next step in human development?" ... are some of the questions raised by this documentary which takes a new non-Darwinian look at our history.*

*"Two researchers, palaeontologist Anne Dambricourt-Malasse and orthodontist Marie-Josephe Deshayes, have uncovered a curious fact about the sphenoid, a small bone at the base of the skull. Over millions of years, each change in the sphenoid's position brought a new species into our primate family."*

## **An Internet comment on that program: Quote:**

*"The main idea presented in the documentary was that the large changes in hominid evolution have been driven by increasing flexion of the sphenoid bone, which is an important part of the skull. The flexing changes the shape of the skull and neck bones, leading to increased brain volume and more upright posture. The first major flexing made monkeys 40 million years ago then another created the great apes 20 MYA, another 6 Mya made australopithecus, another made Homo 2 Mya, and 150,000 years ago the last flexion made Homo sapiens. ...*

*The various people interviewed stressed that this was all done internally - ...[not by] adaptation to environment."*

*"I wasn't sure what was meant by this - if sphenoid*

*flexing did indeed lead to more intelligent hominids, then the more intelligent beings would be able to plan hunts for food better and evade predators more successfully, and so would be naturally selected." ...*

*The people in the documentary then started talking about Asian skulls, and came to the conclusion that the last sphenoid flex occurred roughly simultaneously in both European longitudes and in Asia, so that Homo sapiens arose independently in more than one place. The advantage of this theory is that it means that humans didn't have to leave Africa twice, but merely once. Unfortunately, independent evolution in Europe/Africa and Asia into Homo sapiens is preposterous from a DNA perspective." ...*

**[Note: That viewer misses the point! Chance lacks foresight; change, beneficial in future environment and occurring suddenly after long intervals, denies gradual mutation. The research argument is valid but not conclusive. This is not the first science to see that change is not related to gradual DNA evolution.]**

**Academia is unable to admit simple progressive design because the risk of being ridiculed and denied university employment is too great. But the evidence that creation can only occur by design and is impossible by chance is beyond all logical challenge.]**

*"The main palaeontologist interviewed, Anne Dambricourt-Malassé, put her name to a petition put out by the Discovery Institute. The documentary caused quite a stir in France, and mainstream biologists ridiculed it, saying that Dambricourt doesn't do science, that her ideas are not revolutionary, there are many more factors at work than just the sphenoid, you can't separate internal and external factors, and that the documentary is theology disguised as science.*

*...*

*"You'll note that the intervals between sphenoid flexings gets shorter and shorter. It was said a couple of times that it was as though the evolution was driven by some internal clock."*

**[Note: In our literature you will see that change needs planning. It needs timing with the development of earth until ready for the human development.]**

As shown in gniebxbbeing, physics cannot explain our universe; nor, despite 100 years of determined effort, can plausible genetics explain life. All life was planned by one mind in service to life development. Evolutionists pretend the small differences between genes of man and ape is proof of relationship but common genes are common!

Earth changes, life-forms appear! Plausible claims aren't good enough! Something else is happening. Evolution never attained standing of science; let us look at other research that challenges this theory.

**The dolphin connection: Quote:**

***"Characteristics that distinguish us from apes may have been forced on our ancestors by the presence of water, writes Ruben ...***

*"If the proponents of a revolutionary theory of human origins are correct, our ancestors abandoned the trees not for the Savannah, but for the water – and humans share more physical traits with dolphins than with apes. ...*

*"This means that the story of how our ancestors developed the characteristics that distinguish us from the apes will have to change ...*

*"At the recent Dual 98 Congress on Palaeontology and Human Biology ... Elaine Morgan. ... For the past 27 years she has been promoting an alternative hypothesis on human origins which was put forward by scientist Alistair Hardy in 1960. Hardy noticed that humans share certain physiological attributes with aquatic mammals. ...*

*"Hardy was advised by his academic mentors not to pursue the subject for fear of damaging his career. [as] In the savannah hypothesis palaeontology already had a "good enough" story to explain bipedalism.*

Well does "good enough" plausible dogma satisfy you? Present philosophy, based on these "good enough" arguments, has produced the kind of human behaviour that will destroy us? Is that good enough for you?

Same designer, same principles, same materials, same tools, same nature – an intelligently progressive plan.

Checking the URL from which I obtained original information related to the "Dual 98 Congress on Palaeontology and Human Biology" I found it closed. Is there now public access from any source? Any scientific congress, conference or research that reveals the weakness of the evolution theory, appears to fade from public view.

New research on ageing will be hard to ignore! It's now known that our genes include an ageing control. Anyone who thinks this very intricate system could have been created by chance has never developed the logical ability they were born with. See DVD TA-65 Seminar October 26th 2008. [www.alsearsmd.com](http://www.alsearsmd.com)

**Follow up for the above:**

**<http://home.snafu.de/ulisses/tursiops.htm>**

**For unchallenged evidence against chance creation see examples scattered on this site.** For associated literature on the human situation: [www.lifetruth.org.au](http://www.lifetruth.org.au) or:

[www.themindweb.com](http://www.themindweb.com) or:

[www.gniebxbbeing.org.uk](http://www.gniebxbbeing.org.uk)